

SUMMARY OF MINUTES

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

6:37 P.M., TUESDAY, JULY 13, 2010

COMMITTEE ROOM

ROOM 239, CITY HALL

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Allen Joines
Council Member Robert C. Clark, Chair
Council Member Derwin L. Montgomery, Vice Chair
Council Member Denise D. Adams
Council Member Dan Besse

OTHERS PRESENT: Council Member Molly Leight
Council Member James Taylor, Jr.

Chair Clark called the meeting to order and stated that without objection, the Committee would first consider the Consent Agenda and asked if any items needed to be removed for discussion. He stated that staff had requested to pull Item C-1 and Chair Clark noted he would briefly comment on that item after the discussion of other removed Consent items. Council Member Leight requested to pull Item C-7. Council Member Montgomery requested to pull Item C-8. No items were removed for discussion.

Council Member Montgomery made a motion to approve the balance of the Consent Agenda. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Besse and carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

- C-2. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT WITH THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO RECEIVE ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE BRUSHY FORK GREENWAY PROJECT.
- C-3. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS RELATING TO FEDERAL FUNDING FOR TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR LOW INCOME INDIVIDUALS, ELDERLY AND PERSON WITH DISABILITIES:
 - a. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION ACCEPTING JOB ACCESS REVERSE COMMUTE AND NEW FREEDOM FUNDS FOR THE WINSTON-SALEM URBAN AREA.

- b. ORDINANCE AMENDING THE PROJECT BUDGET ORDINANCE FOR THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM, NORTH CAROLINA FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011.
- C-4. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS RELATING TO AN AGREEMENT WITH NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO RECEIVE FUNDS FOR THE INSTALLATION OF WAYFINDING SIGNS DOWNTOWN:
- a. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO AN ASSUMPTION AGREEMENT WITH THE DOWNTOWN WINSTON-SALEM PARTNERSHIP, INC. TO PASS-THROUGH FUNDING FOR INSTALLATION OF WAYFINDING SIGNS IN DOWNTOWN WINSTON-SALEM.
 - b. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A STATE SMALL CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT WITH THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO RECEIVE PASS-THROUGH FUNDING FOR WAYFINDING SIGNS IN DOWNTOWN WINSTON-SALEM.
 - c. ORDINANCE AMENDING THE PROJECT BUDGET ORDINANCE FOR THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM, NORTH CAROLINA FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011.
- C-5. RESOLUTION ALLOWING AN ENCROACHMENT OF TRAILBLAZER SIGNS - *Downtown Winston-Salem Partnership.*
- C-6. UTILITY CUT STREET REPAIR UPDATE.
- C-9. CITY/COUNTY UTILITY COMMISSION EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.
- C-10. APPROVAL OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MINUTES - *June 15, 2010.*
- C-7. MONTHLY REPORT ON THE CURBSIDE GARBAGE COLLECTION PROGRAM.

Council Member Leight noted that she had heard some concern from those who had applied for the disability exemption and wondered if any acknowledgement would be forthcoming.

Mr. Gregory M. Turner, Assistant City Manager/Public Works, stated that staff will respond to those who have requested the exemption. Once an application is processed, citizens can be sure that they will be allowed to participate in backyard garbage collection. He briefly reviewed the process of applying for the exemption.

In response to Mayor Joines' question, Mr. Turner stated that in the interim, the same collection crews will collect curbside garbage, then collect backyard garbage. In the future, there will be

separate collection crews.

In response to Chair Clark's question, Mr. Turner noted that staff is currently delivering carts that are in stock, while the large order of carts will arrive in August and will then be delivered.

Council Member Besse received confirmation that if a citizen currently has a cart and they have not applied for the disability exemption, a new cart will be delivered to them.

C-8. MONTHLY REPORT ON ECONOMIC STIMULUS PROJECTS UNDER THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT.

In response to Council Member Montgomery's question, Mr. Turner stated that as projects are completed, staff submits funding requests for them and then reflects those receipts on the aforementioned spreadsheet. The most recently submitted item was the Northwest Boulevard pavement project. Staff has also submitted for the reimbursement of two sidewalk projects, one on New Walkertown Road and one on Peters Creek Parkway.

Council Member Adams requested that the chart included with the item be made larger or inserted separately with larger print.

