COUNCIL MINUTES

The City Council of the City of Raleigh met in a regular session at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 15, 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
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 Tom Harris, Saint Andrews Presbyterian Church. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Council Member Cox.

The following items were discussed with action taken as shown.

RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL AWARDS

PROCLAMATION – TEDxRALEIGH DAY - PROCLAIMED

Mayor McFarlane read a proclamation proclaiming Saturday, March 19, 2016 as TedxRaleigh Day in the City of Raleigh. She explained TED is a nonprofit devoted to spreading innovative ideas that change attitudes, lives and ultimately the world, usually in the form of short, powerful talks less than 18 minutes. TED began in 1984 as a conference where technology, entertainment and design converged and has grown to cover almost all topics from science to business to global issues. She talked about the participation. The proclamation was received by Kevin Snyder, Curator for the TEDxRaleigh who expressed appreciation for the proclamation and invited all Council Members to attend the upcoming event.

RECOGNITION – PARKER POE - ANNOUNCED

Mayor McFarlane pointed out Parker Poe is celebrating it's 50th year in Raleigh and has a long standing tradition of community services in many forms including participation of members on several boards, commissions and public offices. As a part of their on-going community service in Raleigh, over the 5 decades Parker Poe has donated $2,500 towards the renovation of Moore Square and worked with the Raleigh City Museum on an exhibit about the history of the firm and donating $2,500 to the Friends of the City Museum. The recognition was accepted by Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources Director Diane Sauer and Kevin Chignel, Managing Partner from Parker Poe.

AGENCY GRANTEE PRESENTATION

AGENCY GRANTEE PRESENTATION – THE HOPE CENTER AT PULLEN - RECEIVED

Stacy Bluth, The Hope Center at Pullen, was at the meeting to give highlights of their program pointing out they serve 140 young people between the ages of 13 and 25, mostly at risk or young people who have aged out of the foster system. She stated that is the group that is most often found in jail, pregnant or homeless. She pointed out last year they housed 30 children under the age of eight explaining there are children of the population they serve. She pointed out they have partnered with others in the community including Wake Tech, Wake Human Services, PLM Families Together, etc., working on housing, education, building support networks etc., for the people they serve. She pointed out 90% of the young people they serve were housed compared to about 40% nationally; 65% were enrolled in post education compared to 8% nationally and as of yesterday 100% of their 24 years old were employed as compared to 20% nationally. She stated they could not have done this without the support of the City of Raleigh pointing out they started off very small and the City believed in them. She talked about the human service mentoring and internship programs they have been able to establish as well as the work made possible through the enhancement grants. She stated last week the Hope Center at Pullen along with six other similar groups were awarded a $1M grant from GSK and talked about what that will enable the groups to do. She expressed appreciation to all involved.

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. Gaylord to withdraw the item relating to an encroachment request 223 South West Street. Without objection, that item was withdrawn from the consent agenda. Mr. Thompson moved approval of the consent agenda as amended. His motion was seconded by Ms. Baldwin and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote. The items on the Consent Agenda were as follows.

ANNEXATION PETITION – 9600 FONVILLE ROAD – REFERRED TO CITY CLERK TO CHECK SUFFICIENCY AND SCHEDULE PUBLIC HEARING FOR APRIL 19, 2016

The agenda presented the following petition for annexation.

AREA NAME AND DISTRICT	PETITIONER	ACRES	PROPOSED USE
Contiguous Petition:			
Taylor-Long Residence 9600 Fonville Road (A)	Ruth Ann Long	0.97	Residential

Recommendation: Acknowledge the annexation petition and direct the City Clerk to check the sufficiency of the petition pursuant to State statute and, if found sufficient, authorize advertisement for public hearing to be held on April 19, 2016. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ANNUAL ACTION PLAN – PUBLIC HEARING AUTHORIZED FOR APRIL 5, 2016

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires entitlement communities under the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership (HOME), and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) programs to hold two public hearings annually. The first hearing occurs at the beginning of the process associated with the preparation of the five-year Consolidated Plan or Annual Action Plan in order to obtain citizen views on housing and community development needs, including priority non-housing community needs. The City held that hearing on December 1, 2015. The second hearing is held prior to the May submission of either the Consolidated Plan or Annual Action Plan to HUD.

Recommendation: Authorize a public hearing to be conducted April 5, 2016. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes.

POLICE – CRASH RECONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT GRANT – ACCEPTED – BUDGET AMENDED

The City has been awarded $11,250 in grant funding from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to purchase equipment that will assist the Crash Reconstruction Unit with the investigation and adjudication of very serious and/or fatal motor vehicle crashes, and to provide continuing education for staff assigned to the unit. The City match amount for the grant is $3,750; a budget amendment totaling $18,750 is necessary to appropriate the grant funding and the grant match. The grant was administratively approved by the Grants Committee December 17, 2015.

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute grant documentation and authorize a budget amendment in the amount of $18,750. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes. See Ordinance 553 TF 271.

FIRE STATION 14 – DESIGN CONTRACT AWARDED TO STEWART COOPER NEWELL ARCHITECTS, PA

Fire Station 14 is currently located on Lake Boone Trail but is scheduled to be replaced and, in conjunction with that replacement, will be relocated to a site at 3504 Harden Road. Stewart Cooper Newell Architects, PA is in the process of performing preliminary site evaluation work, including building location layout for Fire Station 14. The site for construction has been acquired by the City. In order to provide cost savings, the consultant is developing an option to consider utilizing the building footprint of the design from Station 12, provided the footprint can be accommodated on the site. It is now necessary to proceed with professional design services for design, permitting, bidding, and construction administration services for Fire Station 14.

Contract negotiations with Stewart Cooper Newell Architects, PA for professional design services associated with replacing Fire Station 14 have resulted in a proposed contract amount of $474,540. Funding for the design of the replacement of Fire Station 14 was appropriated in the capital budget.

Name of Project:	Fire Station 14 Replacement
Managing Division:	Public Works – Construction Management
Reason for Council Review:	Professional services contract >$150,000
Original CIP Budget:	$7,216,718
Vendor:	Stewart Cooper Newell Architects, PA
Budget Transfer:	Administrative
Prior Contract Activity:	$51,500 (Includes evaluations for multiple fire station design and sites)
Encumbered with this approval:	$474,540

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute a contract in an amount not to exceed $474,540. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes.

FIRE STATION 11 RENOVATIONS – STEWART COOPER NEWELL ARCHITECTS, PA – AMENDMENT #1 – APPROVED

Stewart Cooper Newell Architects, PA has completed conceptual and preliminary designs for renovations to Fire Station 11, located at 2925 Glenridge Road. Improvements to the station include waterproofing; replacement and upgrades to the existing HVAC systems; electrical system and life safety building code improvements; and replacement of the communications tower. This amendment is for proceeding with final design, permitting, bidding, and construction administration services.

Contract negotiations have been concluded with Stewart Cooper Newell Architects, PA for professional design services, in an amount not to exceed $192,185.

Name of Project:	Fire Station 11 Design Services Contract
Managing Division:	Public Works – Construction Management
Reason for Council Review:	Contract amendment >$150,000
Vendor:	Stewart Cooper Newell Architects, PA
Original CIP Budget:	$450,000
Prior Contract Activity:	$88,796
Budget Transfer:	Administrative
Amendment One:	$192,185
Encumbered with this approval:	$280,981

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute the contract amendment one in an amount not to exceed $192,185. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes.

PARATRANSIT SHARED MOBILITY MANAGEMENT SERVICE – INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH WAKE COUNTY – MANAGER AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE

The GoRaleigh Americans with Disabilities Act compliant paratransit program, GoRaleigh Access (formerly Accessible Raleigh Transportation, or ART), has partnered with Wake County to develop a para-transit service model referred to nationally as Mobility Management. Through the execution of a contract for mobility management services and accompanying technology, the GoRaleigh Access program continues to improve paratransit program oversight and passenger convenience. Through an interlocal agreement with Wake County, the GoRaleigh Access program utilizes the services of Ride Right, LLC; Ride Right provides a general manager and an appropriate level of staffing to support the defined mobility management activities. The initial contract began in the last half of FY2014. FY2016 marks the second full year of implementation, and includes program elements described below:

- Contractual arrangement with Wake County for the use of a shared mobility management contractor to schedule all GoRaleigh access trips, as well as Wake County paratransit trips and providing contractor oversight.
- Utilize the GoRaleigh facility located at 1430 South Blount Street for the mobility management team and select service providers. Basic improvements to the facility are underway; this includes rehabilitation of staff parking areas and the renovation of maintenance areas.
- The use of a single phone number and dispatch office to handle all incoming calls regarding trip status and cancellations during GoRaleigh service hours.
- The use of hosted ride scheduling software; the software will eventually be accessible by vendors and will communicate with contracted vehicles.
- The use of automated vehicle location (AVL) technology to track vendor vehicles to ensure productivity, provide complaint resolution and validate performed trips as they occur.
- An interactive voice response (IVR) system utilized to improve client information. This system provides courtesy calls to clients the night before a scheduled trip and notifies the client by call that they are next in queue for pickup.

Funding for the agreement is available from eligible grant funding; the local share commitment is 20 percent or $53,053.

