
**MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN
FRANKLIN, TENNESSEE
CITY HALL BOARDROOM
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2012 – 5:00 P.M.**

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

Department Directors/Staff

Eric Stuckey, City Administrator		Shirley Harmon, HR Director	P
Vernon Gerth, ACA Community & Economic Dev.	P	Mark Hilty, Water Management Director	P
Russell Truell, ACA Finance & Administration	P	Paul Holzen, Engineering Director	P
David Parker, CIP Executive/City Engineer	P	Catherine Powers, Planning/Sustainability Director	P
Shauna Billingsley, City Attorney	P	Joe York, Streets Director	P
Rocky Garzarek, Fire Chief	P	Brad Wilson, Facilities Project Manager	
David Rahinsky, Police Chief		Steve Sims, Assistant City Recorder	P
Fred Banner, MIT Director	P	Dan Allen, Assistant Director Engineering	P
Chris Bridgewater, BNS Director	P	Lanaii Benne, Assistant City Recorder	P
Becky Caldwell, Solid Waste Director	P	Linda Fulwider, Board Recording Secretary	P
Lisa Clayton, Parks Director	P		

1. Call to Order

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

2. Citizen Comments

None

WORK SESSION DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. Presentation and Discussion on Cost of Service for Water Service

**Mark Hilty, Water Management Director
Jim Marshall and Sarah Chandler,
Jackson Thornton Representatives**

WATER COST OF SERVICE STUDY

12-Months Ending June 2013 Pro Forma

Typical Objectives of Rate Study

1. Revenue Stability and Sufficiency
2. Fairness and Equity
 - ♦ Fair is related to cross subsidies
 - ♦ Equity is related to Price=Cost
3. Ability to Pay
4. Simplicity (Admin and Customer Understanding)
5. Legally Defendable

Overview of Process

1. Determine Revenue Requirements
 - How much does the system need to recover?
2. Develop Revenue Requirements by Rate Class
 - How much do I need to make by rate class?
3. Develop COS Rates and Design Acceptable Rates
 - How do I best recover the needed revenues?
4. Implement Rate Changes

Recovery by Rate Class – “Normal”

• Total	93%
• Residential-Inside	85%
• Residential-Outside	113%
• C/I-Inside	110%
• C/I-Outside	135%

Residential Cost Curve – “Normal”

	Cost of Service	Current	Proposed	Difference
Availability Charge	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.42	\$ 10.42	\$ --
Next 9,000 Gallons	\$ 4.52	\$ 3.72	\$ 3.72	\$ --
Next 15,000 Gallons		\$ 4.65	\$ 4.65	\$ --
All Additional		\$ 5.58	\$ 5.58	\$ --

IWRP Water Projects

Item Description	BOMA (Proceed)	Estimated Cost (\$)	% Growth Funded (Est)	Rate and/or SDF Funded*	FY2013-Cost (Rates/SDF)	FY2014-Cost (Rates/SDF)	FY2015-Cost (Rates/SDF)
Upgrade of Water Treatment Plant	YES	\$ 5,432,600	0%	\$ 5,432,600	\$ 1,498,648	\$ 2,247,972	\$ 1,685,979
Expansion to 4.0 MGD WTP	DESIGN	\$ 4,416,000	50%	\$ 2,208,000	\$ 609,103	\$ 913,655	\$ 685,241
Water Treatment & Distribution SCADA	YES	\$ 830,000	0%	\$ 830,000	\$ 228,966	\$ 343,448	\$ 257,586
Distribution Water Quality Improvements (D/DBP): Various modifications to the distribution system to reduce water age and improve overall water quality	YES	\$ 2,100,000	0%	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 900,000	\$ ---
Advanced Metering Infrastructure of AMI transmitters and receivers	NO	\$ 3,000,000	0%	\$ 3,000,000	\$ ---	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
WATER TOTAL		\$ 15,778,600		\$ 13,570,600	\$ 3,356,717	\$ 6,405,076	\$ 3,628,807

