
**MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN
FRANKLIN, TENNESSEE
CITY HALL BOARDROOM
TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 2019 – 5:00 P.M.**

Board Members

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

Department Directors/Staff

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

Presentation:

Carl Forsberg, Troop 135, is working on becoming an Eagle Scout. For his project he made two colorful boxes for citizens to place retired American flags. One is placed on Third Avenue close to City Hall and one is on Highway 96-W close to the Fire Station. He mentioned the meaningful retired flag ceremonies done by his troop. He told what he learned by doing this project and thanked those who supported him during the project. This was followed by a round of applause.

Mayor Moore offered congratulations for his hard work on this project to be used by the community.

WORK SESSION DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. 19-0322 **Consideration of Event Permit for Derby Day Party at the Park at Harlinsdale Farm sponsored by the Downtown Franklin Rotary Club on May 4, 2019.**

Lisa Clayton, Parks Director

No questions or comments.

2. 19-0293 **Consideration of RESOLUTION 2019-22, A Resolution to Establish Decision Points for the Transition of Sanitation and Environmental Services Department (SES) Recycling and Commercial Services.**

**Mark Hilty, Assistant City
Administrator/Public Works**

Jack Tucker, SES Director

Nate Ridley, SES Assistant Director

Key Transition Areas

- ♦ Curbside Recycling

- Status of recycling
- Employee safety
- Consolidation of equipment types
- Efficiencies
- ♦ Commercial Dumpster Collection
 - Not recovering costs adequately without a significant rate increase

Transition Decisions

- ♦ Curbside Recycling
 - Should SES pursue automated curbside recycling?
 - Should the program be voluntary or mandatory?
 - Should there be an administrative setup fee? If so, at what rate?
 - Starting point: Propose to start setting carts the first full week of January 2020 (January 6, 2020)
 - Additional points of consideration
- ♦ Commercial Dumpster Collection
 - Should SES pursue elimination of commercial dumpster service?
 - End point: propose last day of service to be June 28, 2019
 - Provide approximately 3 months-notice (propose to issue notice first week of April 2019)

Discussion:

- ♦ Many vendors will no longer accept recycling in bags because the bags are contaminated. Our current vendor is transitioning. The City pays no tipping fee for recycling now.
- ♦ Recycling in bags is considered trash and thrown away.
- ♦ State law banning plastic bags.
- ♦ Carts are cleaner. Williamson County accepts glass at their collection places.
- ♦ This is a voluntary program. Optional whether to use the roll out carts.
- ♦ If mandatory customer would pay the \$45 setup charge.
- ♦ About 60% of bags are set out every week, but more participate. Not everyone has recycling set out every week
- ♦ Offer options to pay administrative setup fee. The City retains ownership of the carts, the \$45 is just a setup fee.
- ♦ Start promoting this month.
- ♦ Commercial dumpster customers will be given enough time to find another vendor
- ♦ Alderman Burger said a constituent wants to discuss cardboard pickup.
- ♦ Mr. Tucker said staff is looking into this.

3. 19-0325 **★Consideration of Procurement Award to JLD Preservation Consulting, LLC of Nashville, Tennessee in the Total Amount of \$7,950 for Hincheyville Historic District National Register Listing Update Consulting Services for the Planning and Sustainability Department (Purchasing Office Procurement Solicitation No. 2019-006; \$10,000 to be Budgeted in 110-84950-41700 for Fiscal Year 2020; Contract No. 2019-0103.**

Emily Hunter, Planning/Sustainability Director

Amanda Rose, Preservation Planner

This is a simple project to update the Hincheyville Historic District National Register listing. Over time things change and this will verify if a listing is still qualified to be on the list. There is a matching grant.

4. 19-0285 **Presentation of Fire Department Strategic Plan Update.**

Rocky Garzarek, Fire Chief
Glenn Johnson, Deputy Chief

Strategic Plan Highlights:

- ♦ 37% complete overall
- ♦ 95% Complete Administrative Policies
- ♦ Worked with the County on a Bystander CPR Program
- ♦ Worked with GIS and local water departments to improve the hydrant testing and work flow process to address problems when found.

Technical Rescue:

- ♦ Recommendation #1: The committee has developed the S.O.G's. and are in the review stages of administration.
- ♦ Recommendation #2: Designating a team of dedicated members certified and proficient in technical rescue to improve our department's ability to respond to events necessitating interventions from specifically trained responders. Further establishing technical rescue team and designate stations to help to legitimize our department's goal of becoming the best fire department in the nation.

Hazmat Team:

- ♦ Strategic Plan Recommendation #2
- ♦ For our department to possess a HazMat Team, there will be a number of goals to meet. The members of this team will need to train together on a regular basis. The training will need to be developed and planned out well in advance and approved by the Rescue and Hazmat Subcommittee.

