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# Meetings in February '90

## THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 1 - FEBRUARY 3

1. Thursday, 7:30 a.m. | Charlotte Firefighters' Retirement System - 428 East Fourth Street, Suite 205
2. Thursday, 5:00 p.m. | City Council Transportation Committee - CMGC, Room 270

## THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 4 - FEBRUARY 10

3. Monday, 12 Noon | Planning Commission/Work Session - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room
4. Monday, 5:00 p.m. | City Council Workshop - CMGC, Room 267
5. Tuesday, 4:00 p.m. | Planning Commission/Planning Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room
6. Tuesday, 7:00 p.m. | Metropolitan Planning Organization - CMGC, Room 267
7. Wednesday, 5:30 p.m. | City Council/County Commission Dinner - CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room
8. Wednesday, 6:30 p.m. | City Council/County Commission/Public Hearing on General Development Policies - CMGC, Meeting Chamber
9. Thursday, 4:00 p.m. | Charlotte-Mecklenburg Art Commission/Ready Creek Ad Hoc Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room
10. Thursday, 5:00 p.m. | Charlotte-Mecklenburg Art Commission/Executive Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

## THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 11 - FEBRUARY 17

11. Monday, 6:00 p.m. | Council/Manager Dinner - CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room
12. Monday, 4:30 p.m. | Citizens Hearing - CMGC, Meeting Chamber
13. Monday, 7:00 p.m. | City Council Meeting - CMGC, Meeting Chamber
14. Monday, 7:30 p.m. | Historic Landmarks Commission - 1221 South Caldwell Street
15. Tuesday, 10 a.m. | Political Consolidation Committee - CMGC, 15th Floor Conference Room
16. Tuesday, 4:00 p.m. | Planning Commission/Planning Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room
17. Tuesday, 4:30 p.m. | Community Relations Committee - CMGC, Room 267
18. Wednesday, 8:00 a.m. | Clean City Committee - CMGC, Room 270
19. Wednesday, 8:30 a.m. | Civil Service Board - CMGC, 7th Floor Conference Room
20. Wednesday, 4:30 p.m. | Citizens Cable Oversight Committee - CMGC, Room 119
21. Thursday, 7:00 p.m. | Charlotte Tree Advisory Commission - CMGC, Room 270
22. Friday, 7:30 a.m. | Planning Liaison Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

(Continued on back)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 19</td>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td>COUNCIL/MANAGER DINNER - CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 19</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL/Zoning Hearings - CMGC, Meeting Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 20</td>
<td>12 Noon</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL/COUNTY COMMISSION/SCHOOL BOARD LUNCHEON - CMGC, Room 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 20</td>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>POLITICAL CONSOLIDATION COMMITTEE - CMGC, 15th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 20</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>FUNCTIONAL CONSOLIDATION COMMITTEE - CMGC, Rooms 270 &amp; 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 20</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>HOUSING AUTHORITY - 1301 South Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 20</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Planning Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 21</td>
<td>7:45 am</td>
<td>PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL - CMGC, Room 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 22</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ART COMMISSION/Executive Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 22</td>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ART COMMISSION/Board Meeting - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 26</td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>COUNCIL/MANAGER LUNCHEON - CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 26</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>CITIZENS HEARING - CMGC, Meeting Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 26</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL MEETING - CMGC, Meeting Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 26</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Executive Board - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 26</td>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Zoning Session - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 27</td>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>AUDITORIUM-COLISEUM-CONVENTION CENTER AUTHORITY - First Union Center, 301 S College Street, Suite 3495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 27</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>CITY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - 700 North Tryon Street, Hall Marshall Building, Agricultural Extension Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 27</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>FUNCTIONAL CONSOLIDATION COMMITTEE - CMGC, Rooms 270 &amp; 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 27</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Planning Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 28</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>SPECIALIZED TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - CMGC, Room 271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These organizations will not meet in February:

- Community Facilities Committee
- Housing Appeals Board
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Council Agenda

Monday, February 26, 1990

11:30 AM - Budget/Finance Orientation, 15th Floor
12:30 PM - Criminal Justice Luncheon, Rm 267
1:30 PM - Council-Manager Agenda Discussion
2:00 PM - Citizens hearing
2:30 PM - Council meeting

ITEM NO

1 Invocation by Rev. Kenneth Woodard of Newell Presbyterian Church

2 Consider approval of minutes of Regular Meeting on January 22, Special Meeting, ULI - City Fair on January 31, and Council Workshop on February 5, 1990

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3 A Conduct a public hearing to abandon a portion of an alleyway off Clement Avenue

B Recommend adoption of a resolution to close a portion of the alleyway.

Petitioner: Mr. Worth Madry and Mr. & Mrs. Michael Gaspar
Right-of-Way to be Abandoned: Portion of an alleyway
Location: Between Clement Avenue and Pecan Avenue
Reason: To incorporate right-of-way into adjoining parcels to provide proper maintenance

Clearances: City departments and private utility companies
No objection: Elizabeth Community Association. No objection
Property owners (within area of abandonment notified by certified mail on September 15, 1989): Of the 13 owners, one responded with no objection, eleven did not respond, one objected Mr. Edward A. White and Mr. & Mrs. Roy J. White, Jr objected stating that they wanted the alleyway to remain in whole or in part to serve their business (Roy White Flowers)
They further stated that they needed the alleyway for access to their property at this time and anticipate a greater need in the future. The alleyway has been blocked by a fence for the past two years without any complaints being received by Engineering.

**Funding** No City funds are involved.

A map is attached.

Attachment No 1

---

4 Conduct a public hearing to abandon an unnamed street between Brookside Avenue and Park Road.

B Recommend adoption of a resolution to close the unnamed street.

**Petitioner** Mr George Gray and Ms Doris Cromartie

**Right-of-Way to be Abandoned** An unnamed street

**Location** Between 824 Brookside Avenue and 2000 Park Road

**Reason:** To incorporate right-of-way into adjoining residential lots; thereby providing for proper maintenance and allowing for proposed home improvements.

**Clearances** City departments and private utility companies

No objection. Dilworth Community Development (notified by certified mail) No response

**Funding** No City funds are involved

A map is attached.

Attachment No 2

---

5 Conduct a public hearing to receive citizens comments on the proposed changes to the Housing Assistance Plan.

**HAP Background** The current Housing Assistance Plan (HAP) was revised and approved by City Council on November 14, 1989. Prior to the last revision, City Council had discussed and reviewed the HAP during Council workshops on September 5 and October 9, 1989. During these discussions, staff was directed to research options for concentration and size of assisted housing units. Staff
reviewed several Housing Assistance Plans from around the country and at Council's February 5, 1990 workshop proposed changes to the HAP Locational Policy regarding options for concentration and size of assisted housing were presented. The proposed changes have been modified based on comments and discussion from City Council at the February 5 workshop (see attached). The primary changes are as follows:

Adds three objectives to Locational Standards

1. Protect racially integrated neighborhoods
2. Pursue housing proposals responsive to the School System's Pupil Assignment Plan
3. Promote community development of selected neighborhoods.

Reduces census tracts where black population exceeds 40% to 25% under Prohibited Areas (see Exhibit 3 - Criteria A.3). This change made the following five census tracts prohibited: 15.01, 38.03, 38.04, 54.02 and 61 (see attached map). This proposed change meets the new objective to protect racially integrated neighborhoods.

Stipulates how Request for Proposals will be evaluated (see Exhibit 3 - Criteria J)

Council advised staff to hold a public hearing and to contact the Board of Education, the Housing Authority and the Housing Partnership for a presentation of the proposed changes to the HAP. The presentation was given on February 16, 1990, to the requested organizations and comments are attached. Also, a presentation on the proposed changes to the HAP will be made to the School Board at its February 27, 1990 meeting.

Approval of the HAP will be on the March 12, 1990 Council agenda.

Clearances: Community Development Department

Attachment No 3
POLICY

6

Recommend approval of the Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit proposals to develop approximately 50 multi-family affordable housing units using $1.5 million in Innovative Housing Funds.

On September 11, 1989, City Council approved a policy framework for expending Innovative Housing funds not allocated to the Housing Partnership. The policy allocated $1.5 million to develop 50-75 affordable housing units with proposals being solicited by the Innovative Housing Committee using the Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The units will be targeted to serve families earning less than 40% of median income and living in substandard, overcrowded or unaffordable housing or are on the Housing Authority's master list needing housing. The committee will provide a technical review of all proposals and make recommendations to City Council.

RFP

The subject RFP, designed to solicit housing proposals, should not be confused with the RFP process approved by Council on January 8, 1990, which will be utilized to identify land to be acquired for future development of housing by the City.

Key elements of the RFP include the following:

- Solicit proposals from qualified developers to develop, own and provide management services for approximately 50 new multi-family affordable housing units

- Preference will be given to proposals that provide a distribution of bedrooms in accordance with the needs of the Housing Authority's Master waiting list and specified in the RFP

- Preference will be given to projects that utilize multiple leveraging mechanisms such as low income housing tax credits in addition to any City subsidy.
Proposals will be evaluated for consistency with the Housing Assistance Plan's Locational Policy,* any approved land use plans and the School Board's Pupil Assignment Plan.

*City Council is contemplating proposed changes to the HAP Locational Policy which may not be adopted by the Council at the time the RFP is being advertised; however, the proposed changes may be adopted by the Council before the submitted date of the RFPs Therefore, all RFPs must comply with the City's approved HAP in existence at the time of submission deadline.

Proposals must demonstrate that the developer has the ability to financially carry out the project and management expertise to operate a finished project.

RFP Schedule

The attached RFP has been reviewed and approved by the Innovative Housing Committee at its December 19, 1989 meeting. The proposed schedule for soliciting proposals is as follows.

Mail RFP to Developers February 28, 1990
Pre-Proposal Conference March 8, 1990
Submission Deadline March 30, 1990
Review by Innovative Housing Committee and Recommendation April 10, 1990
Request for Council Action April 23, 1990
Execution of Loan Agreement May 5, 1990

The proposed schedule for the RFP is being coordinated with the application schedule of the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency for the use of low-income tax credits. The application process opens March 1, 1990 and closes April 30, 1990. There will be a second application cycle for left-over funds in June - July, 1990.

Funding

Innovative Housing Capital Account

Clearances

RFP document approved by the Innovative Housing Committee on December 19, 1989

Attachment No 4
Consider approval of the unanimous recommendations of the Community Development and Housing Committee which defines the strategies to be used by the Community Development Department for identifying land for developing housing for persons earning 40% or less of the median income.