Total Revenue Requirement

Operations & Maintenance Expense	\$ 7,813,387
Plus: Debt Service (Current)	\$ 249,246
Debt Service* (BOMA Approved)	\$ 507,660
Debt Service* (BOMA Pending)	\$ 316,157
Plus: Rate Funded Capital	\$ 1,300,000
Total Revenue Requirement	\$ 10,186,450
Less: Other Revenue	\$ 617,462
Rate Requirement	\$ 9,568,987

*Debt Service – IWRP Projects

Two Year Comparison

Revenue Requirement	2011 Pro Forma	2013 Pro Forma	Difference (\$)	Difference (%)
Operations & Maintenance Expense	\$ 7,643,114	\$ 7,813,387	\$ 170,273	2.2%
Plus: Debt Service	\$ 410,587	\$ 1,073,063	\$ 662,476	161.3%
Plus: Rate funded Capital	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 200,000	18.2%
Total Revenue Requirement	\$ 9,153,701	\$ 10,186,450	\$ 1,032,749	11.3%
Less: Other Revenue	\$ 492,172	\$ 617,462	\$ 125,290	25.5%
Rate Requirement	\$ 8,661,529	\$ 9,568,987	\$ 907,458	10.5%
ANNUAL SALES (Kgal)	\$ 1,537,162	\$ 1,491,885	\$ (45,277)	-2.9%

Revenue Requirement

Operations & Maintenance Expense	77%
Debt Service	10%
Rate Funded Capital	13%

Revenue Requirement by Class

Residential-In	71%
Residential-Out	12%
C/I-In	16%
C/I-Out	1%

Current Revenue by Class

Residential-In	64%
Residential-Out	15%
C/I-In	19%
C/I-Out	2%

Recovery by Rate Class - IWRP Funded

Total	86%
Residential-In	78%
Residential-Out	104%
C/I-In	101%
C/I-Out	124%

Results & Recommendations - Water

- Based on the 12-months ending June 2013, the City is projected to under-recover by approximately \$1,471,000
- Additional increases are warranted, and we recommend the continued long-term approach to reaching full recovery
- Continue to identify efficiencies and refine operations to manage operations and maintenance costs
 - Continue planned leak detection surveys. FY 2012 efforts included survey of 815,000 feet of pipe and reduction of 94,000,000 gal/year of water loss (HVUD purchase value of ~ \$113,000/year)
 - Implement within the water systems the lessons learned through the Tennessee Water and Wastewater Energy Efficiency Partnership

RESIDENTIAL INSIDE - OPTION 1

	Cost of Service	Current	Proposed	Difference
Availability Charge (1,000 Gal)	\$ 13.70	\$ 10.42	\$ 12.06	\$ 1.64
Next 9,000 Gallons	\$ 4.52	\$ 3.72	\$ 3.72	\$ ----
Next 15,000 Gallons		\$ 4.65	\$ 4.65	\$ ----
All Additional		\$ 5.58	\$ 5.58	\$ ----

RESIDENTIAL INSIDE - OPTION 2

	Cost of Service	Current	Proposed	Difference
Availability Charge (1,000 Gal)	\$ 13.70	\$ 10.42	\$ 10.42	\$ ----
Next 9,000 Gallons	\$ 4.52	\$ 3.72	\$ 4.02	\$ 0.30
Next 15,000 Gallons		\$ 4.65	\$ 4.95	\$ 0.30
All Additional		\$ 5.58	\$ 5.88	\$ 0.30

RESIDENTIAL INSIDE - OPTION 3

	Cost of Service	Current	Proposed	Difference
Availability Charge (1,000 Gal)	\$ 13.70	\$ 10.42	\$ 11.24	\$ 0.82
Next 9,000 Gallons	\$ 4.52	\$ 3.72	\$ 3.87	\$ 0.15
Next 15,000 Gallons		\$ 4.65	\$ 4.80	\$ 0.15
All Additional		\$ 5.58	\$ 5.73	\$ 0.15