Discussion:

- ♦ Chief Garzarek related that every fire person provided input.
- ♦ They are to the point of doing realignment
- ♦ 5-year plan 95% complete

For the record, Alderman Bransford asked Chief Garzarek if he has engaged the staff and he himself has been part of the discussion. Chief Garzarek answered in the affirmative.

5. 18-0604 Discussion on Irrigation Metering Structure.

Michelle Hatcher, Water Management Director

Summary of Previous Discussions & Proposed Direction:

- ♦ Irrigation Rates
 - Potable water – inclining rate structure to capture costs associated with large demands caused by irrigation and other uses.
 - Sewer – declining rate structure – acknowledges that increased water consumption can be associated with irrigation and other uses that may not enter the wastewater stream.
- ♦ Irrigation Meter Fee
 - Current irrigation impact fee plus installation fee: \$3,150 (impact fee) + \$756 (installation) = \$3,906 (total) – RESIDENTIAL ONLY
- ♦ Board direction from November 13, 2018 to investigate the revision to the impact fee and proposed rate structure.

Usage Calculation – Residence on Winder Drive (3/4" meter)

- ♦ Evaluated annual water consumption data from 2013 to 2018
- ♦ Estimated the volume of water that was used that did not contribute flow to the sanitary sewer. The estimated fees paid with respect to the estimated flow that did not reach the sanitary sewer was ~\$1,591 over the period or approximately \$318 annually
- ♦ Determined the return on investment using the current impact/installation fee
 - $\$3,906.00 / \$18.19 = 12.3$ years (would take this long to recapture the current irrigation meter investment)

- ♦ Recalculated using a recommended 5-year return on investment to determine the impact fee (\$1,590)

Existing Structure (No Irrigation Meter) Water – 1-SFUE \$61.24
Existing Structure (No Irrigation Meter) Sewer - 1-SFUE \$75.95
Current Bill Totals \$137.19

Proposed Structure (Reduced Impact Fee for Irrigation Meter) Water – 1-SFUE \$85.49
Proposed Structure (Reduced Impact Fee for Irrigation Meter) Sewer – 1-SFUE \$00.00
Proposed Bill \$85.49

Summary – Existing vs. Proposed

Description	1 SFUE – 10,500 Gallon Customer
Existing Impact Fee	\$3,906
Proposed Impact Fee (3/4" Meter)	\$1,500
COF months to recover ¾" Meter Impact Fee through Rates (Water only)	99.2
COF Years to Recover assuming 6 month/year usage	16.5
Customer Recovery (Months)	29.0
Customer Recovery (Years, Assuming 6 Month/Year Usage)	4.8

Summary:

- ♦ Issue: sanitary sewer charges for water that's not entering sewer
- ♦ The example summer average usage is more than the typical SFUE in which infrastructure is designed
- ♦ Impacts related to encouraging irrigation:
 - Daily use higher than SFUE equates to larger infrastructure needs (mains, booster stations, tanks, etc.)
 - Increased use of irrigation water will result in increased purchased water from HVUD, resulting in higher projections for purchased water and higher minimum bills from HVUD
 - Cost of service study performed to determine full impact of this change
- ♦ Proposed Structure:
 - Impact/installation fee:
Reduce from \$3,906.00 to \$1,590.00 (reduction of \$2,315.00)
 - Rates:
No increase in customer charge (first 1,0000 gallons)
Incremental increases of \$2.50, \$3.50 and \$5.00 depending upon usage volume

Discussion:

- ♦ Significant savings if an irrigation meter is installed.
- ♦ Alderman McLendon: Proposed to take the purchase of an irrigation meter down to \$1,500 which takes it down by 2/3. Those who buy meters are subsidizing the rest.
- ♦ Alderman Burger: Those with smaller lots won't buy a meter. She distributed assumptions she had done. She was unsure that meters would solve the problem.
- ♦ Alderman Speedy: No one will ever make people want to pay for the meters.
- ♦ Vice Mayor Barnhill: Many do not water their lawns. He doesn't think this is a big issue with the public.
- ♦ Mr. Stuckey: Asked if we need to try to fix this and what are we trying to fix.

6. 19-0338 **Consideration of DRAFT Resolution 2019-53, A Resolution Providing Staff with Funding Direction for the Home Raising Project Developed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers as part of the Harpeth River Feasibility Study.**

Paul Holzen, Director of Engineering

Jonathan Marston, Assistant Director of Engineering

William Banks, Staff Engineer II

This item is back for the Board to decide if the City should participate in this program, and if so, what percentage of participation.

Battle Avenue and emergency repair in Maplewood would probably take all the Stormwater Funds. There are at least two more homes added to the elevations since the last discussion. This is a voluntary program. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers agreed to pay 65% of the construction and there are three options from which to choose for the 35%. At this time there are 36 homes.

