

Tuesday - May 19, 1998 - 3:00 p.m.

Worksession

Present: Mayor Leni Sitnick, Presiding; Vice-Mayor Edward C. Hay Jr.; Councilman M. Charles Cloninger; Councilman Earl Cobb; Councilwoman Barbara Field; Councilman Thomas G. Sellers; and Councilman O.T. Tomes; City Attorney Robert W. Oast Jr.; City Manager James L. Westbrook Jr.; and City Clerk Magdalen Burleson

Absent: None

**CONSENT:**

**Approval of Grant from FAA for Phase III of Runway 16 Project**

Summary: This grant from the Federal Aviation Administration, in the amount of \$652,731 consists of a project to construct extended runway safety area, Runway 16 (Phase III).

**Fifth Modified Grant Agreement with the N.C. Dept. of Transportation for Phase III Terminal Expansion**

Summary: The City is required by law to execute certain contracts and agreements for the Airport Authority. This Fifth Modified Grant Agreement is to allow the Authority to receive additional matching funds from the Dept. of Transportation ("DOT") for the Phase III Terminal Expansion.

Airport Director Jim Parker advises that the Terminal Expansion project was financed almost entirely with bond money, and that it was completed several years ago. The estimated cost of the project was \$3.63 million and DOT's projected commitment under the State Aid to Airports program is approximately half of the estimate. Because of budgetary limitations, this entire amount was not available when the project was completed, and DOT has been making "installment" allocations of \$300,000 or \$200,000 on a yearly basis, as funds become available. In order for these allocations to continue, the Grant Agreement must be extended for another year, even though the project has been completed.

The \$200,000 allocation for this year will still not complete the DOT's program commitment.

**Speed Limit Reductions on Lindsey Road to 15 mph and Cherokee Road to 20 mph**

Summary: The City 's Traffic Engineer has performed the necessary traffic analyses associated with the above mentioned locations as per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and the North Carolina Supplement. We are seeking authorization from the City Council to change these speed limits.

Change to 15 MPH: Change to 20 MPH:

(1) Lindsey Road (Entirety) (1) Cherokee Road (Entirety)

These locations have been reviewed over the past 12 months as per the request of residents and motorists who utilize these roadways. Field surveys and speed studies were conducted and data reviewed based upon the 85th percentile speed, which is the speed at or below which 85 percent of the vehicles are moving. This speed is reviewed in relationship to the median speed and the pace speed range. The pace speed range is the range of speeds at which the largest -2-

concentration of motorists drive. These speeds were all reviewed to address the speeding problems in these areas.

## 1. Lindsey Road

A speed study was conducted along Lindsey Road per the request of citizens in this area. The residential nature of this roadway vertical/horizontal alignment and width suggest that the speed limit needs to be 15 MPH. The Asheville Police Department concurs with our recommendation.

## 2. Cherokee Road

A speed study was conducted along Cherokee Road per the request of citizens in this area. The residential nature of this roadway vertical/horizontal alignment and width suggest that the speed limit needs to be 20 MPH. The Asheville Police Department concurs with our recommendation.

### **Sale of Alcoholic Beverages for the Asheville Downtown Association's 1998 Events**

Summary: The consideration of a resolution making provisions for the possession and consumption of malt beverages and/or unfortified wine for the 1998 events of the Asheville Downtown Association at the locations and times specified in the resolution.

For many years, the Asheville Downtown Association has co-sponsored with the City of Asheville events to bring both the public and visitors to the downtown area. These events include: *Moonlight Over Downtown*, *Honda Hoot Public Rally*, and four *Downtown After Five* activities. The Asheville Downtown Association has requested permission to allow possession and consumption of beer and wine during these events as they have been allowed in the past.

### **Budget Amendment to establish a Budget for Funds to Construct the Amboy Road Greenway**

Summary: The consideration of a budget amendment, in the amount of \$60,000, to establish a budget for the construction of a greenway that will connect the Amboy Road Park and the French Broad River Park.

### **Budget Amendment to appropriate funds from grant for Summertime Kids Program**

Summary: The consideration of a budget amendment, in the amount of \$1,000, to appropriate funds from the Community Foundation of Western North Carolina for the Summertime Kids program to provide enrichment activities for the Summer Teen Program.