PROJECTED REVENUE

5% Increase in Revenue Generated

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Revenue Created
Residential In				
Customer Charge Adjustment	\$ 1.64	\$ ----	\$ 0.82	
Consumption Charge Adjustment	\$ -----	\$ 0.30	\$ 0.15	
Revenue Generated				\$ 256,929
Residential Out				
Customer Charge Adjustment	\$ 2.21	\$ ----	\$ 1.10	
Consumption Charge Adjustment	\$ -----	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.21	
Revenue Generated				\$ 60,969
Commercial In				
Customer Charge Adjustment	\$ 6.41	\$ ----	\$ 3.21	
Consumption Charge Adjustment	\$ -----	\$ 0.29	\$ 0.14	
Revenue Generated				\$ 79,009
Commercial Out				
Customer Charge Adjustment	\$ 10.05	\$ ----	\$ 5.03	
Consumption Charge Adjustment	\$ -----	\$ 0.35	\$ 0.18	
Revenue Generated				\$ 8,014
Total Additional Revenue Annually				\$ 404,921
Total Additional Revenue - Five Years				\$ 2,024,605

Water Projected Recovery

	Current	Projected
Total	86%	90%
Res-In	78%	82%
Res-Out	104%	109%
C/I-In	101%	106%
C/I-Out	124%	130%

Water Rate Comparison – Residential Inside

	1,000 Gallons	7,000 Gallons
Columbia	\$ 9.50	\$ 26.90
HVUD	\$ 9.50	\$ 27.05
MVUD	\$ 9.00	\$ 31.50
City of Murfreesboro	\$ 10.52	\$ 32.50
City of Franklin	\$ 10.42	\$ 32.74
Brentwood	\$ 12.56	\$ 35.26
Spring Hill	\$ 9.80	\$ 38.05
NCGUD	\$ 14.59	\$ 43.85
White House	\$ 13.14	\$ 51.90
HB&TS	\$ 15.54	\$ 53.04
Consolidated Utility District (Rutherford County)	\$ 13.78	\$ 53.12
MUD	\$ 21.98	\$ 57.86

WASTEWATER COST OF SERVICE STUDY

12-Months Ending June 2013 Pro Forma

Recovery by Rate Class 0 “Normal”

Total	100%
Res-In	95%
Res-Out	121%
C/I-In	111%
C/I-Out	159%

Residential Inside Cost Curve/Kgal - "Normal"

	Cost of Service	Current	Proposed	Difference
Availability Charge (1,000 Gallons)	\$ 17.65	\$ 14.55	\$ 14.55	\$ ---
Next 14,000 Gallons	\$ 3.05	\$ 3.61	\$ 3.61	\$ ---
All Additional		\$ 2.82	\$ 2.82	\$ ---

IWRP Wastewater Projects

Item Description	BOMA (Proceed)	Estimated Cost (\$)	% Growth Funded (Est)	Rate and/or SDF Funded*	FY2013-Cost (Rates/SDF)	FY2014-Cost (Rates/SDF)	FY2015-Cost (Rates/SDF)
*Water Reclamation Facility Expansion to 16 MGD	YES	\$ 18,600,000	25%	\$ 13,950,000	\$ 3,255,000	\$ 5,580,000	\$ 5,115,000
*Wastewater Collection and Treatment SCADA	YES	\$ 4,800,000	0%	\$ 4,800,000	\$ 1,120,000	\$ 1,920,000	\$ 1,760,000
*Biosolids Facilities for 16 MGD	NO	\$ 50,000,000	25%	\$ 37,500,000	\$ ---	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 12,500,000
WASTEWATER TOTAL		\$ 73,400,000		\$56,250,000	\$ 4,375,000	\$ 32,500,000	\$ 19,375,000

Total Revenue Requirement

Operations & Maintenance Expense	\$ 7,202,061
Plus: Debt Service (Current)	\$ 1,010,574
Debt Service* (BOMA Approved)	\$ 1,138,237
Debt Service* (BOMA Pending)	\$ 2,277,000
Plus: Rate Funded Capital	<u>\$ 3,624,642</u>
Total Revenue Requirement	<u>\$ 15,252,514</u>
Less: Other Revenue	<u>\$ 243,826</u>
Rate Requirement	\$ 15,008,689

