

**FAYETTEVILLE CITY COUNCIL
WORK SESSION MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
SEPTEMBER 3, 2024
2:00 P.M.**

Present: Mayor Mitch Colvin

Council Members Katherine K. Jensen (District 1) (arrived at 2:11 p.m.); Malik Davis (District 2); Mario Benavente (District 3) (via Teams); D. J. Haire (District 4); Lynne Greene (District 5); Derrick Thompson (District 6); Brenda McNair (District 7) (arrived at 2:07 p.m.); Courtney Banks-McLaughlin (District 8) (arrived at 2:12 p.m.); Deno Hondros (District 9)

Others Present: Douglas Hewett, City Manager
Lachelle Pulliam, City Attorney
Kelly Olivera, Assistant City Manager
Jodi Phelps, Assistant City Manager
Kimberle Braden, Police Chief
Kevin Dove, Fire Chief
Loren Bymer, Marketing & Communications Director
Jerry Clipp, Human Resource Development Director
Rob Stone, Construction Management Director
Brian McGill, Interim Assistant Public Services Director
Gerald Newton, Development Services Director
Willie Johnson, Chief Information Officer
Joshua Hall, Police Attorney
Erin Swinney, Police Attorney
Chris Cauley, Economic and Community Development Director
Kim Toon, Purchasing Manager
Kecia Parker, Real Estate Manager
Michael Gibson, Parks, Recreation and Maintenance Director
Pamela Megill, City Clerk
Members of the Press

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Colvin called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

2.0 INVOCATION

The invocation was offered by Council Member Haire.

3.0 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by City Council.

4.0 CITY MANAGER REPORT

There was no report for this meeting.

5.0 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Council Member Haire moved to approve the agenda.
SECOND: Council Member Davis
VOTE: UNANIMOUS (8-0)

6.0 OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS

6.01 Market House Project Pedestrian Improvement and Traffic Mobility Discussion and Direction

Mr. Byron Reeves, Assistant Public Services Director, presented this item and stated Council was previously presented two options for

improvements at the Market House to improve ADA access and pedestrian safety around the building. Option A consisted of extending the brick paver into the inner traffic circle, with traffic rated concrete brick paver crosswalks. Option B consisted of milling and paving to a 4,400 sq. ft. square, creating a square traffic pattern with ADA slopes, traffic rated concrete brick paver crosswalks, and extending the arcade from the base of the steps. Council selected to move forward with Option B.

With converting the roundabout to a traffic square, the traffic control type will be the primary factor when considering the functionality of the project. There is a high likelihood that stop signs will need to replace the current yield signs on the circulating flow of traffic. Currently traffic can free flow through the roundabout, however, with the proposed layout Council approved, a vehicle would likely have to make four complete stops when making a left turn through the proposed square. Staff is uncertain if this was Council's understanding of the traffic control type when they selected the square option, and if not, how would it have weighed in on their decision.

Additionally, queuing on the approaches to the traffic square could become an issue due to the use of stop signs. Traffic may queue back to traffic lights on Person, Gillespie, and Green Streets as traffic flows through the traffic square due to the expected increase in delay when all movements have to stop. The full impact would be determined through a Traffic Operational and Safety Analysis. With this analysis, traffic counts would be collected to determine peak traffic hours, directional distribution of traffic, and the existing operation efficiency of each intersection. This analysis will also take into consideration downtown development, FAMPO model outputs, and historic growth rates to apply to alternatives while evaluating the different signal controls. The analysis is crucial to provide both near- and long-term solutions that balance the need for both pedestrian and traffic mobility around the Market House and is recommended to be conducted to evaluate both the traffic square and other alternatives previously presented to Council for a Design year of 2050.

The schematic drawings previously provided do not contain a detailed survey. There were no elevations or control points provided. Utility locates were not collected or incorporated in the schematic drawings either. Staff has visited the site and noted existing items within the project limits were not reflected on the schematic plan set and would be in conflict with what is proposed (e.g., concrete islands, streetlights, signs, etc.). Also, the existing crown in the traffic circle conveys stormwater inward toward the Market House, however, existing storm sewer alignments and structures were not included either in the schematic drawings. The conceptual analysis will be developed base off acquiring a survey to identify any impacts to existing right-of-way, utilities, and other surface features.

There is approximately \$1.1 million in available, unencumbered funds to complete this project. This funding will need to be used to complete detail design, produce construction drawings and documents, and construction.

Staff did review the consultant provided construction estimate, which appeared to be adequate based on major line items that could be confirmed and provided assumptions (based on lump sum, not quantities) on items such as drainage, landscape, irrigation, and building lighting. The construction estimate was less than \$1,000,000.00, which aligns with what was presented to Council. Upon completion of the conceptual analysis (35 percent design), more detailed cost estimates will be presented based on quantities, not lump sum.

The cost to perform the needed traffic operational and safety analysis and conceptual evaluation of proposed pedestrian and traffic improvements at the Market House is approximately \$100,000.00.