### **Budget Amendment to appropriate expenditures for Non-Resident Fees Collected for Various Parks & Recreation Programs**

Summary: The consideration of a budget amendment to appropriate expenditures for non-resident fees which have been collected for various Parks and Recreation programs.

-3-

### **Budget Amendment revenues and expenditures for Racquet Club Road Project**

Summary: The consideration of a budget amendment to appropriate revenues and expenditures for Racquet Club Road Project.

Mayor Sitnick asked that the record show that City Council has received this information and instructs the City Manager to place these items on the next formal City Council agenda.

### **CITY-COUNTY MINORITY BUSINESS PLAN**

Mr. Bill Schaefer, Finance Director, said that in 1993, the City contracted with Research and Evaluation Associates, Inc. for a "Minority Business Study to Support City of Asheville Minority Business Plan". The study's purpose was to determine whether there was sufficient evidence of discrimination in the award of contracts and procurement of supplies, materials and services during the past to justify continuance of the then-existing Minority Business Plan and, if so, to identify any modifications to the plan which would be required to place the plan on a legally defensible basis. The City's current Amended Minority Business Plan, dated December 6, 1994, incorporated revisions recommended by the disparity study. In July 1996 the City and County established a joint Minority Affairs Office. In November 1996, the Minority Business Commission held a retreat at the YMI Cultural Center to begin the process of developing a joint Minority Business Plan to provide policy and direction for a joint City/County minority business program. They used the City's existing 1994 plan as the baseline from which to develop the new joint plan. Subsequently, the Commission held a series of meetings with various constituencies, including representatives of minority businesses, the general public, and City and County staffs, to receive their comments and recommendations regarding the joint plan. The Draft City of Asheville - County of Buncombe Minority Business Plan was approved by the Minority Business Commission on April 23, 1998, and adopted by the County on May 12, 1998. Significant changes from the 1994 Plan are:

Inclusion of Buncombe County in all aspects of the Plan. Note: separate goals are

established for the City and County (Section VII.D.3; page 17 of draft). The City goals are at the same as adopted in the 1994 Plan.

Minority Business Commission Membership: Increases membership from 9 to 13 (Section IV.A.3; page 4 of draft).

Retains: Council of Independent Business Owners, Associated General Contractors of America, Women in Construction, Asheville Area Chamber of Commerce, Asheville-Buncombe Community Relations Council, American Institute of Architects and Asheville Business Development Center.

Deletes : Black Business and Professional League and YMI Cultural Center.

Adds: Minority Business Alliance, NAACP, Eagle Market Streets Development Corporation and three certified minority business owners (one each from the four categories for which goals have been established: construction, professional services, procurement, and other services).

Staff Evaluations: Requires as part of the evaluation of all those staff members who are

directly involved in the procurement and contracting process, that good faith efforts towards goal attainment be a consideration in evaluations and that City and County Managers meet semi-annually, at the request of the Commission, to discuss specific concerns (Section IV.B.3; page 6 of draft).

Certification of Minority Business Firms: Changes responsibility for certification of

firms from the Minority Business Commission to the Minority Affairs Office and clarifies procedures and responsibilities for appeals of certification denial (Section VII; pages 12 through 16). -4-

Enforcement: Strengthens enforcement options: Bids containing no documentation of

good faith efforts shall be deemed non-responsive. Expands sanctions for failure to make or maintain good faith efforts to add provisions for removal of bidders from bid lists and/or debarment for a period of one year (Section VI; pages 17 - 19).

Grievance Procedure: Clarifies the procedures and responsibilities. Provides that when

a grievance has been submitted, the bid process shall be held in abeyance and no award will be made until such time as the grievance is resolved or a final decision regarding the grievance is made by the City or County Manager (Section IX; page 19).

Additionally, numerous changes have been made to improve clarity, to streamline procedures and to generally enhance the plan's functionality in fulfilling its purposes of widening opportunities for participation, increasing competition, and ensuring the proper and diligent use of public funds.

Staff recommends the City Council adopt the resolution which replaces the current City of Asheville Minority Business Plan with a joint City of Asheville - County of Buncombe Minority Business Plan.

Ms. Laura Thompson, Chairman of the Minority Business Commission, was pleased to present this Plan to City Council for their consideration of adoption.