C-1. ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 75, SECTION 404 OF THE CITY CODE RELATING TO POST CONSTRUCTION STORMWATER ORDINANCE PERFORMANCE SECURITY AND CREATION OF A STORMWATER REPLACEMENT FUND.

Mr. Turner noted that as the City Council was previously discussing an increase in stormwater ordinance regulations, a need arose to ensure adequate funding for the maintenance of stormwater devices required under the new ordinance. At that time, the world economy allowed for the procurement of a maintenance or performance bond but due to changes in the economic environment, those bonds are no longer available. As a proposed alternative for the bond requirement for stormwater maintenance devices, an up-front cash payment could be pursued. The Public Works Committee reviewed procedures from other cities and Durham charges an up-front cost equal to approximately 20% of the cost for the ongoing maintenance of the stormwater device. After reviewing these options in the preliminary agenda, a representative from the Homebuilders and Realtors Association noted that it would like additional time to evaluate the proposed option and make an alternative proposal.

Chair Clark noted that the issue should be resolved quickly because if the required maintenance bond does not exist, there needs to be an alternative in place. He also noted that no action was required on this item as it is being held in Committee.

GENERAL AGENDA

G-1. PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED RENAMING OF A SEGMENT OF "BONBROOK CIRCLE" TO "INGLE STREET" - *Northwest Ward*.

Ms. Glynis Jordan, Deputy Planning Director, noted that this request was received from a citizen on Bonbrook Circle who experienced difficulty during an emergency response call. Staff contacted the five affected property owners and received a response from three. She also noted that Bonbrook Circle and Ingle Street are not connected but staff reviewed the area and there are other routes through the area to substantiate the change.

Chair Clark stated that this was now a public hearing and asked if anyone wished to be heard. Seeing no one, he declared public hearing closed.

Council Member Besse made a motion for approval of the street renaming. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Adams.

In response to Council Member Montgomery's question, Ms. Jordan stated that a portion of Bonbrook Circle will remain and a portion will be renamed to Ingle Street.

The motion for approval carried unanimously.

G-2. ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 74, SECTION 179 OF THE CITY CODE RELATING TO CITY PARTICIPATION IN COST OF LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS.
(*Private Streets*)

Mr. Turner noted that the Public Works Committee requested changes to the previous ordinance that was submitted that would add a requirement for a development to be 15 years old, for there to be a certain amount of development activity on the roadway and that the calculation method for housing prices in the community be based upon built houses, as opposed to vacant lots and built houses. Any lot that is not built upon will not be counted. In response to Chair Clark's question, Mr. Turner stated that mobile homes are considered personal property rather than retail property and will be excluded as a lot in this analysis.

In response to Council Member Besse's question, Mr. Turner stated that upon the Committee's approval of alternative language, staff will make final revisions and send the ordinance to the full Council for approval.

In response to Chair Clark's question, Mr. Turner stated that staff does set the minimum developed lot percentage for a neighborhood to qualify, which is 75% or greater.

Council Member Adams made a motion to approve the item. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Montgomery and carried unanimously.

G-3. ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 42 OF THE CITY CODE RELATING TO ON-STREET PARKING METERS.

Mr. Turner stated that the City will implement parking pay stations which will be situated mid-block, with one per side of a street for short blocks and possibly two for longer blocks. The pay stations will help to regulate payment for those who have a handicapped sticker and to encourage those

desiring to park for longer periods of time to move to parking decks. He also stated that the pay stations accept various payment options, are vandal resistant and staff anticipates a long-term cost savings from the stations. He further stated that the proposed location for the first stations will be near City Hall around the Forsyth County Detention Center, along First and Chestnut Streets and possibly on Church Street between Third and First Streets. An ordinance change is necessary to eliminate the reference to meters only and to accommodate pay stations. In response to Council Member Montgomery's question, Mr. Turner noted that handicapped citizens will pay in the same manner as the general public.

In response to Council Member Taylor's question, Mr. Turner stated that citizen education will be a component of this change, but as the pay stations were reviewed in other communities, they appear to be an effective tool for on-street parking and more equitable to all citizens.

