

**MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN
FRANKLIN, TENNESSEE
CITY HALL BOARDROOM
TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 2018 – 5:00 P.M.**

Board Members

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

Department Directors/Staff

Eric Stuckey, City Administrator		Jack Tucker, SES Director	
Vernon Gerth, ACA Community/Economic Dev	P	Lisa Clayton, Parks Director	
Mark Hilty, ACA Public Works	P	Michelle Hatcher, Water Management Director	
Kristine Tallent, ACA/CFO	P	Paul Holzen, Engineering Director	
Shauna Billingsley, City Attorney	P	Emily Hunter, Planning & Sustainability Director	
Deb Faulkner, Police Chief		Kevin Townsel, HR Director	
Rocky Garzarek, Fire Chief		Joe York, Streets Director	
Jordon Shaw, IT Director		Lanaii Benne, Assistant City Recorder	P
Chris Bridgewater, BNS Director		Linda Fulwider, Board Recording Secretary	A

Call to Order

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

Citizen Comments

- 🗣️ Evelyn Hickerson, 4221 Warren Road, Founder of Gentry's Educational Foundation: Thanked the Board for once again partnering with the entity in providing intense tutoring to children in science, reading and math. Gentry's will be participating in the after-school program at New Hope Academy this fall as well as providing tutoring services to scholarship students there. Ms. Hickerson brought parents to offer testimony on how the program has helped their children:
- 🗣️ Talia Mayes: Her son attends Johnson Elementary and has been tutored at Gentry's. He has progressed to the extent that he now receives academic awards.
- 🗣️ Brian Meyers: His four-year old hearing-impaired daughter with bilateral cochlear implants attends Johnson Elementary. The in-school and after-school help she receives has been invaluable. Miss Sue has helped his daughter with speech therapy and taught the class integrated sign language. He is impressed with the young people who work there as well.

WORK SESSION DISCUSSION ITEMS

**1. 18-0103 Discussion of Possible Ordinance Restricting the Retail Sale of Dogs and Cats.
Alderman Beverly Burger**

Mayor Moore noted that several citizens wished to speak on this issue:

- 🗣️ Kathy Lewis, DVM, 1210 Reese Drive, Franklin 37069 is a veterinarian at Animalia. This issue is all about commercial breeding facilities a/k/a puppy mills (large inhumane breeding operations that do nothing to protect animal health) They keep dozens, if not hundreds of animals in stacked small wire cages for their entire lives with little or no exercise, no veterinary care or human attention. They are there solely to pump out puppies for the pet trade. These puppies are more likely to have genetic abnormalities, as well as serious ongoing health and behavioral problems. Despite what they say, pet stores do sell animals from puppy mills. Truly responsible breeders do not. They want to meet their buyers personally and not sell to the first person that shows up with cash in hand. More than 350 cities, including Nashville, have passed similar bans and puppy mills are finding it more difficult to procure buyers. Banning the sale has begun to reduce the number of puppy mills across the country. Shelters in areas with ordinances have reduced euthanasia rates as well.