**Acquisition of Land for Housing**

On January 8, 1990, City Council approved the recommendation that the City, acting through the Community Development Department, be the entity responsible for coordinating the process for identifying land to be acquired for the purpose of developing housing for persons earning 40% or less of the median income. In doing so, City Council asked that the Community Development and Housing Committee review the proposed strategies for acquiring land and come back to City Council with a recommendation within 60 days.

**CD and Housing Committee**

On February 13, 1990, the Community Development and Housing Committee discussed the following three strategies for acquiring land outlined in the January 8 Request for Council Action:

- **Request For Proposals** - This strategy would use a RFP to solicit offers to sell land to the City. The RFP would request land that is appropriately zoned and consistent with the HAP's Locational Policy. The RFP would be marketed to land developers, real estate brokers and individual land owners to insure broad private sector participation.

- **Contract for Real Estate Services** - This strategy involves entering into a contract(s) for exclusive or non-exclusive services with private real estate firms to identify land to be recommended for Council consideration.

- **Condemnation** - The City Council has the authority by State statute to acquire land for housing by condemnation which would likely be the least preferred strategy to be recommended to Council only after all other processes of negotiation are exhausted.
Recommendation

The Community Development and Housing Committee recommended staff utilize the following strategies for identifying land to be acquired for developing housing:

- Develop a two-tiered approach that would first utilize the RFP process for identifying land. Second, it would allow staff, independent from the RFP process, to identify land using other resources which could be recommended to Council for consideration.

- All efforts to identify land for acquisition will be restricted to those census tracts defined as "priority areas" by the revised Housing Assistance Plan (HAP) for a period of one year. In addition, those census tracts defined as priority areas would be prioritized into three groups with efforts being targeted to Group 1, Group 2 and Group 3 respectively, with 1 being the highest and 3 the lowest.

- The preference will be to identify land that is properly zoned, however, Council will consider requests to rezone property that meets all other specified criteria in the RFP.

Refer to Attachment No. 3 for a map. An executive summary of the Community Development and Housing Committee meeting is attached.

Funding

Funds received from Community Development land sales

Clearances

Community Development & Housing Committee

Attachment No 5
8. Recommend approval of a contract between the City of Charlotte on behalf of the Cultural Study Committee, and the Wolf Organization, Inc.; and adoption of a budget ordinance for $95,000 (City's share, $56,000).

Cultural Study Committee

The last cultural plan for Charlotte was produced in 1975. On February 27, 1989, Council approved the creation of a 15 member Cultural Study Committee to provide guidance on public funding decisions by the end of 1989 and to provide a new cultural plan by the end of 1990. This Cultural Study Committee, jointly appointed by the City (12 members) and the County (three members) was officially appointed on April 24, 1989. They began meeting in June 1989 and submitted their Phase I report to Council on December 11, 1989. A list of the Committee members and a summary of their report is attached.

Phase I Report

This report summarized the work to date, including that of the 10 focus groups involving about 150 citizens. The report identified two major themes, children and region, as well as sub-themes - organization, participation, partnerships, and financing.

The Phase I report anticipated that the Cultural Study Committee would return to Council in February after completion of a consultant selection process, which is now complete.

Recommendation

The Cultural Study Committee unanimously recommends that the Wolf Organization, Inc., of Cambridge, Massachusetts be placed under contract to assist with the completion of the cultural plan (see attached memorandum from Pat Phillips, Chairman). The $95,000 cost of the contract will be shared. The private sector will contribute $25,000. The remaining $70,000 will be shared between the City (80% or $56,000) and the County (20% or $14,000). This cost sharing arrangement with the County was agreed to at the time the Committee was appointed.
Funding  In the Phase I report submitted in December, the Cultural Study Committee indicated that funding policies should logically flow from the completed plan. But the Committee is aware of the Council's preference to have recommendations on allocation of public funds for the upcoming fiscal year. If the funds for this contract are approved, the Committee will provide Council an interim allocation report by April 15, 1990 to assist with the FY 1991 budget cycle.

However, when the Cultural Plan is submitted in December, this interim allocation process may be modified.

Funding  General Fund Contingency  (Balance at eight months into the fiscal year - $203,450.00)

Clearances  Budget & Evaluation, Economic Development

Attachment No 6

9  Recommend approval of a process to study City-County functional consolidation.

Consolidation Committees  At a joint meeting of the City Council and County Commission, two committees of the governing boards were appointed to recommend study processes for political consolidation and functional consolidation.

The Functional Consolidation Committee is composed of Council members Stan Campbell, Pat McCrory and Ella Scarborough and Commissioners Ken Andrews, Jerry Blackmon and Barbara Lockwood. Mayor Myrick also participated in the Committee deliberations. The Committee approved a process to study functional consolidation and recommends adoption by the Council and Commission.

Recommended Process for Functional Consolidation  The following is the recommended process.

- Establish a committee of elected officials and citizens.

- Three Council members Current appointees continue to serve.
Three Commissioners Current appointees continue to serve.

Four citizens. Each governing board to appoint two citizens.

One Chairperson. Mayor and County Chairman to appoint Chairperson.

**Facilitator** Engage a facilitator. The Institute of Government has been suggested.

**Study Period**: Four months

**Committee** Determine if functional consolidation is needed, and if so, on what basis

- by traditionally defined roles
- by duplication of service
- by what serves the customer best

If consolidation is recommended, determine under which unit and an appropriate implementation date

**Process**

1) Develop Consensus What do you want to achieve by functional consolidation, what do you hope to gain?

2) Obtain background information on City/County roles (traditional and statutory), review of nontraditional service delivery systems, develop profile of common functions (i.e., cost, efficiency measures, organizational structures)

3) Determine criteria for consolidation, i.e., easiest to do, most cost effective, customer accountability and demand, method of financing, how many to do and at what interval.

4) Develop preliminary evaluation of background profiles and criteria.
5) Develop Consensus: Proceed with more detailed refined work plan or stop.

6) Report to governing boards

7) Propose model form of consolidation services and implementation timetable.

8) Develop Consensus: Make recommendations.

9) Report to governing board.

Clearances The Functional Consolidation Committee has recommended this process. The County Commission will review the proposed process on March 5.

10 Recommend rescheduling the Council meeting of May 14, 1990 to Tuesday, May 29, 1990.

The Charlotte Chamber's annual intercity visit will be May 14-16, 1990. Only one Council meeting was scheduled in May - May 14 - because the date for the second regular Council meeting fell on Monday, May 28, Memorial Day. In view of the Chamber's trip, we propose the May meeting be moved from Monday, May 14 to Tuesday, May 29. It would be an afternoon meeting.

11 Recommend setting a date for the March workshop for a preliminary review of the FY91 Operating Budget and the FY91-96 Capital Improvement Program.

March Workshop The March workshop has been cancelled due to the National League of Cities meeting in Washington from March 3-6.

Suggested Dates As a follow-up to the retreat, the workshop would have included a preliminary review of the FY91 Operating Budget and the FY91-96 Capital Improvement Program. In order to provide this briefing, it is recommended that a special meeting be set. The following dates and times are available:
Date | Time | Notes
--- | --- | ---
Wednesday, March 7 | 5:00 - 6:30 p.m. | This is the day following the NLC meeting
Thursday, March 8 | 4:30 - 6:00 p.m. | This is prior to the South Boulevard Zoning decision, Planning will need approximately 20 minutes before the formal meeting
Tuesday, March 13 | 5:00 - 6:30 p.m. | This follows the March 12 evening Council meeting

Decision on Petition No. 89-86 by Zaremba CenterPoint Company for a change in zoning from O-6 and R-6MF to B-1SCD for a 13.8 acre site located on the northeasterly corner of Eastway Drive and Biscayne Drive

Council member Clodfelter was excused from the public hearing.

This petition was deferred at the November, December, January and February meetings.

The Zoning Committee recommends that this petition be approved

Attachment No. 7

Recommend a schedule for holding a public hearing on the use of the tax levy on Municipal Service District 1 to fund Cityfair

Information on this item will be sent in the February 23, 1990 Council-Manager memorandum
Consider appropriating $400,000 to widen the Memorial Stadium playing field to accommodate a potential exhibition game of World Class Soccer in August, 1990

Memorial Stadium
This item was originally brought to Council for discussion at the February 5 workshop.

Concerns
Rich Melvin, who heads The Carolina International Soccer Limited Committee, has proposed that the City widen the Memorial Stadium playing field at a cost to be between $40,000 and $90,000 depending on whether it is to be done by City forces or private contractor. City staff has been in contact with Mr. Melvin and with the people who did Mr. Melvin’s original estimate and several concerns over the low cost of this project were discussed.

No contingency was provided in the original estimate.
Construction did not take into account working around already scheduled Memorial Stadium events
Construction did not take into account protecting the playing field
Extension of the existing perimeter drain system was not included
Replacement of the existing stone wall was not included

We do not have resources in-house to do this work and State law does not allow the use of City forces in projects estimated to cost more than $75,000.

Cost Estimate
City staff has approached the consulting firm of Grier-Fripp Associates, Inc. who prepared a study of Memorial Stadium improvements in April, 1983. They have updated their cost estimate for widening the field to 220' and reestablishing the stone wall. Costs for widening the field by August, 1990 are over $400,000.

450 Seats
These improvements will result in the removal of approximately 450 seats.
Funding

We do not recommend approval of this request. If approved as requested, funding would be from The Improvements to Existing Parks Capital Account. Eight park projects would experience a six to twelve month delay. These parks include:

First Ward Park - additional plantings
Grayson Park - drainage and basketball court rehab
Abbott Park - drainage and basketball court rehab
York Road Renaissance Park - new shelter, trails, and basketball court
Greenville Park - ballfield rehab
Midwood Park - ballfield rehab
Colonial Park - replace picnic shelter
Sugaw Creek Park - drainage and restroom rehab

A copy of Richard Vinroot's February 1, 1990 memo is attached.

Attachment No. 8

Recommends approval of a grant application to the Governor's Crime Commission to fund a multi-jurisdictional drug task force and drug training and adoption of a budget ordinance for $246,848.

The Grant

This grant application is a cooperative effort between the:

Charlotte Police Department
Mecklenburg County Police Department
Gastonia Police Department
Gaston County Police Department

which will fund a multi-jurisdictional drug task force and training in street drug interdiction and advanced narcotics enforcement for a majority of the sworn personnel in the four participating departments
Charlotte's portion of the grant application will fund:

- Street drug interdiction training for officers, sergeants, and captains in the nine patrol districts
- Advanced narcotics interdiction training for vice officers and members of the task force
- Equipment to be used jointly by both vice and task force officers including night vision scopes, binoculars, cellular phones, etc.
- One fourth of the drug imprest fund to be used by the task force

The Police Department will use existing personnel and vehicles to staff its part of the task force.