In response to Council Member Besse's inquiries, Mr. Turner noted that this change will only impact those areas where the pay stations have been installed and longer parking periods will be implemented where installed. Outside of the initial locations, citizens with a handicapped sticker will still be exempt from paying at hourly meters. He also noted that in an area of low utilization, ten-hour parking is provided for everyone. Staff reviewed the possibility of requiring all citizens to pay for parking, no matter if there is still a meter or a pay station and regardless of the possession of a handicapped sticker because the State statues only stipulate that the ability has to be provided for an individual to park in a handicapped space and not have a time restriction. There is no specification to exempt those possessing a handicapped sticker, but they are not required to be constrained by a timed parking meter. Staff has had discussions about changing the exemption but it is not a part of the overall ordinance change at this time.

Council Member Montgomery made a motion for approval of the item. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Adams and carried unanimously.

G-4. PRESENTATION BY WORLD CONSTRUCTION ENERGY GROUP.

Mr. Redmond Jones, Davenport, Iowa, with Delimar Consulting Firm, gave the presentation on a Winston-Salem Bio Mass Refinery Proposal. In response to Council Member Leight's question, Mr. Jones stated that World Construction Energy Group (WCEG) is not committed to utilizing current landfill space for the proposed gasification facility but would ask for direction from the City as to whether or not that would be the most appropriate site. Currently, there is solid waste close in proximity so the transportation of waste would be less of an issue as it is readily available. He also stated that there are other facilities that are mining old landfills and gasifying that solid waste.

In response to Council Member Taylor's question, Mr. Jones noted that WCEG is confident that obtaining the permits should be a relatively smooth process as the technology is a closed loop system with no emissions, and most states seem agreeable to fast tracking permits. He also noted that there are federal government tax credits available for alternative waste disposal plans that municipalities may take advantage of.

Mr. Tyrone Holmes, 3170 Shaftesbury Lane, stated that WCEG feels confident with the project

because of its partnership with various engineering, procurement and construction firms and technology partners, because they are the only commercially proven gasification firms. They are also working with local engineering firm RTP Environmental Associates, Inc. (RTP) which has performed all of the permitting for technology partners in Taunton, Massachusetts, and feels confident that it can meet deadlines with a potential public/private partnership or a development agreement with the City of Winston-Salem.

Council Member Adams noted that she has compared this project to the manufacturing industry and throughout her research of the process and facilities in locations outside of the U.S., she has not found a risk or safety analysis and the effect of these facilities on a quality of life. She also noted that as a proponent of the environment and sustainability, she will always err on the side of safety for the citizens of the North Ward and the City of Winston-Salem. She requested to see quantifiable data for this process and its product.

In response to Council Member Montgomery's question, Mr. Jones stated that the eligibility of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds is time sensitive, but WCEG is prepared to cover any costs not obtained through the ARRA funds. If ARRA funds are not received, tipping fees and overall project costs will increase. He also stated that gasification technology has been used in the industrial sector for some time but private sector industrial partners are not as open to providing information on proven abilities. He further stated that he will personally perform research and provide safety information.

Mr. Holmes noted that gasification technology is not a new process and that synthetic fuel was being produced through a similar process in the 1950's. This specific technology is not yet available in the U.S. but WCEG is also not launching a new product, rather it is simply a landfill diversion option. He also noted that he believes renewable energy will be the next growth sector in the U.S. but admitted that there is no track record of U.S.-based companies partnering with facilities outside of the U.S. with proven effectiveness. He further noted that he is willing to provide any additional information that the Committee requests and that responses to questions from his previous presentation were outlined in the current presentation.

In response to Council Member Montgomery's questions regarding contracts with other cities and the capacity to operate the facility at a level profitable for the City, Mr. Jones stated that there is a specific method of building and constructing these facilities to produce a technology proven in plants all over the world. There are specific firms that are required to be involved once the project launches who are used to working with companies like WCEG.

