

**CITY OF MONROE
PUBLIC ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE
300 W. CROWELL STREET, MONROE, NC 28112
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2020 - 3:30 PM
AGENDA
www.monroenc.org**

1. Minutes of Public Enterprise Committee Meeting of December 17, 2019
2. Outside City Customer Water Service Request by Sybil Huntley
3. Resolution Endorsing Interlocal Agreement for Critical Intersection Analysis of Sutherland Avenue and Walkup Avenue Intersection
4. Other

Public Enterprise Committee Minutes

December 17, 2019

Conference Room

3:30 PM

Members Present: Council Member Freddie Gordon, Council Member Franco McGee and Committee Member Loretta Melancon

Members Absent: Council Member Surluta Anthony

Staff: Ashley Britt, Chris Costner, Larry Faison, Jim Loyd, David Lucore, Sarah McAllister, Mujeeb Shah-Khan, Amanda Horne, Laurie Broome, Rodrigo Diaz, Ellen Dowling

Guest: Michelle King, Matt Jones, Alex Aliyex

Council Member Franco McGee opened the meeting at 3:30 PM.

Mr. McGee said I would like to take this time to thank everyone for the opportunity to chair this committee and I do not take it for granted. He said I look forward to working with each and every one of you. Just know that if you have been asked to give data or some evaluations, just know that it is not an indictment against your services, but we are here to provide the best service for our citizens as well as making sure that we are practicing the best practices for our City. My duty that I am going to charge myself to is to make sure that we are doing that. I know that we have excellent employees and very brilliant employees so we are going to make sure that we challenge each other to be the best that we can be and I just want to make sure that I put that out there. I look forward to working with you for the next year or however long my term is.

Adoption of Minutes of the Meeting

Recommendation:

Adopt October 15, 2019 PEC meeting minutes.

Motion: Adopt October 15, 2019 PEC meeting minutes

Motion made by: Committee Member Loretta Melancon

Second: Council Member Freddie Gordon

Voting: **In Favor** – Committee Member Loretta Melancon, Council Member Freddie Gordon, and Council Member Franco McGee

Opposed – None

Action: Motion adopted

Staff Report – Littering Slogan & Optional “Welcome to” Signs

Recommendation:

Provide Staff with input and direction on slogan to be used with options “Welcome to” signs and forward to General Services Committee.

Presentation:

Jim Loyd, Engineering Director, introduced this item by saying the Public Enterprise Committee meeting on October 15, 2019 took two actions related to littering. First, the Committee directed Staff to proceed with obtaining an encroachment agreement from NC DOT for standalone “No Littering” signs to be placed 100 feet after the optional “Welcome to Monroe” signs at the major entry points into the corporate limits. The six initial locations include US 74 West, US 74 East, US 601 North, US 601 South, NC 200 North and Lancaster Avenue (SR3515). Signs for the remaining entry points into Monroe will occur within 12 months of the completion of the first six. This approach allows completion by Engineering Staff using the department’s current operating budget without requiring a budget amendment by City Council.

The second action was that Staff was directed to work with Loretta and Litter Busters of Union County to recommend a slogan that could be included in conjunction with the optional “Welcome to” signs. On November 20, 2019, Engineering met in the Conference Room with Loretta and several members of Litter Busters, along with various members of City Staff. The City currently has 18 optional “Welcome to Monroe” signs placed at entry points into Monroe with all being on NC DOT maintained streets. In your packet you have a map that shows the locations. The red dots indicate the major entry points into Monroe at US 601 North, US 601 South, US 74 West, US 74 East, NC 200 North and Lancaster Ave. The six locations bear slogans recognizing various high school sport achievements. In accordance with the NC DOT Policy W-17 – Standard Practice for Optional “Welcome to” Signs stipulates that signs with slogans are limited to two slogans with a maximum of three lines of copy. The sports teams at the six locations that are currently in place have three lines of copy so if we placed a litter slogan at those locations then those signs would need to come down and be replaced. With the understanding that a litter slogan placed at the current locations recognizing the sports team would eliminate this ability, the group decided early in the discussion that the litter slogan would be proposed for the remaining 12 locations that do not have a supplemental sign placed in conjunction with the optional “Welcome to” signs.

The group identified several options for the slogans and the group selected the “Litter Stops with You” slogan due to its brevity as related to highway speeds and the to-the-point statement.

I would like to point out that there was still an opportunity to add an additional slogan on the supplemental sign not to exceed two lines of copy in conjunction with the litter slogan if we so choose. This may be something that the Committee desires to discuss as well. Since the General Services Committee has handled the optional “Welcome to” signs process in the past, Staff recommends presenting findings of the Public Enterprise Committee to them as part of the approval process.

Just for reference, if you wanted to put another supplemental litter sign underneath that, we could go with “Where Heartland Meets High Tech”. That is part of the City’s current logo and usually that is what you see at these sign locations is something that reflects the City as a whole. Mr. McGee said I like that. I think that it is clean and “Where Heartland Meets High Tech” is already included in the sign so I think it works. Ms. Melancon said I do not know if we want to repeat that in a separate sign “Where Heartland Meets High Tech”. Mujeeb Shah-Khan, City Attorney, said that is the City slogan and that is not a separate sign. Ms. Melancon said oh ok, were you suggesting that we put as a separate sign. Mr. Loyd said I did say that we put it separate to make it more visual but that is just an option. Mr. McGee said I like that though as its clean and simple.

