COUNCIL MINUTES

The City Council of the City of Raleigh met in a regular session at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 2016 in the City Council Chamber, Room 201 of the Raleigh Municipal Building, Avery C. Upchurch Government Complex, 222 W. Hargett Street, Raleigh, North Carolina, with the following present.

Mayor Nancy McFarlane, Presiding
Councilor Mary-Ann Baldwin (absent & excused)
Councilor Corey D. Branch
Councilor David Cox
Councilor Kay C. Crowder
Councilor Bonner Gaylord
Councilor Russ Stephenson
Councilor Dickie Thompson

Mayor McFarlane called the meeting to order and invocation was rendered by Reverend John L. Saxton, Unitarian Universalist Fellowship of Raleigh. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilor Dickie Thompson. Mayor McFarlane stated Ms. Baldwin is excused from the meeting.

The following items were discussed with action taken as shown.

RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL AWARDS

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT – PATRICK BUFFKIN – PRESENTED

Mayor McFarlane explained the Certificate of Appointment presentation and presented a certificate to Patrick Buffkin who was recently reappointed to the Parks, Recreation and Greenway Advisory Board. In accepting the Certificate, Mr. Buffkin expressed appreciation to the Council for allowing him to be of part of what makes Raleigh great.

AGENCY GRANTEE PRESENTATION

AGENCY GRANTEE PRESENTATION – TAMMIE LYNN CENTER – COMMENTS RECEIVED

Holly Richard, Sara Hansen and Jeana Ellis representing the Tammy Lynn Center were present to express appreciation for the contributions and participation of the City of Raleigh in their program. Ms. Richard talked about the grant from the City of Raleigh which enables them to carry out the Early Intervention program. She stated if it were not for the funding from the City of Raleigh, this program could not occur.

Sara Hanson talked about the growth of the Early Intervention program pointing out in the 14/15 year the program served some 138 students with 1500 volunteer hours; thus far in the 15/16 fiscal year they have served 134 students and provided 1400 hours. She stated their work has doubled; they have been able to hire a consultant to help provide bilingual services pointing out 68% of the children in the program are from the City of Raleigh. She expressed appreciation for the contribution which enables them to do this work.

Jeana Ellis, Director of Services told about the growth and the benefits of the program. She stated they have a waiting list and with the first opening being in July. She stated they would love to have additional space so that they can serve all of those who apply. She expressed appreciation for the generous support and participation of the City of Raleigh.

CONSENT AGENDA

CONSENT AGENDA – APPROVED AS AMENDED

Mayor McFarlane presented the consent agenda indicating all items are considered to be routine and may be enacted by one motion. If a Councilor requests discussion on an item, the item will be removed from the consent agenda and considered separately. Mayor McFarlane explained the vote on the consent agenda will be a roll call vote. Mayor McFarlane stated she had received a request from Mr. Cox to withdrawn the encroachment request from Google Fiber North Carolina, LLC and a request from Mr. Branch to withdraw the professional services, New Bern Avenue Sidewalk and Transit Improvement Project. Without objection, those items were removed from the consent agenda. Ms. Crowder moved approval of the consent agenda as amended. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Baldwin who was absent and excused from the meeting. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote. The items on the Consent Agenda were as follows.

SURPLUS PROPERTY – FIVE SEWER FLUSHER TRUCKS – RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SALE ADOPTED

The Public Works department has five sewer flusher trucks now considered surplus property, each with an estimated valued that exceeds $30,000. To authorize a sale by auction of surplus property at this value threshold, a Council resolution is required by state law. Included with the agenda packet was a draft resolution authorizing the Purchasing Manager to conduct a public sale.

Recommendation: Adopt the resolution to authorize the sale of surplus property. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused). See Resolution 269.

ANNEXATION AREAS – VARIOUS – REFERRED TO CITY CLERK TO CHECK SUFFICIENCY AND SCHEDULE HEARINGS; 9601 FONVILLE ROAD – DEFERRED

The agenda presented the following petitions for annexation:

AREA NAME AND DISTRICT	PETITIONER	ACRES	PROPOSED USE
Contiguous Petition			
10410 Globe Road (E)	Chris Strickland of Discovery Properties	2.0	Commercial
Aspan Subdivision, 4114 Westwood Place (E)	Yogesh Sanghvi of Aansan, LLC	2.19	Residential
Deferred Annexation			
9601 Fonville Road (A)	Jerry Looper for Paul T. and Melinda Barham	1.53	Residential

Recommendation: Acknowledge the annexation petitions and direct the City Clerk to check the sufficiency of the petitions pursuant to State statute and if found sufficient, authorize advertisement for a public hearing to be held March 15, 2016.

Because the property located at 9601 Fonville Road is connecting to City water only and sewer service is not available at this time, it is recommended that the annexation of this property be deferred. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes. (Baldwin absent and excused).

HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM – CRASH RECONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT GRANT – APPROVED – RESOLUTION ADOPTED

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration offers a grant program via the Governor's Highway Safety Program which will offset the full cost of equipment that will assist the Police Department crash reconstruction unit with the investigation and adjudication of serious or fatal motor vehicle crashes. The grant is funded at 75 percent and will provide $11,250 in federal funds which would be allocated for equipment purchase. The City match for the grant is 25 percent, which will amount to $3,750. The grant was administratively approved by the grants committee on December 17, 2015; the application requires a resolution from the governing body which acknowledges the public interest of the project.

Recommendation: Adopt the local government resolution and authorize the Mayor to sign the required documentation. Authorize staff to submit the grant application. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused). See Resolution 271.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENTS – APPROVED; BUDGET AMENDED

The City was previously awarded grants on three projects from the federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program. The three projects include the Bicycle Restriping and Bike Lane Striping; Six Forks Road Sidewalks (from Coleridge Drive south of I-440 to Wake Forest Road); and the I-40 Overpass Pedestrian Retrofits at three locations.

Grant amounts were exceeded for the Six Forks Road sidewalks and the I-40 Overpass Retrofits upon award of contracts in July 2015, due mostly to an escalation in construction costs during 2015. The City utilized appropriations from Public Works capital funds to expedite award of the construction contract. The contract award for the Bicycle Restriping and Bike Lane Striping project, now nearing completion, was lower than the original grant allocation. It is not feasible at this time to utilize funding for additional bike lane striping; staff recommends reallocation of this grant to the remaining eligible projects.

City staff, NCDOT, and the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization have agreed to revise the existing funding allocations three grants to reallocate federal funding from the Bicycle Restriping project to cover a portion of the higher construction costs on the other two projects.

Name of Project Number One:	CMAQ Bicycle Restriping
Managing Division:	City Planning – Transportation
Approval Requested:	Supplemental to Municipal Agreement
Reason for Council Review:	Interlocal Agreement
Amount to be forfeited:	$412,562
Vendor:	NC Department of Transportation
Originally budgeted:	$1,115,703
Currently budgeted:	$600,000
Name of Project Number Two:	Six Forks Road Sidewalks (Coleridge Drive south of I-440 to Wake Forest Road)
Managing Division:	City Planning – Transportation
Approval Requested:	Supplemental to Municipal Agreement
Reason for Council Review:	Interlocal Agreement
Additional amount to be received:	$121,233
Vendor:	NC Department of Transportation
Originally budgeted:	$483,000
Currently budgeted:	$725,466
Name of Project Number Three :	I-40 Bridge Pedestrian Improvements
Managing Division:	City Planning – Transportation
Approval Requested:	Supplemental to Municipal Agreement
Reason for Council Review:	Interlocal Agreement
Additional amount to be received:	$300,946
Vendor:	NC Department of Transportation
Originally budgeted:	$2,050,000
Currently budgeted:	$2,651,892

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute the supplemental agreements and adopt a budget amendment to reallocate the grant funding. Accounting details were included with the agenda packet. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused). See Ordinance 547 TF 269.

SEWER EASEMENT – 5212 NORTH HILLS DRIVE - APPROVED

A request has been received from Mangrum Builders, LLC for an easement on City property located at 5212 North Hills Drive for the purpose of connecting a private residence to existing public sanitary sewer facilities. The sewer infrastructure to be installed in the easement area will be maintained by Mangrum Builders, LLC or its successors in interest. The Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources (PRCR) department is the maintenance manager of this property and is in agreement with the exchange of real property interests. Compensation in the amount of $100 will be provided for the granting of the easement and is subject to the following conditions: (i) The easement area shall be flagged and field verified by PRCR; (ii) the specifications for construction, vegetation removal, and planting shall be submitted to and approved by PRCR; (iii) a Tree Impact Permit shall be submitted to and approved by PRCR. A report was included with the agenda packet.

Recommendation: Authorize the easement. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

ERP ANALYSTS, INC. – AMENDMENT #1 CONTRACT SERVICES – APPROVED

The City recently completed a successful software upgrade to the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system, upgrading the Oracle PeopleSoft product from software version 9.0 to version 9.2. The ERP system operates the City's core financial, human resource, and payroll functions. During the course of the upgrade project, certain desirable features of the software system were deferred to ensure the overall software upgrade project maintained the planned delivery schedule and project budget. The upgrade project is complete and the contract with the implementation vendor is substantially complete.