Name of Project:	Wake County Shared Transportation Resources
Managing Division:	Public Works – Transit
Request Reason:	Interlocal Agreement
Original CIP Project Budget:	N/A
Vendor:	Wake County
Prior Contract Activity:	N/A
Budget Transfer:	N/A
New Project Budget:	$265,265
Currently Encumbered:	$0
Amount of this Contract:	$265,265
Encumbered with this Approval:	$265,265

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute the interlocal agreement in an amount not to exceed $265,265. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes.

PUBLIC UTILITIES - NEUSE RIVER, SYCAMORE CREEK, GREEN SPRING VALLEY AND CRABTREE CREEK PUMP AND LIFT STATION UPGRADES – SOLE SOURCE PROCUREMENTS – APPROVED

Three capital maintenance projects are nearing the bid stage process. The projects include the Neuse River Pump Station Improvements Project (Phase 2); the Sycamore Creek Pump Station Upgrade; the Green Spring Valley Pump Station Replacement project; and the Crabtree Creek Lift Station Expansion project. Sole Sourcing or limiting competition on certain plant components and construction work will offer certain benefits and cost savings to the City that other manufacturers or vendors cannot offer. The City is allowed by state statute (GS 143-129 (e)(6)I to waive competitive bidding when the need for standardization and compatibility is an overriding consideration.

It is recommended that the following vendors be sole sourced for the various projects, as identified:

CITI – Instrumentation, Control System Integration Services

- Neuse River PS Improvements Project (Phase 2):
  - The negotiated cost is $11,427.
- Sycamore Creek PS Upgrade and Green Spring Valley PS Replacement Project:
  - The negotiated cost is $124,700.
- Crabtree Creek Lift Station Expansion Project:
  - The negotiated cost is $138,120.

Fairbanks Morse Pump represented by ClearWater, Inc.

- Neuse River PS Improvements Project (Phase 2):

- The negotiated cost is $101,535. It is also requested to approve the direct purchase of Fairbanks Morse Pump Number Four from ClearWater, Inc. which is the only Fairbanks Morse supplier available.

Cornell Pump Company – Vertical Coupled Solids Handling Pump

- Sycamore Creek PS Improvements:
  - The estimated cost is $42,000.

Smith & Loveless – Wetwell Mounted PS

- Green Spring Valley PS Replacement:
  - The estimated cost is $95,400.

Recommendation: Authorize sole source procurement of the equipment and services specified for the associated capital improvement projects, and authorize the execution of contracts with each vendor in amounts not to exceed as identified above. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes.

CAPITAL BOULEVARD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT – UTILITY AGREEMENTS WITH NCDOT – APPROVED

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) is currently conducting planning, environmental, and design studies for the proposed project to replace the bridges at the Capital Boulevard interchanges at Peace Street and Wade Avenue. During the planning phase of this project, alternatives are being studied that replace the bridges with new bridges in similar configurations in different styles of interchange configurations. The bridge on Capital Boulevard over Peace Street was built in 1948 and has a sufficiency rating of 44.9 out of a possible 100. The bridge on Capital Boulevard at Wade Avenue was built in 1954, has a sufficiency rating of 34.1, and is posted with a weight limit. Both bridges are classified as "structurally deficient" due to age. While the existing bridges are still adequate to support traffic, they are nearing the end of their design lives and need to be replaced in a timely manner.

NCDOT is coordinating with the City, to include coordination with the Capital Boulevard Corridor Study approved in August 2012. The bridge replacement projects will not restrict the City from completing future projects that fulfill the long-term vision for this area.

Staff has been working with the NCDOT regarding water and sewer infrastructure replacements as part of the bridge work, as well as road improvements on and around Capital Boulevard. Several water and sewer lines will be relocated and replaced as a part of this project, including a 24-inch sanitary sewer interceptor. The amount of the agreement was $5,201,858.

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute the agreement. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes.

BRENTWOOD ESTATES SEWER IMPROVEMENTS – CONTRACT AWARDED TO THE WOOTEN COMPANY

On September 16, 2015, 10 proposals were received for the Brentwood Estates Sewer Project. The project is located along a tributary to Marsh Creek between New Hope Church Road and the dead end of Long Bow Drive for a distance of 6,100 feet. This contract will provide Phase I professional engineering services for pipe condition and capacity assessment resulting in a report with recommendations for rehabilitation and/or replacement. Phase II efforts for preliminary and final design of the recommendations will be performed under a future amendment to this contract.

Name of Project:	Brentwood Estates Sewer Improvements Project
Managing Division:	Public Utilities – Capital Improvements Management Division
Approval request:	Contract award
Reason for Council Review:	RFQ selection
Original CIP Budget:	$584,000
Vendor Name:	The Wooten Company
Prior Contract Activity:	N/A
Encumbered with this approval:	$130,000

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute the contract in an amount not to exceed $130,000. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes.

PUBLIC UTILITIES - WASTEWATER TREATMENT MASTER PLAN – CONTRACT WITH BLACK AND VEATCH – APPROVED – BUDGET AMENDED

On August 28, 2015, three proposals were received for professional engineering services for the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan. This project involves an assessment of existing wastewater treatment capacity throughout the service area, along with evaluations of future wastewater treatment options for a 30-year planning window. This master plan was included in the approved FY16 Capital Improvement Program.

Public Utilities staff evaluated the proposals, conducted interviews, and selected Black and Veatch as the most qualified consultant to complete this work. A contract has been negotiated in the amount of $532,153. A budget transfer in the amount of $532,153 is necessary; accounting details were included with the agenda packet.

Name of Project:	Wastewater Treatment Master Plan
Managing Division:	Public Utilities – Capital Improvements Management Division
Approval request:	Contract award
Reason for Council Review:	Contract >$150,000
Original CIP Budget:	$400,000
Vendor Name:	Black and Veatch

Prior Contract Activity: N/A
Encumbered with this approval: $532,153

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute a contract in an amount not to exceed $532,153; authorize the necessary associated budget transfer. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes. See Ordinance 553 TF 271.

CELLCO PARTNERSHIP/2651 SOUTHALL ROAD – LEASE AGREEMENT AUTHORIZED

A lease agreement has been negotiated with Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (referenced to herein as the "Tenant") that will lease space on City-owned property located at 2651 Southall Road, site of Fire Station 21. The lease agreement will be for the purpose of allowing the Tenant to install cellular telecommunications equipment on the Duke Energy transmission tower and the site. The lease is for $10,800 per year with a three percent annual increase at the beginning of each year over the rent for the previous year during the ten-year term. Published notice of intent to authorize the lease was made in the News & Observer on February 13, 2016, in accordance with statutory requirements.

Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to execute the lease agreement. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes.

ENCROACHMENTS – 3128 HIGHWOODS BOULEVARD AND NORTH WILMINGTON/SOUTH WILMINGTON AND CAPITAL CENTER DRIVE – APPROVED CONDITIONALLY

The agenda represented the following encroachment requests:

3128 Highwoods Boulevard

A request has been received from Level 3 Communications to install fiber optic cable located in the right-of-way of Highwoods Boulevard. A report was included with the agenda packet.

North Wilmington, South Wilmington, and Capital Center Drive

A request has been received from Fiber Technologies Networks, LLC to install 4,728 feet of fiber optic cable 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. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes.

BUDGET AMENDMENTS AND TRANSFERS – VARIOUS – APPROVED

A budget amendment is needed to appropriate insurance proceeds in the equipment fund in the amount of $90,944. In fiscal year 2016, 29 city vehicles have been declared a total loss as the result of accidents; the Risk Management office has settled all claims. The appropriations will be used for to procure replacement vehicles.

Recommendation: Authorize the budget amendment in the amount of $90,944. Accounting detail was included with the agenda packet. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes. See Ordinance 553 TF 271.

CONDEMNATION – SUNNYBROOK ROAD REUSE WATER TANK SITE - 245 SUNNYBROOK ROAD – RESOLUTION ADOPTED

The Public Utilities Department is managing a capital improvement project to address the need for the Sunnybrook Road Reuse tank to be drained, cleaned, and maintained on a more regular basis due to the low turnover in the reuse system at this location. The project will help maintain reuse water quality and minimize treatment costs.

Due to title issues that prevent the City from acquiring clear title to the necessary easement interests by deed, it is recommended that a resolution of condemnation be authorized for the following property:

PROPERTY OWNER	ADDRESS
Maximus E. Frederick	245 Sunnybrook Road

Recommendation: Adopt a resolution of condemnation. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes. See Resolution 273.

TRAFFIC – SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION – ASHLEY RIDGE DRIVE, COXINDALE DRIVE AND VALLEY STREAM DRIVE – ORDINANCE ADOPTED

It is recommended that the speed limit be reduced from 35 mph to 25 mph on Ashley Ridge Drive, Coxindale Drive, and Valley Stream Drive. Valley Stream Drive is classified as a Neighborhood Street. Ashley Ridge Drive and Coxindale Drive are classified as Neighborhood Local. All three streets are 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 each street in support of the speed reduction request.