*Debt Service - IWRP Projects

Two Year Comparison

<i>Revenue Requirement</i>	<i>2011 Pro Forma</i>	<i>2013 Pro Forma</i>	<i>Difference (\$)</i>	<i>Difference (%)</i>
Operations & Maintenance Expense	\$ 7,694,049	\$ 7,202,061	\$ (491,988)	-6.4%
Plus: Debt Service	\$ 1,894,551	\$ 4,425,811	\$ 2,531,250	133.6%
Plus: Rate Funded Capital	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,624,642	\$ 624,642	20.8%
Total Revenue Requirement	\$ 12,588,600	\$ 15,252,514	<u>\$ 2,663,915</u>	-21.2%
Less: Other Revenue	\$ 46,195	\$ 243,826	\$ (197,631)	-427.8%
Rate Requirement	\$ 12,542,405	\$ 15,008,689	<u>\$ 2,861,545</u>	22.8%
Annual Sales (Kgal)	\$ 2,150,820	\$ 2,285,954	\$ 135,134	6.3%

Revenue Requirement

Operations & Maintenance Expense	47%
Debt Service	29%
Rate Funded Capital	24%

Revenue Requirement by Rate Class

Res-In	73%
Res-Out	1%
C/I-In	25%
C/I-Out	1%

Current Revenue by Class

Res-In	71%
Res-Out	1%
C/I-In	26%
C/I-Out	2%

Recovery by Rate Class – IWRP Funded

Total	77%
Res-In	75%
Res-Out	101%
C/I-In	81%
C/I-Out	116%

Results & Recommendations – Wastewater

- ▲ Based on the 12-months ending June 2013, the City is projected to under-recover by approximately \$3,441,000
- ▲ Additional increases are warranted, and we recommend the continued long-term approach to reaching full recovery
- ▲ Continue to identify efficiencies and refine operations to manage operations and maintenance costs
 - Tennessee Water and Wastewater Energy Efficiency Partnership efforts resulting in projected annual cost savings of approximately \$194,000
 - Continued work in the collection system to reduce rainfall dependent inflow and infiltration

RESIDENTIAL INSIDE – OPTION 1

	Cost of Service	Current	Proposed	Difference
Availability Charge (1,000 Gal)	\$ 27.82	\$ 14.55	\$ 17.09	\$ 2.54
Next 14,000 Gallons	\$ 3.05	\$ 3.61	\$ 3.61	\$ ---
All Additional		\$ 2.82	\$ 2.82	\$ ---

RESIDENTIAL INSIDE – OPTION 2

	Cost of Service	Current	Proposed	Difference
Availability Charge (1,000 Gal)	\$ 27.82	\$ 14.55	\$ 14.55	\$ ---
Next 14,000 Gallons	\$ 3.05	\$ 3.61	\$ 4.05	\$ 0.44
All Additional		\$ 2.82	\$ 3.26	\$ 0.44

RESIDENTIAL INSIDE – OPTION 3

	Cost of Service	Current	Proposed	Difference
Availability Charge (1,000 Gal)	\$ 27.82	\$ 14.55	\$ 15.55	\$ 1.00
Next 14,000 Gallons	\$ 3.05	\$ 3.61	\$ 3.88	\$ 0.27
All Additional		\$ 2.82	\$ 3.09	\$ 0.27

PROJECTED REVENUE

7% Increase in Revenue Generated

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Revenue Generated
Residential In				
Customer Charge Adjustment	\$ 2.54	\$ ---	\$ 1.00	
Consumption Charge Adjustment	\$ ---	\$ 0.44	\$ 0.27	
Revenue Generated				\$ 573,001
Residential Out				
Customer Charge Adjustment	\$ 2.37	\$ ---	\$ 1.18	
Consumption Charge Adjustment	\$ ---	\$ 0.90	\$ 0.45	
Revenue Generated				\$ 10,816
Comm In				
Customer Charge Adjustment	\$ 12.82	\$ ---	\$ 6.41	
Consumption Charge Adjustment	\$ ---	\$ 0.31	\$ 0.15	
Revenue Generated				\$ 212,742
Comm Out				
Customer Charge Adjustment	\$ 14.32	\$ ---	\$ 7.16	
Consumption Charge Adjustment	\$ ---	\$ 0.45	\$ 0.23	
Revenue Generated				\$ 13,177
Total Additional Revenue Annually				\$ 809,735
Total Additional Revenue – Five Years				\$ 4,048,673