Ms. Melancon said is this the time for me to speak up to an idea that I have or should I wait. Mr. Loyd said I am done with my presentation. Mr. McGee said yes, go ahead. Ms. Melancon said someone had suggested, and it’s listed in some of these ideas, “Litter Not Welcomed” and you know that hit me as maybe the next thing after “Welcome to Monroe” and then below that “Litter Not Welcomed” and then “Litter Stops with You”. I am just throwing that out there. Mr. McGee said I personally like it how it is,

I think it is clean and simple, and I think that the message is clear. It really puts the ownership on the individual to be cognizant about their position so I like it personally. Ms. Melancon said yeah, I tend to want to say more, but sometimes more would get in way of the big message. Mr. Loyd said well we are going to have these additional signs 100 feet past that say “Do Not Litter”, so it is going to be repeated. Mr. Gordon said I will have to ask for clarification on that. What are you saying, that another sign recognizing to not litter will be within 100 feet of this? Mr. Loyd said yes. Mr. Gordon said I do not believe that is in this packet or I missed it. Ms. Melancon said yeah I do not think it is in here. Mr. Loyd brought it up on the screen. Mr. Gordon said yes, so that is going to be within 100 feet of this sign. Well that obviously gives it reinforcement. Sadly, I think that you could put up a thousand of those signs. It could not get any more obvious than this, and I hope and pray that they will read it and pay some attention to it. I would agree with Franco. I like that “Litter Stops with You”. It is simple and easy and brings it to their attention and then they are going to see this “Do Not Litter” sign 100 feet from it. That is about all we can say I think.

Mr. Loyd said are there any thoughts on an additional supplemental sign. Mr. McGee said I like that one fine personally. Good job on that.

Motion: Recommend that the “Welcome to Monroe” and “Litter Stops with You” signage be forwarded to General Services Committee for further actions.

Motion made by: Committee Member Loretta Melancon

Second: Council Member Freddie Gordon

Voting: In Favor – Council Member Freddie Gordon, Council Member Franco McGee, and Committee Member Loretta Melancon

Opposed - None

Action: Motion approved

Staff Report – EMH Imports Request for Sidewalk Waiver

Recommendation:

Engineering Staff recommends installation of the 10-foot wide multi-use path associated with EMH Imports site development as per the requirements of the Standard Specifications and Detail Manual.

Presentation:

Sarah McAllister, Engineer, introduced this item by saying this is a request for laying a sidewalk on Highway 74 at a property near the northwestern corporate limits. There is a letter attached from Matt Jones, who is here, for the request. The reasons cited are excessive grading and impacts to their current storm water design for the parcel. They also make mention of future U-turn that has been recently been constructed at intersection to Rocky River Road and Highway 74.

Sidewalks are required along existing arterial and collector streets as a development requirement based on a list of streets identified in our Manual. We accomplished that in September 2018 in keeping with participation and pedestrian enhancements to the US 74 widening project. As far as that project, US 74 will be widened from 4 lanes to 6 lanes between Dickerson Boulevard and Rocky River Road. An 8-foot sidewalk will be installed on the north side of US 74 from Secrest Shortcut to Fowler Secrest Road and a 10-foot wide multiuse path (MUP) will be installed along the south side in that same area. The completion of those improvements and the western most corporate limits would then be completed by in-fill development such as EMH Imports.

As proposed, the site development requires approximately 128-linear-feet of 10-foot wide MUP. We have estimated those costs at less than \$15,000 inclusive of any required storm drain work. We have a few pictures in your packet of the area. They provided a sketch of the area also. It appears that the sidewalk could be placed at the back side of the existing ditch in the area. Our ultimate recommendation is that the sidewalk be installed. Ultimately, the City would complete sections of existing developed lots to provide connectivity when it does not connect.

Discussion:

Mr. McGee said what is the actual location of this. Ms. McAllister said its north of Goodwill. Mr. Loyd said that we were feeling that the sidewalk could be placed on the backside of the ditch. Mr. Gordon said and that would be a MUP. Mr. Loyd said yes, that would be a MUP. Ms. McAllister said the south side of US 74 is a 10-foot MUP and then the north side is an 8-foot sidewalk. Mr. Gordon said so we have a path on one side and a sidewalk on the other. Ms. McAllister said yes, that is what we will have when NC DOT widens US 74. Mr. McGee said so will a path be along US 74 on that side throughout. Ms. McAllister said it would from Secrest Shortcut to Fowler Secrest Road so it stops just short of it. Fowler Secrest is the next signal headed westbound. Mr. Gordon said I hate playing ignorance but I am ignorant so let me understand this problem, this really does not have anything to do with the widening of 74. Ms. McAllister said no, just the requirements are keeping with what will be coming for the property. Mr. Gordon said I get all that, but again let me just understand where exactly this is. Is it somewhere between Secrest Shortcut and Fowler Secrest? Ms. McAllister said no sir, it is west of that. Mr. Gordon said and it is before Rocky River. Ms. McAllister said yes sir it's just prior to it. Ms. McAllister said here is the gas station at Rocky River and US 74, the Goodwill, and then this property. Mr. Gordon said is this company there in business at that location. Ms. McAllister said no they are trying to get plans approved so that they can redevelop there. The redevelopment is what prompted the requirement. Mr. Loyd said the sidewalk and the MUP is part of our Development Requirements in our Detail Manual. Mr. Gordon said so this path is ultimately going to be on the north side and the sidewalk on the south. Ms. McAllister said no the path would ultimately be on the south side and the 8-foot wide sidewalk would be on the north. Mr. McGee said the 8-foot wide would go from there all the way down to? Ms. McAllister said it stops at Fowler Secrest Road. The improvements as part of the US 74 widening will stop right at John Moore and Fowler Secrest. Mr. Loyd said and then the plan was for the remaining pedestrian improvements be completed by in-fill development so that area is part of that. We are currently participating in the section from Secrest Shortcut out to John Moore Road at an estimated cost of \$360,000 to provide these pedestrian enhancements. Mr. Gordon said do we have a timeline on that. Ms. McAllister said I believe it was slightly delayed because of DOT's funding issue but it should be within the next 5 years. Mr. Gordon said yeah, I have heard that one before too. Mr. Loyd said it is in the STIP. Mr. Gordon said the only thing that I can say about it is I do not think that we have ever had a property owner that did not come forward and want this exception and also it is pretty far out, as in we might be talking about another lifetime. We just granted one to somebody at the last meeting didn't we. Mr. Loyd said you may be referencing earlier this year regarding Rocky River Road at Union Power. Mr. Gordon said I have gone through this myself personally, I built the sidewalk, and it has not ever been connected but maybe it could be at some point.