Mr. Schaefer responded to several questions from Council, some being, why the grievance procedure's final decision is either the City Manager or the County Manager, what was included in the definitions of "Minority Person", why the City is waiting to do a comprehensive Disparity Study in 2013;

Discussion surrounded the request of Mayor Sitnick, who was trying to be inclusive as possible, to include a letter, document of intent, addendum or attachment to the Minority Business Plan to send a message that we, as a community, also extend equal opportunities to the international community. She said that since Asheville has changed since the first Disparity Study was first completed, that when the comprehensive Disparity Study is conducted in 2013 that that particular category be included.

Councilman Tomes expressed his support for the Plan and stressed how important it was for the Plan to be enforced.

Upon inquiry of Ms. Dee Williams about how Buncombe County's goals were set since they did not have a Disparity Study completed, City Attorney Oast said that he would look into that issue and report to Council next week. Ms. Williams also suggested that the City contact the cities of Wilmington and Charlotte in that they are doing a number of things with those programs that work very well.

Ms. Vickie Gaddy, representing the National Association of Women in Government, said that they would like the adoption of the Plan to be by ordinance and not resolution. Ms. Gaddy then presented Mr. Oast with a copy of the Plan with their notes on it, noting that on page 19 in the third bullet, the comment reads "the county refuses to make this a part of the bid documents so that with this wording they cannot assess penalties" and on page 6 in the third paragraph - the comment reads "this is real important because the department heads need to be held accountable."

-5-

When Ms. Gaddy said that they have not presented these comments to Buncombe County, City Manager Westbrook reminded the Council that the Plan has already been adopted by the Minority Business Commission and Buncombe County and any amendments would need to go through both of those bodies first.

When Mr. Clarence Benton said that several business owners he has talked to have not seen the Plan that the County promised to make available to them, Mr. Schaefer said that he would be happy to give Mr. Benton those copies to review.

Mayor Sitnick asked that the record show that City Council has received this information and instructs the

City Manager to place this item on the next formal City Council agenda.

### **UPDATE ON THE VISION PROCESS**

Ms. Pat Smith, Chair of the Vision Board of Directors, referenced a press release sent out on May 26, 1998, of the following five benchmarks: (1) Average Wages Per Job - the average earnings per job in Buncombe County will increase at an annual rate of at least 1% greater than the North Carolina average; (2) Graduation Outcome Index - The City of Asheville and Buncombe County will have an education that is rated number one on the Graduation Outcome Index for comparable Metropolitan Statistical Areas of our size; (3) Persons Below Poverty Level - The number of people in Buncombe County at the poverty level will be reduced by 1/2 of the 1990 level. Particular attention will be paid to reducing the level of poverty for those households with children; (4) Population Between 18-34 - There will be an increase in population age 18-34. This should result from opportunities encouraging our young people to make a decision to live and work in Buncombe County; and (5) Manufacturing Jobs - The proportion of manufacturing jobs in Buncombe County will be at the North Carolina average or higher.

Ms. Smith explained that these five key benchmarks are indicators of whether or not progress is being made in areas of education, quality of life, economic development and youth population. Benchmarks are indicators of community conditions that can be tracked over time to measure progress, or lack of progress, as we work to achieve our Vision. Three of the five key benchmarks compare conditions in Asheville and Buncombe County to state statistics or comparable Metropolitan Statistical Areas of our size. Two benchmarks present City and County statistics only.

All five benchmarks have percentage or numerical targets which indicate the urgency and direction of change that must be achieved for community improvement. The Vision will track these benchmarks annually.

Ms. Smith thanked City Council for their financial and volunteer support noting that without the level of support, they would not have this common vision.

Ms. Smith responded to several questions from City Council regarding the benchmarks.

Mayor Sitnick thanked Ms. Smith for the update on the Vision process.

### **TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO HENDERSON COUNTY - BREVARD ROAD SITE**

Assistant City Manager Doug Spell said that this is consideration of executing a deed transferring property on Brevard Road to Henderson County as a part of the Water Agreement.

-6-

On November 11, 1995 the Regional Water Authority, City of Asheville, Buncombe County, and Henderson County entered into the Water Agreement. This agreement was a part of the overall provision of water service via the Mills River Water Treatment Plant.