Recommendation: Approve as recommended and authorize the appropriate changes in the traffic code was included with the agenda packet. Upheld on Consent Agenda Thompson/Baldwin - 8 ayes. See Ordinance 554.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

ENCROACHMENT – 223 SOUTH WEST STREET – APPROVED CONDITIONALLY

A request has been received from Kane Realty Corporation to install temporary shoring, specialty pavers, light poles, tree grates, bike racks, trash cans, building foundations to support existing wall, grease traps, 19 linear feet of 15-inch reinforced concrete pipe for roof drainage, balconies, metal and fabric awnings, canopies, and sconces in the right-of-way. The site plan for the project was recently approved as part of the development permitting process. 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. Gaylord stated he had withdrawn this from the Consent Agenda as he needs to be recluse from voting. Ms. Baldwin moved Mr. Gaylord be excused from participation on the encroachment at 223 South West Street. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

Ms. Baldwin moved approval of the encroachment as outlined. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and put to a roll call vote which resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Mr. Gaylord who was excused from participation. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-0 vote.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

REZONING Z-27D-14 – CITYWIDE REMAPPING – REFERRED TO WORK SESSION SCHEDULED FOR MARCH 28, 2016

This is a request to rezone property to apply Unified Development Ordinance Districts.

The Planning Commission recommends approval of rezoning per attachment two; for all but one item, Planning Commission's zoning recommendations are less restrictive than the zoning advertised for the July 7, 2015 and July 21, 2015 Public Hearings and require a new Public Hearing be held before Council decision. City Council may schedule Z-27D-14 for Public Hearing or refer it to committee or work session for further discussion.

Planning Commission Chair Schuster explained these relate to the properties which were pulled out during the remapping discussion process. He pointed out the Planning Commission went through each of the cases individually, looked at any and all new information and voted independently on each location.

Mayor McFarlane pointed out it may be best to have a work session to consider the various locations before going to public hearing. City Manager Hall pointed out if the Council would

like to schedule a UDO work session we could do something at 1:00 or 4:00 on one of the Mondays in March or April.

Ms. Baldwin moved that Z-27D-14 be referred to a work session to be scheduled at 4:00 p.m. on March 28, 2016. Her motion was seconded by the Mayor and put to a vote which passed unanimously. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

TC-3-16 – HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICTS – PUBLIC HEARING AUTHORIZED FOR APRIL 5, 2016

This is a request to amend Part 10A of the Unified Development Ordinance, in Streetside Historic Overlay Districts, to remove the review of color and to clarify that alleys are not "streets" for the purpose of this section of the Unified Development Ordinance. Additionally, the text change amends and corrects other sections of the Part 10A Unified Development Ordinance relating to administration of Certificates of Appropriateness regarding height and setbacks, the appeals process, and the process diagram.

The Planning Commission recommends approval of the request. Staff suggests a public hearing date of April 5, 2016.

Planning Commission Chair Schuster pointed out this is a technical change which was initiated by the Historic Development Commission. Ms. Baldwin moved approval of the April 5, 2016 public hearing. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and put to a vote which passed unanimously. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on 8-0 vote.

REZONING Z-34-13- HILLSBOROUGH STREET – PUBLIC HEARING AUTHORIZED FOR APRIL 5, 2016

This is a request to rezone property from Residential-10 (R-10) [northern portion] and Residential-4 (R-4) [southern portion], to Residential-10-Conditional Use (R-10-CU).

The proposal is consistent with the Future Land Use Map, Urban Form Map, and pertinent policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed rezoning is reasonable and in the public interest. Conditions exceed code in addressing storm water runoff, and support transit use on the Hillsborough Street corridor. The proposal is compatible with the surrounding area. Building type height caps are comparable to those of adjoining properties. On-site stream course and tree conservation areas will serve to buffer neighboring low-density parcels from site development.

The Planning Commission recommends approval of the request. Staff suggests a public hearing date of April 5, 2016.

Planning Commission Chair Schuster indicated this case has had several extensions and the last time it was before Council, he promised he would not request any further extensions. He talked about the comments from the neighborhood and the fact that the applicant had added a condition relating to 25 year floods to start addressing the concerns of the community. He talked about the

discussions that had taken place to this point and work that may be needed. Ms. Crowder expressed appreciation to the Planning Commission and all involved for their work on this project. Mr. Gaylord moved approval of the April 5, 2016 public hearing. His motion was seconded by Ms. Baldwin and put to a vote which passed unanimously. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

REZONING Z-46-15 – WEST LENOIR STREET – PUBLIC HEARING AUTHORIZED FOR APRIL 5, 2016

This is a request to rezone property from RX-3 to Industrial Mixed Use, 4 stories, with Urban Limited frontage and conditions (IX-4-UL-CU).

The proposal, though inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map, is consistent with pertinent policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed rezoning is reasonable and in the public interest. The proposal would allow for the development of a mix of uses consistent with the Downtown West Gateway Plan and the Saunders North Area Redevelopment Plan. The proposal is compatible with the surrounding area. Conditions provide a range of measures to mitigate impacts on adjacent and surround uses, including limits on uses, noise and development intensities.

The Planning Commission recommends approval of the request. Staff suggests a public hearing date of April 5, 2016.

Planning Commission Chair Schuster presented the case. Ms. Crowder moved approval of the April 5, 2016 public hearing. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Gaylord and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

SPECIAL ITEMS

TRAFFIC – NO PARKING ZONE ON ST. ALBANS STREET – APPROVED – ORDINANCE ADOPTED

The following item appeared on the March 1, 2016 agenda:

It is recommended that a No Parking zone be implemented on the south side of St. Albans Drive, west of the intersection with Cardinal at North Hills Street. The parking lane at this location narrows and vehicles continue to be parked in such manner that they are encroaching into the eastbound travel lane.

Recommendation: Authorize the appropriate changes in the traffic code was included with the agenda packet.

Mr. Gaylord requested that the item be held as he would like to gather some additional information before considering this item. It was directed that it be placed on this agenda for further consideration.

Mr. Gaylord pointed out he had had his questions resolved; therefore, he would move approval of the traffic code change as outlined. His motion was seconded by Ms. Crowder and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote. See Ordinance 554.

LEESVILLE ROAD WIDENING PROJECT – COMMENTS RECEIVED

During the March 1, 2016 Council meeting, Scott J. Benrube, 11416 Leesville Road, expressed concerns relative to the Leesville Road Widening Project and various damages to his property.

The item was referred to administration and during Council discussion it was directed that a report be placed on this agenda.

City Manager pointed out the staff has spent time on this item since the last meeting, pointing out the Council had asked for a report. He stated Council members received the report in their agenda packet.

> This report is in response to the City Council meeting on March 1 where Mr. Benrube made a petitions of citizen presentation regarding driveway repair, drainage issues, and broken landscape curbing at his residence (11416 Leesville Road). Following the Council meeting, City staff from both Design/Construction and Stormwater Management, as well as the roadway and stormwater design consultants (AECOM and Sungate Design Group) visited the property to observe the existing conditions, review the list of punchlist items provided by Mr. Benrub, and specifically to analyze the drainage concern raised about this property. Staff's responses and recommendations for each item raised by Mr. Benrube are as follows:
>
> **DRIVEWAY REPAIRS**
>
> Staff reviewed the conditions of the asphalt driveway and support Mr. Benrube's recommendation that the driveway be replaced. It was determined that due to the small section of asphalt replacement, as well as the fact that four panels of broken sidewalk panels were located close to the driveway that a new concrete driveway apron would be more appropriate at this time. Therefore, staff recommends for the asphalt driveway tie be removed and replaced with a concrete driveway tie in the same location by the bonding company as part of the Leesville Road project completion.
>
> **LANDSCAPE CURBING**
>
> Staff reviewed the landscape curbing and there was approximately 30 LF of broken curbing to replace. However, Mr. Benrube has noted that any small repairs would not

match his existing curbing. Staff recommends obtaining curbing in like kind. If a suitable color match is not possible, then staff recommends that all 180 LF of curbing along the Leesville Road frontage be replaced. This work may be addressed by the bonding company as part of the Leesville Road project completion. The work could also be handled by City forces.

GRADING/TIRE RUTS

There are still a few ruts in the shoulder that need repair and reseeding. Staff recommends these items be addressed by the bonding company as part of the Leesville Road project completion. The work could also be handled by City forces.

FLOODING CONCERNS

Mr. Benrube claims the road widening project has caused an increase in stormwater runoff to his property that has resulted in flooding of his crawlspace. During the site visit, Mr. Benrube requested that additional soil material be added around his yard to mitigate his flooding issues. Following field observations by City staff and the City's design consultants, it is our opinion that any flooding issues inside the property are not a result of the road widening project, but rather was an existing condition on the property prior to construction. Several pictures were taken for reference (see attached) that depict the original site conditions as compared to site conditions today. Prior to construction, Leesville Road had a roadside ditch that conveyed runoff from the two-lane roadway. However, the yard outside of the road prior to construction drained away from Leesville Road (towards the home and rear of the Benrube property). This is confirmed by review of drainage information provided by our Stormwater staff (see attached).

The Leesville Road project widened the roadway, but the road and shoulder are graded to drain into the roadway (away from Benrube property), captured in the road storm system, and discharged to the opposite side of the road from this property. Although there is a small fill slope along the frontage due to the road widening, there is actually less runoff area being directed towards the Benrube property in the post construction site conditions as compared to the site conditions prior to construction.