Mr. Franco said are we requiring all new development to have sidewalks. Mr. Loyd said yes. Ms. McAllister said there is a list of streets in our Detail Manual and if it is listed on those streets then yes. Mr. McGee said plus I think it makes us even more pedestrian friendly. At least we are encouraging people to get outside on the sidewalks and right now we do not have any, so I am for any sidewalks throughout our city.

Ms. Melancon said and Engineering accepts what is said in hardships #1, 2 and 3 and what they are saying will happen to their property is so as a result of going through with the plan. Ms. McAllister said we are not really identifying that those are extreme hardships and that the path can be constructed at

around \$15,000. Mr. Shah-Khan said Staff is saying it does not in their opinion rate to a hardship and it is fair to say that Staff does not agree. Mr. Loyd said that we went out to look at the area and we made an estimate of what we felt like it would cost to do the improvements and we felt like it could be less than \$15,000.

Mr. Gordon said ok let me ask you this question, the applicant wants to omit this path at this time at least until work is done along 74 so is that about completed. Mr. Loyd said that area is completed. Mr. Gordon said you do not really have any way of holding their feet to the fire to put that there in the future when the State and path does come that way. Ms. McAllister said if we delayed it now it would on the City probably as an existing developed lot if we need to connect it. We would not have any manor to require the property owner to install it then.

Ms. Melancon said so would it be automatic if this Committee said that we agree with their potential hardships and would the City then be liable for the \$15,000 or the owner of the property would be paying that fee. Mr. Loyd said that would be the developers cost on that lot. We established these standards for sidewalks to increase pedestrian friendliness along our roadways, we will make a big step forward with the improvements on US 74, and we have also in the past gotten approval for improving the sidewalk on Charlotte Avenue. One way that helps is to have development pay their share of the cost and if not then the City would have to pick up the tab. Ms. Melancon said so bottom line is that Staff does not feel that any of their points are valid so to speak in terms of what they are calling hardship. Mr. Loyd said we do not agree with their points. Mr. Shah-Khan said I recommend you say that Staff does not agree to the degree that they contend is a hardship. Staff recognizes the points but not that it is going to create the level of hardship.

Ms. Melancon said well I trust our Engineering Departments evaluation and I am willing to make the motion to forward the recommendation to Council for installation of the 10-foot wide MUP. Mr. Shah-Khan said actually you do not need to do that. Essentially, they are requesting a waiver. If you take no action, then they have to act in accordance with the Manual. You can affirmatively say that you agree with Staff's recommendation but there is nothing that you need to be forward to Council unless you agree with the owner and then there would be a waiver. If you agree with Staff, then you don't need to take any action or you could vote to say that the Committee agrees with Staff's recommendation, period. Ms. Melancon said I am willing to say that I make the motion that this Committee agrees with Staff with regards to their recommendation. Mr. Gordon said I will second it with heartache. I feel their pain but I will have to second this motion.

Motion: Motion that this Committee agrees with Staff's recommendation with regards to the MUP associated with EMH Imports site development as per the requirements of the Standard Specifications and Detail Manual.

Motion made by: Committee Member Loretta Melancon

Second: Council Member Freddie Gordon

Voting: In Favor – Council Member Freddie Gordon, Council Member Franco McGee, and Committee Member Loretta Melancon

Opposed - None

Action: Motion approved

Staff Report – Proposed Pavement Resurfacing Contract Increase

Recommendation:

Motion to forward recommendation to Council for 1) Authorizing a future change order not to exceed the remaining budgeted amount of \$143,686.20 for the 2019-2020 Asphalt Paving Program contract with Lynches River Contracting with total project costs increasing from \$1,144,083.80 not to exceed \$1,287,770.00 and 2) Authorizing City Manager to execute the change order on behalf of the City of Monroe.

Presentation:

Sarah McAllister, Engineer, introduced this item by saying the Asphalt Paving Program was awarded to Lynches River in October 2019. There is still a little over \$143,000 remaining in the budget. The bid came in a little below the estimate, so we are proposing to add 2 additional streets. Per our contract, we have a right to increase the asphalt tonnage up to 25%, which we are staying at that threshold.

Staff proposes to add Hound Run Court which is in the Fox Hunt neighborhood and Waterview Lane which is in Village Lake neighborhood to that contract. We will clear this with the other Utility Departments to make sure there are no pending projects on those streets.

The contingency allowance of \$50,000 that was awarded in October will remain in place. The contract time does not change, they will get no additional time, and they agreed to that.

We are asking that you recommend that the City Manager be able to execute the change order and that it not exceed the existing budgeted amount.

Discussion:

Mr. Gordon said out of curiosity, do you still have in place a survey and a priority and these 2 are next on the list. Ms. McAllister said yes.

Motion: Motion to forward recommendation to Council for 1) Authorizing a future change order not to exceed the remaining budgeted amount of \$143,686.20 for the 2019-2020 Asphalt Paving Program contract with Lynches River Contracting with total project costs increasing from \$1,144,083.80 not to exceed \$1,287,770.00 and 2) Authorizing City Manager to execute the change order on behalf of the City of Monroe.

