

FAYETTEVILLE CITY COUNCIL/CUMBERLAND COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES, MEETING ROOM B
1225 RAMSEY STREET, FAYETTEVILLE, NC
NOVEMBER 18, 2010
8:00 A.M.

Present: Mayor Anthony G. Chavonne

Council Members Keith Bates, Sr. (District 1) (departed at 8:30 a.m.); Kady-Ann Davy (District 2); Robert A. Massey, Jr. (District 3); Darrell J. Haire (District 4); Bobby Hurst (District 5); William J. L. Crisp (District 6); Valencia A. Applewhite (District 7); Theodore W. Mohn (District 8); Wesley A. Meredith (District 9)

Commissioners Billy R. King, Chairman; Kenneth S. Edge, Vice Chairman; Dr. Jeannette Council; Marshall Faircloth; Phillip Gilfus; Jimmy Keefe; Ed Melvin
Commissioner Elect Charles E. Evans

Others Present:

Dale E. Iman, City Manager
Doug Hewitt, Assistant City Manager
Kristoff Bauer, Assistant City Manager
Karen M. McDonald, City Attorney
Michael Gibson, Parks and Recreation Director
James Martin, County Manager
Juanita Pilgrim, Deputy County Manager
Amy H. Cannon, Assistant County Manager
Rick Moorefield, County Attorney
Phyllis Jones, Assistant County Attorney
Sally Shutt, County Communications and Strategic Initiative Manager
Dr. John Lauby, County Animal Services Director
Kenny Currie, County Emergency Services Director
Thomas Lloyd, County Planning and Inspections Director
Torn Cooney, County Public Utilities Director
Marie Colgan, County Clerk
Candice H. White, Deputy County Clerk
Rita Perry, City Clerk
Members of the Press

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Billy R. King, Chairman of the Cumberland County Board of Commissioners, and City of Fayetteville Mayor Anthony G. Chavonne called the meeting to order.

2. CONSOLIDATION OF E-911 FACILITY

Mr. Kenny Currie, County Emergency Services Director, presented this item and provided an overview of the consolidation information of the two primary Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), Cumberland County and City of Fayetteville. Mr. Currie summarized the history of the phased consolidation process and provided an update on the timeline of future mergers, equipment, training, and human resources. He clarified that personnel and building construction costs were the two funding issues.

Mr. Currie explained that before grant applications could be submitted for brick and mortar to build the consolidated dispatch facility, a commitment would be needed from both the City and the County through either a letter of understanding or agreement that would state the two agencies were willing to combine into one E-911 center.

Mr. Currie responded to questions and discussion ensued regarding personnel costs, salary discrepancies, employee shifts, and equipment costs. Mr. Currie stated the County's 50/50 funds would have to be spent by July 1, 2012, and would have to be committed to public safety.

He further stated grant applications could be submitted the first of 2011 and because consolidated E-911 centers were one of the top priorities, there would likely not be any

limitations on the amount of funds that could be applied for. He also stated if the two centers were merged, the County could possibly get more funds than the centers could get separately. Mr. Dale Iman, City Manager, stated the City needed to develop data because it had nothing to support potential personnel costs or savings.

Mr. Currie stated the consolidation was not about saving dollars but was about saving seconds and lives, and providing citizens in the City and the County the same level of service. He explained why ultimate efficiencies would not be realized until combined services were centralized. Mr. Currie responded to additional questions and discussion continued.

Mayor Chavonne stated the City would have their decision by January 31, 2011.

3. REGIONAL TRANSIT STUDY RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mayor Chavonne referenced the Phase 2 or final report on the Consolidated Transportation Development Plan that had been presented to the City and the County by the consultant, RLS Associates, Inc., and stated the next phase would be the development of an interlocal agreement and an implementation plan to accomplish the overall objective of mobility management that would focus on ADA and para-transit. Mayor Chavonne asked whether the County had interest in pursuing efficiencies as identified by the consultant.