**Funding**

The funding request is for $246,848 - $185,136 in federal funds and $61,712 in matching City funds. The City's match is anticipated to be $39,112 in FY91 and $22,600 in FY92. The City's matching funds would be taken from the U. S. Treasury Asset Forfeiture Funds (i.e. confiscated drug money)

**Clearances**

Charlotte Police Department; Grants Review Committee

16. Consider a request from Crisis Assistance Ministry to transfer a savings in fees of $18,000 to the Special Energy Fund.

**Crisis Assistance Ministry**

Crisis Assistance Ministry was appropriated $86,661 for FY90. From this amount, $30,000 was dedicated to restoring service for clients after a water and sewer service disconnection. The remaining $52,661 was used under the Special Energy Program, a program for City residents at poverty level, who had their heating service cut off or were facing a heating emergency.

Crisis Assistance Ministry also operates the Duke Share The Warmth Program and the Crisis Intervention Program which are heating emergency programs similar to the Special Energy Program. Crisis Assistance Ministry received $211,169 to operate the Crisis Intervention Program for the Department of Social Services; $95,000 was received from Duke Power to operate the Duke Share The Warmth Program. At present, the funding received for the Special Energy Program, Duke Share The Warmth, and the Crisis Intervention Program has been expended.
Decrease in Water/Sewer Disconnects

Upon recommendation from Crisis Assistance Ministry, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department along with the City's MIS and Finance Departments developed an additional notification form that would be sent to clients as a final notice denoting a date of disconnection. The additional notice has been in use for over a year, and as a result disconnections have decreased. With a decrease in disconnections, the $30,000 to be used to restore water and sewer service has not been expended at the rate anticipated. The $52,661 dedicated for the Special Energy Program has been expended.

Request to Transfer Savings

Crisis Assistance has made a request to transfer to the Special Energy Program an $18,000 savings originally dedicated for restoring water and sewer service. This represents a 34% increase in the amount originally dedicated to the Special Energy Fund while the percent increase set for the benchmark is 6%.

Funding

Existing appropriation in General Fund Non-Departmental Account.

Clearances

Budget and Evaluation

* * * * * * * * * * *

The City Attorney advises that agenda items no. 17 through 27 may be considered in one motion. However, any member of Council may request that an item be divided and voted on separately.

* * * * * * * * * * *
BID LIST

17. **Recommend adoption of the bid list as shown.** The following contract awards are all low bid and within budget estimate unless otherwise noted. Each project or purchase was authorized in the annual budget.

A 25 - Automobiles, 4-Door Sedans, Police Dept
(Unmarked, Compact Size, Ford Tempo)

**Recommendation:** By the Purchasing Director and the Police Chief that 25 - 4-Door (Unmarked) sedans be purchased from the present City Contract #80-101 with Harrelson Ford, Inc, Charlotte, N C , at $8,917.50 each, for a total of $222,937.50 Contract #80-101 was awarded to Harrelson Ford, Inc by City Council on January 8, 1990

**Project Description:** These unmarked vehicles will be used primarily in investigatory work. Twenty-three are replacements. Two new cars have been approved, one for a school resource officer and one for use with Project DARE

**Source of Funding:** Capital Equipment Fund - (Police Department).

---

B Devonshire Park Rehabilitation Engineering

**Recommendation:** By the City Engineer that the low bid of $73,797.68 as submitted by Eddins Construction, Inc, be accepted for award on a unit price basis.

**Project Description:** This project will improve the existing park by providing new playground equipment, installing new paths, picnic shelter and the construction of a one-half basketball court in addition to new drainage structures and sidewalk, timber borders and improvements to existing channel. The park is located at 6300 Barrington Drive

**Source of Funding:** General Capital Improvement Fund - (Improvements to Existing Parks - Pay-As-You-Go Funding).
C  Lakeview Storm Drainage Repair  Engineering

**Recommendation.** By the City Engineer that the low bid of $310,442.10, as submitted by *Proper Construction* Company, be accepted for award on a unit price basis.

**Project Description.** Project consists of storm drainage repairs and sidewalk improvements in the Lakeview neighborhood off Rozzelle Ferry Road. Storm drainage repairs are being performed under the Storm Drainage Repair Policy and sidewalk construction is being performed under the Sidewalk Improvement Program.

**Source of Funding.** General Capital Improvement Fund - (Storm Drainage Repair Program - 1986 Storm Drainage Bonds)

D  Sardis Road Bridge Replacement  Engineering

**Recommendation.** By the City Engineer that the low bid of $309,315.65, as submitted by *Ferebee Corporation* be accepted for award on a unit price basis.

**Project Description.** This project will replace the present substandard bridge on Sardis Road at Sardis Branch. A temporary detour bridge will be maintained during construction of the new culvert.

**Source of Funding.** General Capital Improvement Fund - (Bridge Replacement Program - Powell Bill Funds)

E  Repairs to Ballfield & Tennis Court Lights  Parks & Recreation

**Recommendation.** By Purchasing Director and Director of Park & Recreation that a service contract for time, materials and labor be awarded to the low bidder, *Pike Electrical Contractors*, Charlotte, N.C., in an amount not to exceed $70,000.00 to repair lights in ballfield and tennis courts damaged by HUGO.

**Project Description.** Contract to be awarded to provide labor and materials to repair, re-aim, and replace lights in eight tennis courts and 11 ballfields damaged by Hurricane Hugo.

**Source of Funding.** Disaster Relief Fund (Hugo) - (Parks and Recreation - Operations).
AGREEMENT

18. Recommend approval of an agreement for geotechnical engineering services with Westinghouse Environmental and Geotechnical Services for $80,800.00 for quality control testing for the construction of the Beatties Ford Road widening project.

**Inspection Testing**

On February 8, 1988, City Council awarded the design contract for the Beatties Ford Road widening project to Ralph Whitehead and Associates. As part of their design contract, Ralph Whitehead & Associates used Westinghouse Environmental and Geotechnical Services for subsurface investigations. The design is complete and construction has begun.

The Engineering Department recommends Westinghouse Environmental and Geotechnical Services perform the inspection testing services during the construction of the Beatties Ford Road project because of Westinghouse’s familiarity with the project.

**Funding**

Beatties Ford Widening Capital Account

**Clearances**

This contract has been reviewed by the Engineering Department and approved by the City Attorney.

CONTRACT AMENDMENT

19. Recommend approval of Amendment No. 1 to the construction administration contract for FY89 spring resurfacing with Ralph Whitehead and Associates of Charlotte, North Carolina for $100,000.00 to perform construction administration and testing services for the FY90 fall resurfacing project.

**Contract Amendment**

This is an amendment to Ralph Whitehead and Associates' contract to provide construction administration and testing for the fall resurfacing contract. Ralph Whitehead and Associates provided these services for the spring contract and because they performed well on that contract, they are recommended to continue the services for the fall contract. The firm has agreed to provide the fall resurfacing services at the same hourly rate. In addition, material testing has been added to the scope of services.
Funding  Powell Bill Fund

Clearances  The amendment has been reviewed and approved by the appropriate City Engineering staff and the Street Maintenance Division of CDOT

FIREFIGHTERS RETIREMENT SYSTEM

20  Recommend approval of disability regulation for the Charlotte Firefighters' Retirement System

Disability Regulation  The disability regulation is designed to supplement Sections 19 and 20 of the Charlotte Firefighters' Retirement System Act by establishing procedures to ensure due process for disability claims, provide partial or total disability benefits and to incorporate rehabilitation into the disability process.

Clearances  The Board of Trustees of the Charlotte Firefighters' Retirement System has unanimously approved a new disability regulation. The regulation has been reviewed and is supported by the Fire Chief and a Fire Department committee that was named by the Chief to represent the Retirement System membership.

HOUSING CODE

21  Recommend adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of in rem remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1700 N. Allen Street (Belmont)

Funds for this action are available and a lien will be placed against the property for cost incurred.

Attachment No 9
SPEED LIMITS

22 Recommend adoption of ordinance to lower the speed limit on one neighborhood street from 35 miles per hour to 25 miles per hour

25 MPH In accordance with Council's approved policy, one street in one neighborhood has had a petition validated and is determined by the engineering study to be appropriate for a 25 miles per hour speed limit. The street is Tuscan Drive (Crown Colony Estates)

Clearances Charlotte Department of Transportation; the City Attorney has approved the ordinance as to form.

REAL ESTATE TRANSACTION

23 Recommend purchase from the Gathings their residential dwelling, 5800 Sharon Road, and fee simple (right-of-way for intersection improvement) and in turn sell the residential dwelling back to the Gathings for $3,000.00 (salvage value) and the City-owned adjoining lot for $4,000.00 (appraised value of remainder).

Council Action It is recommended that City Council (1) approve the purchase of the Gathings house and needed right-of-way for the appraised value of $89,000 00 and (2) approve the sale of the residential dwelling at salvage value ($3,000.00) and the adjoining residual lot (5810 Sharon Road) at appraised value of $4,000 00 to the Gathings

Sharon Road/Quail Hollow Road Project During the public hearings for the intersection improvement for Sharon Road at Quail Hollow, the owners of four residential dwellings were informed that their properties would likely be acquired as a result of the severe damages caused by this project. It was expected that two of the four residential owners would have the option to purchase back their dwellings and relocate them onto the newly reconfigured lots, placing them back into compliance with zoning requirements. Community Development Department will receive the other two houses to be relocated and utilized in a housing rehab program.
One of the houses to remain on the reconfigured lots is owned by the Gathings. The City is purchasing the Gathings house and a strip of land on two sides of their corner lot. The Gathings wish to retain the remainder of their lot, purchase from the City their house at salvage value ($3,000.00), and acquire the adjacent residual City-owned lot (5810 Sharon Road) for the appraised value of the remainder for $4,000.00.

We are negotiating with the owners of the remaining house which will be relocated on the reconfigured lot.

Clearances Engineering/Real Estate. Mandatory Referral is not needed due to Planning Commission's prior approval of this intersection improvement project.

A map is attached.

Attachment No. 10

SET PUBLIC HEARING

24. Recommend that City Council (1) set a public hearing on April 9, 1990 to obtain the views of citizens on community development and housing needs associated with the expenditure of an anticipated $3,310,000 in FY91 Community Development Block Grant funds in addition to the expenditure of applicable program income and (2) authorize the Community Development Department to conduct a second public hearing on May 10, 1990 to review program performance and proposed activities for the FY91 Block Grant Application.

SPECIAL OFFICER PERMIT

25. Recommend approval of application for Special Officer Permit to Millicent Regina Robinson for use on the premises of the Parks and Recreation Department.
PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Recommend approval of the following property transactions and adoption of the condemnation resolutions.