Wastewater Projected Recovery

	Current	Projected
Total	77%	83%
Res-In	75%	81%
Res-Out	101%	108%
C/I-In	81%	86%
C/I-Out	116%	124%

Sanitary Sewer Rate Comparison – Residential Inside

	1,000 Gallons	7,000 Gallons
Spring Hill	\$ 10.97	\$ 31.52
City of Franklin	\$ 14.55	\$ 36.21
City of Murfreesboro	\$ 12.03	\$38.81
Consolidated Utility District (Rutherford County)	\$ 28.00	\$ 42.00
Brentwood	\$ 16.39	\$ 46.49
MWS	\$ 8.38	\$ 46.72
Murfreesboro	\$ 13.22	\$ 47.23
Columbia	\$ 14.99	\$ 49.29
HVUD	\$16.27	\$ 52.61
Goodlettsville	\$10.45	\$ 58.24
Smyrna	\$18.94	\$61.88
Whitehouse	\$16.47	\$ 62.01

Discussion:

- ▲ Questions were asked and answered during the presentation.
- ▲ Each of the three options generates the same amount of revenue and about 90% recovery. None get the City to 100% full recovery.
- ▲ Aldermen not in favor of closing the gap between inside residential and outside residential.
- ▲ The proposed increases widen the gap between inside and outside.
- ▲ Something must be done soon about biosolids

Russ Truell noted the next two steps bring this back via ordinance. Mr. Hilty said the draft ordinance would be based on feedback from this meeting and discussions moving forward.

4.* Consideration of Agreement Between The City of Franklin, Tennessee, and Stream Valley Franklin Partners, LLC Relative to Phasing of The Stream Valley Development (COF Contract No. 2012-0143 Shauna Billingsley, City Attorney

At the 7:00 p.m. meeting this item will be deferred to October 23, 2012.

Mary Ruth Castelli, 601 Cattail Lane, Franklin, and Art Rietz, 612 Cattail Lane, Franklin, voiced concerns about the road going through Goose Creek Estates next to homes or garages without any buffer. Concerned that property values would fall as well. There is Flood Plain between I-65 and the Goose Creek Estates Subdivision. They are concerned about noise and another traffic signal.

Alderman Skinner said it would be a right in/right out access with no traffic signal. Vernon Gerth explained that nothing has changed from the original approval several years ago. This agreement allows the developer to find an alternative location for the road.

Vernon Gerth offered to meet with the Goose Creek Estates residents and provided them his business card.

5.* Consideration of Amendment No. 1 (COF 2012-0097) with Kimley-Horn and Associates in an Amount Not to Exceed \$17,500 for the Carothers and McEwen Corridor Traffic Impact Study

David Parker, City Engineer/CIP Executive

Paul Holzen, Engineering Director

Alderman Petersen said she was told there were two alternatives, but what is being presented provides only one choice and that is to widen the road on the inside and possibly eliminate the median with no widening of the outside of the road. Alderman Skinner said that he, too, had been told there would be multiple options.

There was discussion on having vegetation in the area since trees are not allowed in a six foot median. The median would have to be at least 10 feet to have a clear zone; however, it should be more like 12-15 feet for trees. Mr. Parker said the Board must decide on a median or minimum grassy area. Alderman Petersen noted this is located in a showplace area.

Dan Allen said they would bring this back to discuss other options. It is imperative they start with some initial options now. Aldermen Skinner and Petersen wanted inside and outside options. Mr. Parker said the more this is pushed back the harder it will be to work with the developments. Alderman Martin said she would vote to go ahead with the inside widening to be fair to the developers.

Paul Holzen commented if the Board wants both options, let staff get started and then come back with an amendment.