At the January 20, 1998, City Council worksession, staff presented this item to Council for consideration. The City Council requested additional information which staff provided via a memorandum dated January 26, 1998, including copies of prior water agreements.

One condition which is a part of the aforementioned Water Agreement pertains to the City of Asheville transferring by deed property to Henderson County on Brevard Road (NC 191). The stipulation outlined in Section XXII of the Agreement indicates that Henderson County must convey the property to MSD to be used for a wastewater treatment plant site within ten (10) years or convey it to a regional water and sewer authority of which Henderson County, the Authority and Asheville are a part. If neither of these conditions

are complied with within the 10 year date of the transfer of the deed to Henderson County the property automatically reverts back to the City of Asheville.

The City Attorney's office has reviewed the deed prepared by the attorney for the Regional Water Authority. The deed has been prepared to take into account the automatic reversion to the City of Asheville in the event the property is not utilized in accordance with the stipulations of the agreement.

Staff recommends that City Council authorize the Mayor to execute the deed transferring the property to Henderson County in accordance with the Water Agreement dated November 11, 1995.

Upon inquiry of Councilman Sellers, Mr. Spell said that the City purchased the Mills River site directly from the private property owners.

Mayor Sitnick, in no way felt that the City should not honor the condition in the Water Agreement which pertains to the City of Asheville transferring by deed property to Henderson County on Brevard Road, however, she did not remember that provision being explained by staff prior to signing and she was sorry that the City had agreed to that. Mr. Spell said that he would be happy to research the minutes during that time period and report back to Council.

Upon inquiry of Councilman Cloninger, Mr. Spell said that he was not aware if Henderson County has any plans to convey the property to MSD or if Henderson County has any plans to convey it to a regional water and sewer authority of which Henderson County, the Authority and Asheville are a part.

Councilwoman Field said that it was her understanding that from the very beginning of the negotiations, this was seen as an opportunity of a combination water/sewer deal.

Mayor Sitnick felt that City Council should review the Water Agreement and how it impacts the City taxpayers. She felt this would be a good worksession item.

City Manager Westbrook asked the City Attorney if there was some way to set up an automatic notification process to the City if that site is developed as a wastewater treatment plant site. City Attorney Oast said that the notification process has to occur by statute because there are certain permitting processes these facilities have to go through. That is the only thing that can be built on this property and if it's not built , it reverts back to the City.

Councilman Tomes was in favor of honoring our commitment if it is legal and binding, however, he still questioned the City's reasoning behind that portion of the agreement.

-7-

Mayor Sitnick about a rumor that a pesticide treatment plant may be located on the site of the Mills River Water Treatment Plant. Mr. Spell said that that issue was discussed at the Regional Water Authority meeting and what is being looked at is mix facilities where the individual growers would mix the chemicals - it is not actually a treatment process. This would be a mixing and handling facility.

Mayor Sitnick asked that the record show that City Council has received this information and instructs the City Manager to place this item on the next formal City Council agenda.

### **REPORT ON MEMORIAL STADIUM**

Mr. Irby Brinson, Parks & Recreation Director, said that the Parks and Recreation staff was asked to review the possibility of selling a portion of Memorial Stadium and report back with a recommendation to City Council.

On March 10, 1998, Asheville City Council rejected an offer from Robert Camille to purchase approximately 21 acres of property known as Memorial Stadium. City Council did take action by requesting staff to investigate the possibility of selling a five-acre tract of the 21 acres. This five acres represented the gated area of the Stadium which is currently used for recreation purposes. In addition, Council directed staff to investigate the expansion of renovations to Mountainside Park, assist in the funding of a veterans' memorial, and construct the youth sports complex at Richmond Hill. Based upon City Council's request, staff investigated the potential dollar value for selling the five-acre tract and determined that the appraised value of this tract would represent approximately \$500,000 in revenue. It is estimated that the above changes in the scope originally outlined in the proposed sale of the Stadium would result in a project of over \$1.5 million. In addition, since the March 10 City Council meeting, staff has not had any response from the public in regard to the availability of this property for purchase. Staff contacted Robert Camille to determine whether he would be interested in this proposal and Mr. Camille stated he was not interested. Therefore, based upon the above information, staff does not recommend selling the five acre tract portion of Memorial Stadium.