The City has an existing managed services agreement with ERP Analysts, Inc. It is desirable to amend the existing contract with this vendor for the purpose of implementing upgrade project items originally intended to be included but deferred from the core project as described above. Items to be implemented by ERP Analysts include improved and expedited vendor payment processing; notification rule changes for purchasing cards and general ledger journals; reconfiguration of the purchase requisition change order process; improved end-user Work Center functionality; and custom reporting improvements and corrections. Sufficient funding remains within the PeopleSoft Upgrade 9.2 capital budget. The contract amendment will not exceed $204,000, with work to be complete by June 30, 2016.

Prior Contract Activity:	Original contract $100,000
Amendment One:	$204,000
Encumbered with this Approval:	$304,000
Budget transfer required:	Administrative

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute the contract amendment in an amount not to exceed $204,000. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

PARKS SYSTEM PLANNING – AECOM TECHNICAL SERVICES, INC. – CONTRACT EXTENSION/AMENDMENT #3 – RATIFIED – APPROVED

AECOM Technical Services, Inc. has been under contract since August 6, 2012 (PR173-12) to develop and implement the Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources System Plan. The City expanded the scope of services of the contract to include Greenway Design guidelines and development of a park evaluation and training pursuant to a contract amendment on August 3, 2015. The contract with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. expired effective December 31, 2015.

Staff is requesting City Council ratification for an amendment to extend the contract from December 31, 2015 to May 31, 2016 in order to complete work. Ratification and authorization of the amendment to extend the contract is required. No additional cost would be incurred by way of this contract extension.

Recommendation: Ratify the extension of contract services with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. and authorize the City Manager to execute a contract amendment. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

RALEIGH ARTS PLAN – CULTURAL PLANNING GROUP, LLC – CONTRACT RATIFICATION/AMENDMENT #4 - APPROVED

The Cultural Planning Group, LLC has been under contract since August 12, 2014 (PR156-14) to provide consulting services for the development, coordination, and implementation of the Raleigh Arts Plan. The four phase project is substantially completed with only Phase Four remaining which consists of workshops with Raleigh Arts Partners scheduled for March 2016. The contract with The Cultural Planning Group, LLC expired effective December 31, 2015.

Staff is requesting City Council ratification for an amendment to extend the contract from December 31, 2015 to May 31, 2016. Ratification and authorization of the amendment to extend the contract is required. No additional cost would be incurred by way of this contract extension.

Recommendation: Ratify the extension of contract services with Cultural Planning Group, LLC and authorize the City Manager to execute a contract amendment. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT – PAVING SERVICES/TOWN OF GARNER – APPROVED

The City desires to update the contract with the Town of Garner to perform restoration services in the form of pavement cut repairs, concrete curb and gutter replacements, and concrete sidewalk repairs associated with water and sewer infrastructure work performed within the jurisdiction of the Town of Garner. Under this agreement, the Garner Public Works Department shall perform repair services upon the direction of the Public Utilities department. Utilizing Garner town forces for these services allows for more timely restoration to disrupted roadway infrastructure as a result of utility repairs. Raleigh has been operating the water and sewer systems in the Town of Garner under a merger agreement executed in July 2000.

A contract has been negotiated with the Town of Garner to provide these services at a cost not to exceed $50,000 per year, with an option to renew for four additional one-year terms.

Name of Project:	Town of Garner Paving Services
Managing Division:	Public Utilities – Sewer Maintenance Division
Approval request:	Contact award
Reason for Council Review:	Interlocal Agreement
Fiscal Year 16 Budget	$50,000
Actual Contract Amount:	$50,000
Vendor Name:	Town of Garner
Prior Contract Activity:	N/A

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute the contract in an amount not to exceed $50,000. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SERVICES – ON-CALL CONSULTING AMENDMENT #3 - APPROVED

A contract to perform on-call Geographic Information Service (GIS) consulting was executed April 4, 2013 with individual Colleen Sharpe. The purpose of the contract is to provide GIS consultation for projects such as hydrant and meter mapping applications, master address repository, synchronization of meter billing data and GIS, as well as other needs. Contract amendment number three, in the amount of $49,900 with a time extension to December 31, 2016, will provide for the fourth year of the anticipated five-year contract. The total contract amount subsequent to this amendment will exceed the threshold that can be approved at an administrative level.

Contract History:

Name of Project:	GIS On-Call Consulting Services
Request Reason:	Contract amendment approval (contract >$150,000)
Vendor:	Colleen Sharpe
Prior Contract Activity:	$50,100 (administrative approval)
Amendment One:	$49,900 (administrative approval)

Amendment Two:	$49,900 (administrative approval)
Currently Encumbered:	$149,900
Amount of this Contract Amendment:	$49,900
Encumbered with this Approval:	$199,800

Recommendation: Authorize City Manager to execute the contract amendment in an amount not to exceed $49,900. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

PARKING – 213 SOUTH HARRINGTON STREET LEASE AMENDMENT – APPROVED

The City has an existing lease arrangement for three surface parking lots fronting West Hargett and South Harrington streets from Dillon Supply Company (Dillon), in effect since 2004. In December 2015 Dillon sold two of the three lots and has given a 30-day termination notice for release in accordance with provisions of the existing lease. The existing lease is scheduled to expire August 1; following termination of the two lots leaves one surface parking area at 213 South Harrington Street. The lot is located adjacent to the City's Dillon Building parking lot.

Staff has reviewed the benefits of continuing the lease with Dillon, and recognizing the increasing need and demand for parking in the vicinity stemming from upcoming development projects, staff recommends amending and extending the lease for 213 South Harrington Street. Dillon has agreed to amend the lease at the current per space rent amount for the 27 space parking lot, with an extension of the lease period from to January 31, 2018.

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute a lease amendment. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES/POST EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS/CAPITAL RESERVE/RISK RESERVE – WEAVER C. BARKSDALE & ASSOCIATES, INC. – AMENDMENT #1 – APPROVED

The City utilizes the services of Weaver C. Barksdale & Associates, Inc. to investment management services for two funds – the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) trust reserves and Capital Reserves/Risk Reserves – for which the City has broad statutory investment authority. Since inception of the agreement in 2010, Weaver has been paid an average annual amount of $26,000. The accumulated fees will exceed the $150,000 contract threshold in FY16; therefore the contract is being amended to extend the contract through December 2016 and to adjust the fee cycle from a rolling 12-month period to the City's 12-month fiscal year period. A request for proposals process will be conducted later in the 2016 calendar year for investment consultant services. At that time a decision will be made regarding further extension of Weaver Barksdale as they are one of the fund managers recommended by the current investment consultant.

Name of Project:	Investment Management Services
Managing Division:	Finance – Treasury
Approval Requested:	Contract amendment
Reason for City Council Review:	Contract amendment > $150,000
Vendor:	Weaver C. Barksdale & Associates, Inc.
Prior Contract Activity:	Original contract January 1, 2010 (administrative approval); $147,280 paid to date
FY16 Budget:	$26,000
Currently Encumbered:	$7,202
Amount of this Contract Amendment:	$31,799 ($18,799 FY16, $13,000 FY17)
Encumbered with this Approval:	$39,000

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute the contract amendment. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

INVESTMENT ADVISORY SERVICES/SUPPLEMENTARY RETIREMENT PLAN – INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT AND ADVISORY GROUP INC CONTRACT EXTENSION – APPROVED

The City utilizes the services of Investment Research & Advisory Group, Inc. ("IRA Group") to provide investment advisory services for employee Supplemental Retirement Plan. The City's engagement of the IRA Group represents a key fiduciary relationship in the management of the plan. The contract with IRA Group expires February 29 and it is desirable to renew the contract for a two-year term with the same fee structure. The City plans to issue a request for proposals for investment advisory services and trustee services, currently provided by BB&T, related to the plan prior to the end of this two-year contract extension.

Name of Project:	Investment Advisory Services
Managing Division:	Finance – Administration
Approval Request:	Award of contract extension
Reason for Council Review:	Contract extension >$150,000
Vendor:	Investment Research & Advisory Group, Inc.
Prior Contract Activity:	Original contract March 1, 2012 – two-year term First extension March 1, 2014 – two-year term
FY16 Budget:	$50,000
Amount of this Contract Extension:	$100,000
Encumbered with this Approval:	$100,000

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute the contract extension. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

CHOATE CONSTRUCTION – RATIFICATION OF CONTRACT – APPROVED

In August 2015, Public Works staff worked in partnership with the developer of the Charter Square tower and its general contractor, Choate Construction, to complete needed infrastructure work associated with the Charter Square project. To help meet the scheduled opening of Charter Square, staff requested Choate Construction complete work that the City was required to perform

to improve the safety, appearance and functionality of City streets, utility lines and sidewalks adjacent to the office project. Choate Construction completed the following work at the request of the City in a timely and satisfactory manner: repair and pavement of Lenoir Street, clearing of sewer line on Lenoir Street, filled planting trench along Fayetteville Street and planted shrubs, replaced curb and gutter on Wilmington Street, milled and repaved turn lane along Wilmington Street, striped Wilmington Street, and corrected sidewalk grade at the intersection of Fayetteville and Lenoir Streets. Total cost for the work completed is $90,000.