In response to Council Member Montgomery's inquiry about the required number of tons for the facility, Mr. Holmes stated that WCEG is looking for a public-private partnership with a long-term contractual agreement for waste disposal over 30 years and dedication of all tipping fees, in addition to a down payment. In exchange, WCEG will commit \$400 million to build a facility and process up to 1,700 tons of waste per day. In regards to the number of citizens the facility will employ, Mr. Holmes noted that 1,200 jobs will be created for the construction of the facility and once the facility is running, 180 employees will be required to operate it. Those 180 employees will have salaries ranging between \$72,000 and \$150,000 and must possess at minimum, a high school diploma. In

regards to WCEG's commitment to growing with other technologies, Mr. Holmes stated that WCEG aligns itself with the best in municipal solid waste (MSW) disposal. While there are other technologies available, gasification is the only proven MSW technology. WCEG will continue to research other technologies while it has a potential patent pending on this process. He also stated that some municipalities store waste for up to 18 months before gasifying but the City will not have to wait if it serves as a hub and processes waste from other cities.

In response to Council Member Besse's question regarding waste hauler contracts, Mr. Holmes stated that there are no current contracts because no location has been identified for a facility. He also stated that there are contracts written and ready once there is a commitment from a hauler. He further stated that tipping fees of \$30 per ton was the amount set by the City/County Utility Commission (CCUC).

Mr. Jones stated that a long-term agreement with a waste hauler would be the best option for the ongoing success of the facility, but profits may fluctuate based on the number of committed waste haulers.

In response to Council Member Besse's questions regarding the number of tons and potential flow control ordinances, Mr. Holmes stated that WCEG needs to know what amount of waste the City could commit to per day and hopes that the City and County will adopt flow control ordinances which will require producers of municipal waste in the area to direct all waste to this facility. He also stated that WCEG would cover the cost of any legal challenge to a proposed flow control ordinance but he does not feel there will be any such challenge as the City has jurisdiction to implement flow control.

In response to Council Member Besse's inquiry, Mr. Turner stated that recent Supreme Court legislation authorized the concept of flow control as part of a comprehensive waste management process but he is not aware of any North Carolina city with any such ordinance.

Council Member Besse stated that he can guarantee that there will be litigation for any jurisdiction attempting a flow control ordinance.

Chair Clark clarified that there was a recent Supreme Court ruling stating that a municipality can require any garbage generated within their limits to go to a municipal facility.

In response to Council Member Besse's question, Mr. Jones stated that biohazard waste or hospital waste is a feedstock that can be handled within the thermoselect process.

In response to Council Member Besse's inquiry regarding a proposed waste to energy contract with a public utility to purchase the electricity produced at the site, Mr. Holmes stated that currently, there are no contracts but WCEG is having discussions with Duke Energy, Progress Energy, Midamerican Energy and Alliant Energy. He also stated that WCEG proposes to sell the produced energy at a rate of \$0.147 cents per kilowatt hour (kwh), and as it is considered a renewable energy, public utility companies are willing to pay cost plus a premium for the energy.

Council Member Besse questioned how WCEG's proposed rate compares with prices in other waste to energy contracts.

Mr. Jones stated that in situations he is familiar with, most states require the energy utility closest to the facility to purchase it, but that may not be the case with this facility.

Council Member Besse noted that a law was recently passed in N.C. requiring public utilities to have targets for the purchase of renewable energy, regardless of where it is generated and part of that process is negotiating contract prices. He questioned the reality of the proposed price to be paid for electricity compared to contracts other companies have.

Mr. Holmes stated that the facility in Mecklenberg County has a letter of intent to receive \$0.13 per kwh for an incineration plant and WCEG proposes the City's rate to be higher because the gasification plant will produce a clean, synthetic gas.

Council Member Besse questioned why the proposed cost for the waste to energy sale is almost four times what appears to be in current contracts.

Mr. Jones noted that it is difficult to know where the bottom line is and what the real cost of the energy produced will be because WCEG is not yet at that level of discussion, but once an agreement is in place, WCEG will have more leveraging power.

In response to Council Member Besse's question on tipping fee escalation rates, Mr. Jones stated that those fees will depend upon WCEG's negotiations with staff but it is their intent to follow trends based on a 30 year window of tipping fee rates.

Council Member Besse stated that the problem with this scenario is that the Committee is being asked to make a short term decision on a very long term, complex study. He also stated that he did not feel comfortable making a yes or no decision on an unsolicited proposal.

Mr. Holmes noted that recently, Council Member Besse and WCEG staff had a conference call with Interstate Waste Technologies (IWT) and that Council Member Besse appears to be asking the same or similar types of questions that were answered on that conference call.

Council Member Besse stated that information presented today seems to be contradictory to what was discussed during that conference call.