The Parks and Recreation staff recommends retaining Memorial Stadium and not pursuing the sale of this facility.

Upon inquiry of Mayor Sitnick, Mr. Brinson said that in the Master Plan there are 26 different park areas that staff will be looking at regarding improvements and Memorial Stadium is one of those site.

When Councilman Cobb asked if the City could put some ballfields on the Memorial Stadium property temporarily, Mr. Brinson said that you could build three very small fields but they can't accommodate the children over 13 who would continue on to Senior Babe Ruth. The fields would also hinder the use of outdoor volleyball and football program that currently use the property.

It was the consensus of City Council not to pursue the sale of Memorial Stadium.

### **UPDATE ON CHARLOTTE STREET CORRIDOR PLAN**

Mr. Mike Matteson, Urban Planner, said that staff has been working for the past couple of years to prepare a plan to help guide the future development of Charlotte Street. The plan contains staff's recommendations which are based upon numerous meetings with many individuals with a stake or an interest in the street. It is staff's view that the plan's -8-

recommendations will assist in allowing Charlotte Street to develop in a manner that is beneficial to the City of Asheville, the property owners and tenants, as well as the residents of surrounding neighborhoods.

This draft will be modified to include additional comments from staff, members of the advisory committee and/or members of the community. Additionally, staff is in the process of formatting the plan (in a similar manner as previous small area plans) and incorporating numerous maps and graphics which help to illustrate the concepts and recommendations of the plan.

Staff has tentatively scheduled a community meeting to present the plan and receive input from the community. This meeting has tentatively been set for Thursday, May 28<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. at the Jewish Community Center. Following the community meeting, the plan will be presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission and then to City Council for formal review and adoption. Staff anticipates these public hearings to take place in June.

He then reviewed the following three goals of the Plan which staff hoped would benefit the property owners and the City in general:

(1) Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation

- Improve the safety and efficiency of all modes of transportation within the Charlotte Street corridor

- Promote increased pedestrian activity as well as alternate means of transportation within the Charlotte Street corridor

## (2) Land Use

- Continue the existing balanced mix of uses on Charlotte Street between commercial, residential, institutional and open space

- Encourage compatible new development that serves adjacent neighborhoods and helps to create an economically vibrant pedestrian environment

## (3) Streetscape and Appearance:

- Improve the appearance of Charlotte Street and create a unique and unifying for the corridor

City Council discussed some specific items in the Plan and how the draft should be distributed.

Councilman Sellers felt this Plan will be an excellent example of a tool for the Haywood Road Corridor Plan

Mr. Jerry Bailey submitted a letter to Council dated May 18, 1998, to Mr. Mike Matteson, which states that his biggest problem with the Plan "is the emphasis placed on the findings and conclusions of the Charette process. Mike, we have continually been willing to find common ground on this process; however no commercial property owner along Charlotte Street supports this process and particularly the findings of the Charette." The letter then continues that "... our key and significant points on the Charette process that prevent our support (you will notice that we have had serious problems with the involvement of Jane Matthews in this process from the beginning)."

-9-

Mayor Sitnick thanked Mr. Matteson for his report and Mr. Bailey for bringing his concerns to the attention of City Council.

## **DOG PARK TASK FORCE REPORT**

Mr. Irby Brinson, Director of Parks and Recreation, said that in January, 1998, the Parks and Recreation Department established a Dog Park Task Force which was formed by individuals who were interested in developing a dog park for the City of Asheville. This group has investigated various dog parks throughout the country and has developed criteria which they feel could be used for a development of a park in Asheville. Even though a location has not been determined, the Dog Park Task Force feels that it has made headway in determining a viable park for this community. The Task Force plans to present information on a prototypical park with various amenities which typically would be found in the park.

The Parks and Recreation Department and the Dog Park Task Force is asking City Council's into the feasibility of developing a dog park in Asheville.



Ms. Ann Weber, Chair of the Dog Park Task Force, reviewed the following: (A) "Dogmographics" - (1) dog families: half of all households - an important constituency; (2) dog ownership, dog care, and citizens' responsibilities; (3) local challenges to canine good citizenship; and (4) the work and mission of the Canine Coalition of Asheville/Dog Park Task Force; and (B) "Dogma" - (1) what dogs mean to us; (2) what dogs need from us; (3) what dog owners need from the City and community; and (4) off-leash dog parks: solutions and benefits offered.

