

**MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION  
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN  
FRANKLIN, TENNESSEE  
CITY HALL BOARDROOM  
TUESDAY, MAY 24, 2016 – 5:00 P.M.**

Mayor Ken Moore	P		
Vice Mayor Brandy Blanton	P	Alderman Dana McLendon	P
Alderman Clyde Barnhill	P	Alderman Margaret Martin	P
Alderman Pearl Bransford	P	Alderman Ann Petersen	P
Alderman Beverly Burger	A	Alderman Michael Skinner	P

**Department Directors/Staff**

Eric Stuckey, City Administrator	P	Lisa Clayton, Parks Director	P
Vernon Gerth, ACA Community/Economic Dev.	P	Shirley Harmon-Gower, Human Resources Director	P
Russell Truell, ACA Finance & Administration		Mark Hilty, Water Management Director	P
Shauna Billingsley, City Attorney	P	Paul Holzen, Engineering Director	P
Rocky Garzarek, Fire Chief	P	Bob Martin, Interim Planning & Sustainability Director	P
Deb Faulkner, Police Chief		Joe York, Streets Director	P
Fred Banner, IT Director	P	Brad Wilson, Facilities Project Manager	
Chris Bridgewater, BNS Director	P	Lanaii Benne, Assistant City Recorder	
Becky Caldwell, SES Director	P	Linda Fulwider, Board Recording Secretary	P

**Call to Order**

Mayor Ken Moore called the Work Session to order at 5:00 p.m.

**Citizen Comments**

- Brandy Whitehead, 442 Beauchamp Cr., Franklin: East McEwen Widening Project - Has three children at Clovercroft Elementary and spoke of the dangers on East McEwen for school buses: 1,458 children ride the buses per day. She follows the bus route, and the road is so curvy it is impossible for the buses to remain within the road lines. There are no shoulders. She will not let her children ages 5, 7, and 9 ride the buses. It is a dangerous stretch of road and only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. As a parent, she asks that the Board make the widening of this road a priority.

**WORK SESSION DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. **16-0436 Initial Discussion and Guidance is Requested for Proceeding with Creating a Communitywide Public Art Program. Julie Walton, Walton’s Antique Jewelers; Ellie Westman Chin, Williamson County Convention and Visitors Bureau; and, Kelly Harwood, Gallery 202, are representing the Artisan Community**

**Eric Stuckey, City Administrator  
Vernon Gerth, ACA Community & Economic Development  
Monique McCullough, Public Outreach Specialist**

As stated in the caption, the group was present to talk about initiating and exploring a public art program. Vernon Gerth explained the goal is to receive acknowledgement and guidance from BOMA, and look at what other communities have done, and come back to the Board with framework that would allow public art to move forward in our community, if the Board is so inclined.

Julie Walton Garland, Walton’s Jewelry, and Promotions Chair for the Downtown Franklin Association Board, said they have come in support of establishing a plan for public art in Franklin. Public art has proven to be a hugely beneficial element in creating a strong community both

economically and culturally for many different cities throughout the country. Community based art and cultural experiences would not only display the history and vibrancy of Franklin to the many visitors we welcome, but would also nurture the love and pride for those who call Franklin home. Moving forward, they would like to establish a formal review process to show the beauty, history, and love they have for Franklin.

Ellie Westman Chin, President and CEO of Visit Franklin, said tourism is a thriving business in Franklin. In 2014 over 1.2 million people visited Franklin and Williamson County. One of the groups the CVB promotes is the cultural tourist who seeks out distinctive experiences, specifically art museums, visual arts and performing arts. Based on a study conducted in 2013 the U.S. cultural traveler spends approximately \$1,319 per trip as compared to \$820 for a domestic traveler (approximately 60% more). The cultural traveler takes more trips and tends to stay longer in the destination and is predominately affluent and well-educated. Establishing a plan for public art in Franklin will allow the CVB to tap into this additional prime audience.

Kelly Harwood, owner of Gallery 202, one of the founding members of The Franklin Art Scene, and one of the active members of the Heritage Foundation Board, related that after opening Gallery 202 in 2010, his friends and gallery owners Autumn Du Fay, and Adam Damico met for discussions on starting an art crawl in Franklin, which they eventually decided to call *The Art Scene*. Our community was very desperate to do something that was art related and artists were seeking a place to show their works. Now, everyone seems to be enjoying it. It is an event people tend to look forward to and share with their guests every month. The Heritage Foundation joined us a few years ago to help manage the shows. *The Art Scene* is celebrating its Five Year Anniversary. Visitors to Gallery 202 often ask why there is no public art. His answer is always the same that they are working on that. With BOMA's guidance and support, let's make this happen together.