Staff is updating Council on next steps and confirming interest in current pursuit. Staff is excited to move forward with a traffic operational and safety analysis and a conceptual evaluation of the previously presented alternatives to ensure that pedestrian and traffic mobility around the Market House is properly evaluated before moving forward with detail design and construction. The estimated schedule to complete this analysis is 5 to 6 months. Upon completion, staff will bring back to Council to present a recommendation on a path forward.

There is no impact to the General Fund. Previously appropriated State grant funding will be used to complete the work as proposed.

Discussion ensued.

MOTION: Council Member Benavente moved to remove the mural around the Market House.

SECOND: Council Member Banks-McLaughlin

VOTE: FAILED by a vote of 5 in favor to 5 in opposition (Council Members Colvin, Davis, Haire, Thompson, and McNair)

MOTION: Council Member Davis moved to select Option A.

SECOND: Council Member Banks-McLaughlin

VOTE: PASSED by a vote of 8 in favor to 2 in opposition (Council Members Benavente and Banks-McLaughlin)

6.02 Establishing a Scoring Matrix to Prioritize Demolition Projects

Ms. Jennifer Baptiste, Development Ombudsman Manager, presented this item with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and stated In order to be good stewards of the demolition funds provided to the department from the City and continue to remove blighted buildings, the Development Services Department is proposing to utilize a Demolition Spreadsheet to determine priority demolition projects.

The Code Enforcement Department is charged with the heavy task of actively enforcing certain Chapters of the City of Fayetteville's Municipal Code of Ordinances:

Chapter 10 - Fair Housing

Chapter 14 - Housing, Dwellings, and Buildings

Chapter 27 - Trailers, Manufactured Homes, and Manufactured Home Parks

Chapter 30 - Unified Development Ordinance

These sections include the regulation of substandard housing and subsequent demolition of said structures.

Recently, the American Planning Association spotlighted Genesee County Land Bank Authority's (Land Bank) process for ranking demolition projects. The Land Bank is a public/private organization that receives funding from Genesee County, Michigan; the City of Flint, Michigan; Michigan State; and several private foundations to mitigate blight within the City of Flint and Genesee County. Between September 2022 and February 2024, the Land Bank received approximately \$52,000,000.00 in funding.

By having the aspect of being a private entity, the Land Bank has the authority to purchase properties, remove any dilapidated structures or rehabilitating the structure, as well as perform any property cleaning if needed. Once improved, the property is either retained by the organization, donated to a nonprofit organization for a tax write off, or sold for redevelopment. Funds received through the sale of a property is often reinvested in the organization's demolition program.

The Land Bank uses a scorecard to determine the feasibility of demolishing each property or the rehabilitation of structures. The scorecard uses several factors such as location, extent of structural damage to the building, etc.

Currently, the City of Fayetteville does not utilize a scorecard system to evaluate demolitions, and although the City is not a land bank, there are merits to the City using a scorecard with demolitions. The main importance being that the scoresheet would ensure that demolitions are based on the same established criteria identified below:

1. **Structural Damage** - Structural damage considers the safety of the structure as well as both the visual and physical perspective of the building by asking specific questions.
 - a. Does the building have substantial or minor fire damage?
 - b. Are there obvious structural damage such as missing roofing components? Damaged or missing wall elements?
 - c. Are there hidden interior utility damage such as electrical or plumbing issues?
2. **Time on the Demolition List** - Time on the demolish list seeks to give structures that have a history of being identified as blighted in the City additional consideration for demolition.
3. **Ordinance** - These points are given if a demolition ordinance has been issued by the City Council.
4. **Financial Cost** - Financial Cost identifies how much of the funds provided by the City Council are being allocated to the demolition of one property. In an effort to stretch the funding provided, more points are given to demolitions that utilize less than 20% of the allocated demolition budget.
5. **Crime** - Crime looks at how many police calls are registered to the property or how many Code Enforcement Complaints have been received over the last five years.
6. **Location** - Location considers if the blighted structure is located within a certain distance of a school, park or public facility. If the structure is within a floodplain, other environmental sensitive area, or within a neighborhood revitalization area, then the structure can obtain points as well.

Points are assigned to each criteria and then a multiplying factor is then used. The multiplying factor allows more weight to be given to certain criteria such as structural damage, time on demolition list, and financial cost. These criteria were identified by staff as being most important to the demolition request. This scoresheet will be done prior to and submitted as part of the Demolition Ordinance request packet to City Council.

This measure can help the Development Services Department, and the City, plan current and future demolition projects by identifying projects that are fiscally responsible.

Discussion ensued.

MOTION: Council Member Hondros moved to receive the report and the City Council Initiated Demolition Score Matrix.
SECOND: Council Member Banks-McLaughlin
VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

6.03 City Council Agenda Item Request - Innovation District - Mayor Colvin

Mayor Colvin presented this item and stated he would like for the City to create an Innovation District to encourage cluster innovation and technology related services.

We need to be thinking about 25 years in advance planning. We need to increase labor growth, other communities have created innovation districts, our best performers are health and defense. Oklahoma City, and Boston, are good examples of cities that have created innovation districts.

Discussion ensued.

Consensus of Council was to direct staff to move this item forward.

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:42 p.m.