- Ashley Cunningham, 317 Main Street, Franklin 37064: Three primary reasons why this ordinance is needed: 1) public health 2) animal welfare 3) consumer protection. She addressed questions received from the Board: 1) the industry has made people sick, including two in Knoxville who contracted campylobacter from puppies purchased at pet store. The CDC traced 113 cases of campylobacter back to the stores. The national chain Pet Land told the Tennessee legislature they wanted to open a store in Middle Tennessee. In response, Nashville enacted an ordinance almost identical to this one. Pet Land will look for another affluent community. Some asked if this should be regulated by State or Federal governments; however, due to weak standards in both, more than 250 cities have restricted pet store sales. The USDA inspects commercial breeders who sell to pet stores. The USDA license is not a seal of approval. They have minimal requirements. There is a large network of responsible breeders in this area who place their dogs' well-being against all else. She asked the Board to protect animals and residents by cutting off the puppy mill/pet store pipeline.
- Shawn Aswad, 2754 Buckner Lane, Snooty Giggles Dog Rescue: They take on special needs medical care issues including senior and hospice. She knows firsthand where these dogs come from and the conditions they live in. Although a puppy looks happy and healthy in a pet store, generally there are hidden problems at the time of purchase. They've had several calls for help with dogs purchased in pet stores that turned out to be blind, deaf or have birth defects. The buyers can't afford to take care of them. There was a backyard breeding situation in Mt. Pleasant selling to pet stores. Eighteen dogs left in horrible conditions in a barn. There was no air flow in cages they hadn't been out of the cages. Hours old pups were left on the ground in dirt with no mamas in sight. These are considered designer breeds. No male dogs were found. The dogs were dehydrated, sick, and full of parasites. Those are the puppies that get passed on.
- Dani Mangiagli, 179 Royal Oaks Boulevard, Apt E-8, Franklin 37067: Purchased a German Shepard from Pawfect Puppy Store. Within 5 days they learned he had Giardia, Coccidia, hook worms, tape worms, anemia, is severely underweight, has a congenital intestinal disease, developmental issues in his front hip, dysplasia in the back, bile issues, and vomiting. She hopes the Board doesn't support puppy mills because she has seen him go through the worst and no other dog should have to go through that. No one deserves to see an animal go through that. They paid \$1,700 for the dog and have spent thousands of dollars to date with another \$1,000 scan scheduled. That is what these people are selling.
- Ann Logan, 143 Yorktown Road: She has personal experience with the source of dogs and what it means to people who acquire them. In 2004 in Williamson County, because of Consumer Affairs at the State level having received over \$100,000 of value in complaints, a group of people were brought together, including the DA's office, Child Welfare, and other components that were relevant. They seized over 200 dogs in the Siliski Case. They were breeders and some of the puppies had not yet been shipped out. She shipped them to individuals all over the country. Pet stores in general get their puppies from the same kind of source. Health wise, they found every kind of imaginable issue. The county spent well over \$100,000 trying to get through the court case and that didn't include what the DA's office spent. They spent 9 months of emotional ups and downs along with the work that is involved in taking care of animals that have not been properly cared for medically or socially. These animals would run in circles because that is all they were used to in the cages. They were terrified of everything. That's the kind of source we're talking about with the ordinance.
- Ann Cox, 307 White Moss, Franklin, Volunteer at Williamson County Animal Center: She brought a puppy mill dog named Gina from the animal shelter and related the dog's background. She also submitted a picture of a puppy in a rusty, filthy, old cage at a puppy mill. The cages are stacked and have wire bottoms. This allows the animals excrement to fall into the cages below them.

Comments:

- Alderman Burger:** She sponsored this to look at the big picture. She is aware of the entity looking for an affluent area Middle Tennessee. This is about how Franklin protects its animals in the future and not about putting someone out of business. She read an amendment to the proposed ordinance:

- Any pet stores operating with a valid business license prior to the effective date of this act are exempt from this section with the following conditions – (1) Only animals sourced from USDA licensed commercial breeders with no USDA violations shall be offered for sale, barter, or trade. Upon request, the pet store shall provide a copy of the clean USDA inspection report for the breeder of every animal in the pet store. (note: the pet store still has easy access to these records from the breeders whereas consumers and law enforcement don't because the USDA purged it from their website) (2) Each dog or cat offered for sale, barter, or trade must list the breeder's name and address on the front of the enclosure where the animal is held. (3) Any business found to be in violation of Provision (1) or (2) will be subject to a fine of \$50 per violation, per day.

One local pet store owner said in an article, *we only deal with best breeds out there that are inspected on a regular basis that have no type of violations of USDA*. Points of interest: I'm inspected by the TN Department of Agriculture: Inspection is a simple checklist that looks at things like exercise plans and food storage. Doesn't prohibit importation of dogs from abusive puppy mills which is what the ordinance is about. Inspectors aren't vets-they don't test animals for genetic defects or diseases like intestinal parasites or parvo.