Discussion:

- Alderman Bransford asked if they were talking about putting the art on private property, City property, or murals on buildings.
- Ms. Garland responded that it would probably encompass all – murals, sculptures, etc. The goal is to establish a process and review committee to determine what will be done. She related that Franklin Tomorrow wants to be involved as well.
- Mr. Stuckey said what they want tonight is some kind of endorsement to get started and do some research. Monique McCullough and Mr. Gerth met with the group earlier.
- Vice Mayor Blanton supports the project and mentioned the public art the Board saw when they were in Carmel, Indiana. She would like to see the art spread further than just Downtown Franklin, and be in Cool Springs as well.
- Alderman McLendon asked if this had been run past the Law Department. This hypothetical conjures up the law of unintended consequences.
- Mr. Stuckey that is a factor in the process.
- Alderman Skinner commented that *The Art Scene* has become a tradition in Franklin, drawing people from other parts of Middle Tennessee. He looks forward to more information.
- Ellie Westman Chin related the Heritage Foundation and Mary Pearce have been involved, as well as O'More College, CVB, DFA, and Franklin Tomorrow will be involved.

**2. 16-0450 Consideration of Event Permit for Franklin on the Fourth sponsored by the Franklin Lions Club in Downtown Franklin.**

**Deb Faulkner, Police Chief**

No questions or comments.

**3. 16-0434 Discussion of Procedure for Adopting an Increase in the Hotel/Motel Tax Rate for the City of Franklin.**

**Eric Stuckey, City Administrator**

**Michael Walters Young, Budget & Analytic Manager**

At a previous meeting, former alderman Pam Lewis suggested the Board consider raising the Hotel/Motel tax by 1% and use it for affordable housing. The City has the authority to raise the tax

to the 5% cap. It was noted the City of Brentwood and Williamson County both have 4% Hotel/Motel tax in place.

In 1996 the City of Franklin requested a Private Act of Legislature creating the Franklin Hotel/Motel Occupancy Tax. The legislation authorized the City to “levy and collect a privilege tax upon the privilege of occupancy in any hotel of each transient in an amount not to exceed 5%.” Ordinance 1996-61 adopted the hotel occupancy tax and established the rate at 2%. In 2004 the hotel tax rate was increased to 4% to provide sufficient revenues to support additional debt service for the purchase of Harlinsdale Farm. Debt Service on the Eastern Flank was later added. Beginning in 2008 improvements to Harlinsdale and Eastern Flank parks were funded by this tax as well as tourism-related improvements after the bonded debt on the Conference Center was paid off in 2015. In 2005, 2006, and 2008 discussions were held about raising the rate to 5%, but not supported.

Discussion:

- Alderman Bransford advocated for some portion, if not all, of the 1%, be used for affordable housing to allow public servants to work and live here.
- Alderman Martin asked how the 1% would be divided and how Franklin’s tax compares with other cities in Tennessee.
- Alderman Skinner asked for input from hotels and the CVB on concerns expressed during previous discussions. There may be future improvements needed at the Cool Springs Conference Center.
- Alderman Barnhill wanted to be sure the perception is not that the Board is tying this together with affordable housing. The money should go for projects that are connected to tourism or historic preservation. He asked what the City still owes on Harlinsdale and the Eastern Flank, and if the City is able to pay down that debt for things purchased previously. He won’t support tying affordable housing with a 1% increase in the hotel/motel tax.
- Ellie Westman Chin, 604 Treelawn Place, Franklin, CVB President & CEO: When looking at the list comparing Franklin to other cities, one needs to know that Franklin’s 4% is added to the Williamson County 4% which is added to the State 9.25% putting the hotel tax at 17.25%. That is what the visitors pay. Looking at that bigger number vs. our competitors, Franklin is higher. Asheville, North Carolina, which they bid against a lot is at 13% hotel/sales tax, Charleston, South Carolina, another competitor, is at 13.5%. The SMERF market (Sports, Military, Education, Religion and Fraternity) always looks for a lower rate, the \$129ish type rate. The 17.25 % added to the \$129 will make a difference compared to 13% added to the rate. It is a very competitive market and they want to have an edge up on competitors.
- Alderman McLendon: Why would we raise the tax if we don’t know what we would apply it to, and if we did know, is it important enough to be the last choice we ever get to make on allocating this hotel/motel tax? Unless we applied for a new private act, we would be going to the piggy bank for the last time. He supported the previous increase to pay off park acquisitions. Will an increase actually raise any revenue? It could be revenue neutral.