Mr. Thomas Lloyd, County Planning and Inspections Director, reviewed discrepancies contained in the final report; to include door-to-door transportation for the elderly and disabled; the fact that County ridership had increased rather than decreased; a decrease in the County's per unit cost; and other transportation provided to rural residents through the addition of a partnership with Workforce Development. Mr. Lloyd requested the report depict accurate data if it was the decisive factor in the assessment process.

Mr. Lloyd responded to questions and discussion followed. Mr. James Martin, County Manager, stated it was the County's belief that the recommendation of the report was that the County would agree to consolidate all current County transportation services through the Fayetteville Area System of Transit (FAST). Mr. Martin further stated based on the cost of units for travel with FAST, the bottom line was that the consolidation would result in the County paying a higher cost per unit of travel and therefore reduce the units of service provided to County residents who qualify for County transportation services.

County and City staff responded to additional questions and discussion continued, Commissioner Council inquired whether correct data could be incorporated into the report so that neither party moved forward with incorrect information. Commissioner King suggested that the Board of Commissioners reassemble in order to revisit the question. Mr. Martin stated in February, the County indicated to the consultants that it would be willing to support a recommendation to move forward together if there was a provision that the transportation service could be provided at the lowest unit cost. Mr. Martin further stated his understanding was that this never got included as a recommendation within the report either.

Mayor Chavonne suggested that the consultant meet with the County and the City simultaneously to resolve the issues to ensure agreement on the facts contained within the report. Mr. Martin requested that the City coordinate the meeting with the consultant.

4. PARTICIPATION OF PWC IN COUNTY WATER PROJECTS WATER SERVICE AGREEMENT BETWEEN PWC AND GRAYS CREEK WATER AND SEWER DISTRICT MIA SEWER SERVICE AREA AGREEMENTS

Chairman King stated the County was seeking clarification on two existing agreements related to the Public Works Commission (PWC) that were affecting the Gray's Creek Water and Sewer District. Chairman King called on Rick Moorefield, County Attorney, who stated the County was seeking clarification of the City's interpretation of the term "at the PWC standard wholesale rate".

Mr. Moorefield further stated under the terms of the tri-party agreement, the County was led to believe that PWC would have a standard wholesale rate which would be offered to the County, but later learned from Mr. Steve Blanchard, PWC CEO/General Manager, that there was no published standard wholesale rate. Mr. Moorefield also stated as of November 15, 2010, he was informed that 65 psi was needed at the connection point and PWC had 74 psi; however, PWC would not commit to a figure.

Mr. Moorefield advised the County was running out of time because it had to have a contract in place by December 7, 2010, for bond consideration by the Local Government Commission.

Mr. Moorefield advised that this had become such a critical issue that he was prepared to recommend the Board of Commissioners to notice the City that the County considered this lack of commitment from PWC as a breach of the tri-party agreement. Mayor Chavonne advised that PWC had in fact confirmed its wholesale rate was the same rate as bulk water sold to the Town of Stedman, Hoke County, and Aqua NC. Mayor Chavonne stated this had been submitted to the County in a written memorandum the day prior. Mr. Moorefield stated that he had been out of the office all of yesterday and was not aware of the memo. Mr. Moorefield stated that this would be an acceptable way to determine the wholesale rate and that understanding would resolve the rate issue. He stated that the County still needed confirmation on the delivery pressure issue. Mayor Chavonne asked Mr. Moorefield to write down the specific questions that were remaining so that he could obtain the answers by the end of the day.

5. DETENTION CENTER CAPACITY

Chairman King stated the Board of Commissioners had agreed to move forward with expansion of the Detention Center. Mr. Iman confirmed City Council members had been invited to attend the Detention Center Expansion Kick-Off meeting on Tuesday, November 23, 2010.

6. MURCHISON ROAD REVITALIZATION

Chairman King stated the understanding was that the Murchison Road Corridor Development, including the implementation of a redevelopment plan and the securing of HUD Section 108 loan funding, was one of the City Council's strategic targets for actions. Chairman King inquired regarding the plans for revitalization and whether there was anything the County could do to help move the plan forward.