She then outlined a request for an off-leash dog park in Asheville. The requirements include: (1) land: 2+ acres of park land within city limits (city-owned property); (2) community support and neighborhood cooperation: getting/keeping it!; (3) gated entry, rules, fencing and maintenance; (4) pathways, lighting, monitoring, and security; (5) central location, unimpeded access, adequate parking; (6) "honor system" participation, monitored/overseen by volunteer advisors; and (7) Canine Communication Center: a notice board and more! The rationale is (1) dog owners are a significant and deserving segment of City population; (2) responsible dog care requires space and opportunities for community; (3) location and access of dog park must be competitive with other sites; (4) committed, volunteer advisory group will oversee park activities; (5) matching funds will continually be sought for park development; and (6) as visitors learn to use the dog park well, new parks can be developed.

She reviewed "The Best Friends Bark Park" as (1) freedom with security; (2) socializing with people and dogs (3) providing needed service to a large "special interest" group of citizens; (4) removing the burden of inappropriate dog presence from fragile locations; and (5) a model of how one park can flourish - and others can be developed! She outlined the "Center for Canine Good Citizenship" (1) be visible proof of "our taxpayer dollars at work"; (2) geographic center for dogs and owners' socialization and education; (3) more efficient information distribution and dog tax collection; (4) happier, better-behaved dogs; (5) more responsible, responsive dog owners; and (6) a more humane City and community.

She then asked for Council's support in developing an off-leash dog park in Asheville.

It was the consensus of City Council to offer support to continue this process to continue working toward the development of an off-leash dog park in Asheville.

Mr. Jerry Rice suggested that the Dog Park Task Force approach the County about this because there is a lot of land in the City that the County owns and some of those lots are in places that can't be built on. -10-

### **SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM**

Mr. Jeff Richardson, Personnel Director, said that this is the consideration of a budget amendment to provide funding for a Summer Youth Program ("SYP").

Asheville City Council has appropriated \$100,000 since 1992 to fund a SYP. The program's purposes have been to employ "at-risk" City youth and to promote positive work ethics and healthy lifestyles. To qualify, applicants have had to be 14 - 19 years of age, a resident of Asheville and a student in a public or private school system. Household income has also been an indirect consideration.

### **1997 Summer Youth Program**

- A decision to fund the program was made on April 22, 1997 via (Ordinance No. 2358) in the amount of \$100,000 . Council recommended (1) designation of at least three slots from "One Youth At A Time" (OYATT), a job placement and training program. These youth were to go through the same recruitment and selection procedures as other participants; (2) incorporating applicable sections of the OYAAT training curriculum into the SYP training component and hire their instructors, if possible; and (3) evaluating the OYAAT and SYP efforts for future consideration.

- Seventy-two youth and one part-time Program Administrator/Counselor (30 hours per week @ \$15.00 hourly) were hired.
- Youth were paid \$4.65/hour and worked an average of 30 hours/week in various City Departments, United Way Agencies, Asheville Housing Authority and the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance Summer Camp. Four (4) participants were also placed with OYAAT.
- Total direct cost was \$101,195.

### **1998 Summer Youth Program**

#### Current Issues For Consideration:

Current size of the program requires a program administrator to be hired. The City has utilized the same Program Administrator for the past five summers. He is not available for re-hire this summer.

Participating departments have expressed a desire to employ the youth 40 hours per week as opposed to 30 hours weekly.

Federal minimum wage law mandates \$5.15 per hour (10% increase from last year).

**OPTION A:** Restructure Program. Pay youth a more competitive per hour wage (\$5.50 hourly) and increase hours to 40 weekly. Eliminate the Program Administrator/ Counselor position and redesign the program to place more responsibility on the youth supervisor. Accept up to 25 of the top youth from last year's program. COST: \$50,000 COST SAVING TO THE CITY: \$51,195

**OPTION B:** Continue the program as currently designed. COST: \$115,000

**OPTION C:** Discontinue the program and re-prioritize funding elsewhere. -11-

Staff recommends Option A. Eliminate the Program Administrator. By decreasing the program's scope from 72 to 25, it will allow the program to be monitored internally by participating departments, along with the Personnel Department.