**4. 16-0453 ★Consideration of RESOLUTION 2016-23, a Resolution to Adopt Amendment 4 to the City of Franklin Employees’ Pension Plan.**

**Eric Stuckey, City Administrator  
Russ Truell, ACA Finance & Administration  
Shirley Harmon, HR Director**

Recommended for approval by the Employee Pension Committee. The current plan calls for employees leaving service with the City to receive a lump sum payout instead of monthly retirement checks if their actuarial calculated benefit is less than \$10,000. This has not been adjusted for inflation since 2006. The City is satisfied that it is in the best interest of the Plan and the Employee to adjust the threshold amount to \$15,000 for lump sum payouts. An employee can roll the sum into another retirement plan.

**5. 16-0454 ★Consideration of RESOLUTION 2016-27, a Resolution to Amend the Partnership Agreement with Forest Growth Timber Advisors.**

**Eric Stuckey, City Administrator  
Russ Truell, ACA Finance & Administration  
Shirley Harmon, HR Director**

Small text changes in the agreement as recommended by the Employee Pension Committee.

**6. 16-0324 Consideration of Amendment #1 to Interlocal Agreement Between City of Franklin and Bi County Solid Waste Management for the Transport and Disposal of Solid Waste (COF Contract No. 2012-0023).**

**Eric Stuckey, City Administrator**  
**Becky Caldwell, SES Director**

Amendment #1 is the first amendment to this Interlocal Agreement since it went into effect on July 1, 2012. Benefits included a long-term commitment. The amendment recognizes the extended transfer station operating hours, increases in the volume Bi County shall manage to reflect at 500 tons per work day, clarifies the contact information for the City of Franklin Risk Manager, and extends the agreement to reflect a total of thirty (30) years from the initial execution of the agreement in 2012. The financial terms of the agreement remain as defined in the initial agreement. Fees for each successive term will be adjusted Consumer Price Index (CPI) in comparison to the same index for July 2012. There are seven consecutive four-year terms. This agreement offers significant cost control and guaranteed capacity. If there is ever a better option available, the City has a 30-day option to terminate. The volume increased significantly with the longer transportation hours. The City pays Bi County \$33.09 per ton for hauling. Bi County is in the process of working with TDEC on permitting additional capacity. The Bi County Board will vote on the amendment June 8, and BOMA will vote June 14, 2016.

**7. 16-0384 Consideration of COF Contract No. 2016-0096, an Agreement Between Middle Tennessee State University and The City of Franklin, Tennessee.**

**Lisa Clayton, Parks Director**

100% grant for signage at Carter Hill Park.

**8. 16-0437 Consideration of a Lighting Maintenance Agreement Between The City of Franklin and Charlton Green, Sections II & III, Homeowners Association, Inc.**

**Eric Stuckey, City Administrator**  
**Vernon Gerth, ACA Community & Economic Development**

Several Charlton Green residents were present for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Gerth displayed a picture of the Watercress Drive entrance to the subdivision showing placement of the four decorative gas lights on the bridge that sits within the public right-of-way. The purpose of the maintenance agreement is to establish responsibility and liability for the installation of those lights and extend electric service to an adjacent median located immediately south of the bridge and within the Watercress Drive right-of-way. Charlton Green is served by two separate Homeowners Associations: Section I has 12 parcels with 11 dwellings, and there are 53 parcels in Sections II & III. Homeowners Association Sections II and III agrees to accept all cost obligations for installation and future maintenance including the costs associated with the gas and electric services.

Discussions began in 2012 or 2013. Since last summer, staff engaged representatives from both HOA Boards on multiple occasions to facilitate this agreement. Homeowners Association Section I decided not to be a party to this agreement. Some residents in Section I think the lights may be intrusive, but they are low volume lights and are for the safety of the residents.

Discussion:

- Alderman Martin said this is in her Ward and many people have been upset about the situation. The neighborhood is fractured and hopes they can come to an agreement.
- Harriet Keyes, 100 Basil Court, Charlton Green Homeowners Association Section I: She related that Section I has been in the deeds office since 1973 as being responsible to maintain the front entrance. The back sections I and II were built in 1975. The agreement recently given to Section I, that they did not sign, more or less removed Section I from the maintenance factor, and gave everything to Sections II and III to run. Section I requests that a letter or document of some sort be put into the deeds office so they are no longer under the plat plan which was given to them as their community common ground. Ms. Keyes referred to maps and documents that define Section I property owners as servient owners in the tax records. She said the walls are sitting on Section I property, and they have never

approved the gas lamps. As servient owners they also want documentation with the plat that they are not liable for any catastrophe caused by the gas lamps on the walls. If that is done Section I doesn't care what Sections II and III do.