Staff has reviewed the invoices and inspected the completed work. Funds to pay Choate Construction are available in the Public Works department operating budget. As the work was performed in the absence of a written contract, City Council ratification of the understanding is required by statute to allow payment to proceed.

Recommendation: Ratify the obligation of the City to pay Choate Construction in an amount not to exceed $90,000 for the work described. Authorize the City Manager to execute a written agreement to document the obligations of the parties with regards to the completed work. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

PERSONNEL CHANGES – PUBLIC UTILITIES – APPROVED

The new positions below were reviewed by the Human Resources Department. The fiscal impact of the reclassification will be absorbed within existing approved salary and benefit appropriations. These positions are requested as mid-year additions to augment billing and customer service functions in Utility Billing division of the Public Utilities Department.

Public Utilities

Customer Services Specialist (code 0127; PG 28), four positions

Recommendation: Authorize the new positions. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

ENCROACHMENTS – VARIOUS LOCATIONS – APPROVED CONDITIONALLY

The agenda presented the following encroachment request.

Bartram Road

A request has been received from TK Real Estate Holdings, LLC to install a storm drainpipe in the right-of-way. A report was included with the agenda packet.

234 Fayetteville Street

A request has been received from First Empire Telex, LLC to relocate a grease trap in the right-of-way. A report was included with the agenda packet.

Fiber Technologies Networks, LLC - Various locations

A request has been received from Fiber Technologies Networks, LLC to install fiber optic cable and pole sets in the right-of-way. A report was included with the agenda packet.

Recommendation: Approve the encroachments subject to completion of a liability agreement and documentation of proof of insurance by the applicants. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

MOORE SQUARE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT – BUDGET AMENDMENT – APPROVED

A donation in the amount of $2,500 for development and operation of Moore Square has been received. Accounting detail was included with the agenda packet. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused). See Ordinance 547 TF 269.

FIRE STATION FIVE – RENOVATIONS AND REPAIRS – BID AWARDED TO ENGINEERED CONSTRUCTION COMPANY

On January 27, 2016, nine formal bids were received and publicly opened for the Fire Station Five Renovations and Repairs project. Engineered Construction Company submitted the low bid of $950,663. Small Disadvantaged Minority Women Owned Business (SDMWOB) participation is 17.95 percent. Funding is appropriated in the capital budget and will be transferred to the deferred maintenance reserve budget. Renovations to the station include the addition of a Captain's office in the apparatus bay, a large concrete deck on the back of the station, new fire protection, complete new sewer and water services, and a 300 GPM grease trap.

Name of Project:	Fire Station Five Renovations and Repairs
Managing Division:	Public Works – Construction Management
Approval Request:	Bid award
Reason for Council Review:	Formal bid award
Original CIP Budget:	$505,000
Construction Bid Award:	$950,663
Vendor:	Engineered Construction Company
Prior Contract Activity:	None
Budget Transfer:	Administrative
Encumbered with this approval:	$1,045,729

Recommendation: Award the bid to Engineered Construction Company and authorize the City Manager to execute a construction contract with Engineered Construction Company. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

CONCORD STREET WATER AND SEWER REPLACEMENT – BID AWARDED TO PIPELINE UTILITIES, INC.

On January 21, 2016 six bids were received for the Concord Street Water and Sewer Replacement Project. The project will replace the existing water and sewer lines along Concord Street and the surrounding streets including Stanhope Avenue and Rosemary Street. This project is funded through the capital budget program that replaces aging and undersized mains in the older areas of the City. The project will install approximately 1,600 linear feet of sewer lines and 2,400 linear feet of water lines.

Pipeline Utilities, Inc., Raleigh submitted the lowest responsive bid in the amount $1,364,000 with a 15.32 percent Small Disadvantage Minority Women Owned Business (SDMWOB) participation.

Name of Project:	Concord Street Water and Sewer Replacement Project
Managing Division:	Public Utilities – Capital Improvements Management Division
Approval request:	Bid award
Reason for Council Review:	Formal bid award
Original CIP Budget:	$1,973,000
Construction Bid Award:	$1,364,000
Vendor Name:	Pipeline Utilities, Inc. of Raleigh, NC
Prior Contract Activity:	N/A
Encumbered with this approval:	$1,364,000

Recommendation: Award the bid to Pipeline Utilities, Inc. of Raleigh, NC in the amount not to exceed $1,364,000. Authorize the City Manager to execute the contract. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

SPRING VALLEY LIFT STATION ABANDONMENT/ETON ROAD GRAVITY SEWER EXTENSION – BID AWARDED TO PIPELINE UTILITIES, INC OF RALEIGH

On January 19, 2016, two bids were received in this informal bidding process for the Spring Valley Lift Station Abandonment and Eton Road Gravity Sewer Extension**.** The project will abandon the existing lift station at 194 Spring Valley Road in the Town of Wake Forest. It will also replace the existing aging sewer lines serving properties along Eton Road in the City of Raleigh. The project will abandon the lift station and install a total of 1,015 linear feet of sewer lines.

Pipeline Utilities, Inc. of Raleigh, NC submitted the lowest responsive bid in the amount $499,990 with a 10.41 percent Small Disadvantage Minority Women Owned Business (SDMWOB) participation.

Name of Project:	Spring Valley Lift Station Abandonment and Eton Road Gravity Sewer Extension

Managing Division:	Public Utilities – Capital Improvements Management Division
Approval request:	Bid award
Reason for Council Review:	Informal bid award
Original CIP Budget:	$513,000
Construction Bid Award:	$499,990
Vendor Name:	Pipeline Utilities, Inc. of Raleigh, NC
Prior Contract Activity:	N/A
Encumbered with this approval:	$499,990

Recommendation: Award the bid to Pipeline Utilities, Inc. of Raleigh, NC in the amount not to exceed $499,990. Authorize the City Manager to execute the contract. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

EAST COLLEGE PARK – INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT – BID AWARDED TO T. A. LOVING COMPANY

On June 14, 2015, the Community Development Division of the Housing and Neighborhoods Department issued a Prequalification Application for the East College Park Infrastructure Project. The project consists of the removal and replacement of live infrastructure systems, including water, sewer, storm drain, sidewalks, milling and paving, curb and gutter, utility coordination, grading and erosion control activities to be completed in an area bounded by Oakwood Avenue, Hill Street, Raleigh Boulevard, and New Bern Avenue. These improvements are necessary in order to be able to construct new residential units on City-owned properties in East College Park.

This project is one of the planned activities outlined in the 2016 Action Plan, which is part of the 2016-20 Consolidated Plan approved by Council on May 5, 2015. The Action Plan describes the City's plans for the expenditure of federal housing funds for a given fiscal year. Furthermore, infrastructure improvement is one of the goals set forth in the Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) Plan, with this project being a specific performance measurement benchmark. The NRSA Plan was approved by Council November 3, 2015.

Seven submittals in response to the Prequalification Application were received on July 7, 2015. Five of the seven construction companies were prequalified to bid on the East College Park Infrastructure Project. A formal bid for the project was issued on November 29, 2015 and bids were received until January 14, 2016 at 3:00 p.m. Three bids were received from: T. A. Loving Company; Pipeline Utilities, Inc.; and J.F. Wilkerson Contracting Co., Inc. The apparent low-bidder was T. A. Loving Company with the bid amount being $4,585,000. T.A. Loving Company proposes to utilize 17 percent Small Disadvantaged Minority Women Owned Business (SDMWOB) participation.

This project is a joint funding effort between the Public Utilities and Housing and Neighborhoods Departments. Details were provided in the agenda packet.

Name of Project:	East College Park Infrastructure Project.

Managing Division:	Housing and Neighborhoods – Community Development
Approval Request:	Bid award
Reason for Council Review:	Formal bid award
Construction Bid Amount:	$4,585,000
10 Percent Contingency:	$458,500
Total Contract Amount:	$5,043,500
Vendor:	T.A. Loving Company
Prior Contract Activity:	N/A

Recommendation: Award the bid to T.A. Loving Company in the amount of $5,043,500 and authorize the City Manager to execute a construction contract. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused).

TRAFFIC – SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION ON COUNTRY RIDGE DRIVE – APPROVED

It is recommended that the speed limit be reduced from 35 mph to 25 mph on Country Ridge Drive. Country Ridge Drive is classified as Neighborhood Local and is constructed to typical residential street standards. This request meets the requirements of the adopted Neighborhood Traffic Management Program. A signed petition has been received by staff representing at least 75 percent of the residents or property owners along the street in support of the speed reduction request.

Recommendation: Approve as recommended and authorize the appropriate changes in the traffic code was included in the agenda packet. Upheld on Consent Agenda Crowder/Branch - 7 ayes (Baldwin absent and excused). See Ordinance 548.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

NEW BERN AVENUE – NEW BERN AVENUE SIDEWALK/TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS – BID AWARDED TO KIMLEY HORN AND ASSOCIATES

Council previously authorized sidewalk and transit improvements along New Bern Avenue. The project will include installation of new sidewalk, replacement of existing sidewalk, enhancing and upgrading crosswalks, transit stop improvements, mid-block crossings, improving pedestrian safety, and other pedestrian improvements from Tarboro Road to Sunnybrook Road.