1. Project: Intersection Improvements - Providence/Alexander/Rea Roads
   Owner(s): Lawrence H. Wilson and wife, Teresa H. Wilson
   Property Address: 6617 Alexander Road
   Property to be acquired: 4255.72 sq. ft. (0.0977 ac) plus temporary construction easement.
   Improvements: landscaping (shrubs, med & large trees, R/R ties & decorative trim)
   Price: $21,300.00
   Remarks: Property is zoned R-15 and is being used as residential.

2. Project: Intersection Improvements - Providence/Alexander/Rea Roads
   Owner(s): Thomas L. Burgess & Norma S. Burgess
   Property Address: 2616 Rea Road
   Property to be acquired: 9,712.528 sq ft. (0.223 ac.)
   Improvements: privacy trees, fencing
   Price: $12,000.00
   Remarks: Zoned R-15 used as residential property.

3. Project: Park Road/Johnston Road Widening - Phase I
   Owner(s): Axel D. Speer and wife, Kimberly J. Speer
   Property Address: 3700 Monique Lane
   Property to be acquired: 320 sq. ft. (0.0074) plus 1,764 sq. ft (0.0405 ac) temporary construction easement
   Improvements: 7 ft brick wall, fences, custom-built mailbox, trees, shrubs, landscaped lawn
   Price: $28,500.00
   Remarks: Property is zoned R-12 and used as residential.

4. Project: Park Road/Johnston Road Widening - Phase I
   Owner(s): Thomas F. Sheridan and wife, Betty J. Sheridan
   Property Address: 3701 Surry Ridge Ct
   Property to be acquired: 600 sq. ft (0.014 ac) plus 2,513 sq. ft (0.0577 ac) of temporary construction easement
   Improvements: brick wall, trees, shrubs, and landscaping
   Price: $24,000.00
   Remarks: Property is zoned R-12 and used as residential.
5. **Project:** Park Road/Johnston Road Widening - Phase I  
**Owner(s):** Harry A. Jamison  
**Property Address:** 7731 Park Road  
**Property to be acquired:** 4909 sq ft (0.1127 ac) plus 2,762 sq ft of temporary construction easement.  
**Improvements:** shade trees, landscaping, driveway, septic tank  
**Price:** $23,100.00  
**Remarks:** Zoned R-12 single family residence.

6. **Project:** F A R Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program - Residential  
**Owner(s):** Ray Thompson, single  
**Property Address:** 6708 Virginia Circle - Moores Park, Charlotte, N.C  
**Property to be acquired:** 2 bedrooms - 1,775 sq ft ranch home  
**Price:** $70,500.00  

7. **Project:** F A R Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program - Residential  
**Owner(s):** Ronald B. Patterson & Shirley A. Patterson, husband and wife  
**Property Address:** 5008 Withrow Road, Charlotte, N.C  
**Property to be acquired:** one - 2 bedrooms - 1,175 sq ft. ranch home  
**Price:** $44,000.00  

8. **Project:** F A R Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program - Residential  
**Owner(s):** John M. Blue and wife, May C. Blue  
**Property Address:** 6609 Virginia Circle, Charlotte, N.C  
**Property to be acquired:** .442 acres  
**Price:** $62,500.00  
CONDEMNATION

9  Project: Intersection Improvements - South Boulevard/ Tyvola Road  
   Owner(s): Western Auto Supply Co., and any other parties of interest  
   Property Address: 5130-5136 South Blvd, Charlotte, N.C.  
   Property to be condemned: 418 sq ft (0.0095 ac) plus temporary construction easement.  
   Improvements: (1) 10-foot cherry tree-minimal amount of asphalt paving  
   Price: $3,035.00  
   Reason for condemnation: Property owner unable to convey release on outstanding Deed of Trust. Condemnation is recommended by Legal Department to obtain clear title.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

27. Recommend adoption of a motion to hold an executive session upon conclusion of this meeting for the purpose of consulting with the City Attorney concerning a lawsuit in accordance with the North Carolina Open Meetings Law.
At the February 5, 1990 workshop, staff shared with you proposed changes to your Housing Assistance Plan (HAP) Locational Policy criteria. Staff has added the following to the proposed changes of the HAP Locational Policy based on comments and discussions at the workshop:

- Added three objectives to Locational Standards.
  1. Protect racially integrated neighborhoods.
  2. Pursue housing proposals responsive to the School System's Pupil Assignment Plan.
  3. Promote community development of selected neighborhoods.

- Reduced census tracts where black population exceeds 40% to 25% under Prohibited Areas (see Exhibit 3 - Criteria A.3). This change made the following 5 census tracts prohibited: 15.01, 38.03, 38.04, 54.02 and 61 (see attached map). This proposed change meets the new objective to protect racially integrated neighborhoods.

- Stipulated how Request for Proposals will be evaluated (see Exhibit 3 - Criteria J.)

We are providing you the same information on the HAP that was given you at the workshop; a synopsis background of the HAP, the highlights of the major components of the existing HAP Locational Policy criteria, the highlights of the major components of the proposed HAP Locational Policy criteria and the highlights of the differences and similarities between the existing and proposed criteria. However, the text of the information has been updated and changes to the original text have been underlined.

**BACKGROUND**

The current HAP was revised and approved by City Council on November 14, 1989. Prior to the last revision, City Council had discussed and reviewed the HAP during Council workshops on September 5 and October 9, 1989. During these discussions, staff was directed to research options for concentration and size of assisted housing units. Staff has reviewed several Housing Assistance Plans from around the country and particularly liked the HAP Locational Policy criteria being utilized in Seattle, Washington and some of the criteria was incorporated into the proposed HAP. These proposed changes were presented to you at your February 5 workshop, and you will be considering the proposed changes at your February 26 meeting. Please be aware that the current HAP is in effect until September 30, 1991. The attached Exhibit 1 gives an overview of the HAP, its definition, its purpose and its uses.
HIGHLIGHTS OF THE MAJOR COMPONENTS OF THE EXISTING HAP LOCA TIONAL POLICY CRITERIA

The primary objectives of the Locational Policy criteria are the following:

- Avoid concentration of low income persons
- Leverage private dollars
- Provide for scattered site housing (geographic dispersal)
- Ensure economic and racial integration of areas

Our existing HAP Locational Policy criteria provides for the following categories of new construction assisted housing:

- Federally built public housing
- City built public housing
- City/Housing Authority transitional housing
- Public/Private Housing Developments

The definitions of these various categories of assisted housing are listed in the attached Exhibit 2.

There are seven major policy criteria that determine where the different types of housing can and cannot be built, which are identified and defined in Exhibit 3 under the heading "Existing Criteria".

There are a total of 83 census tracts located within the City of Charlotte. Applying and analyzing this criteria results in the following which is shown on the attached Map - Exhibit 4:

- Within these 83 census tracts, there are 45 ineligible areas that prohibit assisted housing projects from being built within a 1/2 mile radius of another assisted housing project of 25 or more units.

- 44 or 53% of the 83 census tracts are ineligible census tracts for the following reasons:
  - 36 census tracts are ineligible because of low income concentrations (50% or more of the households earn 80% or less of the median income);
  - 6 census tracts are ineligible because black population increased more than 15% between 1970 and 1980;
  - 2 census tracts are ineligible because its 1980 black population was greater than 40%.

Therefore, 39 (or 47%) census tracts are eligible to receive assisted housing projects of 25 or more units based on our existing criteria.

*Some census tracts may be ineligible due to more than one criteria.
HIGHLIGHTS OF THE MAJOR COMPONENTS OF THE PROPOSED HAP LOCATIONAL POLICY CRITERIA

Added the following 3 objectives based on Council's direction at the February 5, 1990 workshop:

- Protect racially integrated neighborhoods.
- Pursue housing proposals responsive to the School System's pupil assignment plan.
- Promote community development of selected neighborhoods.

In Exhibit 3 under the heading "Proposed Criteria", there are nine major policy criteria that determine where the different types of housing can and cannot be built. One additional section (J) was added based on Council's discussion at its February 5, 1990 workshop.

Applying and analyzing this criteria on the 83 census tracts within the City results in the following which is shown on the attached Map - Exhibit 5:

- Within these 83 census tracts, there are 45 prohibitive areas that prohibit assisted housing projects from being built within a 1/4 mile radius of another assisted housing project of 25 or more units.

- 43 or 51%* of the 83 census tracts are prohibited census tracts for the following reasons:

  - 11 census tracts are prohibited because assisted housing exceeds 5% of the total housing stock within the census tract;

  - 25 census tracts are prohibited because of low income concentrations (50% or more of the households earn 80% or less of the median income);

  - 7 census tracts are prohibited because its 1980 black population was greater than 25%.

- 19 census tracts are restricted areas and may receive additional assisted housing within the limitations of 5% of the total housing stock within the census tract.

- 21 census tracts are priority areas because no assisted housing units exist in these census tracts and Council would give priority for new assisted housing.

- Identifies 12 current Special Objective Areas

Therefore, 40 (or 49%) census tracts are eligible to receive assisted housing projects of 25 or more units based on the proposed criteria.

*Some census tracts may be ineligible due to more than one criteria.
HIGHLIGHTS OF THE EXISTING AND PROPOSED HAP LOCAITIONAL POLICY CRITERIA WHICH ARE THE SAME

- Objectives of Locational Standards (Deleted)
- Does not allow new assisted housing projects in census tracts where 50% or more of households earn 80% or less of City-wide median income.
- Does not allow new assisted housing projects where the black population exceeds 40%. (Deleted)
- Seeks long term affordability.
- Provides Policy exemptions for:
  - Elderly/handicapped housing
  - Assisted housing developed for homeownership
  - Rehabilitation
  - City Council can exempt projects from any of the stated criteria on a case-by-case basis
  - North Carolina Housing Finance Agency Bond Financing

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EXISTING AND PROPOSED HAP LOCAITIONAL POLICY CRITERIA

Existing HAP Differences:

- Public/private housing projects are exempt from a maximum number of units.
- Census tracts are ineligible where the black population has increased by 15% or more between 1970 and 1980.
- Maintains a 1/2 mile radius between existing housing projects.

Proposed HAP Differences:

- Regulates the number of housing units that can be built within a census tract and within the City.
- Limits the maximum number of all categories of assisted housing to 50 units per project.
- Identifies priority census tracts to build assisted housing.
• Makes available five additional census tracts to build assisted housing because the black population increased over 15% between 1970 and 1980. (This criteria was deleted because these 5 census tracts did not comprise the majority of black or low income residents.) [Deleted]

• Adds objective to protect racially integrated neighborhoods and obtain objective by reducing census tracts where the black population exceeds 40% to 25%.

• Stipulates how Request for Proposals will be evaluated.

• Identifies special objective areas where assisted housing can be built for revitalization purposes.

