

**FAYETTEVILLE CITY COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
LAFAYETTE ROOM
JUNE 18, 2012
5:00 P.M.**

Present: Mayor Anthony G. Chavonne
Council Members Keith Bates, Sr. (District 1); Kady-Ann Davy (District 2) (arrived at 5:30 p.m.); Robert A. Massey, Jr. (District 3) (arrived at 6:30 p.m.); Darrell J. Haire (District 4); Bobby Hurst (District 5); William J. L. Crisp (District 6); Valencia A. Applewhite (District 7); James W. Arp, Jr. (District 9)

Absent: Council Member Wade Fowler (District 8)

Others Present:

Kristoff Bauer, Interim City Manager
Brad Whited, Interim Assistant City Manager
Karen M. McDonald, City Attorney
Michael Gibson, Parks, Recreation and Maintenance Director
Pamela Megill, City Clerk
Members of the Press

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Chavonne called the meeting to order.

2.0 ITEMS OF BUSINESS

2.1 Parks and Recreation – Park Bond Proposal

Mr. Kristoff Bauer, Interim City Manager, and Mr. Michael Gibson, Parks, Recreation and Maintenance Director, presented this item with the aid of a power point presentation. Mr. Bauer stated at the Council's direction in 2005 the Strategic Plan called for an increase in Parks and Recreation opportunities. He further stated a Master Plan was developed in 2006 and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan was adopted in 2007. The City and County completed a Parks and Recreation project list in 2008 and a funding plan for the project list was created in 2009. He stated the Master Plan was approved by the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board. Finally, he stated in May 2012 the County withdrew from the joint venture, and the Master Plan was revised to become a City-only project that would be operationally self-sustaining as a package and would provide the best opportunity for community support.

Mr. Bauer then reviewed the questions he had received from Council and the responses as follows:

Q1. Can there be a list of options on the ballot?

Only issue is debt authority – separate ballot for each debt authorization – must pass independently.

Q2. Can portions of the community vote separately?

No, all General Obligation (GO) debt must be approved by a vote of the entire jurisdiction.

Q3. Can the vote be in phases?

The vote authorizes a maximum debt issuance. All debt must be incurred and spent within seven years of the vote. Any differentiation would require a separate ballot.

Q4. Can an individual “opt out?”

No, they can vote “No”. The vote is to authorize GO debt. Any GO debt issued becomes an obligation of the entire jurisdiction. The Council retains authority on how to apply any tax, but can't differentiate on an individual basis.

Q5. Were “Planning and Design” cost reduced when the proposal changed to City only?

No, there was only one County project eliminated that was estimated to need some Planning and Design resources.

Q6. Are estimated property acquisition costs included in the financial plan?

Yes, \$1.5 million.

Q7. How do we ensure local business participation?

We can provide support of local business as long as it is consistent with State law.

Council Member Haire stated he had spoken with Ms. Andrea Harris, President of the North Carolina Institute of Minority Economic Development, and offered to ask her to address the City Council at the next special meeting on June 27, 2012, regarding the parks bond proposal, specifically pertaining to a way to increase participation in the proposed parks and recreation facilities construction by minority-owned businesses. Consensus of Council was to allow Council Member Haire to request Ms. Harris address the City Council at the June 27, 2012, special meeting.

Q8. Where are the exact locations of the neighborhood pools, tennis complex, neighborhood parks, skate board parks, and greenways?

The properties for these projects have not been purchased. The proposal identifies areas and, should the issuance pass, options for each will be developed and brought back to Council for consideration. Existing City property and partnerships with other property owners will be considered during this phase of the projects. The neighborhood parks will be within the Bailey Lake Road, Montclair, and South Gate neighborhoods. The greenways have been identified (Mr. Bauer provided the Council with a map).

Q9. Can the skate park be scaled back and skate board amenities placed at the pool sites?

The pool sites have not been designed. The proposal has always been for each pool to have its own personality. It would be possible to add amenities of this kind during design within existing resources. It is not recommended, however, for all pool locations. Further, this would not meet the need identified in the Master Plan for the proposed facility.

Discussion followed the question and answer period regarding economic growth, size and location of the skateboard park, location of the multi-center, and land acquisition. There was additional discussion on whether to hold the proposed bond election in February or November of 2013.

Council Member Applewhite stated she thought the multipurpose center should be in the center of the City and not located next to I-95.

Council Member Crisp stated he liked the location for the multipurpose center because the City already owned the property designated for the multi-center and stated there were restaurants and hotels in the vicinity. He suggested the skateboard facility be scaled down and in its place provide smaller skateboard parks in a few neighborhoods.

Mayor Pro Tem Arp presented three parks and recreation bond program alternatives; all of which could be mixed and moved around; in effect an a la cart choice and the ability to create the best match. He inquired what the objective of the item was, and stated the price tag was too big and they needed to get the best return on the investment; they have to decide what they were willing to spend and provide the best facilities for the most citizens. He stated he had a problem with seasonal facilities.

Council Member Applewhite requested the Council not make a final decision on the proposed bond package until after the new city manager had been hired, and also proposed a public safety component--a police department sub-station to be included in the bond package at an approximate cost of \$7 million.

Council Member Massey stated the Council needed to get on board with what was the most effective way to get the public's favorable vote. He stated the Police Department substation needed to be addressed and citizens needed to be safe in their environments.

Mayor Chavonne stated he did not think having the bond proposal on the November 2013 ballot was a good idea, and stated Council candidates next year would be put in the uncomfortable position of having to defend a parks bond package that would require a tax increase. He stated the council needed to focus on developing a bond package that could be put before the voters and then figure out how to promote the package. He stated further discussion of the item would take place at a special meeting on June 27, 2012, at 5:00 p.m.

2.2 North Carolina League of Municipalities

Council Member Bates stated he needed a consensus from the City Council to attest to the North Carolina League of Municipalities that the City Council would like them to place items on the agenda for discussion and to hopefully follow through on. He stated the two items submitted at this point were (1) false accusations against the Police Department and (2) phases of annexation.

Mayor Chavonne requested the Council to respond with written consent to Council Member Bates via e-mail.

2.3 City Manager Interviews

Mayor Pro Tem Arp announced the City Manager interview notebooks would be available sometime on June 20, 2012, at City Hall. He stated the notebooks were to be signed out and viewed at City Hall only. He also stated copying would not be permitted. He further stated the interviews would be conducted on June 28 and 29, 2012. Finally, he stated confidentiality and privacy of the candidates was to be respected.

3.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:58 p.m.