I only buy from USDA licensed breeders: The USDA repeatedly asserted their regulations and standards are minimum requirements that should be built upon by the states and that regulated businesses should exceed. USDA standards allow dogs to be kept in cramped, stacked, wire cages only six inches larger than each dog for their entire lives. NO limits on how often dogs can be bred, nor requirements that dogs must be healthy or free from genetic disorders to be bred. Even if breeder complies with all USDA requirements, a breeder can keep animals in extremely inhumane conditions.

State of TN should be regulating: Aside from the Ag checklist, there is no state oversight of pet stores or breeding facilities. State legislators have been trying to get this done for five years but the rural legislators have blocked it in Ag Committee. Cannot wait on the state or federal governments to act.

AKC is Opposed: AKC not the champion for dogs as thought. It is sustained by fees breeders pay to register puppies. The more dogs registered with AKC, the richer they get. AKC financially beholden to commercial dog breeding. Over 10 past years, AKC opposed 250+ common sense bills across the country that would protect dogs; such as allowing veterinarians to perform surgeries, lemon laws to protect purchasers, preventing dogs from being left in hot cars, banning sale of dog and cat meat, inhumane chaining, and opposed a bill in TN preventing chaining a dog to a tree during a hurricane. AKC reason TN hasn't been able to pass a bill to regulate breeders. Through political action committee, AKC funnels thousands of dollars in donations to some of the most aggressively anti-animal welfare politicians in the country.

- Alderman Blanton:** If there were something in place to protect the animals, we wouldn't be here now. The ordinance utilizes the Davidson County ordinance with additions. She would rather see the ordinance go for a vote as written, and Alderman Burger's amendment be handled as an addendum since the amendment submitted today negates the entire reason for discussion. In favor of the one inspired by Davidson County.
- Alderman Bransford:** She met with Ashley and her team and is concerned about the public health aspects. Fully supports the ordinance based on Metro Nashville.
- Vice Mayor Martin:** She was for State regulation, but was told that wouldn't happen. She supports a City ordinance.
- Alderman Speedy** submitted a written statement of why he does not support the proposed ordinance which Mayor Moore read into the record:

 - I will not be supporting proposed Pet Shop Ordinance, an ordinance that would limit commerce for an existing Franklin business that is already regulated by the State of Tennessee and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I agree with the American Kennel Club in opposing a restriction on the retail sale of pets from licensed, inspected and regulated sources and believe we should allow our citizens freedom of choice in selecting a pet. I also feel like enforcement of the existing Federal Animal Welfare Act protects our consumer's safety more than the proposed Pet Shop Ordinance.
- Alderman McLendon:** Concerns: doesn't have a sense of whether this is perfectly fine that dogs are bought at a pet store. Would moving forward with this ordinance potentially severely impact an existing business? It may not be as narrow and tailored to the problem as it could be. The way the ordinance came forward was pretty much to say that a pet store couldn't sell any animals except those from a shelter. Imbedded in that is the universal condemnation of anyone who is a breeder that would deal with a pet store. Not sure condemnation is warranted. Concerned about legislating against the lowest common denominator. Before going forward with this ordinance wants to be convinced it is necessary to go that far. There are terrible puppy mills, but if there is

another side he would like to give them an opportunity to explain their side. The Board is in the business of regulating public policy. Concerned about the draft because he doesn't have any idea what a USDA violation is. Layered on top of this, are we going to get into the business of legislating against things we find morally repugnant although they are otherwise lawful.

☛ Alderman Blanton: This is the third or fourth time discussed and she hasn't heard anyone talk about a good experience.

☛ Alderman Burger: The other side has had an opportunity to speak. Other language is needed because of concerns of someone going out of business. USDA concerns can come to the Board. Not banning sales, just retail sales of dogs from puppy mills.

2. **18-0590 Consideration of Event Permit Application for Raise the Roofs on August 18, 2018 at the Park at Harlinsdale Farm Sponsored by Friends of Franklin Parks.**

Lisa Clayton, Parks Director

No questions or comments.