6.* Consideration of Agreement (COF 2012-0160) With MTEMC for the Relocation of Utilities Associated with the McEwen & Wilson Pike Intersection Project at an Estimated Cost of \$68,607.94

David Parker, City Engineer/CIP Executive

Paul Holzen, Engineering Director

The \$68,607.94 is not the full cost as some of the utilities are in existing ROW. The City is not responsible for that cost; however, the City will end up reimbursing 57% of project cost because of those in private easements. There is no contract at this time due to the urgency of getting this project started. The Board can vote to enter into a contract for this amount contingent on refinement of the language by the City Attorney, City Administrator, and City Engineer.

7.* Consideration of RESOLUTION 2012-54, A Resolution for Water System Improvements (IWRP)

David Parker, City Engineer/CIP Executive

Mark Hilty, Water Department Director

▲ Alderman Martin was recused and left the meeting.

The approval of Resolution 2012-54 authorizes Staff to enter into contract negotiations with selected consulting firms pertaining to the BOMA approved IWRP water system projects. Based on the evaluation of 13 Statements of Qualifications from various firms the selection committee recommends the City enter into contract negotiations with Smith Seckman Reid, Inc. for the design services associated with water treatment in support of the IWRP. The selection committee also recommends that the City enter into contract negotiations with Jacobs, URS, CDM Smith, Gresham Smith and Partners, Hazen & Sawyer, and Smith Seckman Reid, Inc. for design services associated with individual water distribution projects in support of the IWRP on a case-by-case basis as BOMA-approved projects move forward. Each must come back as a contract for approval. The six are not

ready to bring forward.

- ▲ Alderman Martin rejoined the meeting

8.* Consideration of ORDINANCE 2012-54, An Ordinance to Rezone ±17.40 Acres From Medium Residential District (R-2) To Residential Variety District (RX) for the Property Located at 567 Franklin Road

Alderman Ann Petersen, FMPC Board Representative

The Aldermen asked if the improvements would come to the entrance of Gateway Commons. Catherine Powers and Paul Holzen said they thought the project would come to that entrance. This is a Brentwood project and The City of Franklin is committed to purchasing the right-of-way.

9. Consideration of RESOLUTION 2012-51, A Resolution Approving a Development Plan for The Commons at Gateway Village PUD Subdivision, Located at 567 Franklin Road, by the City of Franklin, Tennessee

Alderman Ann Petersen, FMPC Board Representative

Catherine Powers said this is a continuation of Gateway. They are asking for 42 attached units.

10.* Consideration of ORDINANCE 2012-53, An Ordinance to Rezone ±3.87 Acres from General Office District (GO) and High Residential District (R-3) to Residential Variety District (RX) for the Properties Located at 1720 West Main Street and 113 Rucker Avenue

Alderman Ann Petersen, FMPC Board Representative

Ms. Powers commented that this is almost a continuation of Hardison Hills and the rezoning is to accommodate a mix of attached housing

Bob Haemmerliene, RBF Investments, representing the developer, said they want to donate frontage on the Rucker and West Main property for a pocket park for the development residents as well as residents in that area. The essence of the ordinance is that the Parks Department reviews all such property and decides if the property meets the criteria of a City park or the developer will be required to make a payment in lieu of. They realize the City has an overall master plan for park land in the City. This would be a small neighborhood park within walking distance of residents. This property has over 56% of open space. They are willing to make a payment in lieu of but would rather establish a park and have the HOA maintain it.

Alderman Bransford thought a park would be a nice improvement in this area.

Vernon Gerth said the Parks Department reviewed this proposal and determined a fee in lieu of to be the appropriate decision in this case. There are many factors to consider in the establishment of a City park. They encourage developers to always include private parks. Mr. Haemmerliene said they were prepared to comply with all the conditions and are not asking for a modification of standards. They cannot stop and wait for this to go back to the Planning Commission. They are prepared to go forward with the way BOMA votes tonight. Russ Truell responded to Alderman Petersen's question about the use of Facilities Taxes and Lisa Clayton briefly commented on the Parks Department decision making process in requiring the payment-in-lieu in this instance.