Both Motions made by: Council Member Freddie Gordon

Second: Committee Member Loretta Melancon

Voting: In Favor – Council Member Freddie Gordon, Council Member Franco McGee, and Committee Member Loretta Melancon

Opposed - None

Action: Both Motions approved

Staff Report – Electric Rate Comparison

Recommendation:

No Committee action required. Presentation is for informational purposes only.

Presentation:

David Lucore, Energy Services Director, introduced this item by saying if the Committee will indulge me a minute to get into the computer and bring this up on the screen so you could see. I apologize, as I was not expecting this large crowd so I do not think I brought enough packets. Amanda Horne, Water Resources Administrative Assistant II, said would you like me to hand them out for you. Mr. Lucore said yes, would you please, thank you.

Okay, this is not working so I will just go from the handout. We have had a lot of questions regarding electric rates and how our rates compare to other Electric Utilities so in that regard I was asked to bring you a presentation on where are rates stand and how we determine them.

On the first page is how we determine electric bills. Basically, every electric device used in your home consumes electricity. The consumption varies based on the device, with your major users being your heating and air, water heaters, stove, and dryer. Larger appliances consume more electricity. Consumption is measured in kilowatts used per hour and can be calculated using voltage and amperage. Voltage on electricity is basically the pressure that pushes the current through and amperage is the flow of the energy. There will not be a test but I am just throwing all this out here to get you interested. A kilowatt is the unit of electric power. If you take 1 volt times 1 amp we get 1 watt. The prefix kilo is for 1,000 so a kilowatt is basically 1,000 watts. If you use 1 kilowatt for 1 hour, then you get 1 kilo-watt-hour.

To determine your electric bill, if you took a 100-watt lightbulb and it burned for 10 hours you would take 100 watts' times 10 and that would be 1,000 watt-hours. To turn that into kilo-watt-hours (kWh) you would divide that by 1,000 so that is 1 kilo-watt-hour. So one 100-watt lightbulb burning for 10 hours is 1 kilo-watt-hour. The electric meter measures all of the consumption in your business or home or whatever. That is basically how we determine the amount of energy each customer is consuming. When an electric meter is first installed, the reading is taken from that meter. When it is a brand new meter it is all zeros but it may not be a brand new meter, we may have one that we took from somewhere else, but whatever that reading is that number is recorded in Billing and then at the next billing cycle that meter is read and they subtract the original reading from that and that is the consumption in that time period. Typically, every 30 days that process continues and that is how the customer is billed.

If you look at the residential electric rates it is consisting of a basic facilities charge of \$12.00. Then there is the energy charge and it is a tiered rate. The first 300 kWh's are billed at \$0.122 per kWh, the next 700 kWh's is \$0.1149 and then anything over 1,000 kWh's is still \$0.1149. The sales tax is 7% currently and that is state mandated. There is a REPS charge, which is Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards (REPS) that we are required to collect as our share of making the planet a better place to live. Any questions on any of that. Mr. Gordon said I am glad we got that declining rate so I can tell my wife that the less I use the more it costs. Mr. Lucore said yep; let's see how that goes over. Mr. Gordon said I do not think she will believe it but I will tell her anyway.

Ms. Melancon said how about that REPS charge. We are required to collect that but where does it go. Does it stay in our pockets or does it go to the State? Mr. Lucore said that goes to the State. Ms. Melancon said oh, and what do they do with it. Mr. Lucore said that is a question you would have to ask the State. Basically, it is there to promote renewal energy.

Mr. Lucore said on the next slide is a chart of the typical home energy consumption and it is broken down into several different components. If you will notice that the biggest thing to take away from this slide is that heating and cooling accounts for 43% of your residential home energy usage. When you are looking at how do I reduce my energy usage, look for the largest consumers first and see what you can do to eliminate how often and how much you use. Next on the listing is water heating and then lighting. Some

of the other things listed are appliances, computer, electronics and refrigerators. Those are less consumers than the other things.

There are many factors that affect the amount of energy each customer uses. I know one of the complaints that I've heard recently was that I have an 800-square-foot apartment and my electric bill is \$241 and it's ridiculous and I have friends that live in Charlotte in a bigger apartment and their bill is less than mine and this can't be right; the City is gauging me. Has anyone ever heard anything like that? Well in that particular incident I pulled up the customer's bill and recognized right away the \$241 was the total bill sent by the City of Monroe, which includes all utilities and the electric portion of that was \$123, so that kind of changes the narrative just a little bit. A lot of times that is what we see is that the customer will see that they get this bill from the City of Monroe and it's my electric bill and it's \$241 and start calling and complaining. The biggest factors that contribute to large energy usage in homes, especially apartments, is the age and insulation properties of the buildings. Particularly in apartment buildings you see this because it is a business, so they are going to build them as quickly and cheaply as they can to get customers in there to pay the rent and that's how they make their money, so they may not be as concerned to put good insulation in there to make it as energy efficient as it could be. That is what we see, especially with older homes, some of the historic homes were built without any insulation, so basically every time your heat comes on it's just going through the walls, the windows, the ceiling and you are dissipating a lot of heat and it's causing the heater to work harder to keep that space warm.

Mr. McGee said what is a good time frame that we can pretty much tell if the house has been built more efficiently than others; what years would you say. Mr. Lucore said if you go back to the Energy Crunch in the mid to late 70s, people were riding to gas stations and depending on what your license plate was depended on what day you could get gas, and at that point there was a push to start creating more energy efficient buildings, homes, businesses or whatever. From that point forward, things have continually improved as far the rating on your heating and cooling units as it used to be like an 8 and now it is more like a 15 or 16. The standards have come up to where newer things have to be built more energy efficient, but the older residences were not built under those standards.