3. **18-0596 ★Consideration of Certificate of Compliance RENEWAL for Wine in Grocery Store for Publix Tennessee, LLC #0160, Located at 2020 Fieldstone Parkway, Franklin, TN 37069 (Cory Ring, Managing Agent; Randall T. Jones, Sr, President; John A. Attaway, Jr., Secretary; David Patrick Phillips, Treasurer; Joseph DiBenedetto, Vice President; Jeffrey G. Chamberlain, Vice President (Executive Officers).**

Lanaii Benne, Assistant City Recorder

No questions or comments.

4. **18-0597 ★Consideration of Certificate of Compliance RENEWAL for Wine in Grocery Store for Publix Tennessee, LLC #0176, Located at 1021 Riverside Drive, Franklin, TN 37064 (Tony Gonzalez, Managing Agent; Randall T. Jones, Sr, President; John A. Attaway, Jr., Secretary; David Patrick Phillips, Treasurer; Joseph DiBenedetto, Vice President; Jeffrey G. Chamberlain, Vice President (Executive Officers).**

Lanaii Benne, Assistant City Recorder

No questions or comments.

5. **18-0598 ★Consideration of Certificate of Compliance RENEWAL for Wine in Grocery Store for Publix Tennessee, LLC #1031, Located at 1400 Liberty Pike, Suite 200, (McKay's Mill), Franklin, TN 37067-8560 (Nicole Hill, Managing Agent; Randall T. Jones, Sr, President; John A. Attaway, Jr., Secretary; David Patrick Phillips, Treasurer; Joseph DiBenedetto, Vice President; Jeffrey G. Chamberlain, Vice President (Executive Officers).**

Lanaii Benne, Assistant City Recorder

No questions or comments.

6. **18-0553 Consideration of City of Franklin Contract No. 2018-0084 for a Professional Services Agreement (PSA) with Tuck Hinton Architects for Master Planning of the Park at Harlinsdale Farm in the Amount Not-to-Exceed \$39,450.**

Lisa Clayton, Parks Director

Mark Hilty and Kevin Lindsay noted this item is an update to Harlinsdale Master Plan. Details for projects on various structures, and to partner with others for those projects. Breaks the projects down into manageable pieces.

7. **18-0642 ★Consideration of Contract No. 2018-0014 Between the City of Franklin and the Tennessee Consolidated Retirement System (TCRS) for Provision of Pension Services**

Eric Stuckey, City Administrator

Kristine Tallent, ACA/CFO

Sara Sylvis, Risk/Benefits Manager

Services Covered by this Agreement

- Co-Investment of Assets. As of 3/31/18 TCRS is managing 91% (\$96.7 million) of the total plan assets of \$105.7 million.
- Plan Administration Services to begin January 1, 2019

-Basic Payroll Services - make monthly benefit payment to retirees on last business day of the month by electronic funds or debit card, provide customer service, and implement annual COLA as determined by the City.

-Benefit Calculation Services – provide estimates of monthly benefits utilizing processes provided by the City. Monthly benefits for new retirees shall be calculated by an actuary contracted by the City.

Fees for Services Rendered

- Co-Investment of Assets as in Group Trust Disclosure Brochure
- Plan Administration Services
 - Infrastructure/Technology Fee -\$13,360.32 annually for first three years. Total fee of \$40,080.96
 - Basic Payroll Services Fee - \$17.64 per recipient each quarter. Assuming 180 recipients – annual fee \$12,700.80 (City currently pays \$13,980 to USBank)
 - At request of City, TCRS may provide additional active member reporting services and would require additional fees.
 - At this time, TCRS does not intend to charge the City any other fees.

Termination – Either party may terminate by giving written notice to the other with a minimum of 60-days-notice.