• Reduces the radius between assisted housing projects from 1/2 mile to 1/4 mile.

• Provides criteria for market rate housing project conversion into assisted housing.

SUMMARY

If Council decides to leave the HAP as is, no action is required because the current HAP will remain in effect to September 30, 1991. If Council decides to modify the HAP to address concentration and size of assisted housing projects, the following procedures need to be followed:

1. hold a public hearing to receive comments on the HAP and proposed revisions (to be held February 26, 1990);

2. adopt the revised HAP; and

3. submit to HUD for review and their final approval.
HOUSING ASSISTANCE PLAN

The Housing Assistance Plan (HAP) is a narrative and statistical document that outlines the needs, goals and locations for various types of housing for low and moderate income households. The HAP identifies all housing policies and housing programs for the City of Charlotte including some activities not funded by Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. Each City which expects to receive a CDBG Entitlement Grant must have a three year HAP approved in accordance with HUD regulations.

**Purposes of the HAP**

1. To provide a survey of the conditions of the City's existing housing stock.
2. To provide an assessment of the housing assistance needs of low and moderate income households.
3. To specify a three-year goal for the number of low and moderate income households to be assisted.
4. To provide an annual goals report.
5. To provide a description of the general locations of proposed assisted housing for low income persons.

**Uses of the HAP**

The HAP is used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the City in different but related ways. The uses are listed below:

**HUD**

1. For decisions in allocating assisted housing funds.
2. To monitor a local government's assisted housing provisions to assure compliance with the HAP.

**CITY**

1. To maintain data on the conditions of the City's housing stock.
2. To maintain an assessment of the housing needs of low and moderate income households.
3. To develop annual housing goals to respond to the needs of low and moderate income households.
4. To determine and document the possible locations of proposed assisted housing.
DEFINITIONS

FEDERALLY-BUILT PUBLIC HOUSING:

This includes conventional public housing and Section 8 new construction. Federal funds come to the City via the Housing Authority to provide housing for persons who earn 80% or less of the local median income.* These housing units are managed by the local Housing Authority. There is no restriction as to how long persons may live in public housing.

CITY-BUILT PUBLIC HOUSING:

These are multi-family public housing developments totally financed by the City to house persons who earn 80% or less of the local median income.* These units are managed by the Charlotte Housing Authority. There is no restriction as to how long persons may live in public housing.

CITY/HOUSING AUTHORITY TRANSITIONAL HOUSING:

This housing is developed using a combination of private and City funds. One such project currently under development in Charlotte is Project Stepping Stone. This housing is targeted for persons earning a minimum of $13,000 and a maximum of 80% of the local median income annually.* The minimum income is required so that participants in the program can be assured of sufficient resources to enable them to move into private housing within 5-7 years. During their years of participation, residents receive financial, employment and homeownership counseling, in addition to opportunities for job and training opportunities and supportive services. This program offers the opportunity to move from dependency to self-sufficiency in the private market. This housing is managed by the Housing Authority, with services provided by the Housing Authority, the Department of Social Services, Employment and Training Department, Project Self-Sufficiency, Stepping Stone Housing and other local agencies.

PUBLIC/PRIVATE HOUSING:

These are developments financed 25% or more by private funding. Private financing includes any funds which are non-tax initiated dollars such as property tax, sales tax, etc. A percentage of such units are reserved for persons who earn 80% or less of the median income.* Such projects will be owned by a private on non-profit entity, and may be managed either privately or publicly.

*80% of the local median income for a family of four in 1988 is $26,150 annually.
# Exhibit 3
## HOUSING ASSISTANCE PLAN
### LOCATIONAL POLICY CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING CRITERIA</th>
<th>PROPOSED CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVES OF LOCATIONAL STANDARDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVES OF LOCATIONAL STANDARD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Avoid Concentration of Low Income Persons</td>
<td>Previous Objectives Plus the Following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leverage Private Dollars</td>
<td>- Protect racially integrated neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Geographic Dispersal</td>
<td>- Pursue housing proposals responsive to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encourage economic/racial Integration of Areas</td>
<td>School System's Pupil Assignment Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. INELIGIBLE AREAS:**

Areas within a ¾ mile radius (property line to property line) of any 100% assisted housing project (Federally or City Built Public Housing) of 25 or more units are ineligible. Exemptions from the ¾ mile radius include:

1. City/Housing Authority Transitional Housing but ineligible census tracts standard will apply
2. Public/private ventures using Low income Housing Tax Credits and/or City's Innovative Housing fund if the project is funded 50% or more by private funds or the project is funded 25% or more by private funds and has at least 5% equity and is 100% privately owned and managed

**A. PROHIBITED AREAS:**

1. Areas within a ¾ mile radius (property line to property line) of any assisted housing project ≥25 units. Assisted housing is hereafter defined as any housing project with public financial assistance such as Federal or City built public housing public/private ventures using Low Income Housing Tax Credits and/or the City's Innovative Housing Fund and City/Housing Authority Transitional Housing

**B. INELIGIBLE CENSUS TRACTS:**

1. Census tracts where 50% or more of households earn 80% or less of the City wide median income are ineligible for additional Federally built public housing. City built public housing and City/Housing Authority transitional housing. Public/private venture projects are exempt if 40% or less of the units are reserved for households earning 60% or less of median income
2. Census tracts where the black population exceeds 40%
3. N/A
4. Census tracts where the black population has increased by 15% or more between 1970-1980
5. City Council can exempt projects on a case by case basis

2. Census tracts where 50% or more of households earn 80% or less of the City wide median income are ineligible for additional assisted housing

3. Census tracts where the black population exceeds 25%
4. Census tracts where the total number of assisted housing units exceeds 5% of all housing units in a census tract
5. Deleted

Same —Moved to Section H Policy Exemptions

*(Combines Existing Criteria Ineligible Areas and Ineligible Census Tracts)*
### LOCATIONAL POLICY CRITERIA
(continued from page 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING CRITERIA</th>
<th>PROPOSED CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>B. RESTRICTED CENSUS TRACTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Census tracts not meeting the prohibited criteria and with less than the 5% maximum number of assisted housing units are eligible for additional assisted housing units up to the maximum limit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N/A                | **C. PRIORITY CENSUS TRACTS** |
|                    | Census tracts not meeting the prohibited criteria and currently without any assisted housing will be given priority for funding |

| N/A                | **D. SPECIAL OBJECTIVE AREAS** |
|                    | Areas encompassing approved Small Area Plans or Special Project Plans that include recommendations for assisted housing will be considered for additional assisted housing by City Council on a case by case basis even when located within census tracts meeting the prohibited criteria |

| **C. LONG-TERM AVAILABILITY** |
| City has first right of refusal to purchase public/Private housing development or the developer will provide the City with options on how the units can be maintained long term as low income housing units |

| **E. LONG-TERM AVAILABILITY** |
| Same |

| **D. CENSUS TRACTS EXTENDING BEYOND CITY LIMITS** |
| Eligible or ineligible based upon entire census tract's data |

| **F. CENSUS TRACTS EXTENDING BEYOND CITY LIMITS** |
| Prohibited Restricted or Priority census tracts are based upon entire census tract's data |

| **E. MAXIMUM UNITS** |
| Not more than 50 units per site for Federally or City built public housing Public/private ventures using Low Income Housing Tax Credits and/or the City's Innovative Housing Fund are exempt |

| **G. MAXIMUM UNITS** |
| No more than 50 units per site are permitted for all program approaches |
### LOCATIONAL POLICY CRITERIA

(continued from page 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING CRITERIA</th>
<th>PROPOSED CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. POLICY EXEMPTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>H. POLICY EXEMPTIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Elderly/handicapped housing</td>
<td>1 Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Single family units under Section 234 Program North Carolina Housing Finance Agency or similar below market housing</td>
<td>2 Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Assisted housing within Community Development areas with an equal number made available outside of such areas within one year (Community Development areas are census tracts where 50% or more of the households earn 80% or less of the local median income)</td>
<td>3 Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Assisted units developed for homeownership</td>
<td>4 Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 N/A</td>
<td>5 Project conversions defined as market rate units where at least 51% of the units convert to assisted housing will be considered for funding assistance on a case by case basis by City Council. These assisted housing units will be included when calculating the 5% limit for assisted housing in a census tract. Project conversions are not subject to the 1/4 mile radius criteria or the 50 unit limit per project. However, these projects will be reviewed case-by-case and are subject to City Council exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 N/A</td>
<td>6 City Council can exempt projects from any of the above stated policy criteria on a case by case basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G. NORTH CAROLINA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY (NCHFA) BOND FINANCING

Developers of any 80%/20% developments financed by the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency are required to provide that 30% of the 20% units for low income families be two and three bedroom units or to provide a justification as to why they cannot

### I. NORTH CAROLINA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY (NCHFA) BOND FINANCING

Same
PROPOSED CRITERIA

J. EVALUATION OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

1. Proposals will be reviewed by the Innovative Housing Committee. The composition of the Committee includes:
   - Assistant City Manager for Policy and Evaluation
   - Assistant City Manager for Development Services
   - Director, Community Development Department
   - Director, Planning Commission
   - Director, Finance Department
   - Two Board members of the Charlotte Housing Authority
   - Two Board members of the Housing Partnership

   This committee will provide a technical review of all proposals and RFPs and make recommendations to City Council.

2. Responding proposals will be evaluated on all of the following but must comply with items a and b:
   a. Priority assistance is to be provided to families earning 40% or less of median income and living in substandard overcrowded or unaffordable housing or are residing in public housing and are listed on the Charlotte Housing Authority’s Master List needing housing.
   b. Compliance with the Housing Assistance Plan and the Housing Policy Plan — the geographic disbursement of proposed projects and proximity to other assisted housing will be a major consideration.
   c. The project’s effect on the School Board’s pupil assignment plan and other impacts created on the school system in terms of total new students and current plans for the construction of new schools.
   d. Land use and urban impact of projects on neighborhoods and commercial areas.
   e. Neighborhood renewal and number of housing units.
   f. Cost comparison to the City with other funded projects; this will require a financial analysis of the City’s cost per unit, private funds leveraged and the terms of the City loan in regard to payback of City funds for reuse within the Innovative Housing Fund.
   g. If tax credits are required for the project and subsequently endorsed by the City, then the submission must meet all criteria required by the North Carolina State Housing Finance Agency. The City will give priority to projects that utilize multiple leveraging mechanisms such as tax credits in addition to any City subsidy.
   h. Design compatibility with the neighborhood impact on the viability of the neighborhood, the provision of necessary amenities for children, availability of public transportation, and assurance of a good maintenance program.
COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
HOUSING ASSISTANCE PLAN LOCATIONAL POLICY

At City Council's request, a meeting was held on Friday, February 16, 1990 at 2:00 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center for a presentation of the proposed changes to the Housing Assistance Plan Locational Policy and to receive comments from representatives of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, the Charlotte Housing Authority and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership regarding these proposed changes.