Mr. Iman provided a brief overview of the Murchison Road Revitalization Study to include project description, background, and funding status. Mr. Iman stated redevelopment of the Washington Drive School, which was owned by the MLK Memorial Park Committee, was included in the targeted southern Murchison Road area and the property needed to be dealt with in order to advance efforts to redevelop the area into a productive use. Discussion followed regarding the County's gifting of the property to the MLK Memorial Park Committee, the Committee's subsequent inability to sell the property, the vandalism and degradation that ensued, and efforts by the City to resolve the issues.

Chairman King stated the Board of Commissioners would support positive action to remediate the school property.

7. ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICES (TO INCLUDE ENFORCEMENT OF THE TETHERING ORDINANCE)

Dr. John Lauby, County Animal Services Director, provided information regarding the number of calls responded to, citations written against the tethering ordinance, and limitations under the current tethering ordinance that would impact how enforcement was enacted. Dr. Lauby responded to questions and discussion followed.

Mr. Moorefield stated although the City adopted the County's ordinance, problems had arisen because of differences in codification which required the use of different citation books. Mr. Moorefield further stated some of the enforcement aspects had not been well thought out. Mr. Moorefield stated the solution was for the City to apply the same ordinance within its jurisdiction so County Animal Services could do a better job with enforcement. Mr. Moorefield further stated that he hoped to work with Chief Judge Keever to develop a procedure to take all code enforcement actions through Environmental Court rather than the regular court dockets so the process would be more streamlined. Mayor Chavonne stated the City had interest in having the same ordinance as the County.

Mayor Chavonne inquired regarding service levels on weekends and evenings. Dr. Lauby stated three to four officers were available on Saturday and Sunday, two of which were on standby for emergencies, and two officers were on duty after 6:00 p.m. Mayor Chavonne then inquired regarding the telephone messaging system. Dr. Lauby explained a new phone system had been installed so calls would have a 45-second response time and would be received by a

live person; voicemails would be retrieved every two minutes.

CountyManagerMartin asked Mr. Moorefield to explain the ordinance regulations for barking dogs. Mr. Moorefield advised that barking dogs were not encompassed in the City's animal services ordinance but the City's noise ordinance. He explained this was what citizens generally preferred, and that it was only enforceable by City police.

Dr. Lauby responded to additional questions regarding officer response time, protection for officers, and financial resources to include dog license fees. Mayor Chavonne asked that the County explore the collection of fees from veterinarians for remittance to the County and stated this had created a lot more money for animal services in some counties.

8. PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN

Mayor Chavonne stated the 2006 Parks and Recreation Master Plan did not have an accompanying funding plan and the City Council would like to explore funding in the amount of \$86 million to locate facilities throughout the County through a bond referendum within the next 12 to 24 months. Mayor Chavonne asked if the Board of Commissioners would support a bond referendum.

Mr. Michael Gibson, Parks and Recreation Director, responded to questions and stated a potential funding package that would incorporate just about everything in terms of facilities would come back to both bodies within the next 6 months with the hope that there would be an opportunity to place this item on a ballot within the next 18 months.

9. GATEWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Ms. Juanita Pilgrim, Assistant County Manager, stated she had been in contact with Mr. Richie Hines, N.C. Department of Transportation, regarding the use of Department of Corrections' state prisoners to help clean up the main roads in Cumberland County at six sites. Ms. Pilgrim stated she received a response that the sites would be reviewed and Mr. Hines would then contact the Department of Corrections to get the County on the schedule for clean up. Mayor Chavonne asked that the sites be forwarded to the City. Mr. Iman stated the City's interest was somewhat broader in that the City would like to see signage, landscape improvements, and improved property maintenance.

Commissioner Council stated both she and Council Member Davy would meet with the joint committee.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the availability of funds and budget requests for the next year.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.