- Harris Pearce, Woodview Court, Charlton Green, President of Homeowners Association Sections II and III: There are 50 homes in the back and 11 homes in the front, and for the most part in the history of Charlton Green they have worked together. They had a landscape agreement that went awry. Homeowners Association Sections II and III is absolutely willing to take on the responsibilities in the Agreement. They already have a \$2 million liability policy in place and will take full responsibility for the masonry walls, the gas lamps and the electrical on the median that is within the public right-of-way owned by the City (It does not belong to Sections II and III, nor does it belong to section I), as well as be liable if there should be a catastrophe caused by the gas lights. He has been an insurance adjustor for 40 years and a catastrophe caused by gas light explosion is not likely.
- Mr. Gerth said he wanted to make it explicitly clear that the pavement seen on Watercress Drive, the masonry walls, and approximately 5 feet outside of the walls is City right-of-way. If a car would damage that bridge the City's Risk Manager would pursue recovery from the damager's insurance company. This agreement states that Sections II and III will be totally responsible for the four gas lights, repair, liability, and the electric.
- Alderman Petersen: Ms. Keyes has said they own the land underneath. Looking at the plat, Alderman Petersen believes that is the case for Section I and Sections II and III. It says it is common use and appears to go beyond the bridge. As she understands it, as long as the Agreement in question is on the plat, it indicates the liability will solely be Sections II and III.
- Alderman McLendon: We must sort out who owns the land because if Section I is actually the owner they need to be party to this agreement in order to be a beneficiary of it. If they don't own it and they are protesting, then they need to sort that out amongst the two HOAs. Right-of-way is not the same as ownership. What the plat says, because of the dating on plats provided by Ms. Keyes, is that there is common use of land. The City has right-of-way it doesn't own.
- Carolyn Savage, 103 Tarragon Court, Charlton Green responded, Section I owns the property. The plat plan shows that. The surveyor for the City walked the whole area with her when she was president of Homeowners Association Section I. She was the representative for Section I to Sections II & III for 10 years. She tried to tell everyone that she is the person responsible for wanting lights because she walked every night and it would be safer. She informed them it was public right-of-way.
- Mr. Stuckey said staff will try to clarify the right-of-way and City ownership. In every right-of-way situation he is aware of, the City owns the right-of-way. The parties will be advised.

9. **16-0360 ★Consideration of ORDINANCE 2016-015, To Be Entitled: "An Ordinance Amending The City of Franklin Municipal Code, Appendix A – Comprehensive Fees and Penalties, Chapter 18 – Water & Sewer for the Purpose of Updating Water and Sanitary Sewer User Rates"; Establishing a Public Hearing for June 14, 2016.**

**Eric Stuckey, City Administrator**  
**Mark Hilty, Water Management Director**

A presentation was made several months ago on the cost of service for water and wastewater. Two years of rates in the Five-Year Plan were adopted previously and it is time to approve the next two years of rates. According to the study, water rates should increase 3.5% and the wastewater rates would increase by 6.5%; however, the wastewater rate will be lowered to 5.5%. Options on how to apply the increases to the rate structure were reviewed by the Budget & Finance Committee, and two options are recommended:

◆ **Option A – Volumetric Rate Adjustment Only:**

*Water* - Fixed charge for 1,000 gallons would remain the same for Residential-Inside @ \$11.86. The volumetric rate adjustment would be a 3.5% increase.

*Sewer* – Fixed charge for 1,000 gallons would remain at \$16.55 and volumetric would be a 5.5% increase.

This would not affect the people on fixed incomes that do not use much water.

- ◆ **Option C – Customer Charge and Volumetric Rate Adjustments:**  
*Water* - Fixed charge for 1,000 gallons would increase to \$12.86 with a 3.5% increase in the volumetric charge.  
*Sewer* –Fixed charge would go from \$16.55 to \$18.55 with a 5.5% volumetric increase.

The revenue implications are the same. The upgrades are for wastewater and water plants. \$1.1 million for wastewater and \$875,000 for water. Volume rates can fluctuate while the customer charge is the most consistent.