J. W. Walton, Director of the Community Development Department made the presentation and a question and answer/discussion period followed.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools was represented by Harold Deal, Assistant Superintendent for Planning and Research. Comments received were:

- Generally supportive of the proposed changes and believed they would enhance the School Board's goals of spreading assisted housing throughout the City thereby helping to alleviate some of the busing necessary to maintain black/white ratios.
  - Example given of how this is working in the Hickory Grove Area where an assisted housing project was built.

- Encouraged by the efforts being taken to coordinate HAP with School Board.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership was represented by Pat Garrett, President, Peter Hubicki, Director of Operations, Tom Herrin, Board Member, Perrin Henderson, Board Member, and Ned Bishop, Board Member. Comments received were:

- Interested in understanding what impact the proposed changes would have on their efforts to develop affordable housing.

- Wanted to ensure that any efforts by the Housing Partnership to develop projects of 24 units or less in the prohibited areas would be exempt from the HAP.

- Wanted to be sure we do not lose sight of goal to provide affordable housing for poor. Land cost and rezoning problems may be prohibitive in southeast Charlotte.

- There needs to be some effort to address issue of vacant rental units on the west side and to ensure that efforts to build assisted housing in the priority areas do not aggravate this problem.
Would we lose bonus points from the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency by high land cost? It was stated that cost may have to be under $45,000 to get these bonus points, and if this is true we may need to get amended with State.

Charlotte Housing Authority was represented by Larry Loyd, Acting Executive Director, Kitty Huffman, Board Member, Otis Crowder, Board Member, Ricky Hall, Board Member and Bob Sink, Attorney.

City Council is moving in the right direction. However, concerned about cost of land in priority areas and rezoning problems. Have to be willing to rezone land especially if public/private housing wanted in the priority areas.

Would there be any way to work in concert with the School Board and block out tracts of land for assisted housing where new schools are built similar to the way the School Board and City's Park & Recreation Dept. work out school and park land combinations.
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

For: Request for Proposals to Leverage $1.5 Million to Develop Affordable Housing

As Requested by: Director of Community Development
Community Development Department
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2859

PROCEDURE FOR SUBMISSION

I. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The City of Charlotte seeks proposals from qualified developers to develop, own and provide management services for approximately 50 new multi-family affordable housing units. These housing units will benefit people earning 40 percent or less of the median income for Charlotte, North Carolina (median income for a 4-person family in Charlotte is $35,300) and who are on the Charlotte Housing Authority Master Waiting List. Preference will be given to proposals that provide a distribution of bedrooms as follows: ____ percent two bedrooms, ____ percent three bedrooms; and ____ percent four bedrooms.

A total of $1,500,000 is available to assist projects addressing the above stated need. Proposals may include a request for all or a portion of the $1,500,000 depending upon the demonstrated need for assistance and size of the proposed project. Options for utilizing the $1,500,000 to create affordable housing include, but are not limited to, the following: land acquisition, debt financing alternatives, such as construction financing, secondary permanent mortgages and deferred payment loans, and other methods of gap financing.

II. SUBMISSION ELEMENTS REQUIRED FROM DEVELOPERS, FORMAT OF PROPOSALS AND DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION

Sealed written proposals should be submitted to the Director of the Community Development Department, City of Charlotte, 600 East Fourth Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28202, on or before __________. Submissions must be clearly marked "Proposals for Innovative Housing Program". Proposals will be written and presented in the following format, utilizing the headings presented below for the organization of responses. Respondents shall address all items requested and provide a sufficient level of detail to enable evaluation of the proposal. The City has the right to request additional information as needed. The City of Charlotte shall reserve the right to accept or reject any and/or all proposals.
SECTION 1 - DEVELOPMENT ENTITY

Describe the development entity and its development history, including at a minimum:

Subsection A - General Information

1. Name, address and telephone number of the applicant and the name, address and telephone number of a representative authorized to act on behalf of the applicant during the course of this project.

2. Attach an organizational chart of the development entity. (In addition, identify the names and responsibilities of key personnel relating to this project.)

Subsection B - Development History

1. List and provide a brief description of developments which are comparable in scale, complexity and quality to the development suggested. The developer should state any experience the firm has had in providing affordable housing which for this request is defined as housing for persons earning 40 percent or less of the median income ($35,300 for a four-person family in Charlotte). Include the name and address of each development and, in addition, include the name and telephone number of a contact person familiar with each project who will respond to inquiries from the City.

Subsection C - Financial Capacity

1. The development entity should enclose current financial statements prepared by an independent CPA.

2. Where appropriate, include the personal financial statements of principals of the development entity.

3. Attach a current Bishop Report, Dunn and Bradstreet or similar report, if available, on the development entity and related businesses.

4. Provide the names, addresses and telephone numbers of two commercial or institutional credit references from which the applicant has previously obtained substantial project financing. Attach a letter authorizing each credit reference to respond to inquiries from the City.
SECTION 2 - THE PROPOSAL

Subsection A - Neighborhood Impact Assessment

A thorough narrative description of the project is needed. The proposal should also include a conceptual site plan, a rendering and/or building elevations, vicinity map and photographs of the site and adjacent parcels. The vicinity map should include references to public transit routes, neighborhood shopping facilities and public facilities such as schools, parks, etc. In addition to the above items, the proposal should include the following information:

1. Provide a letter from the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School Administration regarding what impact this project will have on the School Board's Pupil Assignment Plan. The contact person for obtaining this information is Mr. Harold Deal, Assistant Superintendent for Planning and Research.

2. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission staff should be consulted to determine if the proposal is consistent with the Generalized Land Plan 2005 and any applicable Small Area Plan or Special Project Plan.

Subsection B - Developer Commitments/Site Control

A principal or chief operating officer of the development entity must commit in writing to complete the project if selected by the City. Furthermore, the development entity must provide evidence that site control has been established at the time the proposal is submitted to the City for consideration. Evidence of site control can include a copy of the deed, option agreement, purchase contract or other document giving site control.

Subsection C - Uses and Sources of Funds

1. A budget for the project, including all hard and soft costs should be itemized.

2. All interim and permanent sources of funds need to be identified. Firm financing commitments specifying terms and conditions must be submitted.

3. Developer must evidence the capacity to raise the equity necessary for the completion of the project. Specify the sources and terms and conditions of the required equity injection.

4. Explain the type of subsidy mechanism and terms of the subsidy the City is being requested to provide.

Subsection D - Financial Information

1. Include pro formas for a 15-year period which indicate pretax cash flow, cash flow after tax, and the net proceeds after tax for the sale or refinancing of the project.
2. Provide a detailed 15-year projection of the rent structure by bedroom size and specify how the units will be affordable to people earning 40 percent or less of the median income for Charlotte.

Subsection E - Project Schedule/Key Personnel

1. Attach a project schedule which at a minimum shows the anticipated dates of starting and completing the construction.

2. Identify the key personnel and responsibilities of the construction team relating to this project.

3. Present a detailed management plan for the project's implementation and the operation of the finished project. Identify the method of management to be employed and identify the individuals and/or firms to be responsible for each element of the management plan.

Subsection F - Compliance with the Housing Assistance Plan (HAP)

Show how the project complies with the Housing Assistance Plan's Locational Policy (Attachment A).

III. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

A. Proposals will be reviewed by the Innovative Housing Committee. The composition of the Committee includes:

Assistant City Manager for Policy and Evaluation
Assistant City Manager for Development Services
Director, Community Development Department
Director, Planning Commission
Director, Finance Department
Two Board members of the Charlotte Housing Authority
Two Board members of the Housing Partnership.

This committee will provide a technical review of all proposals and RFP's and make recommendations to City Council.

B. Responding proposals will be evaluated on all of the following but must comply with items 1 and 2:

1. Priority assistance is to be provided to families earning 40% or less of median income and living in substandard, overcrowded, or unaffordable housing, or are residing in public housing, and are listed on the Charlotte Housing Authority's Master List needing housing;

2. Compliance with the Housing Assistance Plan and the Housing Policy Plan - the geographic disbursement of proposed projects and proximity to other assisted housing will be a major consideration;
3. The project's effect on the School Board's pupil assignment plan and other impacts created on the school system in terms of total new students and current plans for the construction of new schools;

4. Land use and urban impact of projects on neighborhoods and commercial areas;

5. Neighborhood renewal and number of housing units;

6. Cost comparison to the City with other funded projects; this will require a financial analysis of the City's cost per unit, private funds leveraged and the terms of the City loan in regard to payback of City funds for reuse within the Innovative Housing Fund.

7. If tax credits are required for the project and subsequently endorsed by the City, then the submission must meet all criteria required by the North Carolina State Housing Finance Agency. The City will give priority to projects that utilize multiple leveraging mechanisms, such as tax credits, in addition to any City subsidy.

8. Design compatibility with the neighborhood, impact on the viability of the neighborhood, the provision of necessary amenities for children, availability of public transportation, and assurance of a good maintenance program.

IV PROCESS

All interested developers will be briefed at a "Pre-proposal Conference" to be held as shown in the following schedule of events. All due dates are final and cannot be extended for any reason. Failure to respond to any of the requested submission items is cause for the proposal to be rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-proposal Conference</td>
<td>3-8-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Deadline</td>
<td>3-30-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review by Innovative Housing</td>
<td>4-10-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee and Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Action</td>
<td>4-23-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution of Loan Agreement</td>
<td>5-5-90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All questions regarding this request for proposals should be addressed to A. C. Shull, Neighborhood Development Supervisor at 336-2410.