Secondly, it should be noted that the cumulative rainfall over the past 12 months has been approximately 12.2" above normal (based on data from RDU), which equates to almost a 30% increase of annual rainfall. The heaviest months of rainfall over the past year occurred between October 2015 and February 2016. This may help explain why the flooding issues appear exacerbated as compared to previous years. No corrective action is currently recommended. Staff will continue to monitor the situation during upcoming rain events to verify issues are appropriately addressed.

Engineer Chris Johnson highlighted the report which was received without comment.

STREETSIDE VENDING – PILOT PROGRAM – APPROVED AS AMENDED

The City Council conducted a public hearing on December 1, 2015 to consider food truck service within the right-of-way. One food truck would be permitted within each of the five target zones near the downtown area. At the conclusion of the public hearing, Staff was asked to work with the Downtown Raleigh Alliance to survey property owners within the five target areas and asked about food truck service on property owned by the City. Staff will provide a presentation and identify next steps in authorizing streetside vending should the City Council choose to proceed.

Assistant Planning Director Travis Crane pointed out the proposed pilot program presented at a public hearing on December 1, 2015, would allow food truck service from right-of-way at designated locations and was proposed for a six month pilot program. The pilot program was set up for five zones/one truck per zone/in identified parking areas between 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. each day of the week with the exception of first Friday which would be 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Crane pointed out the UDO contains regulations for food trucks on private property. If the City so chooses it could allow food trucks on City owned parcels that meet zoning requirements. He stated as far as the DRA survey is concerned, staff provided a list of property owners within and adjacent to the five areas and DRA mailed notices and received 14 responses. Almost all were positive. He stated the survey showed support for food trucks in the downtown area in general and support near places of residence. He stated however there was no clear preference for consolidated locations versus scattered locations. The majority of the responses did not support spacing from restaurants.

Mr. Crane presented a map showing the five proposed locations and pointed out the proposed regulations relate to minimum spacing of 100 feet from a restaurant and 50 feet from a push cart as well as spacing from utilities, driveways, handicap ramps and street intersections. The operator would be responsible for disposal of all waste.

Mr. Crane pointed out in December staff discussed a lottery system to "award" permits. The lottery system would allow one food truck operation per location per month. He stated however during the Council committee discussion there was a desire for a variety of food trucks to be allowed in each area and a lottery would not create that type variety. A lottery could result in unused food truck spaces as food trucks are successful only if located near the demand.

Mr. Crane pointed out after discussion staff looked at an alternate option such as treating the food truck permit like a parklet permit. That is an adjacent property owner would apply for a permit and that property owner would permit and manage the food truck rotation in that area. The staff would issue a permit to an adjacent property owner and they would regulate etc; however, staff would perform inspections and enforce the regulations.

Mr. Crane pointed out the Council needs to determine if the identified locations and if the proposed regulations are acceptable. He pointed out with the Moore Square redesign and Moore

Square Transit project and there has been discussion about potential problems with the Zone 4 location.

Mr. Crane pointed out the next steps would be for the Council to decide whether to move forward and if so, staff would finalize the permitting process which would include the intake, review, issuance, inspections and enforcement in the Planning Department. Planning would coordinate with Public Works on parking location, markings, signage, etc. He stated if the Council wishes to move forward Staff would suggest revisiting in six months.

In response to questioning, Ms. Baldwin pointed out the locations came about in committee discussions when adjacent property owners requested potential locations. Discussion took place with the Mayor pointing out as she understands the alternative option, the permit would be granted to the adjacent property owner and the adjacent property owner would negotiate with the food trucks and be responsible to make sure every thing is in order. Mr. Cox talked about the parklet model pointing out as he understands the adjacent property owner would get the permit and would decide what type truck goes in that location. Mr. Branch questioned if there were problems with a food truck, who would be held responsible with it being pointed out the owner of the permit would be held responsible; however the food truck operator would have to abide by all city rules and regulations. Mr. Branch questioned if this were approved how long it would take to be put in place with Mr. Crane pointing out there has to be additional coordination with Public Works and others but it is felt it could be put in place within 60 days. In response to questions, it was pointed out the permit holder would schedule the food trucks and rotate them as they choose. Discussion took place relating to noise, code regulations, how noise would be measured, the need for food trucks to be designed to control noise, how to measure noise, etc.

Ms. Crowder questioned the conflicts relating to Moore Square with Ms. Baldwin pointing out the other locations came about as the result of interested property owners in that area but she is not sure how the Moore Square location came about. Discussion took place on the two construction projects going on in the Moore Square area and possible conflicts with several Council members expressing concern about the Moore Square location at this point.

Ms. Baldwin moved approval of the alternative program as outlined by Mr. Crane that is treating food truck permits like a parklet permit for the four locations – dropping the Moore Square location and adding in that the operator should provide some type hand sanitizing dispenser and also look at some type 3 strikes and you're out, that is three violations relating to noise, trash, etc. Mr. Crane pointed out that part would be easy and talked about the ordinance which has a $100 fine for first violation and increased fine for the second and the third could be revoking the food truck license. Ms. Baldwin's motion to approve the alternate option that is the parklet permit concept, operator providing hand sanitizing dispenser and have a three strike and you are out provisions. It was seconded by Mr. Gaylord. Mr. Cox asked about putting a cap on the noise that a food truck generates with it being pointed out that could be discussed in the six month review if needed. The motion as stated was put to a vote which resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote. See Ordinance 555.

BIKE SHARE PROGRAM – APPROVED – DIRECTION GIVEN

Mayor McFarlane stated there was a discussion on the bike share program in Work Session earlier today and since the Council has a standing rule to not vote on items in work session the Council decided to bring the issue to the table today.

Mr. Gaylord stated the Council did talk about this issue in work session and moved that the Council move forward with the bike share program as presented in the feasibility study during work session, ask the County and NC State to participate as discussed in work session and that the Council allocate cost as appropriate in the upcoming budget. He stated this is all with the understanding that the Council would re-evaluate the program after three years and that the Council look at a monthly fee arrangement and also move forward with forming a committee to sell additional sponsorships. His motion was seconded by Ms. Baldwin.

Ms. Crowder indicated she wanted to be very clear that she does not dislike the bike share program but the Council has a lot of value judgments to do. Many of them are hard sometimes and she also wants the City to be a city of innovation and a city for all people. She stated there are many people in the City who are broken, poor, homeless, down trodden, children without homes and the elderly. Many of these people need the Council's help and some time the Council is the only voice they have. There is so much to be done in the City and so little money to get it all done. The $653 a year to maintain a bike share program she feels could be used in many ways to help many people. She stated she feels that the bike share program will pass today but she wants the Council to consider that we need to be a city of value for all people and that the people this Council and City serves must also be served not at the exception of a few but a city for all people and she feels that's the job of councilors.

Mr. Stephenson stated he feels all Council members are well aware of the fact that we have limited resources and many worthy needs across the City. He stated however there is a $2M grant associated which is 80% of the capital cost for the bike share program. We would be forfeiting that money if we did not move forward with this program by April. He stated the operating expenses are $653,000 a year but projections are that two-thirds of that would be covered not by taxpayers but by sponsorships and receipts from the use of the system. He stated we have had several organizations come forward stating they are interested in sponsoring the program and it is his feeling that we will have many more coming forward. He stated at the end of the three year period we would find one of two things, either we are not getting the sponsorship we want at which time we could reevaluate whether this is a good program or we will see that there are plenty of sponsorships and that the program is self supporting. He stated we will not be able to find out the results unless we take this first step; therefore he would be supporting the motion.

Mr. Thompson stated he believes that the bike share program could be a good thing for the City; however, he too is very concerned about the possible lost of the grant and questioned if we actually thought we would lose that money. He stated he does not think we will. He stated it is up to the people that the Council has heard from trying to promote bike share, so it is up to all of

those people in support to use the system and make it work. If it doesn't at the end of three years we will lose it.

Ms. Baldwin stated she totally understands where Ms. Crowder is coming from and she very much appreciates the concern. It is a passion that she shares, that is making sure that people who have the least are cared for stating that is an important piece and she thinks that it is an area that we do need to constantly look at in review.

Mr. Branch stated he had gone back and forth on the concept as to where to support it or not support it. He stated he looks at the community and where it is going and he realizes we have a bright future ahead of us and it is going to take all of us coming together in many different ways to make it work and to make sure that this program is shared and we make sure that everyone has an opportunity to use it. With that comment he will support the program and he feels three years will give us enough time to review it and if at the end of three years if it is not a diverse program then the Council could make the right decision.