Transition Items from City Administration to TCRS

- Direct Deposit of all monthly payments – Recipients of paper checks have been notified.
- Change of Payment Dates – The City makes payments on the first business day of the month. TCRS makes payment on the final business day. Upon transition, recipients will receive payment on the first day of the month and receipt of the next payment approximately 60 days later the final day of the next month.
- Options for transitioning the change of payment dates:
 1. Adjust the December 2018 payment date from December 1 to December 14. To reduce number of days between the transition payments. Least amount of disruption for retirees and only one 1099 issued for 2018. That would be two 45-day periods between payments.
 2. Utilize the City's Payroll Operation to stagger additional payment in late 2018 – USBank is unable to make more than one change of payment date. Could reduce payment dates to about 40 days apart. This makes for more months of disruption, and retirees would receive two 1099 forms. There would be costs to the Pension Fund for transaction fees and establishment of new fiduciary bank account during City transition period.
 3. Make a one-time additional payment from the Pension Plan at a cost of approximately \$425,000 – USBank makes December 1 payment, and one-time transition payment on December 31. TCRS payments begin January 31, 2019. Least amount of disruption to retirees. Retirees receive one 1099 for 2018. Cost to Pension Plan approximately \$425,000 with one-time fee considered offset by reduced annual investment management fees of approximately \$500,000.

Discussion ensued on the pros and cons of the options and the hardships the longer spans could impose for those on fixed incomes. The Board suggested a survey be taken with each retiree stating which option is preferable. There is a deadline for approval because of set-up time for the transition. It was suggested the Board approve the transition to TCRS, and report the results of the survey at the first meeting in August.

8. 18-0510 Discussion Regarding Stormwater Project Funding.

Eric Stuckey, City Administrator

Kristine Tallent, ACA/CFO

Paul Holzen, Engineering Director

Michael Walters Young, Budget/Strategic Mgr.

This is an opportunity for the Board to see what the list of Stormwater projects, how they are ranked, and where they stand. Since the Stormwater Fee has not changed in many years, it is a good time to review a potential increase as well.

Projects are ranked off the strategic plan FY 2019 through FY 2028




Project	Rank	Description	Cost
Ralston Creek at Liberty Hills Stream Restoration	★★	Bigger project. Complaints. Structural damage 1 house. Moving toward design. Temporary fix failed.	\$350,000
Parkview Drainage Project	★	No Stormwater infrastructure. Nuisance flooding. Not easy to fix. Long term fix.	\$2,250,000
100 Block Battle Avenue Drainage Improvements	★★	Approved through ROW and construction. 5 houses. 1-5' water in basement during flood. Spent a lot of time on this. Not an easy engineering project. Considering 2-house buyout then underground retention system.	\$1,850,000
Figuers Drive Area Drainage Improvements	★	Nuisance flooding. 5 residential structures. Lack of infrastructure and too small culvert.	\$1,846,000
Jordan Branch Cool Springs East Stream Restoration	★★★★	No flooding issues. Trees falling and root structures exposed. Working with HOA several years. Public meetings held. Bidding phase.	\$760,000
Maplewood Stormwater Project	★★★★	72" corrugated metal pipe failure on bottom. Not feasible to dig and replace. Critical infrastructure project. Line pipe and gravel surround to maintain structural integrity.	\$530,000
Carnton Lane Bridge Replacement	★★★★	Corrugated parts missing, box culvert, serves 1 residence but cul-de-sac turnaround. Already bid.	\$300,000
Carlisle HOA Culvert Project	★★★	Property flooded 3 times, garage floor lower than stream channel. 3 houses 100-year flood. Wet weather conveyance. In CIP to work toward solution.	\$535,000
Fairground St. Drainage Improvements	★	Limited infrastructure. Discharge in low spot. Not the main cause of Battle Ave. flooding. Stormwater infrastructure, roadway, extension of Columbia Ave. project.	\$1,600,000
USACE-Home Raising Project	★★	26 homes. Corps revisiting the number of homes. Corps 65%, City 35% participation. Determine if City participating financial resolution in July to commit 65% but not funding. 2-feet above 100' flood level.	\$2,700,000
West Main Bridge Widening Project	★★★	Resolution to go forward with design. Brakes put on it. Intent to widen bridge to north for shoulder for pedestrians as no way to cross there. Want to look at all projects before moving forward. Could do design to keep it going.	\$455,000

More time is needed to discuss. Mayor Moore related it is appropriate to move forward with the design of some of the projects.