Revised 2/90
# Exhibit 3
**HOUSING ASSISTANCE PLAN**

**LOCATIONAL POLICY CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING CRITERIA</th>
<th>PROPOSED CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVES OF LOCATIONAL STANDARDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVES OF LOCATIONAL STANDARD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Avoid Concentration of Low Income Persons</td>
<td>Previous Objectives Plus the Following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leveraging Private Dollars</td>
<td>- Protect racially integrated neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Geographic Dispersal</td>
<td>- Pursue housing proposals responsive to the School System's Pupil Assignment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encourage economic/racial integration of Areas</td>
<td>- Promote community development of selected neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. INELIGIBLE AREAS:
Areas within a 1/2 mile radius (property line to property line) of any 100% assisted housing project (Federally or City Built Public Housing) of 25 or more units are ineligible. Exemptions from the 1/2 mile radius include:

1. City/Housing Authority Transitional Housing, but ineligible census tracts standard will apply
2. Public/private ventures using Low Income Housing Tax Credits and/or City’s Innovative Housing Fund if the project is funded 50% or more by private funds or the project is funded 25% or more by private funds and has at least 5% equity and is 100% privately owned and managed

### B. INELIGIBLE CENSUS TRACTS:

1. Census tracts where 50% or more of households earn 80% or less of the City-wide median income are ineligible for additional Federally built public housing, City built public housing and City/Housing Authority transitional housing. Public/private venture projects are exempt if 40% or less of the units are reserved for households earning 80% or less of median income
2. Census tracts where the black population exceeds 40%
3. N/A
4. Census tracts where the black population has increased by 15% or more between 1970 and 1980
5. City Council can exempt projects on a case-by-case basis

### A. PROHIBITED AREAS:

1. Areas within a 1/4 mile radius (property line to property line) of any assisted housing project ≥25 units. 'Assisted housing' is hereafter defined as any housing project with public financial assistance such as Federal or City built public housing, public/private ventures using Low Income Housing Tax Credits and/or the City's Innovative Housing Fund and City/Housing Authority Transitional Housing

2. Census tracts where 50% or more of households earn 80% or less of the City-wide median income are ineligible for additional assisted housing

3. Census tracts where the black population exceeds 25%

4. Census tracts where the total number of assisted housing units exceeds 5% of all housing units in a census tract

4. Deleted

5. Same—Moved to Section H Policy Exemptions

*(Combines Existing Criteria, Ineligible Areas and Ineligible Census Tracts)*
### LOCATIONAL POLICY CRITERIA
(continued from page 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING CRITERIA</th>
<th>PROPOSED CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. RESTRICTED CENSUS TRACTS</strong></td>
<td>Census tracts not meeting the prohibited criteria and with less than the 5% maximum number of assisted housing units are eligible for additional assisted housing units up to the maximum limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>C. PRIORITY CENSUS TRACTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Census tracts not meeting the prohibited criteria and currently without any assisted housing will be given priority for funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>D. SPECIAL OBJECTIVE AREAS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas encompassing approved Small Area Plans or Special Project Plans that include recommendations for assisted housing will be considered for additional assisted housing by City Council on a case-by-case basis even when located within census tracts meeting the prohibited criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. LONG-TERM AVAILABILITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>E. LONG-TERM AVAILABILITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City has first right of refusal to purchase public/Private housing development or the developer will provide the city with options on how the units can be maintained long term as low income housing units</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. CENSUS TRACTS EXTENDING BEYOND CITY LIMITS</strong></td>
<td><strong>F. CENSUS TRACTS EXTENDING BEYOND CITY LIMITS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible or ineligible based upon entire census tract's data</td>
<td>Prohibited Restricted or Priority census tracts are based upon entire census tract's data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. MAXIMUM UNITS</strong></td>
<td><strong>G. MAXIMUM UNITS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 50 units per site for Federally or City built public housing. Public/private ventures using Low Income Housing Tax Credits and/or the City's Innovative Housing Fund are exempt</td>
<td>No more than 50 units per site are permitted for all program approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LOCATIONAL POLICY CRITERIA

(continued from page 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING CRITERIA</th>
<th>PROPOSED CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. POLICY EXEMPTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>H. POLICY EXEMPTIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Elderly/handicapped housing</td>
<td>1 Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Single family units under Section 234 Program North Carolina Housing Finance Agency or similar below market housing</td>
<td>2 Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Assisted housing within Community Development areas with an equal number made available outside of such areas within one year (Community Development areas are census tracts where 50% or more of the households earn 80% or less of the local median income)</td>
<td>3 Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Assisted units developed for homeownership</td>
<td>4 Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 N/A</td>
<td>5 Project conversions defined as market rate units where at least 51% of the units convert to assisted housing will be considered for funding assistance on a case-by-case basis by City Council. These assisted housing units will be included when calculating the 5% limit for assisted housing in a census tract. Project conversions are not subject to the 1/4 mile radius criteria or the 50 unit limit per project. However, these projects will be reviewed case-by-case and are subject to City Council exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 N/A</td>
<td>6 City Council can exempt projects from any of the above stated policy criteria on a case-by-case basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q. NORTH CAROLINA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY (NCHFA) BOND FINANCING

Developers of any 80%/20% developments financed by the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency are required to provide that 30% of the 20% units for low income families be two and three bedroom units or to provide a justification as to why they cannot

### I. NORTH CAROLINA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY (NCHFA) BOND FINANCING

Same
J. EVALUATION OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

1. Proposals will be reviewed by the Innovative Housing Committee. The composition of the Committee includes:
   - Assistant City Manager for Policy and Evaluation
   - Assistant City Manager for Development Services
   - Director, Community Development Department
   - Director, Planning Commission
   - Director, Finance Department
   - Two Board members of the Charlotte Housing Authority
   - Two Board members of the Housing Partnership

   This committee will provide a technical review of all proposals and RFPs and make recommendations to City Council.

2. Responding proposals will be evaluated on all of the following but must comply with items a and b:
   a. Priority assistance is to be provided to families earning 40% or less of median income and living in substandard overcrowded or unaffordable housing, or are residing in public housing and are listed on the Charlotte Housing Authority's Master List needing housing.
   b. Compliance with the Housing Assistance Plan and the Housing Policy Plan — the geographic disbursement of proposed projects and proximity to other assisted housing will be a major consideration.
   c. The project's effect on the School Board's pupil assignment plan and other impacts created on the school system in terms of total new students and current plans for the construction of new schools.
   d. Land use and urban impact of projects on neighborhoods and commercial areas
   e. Neighborhood renewal and number of housing units
   f. Cost comparison to the City with other funded projects, this will require a financial analysis of the City's cost per unit, private funds leveraged and the terms of the City loan in regard to payback of City funds for reuse within the Innovative Housing Fund.
   g. If tax credits are required for the project and subsequently endorsed by the City then the submission must meet all criteria required by the North Carolina State Housing Finance Agency. The City will give priority to projects that utilize multiple leveraging mechanisms, such as tax credits, in addition to any City subsidy.
   h. Design compatibility with the neighborhood, impact on the viability of the neighborhood, the provision of necessary amenities for children, availability of public transportation, and assurance of a good maintenance program.

FOOTNOTE

City Council is contemplating these proposed changes to the HAP Locational Policy which may not be adopted by the Council at the time the Request for Proposal (RFP) is being advertised. However, these proposed changes may be adopted by the Council before the submittal date of the RFPs. Therefore, all RFPs must comply with the City's approved HAP in existence at the time of submission deadline.
The City Council Community Development and Housing Committee met on February 13, 1990, at 5:00 p.m., in room 270 of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center, with chairman Cyndee Patterson presiding. Committee members Richard Vinroot, Ann Hammond and Tom Mangum were present. Committee member Hoyle Martin was absent. Council member Roy Matthews was also in attendance.

Staff members in attendance were J. W. Walton and Chuck Uhlar - Community Development; Tom Finnie, Pam Syfert, and Darlene Shrum-City Manager's Office.

Also present were Larry Loyd, Harrison Shannon and Peter Hubicki.

### Process for Acquiring Land for Housing

**Discussion:** Tom Finnie presented options available for the Community Development Department to acquire land for developing low-income housing for persons earning 40% or less of the median income. Three strategies were outlined: (1) Use of a request for proposal (RFP) to solicit offers to land developers, real estate brokers and individual land owners to sell land to the city; (2) A contract with private real estate firms to identify land to be recommended for Council consideration; and (3) Acquiring land by condemnation.

**Action Taken:** The committee voted to recommend to Council that an RFP process be developed and used to identify land, and also that staff identify land from other resources; the land for acquisition be restricted to census tracts defined as priority areas by the revised HAP for a one year period, and the areas be prioritized into three groups indicating highest to lowest priority. The committee further recommended that while preference should be to identify properly zoned land, requests be considered to rezone property that meets all specified criteria in the RFP.

### Schedule for CD and Housing Committee Meetings

The committee discussed the difficulty in scheduling meetings and agreed to hold future meetings on the second Friday of the month at 12:00 noon.

Meeting adjourned at 6:05 pm.
### Cultural Study Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Balk</td>
<td>Major Arts Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd C. Campbell, Jr.</td>
<td>Business Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Chapple</td>
<td>Arts Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Cooper</td>
<td>Educational Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne Dwyer</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm E. Everett, III</td>
<td>Business Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Farrar</td>
<td>Educational Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Hair</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Science Council Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Marsicano</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Science Council Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Patrick Phillips, Chairman</td>
<td>Business Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha Robinson</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Robinson</td>
<td>Arts Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Van Allen</td>
<td>Major Arts Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Williamson, III</td>
<td>Major Arts Contributor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cultural Study Committee

Charge

To develop a method to review cultural requests for public funding by December 31, 1989, and to develop a cultural plan for Charlotte/Mecklenburg which will ensure the most effective and equitable use of dollars for the advancement of arts and culture in Charlotte/Mecklenburg. The plan is to be developed by December 31, 1990.
MEMORANDUM

To: Charlotte City Council
    Mecklenburg County Commission

From: Pat Phillips, Chairman
    Cultural Planning Committee

Re: Phase I Report

Date: Tuesday, December 5, 1989

CHARGE REVIEW

The Cultural Planning Committee has been charged with two tasks. The
first task is to develop a method of review for public funding of
financial requests. The second task is to develop a long range cultural
plan which will ensure the most effective and equitable use of dollars
for the advancement of culture in the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg
County. In addition, the committee's objective is to create a cultural
plan that takes the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County into the
21st Century.

SUMMARY OF PHASE I ACHIEVEMENTS

The Planning Committee has divided the 18 months process into three
phases. Phase I consists of the "plan to plan". Phase II consists of
the in-depth planning process itself and Phase III includes the
distribution and communication of results. The first phase of the
process has been completed. The following objectives were achieved in
Phase I:

a. The development of a working definition of the term culture
   (Appendix A).

b. The collection of data from existing cultural assets.

c. The participation in goal setting by ten community focus
groups.

d. The development of themes, goals, and objectives.

e. The development of methodology options.

f. The development of preliminary cost estimates for Phases II
   and III.
g. Immediate next steps.

FOCUS GROUP RESEARCH

The Planning Committee decided that all three phases of the study process should be as participatory as possible, including the goal setting procedure in Phase I. Accordingly, the committee contracted with the Livable Places Partners (LPP) to conduct ten (10) focus group sessions of 150 citizens who contributed 1500 pieces of information to the goal setting process. A complete Focus Group Report is included in Appendix B. Examination of the focus group responses enabled the committee to establish themes and to set goals for the Cultural Plan sensitive to the interests of the citizenry at large.