Mr. Gaylord pointed out he feels this will have a great impact on our city from a transit standpoint. He feels this will help get people the last mile as we move forward with the City's transit referendum in 2016. He stated with this program there is public benefit, it helps get people out, get people active and make them healthier, there is a recreational benefit, a tourism benefit and an economic development benefit. The motion as stated was put to a vote which resulted in all members voting in the affirmative except Ms. Crowder who voted in the negative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a 7-1 vote.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY MANAGER

POLICE – BODY WORN CAMERAS – DIRECTION GIVEN

City Manager Hall stated as Council discusses Police Body Worn Cameras Council he would encourage the Council to think of two primary policy-related questions. The first is, is the City going to move forward with body worn cameras for the Raleigh Police Department and if yes, how to implement that technology in the most effective manner. Mr. Hall stated the purpose of the presentation is to provide information to the Council to describe potential issues for consideration and to outline potential options if the Council wishes to proceed. We have been working on this particular topic for several months within the Raleigh Police Department and multiple city departments. Police body worn cameras is a complicated topic, not just within our own community but nationally. This is something that has gotten the attention of a lot of cities across the country and they are all at various places on the issue. For the City of Raleigh its not just about the police department, it is also about Information Technology, City Attorney's office, budgeting and the City Manager's office. It has many dimensions. Some of those issues for you to think about are more than just the technology of the camera, it's also the cost, data storage, operational procedures, how and when to turn them off and on, and potential legal questions whether it be privacy or public records. So again today those things are not necessary to be resolved, cities across the country are all faced with those very questions. At the end of the

presentation today, we will be available to answer questions and receive any direction you may wish to give staff with regards to next steps.

Police Chief Cassandra Deck-Brown presented a powerpoint and made the following comments. Thank you Mr. Manager, let me begin by saying thank you for giving us this opportunity to come before you to talk about the technology of body worn cameras. As you know, this has been a topic of conversation on local governmental levels in communities across the country. It has been a conversation, it has been a debate, it has collected and branched in many directions in terms of how that technology is used, and what departments will do with the data that is collected and how it is stored. I hope that I will be able to shed light in regards to some of that information today as we go forward with the presentation. Without assuming how familiar you are with the body worn technology, I would like to begin with two things, one the simple explanation of what the body worn technology and device is, and several images of what the body worn cameras actually look like. Basically the body worn camera technology is a video recording system which is worn by the officer on his or her body in some capacity that basically records the interaction between the officer and the public. Beyond recording, it is a multi-faceted device and I will explain a little more about that but it serves a tremendous benefit for both the department as well as the community at large. She presented slides showing the body worn cameras and how they are worn such as on the eye glasses or a part of head gear that is pretty much over the officer's ear. The body worn camera can also be attached in the front of the uniform, on the collar or on the shoulder of the police uniform. Agencies have chosen to wear them in different ways so they do come with a variety of positions. For the past several years, we have had the opportunity to monitor and watch the evolution of the body worn camera technology. Not only have we just seen it from a distance, but being the second largest police department in the State and the 42nd largest police department in the nation, we have had that opportunity to not only sit and be a part of local discussion, but on a much broader level at the national level. I guess you could say that membership has its privilege. As a member of the various national organizations of police enforcement and executives those conversations have happened for a number of years. In terms of policy formation, where to wear the camera, how to wear the camera, how the information is stored is some of what I will share with you today. The benefit in being a part of some of those national conversations is we have been at the table with COPS the Community Oriented Police and services office at the Department of Justice who have actually written a document that serves as the best practice manual for implementation of the body worn cameras. We have had an opportunity to ask questions, to listen and engage in that conversation. With that being said this presentation comes to you with much fore thought, much concern, research and much benchmarking. As we look at the utilization of the body worn camera within our own organization in the City of Raleigh and various membership discussion has given us the opportunity to look at this technology on a broad level but what we have come to realize very early on is that the successful body worn camera program requires an organizational approach and collaboration. Many often review this technology as just police equipment and its very clear to see that that is not the case. As such, all relevant City of Raleigh departments have provided valuable input in getting us to the point that we are now. In its most conceptualized wild-eyed assessment there are so many intricacies to this technology. There are so many complexities to it and that we cannot move forward without the necessary departments. Chief Deck-Brown asked the team members who have played a significant part just getting us to this point, internally and

externally to please stand explaining each bring the unique layer of expertise and a unique area of advice in order to go forward.

Through those organizations that we have memberships and being a part of those conversations from the COPS office, the big question that probably many of you have is "why" body worn cameras here in Raleigh. At the beginning of the conversation I briefly referenced that this is a multifaceted tool. Why has it been noted in some of those best practices manual, they have been a part of that conservation that many Chiefs across this state and across the nation have spoken about and its also mentioned in the President's report of 21st century policing. The whys begin with increased police and public trust, increased accountability for the department as well as the public, increased efficiency and effectiveness toward investigating citizen complaints and increased quality of evidence collection. Additionally, the expected outcomes also reflect an enhanced departmental training. We have a reality based training unit so this will enhance what we are already doing on that level, a reduction in citizen complaints, a reduction in uses of force by our officers and a reduction of officer and civilian injuries and I'm certain that this list is not complete.

Though I mentioned our engagement in conversation on a national level, we have taken the opportunity to look very closely in our state and throughout the county and there are a number of agencies who are currently using body worn cameras some in very early stages and some a little more than a year. The list includes Charlotte, Fayetteville, Winston, Garner, Knightdale and others, agency size varies tremendously. In many instances in terms of releasing that information and research publicly it is too early. One of the early things that Mr. Hall mentioned was the topic of data storage and that is very significant, a concern and a costly aspect of this particular technology. The camera itself is the least of the expenses, it's how you store that data and how you are able to retrieve it and make sure that it gets to where it needs to go. Chief Deck-Brown introduced the City's Chief Information Officer Darnell Smith.

Mr. Smith stated as every one has pointed out this is a big technology issue, there are a lot of players in this space, it is seen as a lucrative business and there are large and small players from Taser to Digital Alley to Wolf and also some I would call "fly by night." What we want to do is make sure as we are going through an RFP process that we pick a solution that we can grow with, one that when we invest in it that we can invest in it for the long term. One of the biggest pieces of this is the storage. I've done my due diligence and as you can see Oakland Police Department is storing 7 terabytes of data with 600 body worn cameras. Our RFP is essentially sized for 600 body worn cameras, as well as replacing what we have in our cars. If you look at that I expect our storage need is going to be a lot more than that 7 terabytes so we need to make sure that we do something that we can grow with and because its going to grow and another thing you need to be concerned with is our data retention. Once we come up with a policy around how long we are going to store this data, we need to make sure that we can retrieve it and can grow with it. We have two ways we can go here, cloud based or on premises. On premises essentially means that we would store it within the city's data center. We would invest in storage, we would invest in servers and we would be responsible for the capital expenditure and the people to keep it up. We could also go cloud based which is more of an elastic approach so as we need space we can consume it and as we consume it, we pay for it, and the more you use

the cheaper it typically gets. So there are some pros and cons for cloud based and on-prem storage. I mentioned a few for the cloud base that is, the flexibility to grow as you need. The biggest piece to me is the security around it because we would have to do a lot internally around staff and procedures to make sure that we can protect this data, but when you do it in the cloud, most of these companies are compliant and they have all of the processes and security in place to make sure that we can protect it. Some of the cons are that when you are dealing with the cloud your upload time is restricted so we would have to work around that. Some I call it hybrid cloud where we could do some all off loading locally before we push it up to the cloud.

Mr. Smith stated on premise is lower recurring cost but you have to typically do a large capital expenditure up front to get that up and operational and again that's down side and on the con side as far as the recurring investment is because again we are keeping this data so we are going to have to continually invest in storage to make sure that we can keep up with the pace of what we are keeping historically. He stated in the RFP, we have taken a lot of time to make sure that we have all of the right questions so that we can determine which technology will work best for the city.

Chief Deck-Brown stated in consideration for cost, utilization and deployment, we basically have two options going forward – a phased approved or total implementation of the body worn camera. While there are many benefits to being a department of this size, we recognize the cost implementation that comes with pushing all of that equipment out to an agency our size as well. Although this technology along with the practices has significantly improved, the recommendation for the phased in approach reflects and is partly because of the evolution of the technology which is constantly evolving. We have watched this technology evolve over a number of years, it gives us the opportunity as we are now in the very early stages of crafting the RFP to make sure that over the course of that three year period that as technology changes we benefit from that as well. With that being said, the three year approach affords us to look at 100 body worn cameras the first year which would pretty much be a pilot program that would be city wide distribution and then 250 the second year and 250 the third year thus giving us the 600 body worn cameras. What the pilot project would afford us to do basically is ensure that we've got best practices going forward. It gives us an opportunity not only to push our initial policy out and tweak it as we need to and ensure that we have our best foot forward in serving and protecting the city. Not all practices can be the cookie cutter approach even though the manuals have been written. We recognize that this is our city and what works here may not necessarily work in anther city. Based on the economy of scale, this is why we have established this approach also. The smaller roll out basically gives us that opportunity once again to look at best practices, to look at cost on the front end and to look at what is best for the greater department.

Chief Deck-Brown stated we are recommending the cloud for a number of reasons, some of the national organizations, IACP and several others are recommending the cloud as well. The preliminary cost that you have before you are clearly without an actual RFP but with much effort from the men and women who stood up earlier as well as our city departments who have partnered with this I do believe that we have given you and provided you the best possible estimate that we can have without having the actual RFP on hand. So the three year plan is basically $4.24M or $1M to $1.25M the first year.

The start up as you have heard with the onsite storage is expected to surpass the cloud storage and there again IACP does recommend the cloud storage. There are ancillary cost such as infrastructure, hardware, software, docking stations at 9 facilities and we have estimated that to be roughly $540,000. As for the technology support, we currently have 8 personnel who support the IT component in addition to the tremendous support that we get from City IT. The three additional personnel would aid and ensure that we can go forward with this technology. When I talk about I'm being able to sit at that table and have those conversations with those other departments, some times this is where they have missed opportunity, the technology has rolled out and the staff has not been considered and that becomes a stumbling block. So not rushing into this having the forethought and the time to really look at this over time has afforded us in some instances to learn from others; pitfalls or stumbling blocks if you will.