- ♦ Option 1 – COF participates in the home raisings project with the USACE through the Project Partnership Agreement for design and construction. The USACE agrees to pay for 65% of the actual construction and temporary relocation costs. The 35% of remaining Non-Federal project costs are solely paid for by the City.
- ♦ Option 2 – COF participates in the home raisings project with the USACE through the Project Partnership Agreement for design and construction. The USACE agrees to pay for 65% of the actual construction a temporary relocation cost. The 35% of remaining Non-Federal project costs are solely paid for by the City.
- ♦ Option 3 – City of Franklin participates in the home raisings project with the USACE through the Project Partnership Agreement for design and construction. The USACE agrees to pay for 65% of the actual construction and temporary relocation costs. The 35% of remaining Non-Federal project costs are paid for by both the City and homeowner. The City and homeowner would both pay a percentage of the remaining 35% construction costs. This City/homeowner split can be developed by the Board, e.g. 50/50, etc.

Discussion:

- ♦ Alderman Bransford: She is not open to the owners paying the 35%. Her thought was more 15%-20%.
- ♦ Vice Mayor Barnhill: Prefers shared cost and the City not paying the entire cost. A percentage could be looked at later. Option 3 – shared costs for City and homeowners.
- ♦ Alderman Martin: Constituents are not in favor of the City paying 35%. It isn't fair to everyone else. They need to be willing to contribute something, but we can't give away all of the Stormwater Fund.
- ♦ Alderman Burger: There were different stormwater rules back when these homes were built. Prefers Option 1 as she supports the City paying.
- ♦ Alderman Petersen: There have been many projects where property owners have not been paid to up their home values, and she named a few, including the upcoming Franklin Road improvements. Prefers the City pay the entire amount. She mentioned the huge amount of personnel costs paid from the Stormwater Fund due to so many people being added.
- ♦ Alderman Speedy: Prefers Option 1.
- ♦ Alderman Blanton: Prefers Option 3.
- ♦ Alderman McLendon: Prefers Option 2, although he might go along with Option 3. Homes that are facing a rapid loss of value many are more affordable housing. Should pay attention not to do something here could have unintended consequences. Long-time residents could be forced out. Putting money in individual

homes not the case that this project doesn't render value but offers a chance of selling homes as a lot. A letter was received from a homeowner forced to raze his home by Codes. He does not have the money to do that. The City doesn't act as an insurer of all loss and casualty. Someone may lose. It may do more for some than others. Option 2 or maybe 3.

Citizen Comments:

- ♦ County Commissioner Betsy Hester, 112 Valley Ridge Road: lives in the UGB. Clarification of 65% from USACE. Meadow Green residents were offered loans at a low interest rate tied to the deeds. Mentioned the deadline and asked how many estimates a homeowner would need.
- ♦ Paul Holzen said there is a 4-month deadline to start working with homeowners. Once the decision is made there will be public meetings. The information will be sent out ahead of time.
- ♦ Elbert Cox – 182 Lancaster Drive: He commented that of all the information the City has there is not a summary from the weather bureaus. When he bought in the floodplain he was willing to take a risk from these sources of where the water would come. He mentioned the 100-year flood in 2010 and cited other major floods. He said nothing has been done about the cause of these floods being urban growth running water into the river. A 2018 WSACE report revealed the 2010 flood exceeded records by 43% a 1.2- inch rise. He believes the City should pay the full 35% because the citizens are not at fault.
- ♦ Martin Dunn, 147 Lancaster Drive, for 40+ years: Get away from the notion everyone needs to benefit from everything the City does. The 100-year flood coming will be 7 ft. higher. \$35,000 is a lot for a pensioner to pay. Even if the City were to pay 35% a great many won't take the option at all so the total cost to the City won't be as much as envisioned.
- ♦ Josh Marcus, 109 Ewingville: His home burned and was restored. The City says he has to raze house. The insurance company tells him he will be responsible to pay for it because of the fire. He spent money on surveys, etc. He is fighting to keep his family in their home and they are struggling.
- ♦ Ben Johnson, 126 Ewingville Drive: He wasn't in the study. He mentioned two figures, \$72,000 and total cost \$100,000. Why did the City agree to build? People will come in and buy the homes then raze them.
- ♦ Jodie Jaudon, 133 Ewingville Drive: The commissioner had answered her question. She appreciates the work that has been done. She's partial to Options 2 and 3. Option 3 because if you own your home, you'll take better care of it.

Other Business

None

Adjournment

Work Session adjourned @ 6:57 p.m.

Dr. Ken Moore, Mayor

Minutes prepared by: Linda Fulwider, Board Recording Secretary, City Administrator's Office 4/25/2019 10:59 AM