10. 16-0357 ★**Consideration of ORDINANCE 2016-012, An Ordinance to Adopt a Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-2017; Establishing a Public Hearing for June 14, 2016.**  
**Eric Stuckey, City Administrator**  
**Russ Truell, ACA Finance & Administration**  
**Michael Walters Young, Budget & Analytics Manager**
11. 16-0358 ★**Consideration of ORDINANCE 2016-013, An Ordinance to Establish a Property Tax Rate for 2017; Establishing a Public Hearing for June 14, 2016.**  
**Eric Stuckey, City Administrator**  
**Russ Truell, ACA Finance & Administration**  
**Michael Walters Young, Budget & Analytics Manager**

Items 10 and 11 taken together. Presented to the Budget & Finance Committee on May 12, 2016.

Budget Highlights:

**The Focus**

Management	Community Development	Strong Financial Base
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy development and implementation</li> <li>• Budget process</li> <li>• High quality service levels</li> <li>• Department level key performance measures</li> <li>• Benchmarking program</li> <li>• Capital Investment project oversight and delivery</li> <li>• Telling “Franklin’s story” locally and beyond</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desired location</li> <li>• High Development Standards</li> <li>• Educated workforce</li> <li>• Sites ready for development</li> <li>• Aggressive State incentives</li> <li>• Work with partners at State and Williamson County</li> <li>• Play “offense”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long-Term financial planning (revenue diversification)</li> <li>• Capital Investment plan process</li> <li>• Multi-year financial planning</li> <li>• Healthy reserve levels</li> <li>• Triple-A Bond rating from both Moody’s and S&amp;P.</li> <li>• Support changing service needs</li> </ul>

General Fund Budget \$64.1 million – 4% up.

**General Fund Overview: Revenues (page 35)**

- Local Sales Tax 51.7%
- State Shared Taxes 17.4%
- Property Tax 9.2%
- Alcohol Tax 6.1%
- Franchise Fees 4.0%
- Building Permits & Licenses 4.3%
- Grants 2.9%
- Court Fines & Fees 0.9%
- In Lieu of Taxes 0.4%
- Interest Income 0.3%
- Other 3.0%

**General Fund Overview: Revenues by Source (page 36)**

- Consumption 73.2%
- Wealth & Assets 11.5%
- Fees & Permits 9.1%
- Other 6.1%

**General Fund Overview: Expenses by Department/Function**

- Public Safety 47.4%
- Finance & Administration 8.5%
- Parks 6.8%
- Streets 10.6%
- Community & Economic Development 13.4%
- Other 4.6%
- Transfers 2.5%
- Governance & Management 7.2%

**General Fund Overview: Expenses by Category**

- Personnel 70.3%
- Operations 25.7%
- Capital 4.0%

**General fund Overview: Opportunities**

- Maintain high quality services
- Invest in our future
- Enhance our communities competitive position
- Focus on possibilities, not just current challenges
- Maintain Franklin's unique character

**Overview: Highlights**

- The budget is balanced with current revenues equaling expenditures
- In compliance with BOMA's debt and reserve policies
- Net reduction of 11 positions across all funds
- The annual pay adjustments for City team members will involve two tiers this year: 1) All employees will receive a \$500 base pay increase to offset medical insurance cost escalations in recent years and 2) a 4% general pay increase will be provided to employees. There will be a cap placed on total base pay increase of \$3,000 between these two elements. The pay adjustment will be effective July 1, 2016.
- The recommended budget includes \$125,000 for funding of merit supplements for a fifth consecutive year.

**General Fund: Revenues: Financial Performance**

- Comparison 2008–2017. 2017: Revenue \$64.1 M; Expenditures \$ 64.1 M; Fund Balance \$57.9 M.

**Other Funds: change in Budget Amounts**

- Reviewed changes 2014-2017

**INVEST FRANKLIN**

- Five Year reappraisal has occurred (still in process).
- Due to increased property values, the existing \$0.4065 per \$100 of assessed valuation will move to approximately \$0.3170 per \$100 of assessed valuation.
- Invest Franklin provides for a \$0.10 increment of property tax bringing the new rate to \$0.4170 per \$100 of assessed valuation.