She stated the first thing upon Council approval would be to go forward with submitting an REP to the vendors around the 4th quarter of the current fiscal year. As you know, we are a department that does engage with the community so conversations would continue but there would be conversations specific to the body worn camera. I'm sure that periodically you have been approached by the body worn camera technology as have I. In the face to face meetings, it came up in terms of technology and where we are going so this allows us to continue that dialogue and ensure that our community is informed in going forward. The next step would be to develop a policy around the body worn camera technology and there again, having the opportunity to sit at that table and those tables over time has given us the opportunity to evaluate as we begin to craft what our policy will look at such as who has the camera, the proper training, when to activate them, when to turn them on and when to turn them off, the storage, the retention period, how will they charged and down loaded, will off-duty officers have them, the disclosure to the district attorney's office, the citizens rights, criminal discovery, the supervisory review of these activities that are recorded, use of video and personnel actions and the list goes on and that is why there is so much conversation regarding body worn cameras for both citizens and law enforcement agencies alike. In putting these on we know that there comes tremendous responsibility as well. In addition to developing the policy there would be the product testing and the product testing of course is in essence in our efforts to determine which product is out there as Mr. Smith has mentioned you got some reputable companies out there that have some long standing preparations and the technology is there that kind of sits their name out there and then you've got those that are much smaller in some incidences, the fly by nights and we want to make sure that whatever price tag is attached that we are good stewards of whatever funding is available as well so this gives us this opportunity to pick the right piece of equipment in going forward.

Police Chief Deck-Brown stated we would make our final selection by the second quarter of the FY17, issue that final version of that policy and then beginning training and product deployment to our personnel. The RFP going forward would provide us with a more definitive cost, a more clear time line, the issue of data storage and the specifics in terms of what that cost looks like is critically important in terms of what works for the City of Raleigh and what works for the Raleigh Police Department. As was mentioned, we want to also look at the integration of in-car cameras. The Raleigh Police Department has had in car cameras since 1998. I been here long

enough now to see the evolution of technology take place over the course of time within our department. In 1998 for some of us who can remember VHS were around and that is the recording devices in our cars and then we evolved to the disk in 2006. We are at a point where the technology that we have is at the end of life. Since I have become Chief it is really important to look at how we optimize our systems and how we work and integrate with our City IT and other departments in that regard. This gives us that opportunity to make sure that as we go forward where one system has reached its end of life, it will be a missed opportunity to not look and see what the same companies in many instances are offering. If those systems can talk to one another that could be a possible win win for all of us. So you may ask at this point, is this the end all, be all. . . and I would say "no." We know that we live in a society today where everyone has a smart phone and whether it is a police encounter or something else some one is constantly recording an activity. This as I see it is as Chief is another part of law enforcement technology and this is the evolution of technology in terms of where we as a law enforcement community have gone. So, instead of asking why or why now, I would ask why not now. Again it has come up in many of my meetings, most of the citizens have asked repeatedly and we are the capital city, it gives us the opportunity to look at it. Having been here and seen that evolution again in terms of technology, I've seen the in-car cameras come and this is where we are now. I've seen the computer enter the police car, we went from pagers to smartphones, and tazers were added since I have been here. When I arrived there were revolvers and now law enforcement across the nation has semi automatic weapons and the body worn camera is one of the newest forms of technology. All of these changes reflect the evolution of policing. I see it as technology that affords us a better opportunity to not only police but to build upon the expectations that I mentioned in the very beginning as to why those expected outcomes can happen and do happen. In closing we are the Capital City and now is the time, and again I thank you for giving us this opportunity to present this technology and the idea of it being here in Raleigh.

Mayor McFarlane thanked all for all of the work went into the presentation.

Mr. Branch thanked Chief Deck-Brown for taking the lead and everyone that brings this together. He stated the Chief is right, we are Raleigh, we are the Capital City, we lead, we don't follow and as you continue to work with your team and your department as well as the Council and all of our citizens one thing we want to make sure we all know the facts and we are transparent and this is another way to help us all move forward towards that. Mr. Branch moved that Raleigh move forward with the implementation of body worn cameras, authorize city staff to create a testing and pilot program to examine alternatives, issue a request for proposal for technology to support the pilot program, develop appropriate city and departmental policies by gathering the best practices of information from both cities and law enforcement agencies, review any potential legal good issues that will need to be addressed, analyze and recommend the best alternatives for the data storage and include the funding options that you gave forth for ways for future budgets. His motion was seconded by Mr. Stephenson.

Ms. Baldwin questioned if the Chief and CIO had given into consideration to local companies such as Red Hats or Citrix or other local companies that store large amounts of data in secure settings which were meant to be shared.

CIO Smith stated in his research thus far there are major players Google, Microsoft and Amazon but he has not checked with the local companies and talked about eligibility.

Ms. Baldwin asked for sensitivity on that issue.

Mr. Thompson questioned if the motion for the phased approach with it being pointed out that is correct. The motion was put to a roll call vote which passed unanimously. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

DOROTHEA DIX PARK – UPDATE – RECEIVED

City Manager Hall pointed out staff is available to provide an informational update on the Dorothea Dix property which will include an overview of the purchase agreement and update on the current work and presentation of a broad framework intended to guide the future master planning effort. The City Council completed the purchase of the Dorothea Dix Park land which includes some 307 acres.

Stephen Bentley, Parks and Recreation and Cultural Resources, pointed out all cities have great park spaces and Raleigh is no different. We have approximately 10,000 acres of parks, greenways, indoor, outdoor pools, etc. He stated however 7 months and 22 days ago the City purchased what he considers to be the crown jewel of our park system and that was the 307 acres known as Dorothea Dix. He gave examples of great parks such as Piedmont Park in Atlanta, Herman Park in Houston, Forest Park in St. Louis, and Boston Commons which was the first city owned park in the United States. He pointed out all of these parks are economic drivers and provide a great experience for its citizens. He gave other examples such as Governor's Island which is a 200 acre island which was a military base converted to a public park, Presidio in San Francisco, Millennium Park in Chicago and talked about the importance and uniqueness of those facilities. He stated he recently met a gentleman in Raleigh who stated when friends visit Chicago he tells them to go to the park, etc., and stated when friends visit him in Raleigh he can tell them to go to the city's welcoming downtown, the museums and Dorothea Dix Park.

Mr. Bentley talked about the purchase agreement which currently has 4 leases; one with the State of North Carolina for 10 years which is on the east side of the railroad and up to 25 years on the west side of the railroad. He pointed out this houses some 2,000 DHHS employees. The second lease is a 25 year lease with Healing Transitions which has two 10-year extensions. The third is a 2-year lease which has a daycare center which is sublet to Bright Horizons Childcare and it is about 3 acres; the third lease covers some 60 acres which relates to the Capital Area Soccer League which is a year by year lease. They are meeting to determine if they plan to renew the lease.

Mr. Bentley talked about the easements along Western Boulevard and Governor Morehead School to connect to Pullen Park, the cemetery which the city has taken over maintenance and the area 5N which has contaminated soil that will have to be removed. He stated this leaves approximately 130 acres of non leased park to be utilized.

Kate Pearce, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources, talked about work which is ongoing which includes 4 full time employees who work with turf and tree care and cemetery maintenance. A lot of due diligence is going on with area 5N relating to assessment and clean up of the contaminated soils. She stated there is no unused parking so work is going on negotiating for parking, signage, trash removal, toilet facilities, etc. She again pointed out there is some 2,000 DHS employees who work at Dix daily and all of the parking lots are within a leased area. She stated in addition the City is honoring some carry over events and uses including six remaining 5K runs or mile walks which are nearly all sponsored by non profit groups with ties to Health and Human Services with one exception and that is the Rock N Roll Marathon 5K which will use portions of Dix. There are three memorandums of agreement - NC State Cross Country Team, NC State Aero Space Engineering Summer Camp and the DHHS softball team usage of the facility.

Ms. Pearce pointed out they are connecting and meeting with their neighbors including NC State University, the Catholic Diocese, working with other groups that have a connection such as the Chamber of Commerce, DRA, Visit Raleigh, etc. She stated in addition they are trying to learn from others and are to having conversations with and visits with various park planners, conservatories, etc. looking at best practices, learning and just familiarizing themselves with all involved.

Ms. Pearce pointed out she recently moved to Raleigh and when people ask her what she does and when she explains she is the new planner for Dorothea Dix Park, people always have a story to tell her. She stated the history and the legacy is important and will be protected as we go through this process. She stated every one knows it is a unique situation, there is nothing to compare it to anywhere, and it will be treated and protected as a unique place. She stated people are already taking ownership and that is great. She stated the planning for the park is going to be a multi-year process; 2016 will be looked at as a time of planning to plan. She stated they will be taking steps, getting people to the facility, working to educate people, make them to understand what is there, how it can be used and inspire various uses. They will continue to work with various groups and they are working on a committee structure for the planning process. She stated the consultant selection process is very important and we have to choose the right people and the right group. She pointed out recommendations will be coming back to the Council on the committee structure and the consultant selection process. We have to choose the best team for Raleigh. We have to be transparent, include everyone and that is what they are doing in the activation and engagement period of exploring, educating and inspiring. She pointed out 2017 will be the master plan process and talked about the consultation selection process which has to be transparent, creditable and deliberate to provide for the best team for Raleigh. She explained for the rest of 2016 they will be in the activation and engagement process, establishing the committee structure and consultant process pointing out they will be returning to the Council many times. The comments were received.

SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS – 2014 PROGRAM – AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED

On January 2, 2013, the City Council adopted the Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan, which promotes a walkable Raleigh by recommending safe and convenient pedestrian facilities throughout the City. The pedestrian plan ranked the following projects 21, 41, and 18 respectively. Funding source is the 2011 Transportation Bond proceeds; the projects involve the installation of all missing sidewalk sections along the following locations and the total length of all sidewalk sections to be installed is approximately 10,250 feet (about two miles):

CRABTREE BOULEVARD: From Capital Boulevard to Timber Drive
SPRING FOREST ROAD: From Atlantic Springs Road to Capital Boulevard
MILLBROOK ROAD: From Atlantic Avenue to Capital Boulevard
NEW HOPE ROAD: From Capital Boulevard to Wallingford Drive

A public meeting was held January 26, 2016 to present design information and preliminary right-of-way and easement needs; the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission reviewed the projects on January 25, 2016. Staff has prepared plans showing the proposed improvements. It is now appropriate to present the project to City Council for review of the design and authorization to proceed. A memorandum containing additional detail was included with the agenda packet.

Recommendation: Authorize the projects to proceed.

City Manager Hall pointed out staff has a presentation or would simply answer questions the Council may have. Ms. Baldwin moved authorizing the projects to proceed as outlined. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

ORGANIZATIONAL REALIGNMENT – PUBLIC WORKS FUNCTIONS – INFORMATION APPROVED

With the assistance of an outside consultant, as well as extensive employee feedback, the City Manager has identified a new organizational alignment which relocates the functions, programs, and assets of the Public Works Department to form two new departments, Engineering Services and Transportation, as well as the realignment of services to the Development Services Department. The intent of the realignment is to position the City for future growth; align services in ways that are more intuitive and reflect core skills and services; improve workflows and to reflect City Council priorities as expressed in the strategic plan.

A copy of the memorandum which has been distributed to impacted employees was included with the agenda packet for reference. The memo provides additional detail and context and also provides a graphic representation of the impacts to services currently located within the Public Works; the Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources; and the City Planning departments. The memo also provides summary information about the current service areas that will be re-aligned to the new departments, as well as an indication of where those functions currently reside within

the organization. The realignment of services will be effective July 1, 2016, in conjunction with the FY2016-17 annual budget.

The existing Public Works Director position will be reclassified to create one department director position; in addition, it is necessary to authorize one new position for the second department director. Establishing the director positions at this time will provide for recruitment to begin immediately.

Recommendation: Approve the realignment and authorize the addition of one department director position. The budgetary impact of the newly authorized position will addressed within existing appropriations.

City Manager Hall indicated this is a basic realignment of functions in the Public Works Department and pointed out if the Council chooses to approve the realignment it would include authorization of one additional department director position as outlined. Mr. Branch moved approval. His motion was seconded by Ms. Baldwin and put to a roll call vote which resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

REQUEST AND PETITIONS OF CITIZENS

HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOODS PROGRAMS – CONCERNS – REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA

Jona Marie Ricci, 4300 Whisperwood Drive, had requested permission to discuss the lack of constructive progress on her issues related to the City's housing and neighborhoods rehabilitation/renovation program as it relates to her home.

Ms. Ricci was not at the meeting therefore the item was removed from the agenda with no action taken.

UNFIT BUILDING – 905 EAST EDENTON STREET – 30–DAY EXTENSION GRANTED

Jared Burnette, 1507 Ashley Downs Drive, Apex, was at the meeting to request an additional 30 days to complete repairs at 9:05 East Edenton Street. He stated he feels they are at the end of a very long project, they feel they are about 80% there but need a little additional time.

Housing Inspections Administrator Ashley Glover indicated he has no problem with the 30-day extension. He talked about work that had been done and permits or approvals that have been secured. Mr. Gaylord moved approval of the 30-day extension. His motion was seconded by Ms. Baldwin. Ms. Baldwin questioned if they will be able to complete the work in 30 days with Mr. Burnette and Mr. Glover both indicating they felt the work could be completed within that time. Mr. Thompson questioned if we are talking about 30 calendar days with it being pointed out that is correct.

The motion as stated was put to a vote which resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

UNFIT BUILDING – 1601 POOLE ROAD – 90-DAY EXTENSION GRANTED

Andrew Clark representing "JBAC Properties, LLC, was at the meeting to request a 90-day extension in order to complete repairs to the fire damage property at 1601 Poole Road. Housing Inspections Administrator Glover explained the history on this location, talked about the fire damage and pointed out the repairs have moved very slowly; however they have pulled all of the permits as of yesterday and he understands they have signed a contract for the work to start on March 27.

Ms. Crowder questioned why no work had been done in the last 90 days. Mr. Glover pointed out he feels the owner will be moving on. He stated Jared Burnette is involved in this property and has been doing work on some other projects, this is a large contract and he feels it will move ahead now. Ms. Crowder moved approval of the 90-day extension. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. They Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

GRAVE REMOVAL – WILLIAMS GROVE CEMETERY – OAKWOOD CEMETERY – APPROVED

Deborah Joy, 3333 Durham-Chapel Hill Boulevard, Durham, representing Williams Grove Baptist Church and Greenpointe LLC, requests permission to relocate approximately 12 graves from the Williams Grove Cemetery to Oakwood Cemetery. The purpose of the proposed relocation relates to future development of property on Blue Ridge Road. All procedures required of state statute have been met. The final step is concurrence of the City Council. Supporting documentation is available for public inspection in the City Clerk's office.

Ms. Joy explained the process. In response to questions, City Attorney McCormick indicated this is a statutory process. The applicant has complied with all of the rules and regulations and the last step is for the local governing body to sign off on the move. He stated Ms. Joy is testifying that they have met all of the requirements.

Council members had questions relative to the location of the graves that are going to be moved, why they could not be relocated in the adjacent cemetery, whether there are head stones, removal of the remains, etc. Ms. Joy presented maps showing the location of the property to be developed, the location of the graves involved, and the procedure which they have followed. Mr. Thompson moved approval. His motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH – COMMENTS RECEIVED

Trisha Elliott, Targeted Persuasion, 206 New Bern Place, representing female restaurant owners and chefs, had requested permission to discuss Raleigh's culinary industry and its benefits to the City. The presentation is in conjunction with Women's History Month.

Ms. Elliott was not at the meeting when this item was called but appeared later.

Ms. Elliott, Maggie Kane and Allison Conners were present to talk about the projected opening of a place at the table planned for Hillsborough Street. Ms. Elliott talked about Women in the restaurant business and the culinary industry and its contributions to the City.

MATTERS SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING

UNFIT BUILDING DEMOLITION – 5411 ALLEN DRIVE – HEARING – ORDINANCE ADOPTED

This was hearing to adopt an ordinance, pursuant to Article 11.6.13 of the Unified Development Ordinance, to authorize the demolition of the unfit building listed below:

LOCATION AND DISTRICT	PROPERTY OWNER	TAX ID NUMBER	TIME LAPSE
5411 Allen Drive (B)	Transformation Properties USA, LLC	0063101	167 days

The Mayor opened the hearing. A lady who indicated she lives next door to 5411 Allen Drive talked about the problems with 5411 Allen Drive. She stated it has been closed since August 2014, talked about all of the problems with the building including odors, how the property had been sold but the sales fell through and the recent sale which she understands was to a motorcycle group who plan to install a metal building for their motorcycle club. She talked about people working on the house without a permit, how a dog was left inside with no one being at the house, how the dog was then left on a leash outside with no one to tend to it and animal control picked it up. She stated the house has caused nothing but problems and the neighbors want it torn down.

The resident at 5415 Allen Drive indicated he talked to the owner of the property and has offered to buy the house. He stated a contract is being drawn up. He stated if the contract goes through he will purchase the house and it will be torn down. The closing date is April 1 and at that time if the house is still standing he will get a permit and tear it down. He stated however he would like for the Council to go ahead and adopt the ordinance requiring demolition just in case his deal falls through. No one else asked to be heard thus the hearing was closed.

Housing Inspections Administration Glover indicated this has been a problem for quite some time. He stated he is in flavor of adoption of the ordinance requiring demolition. Mr. Thompson wanted to make sure that the purchaser understood if the City demolished the house they would

put a lien against the property for the demolition cost. Mr. Glover indicated everyone understands that. Mr. Glover pointed out it takes the City about 45 days to get through the process and to demolition. If the new owner closes and goes through on April 1, he would have time to demolish it prior to the City moving in. Mr. Thompson moved approval of the demolition as outlined. His motion was seconded by Ms. Baldwin and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote. See Ordinance 556.