Mr. Lucore said let us move on to thermostat settings. This is important because a lot of people do not understand this. What kind of heat do you have in your home or apartment; is it a heat pump versus an electric heating unit, is it gas or oil or whatever. The difference between a heat pump and electric and oil units is with a heat pump you do not want to adjust the thermostat continuously. If you leave in the morning, you drop the thermostat back thinking you are conserving energy and then you get home at night and bump it up, every time you move the thermostat 5-degrees one way or another it is a significant change and makes that heating pump unit work harder, especially in the winter time. A heat pump uses the theory that every bit of air contains some heat. They are predominant in the southern sections of the country because a heat pump can only raise the temperature in the house 50-degrees higher than it is outside, so when you get extreme cold weather, you have to have some other source of heat for the heat pump to produce enough heat in your home, so they have electric heat strips in there that will kick on. Anytime you bump the heat up 5-degrees from the setting, those heat strips kick on and they consume a lot of energy. That is an issue if you have a heat pump and if your customers are complaining about their energy bill, that is one of the first things we tell them, that if you are on a heat pump then you want to set it and forget it, just let it go. Heat pumps use a lot of air and circulates a lot of air throughout the day continuously and keeps the home at a specific temperature. That is a lot different than a gas heater as when the gas fires up it heats until it heats to a specific temperature and then it cuts off. That is one of the main factors when people complain about how high their bill is, what kind of heat do you use and what is the temperature that you have it set on. In the winter, I have personally been to people's homes as part of my job in years past, and when they open the door it just about singes my eyebrows off because it was so hot inside and these are some of the same people that complain about how high their electric bill is. If you change your habits and how you set your thermostat, then you could improve your energy efficiency.

Other things to consider are if you have an electric hot water heater then you want to keep it between 120-140-degrees as that is about all you need in a home and anything higher than that will cause you to pay more for your electric bill. If you turn your thermostat down 6-degrees you can save up to 20% on your heating bill, so if you are at 72 and you move it down 6-degrees you could save some energy that way. A lot of people do not like to do that, especially people that are elderly or sick, and it is a personal preference but it is an option. Put on a sweatshirt and you can save some money on your electric bill. Make sure your air vents are not blocked restricting the air flow. This includes your air intake as well. Change your filters on a routine monthly basis as all the dust and particles in your home are sucked into that intake and clogs that filter up which restricts the flow into the pump and that causes it to burn more energy to suck the air through all that dirt. Repair leaky faucets, especially on the hot water side. If you have a faucet that is dripping all day long and it is on the hot water side, then you are losing hot water out of your water heater which means that the water in the heater is going to come down and the water heater is going to kick on to heat it back on. Turn off lights and appliances when they are not in use. Clean your dryer vent annually. This is one that I hadn't really thought about until recently, but my wife kept complaining about how long it took to dry towels, like 2 hours to get them dry, well that is a red flag so I went to looking and cleaned out my dryer vent and you would not believe the pile of lint that came out of that thing, but once I cleaned that out man clothes would dry in half the time they used to. If you have a clogged up dryer vent, then your dryer is going to use more energy trying to dry your clothes. Of course, if you hang your clothes outside to dry that will save your energy bill.

Ok, enough with that let us move on to rate comparisons to other electric utilities. Now you can look at other utilities and say well on our first tier we are charging \$0.122 per kWh, well I know ABC company over here is only charging \$0.008 per kWh, they have a better rate than the City of Monroe. Well that does not tell you the whole story. Now if you go to the basic charges and the tiers, what they indicate as a \$0.008 per kWh rate may not exactly equate to our energy bill. So what I did here to get a good comparison is take a typical 1,000 kWh consumption for a 30-day period and using the information from the different utility companies, I calculated what the bill would be on that 1,000 kWh. On the next page we have Monroe's cost at the top in bold and then the other cities in the area and what that cost would be for that same 1,000 kWh's in a month time. The far right column is the difference as compared to Monroe's cost. As you can see, with all the other cities polled, plus the Union Power Coop, we are competitive. I think Maiden was the biggest difference as they are \$8.19 cheaper than Monroe would be. There are a lot of factors that go into that, such as the size of the utility, how many customers they have, etc. A lot of factors go into creating our electric rates and that gives you an idea of how we stack up to the other cities in our area. Mr. Gordon said just out of curiosity, what would you say is Maiden's biggest advantage over us then and the reason they are cheaper. Mr. Lucore said Maiden is a very small town, they only have about 1,000 to 1,500 customers so they do not have the expenses to maintain the system that we have.

Larry asked me to include this information for your knowledge as well. As far as wholesale power cost projections, we get projections from where we get our electricity from and that is North Carolina Municipality Power Agency #1 (NCMPA1) and they provide us with what they project our rate will be. There are no rate increases projected for 2019 or 2020, however every year between 2021 and 2031, they are showing a 2% increase each year. So if you take that whole time period that is a \$10,156,815.61 increase in our energy costs an average of \$1,015,681.56 or 9.45% annually. In order to maintain the same margin between our revenues and our expenses, the City would have to increase or revenue which means we will have to increase our utility rate by 2% every year to keep up with the rising cost of wholesale power. What we have done is create a Rate Stabilization Fund that we are depositing money into so that we can offset increases in this Wholesale Power Costs through 2031. As we move forward, one of the things we try to do in Monroe is to keep our electric rates as stable as possible. We don't like to see big spikes up, so to minimize that we'll take some of the revenues that we got this year and previous years and put them in this Rate Stabilization Fund and build the fund up to the point where as these Wholesale Power Costs increases begin we can pay that with that money and not have to raise