Points of Discussion:

- ▲ How much land is required to qualify as a City park?
- ▲ Is the Parks Department only interested in compliance with the parks and greenway plan?

- ▲ The Zoning Ordinance still allows for parks.
- ▲ It's either useable park land to be maintained by Parks or fees in lieu of to build out that plan
- ▲ Developers pay facilities tax so this is a second fee.
- ▲ The State froze the facilities tax rate for cities and facilities tax collections no longer generate enough proceeds to fund parks.
- ▲ At the neighborhood meeting it was said the developer could provide a playground on the property.
- ▲ A private drive runs through the property in question. Very little land would be left for the park
- ▲ Based on location and the ability of the public to use it, it could not be functional park.

11. Consideration of RESOLUTION 2012-53, A Resolution Approving a Development Plan for The Rucker Park PUD Subdivision Located at 1720 West Main Street and 113 Rucker Avenue, by The City of Franklin, Tennessee

Alderman Ann Petersen, FMPC Board Representative

Ms. Powers related this plan is for 30 units. If the Board allows this to go forward, the resolution will be on the November 13, 2012 BOMA agenda to coincide with the second reading of the rezoning ordinance.

There was further discourse regarding the Parks Department's acceptance of land, payment in lieu of, and this HOA assuming maintenance of the park.

12. Consideration of RESOLUTION 2012-52, A Resolution Approving a Revision to the Development Plan for Simmons Ridge PUD Subdivision Located at 4408 South Carothers Road, by The City of Franklin, Tennessee (9/27/12 FMPC voted to Recommend Disapproval to BOMA 4-3)

Alderman Ann Petersen, FMPC Board Representative

Ms. Powers explained the developer is requesting approval of a development plan that includes a mix of detached and attached residential units (90 single family detached and 318 attached townhomes for a total of 408 units). Units have been added. One special condition and four modifications of Standards requested. Due to terrain and retention of existing trees, garage doors will be allowed to face the street. Of four modifications, one was denied; garages that face the street cannot be flush with porches. FMPC denied the development plan.

Comments from Residents of Surrounding Neighborhoods:

- Jodi Keeler, 404 Martingale Drive, Cedarmon Valley Subdivision, Williamson County resident. With the development expanding from 240 to 408 homes she is concerned about the safety of the residents living along South Carothers. She showed pictures of the road with its blind hills and curves, and no shoulders. Reasons for concern: numerous serious accidents; thrill-seeking motorcyclists; extreme congestion, especially during rush hour; Page Middle and High Schools must use this road; dangerous for children getting on and off school buses. The infrastructure not there.
- Eddie Williams, 1024 Cedarview Lane, Williamson County, said he was involved in a head-on collision in January at one of the blind curves. Many drivers from the south and east use Arno Road and South Carothers to cut through. It is an extremely dangerous road and infrastructure is not in place for this development.
- Ken Harb, 1113 Cedarview Lane, Franklin, also expressed concern regarding the safety of school children. To continue to add density without the infrastructure in that corridor is disastrous.
- Susan McKenney, 4218 Warren Road, Williamson County, works on Cool Springs Boulevard and

travels the McEwen/Carothers corridor. She noted a 73% increase in the number of homes from the originally approved concept. Ms. McKenney referred to a traffic report commissioned by the developer that doesn't include the proposed 624 homes in Lockwood Glen (formerly Nichols Bend). She asked if the City had done a traffic study of South Carothers south of Highway 96 down to Long Lane as there is need for an unbiased traffic study in that area. There are 3,800 homes to be built in that corridor. She mentioned connection to Warren Road, a short road with a 90 degree hairpin turn that couldn't accommodate safety vehicles. Traffic, infrastructure and the safety of City and County citizens cause concern.

- Michael Grimnes, 1012 Cedarview Lane, Franklin, said safety would be compromised through the Simmons Ridge Development. Bus drivers for the County have said South Carothers is one of the two most dangerous roads in the County. Cycle clubs use this dangerous road. Developers come in and build and they don't have to live with the safety considerations.