Mr. Richardson explained that a program administrator will be hard to find that can work for that time period with the right skills necessary.

Upon inquiry of Councilman Cloninger, Mr. Richardson explained the difference in responsibilities of the youth supervisor and the program administrator.

Upon inquiry of Councilman Cloninger, City Manager Westbrook said there are some non-profits that would be glad to take this program over but it has been staff's impression that City Council wanted a structured program and one that did not only have the youth work in summer for eight-hour days, but had additional training, like how to write a resume, how to conduct yourself during an interview, how to dress for a job, etc.

Mayor Sitnick suggested Mr. Richardson contact the Center for Creative Retirement who may have some people willing to donate their services. She also suggested contacting local colleges.

Councilman Tomes spoke very highly about the program and felt this was an excellent opportunity to help children with low self-esteem. He suggested Mr. Richardson contact Mr. Dwight Hulse at UNC-Asheville who, he felt, would be an excellent choice as program administrator.

Councilman Cobb suggested the City appropriate \$100,000 for the program and ask for matching funds from

the community.

After discussion on several different ideas for the program, City Council agreed upon funding the program at \$100,000 with Mr. Richardson trying to find someone suitable for the program administrator with a 10% reduction in the number of kids being hired. Council also directed staff to begin looking at a philosophical change on the direction the program should take in the future and report back to Council in a memorandum form.

Mr. Jerry Rice felt (1) the age limit should be from 14-21 years; (2) the Chamber of Commerce should donate some money to the program; (3) the Blue Ridge Mental Health is a good resource for people who may want to volunteer their time in the summer; (4) retired teachers and special education teachers may be willing to work in the summer; and (5) churches should be approached to maybe adopt one child.

Mayor Sitnick asked that the record show that City Council has received this information and instructs the City Manager to place this item on the next formal City Council agenda.

### **REPORTS FROM BOARDS AND COMMITTEES**

Vice-Mayor Hay said that the Council Boards and Commissions Committee will be meeting next week to discuss several issues on different boards.

### **SIGN ENFORCEMENT**

Mayor Sitnick stated that the City was continuing to make some progress in the elimination of illegal signs.

-12-

### **TROLLEY CARS**

Mr. David Newman presented Council with an idea for two trolley cars to be run this summer on a trial basis as a service to the tourists who visit Asheville. He proposed that the cars would drop off and pick-up at the Grove Park Inn, several hotels, Pack Place, Biltmore Village and the Biltmore Estate. They propose to sell tickets at the Grove Park Inn and the other hotels. He felt the tourists would be served well by a different form of transportation other than City buses and taxi service. He questioned whether their stopping on City streets fall under any regulation by the City.

Councilwoman Field felt the idea was wonderful, however, she felt it might be confusing to the people where the trolleys stop when they find out they have to go to a hotel to buy a ticket. She suggested that people be allowed to purchase the trolley car tickets at other places, for instance, at Biltmore Estate, Pack Place or a shop in Biltmore Village.

Mr. Bill Kelly, from the Grove Park Inn, spoke in support of this venture and said that their trolley drivers would serve as tour guides.

Ms. Julia Cogburn, Planning & Development Director, felt this was a good idea and they would like to find a way to work out some of the legal concerns the City Attorney may have.

City Attorney Oast said that he would research the issue in terms of the City granting a franchise to the company. The franchise could contain certain terms and conditions that they must meet.

City Manager Westbrook said that he would recommend a franchise and asked Mr. Newman to put his proposal in writing. After City Council has an opportunity to review the information and recommendation by the City Attorney, the City Council can consider approval at that time.

## **UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE ANNUAL REVIEW**

It was the consensus of City Council to have the Planning staff bring to Council, at a worksession, the items they would like for Council to consider for possible amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance. The Planning & Zoning Commission members will be invited to the worksession. After the initial direction by City Council to staff, staff will be directed to prepare the appropriate ordinances for review by the Planning & Zoning Commission. After the Commission's review, City Council will hold public hearings, as appropriate, and consider adoption of the ordinance amendments.

## **ADJOURNMENT:**

Mayor Sitnick adjourned the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

---

CITY CLERK MAYOR

---