electric rates. The Catawba Nuclear Power Facility is where we get our electricity from and part of our rate is based on the debt service on that facility. The debt service is scheduled to be retired in 2032. So when we get to 2032 and the debt services are paid, we should see a significant decrease in our Wholesale Power Costs that we can then pass on to our customers. As long as I have been in Monroe, I have been with Monroe for 30 years and we have been part of this Catawba Nuclear Power Facility the entire time that I have been here, the original projection was 2020 was going to pay the debt on this station. Things change over the years, some of things are the Fukushima meltdown, 3-Mile Island, and anytime something like that happens at a nuclear facility the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) says you need to update your plant so that this doesn't happen here, so through all that time we were hit with a lot of increased costs to upgrade that station to bring it up to new standards, so over the years it didn't work out. If we would have stayed on schedule with the 2020 payoff date, we would have had to increase our electric rates significantly in the double digits just to keep up with that debt service payment, so it was refinanced to extend it out to 2032 again with that methodology to keep things stable and not have large increases.

On the next page I have a graph that basically shows our revenues. Our revenues have been somewhat flat. We have not seen significant increases in revenues. They have basically stayed level. The green line is the revenue projections for 2020-2030 and if we keep with about the same amount of revenues that we have in today, compared with the power cost in blue with 2% each year, our power cost is getting closer and closer to our revenues. Our gross margin is in the orange and you can see it decreasing. In order to offset that, that is why we have this Rate Stabilization Funding. On the next page you can see if we did not have that fund, this would be how much we would need to increase our electric retail rates to keep up with the rising cost of wholesale power. So each year there would be a significant increase to maintain the same margin.

This year the NCMPA1 got to looking at everything that they have charged all the cities over the years. Part of our payments have been placed in what they call an Excess Capital Fund and the Excess Capital Fund was used to help pay some of the additions and improvements. They have been collecting these funds for years from all the city participants. They got to a point where that fund was significantly larger than what they felt they needed to keep on hand, so that was brought before the Board of Commissioners and they said what do you want us to do with this money. What they ended up doing was taking half of that money and paying it toward debt that we already have and taking the other half of that money and distributing it back to the cities based on the percentage of ownership in the NCMPA1. Monroe's ownership is approximately 10%. In August of this year, we did receive a refund in the amount of \$8,866,032. With that money we put a little less than half of that in the Rate Stabilization Fund and we put the other remaining amount in a Capital Project Fund. Both of those amounts will be used to maintain our electric rates offsetting any increases that we would have seen.

On the last page are the electric retail rate recommendations. We are in a very stable situation as far as looking out the next 10 years. For the next foreseeable future, we should not have to raise electric rates. We are doing things now to prepare for increased costs down the road. The recommendation would be to maintain what we are doing. I would be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. Gordon said has our situation as compared to some of the Coop's, or maybe some people that are not a member of that NCMPA1, differed from them. What kind of shape do you think that they are in? Mr. Lucore said I will say this as tactfully as I can, there are a lot of other cities in the state that own and operate an electric system that have not been good stewards with their system. They have Councils that have robbed those funds for years and have used them for General Fund items to improve their communities and have left them in a very precarious situation. Not all of the cities that own their electric systems in the Western part of the state bought into the Power Agency. Some of them are wholesale customers with Duke Energy and some of those are on this list and they are competitive with our costs as well. You really have to get into the specifics of each city, what their revenues are and what their fund

balance is before you can actually say how it is. We are doing a lot better than most cities, I will say that, and that is a result of 30 years of Mr. Don Mitchell and his vision and foresight in getting us to this point. Mr. McGee said as usual Mr. Lucore, we appreciate the awesome presentation. You are always very thorough which I had no doubt and I really appreciate this. Is there any way that we could make this public where we put a little bit out there so that if people have questions we can share either on our website or maybe a couple of the pages on our Facebook page? I love the page you have here with the energy saving tips and I think that is great information to know and just anything like that I think would be helpful, just so if customers have a concern we can direct them to this information on our website and our Facebook page. Mr. Lucore said yes, we can do that.

Other:

Chris Costner, Engineering Manager, said the Engineering Department would like to introduce Ellen Dowling. She is the Engineering Departments Environmental Educator. She has been with us for about 3 weeks now.

Laurie Broom, Solid Waste Coordinator, said we also have Rodrigo Diaz. He is the new Solid Waste Technician. He has been with Solid Waste since November 4th.

Mr. McGee said also I would like to welcome our guest Ms. Michelle King. Thank you for visiting with us. Do you have anything that you would like to say? Michelle King said this is great and I do agree that the information is very helpful and as much as you can share these tips with other is very helpful. This is great to share with citizens. Thank you for having me and I am delighted that we have the litter signs and I think it looks clean and nice.