In order to procure engineering design services for these improvements a Request for Proposals process was conducted. Staff received proposals from nine firms; each proposal has been evaluated with regard to criteria identified in the request for proposals letter, which includes the anticipated level of Small Disadvantaged Minority and Women Owned Business (SDMWOB) participation. A list of the firms submitting a proposal is included with the agenda packet. Once the proposals were reviewed, a review committee comprised of members of the Design Construction Division, Office of Transportation Planning, and Transportation Operations

Division recommends Kimley Horn and Associates (KHA) to perform professional engineering services on the project.

The Design Construction Division has also completed negotiating an agreement and fee with KHA to provide engineering services. The consultant is proposing to utilize 27.7 percent SDMWOB participation.

Name of Project:	New Bern Avenue Sidewalk and Transit Improvement Project
Managing Division:	Public Works – Design/Construction
Reason for Council Review:	Contract award >$150,000
Original CIP Project Budget:	$5,754,071
Vendor:	Kimley Horn and Associates (KHA)
Prior Contract Activity:	N/A
Budget Transfer:	Administrative
Currently Encumbered (% of estimate):	$0
Amount of this Contract:	$618,683
Encumbered with this Approval:	$618,683

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute a contract in an amount not to exceed $618,683.

Mr. Branch stated he withdrew this from the Consent Agenda to say it has been a long time coming and he appreciates it moving forward at this time; therefore he would move approval. His motion was seconded by Mr. Thompson and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Baldwin who was absent from the meeting. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote.

ENCROACHMENT – GOOGLE FIBER NORTH CAROLINA, LLC – VARIOUS LOCATIONS – APPROVED; INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED

A request has been received from Google Fiber North Carolina, LLC to install 30,622 feet of fiber optic cable, 175 access vaults and three LCP (local convergence point) cabinets in the right-of-way. A report was included with the agenda packet.

Recommendation: Approve the encroachment subject to completion of a liability agreement and documentation of proof of insurance by the applicant.

Mr. Cox indicated he is very excited about Google coming to Raleigh and moving forward with their work. He stated however he is a little concern about the Google huts. He stated he went to North Hills Park and saw the one that had been installed and questioned if they could provide a little landscaping around the facility. He stated his other concern relates to the chain link fence around the building. He questioned if the facility could be redesigned or landscaped to be more attractive and fit into the community better.

City Manager Hall indicated staff has received some of the same of the same feedback and staff would be happy to go back and talk to representatives of Google. Paul Kallam pointed out that Google will go back and do some landscaping around some of the facilities. He indicated some of them have landscape requirements. Ms. Crowder questioned if all do not have landscape requirements with Mr. Kallam pointing out some are behind the facility or built into the area such as the one on Wade Avenue where no landscaping is actually needed. He stated because of the season the landscaping is not being installed at this point but Google will come back with the landscaping in many of the locations.

Mr. Cox stated his second concern is whether there is a need for a fence. He stated his father worked for a phone company and they had buildings for their equipment and there were no fences around those buildings. Mr. Cox questioned if the buildings could be made more secure or if there is someway to delete the fence which is not very attractive. Mr. Kallam pointed out it is his understanding the fencing is required for security reasons; however he would be glad to talk with representatives of Google. Mr. Cox questioned the fences being for security as one can easily crawl over the fences. Mr. Kallam stated he would be glad to talk with Google representatives about the landscaping and fencing. Mr. Cox moved approval of the encroachment as requested with the understanding a report would be provided relative to the landscaping and fencing. His motion was seconded by Mr. Gaylord and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Baldwin who was absent and excused. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

REZONING Z-41-15 – HILLSBOROUGH STREET – TO BE PLACED ON MARCH 1, 2016 AGENDA

This is a request to rezone property from Neighborhood Business & Industrial-2 w/Special Residential Parking Overlay District (NB & IND-2 w/SRPOD) to Neighborhood Mixed Use-4 Stories-Urban Limited-Conditional Use w/Special Residential Parking Overlay District (NX-4-UL-CU w/SRPOD).

The proposal is consistent with the Future Land Use Map, Urban Form Map, and most of the pertinent policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed rezoning is reasonable and in the public interest. The proposal would permit mixed-use development in close proximity to the NSCU campus, on a Main Street/Transit Emphasis Corridor. The proposal is compatible with the surrounding area. Conditions help mitigate potential impacts on the adjacent neighborhood and promote pedestrian-oriented uses.

The Planning Commission suggests that the applicant add a zoning condition related to open space on Rosemary Street.

The Planning Commission recommends approval of the request. Staff suggests a public hearing date of March 1, 2016.

Planning Commission Chair Steve Schuster explained the request. He stated the Planning Commission had recommended that before the City Council schedules a public hearing then an additional condition be offered by the applicant to include provision of a "pocket park" on Rosemary Street and that public access to that amenity be part of the condition. Planning Director Bowers pointed out now that the case has been presented to the City Council the window of opportunity to add conditions are open.

Mayor McFarlane questioned if the applicant is agreeable. Attorney Lacy Reeves, 150 Fayetteville Street, representing the applicant indicated they will be happy to add the condition pointing out the design for the area shows a pocket park as a public amenity but they would be glad to add the condition. Ms. Crowder moved that the item be held and placed on the March 1, 2016 agenda to allow the applicant to submit additional conditions. Mr. Stephenson expressed appreciation to the applicant for all the time they spent with the neighborhoods and their willingness to have the condition relative to the pocket part. Without objection it was agreed the item would be placed on the March 1, 2016 agenda.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY MANAGER

POOLE ROAD SIDEWALK PROJECT – AUTHORIZED – INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED

On January 2, 2013, Council adopted the Comprehensive Pedestrian plan, which promotes a walkable Raleigh by recommending safe and convenient pedestrian facilities and continuous connectivity throughout the City. The pedestrian plan ranked the Poole Road sidewalks 13th out of 211 total projects. Funding is available as part of the program allocation for sidewalk improvements from transportation bond proceeds.

A public meeting was held November 5, 2015 to present design information and preliminary right-of-way and easement needs; the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission reviewed the project on December 14, 2015. Staff has prepared plans showing the proposed improvements. It is now appropriate to present the project to City Council for final authorization.

Recommendation: Authorize the project to proceed.

City Manager Hall pointed out public meetings have been held and no citizens attended the meetings. This project has been recommended by the Pedestrian and Bicycle Committee and plans have been prepared. He stated staff has not received any concerns or questions about the project. Mr. Branch stated this is a very much needed project but questioned if it has moved through the Southeast CAC. Engineer Chris Johnson pointed out they have not gone to the CAC but they can reach out to the CAC to make sure they know that is being proposed, etc. Mr. Branch again stated it is a needed project but he wants to make sure the community knows what is being proposed, etc. He stated he feels it would be good to have the design shared with the CAC. Mr. Stephenson asked that the staff provide a summary report back to the City Council of any comments from the CAC. Mr. Gaylord move approval of the project proceeding. His

motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Baldwin who was absent and excused. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote.

RALEIGH BIKE SHARE PROGRAM UPDATE – INFORMATION RECEIVED – REFERRED TO MARCH 15, WORK SESSION

In 2014 Toole Design completed a feasibility study to assess the potential for a bike sharing system in Raleigh. A business plan for implementation of a bikeshare system was completed in 2015, which provided funding options for capital and operation. The City received a Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) grant for $2.0 million through the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) to cover the costs of constructing a system; however the required local match of $425,000 was not appropriated. Staff will provide an update regarding bikeshare program options and will outline potential scenarios for funding, implementation, and operation of a system.

Recommendation: Receive as information.

City Manager Hall pointed out Council asked that this be brought forward to provide information for the new Council members and a status report on the project.

Engineer Eric Lamb highlighted on the following PowerPoint:

What's Bike Share?

- Automatic self-service bicycle rentals
- Typically utilizes short, one-way trips from station to station
- Membership based (typically annual or daily)
- Dense network of conveniently located stations

He provided photos of various type stations – on and off street.

Bikeshare History

- 2009 – Included as an Action Item in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan
- 2013 – City Council approved selection of Toole Design Group (TDG) to develop Feasibility Study & Implementation Plan
- 2014 – TDG determined a bikeshare system is feasible in Raleigh and proposed an implementation Plan
- 2015 – Not included in FY16 budget/CIP

Development Process

- **Part 1 – Feasibility**
  - Bike Share Peer System Review
  - System Review
  - Public Involvement and Stakeholder Engagement

- Existing Conditions And Demand Analysis
- Policy Review
- Policy Model Assessment
- Goals and objectives

- **Part II – Implementation**
  - System Planning and Station Placement
  - Financial Plan Development
  - Implementation Plan

Study – Part 1

- **Bike Share is feasible in Raleigh**
  - Multiple cultural attractions
  - Colleges & Universities
  - Growing bike infrastructure
- **Hot Spots:**
  - Downtown
  - NCSU
  - Cameron Village
  - Glenwood South
  - Chavis Park Area

Study – Part II

- **Develop System Recommendations**
  - System Size
  - Phasing Schedule
  - Station Location Details & Standards

- **Develop Operating and Capital Cost Estimates**
- **Identify Permitting Steps**
- **Adopt a Timeline & Funding Strategy**

Mr. Lamb presented a map setting the coverage area in which it is proposed to have 30 stations five of which would be in the NCSU area.