Citizen Comments:

- 🗨 Elbert Cox, 182 Lancaster Drive: Holding his comments until he gets more details. Requested Paul Holzen provide line item details on some projects for extra costs. He was one of the original members of the Stormwater Committee when the ordinance was drafted and went into details of what this fund was used for. Not comfortable the way funds are being used. Wants to see how they are being used, exact costs and make sure they are not coming from the Stormwater Fund. Should be coming from someplace else per their intention.
- 🗨 Martin Dunn, 147 Lancaster Drive: Looking at the ranking priority of these different projects that are all worthy, but thinks the matrix the City has been using is wrong.

Only one project that comes out ahead as far as the cost and benefits, and it is the raising the 26 houses. If they are raised, the property value will go up which will generate additional property taxes for the City. 2/3 of the cost is going to be paid for by the federal government. Actual cost to the City will not be \$2.7 million, rather \$875,000 to raise 26 houses out of danger from flooding. The most important thing is to raise these houses will provide safety to the people who live there. His floor has to come up 6'10. The one thing not being considered in ranking is that it will be a benefit to the people living there and those who have come to rescue during floods.

- 
Kristen Ridler, 109 Battle Avenue: At one meeting, it was mentioned that homeowners knew they were in the flood zone when they purchased their homes. She clarified that when they moved in they were told the flooding was a storage facility issue, and the pumps were not working. Flood certification and title work came back clean as did refinance documentation. When the City approached them between January and April they were told the dream of building on to their home would never happen. They would never get building permits. And that their basement needed to be gutted. That is 1,200 ft. of living space they had for office, bedroom, bathroom and laundry room taken away. She quoted *FranklinForward*, and the City Mission Statement about providing citizens with excellent quality of life. It's been seven months of stress and uncertainty since they were approached. She understood there was money available for the project two years ago, and now they are on hold again. They put a contract on another house, and were then told, after the June 12 BOMA meeting, it was thought everything was going to move forward. But, it didn't happen and they are stuck again without knowing anything. Stuck in limbo losing quality of life. They urged BOMA to vote on this project so they can move forward and have the quality of life they thought they were going to get.
- 
Buddy Mills, 111 Battle Avenue: Moved to this property in January 1954, before the fill was done to build the mini-storage. They never had standing water in their backyard or in the house before that was built. Paul Holzen and Ben Worley told him that errors were made by the City in the previous generation that caused the area to flood. He commended them for acknowledging this problem. They have been on hold for two years, and funding for the project was approved. They really would like a decision on the project.
- 
Charles Marston, 129 Ewingville Drive: His home is in the group that needs the house raised. The difficulty for him is that providing 35% may put them out of the game. The debate of whether it is the fault of City government that their houses were built in the floodplain is a moot subject. They built, bought, and live there. The City is neither doing them a favor nor compensating for a mistake made 50 years ago. We are doing the City a favor by being willing to have their property permanently raised 7-1/2 ft., making his living space a lot more inconvenient. By helping us, the City keeps our property on the tax rolls and it counts as workforce property. Bottom line, without financial help we may be forced to stay as we are and hope that when our houses are flooded again, FEMA will buy us out, knock down our house, at which point another property goes off the tax roll, is no longer workforce property, and the City forever has another vacant lot to mow 3-4 times a month.

This item will come back to another Work Session.

- 9. 18-0602 ★Consideration of RESOLUTION 2018-49 to Award the FY 2019 On-Call Annual Contract for Asphalt Work (COF Contract No. 2018-0037) to Four Star Paving, LLC**

No questions or comments

- 10. 18-0603 ★Consideration of RESOLUTION 2018-50 to Award the FY 2019 On-Call Annual Contract for Concrete Work (COF Contract No. 2018-0038) to the Joint Venture between M.A.Y. Construction Company, Inc. and Tennessee Valley Paving Co., Inc.**

No questions or comments.