Ms. Melancon said I don't know if this is the place to bring up this concern that this is in fact my last meeting. The rules say that I cannot do more than 2 full terms, I have to set out a year, and then I can apply again. So right now there is this big blank for a citizen. Since applications were taken, I guess it is more than a month ago, is there any chance that someone can make a late application. Mr. Shah-Khan said no. The Council has made the process very clear. It is up to the Council, and I know I mentioned this to you in an email, it is up to the Council as to whether there are citizen members on the Committees and that was a decision made by the Council at one point in time and it would be up to the Council whether or not they wish to continue that but they are not obliged to. Currently there are three Council Members to this Committee and the Council would make the decision on whether or not to appoint citizen members so it would be up to them. The Citizens Appointment Committee meets in I believe in February and it would be up to them and the Council to decide whether or not it is appropriate to have citizen members on this or any other committee. In fact the only citizens we have on the committees are your expiring position and then on the Public Safety Committee and General Services Committee. Ms. Melancon said somewhere along the line I think you explained or I read that the general codes, rules, ordinances allow up to 9 citizen members on committees but that again has to be at the discretion of this committee that chooses. Mr. Shah-Khan said no ma'am it is at the discretion of the Council. Ms. Melancon said the Council. Mr. Shah-Khan said the Council and we would note that having nine citizen members in addition to a mayoral committee is something that we would discuss thoroughly with the Council because one of the concerns you have seen within your time of just having four members on the committee, is it has been difficult to have a quorum. If you then have up to 12 members, then getting 7 to be present would be a lot tougher, so those are considerations that would be up to the Council. Ms. Melancon said so, I have been encouraging several people that I think highly of to consider replacing me. At this point, the approach would be to submit an application to the Citizens Appointment Committee. Mr. Shah-Khan said, no ma'am, it would be to the Clerk's office and then they are required when they submit the application however, the Citizens Appointment Committee made it very clear that folks that wish to apply must attend a committee meeting. So if they are going to apply then they should go ahead

and attend the next meeting in January, if they wish to apply after that then they should submit an application to the Clerk's office and if the committee and Council wishes to fill that spot and add that member then it is up to them. Ms. Melancon said ok, I think I have it. Thank you very much. Mr. McGee said I would like to thank you for serving. Ms. Melancon said oh you are welcomed and it has been my pleasure. I have learned so much and it makes me love my city even more. All of this started with that darn Citizens Academy and it just got me fired up. Ms. Melancon said thank you all, especially Mujeeb and Larry and their patience with me because boy did I feel like a fish out of water to begin with.

Recommendation: Adjourn meeting at 4:40 PM

Motion: Adjourn meeting

Motion made by: Council Member Freddie Gordon

Second: Committee Member Loretta Melancon

Voting: In Favor – Council Member Freddie Gordon, Council Member Franco McGee, and Committee Member Loretta Melancon

Opposed - None

Action: Approved

Next Meeting – January 21, 2020 3:30 PM

Respectfully submitted by:

Amanda Horne

Water Resources Administrative Assistant II



STAFF REPORT

TO: Public Enterprise Committee

VIA: E.L. Faison, City Manager

DATE: February 18, 2020

FROM: Russell Colbath, Water Resources Director

SUBJECT: Outside City Water Service Request, 2202 Whitestore Road

SUMMARY STATEMENT

The Public Enterprise Committee is requested to consider a request for outside city water service at 2202 Whitestore Road.

REVIEW

Water Resources Department Staff has received a request from Sybil Huntley at 2202 Whitestore Road for outside City water service. This is an existing home that wants to convert from well supply to city water supply. City sewer service is not available in this area. This property is not a good candidate for voluntary annexation.

All outside City service requests require both City Council approval, and Union County Board of Commissioner (UCBC) approval pursuant to City Ordinances and the Water and Sewer Master Agreement with Union County. The UCBC approved this request at their meeting on January 6, 2020. As a matter of policy, outside city water and sewer customers pay double tap fees and double monthly customer base charges on their city accounts.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Public Enterprise Committee take the following actions:

Motion to approve outside city water service to Parcel 09-125-058, 2202 Whitestore Road, for one new single family home, OR Motion to deny said service request.

Motion to forward to City Council consent agenda for approval of outside city water and sewer service to Parcel 09-125-058, 2202 Whitestore Road, OR Motion to deny said service request.



STAFF REPORT

TO: Public Enterprise Committee

VIA: E.L. Faison, City Manager

DATE: February 18, 2020

FROM: James N. Loyd, Jr., P.E., Engineering Director

PREPARED BY: Sarah McAllister, P.E. – Land Development & Infrastructure Engineer

SUBJECT: Critical Intersection Analysis – Sutherland Avenue and Walkup Avenue

SUMMARY STATEMENT

The Public Enterprise Committee is provided information regarding an update to the 2019 Union County Critical Intersection Analysis and is requested to consider recommending City Council enter into an Interlocal Agreement with Union County for the analysis of the Sutherland Avenue and Walkup Avenue intersection.

REVIEW

Engineering Staff has been working with Bjorn Hansen, Transportation Planner with Union County, along with representatives from the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and staff from other municipalities within Union County on the 2019 Union County Critical Intersection Analysis. The intent was to identify locations throughout the county that have experienced congestion and safety issues, provide a further evaluation based on existing data, and narrow the list to those that would be most competitive for funding through the NCDOT and/or the Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO).

As previously presented at the June 18, 2019 and July 16, 2019 Public Enterprise Committee Meetings, the County applied for and received planning funds through CRTPO for six intersections late in 2019 that were identified through the critical intersection analysis process. The intersection of Sutherland Avenue, a municipal street, and Walkup Avenue, a State secondary roadway (SR 1751), was one of the six intersections selected for further study. The County has since entered into a contract with RS&H to provide an analysis of each intersection. The cost per intersection

is \$25,000 with Union County providing an overall match of 10% for the total project and each municipality providing a 10% match for the intersection(s) located within their jurisdiction to total the 20% match required by the CRTPO grant. Based on the total of 6 intersections to be studied, the total project cost is \$150,000 with CRTPO funding of \$120,000, Union County's 10 percent match of \$15,000 and each municipality responsible for \$2,500 per intersection located in their jurisdiction. A listing of the overall intersections to be studied is provided in the attached. The end product will be a recommendation on the type of improvements needed for the intersection along with a construction cost estimate for those improvements. RS&H plans to advertise and hold public meetings during the month of March to solicit public input on the initial concepts for each intersection. All recommendations are anticipated to be completed by June 2020.