FORECAST RESULTS

Membership & Ridership:

- 600 annual memberships first year (45% of total rides)
- 11,670 casual members (55% of total rides)
- Rides per Member:
- Annual member will take 19 trips per year
- Casual member will take 1.7 trips per year

BUSINESS MODEL OPTIONS

- Publicly Owned & Operated
- Non-Profit Owned & Operated
- Privately Owned & Operated
- Hybrid Models
- Publicly owned/Non-Profit operated
- Publicly owned/Privately operated

CAPITAL AND INSTALLATION

- Total Phase 1 Construction Costs = $2 million
- City awarded grant via CAMPO for $2 million to install up to 30 stations
- City match requirement of $425,000 still required
- Additional grant for $125,000 received from NCDOT for Planning and Design

OPERATIONS

	Annual Costs
Operating Costs	$ 653,000
User Fee Recovery	$215,000
Funding Gap	$438,000

- Operating costs vary based on vendor selection and re-balancing efficiency
- $1,440 operating cost per dock per year

USER FEE STRUCTURE

		Usage Fees	
User Fee		0-30 mins	Additional Half Hours
Annual	$80	Free	$4.00
24-Hour	$8	Free	$4.00
Student	$50	Free	$2.00

- Pricing supported by online survey responses during feasibility study
- Student rate is per semester

Mr. Lamb mentioned sponsorship opportunities including stations, bikes, website, apps, etc.

OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS

- Should the City pursue a BikeShare system?
- If so, should the City provide capital and/or operating financial support?
- If City utilizes the CAMPO grant, what is the source for the $425,000 match?
- What ownership model should be utilized?
- How much fundraising and sponsorship can the private sector support?

Mayor McFarlane questioned if this could be phased that is start out with a smaller number of stations and let it grow as needed and questioned if this would cut the cost. Engineer Lamb indicated reducing the number of stations would not reduce the cost explaining you still have the maintenance, someone has to check out the bikes, keep the inventory in the needed locations, etc. He talked about situations where the bikes are used mainly for commuters and during the day all of the bikes end up near the offices and at night in the outskirts so you have to rotate the inventory.

Mr. Thompson questioned if the exact locations have been determined with Mr. Lamb pointing out not at this point, they would be within the boundary as shown in the PowerPoint and talked about the 30 locations which would connect parks, universities, etc. He stated they have identified the vicinity of the stations but there is no set site.

Mr. Thompson talked about the $80 fee and questioned if the membership could be utilized for bike share programs in other cities with Mr. Lamb pointing out it depends on the type of system that is set up. Some offer reciprocal memberships with other cities and some do not. Mr. Thompson had questions about helmets and if the program is geared toward recreation or commuter. Mr. Lamb pointed out it depends on where the stations are location. He pointed out a lot of people want to see stations on greenways and others are looking at the program for commuter purposes. He indicated all helmet laws would have to be obeyed. Mr. Thompson pointed out he is a recreational cyclist and appreciates the concept; however, it seems it could be expensive and talked about a family of four who came to Raleigh for the day and wanted to take a bike ride. The charge would shortly mount up to approximately $50 of an hour for a family of four. That seems expensive to him. How the program is used in other cities was talked about.

Mr. Cox had questions relative to the recreational aspects and talked about locations at places such as the Buffalo Road Aquatic Park, Umstead State Park, etc. He stated may be the recreational aspect could help raise money to help pay for the project and questioned if there have been any analysis on revenue from recreational versus commuter, etc.

Mr. Cox stated he needed to understand the details on the cost of the program. You got the cost of the stations, cost of the inventory, cost of the ongoing operations, etc. He stated for instance if the City leases the station from one company and then decides to go with another company is there a cost to switch out, etc. He stated we are looking at a significant coverage and population area and questioned the number of bikes per population. He stated it is a very interesting idea and he personally likes the idea but is concerned about the financial aspect and he needs some more answers before he could go further.

Mr. Lamb talked about the location of the stations, the feedback and suggestions for over 150 different locations, distance between locations such as along Rocky Branch to connect various recreational facilities, etc. Brief discussion followed about connecting parks for recreational use with Mr. Lamb talking about one of the goals of the program is to have dense locations. He stated he did not know if there had been a lot of study on the recreational v. commuter, does not have information on lease switch outs, and talked about the initial coverage area was basically

the CBD, NCSU, and the populations in those areas. The utilization of bike racks for different commuter orientation bike programs was touched on with it being pointed out the commuter utilization of bicycles has a different system and utilizes bike routes, etc., and the bike share program is not usually associated with that.

Mr. Branch indicated as he understands when this was discussed in 2015, there were five outstanding questions and asked if the last two have been answered – "what ownership model should be utilized" and "how much fund raising and sponsorship can the private sector support."

In response to questioning from Mr. Branch, Mr. Lamb pointed out they had engaged the community but not necessarily the CACs. Mr. Branch talked about Anderson Pointe as being a good spot for a station and questioned if the Council decided to move ahead if the Council would review the station areas that have been selected.

Ms. Crowder indicated cost that the cost becomes very vital and when we look at building or developing a bike share program in Raleigh which is looking at transportation bonds, and comparing the cost, bikesharing seems to be extremely high. She stated in her opinion, the bike sharing program is a perfect vehicle for a private company. She talked about the cost in owning, maintaining, etc. stating in her opinion this is the perfect opportunity for a private company and talked about Blue Cross Blue Shield sponsoring the program in Charlotte. She questioned if there is any information available on the trials and/or problems of ownership in cities that have the bike sharing program, if we have any information on what works, what doesn't work, what are the successes and the failures. She stated with the other obligations the City has at this time she would be very concerned about the city entering into the bike sharing program.

Mayor McFarlane stated she understands there are people in the audience that are interested and questioned how many are interested in committing to financing such a program. The Mayor also questioned if you can put these bikes on a bus, Mr. Lamb stated he does not feel that could occur as the bikes are heavier than usual. It is not meant to use the bike share program to ride to a bus, put the bike on the bus and then use the same bike at your designation. The thought is ride the bus to the bus station, leave that bike and ride the bus.

Mr. Stephenson pointed out he understands there is a $2M grant available. He questioned if the system if that money would be available to the private system and questioned if there is a time frame. Mr. Lamb pointed out there is a soft time frame of about a year for the City to determine if it can or wants to move forward. Whether it is possible to have a third party operator and the City act as a pass through for the funding was talked about.

Sig Hutchinson, 2704 Snowy Meadows Court, Raleigh, NC provided Council members with information on the bike share program in Raleigh as follows:

Proposed Raleigh Bike Share Program

- **30 bike stations** in the current bike share plan (mostly downtown; 5 at NCSU)
- **Initial Capital Cost:** $2 million

  - Federal grant: $1.6m (~80%)
  - City: $425K (~20%)
- **Annual Operating Costs:** $660K
  - User fees will cover $220K (1/3)
  - Business sponsorships set to cover ~$220K + (1/3 +)
  - Public funds (suggested) will cover remaining $220K (1/3) or less
- **2014 Feasibility Study for Raleigh** concluded Bike Share would be successful here.

Benefits and Opportunities of Bike Share

1. **Economic Competitiveness for Raleigh and region: Currently *71 bike shares*** *in operation or in pre-launch across the country, including Charlotte, Washington, St. Paul, Austin, even Spartanburg, SC.*
2. **Enhances existing and future transit service:** *Bike share can help the transit system (the last mile) because bikes can easily traverse neighborhoods without bus service.*
3. **Improves physical and mental health and reduces healthcare costs:** *Active transportation gets people more active whether it's a commute to work or a short trip. Great for health!*
4. **Introduces new riders and reintroduces people to benefits of biking:** *More bike users mean more people using bike lanes, increasing awareness about bike safety.*
5. **Raises the profile of the City, promoting it to potential employers, residents and visitors:** *Bike Share programs are popular with visitors, and increasingly more businesses see this as a plus for their employees- especially Millennials.*
6. **Provides economic uplift to businesses:** *More traffic (on bikes) is always good tor business.*
7. **Provides transportation alternative for those who cannot afford cars.**
8. **Access to SE Raleigh and Historically Black Colleges:** *Downtown bike share would provide easy access to near-by neighborhoods, and can be priced to be affordable for all income levels.*
9. **Reduces automobile dependence and reduces overall household transportation expenditure:** *Driving and maintaining a car costs around $9,900/year, and most bike share memberships cost $50-100/year.*
10. **Reduces greenhouse gas emissions:** *If we get more people out of cars and onto bikes, one of the key results will be less contribution to emissions and cleaner air as a result.*

Mr. Hutchinson stated this is a transportation system that operates station to station, a bikeshare program is not designed to commute to a bus station and put your bike on the bus. He talked about the cities across the country that have a program, stated there is great deal of interest from the community in sponsoring, talked about conservations with Diane Ward of the Charlotte program who he feels has information that could work with the City to get the price down. He stated as far as the operating side he believes DRA is looking at the possibility of taking the program on as the operator. Mr. Hutchinson read the following poem.