Mr. Holmes confirmed Mayor Joines assumption that if WCEG is able to secure the equity investment and debt service for the project, there will be approximately \$50 million in operating expenses before it sees a return on its investment and it hopes to produce approximately \$40 million from the sale of electricity at this facility. He also stated that he would prefer Committee Members present financial questions to the team that will be present at the June 19 meeting.

Chair Clark expressed concern that this could be a very time consuming process and provoke legal action by concerned citizens. He also stated that this could potentially involve years of litigation,

time spent on new zoning and approval from the State and he just wanted to clarify that this will be a lengthy process.

Mr. Jones noted that WCEG will have safeguards in place, should there be litigation, and if for any reason timelines are not met, the City can walk away from the project.

In response to Chair Clark's question regarding how far along WCEG needs to be to qualify for the tax credit, Mr. Jones stated that some type of grading or construction will need to begin by the end of this year.

Mr. Holmes noted that qualifications outside of the U.S. are much more stringent and he feels confident that this will be a smooth process due to the fact that the facility will not be putting anything into the ground or emitting anything into the air and will produce a clean, synthetic gas in a closed loop system.

In response to Chair Clark's questions regarding permitting, financing and the site owner, Mr. Holmes stated that WCEG has been working with RTP through industry partners and the issuance of bonds is not the only funding option. WCEG does have an industry partner that will build and finance the facility, but there needs to be an established timeline in place. He also stated the owner of the site will be a local legal licensed corporation and the site will be leased to a local subsidiary.

Chair Clark noted that in speaking with a representative from Duke Energy, it does appear that they negotiate on projects like this to purchase alternative energy, but there is a cap on how much they can increase the average energy bill, which is less than \$0.10 per kwh.

In response to Council Member Besse's questions regarding the project in Taunton, Massachusetts, Mr. Holmes stated that the facility is owned by industry partner IWT, and he is not sure if permits have been issued but the project is moving forward with signed waste agreements and development agreements, and it will be producing ethanol from the gasification of the MSW at the request of the city.

Council Member Besse questioned how Mr. Holmes can anticipate a completed facility in Taunton in 24 months, but is unsure if the required permits have been issued.

Mr. Holmes stated that he is confident the project will move forward to completion due to Taunton's public-private partnership with IWT.

Council Member Besse requested to know if the permits have been issued for the Taunton facility, where the applications were made, the size of the plant, the feedstock waste and the developer of the plant.

In response to Council Member Besse's statements, Mr. Holmes confirmed that IWT has never developed a plant using this technology, but they have co-developed plants with JFE Engineering in Japan. He also stated that there are no other thermoselect gasification technology facilities, other than the seven in Japan and the previous facilities in Italy and Germany that Council Member Besse

mentioned.

Chair Clark read a prepared statement noting that this is an unsolicited proposal, and it will take time to learn and understand the technology. He also noted that solid waste is a core service and issue within the City and County and any potential plans to manage it should be considered. He further noted that the C/CUC is currently undertaking a study reviewing solid waste issues and he met with the consultant from R.W. Beck in Atlanta, Georgia, whose company performs comprehensive solid waste studies. Chair Clark stated that the total cost of the proposed facility is \$400 million which is more than the City's entire five-year capital plan. He cautioned that with this type of project, once the City is at a certain point in the process, it would be costly to back out and pursue another option. He also stated that the next option will have to be a long-term solution with a reputable company that will be a partner of the City throughout the life of the facility. He further stated that the project must be environmentally feasible and obtaining permitting from the state may be the biggest hurdle of the project. A long-term contract must be signed by a major energy corporation to ensure the efficiency of the project. While Chair Clark noted that he has received conflicting information on the feasibility of the project, he has been intrigued by the project and feels that the consulting firm should include alternative technologies in their review of the City's comprehensive solid waste plan.

In response to Council Member Montgomery's question, Mr. Turner stated that the CCUC study should be completed by December.

Council Member Montgomery noted that there are still many questions unanswered but he believes the City Council should take into consideration new opportunities and pursue answers to these questions. He also noted that staff should begin discussions with local energy companies to determine purchase possibilities. He further noted that he does not want the City to become so involved that there is no turning back but ample consideration should be given to determine the feasibility of the project and any possible implications to the City of Winston-Salem.