UNFIT BUILDING DEMOLITION – 106 COLLETON ROAD – HEARING – ORDINANCE ADOPTED

This was hearing to consider adopting an ordinance, pursuant to the provisions of Article 11.6.8 D of the Unified Development Ordinance, to authorize demolition of the unfit building listed below, if repairs necessary to render the dwelling fit for human habitation are not completed within 90 days:

LOCATION AND DISTRICT	PROPERTY OWNER	TAX ID NUMBER	VACATED AND CLOSED
106 Colleton Road (C)	Octavious Benifield	0064236	December 22, 2014

The Mayor opened the hearing no one asked to be heard, thus the hearing closed. Ms. Baldwin moved adoption of an ordinance requiring demolition as outlined. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote. See Ordinance 557.

PUBLIC NUISANCE COST CONFIRMATION – VARIOUS LOCATIONS – HEARING – RESOLUTION ADOPTED

This was a hearing to consider adopting a resolution to confirm as a lien against the properties as listed below the charges for the abatement of public nuisances:

LOCATION AND DISTRICT	PROPERTY OWNER	TAX ID NUMBER	COST OF ABATEMENT
3707 Capital Boulevard (A)	CarSpa Automotive, LLC c/o Marjorie A. Putnam	0045947	$323
2440 Derby Drive (C)	Helena Stephen	0029410	$187
3425 Dogwood Drive (B)	John W. and Carrie J. Dove	0078966	$323
526 Hilltop Drive (C)	JP Morgan Chase Bank NA c/o Chase Home Finance, LLC	0027850	$349
1002 East Martin Street (C)	Lecolia and James Privette	0057385	$423
624 Oleander Road (D)	Kay T. and Percy R. Brown, III	0231508	$323
3229 Pinecrest Road (A)	Christopher and Lucy	0069062	$148

1956 Talamore Court (B)	Swaringen Jennifer Hope Brown	0217520	$423

The City Clerk asked that 3425 Dogwood Drive and 3229 Pinecrest Road be withdrawn as the charges have been paid. The Clerk also asked that 1002 East Martin Street be withdrawn pointing out that one may come back at a later date. Without objection, those three locations were withdrawn.

The Mayor opened the hearing on the remaining locations. No one asked to be heard thus the hearing was closed. Mayor McFarlane moved adoption of a resolution confirming the charges with the exception of the three which were withdrawn. Her motion was seconded by Ms. Crowder and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote. See Resolution 274.

ANNEXATIONS – 10410 GLOBE ROAD AND APSAN SUBDIVISION – HEARING – ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

This is a hearing to consider the following petitioned annexations

LOCATION	ELECTORAL DISTRICT
10410 Globe Road	E
Subdivision Apsan	E

Following the hearing, if the Council wishes to proceed, it would be appropriate to adopt ordinances annexing the properties effective March 15, 2016 and to adopt a resolution placing the properties in the appropriate electoral districts.

The Mayor opened the hearing, no one asked to be heard thus the hearings were closed. Ms. Crowder moved adoption of ordinances annexing properties effective March 15, 2016 and adoption of a resolution placing the properties in the appropriate electoral district. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Stephenson and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote. See Ordinances 558 and 559 and Resolution 275.

WATER ASSESSMENT ROLL 1344A – EDWARDS MILL ROAD – HEARING – CORRECTING RESOLUTION ADOPTED

This was a hearing to consider adoption of a resolution to correct Water Assessment Roll 1344A – Edwards Mill Road Extension in order to reapportion the fees charged against the property owned by the State of North Caroline, as the property is being sold and the charges should be corrected. A copy of the proposed resolution correcting the assessment roll was included in the agenda packet.

Recommendation: Adopt the corrected assessment roll.

The Mayor opened the hearing, no one asked to be heard thus the hearing was closed. Mr. Stephenson moved adoption of the correcting assessment roll as outlined. His motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote. See Resolution 276.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE GROWTH AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

REZONING Z-39-15 – TRAILWOOD DRIVE – PUBLIC HEARING AUTHORIZED FOR 4-5-15

Chairperson Crowder reported the Growth and Natural Resources Committee recommends the Council authorize a public hearing for April 5, 2016 to consider Z-39-15 – Trailwood Drive. She stated during the committee meetings, the applicant indicated a desire to amend the conditions so once the hearing is closed, new zoning conditions may be offered. Ms. Crowder moved approval as outlined. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Stephenson and put to a vote which passed unanimously. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

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

NO REPORT

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION AND TRANSPORTATION AND TRANSIT COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

REPORT OF MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS

SAINT PATRICK'S DAY PARADE – COMMENTS RECEIVED

Mayor McFarlane stated the St. Patrick's Day parade was a blast and thanked everyone involved and who participated.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MENTAL ILLNESS – INFORMATION REQUEST

Mr. Gaylord indicated he understands the National Association of Mental Illness has offered some training which could be available to our public safety officers and questioned if that is something that the City of Raleigh has done or could take advantage of. He stated he would like some information on how to City handles that issue and talked about the type of training relating to substance abuse, transportation, etc. related to the mentally ill. He needs to know what the City does and if we could or should take advantage of the training that is offered. City Manager Hall pointed out he would provide a report on how that is handled in the City.

PILL DROP – ANNOUNCED

Mr. Thompson pointed out the Substance Abuse Commission in cooperation with the Raleigh Police Department will conduct their annual pill drop on Saturday, April 23. He stated it will be in four locations throughout the City and encouraged all to participate pointing out he would provide additional information later.

HOMELESS – MACHINE FOR SPARE CHANGE – REFERRED TO ADMINISTRATION

Ms. Baldwin indicated when she was returning from vacation she noticed machines in the Denver Airport that allows one to put spare change in and it is used for homeless programs. She pointed out after doing some investigation she saw that they earned some $170,000 and that is a good amount of change. She stated there is some interest for The Partnership for Ending Homelessness and maybe working with DRA to take a look at the program, look at options for the airport and downtown. She stated she works downtown and many times she is approached and would like to do something nice and she has purchased lunch, etc. however if one has some spare change and they can simply put it in a meter to help others, she feels that would be good. She asked that the DRA and the Partnership for Ending Homelessness work with the City look at the program and see if there is an opportunity for the City to develop such a program. Without objection the item was referred to administration.

APPOINTMENTS

APPOINTMENTS – VARIOUS ACTIONS TAKEN

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

Appearance Commission – One Vacancy – Mr. Stephenson and Ms. Crowder nominated Bob Greary.

Human Relations Commission – Two Vacancies – the City Clerk reported Taty Padilla received 6 votes (Stephenson, Cox, Crowder, Baldwin, Branch, Thompson); Blaine Wiles – 4 (Stephenson, Cox, Baldwin, Thompson). Mayor McFarlane stated she thought she had submitted the name of Keith Karlsson some time last week but his name did not appear on the

ballot. The City Clerk reported the nominations have to be made at the table. Mayor McFarlane withdrew Mr. Karlsson's name pointing out she would nominate him at a later time and asked that her vote count for Blaine Wiles; therefore Mr. Wiles received 5 votes. Ms. Padilla and Mr. Wiles will be appointed to the Human Relations Commission.

Stormwater Management Advisory Commission – One Vacancy – No Nominees

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

NO REPORT

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY CLERK

MINUTES – VARIOUS – APPROVED AS PRESENTED

The City Clerk reported Council Members received in their agenda packet copies of the minutes of February 29 Budget Work Session and March 1 Council meetings. Mr. Gaylord moved approval as presented. His motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

TAXES – RESOLUTION ADOPTED

The City Clerk reported Council members received in their agenda packet a proposed resolution adjusting, rebating and/or refunding penalties, exemptions and relieving the late listing of property for ad valorem taxes. Adoption is recommended.

Mr. Gaylord moved approval as presented. His motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. Te Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote. See Resolution 277.

MUSEUM – REMOVAL OF MINUTE BOOKS – APPROVED

The City of Raleigh Museum is designing an exhibit entitled People's Politics. I have received a request to utilize one of the older official minute books to be a part of the exhibit. The book would be displayed in a glass case. I am requesting permission to grant the request which would require authorization from the City Council for a minute book(s) to be removed from City Hall during this exhibit. Mr. Gaylord moved approval as outlined. His motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote.

CLOSED SESSION

CLOSED SESSION – HELD

Mayor McFarlane indicated a motion is in order to enter closed session for the following purposes:

1) Pursuant to NCGS.143-318.11 (a)(5) to instruct the city staff regarding the acquisition of property for watershed protection.
2) Pursuant to NCG143-318.11(a)(2) to prevent the premature disclosure of an award.
3) Pursuant to NGS143-318.11(a)(3) to consult with the City Attorney regarding the following items: a) worker compensation case; b) other privilege communications.

Mayor McFarlane moved approval as read. Her motion was seconded by Mr. Branch and a roll call vote resulted in all members voting in the affirmative. The Mayor ruled the motion adopted on an 8-0 vote. The Council went into closed session at 3:10 p.m.

The Council reconvened in open session at 3:59 p.m. Mayor McFarlane announced that the Council had instructed the City staff concerning the Environmental Advisory Board recommendations, workers' compensation case and other privilege information as well as given direction on the purchase of property for watershed protection.

Adjournment. Mayor McFarlane announced the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Gail G. Smith
City Clerk

jt/CC03-15-16