11. 18-0610 **Consideration of RESOLUTION 2018-54, A Resolution Validating the Cost of Construction of Offset Eligible Roadway Improvements for McEwen Drive.**

Eric Stuckey, City Administrator
Vernon Gerth, Assistant City Administrator
Paul Holzen, Engineering Director

Southern Land Company improved McEwen Drive in 2009-10 and in accordance with their approved Road Impact Offset Agreement. The City provided approximately \$1 million of credits for the road impact fees for the buildings constructed by Southern Land Company. Since that time, ownership of the property and the Road Impact Offset Agreement has been transferred to Boyle Investments. Boyle is in the process and have recently obtained building permits for new buildings in McEwen Place. Absent of Southern Land Company providing the documentation the City typically requires validating the cost of completed road improvements, City Engineer Paul Holzen confirmed the cost of the actual improvements were greater than the value approved in the Road Impact Offset Agreement. In accordance with the Road Impact Fee Agreement the remaining approximately \$1 million of offsets will be applied to the buildings Boyle are now developing in McEwen Place after which this agreement will be closed-out.

12. 18-0604 **Discussion on Irrigation Metering Structure.**

Michelle Hatcher, Water Management Director

Desire input on how provide irrigation water to customers.

Presentation:

Current Title 18 – Section 106

- ♦ An Irrigation Meter is a meter designed for measuring the flow of water off the normal domestic water service line, intended for outdoor watering. The intended use for this meter is to allow for deduction of charges for water service when such water is not returned to the sanitary sewer system.
 - Access Fee to Potable Water Main = \$1,1186.00

Irrigation Meter Impact Fee Discussion

- ♦ Irrigation Meter Water Rates (Potable Water)
 - Inclining Rate Structure to capture costs associated with large demands caused by irrigation and other uses
- ♦ Sewer Revenues Associated with Irrigation
 - Declining rate Structure acknowledges that increased water consumption can be associated with irrigation and other uses that may not enter the wastewater stream.

Irrigation Impact Fees	
Meter Size	Fee
¾"	\$ 3,150
1"	\$ 4,725
1.5"	\$ 6,300
2"	\$ 7,875
3"	\$ 9,450
4"	\$11,025
6"	\$12,600
8"	\$14,175

Irrigation Fees Alternatives

- ♦ Winter Pricing Model
 - Potential impact to Wastewater revenue between \$2-\$3 per customer per month based on evaluation of Residential, Inside City Customers (2016)
 - Encourages increased use of potable water for irrigation
 - * Consider reevaluating inclining rate structure
- ♦ Reduction in irrigation meter impact fee
 - Improves the return on investment for customers
 - Actual cost of typical installation is approximately \$1,615 (¾" residential irrigation)
 - * Complete tap installation fee: \$756 however code allows for recovery of full cost
 - Current irrigation impact fee plus installation fee: \$3,150 + \$756 = \$3,906 (¾" residential irrigation)

- Current Irrigation Impact Fee = \$2,089 + \$756 = \$2,845 (3/4" Residential Potable)
- Encourages increased use of potable water for irrigation
 - * Consider evaluating rate structure for irrigation only customers

The actual cost to install the meter is just shy of \$4,000.

Mayor Moore suggested Board members think about the options until this is brought back for discussion.

13. 18-0607 ★ **Consideration of RESOLUTION 2018-01 Awarding the Construction Contract (COF Contract No. 2017-0264) to Kiewit Infrastructure South Co. in the Amount of \$132,380,000.00 for the Water Reclamation Facility Modifications and Expansion Project.**

Eric Stuckey, City Administrator

Mark Hilty, ACA Public Works

Michelle Hatcher, Water Management Director

This item was on the CIC meeting agenda as well. Evaluation of bids completed. Staff recommendation is award bid to Kiewit. Anticipate voting on this item July 10, 2018 BOMA meeting.

Other Business

None

Adjournment

Work Session adjourned @ 6:49 p.m.

BOMA meeting will convene @ 7:05 p.m.

Dr. Ken Moore, Mayor

Minutes prepared by: Linda Fulwider, Board Recording Secretary, City Administrator's Office - 7/23/2018