Other comments:

- Alderman Barnhill commented that a portion of the road is in the County and assumed they had contacted the County Commission with these concerns to make this road a priority.
- Mr. Harb said it is still dangerous on City roads and they are fighting for both County and City residents.

Comments from those in favor of Simmons Ridge Expansion:

- Doug Hale, applicant, asked the Board to reconsider something the FMPC turned down. He thought an appeal was warranted.
- Greg Gamble, development planner representing Simmons Ridge, LLC, presented slides of the proposed concept: Property 87.6 Acres; Townhomes 318; Single Family 90; for a Total of 408 Homes. Currently approved for homes \$350,000-\$425,000. They realized there is an underserved market for families whose income is between \$40,000 and \$75,000 annually. Only 21% of the City of Franklin's employees live within the Franklin city limits. The plan for Simmons Ridge is to provide housing for \$180,000-\$230,000, which is in range of this target market. They learned there is a significant difference between the single family homes and the attached townhomes. Within this increase of homes there will be 21 homes that are deed-restricted to a maximum sales price for the City of Franklin's inclusionary ordinance. South Carothers Parkway connects to major employment centers in Franklin. Off-site improvements: future connection to extend South Carothers Road to Carothers Parkway; 3-Way Stop Improvement to South Carothers Road is planned at one of the 90 degree curves; Simmons Ridge will be required to provide a left turn lane southbound into Simmons Ridge main entrance. He touched on the modification of standards as well.
- Stephen Murray, Executive Director/CHP, Chair Franklin Housing Commission, 129 West Fowlkes Street #129, Franklin. The Housing Commission asked him to speak to BOMA. The plan for this subdivision has a variety of sizes and pricing of housing that is favorable to the City of Franklin. It is imperative at this time that we provide a balance of housing. We need housing for our workforce. Surrounding communities offer housing that is affordable. They lure away new residents. The Franklin Housing Commission unanimously endorses the Simmons Ridge project provided it maintains affordable and workforce standards. This is an opportunity to make an important difference for the City of Franklin.

Comments from Aldermen:

- Alderman Skinner said Simmons Ridge is already approved to build 240 units. He would like to bring back some kind of cap on the number based on some condition of the traffic or on the

number of years out that it would take to build South Carothers. Or, just cap at 250 units until there is access to South Carothers that can be used. He would like staff and the developer to look at that. He agreed there is a need for workforce housing in that area. He wants them to get started on the workforce housing.

- Alderman Martin asked for a show of hands of those who live on South Carothers Road. Some live in Cedarmont Farms in that area, and, as she understands it, they have another entrance into Cedarmont on Highway 96 and Arno Road. Her point was that most of the people present have another access into their subdivision if they don't want to travel on South Carothers Road.
- Alderman Blanton said she was glad to see so many people engaged for a cause. She has traveled that road and although people should travel country roads at the speed dictated, especially a dangerous one, not all do. The affordable workforce housing still doesn't drive home what they are trying to do here. She applauded the Rucker development and the fact that Simmons Ridge is trying to address affordable workforce housing options. Housing in Franklin is not affordable and prohibits many from coming back to their home town. She commended the group for their concern regarding the safety of City and County residents. The Board needs to make South Carothers a priority, change the CIP list, and make changes toward making workforce housing available to future generations. Their presence tonight can inspire changes to the CIP priorities.
- Alderman Burger related she had talked to the City Administrator and the second design will be back sometime in November. The Board will discuss the design. The CIP priorities will then come into play. It is one of the top 2 or 3 on the list. She found the accident report interesting and she will make the report available to the Board.

13. Consideration of Inter-Planning Commission Review of a Special Use Permit to Allow an Event of Public Interest, Extensive Impact (The Grape Stomp) at 3105 Boy Mill Pike in the Second Voting District

Alderman Ann Petersen, FMPC Board Representative

Event was held prior weekend.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned @ 7:40 p.m.

Dr. Ken Moore, Mayor

Minutes prepared by: Linda Fulwider, Board Recording Secretary, City Administrator's Office - 11/14/2012 3:39 PM