**Property Tax Rate Summary**

- Existing Property Tax - \$0.3170:
  - ▲ \$0.2870 – Existing debt service and operations support.
  - ▲ \$0.03 – Established in 2014, 50% pledged to neighborhood street resurfacing, 50% to infrastructure/capital investment
- Invest Franklin - \$0.10:
  - ▲ \$0.07 – Infrastructure and transportation investment. One penny dedicated transit, connectivity (sidewalks, multi-use trails), and other non-roadway transportation improvements
  - ▲ \$0.03 – Dedicated to supporting City operations. The first such dedication of property tax rate capacity since 1987.
- Dedicated funding increases our capacity to invest in infrastructure and transportation over the 10-year planning horizon from approximately \$30 million to \$80 million.
- The ongoing Capital Investment Planning process identifies approximately \$240 million of capital (infrastructure, facilities) needs over the next 10 years.
- Invest Franklin provides important additional capacity, but the City will continue to work with Federal/State funding opportunities, other regional partners, and update development-related fees to fund key infrastructure investments.
- An example of high-impact projects that could be implemented through invest Franklin:
 

× McEwen Phase 4	\$26.4 million
× Franklin Road	\$14.3 million
× Long Lane Connector	\$12.8 million
× Southeast Park	\$13.2 million

***An example of property tax impact:***

2011 Market Value:	\$ 353,500
Assessed Value (25% of market):	\$ 88,375
<b>2015 City Property Tax at \$0.4065:</b>	<b>\$ 359.24 per year</b>
2016 Market Value:	\$ 410,900
Assessed Value (25% of market)	\$ 102,725
<b>City Property Tax at \$0.3170:</b>	<b>\$ 325.64 per year</b>
(a reduction of \$33.60 per year)	
<b>City Property Tax at \$0.4170:</b>	<b>\$ 428.36 per year</b>
(an increase of \$69.12 per year of \$5.76 per month)	

**General Fund: Property Tax Summary:**

- 1984 – 2016 reviewed
- 2017 would be \$0.4170, or an increase of \$0.0105

**General Fund Revenues: Property Tax Rate Comparison**

With an increase, Franklin would probably drop to second place on the comparison list. County tax will go up. Final number should be available around June 1, 2016.

**Discussion:**

- Alderman Barnhill: It is important the entire CIP be reviewed before the second reading of the ordinance establishing the property tax levy. There may be an opportunity to leverage a less costly project. There should be less dependence on sales tax and more stable funding.
- Mr. Stuckey: The review of the capital projects is largely done. Engineering will bring sidewalks, paths, and multi-use trails projects for review.
- Alderman Martin: In favor of McEwen Phase 4 @ \$26.4 million, Franklin Road @ \$14.3 million, Long Lane Connector @ \$12.8 million, and Southeast Park @ \$13.2 million listed in the budget presentation as those improvements would serve many residents.
- Vice Mayor Blanton: Asked for clarification on the cap of \$3,000 per employee for the one time addition of \$500 to employees base pay and the 4% raise. She wants to do something substantial for the employees.
- Mr. Stuckey explained that all employees will have \$500 added to their base pay followed by a 4% increase in pay. The cap on the amount any employee can receive is \$3,000. In the lower salary ranges up to \$62,500, the combined increases will be in the 5%-6% range.
- Alderman Petersen: Property tax this year will be around \$14 million, based on the \$.10 tax increase proposed, property tax next year would bring in around \$19 million. That would be a 35%-40% more revenue. Many people will pay a lot more property tax. Look at special funds like Road Impact fees and Facilities tax for projects instead of raising taxes. There are no property taxes coming in from the TIF District around Nissan. Where does that stand?
- Mayor Moore commented that the money being collected in the funds she mentioned is not extra money to spend as it is figured into the projections.
- Alderman McLendon: Taxes haven't been raised for many years. During the recession, the budget was tightened, and there were no meaningful raises for employees. Throughout the entire time the aldermen would hear from residents that they wanted to continue to have the services and quality of life expected in this community. Having been through the lean years and not contemplating a tax increase, people should know budget cuts were to the full extent and the City still delivered top notch services. When talking about \$15 million road projects, \$13 million parks and capital infrastructure projects, new money is needed to do these things. The community should not say cut some waste, we've done that. He is glad the employees are getting a raise of significance this year. He supports Invest Franklin and the tax increase.
- Alderman Bransford agreed with Alderman McLendon. She reminded people that the City is 51.7% dependent on sales tax vs. 9% revenue on property tax. She applauded the Invest Franklin approach.

**Other Business**

None

**Adjournment**

Work Session adjourned @ 7:08 p.m.

---

Dr. Ken Moore, Mayor

Minutes prepared by: Linda Fulwider, Board Recording Secretary, City Administrator's Office - updated 10/11/2016 1:39 PM