Any way you slice it BikeShare is fun. It's good when you've got lots time, or even on the run.

Think of your favorite city; the ones where we all love to go. BikeShare is there, ready for you to go, to and fro. 70 cities In America are currently in the plan. There's ones you expect like DC and Boston, San Diego and San Fran.

But there are other cities doing BikeShare that you think might would pass, There's Oklahoma City, Spartanburg, Omaha and Charlotte are all kicking our butts.

BikeShare is good for tourist, it good for citizens too. It's good for our brand, and the health of both me and you.

It's good for first timers giving a BikeShare a try; and someday they might even say, "A Bike I'll buy."

It's good for those who use it every day. For them it's like play, grabbing a latté along the way.

It can save you money and make you smile. You can ride with a friend, or if you're taking transit; it can take you your last mile.

It's great for millennials, and seniors too; for me and you, I think it will do. The plan is a buzz, everyone thinks so. From WakeUP Wake County, to Advocates for Health in Action, everyone says go!

From transportation folks like the RTA and Joe, to the Downtown Raleigh Alliance, saying well handle the operations so please give us mo.

From millennials and urbanizes and serving downtown; Matt Tomasulo says I'm down with downtown to bring it around.

We all love BikeShare, and now it's one vote away, it's about making Raleigh Cool!, let's make it happen today.

Approximately 60 persons stood in support of Mr. Hutchison's comments and the program in general.

Ms. Crowder expressed appreciation to Wake County Commissioner Hutchinson and questioned if he bought the county checkbook with him today. Mr. Hutchinson pointed out he is working on that possibility.

Mr. Gaylord talked about a bike share program pursuing cost recovery, public financing, raising private dollars on a one-third type partnership which works out to be some $220,000 of sponsorships. He stated he essentially made three phone calls and was able to get a verbal

commitment for some $250,000. In response to questioning from the Mayor, Mr. Gaylord indicated he has been talking to people about a three year sponsorship.

Catherine Harrell, Senior Director of Marketing at Citrix, pointed out she is a Raleigh resident and lives downtown in the Glenwood Brooklyn area. She stated Citrix strongly supports a bike share program. They support the program for their employees and the city in general. She stated they believe that it will provide a much needed alternative for transpiration for their employees and for citizens and it is really supports a value that is important to her company which is a healthy lifestyle. She stated alternatives in keeping the work force and citizens moving in the right way are healthy and last but not least it increases Raleigh's competitive edge from an economic perspective. We are an emerging city and a developing city and they feel a bike share program would be good. She stated she moved to Raleigh from London and talked about the Boris Bikes pointing out Mayor Boris Johnson road the bikes to work as a part of his commute. She stated she and her husband used bikes for recreation and for commuting purposes and it was quite a successful program. She stated Citrix is very interested and she thinks the big key punch line is that they are interested in being main sponsors for the program should the City decide to move forward.

Kerry Grace Heckle, Public Relations Director at UNC Rex Healthcare, pointed out she too is a Raleigh resident and she appreciates the opportunity to voice their support of the bike share program. UNC Rex is in support of the public private partnership and supports those items that align with health and wellness goals for all of our community and at this time look forward to continuing the conversation, learning more about how they can be of support to bike share in their community.

David Diaz, Downtown Raleigh Associates, pointed out at the February 11 Board of Directors meeting, Eric Lamb provided an overview of the program much like he did today. He stated the DRA Board absolutely supports the concept of a bike share program in Raleigh. They see it as a downtown revitalization project because it enhances the health and wellbeing of the citizens. By encouraging residents to use bikes we are encouraging an active and healthy life style. They also see it as an economic development tool as they feel building stations can stimulate the market place to explore other development in close proximity to the stations and locations where there is existing economic activity, DRA feels the existing businesses will tailor their offerings to capture prospective customers. Mr. Diaz stated they are very open to working with the City to develop the necessary implementation operations in details that will be required to make such a program sustainable. They are willing to explore a model similar to the one in Charlotte where they have a 5013C which oversees the operation of the bike share program. He stated there are many more details to go into the plan but should the Council express its desire the move forward with a capital investment needed for the program they would welcome dialogue with the Council and staff to do further exploring of details.

Brief discussion took place on DRA's willingness and interest in overseeing the program. How the Charlotte Center City Group works their creation of a separate 5013C under the parent nonprofit essentially having a space in downtown where they actually fix the bikes that are in need of repair. How that would work was talked about with it being pointed out more details

would have to be worked out. It was pointed out DRA could have the Charlotte Group send an update that could be shared with the Council and be able to visualize how it actually operates in Charlotte.

Brief discussion took place on the offer extended by DRA. Mayor McFarlane and Ms. Crowder asked if they are willing to assume some of the cost. Mr. Diaz indicated they are with Ms. Crowder questioning if they are talking about assuming some of the cost with money passed to them from the City with it being pointed out that is correct.

Mr. Branch questioned the possibility of sending this issue to a work session. Mayor McFarlane pointed out there seems to be a long list of questions and talked about the time frame. Ms. Crowder questioned if the people from Citrix and UNC Rex who spoke in support of the project are in support in the concept or are willing to commit funding to the program. The work session schedule was talked about.

Ms. Crowder stated she still has a lot of concerns and questions to do with funding. She questioned if the program does not work who would be responsible for picking up the program or paying off the cost. She talked about the need to have something for the whole city. Discussion also took place as to whether the CAMPO grant money would be made available to private organization, the need for sponsorship, value of a sponsorship, how long sponsorships would last and if something happens who would be responsible to pick up the short fall in revenue. The deadline for making a decision was talked about with it being pointed out it is a soft deadline. After discussion it was agreed to refer the item to the March 15 work session.

Other discussion took place as to whether staff could get all of the questions answered and a commitment for the dollars for sponsorship by that time. Mr. Lamb pointed out he would reach out to those who have spoken today and see if they could take some type lead. Mr. Gaylord pointed out it would not be possible to get a formal written commitment until the City has decided whether it wants to commit to the program. The City would also have to decide what type system it is going to use, what type sponsorships will be available for companies to buy, we would have to get contracts in place and that could not occur until a lot of questions are answered. He stated there needs to be a lot of things figured out pointing out we have received commitments from people today saying they are interested and would like to pursue participation but no one can enter into a formal written contract until we know more about the program.

No further action was taken except referring the item to the March 15 work session.

REQUEST AND PETITIONS OF CITIZENS

TEXT CHANGE – ALLEY TRANSITION – REFERRED TO PLANNING COMMISSION

Neil Riemann, 204 East Park Drive and Michael Stephenson 210 E Forest Drive, Cameron Park Neighborhood Association was at the meeting to introduce a text change and ask that it be referred to the Planning Commission. Mr. Riemann stated the text change is a specific case of

residential transition alley. He talked about the situation in Cameron Park particularly those areas fronting Hillsborough Street and Groveland Street which has an alley behind them. The alleys are public parcels, they belong to the City but the City does not maintain them. He stated previously there was no transition whatsoever but in the UDO they got part of the problem fixed; however they have found that the transitions are not very friendly to the development along Hillsborough Street, etc. He talked about the regulations which require physical building separations, the existing regulations in which mixed use property the 50 foot no build area that is unfriendly. He stated presently those areas could have things such as parking lots, out buildings, etc., with restrictions. Under this proposal you could have residential units on the back side and a number of other uses that would allow more usable footage. He talked about what is allowed now and what would be allowed under the proposal. He stated they have worked with the commercial owners, developers and staff and it was suggested they come forward with this proposal. He stated this would allow friendlier development to occur in what is now seen as a 50 foot no build situation.

Mayor McFarlane questioned what is being proposed as she thought that the neighborhood did not want buildings to abut the alleys. Mr. Reimann talked about not wanting a 57 foot building on the alley but no problem with residential across the alley. Mr. Stephenson indicated he had been involved in this some and he understands the neighborhoods and the commercial developers are in agreement and moved the proposal be set to the Planning Commission for consideration. His motion was seconded by Ms. Crowder and put to a vote which passed with all Council members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Baldwin who was absent and excused. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote.

HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD PROGRAMS – CONCERNS EXPRESSED – REFERRED TO ADMINISTRATION

Jona Marie Ricci would like to address the apparent lack of concern for the current and future financial welfare of residents participating in the City's Housing and Neighborhood programs; absence of response or cooperation from the City Manager when a serious issue is repeatedly brought to the attention of his office; failure of City departments to provide specific documents critical to a residents project.

Ms. Ricci pointed out she had three separate concerns and had requested three minutes for each item. She talked about being a resident and participating in one of the housing and neighborhoods programs. She pointed out there are three phases to the program, one relates to forgiveness, the second relates to for giving a certain amount of loans, etc., after certain criteria has been met and the third option is the one she participates in and which was offered to her for repairs to her home. She presented a packet of information which she characterized as a snapshot of work that was to be done on her home at 43 Whisper Wood Drive. She stated the work was to be done by a contractor that was approved, endorsed and funded by the City. She stated when he reached certain thresholds in the contract, they were supposed to do certain things, work with her and correct any deficiencies, etc. She stated the contracts provide schedules, etc., however he has not met those schedules. She stated she brought this to the attention of the people in the City including Larry Jarvis, however she can get no satisfaction.