Council Member Besse stated that in the next six months, Council Members should consider the scope of this project in terms of its size and nature of its risk. The proposed plant is more than five times the size of any facility using this process exclusively processing MSW. The only other two plants in the world outside of Japan have been shut down. He also stated that the technology should be considered as a long-term option, but it is far too early in the developmental process for the scale suggested and its proposed use for a government of this size for the exclusive handling of MSW. He does not anticipate that the City or County will pass flow control ordinances, which are a required part of this project, and its success depends upon uncertain contracts with waste haulers from outside of the County to create the full amount of waste for its anticipated daily function. After careful study, this option may very well be the preferred waste disposal technology but it is not an economically feasible proposal for the City, given its quickly approaching deadline. He further stated that he anticipates local and regional opposition to this facility due to its ambitious nature and size. Given the infeasibility of the project, he feels that the City should offer Mr. Holmes and his investors a candid response so that they may focus his energies elsewhere. Council Member Besse noted that both Los Angeles and New York City considered this technology earlier in this decade, which neither has elected to utilize, and both could have afforded for the option to fail. The City cannot afford to have a project of this magnitude fail at this anticipated cost. Council Member Besse

made a motion that the City Public Works Committee does hereby indicate its interest in having alternative technologies such as waste to energy considered as part of the CCUC's solid waste study and that the study look at what other similar communities in and outside of North Carolina are doing with waste to energy technologies. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Adams.

Council Member Taylor stated that he has weighed the proposed consequences and possible benefits of this proposal and feels that the City should at least engage in preliminary discussions. He also stated that the City Council owes it to citizens to make sure it is not passing on a potentially effective option for waste disposal.

Chair Clark noted that there are various technologies in existence and that all options should be considered. He also noted that it would entail a large commitment from the City's legal staff to begin these efforts.

Mrs. Angela I. Carmon, City Attorney, stated that the required agreements will be time consuming and that she also has questions regarding the proposed required flow control ordinance and whether or not it is consistent with case law.

Council Member Montgomery noted that staff should at least continue conversations and questioned if any of the timelines could be adjusted to meet the needs of the proposal. He also noted that staff should continue or initiate conversations on the state and larger levels so as not to begin the project from square one, rather than simply saying no.

Chair Clark noted that for WCEG to qualify for the 30% tax credit, the City would had to have already passed a flow control ordinance, site the land, complete the rezoning and have a signed contract in place by December 31.

Ms. Sally Hirsch, 1821 Bradley Street, stated that she only heard of the presentation the day before and has concerns about waste being brought into the city and county. She questioned how citizens would be involved in this process.

Chair Clark noted that if the City signs a letter of intent, the process will begin but if there is no intention of following through with the process, it would be unfair to lead on Mr. Holmes and his investors.

Council Member Besse stated that the only urgency in making a decision now is to take advantage of the federal tax credit, which expires in six months, while the truth of the matter is that there is no reasonable potential of acting on that timeline. He encouraged further study of this and other technologies to determine the best option.

The motion carried on a vote of three in favor and one in opposition. Those voting in favor of the motion were Council Members Clark, Besse and Adams, with Council Member Montgomery voting in opposition.

ADDITIONAL ITEM: REPRESENTATIVE WOMBLE'S REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL OR

REPAIRED STREETLIGHTS

Mr. Larry Womble, North Carolina State Representative, greeted the Mayor, City Manager, Council Members and staff. He congratulated the newly elected Council Members and reflected on the duties with which each member is charged. He noted that streetlights on five major streets do not adequately cover the ground for people to feel safe and secure in their communities. The streets of concern are Waughtown Street, Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, Reynolds Park Road, Sprague Street, Thomsaville Road and portions of Clemmons Road. He also noted that citizens, as well as police officers have commented that lighting in these areas is insufficient. He further noted that the issue may be resolved with upgraded lights or possibly the installation of additional lights. Representative Womble stated that he looks forward to periodic meetings with Council Members and everyone's ability to come to agreement to get bills passed. He commended Mrs. Carmon for shepherding the City Council's bills and noted that all were passed.

In response to Council Member Taylor's question, Mr. Turner confirmed that the majority of the streets mentioned are located in the Southeast Ward, and noted that staff would bring a report on this concern.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:55 p.m.