Union County has provided an Interlocal Agreement for the project which includes the City's \$2,500 participation toward to the required match for the grant. A copy of the Interlocal Agreement is provided along with a Resolution supporting the agreement. Sufficient funds are available in the Engineering Department's operating accounts to cover the \$2,500 required match.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the Resolution (R-2020-20) endorsing the Interlocal Agreement with Union County and authorization of the City Manager to execute the agreement. If the Public Enterprise is in agreement, the Resolution (R-2020-20) endorsing the Interlocal Agreement and authorization of the City Manager will be placed on the March 3rd consent agenda for approval.

Attachments:

Resolution Endorsing Interlocal Agreement
Interlocal Agreement with Union County
Listing of Intersections to be studied

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT

COUNTY OF UNION

THIS AGREEMENT, is made and entered into this the ____ day of _____, 2019, by and between Union County (the "County") and the City of Monroe (the "Municipality") (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Parties").

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the County was awarded a grant from the Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization ("CRTPO") for a critical intersection analysis that will study certain traffic intersections in Union County, including certain intersection(s) in the Municipality, in order to consider future intersection improvements and other transit planning (the "Grant"); and

WHEREAS, the Grant will allow for a consultant to perform the critical intersection analysis study and produce a subsequent report (the "Study"); and

WHEREAS, CRTPO will give the County One Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$120,000) in reimbursed cost under the Grant, with an additional Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000) required under the Grant as a local government required match (the "Match"); and

WHEREAS, County will contribute at least Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000) toward the Match; and

WHEREAS, the Municipality has agreed to contribute Two Thousand, Five Hundred Dollars (\$2,500) toward the Match due to the Study including intersection(s) within the Municipality's limits for study; and

WHEREAS, the County will engage a consultant to perform the Study, with CRTPO reimbursing the County through the Grant for the costs of the Study up to One Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$120,000); and

WHEREAS, this Agreement is made under the authority of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 160A-460 et seq.

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements hereinafter set forth, the parties hereto do each contract and agree with the other as follows:

1. The term of this Agreement shall begin on mutual execution and shall continue until December 31, 2020. This Agreement may only be terminated upon expiration of the aforementioned term without an amendment extending the term executed by both parties to this Agreement. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Parties may, by mutual written consent, terminate this Agreement at any time and for any reason.

2. After completion of the Study, and the County's receipt of Grant funds from CRTPO, the County will invoice the Municipality Two Thousand, Five Hundred Dollars

(\$2,500) for its portion of the Match. Within thirty (30) days of receipt of such invoice, the Municipality shall pay the County the invoiced amount.

3. The County shall directly engage a consultant, selected by the County, to perform the Study. The Parties agree to work collaboratively with the consultant to provide any reasonably requested information and assistance needed for the Study. Upon completion of the Study, the County will ensure that the Municipality receives a copy of the Study.

4. This Agreement may be amended at any time by mutual, written consent of the parties.

5. This Agreement may be signed in counterparts, each of which shall be an original, with the same effect as if the signatures thereto and hereto were upon the same instrument. The Parties hereto confirm that any facsimile copy or photocopy of another party's executed counterpart of this Agreement (or its signature page thereof) will be deemed to be an executed original thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this instrument to be executed the day and year above written.

UNION COUNTY:

Attest: _____
Lynn West, Clerk to the Board

By: _____
William Mark Watson,
County Manager
APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM BEL

This instrument has been pre-audited in the manner required by the Local Government Budget and Fiscal Control Act.

Finance Officer

CITY OF MONROE:

Attest: _____
Clerk

By: _____
Manager

This instrument has been pre-audited in the manner required by the Local Government Budget and Fiscal Control Act.

Finance Officer

**RESOLUTION ENDORSING INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT
FOR CRITICAL INTERSECTION ANALYSIS OF THE
SUTHERLAND AVE AND WALKUP AVE INTERSECTION
R-2020-20**

WHEREAS, Union County was awarded a grant from the Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO) for a critical intersection analysis that will study the intersection of Sutherland Avenue, a municipal street and Walkup Avenue, a State secondary road (SR1751), within the corporate limits of Monroe along with other locations around the County in order to consider future intersection improvements; and,

WHEREAS, CRTPO has committed to provide the County One Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$120,000) in reimbursed costs under the grant, with an additional Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000) required under the grant as a local government required match for a total project cost of \$150,000; and,

WHEREAS, Union County has agreed to contribute at least Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000) toward the required match for the analysis of six intersections with each municipality responsible for providing a 10% match for the intersection(s) located within their jurisdiction; and,

WHEREAS, the City of Monroe has agreed to contribute Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$2,500) toward the required match for one intersection; and,

WHEREAS, the remaining local match will be met by other municipalities within Union County where the five other intersections are located; and,

WHEREAS, the project will provide recommended improvements to increase safety and mobility at the Sutherland Avenue and Walkup Avenue intersection along with a cost estimate for construction of said improvements in an effort to be competitive for funding through the NCDOT and/or the Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO).

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Monroe endorses the Interlocal Agreement with Union County for the Critical Intersection Analysis of the Sutherland Avenue and Walkup Avenue intersection and authorizes the City Manager to execute the agreement.

Adopted this 3rd day of March, 2020.

Attest:

Mayor Bobby Kilgore

Bridgette Robinson, City Clerk

R-2020-20

Union County Critical Intersection Analysis

- NC 75 and Old Providence Rd (Waxhaw)
- NC 75 and NC 16 (Waxhaw)
- Sutherland Ave and Walkup Ave (Monroe)
- Lawyers Rd and Stevens mill Rd (Stallings)
- Potter Rd and Forest Lawn Dr (Weddington)
- NC 200 and Old Camden Rd (Unionville)