She stated currently there code violations in two categories: one of the categories relates to improvements that need to be corrected to meet the perimeters of the contract and the other relates to code violations that have not been corrected. She stated nothing has been done by Mr. Jarvis or his group and work has been stopped, even though the corrections have not been made. She talked about the problem she has had and can get no satisfaction or no contacts from the City.

Mayor McFarlane suggested that the items be referred to Administration and the City Manager could provide a report. Ms. Ricci pointed out she had sent the information to the City Manager but had received absolutely no response therefore she is asking the City Council to look at the issue. The City is holding back payment on repairs she is supposed to get done, it is tying up the equity in her house and she is living with unstable conditions caused by the code violations.

Mr. Cox asked the City Manager to look into the specific issues outlining Ms. Ricci's comments. The City Manager stated he would provide a full report and provide the information to the Council. Ms. Ricci requested that she be copied on that report. No further action was taken.

STREET IMPROVEMENTS – PLAINVIEW ROAD – REQUEST – REFERRED TO ADMINISTRATION

Lisa Rowe, PLM Families Together, pointed out that is an organization which provides short term emergency housing and assistance in obtaining permanent housing for homeless families. She explained support they received from various agencies including the City of Raleigh. Ms. Rowe stated they have two apartment buildings in east Raleigh where they have six short term housing units and two units used for staff officers. She stated it is a very low lying area at the corner of two gravel roads off New Bern Avenue just over the beltline – the intersection of Plainview Drive and Polly Streets. She stated the driveway of their parking lot from Polly Street is fairly steep and runoff from the gravel road frequently washes onto the top part of their pavement or is kicked there by tire wheels making that area very slippery and difficult to transverse on foot. She stated there has been a number of falls, some resulting in broken bones, missed work, etc.

Ms. Rowe stated most of their clients do not have cars and all seem to have children. She stated when they need to catch the bus on New Bern Avenue they must carry, walk with or push their children in a stroller down the bumpy gravel road. She stated it is difficult especially in the dark. She stated the lack of adequate street lighting doesn't help. Ms. Rowe explained as a nonprofit with a tight budget they aren't in the position of petitioning the neighborhood to get the road paved. It is primarily an area of low income housing along with a church and previous attempts to get the landlord/property owners to petition and be prepared to pay the assessment fees have been unsuccessful. She talked about the liability issues, and the equity issues and the suggestion that she might ask the Council to consider allowing the paving of the road at a basic cost, that is, with no curb and gutter because it is a low traffic area. She stated she understands that would greatly decrease the cost. She answered questions about the ownership of the buildings, pointing out the apartments are owned by different landlords.

City Manager Hall pointed out there are two issues funding and policy. He stated staff could provide feedback and briefly explain the city's policy as it relates to assessments. He talked about funding for street improvements, our petition requirements and the policy in general.

Mr. Branch stated he understands we have 5 to 6 miles of unpaved streets in the city and talked about funding and needs of those areas, precedent setting, etc.

Chris McGee, Public Works Department, talked about the current policy for ribbon pavement which can be done by the City but it is not maintained by the City and talked about the various issues with gravel roads.

Assessment Supervisor Jimmy Upchurch explained the street improvement petition policy, the fact that the City Council could initiate a street improvement without a petition but assess the property owners, how this could be done for standard paving and/or ribbon paving. The cost to pave this street and the other unpaved streets in the City was talked about. The fact that this property is owned or occupied by nonprofit agencies and the cost which is prohibitive to the nonprofit was discussed. It was agreed to refer the item to Administration to bring back some offers for paving and/or policy exceptions, procedures, etc.

MATTERS SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING

MUNICIPAL SERVICE DISTRICTS – DOWNTOWN AND HILLSBOROUGH STREET AREAS – HEARING – COMMENTS RECEIVED

This is a hearing to receive input from residents and property owners of the Downtown and the Hillsborough Street Municipal Service Districts regarding services provided in the MSD areas. The input will be considered as the City prepares to issue a request for proposals for providing augmented municipal services in each district.

Following the hearing, it would be appropriate to adopt the revised scope of work for service proposals; the criteria to be used in evaluating submittals received in response to the request for proposals process; and to authorize staff to proceed.

City Manager Hall pointed out staff does not have a presentation but would be glad to answer questions. He stated this is not the required formal public hearing, this is a hearing to receive input regarding services to be provided in these areas. The Mayor opened the hearing.

Ann Franklin, 200 South Dawson Street, indicated as everyone knows the City is seeing a huge growth spurt and redevelopment in the downtown area. She stated it is very important mission to develop the scope of service for downtown and the need to find a balance to maintain a viable living successful downtown. She provided the following comments that were collected by Jim Belt.

What's missing:

- A unifying voice for downtown that is leading the conversation on issues affecting stakeholders
- An effective collaboration including an alliance of businesses and residents working together

What could be done differently:

- Raleigh the make-up of the DRA board positions so they better represent those property owners having the most knowledge and experiences, and are most impacted by issues affecting downtown
    - 90% of downtown businesses (retail, restaurant, arts) are independently owned & operated, yet make up only 10% (3/32) board positions.
    - Downtown development is driven by growth in the resident population, et residents represent only 3% (1 of 32) board positions.
- Implement a communication platform that facilitates a wider and deeper conversation and connection with both downtown businesses and residents.

We realize that the corporate DRA board members provide important sponsorship for vents and projects, but we feel that the ideal would be balancing that financial support with on-the-ground resources available to you through small business owners and residents, whose lives revolve around the pulse of growth and activity in downtown.

Ms. Franklin talked about the role of DRA, the desires of the Downtown Living Advocates, feelings on how these needs could be best met, the need to have a unified voice for downtown which could help get ahead of many of the issues, bring these to the City Council, develop partnerships, etc. It is felt that most of the needs could be best met by a collective collaboration, talked about the need to realign the makeup of the DRA board, and how they feel this should proceed.

The Mayor closed the hearing.

Mayor McFarlane indicated Ms. Franklin provides some very valid points, Mr. Stephenson talked about the City Council adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, Downtown Plan, Hillsborough Plan, etc., all of which involved the extensive stakeholder input. He stated it is extremely important that any RFP includes support for the adopted goals and action items including in the various plans adopted by the City. It was pointed out by the City Manager that he felt the comments and compliance with adopted plans are included and he feels Ms. Franklin's comments are captured. Ms Crowder moved approval of the recommendations as outlined. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Thompson and put to a vote which resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Baldwin who was absent and excused. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote.

REZONING Z-44-15 – ACC BOULEVARD – HEARING – APPROVED – ORDINANCE ADOPTED

This is a hearing to consider a request from GHTD Brier Creek, LLC to rezone approximately 2.32 acres from Conditional Use Thoroughfare District with PDD (Alexander Place PDD) (CUD TD w/PDD) to Commercial Mixed Use – 7 stories – with Parking Limited Frontage and Conditions (CX-7-PL-CU). The property is located on ACC Boulevard, south side, west of its intersection with Brier Creek Parkway.

Once the hearing is closed, the council may take action to approve, deny or refer the case to committee.

Planner Bynum Walter presented the request showing the existing development, map of the area, site views, what is allowed under existing versus proposed zoning, Future Land Use Map, Urban Form, Comprehensive Plan Analysis, recommendation of approval by the Planning Commission and a 9-0 vote for approval by the Northwest CAC. She went over the recommendations of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Stephenson asked about transit plan with Engineer Lamb talking about the transit in the area and the fact that this maintains what is there today.

The Mayor opened the hearing.

Attorney Isabel Mattox representing the applicant talked about the transit easement, the active bus stop, recorded easements and the purpose of the rezoning which would provide for an expansion of the existing use. She pointed out the proposed rezoning mirrors what is across the street and talked about the use of abutting property. It is consistent with all plans, it's generally consisted with the remapping, and the Planning Commission and the Northwest CAC recommended approval.

Mayor McFarlane asked about the request and what they are asking for and the conditions in the area. Traffic on this site, trip generation, etc, was discussed as was parking limited frontage.

No one else asked to be heard thus the hearing was closed. Mr. Stephenson pointed out he feels the request is reasonable, generally consistent with plans, therefore he would move approval. His motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Baldwin who was absent and excused. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote. See Ordinance 549 ZC 725.

REZONING Z-45-15 – POOLE ROAD – HEARING – APPROVED – ORDINANCE ADOPTED

This was a hearing to consider a request from Wayne and Ella Adams, Community Alternatives for Supportive Abodes, and Roberson Hill Apartments, Inc., to rezone approximately 2.93 acres

from Residential-10 (R-10) to Residential Mixed use – 3 stories (RX-3). The property is located on the north side of Poole Road just east of its intersection with Raleigh Boulevard.

Once the hearing is closed, the council may take action to approve, deny or refer the case to committee.

Planner Bynum Walter presented the case, talked about the adopted plan for the area, existing zoning and development, what would be allowed under existing versus proposed rezoning, site views, Future Land Use Map, Comprehensive Plan Analysis, recommendation of the Planning Commission and the ECAC to approve the case. In response to questioning from Mr. Branch it was pointed out this does not require a traffic impact analysis. It was pointed out Council can always request one but it is not required. The Mayor opened the hearing.

A representative of Community Alternatives for Supportive Abodes Incorporated (CASA) pointed out she represents the owner of the property at 1719 Poole Road. She talked about the center they operate, various apartments, etc. in the area. She stated in 2011 they developed 1725 Poole Road pointing out it has a larger community space. 1721 Poole Road is under utilized and talked about their efforts to bring affordable housing on line. Mr. Branch pointed out he firmly supports the program but going from 29 units to 101 units he feels will increase the traffic and he feels we need to have some sort of study. He talked about recent improvements to Poole Road consisting of adding a bike lane, turn lanes, he is just concerned about the traffic this project will bring and would like to see a traffic study. The representative of CASA pointed out they have no plans whatsoever to develop or redevelop the property, talked about the population they serve and why the rezoning application is being filed. The fact that a traffic impact analysis would cost some $10,000 it is not required by the proposal and no development is proposed. If development is proposed in the future a traffic impact analysis could be required. Various Council members expressed concern that the property could be rezoned and then resold and there may be development, with it being pointed out a traffic analysis could be required at that point. Traffic Engineer Todd Delk pointed out the proposal for completely build out of this property would add only 35 to 40 cars per day. The fact that if the property is developed at site plan approval a traffic impact analysis could be required, whether a traffic study should be required at this point, the fact that no development is proposed, the feeling that if the traffic impact analysis is required, CASA could not utilized the property as planned, traffic on the road and the fact that is development occurs in the future, the analysis could be required. No one else asked to be heard thus the hearing was closed.

Mr. Branch talked about the needs in the area, concern of a lack of a traffic impact analysis but understanding it could be required later, therefore moved approval of the request. His motion was seconded by Ms. Crowder and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Mr. Thompson who voted in the negative and Ms. Baldwin who was absent and excused. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 6-1 vote. See Ordinance 549 ZC 725.

Mr. Thompson indicated he voted no as he is concerned about the inconsistency of Council requesting a traffic impact analysis. Discussion on what triggers a traffic impact analysis when it is and is not required and/or recommended was talked about.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF GROWTH AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE SAFE, VIBRANT AND HEALTHY NEIGHBORHOODS COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF TRANSPORTATIONS AND TRANSIT COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

REPORT OF MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS

FLAGS IN NEIGHBORHOODS – INFORMATION REQUESTED

Mr. Cox asked that the City staff look into the issue of allowing flags on light poles in neighborhoods. He indicated some neighborhoods want to have flags to identify their neighborhood or special events and he understands there is a problem. He asked the City Manager to investigate the prohibition and/or problem and look at whether it is possible to install holders on the poles and allow neighbors and/or communities to design their own products.

City Attorney McCormick indicated it is a complex issue and talked about the various sign ordinance issues that are involved. Why some neighborhoods have flags on the utility poles in their neighborhood and why others are told it is not allowed was discussed. Mr. Cox pointed out there are neighborhoods such as Bedford and similar neighborhoods that have flags welcoming people to the neighborhood. He stated he would just like to understand what the City has to do to make this possible for the neighborhoods. Ms. Crowder cautioned about visual clutter in our city.

The complexities of the issue, who owns the utility poles and the fact that it is happening in certain areas of the city was talked about. Mr. Cox stated he would just like information on what is needed to make it happen so if a neighborhood wants to have flags identifying their neighborhoods they would be able to go through the process and make it happen. Mayor McFarlane stated the City has had this conversation many many times it takes a lot of staff time to come up with programs or answers such as this and she feels the Council should decide

whether it would support such a program before sending staff off to do the work. Mr. Stephenson pointed out it seems there is already a system in place as there are some neighborhoods which have the flags. He stated may be it would be good if the Council could be provided information and to be able to understand the system in place that is, get information on how the process works, how various subdivisions are allowed to have the flags, how it happens downtown, etc. City Manager Hall suggested that the item be referred to administration which could provide a report that describes the current activities, what is allowed and outline some of the complexities of the issues. The item was referred to Administration.

PARKING – TRACTOR TRAILERS – INFORMATION REQUESTED

Mr. Cox stated he would like to have clarification on whether parking tractor trailer trucks on city streets are allowed. He stated he understands it is not allowed but he is not familiar with any signs to indicate such. City Attorney McCormick indicated it is illegal to have the tractor trailer trucks parked on the street and he would provide information. Mr. Cox stated he would also like to have information as to where tractor trailers can be parked if they cannot be parked on streets in the City. The City Attorney stated he would provide a report.

MOORE SQUARE TRANSIT STATION – RENOVATION ANNOUNCED

Mr. Branch indicated the Moore Square Transit Station will start undergoing renovation on Friday of this week pointing out he is excited to see that happen and encouraged all to attend. The comments were received.

BRIDGES – DISTRICT D – COMMENTS RECEIVED

Ms. Crowder pointed out District D now has a second bridge that is closed which makes two bridges are within one-half a mile of each other and talked about the traffic problems on Trailwood and other parts of District D. She stated District D could have as many as five bridges out at the same time, stating she was just warning people of the potential problems.

CITY NOISE SOFTWARE – COMMENTS RECEIVED

Mr. Gaylord stated he had just learned about an interesting project at Shaw University relating to a city noise software. He asked that the City take a look at the software pointing out it is a very interesting project and he wonders if the City could utilize it in some way.

ESSENTIALS OF GOVERNMENT – COMMENTS RECEIVED

Mr. Thompson indicated he had just returned from a two-day conference put on by the North Carolina League of Municipalities entitled "Essentials of Government." He stated it was very interesting and it provided him with a lot of information, ethics training, etc. The comments were received.

APPOINTMENTS

APPOINTMENTS – NOMINATIONS/VACANCIES ANNOUNCED

The City Clerk reported the following results of the ballot vote:

Human Relations Commission – One Vacancy – No nominees – The City Clerk pointed out since the preparation of the agenda, she has received a letter of resignation from Brian Fitzsimmons, and therefore there are two vacancies on the Human Relations Commission.

Stormwater Management Advisory Commission – One Vacancy – Ms. Crowder nominated Evan Kane.

The items will be carried over to the next meeting.

NOMINATIONS

ART COMMISSION – EXTENSION OF TERMS – TO BE PLACED ON MARCH 1, 2016 AGENDA

The City Clerk reported the terms of Nancy W. Novell and Jason Craighead are expiring in March. Neither is eligible for reappointment because of length of service. It was pointed out by Mr. Cox that Ms. Novell is presently chair person and it has been suggested that her term be extended. It has also been suggested that Mr. Craighead's term be extended. The Ten Year Public Arts Plan has just been adopted and the Arts Commission is about to begin the process of selecting a new executive director. The City Attorney pointed out the Council could simply just hold action and the people would continue to serve until replaced or reappointed. Comments as to how long an extension should be granted was talked about after which it was agreed to place the item on the March 1 agenda for consideration of the length of extension that should be considered.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – J. CARR MCLAMB – REAPPOINTED

The City Clerk reported the term of J. Carr McLamb on the Board of Adjustment is expiring. He is eligible for reappointment and would like to be considered for reappointment. Mayor McFarlane moved that the Council suspend its rules and reappoint Mr. McLamb by acclamation. Her motion was seconded by Ms. Crowder and put to a vote which passed with all members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Baldwin who was absent and excused. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote.

PLANNING COMMISSION – MITCHELL FLUHRER – REAPPOINTED

The City Clerk reported the term of Mitchell Fluhrer on the Planning Commission is expiring. He is eligible for reappointment and would like to be considered for reappointment. Mr. Gaylord moved that the Council suspend its rules and reappoint Mr. Fluhrer by acclamation. His motion

was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Baldwin who was absent and excused. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote.

RALEIGH TRANSIT AUTHORITY – SHERITA MCCULLERS – REAPPOINTED

The City Clerk reported the term of Sherita McCullers is expiring. She is eligible for reappointment and would like to be considered for reappointment. Mr. Branch moved that the Council suspend its rules and reappointment Ms. Branch by acclamation. His motion was seconded by Mr. Gaylord and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Baldwin who was absent and excused. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION – VACANCY ANNOUNCED

The City Clerk reported the term of R. Michael Birch on the Stormwater Management Advisory Commission is expiring. He is not eligible for reappointment because of length of service. No nominations were made. The item will be placed on the March 2, agenda for consideration.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

EUCLID AVENUE CASE – NORTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS – DECISION ANNOUNCED

City Attorney McCormick indicated the North Carolina Court of Appeals voted to uphold the Board of Adjustment in the Euclid Avenue historic house case. He pointed out it was a unanimous decision and explained the process that would have to be followed in an appeal which is a very lengthy process. The comments were received.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY CLERK

MINUTES – VARIOUS – APPROVED

The City Clerk reported Council members received in their agenda packet copies of the minutes of the February 1, 2016 and February 2, 2016 City Council meetings. Mr. Stephenson moved approval as presented. His motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and put to a roll call vote which resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Baldwin who was absent and excused. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote.

Adjournment. There being no further business, Mayor McFarlane announced the meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Gail G. Smith
City Clerk

jt/CC02-16-16