THEMES

The Planning Committee recognizes that this cultural plan will take the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County into the 21st Century. For this reason, the committee has approached the Cultural Plan as a blueprint for our future. During Phase I of the study process, two major themes have emerged which will prepare our community for the 21st Century. These two themes are Children and Region.

The importance of strengthening Charlotte's cultural climate for children and increasing cultural education opportunities has been emphasized repeatedly during the first phase of the study. If the Cultural Plan is to provide a foundation for our future, then that foundation must be built for our children. The Planning Committee will bring their needs to the forefront of cultural development.

Thirteen counties surrounding Mecklenburg County are rapidly developing as one region. Many forces are at work that inhibit this development. Cultural differences must not inhibit our development as a region. Instead, cultural assets can be positioned to lead the effort in regional development. A regionally oriented cultural plan is the key to this achievement.

In addition to the two major themes of Children and Region, four sub-themes have been identified. These sub-themes include Organization, Participation, Partnerships and Financing. They are described in detail in Appendix B. Phases II and III will be conducted within the framework of these themes and sub-themes.

CULTURAL PLAN GOALS

The Planning Committee will achieve the following six (6) goals through Phase II of the Cultural Planning Process:

1. Develop sound financial management for cultural assets by:
a. Reviewing current public and private allocation procedures.
b. Studying public and private allocation procedures nationwide.
c. Establishing improved mechanisms for the distribution of current financial resources.
d. Identifying new sources of funding.

2. Preserve and protect our existing cultural assets.

3. Identify the needs of the community and recommend specific strategies for addressing these needs within the framework of two major themes: Children and Region.

4. Establish an environment supportive of artistic and scientific excellence, as well as the creative endeavors of cultural agencies, individual artists, and citizens at large.

5. Increase public participation in cultural opportunities and expand cultural choices, if necessary, to maximize public participation.

6. Identify and encourage partnership opportunities between cultural, social, historic, and economic assets of the community for the purposes of building a balanced quality of life for all citizens.

METHODOLOGY

The Planning Committee recommends that comparative research, management audits, key informant interviews, surveys, community meetings, and public forums be conducted during Phase II of the process. Phase II is the in-depth planning stage of the process. This Phase is expected to take place between January and June of 1990. It will emphasize participation by a broad cross section of the community and region.

The committee has reviewed a list of potential consultants on paper. A short list has been selected and interviews of the finalists will be conducted during the month of January. By the end of the month a decision will be made whether to employ one consultant or a team of consultants. Preliminary cost estimates have not identified a savings in one approach over another. The committee will be prepared to return to the City Council and the County Commission by February 1, 1990, with a choice of consultant(s), a budget, and proposed sources of funds.

TIMELINE

The following timeline has been established by the Planning Committee:

December, 1990 Phase I Report
RFP written

- 3 -
January, 1990  
Consultant Interviews  
Consultant Selection  
Request for Funds  

February, 1990  
Contract Finalized  
Phase II Begins

March - July, 1990  
In-depth Planning Process  
Consultant Research Period

August, 1990  
Final Report Drafted  
and Reviewed

September - December, 1990  
Phase III Begins  
Published Plan  
Distribution/Communication  
Final Recommendations to  
City/County

IMMEDIATE ISSUES

The Planning Committee recognizes that its decision to look with vision toward the 21st Century poses two dilemmas that require discussion.  
First, the City Council originally requested the funding policy component of the Cultural Plan by December, 1989. Members of the committee were unanimous in their feelings that it was more beneficial to both elected bodies to conduct the full plan prior to the development of funding policies rather than the reverse. Funding policies logically flow from the complete plan rather than ahead of the plan. The committee intends to recommend a comprehensive funding policy that will last well into the 21st Century. However, the committee felt compelled to offer the City Council and County Commission three options for an interim solution.

Two of the options draw on existing human resources knowledgeable about the cultural community, and well placed within established groups structurally capable of conducting a comprehensive review of requests by cultural agencies to both local governments. The first option is to call upon the Grants Committee of the Arts and Science Council to conduct a thorough analysis of the requests and to submit recommendations to the City Council and the County Commission. The Arts and Science Council is set up to deliberate over funding requests with established criteria, but has not yet been approached to consider this expanded interim role.

The second option is to create a Review Committee made up of three members from the Arts and Science Council, two members from the Cultural Planning Committee itself, and one key staff member from the City and County each. This second option would establish an important link to the Planning Committee itself. It provides direct "hands on"
experience by Cultural Planning Committee members who will be recommending a funding policy package at the completion of the full Cultural Plan.

The third option is to continue to review requests as they have been reviewed in the past by direct access to the City Council and the County Commission. This option protects against "quick fix" solutions that would most likely change after the completed plan. There may be no compelling reason by the City Council and County Commission to disrupt the entire system with changes two years in a row. Selection of option three includes an additional recommendation that City/County support to cultural organizations during FY91 be adjusted to reflect the rate of inflation, thus assuring the groups a financial status quo.

The second immediate issue relates to the early identification by the committee of a major problem in our current cultural system. The problem is widespread institutional instability that has resulted in deficit situations within some of our finest cultural organizations. While it is the intent of the committee to address this issue in the comprehensive Cultural Plan, the urgency of the problem cannot be ignored. The committee has been made aware of the well conceived initiatives by the Arts and Science Council to bring new federal dollars to Charlotte to tackle this problem. ASC has made an application for funds to the National Endowment for the Arts to address this issue. The Planning Committee encourages the support of the City and County in this important effort.
MEMORANDUM

To: Charlotte City Council
    Mecklenburg County Commission

From: Pat Phillips, Chairman
       Cultural Study Committee

Re: Consultant Recommendation

Date: February 6, 1990

The Cultural Study Committee has become aware of a preference, by the City Council, to receive recommendations for changes and improvements in the system of allocating public funds to cultural organizations within the next two months. It is the understanding of the committee that a report on April 15, 1990, will enable the City Council to implement recommendations for the immediate budget cycle. The Cultural Study Committee is eager to accommodate the City Council. The delicate nature of the subject, however, requires objective professional expertise between now and then.

The Cultural Study Committee has completed a review of consultants and recommends that the City of Charlotte, in its capacity as lead agent, contract with the Wolf Organization for professional services. Mr. Wolf and his associates will assist the committee in the development of funding and allocation procedures, as well as the comprehensive cultural plan. The cost of the ten (10) months consulting contract is $95,000. The price of the consultancy has been negotiated and is comparable to the cost of the 1975 cultural plan in 1990 dollars.

To date, the Cultural Study Committee has raised $25,000 from the private sector for these fees. The remaining $70,000 is respectfully requested by the committee from the City of Charlotte in the amount of $56,000 and Mecklenburg County in the amount of $14,000. These figures reflect a prior agreement between the City and the County to fund the cultural planning process in the ratio of 80% - 20% respectively.

An investment in the professional expertise of the calibre of Tom Wolf will pay significant dividends. Mr. Wolf’s references have been checked and he is highly recommended. He and his colleagues are responsible for the recent development of community wide cultural plans in major American cultural centers, such as Los Angeles, Houston, and Phoenix.

This cultural plan will prepare Charlotte for the 21st Century by making provisions for a healthy system of cultural organizations and activities. Mr. Wolf, in particular, brings to Charlotte a real vision for the future of the cultural life in America. This vision is grounded in his financial management and organizational skills.
The City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County can expect the cultural plan to include the following:

1. An assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of grantmaking program (public and private) to cultural agencies, including application procedures, application review, grants processing, and final reporting/evaluation systems.

2. Concrete recommendations for changes and improvements in the allocation systems of both public and private funds to cultural organizations.

3. Recommendations for programs and services that address needs and priorities with particular emphasis on the target areas of children and region.

4. Recommendations for expanding the community’s role in serving the region’s children and recommendations to strengthen the educational climate for the arts within the public schools and within Charlotte/Mecklenburg-based cultural institutions.

5. Recommendations for developing a regional approach to cultural development including specific marketing techniques.

6. Recommendations for innovative funding strategies and mechanisms.

7. Recommendations for programs and services for individual artists, cultural organizations, multicultural constituencies and audiences with indications of required levels of funding.

8. Recommendations for infrastructural improvements with respect to cultural activities, including changes in the Arts and Science Council’s programs, services, and administrative procedures.

9. A detailed report on factfinding results, survey research, framework budget projections, and the necessary steps for the implementation of the cultural plan.

The Wolf Organization will achieve this agenda by conducting framework budget projections, survey research, public policy analysis, public forums, personal interviews, needs assessment, and comparative community research to develop a multiyear cultural plan for Charlotte/Mecklenburg.

A finalized timeline has been attached for your review, as well as a budget breakdown. Please note that the timeline has been established around the need to report to both local governments by April 15, 1990, on the recommendations for changes in the system of allocating public funds. Accordingly, the City and County will be able to implement these recommendations during the immediate budget cycle, if they so choose.
The Study Committee strongly urges the City Council and County Commission to employ the Wolf Organization. Thank you for your support of this important process.
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DATE: January 22, 1990

PETITION NO.: 89-86

PETITIONER(S): Zaremba CenterPoint Company

REQUEST: Change from 0-6 and R-6MP to B-1SCD

LOCATION: A 13.8 acre site on the northeasterly corner of Eastway Drive and Biscayne Drive.

ACTION: The Zoning Committee recommends that this petition be approved.

VOTE: Yeas: Burns, Davis, Lassiter, Latham, Majeed, and Head.

Nays: None.

(COMMISSIONER POINTS abstained from discussion and vote, declaring a conflict of interest.)

REASONS

This petition proposes the development of a shopping center in an area where plans call for an office future. The City Council recently approved a major shopping center directly across Eastway Drive from the subject site. This petitioner had requested numerous deferrals in order to continue to modify their plan to try to address the many issues which emerged during the process. Members of the Zoning Committee noted that this did not appear to be a good location for office development. They noted also that the petitioner had addressed all of the main concerns raised by the site plan including improvements to the edge treatment and a relocation of their major entrance to conform to the location of the major shopping center across Eastway Drive. They also noted that they felt this property could be used to soften the impact of commercial relocations from Independence Boulevard.

STAFF OPINION

The staff disagrees with the recommendation of the Zoning Committee. This petition is clearly inconsistent with plans for the area and the development of this site will set the stage for additional commercial development along Eastway Drive in this area and south to U.S. 74. The retail needs in the area are more than adequately served by the existing retail center directly across the street.
PETITIONER Zaremba CenterPoint Co.

PETITION NO. 89-86 HEARING DATE October 18, 1989

ZONING CLASSIFICATION, EXISTING 0-6 R-9 REQUESTED B-1SCD

LOCATION Approximately 13.8 acres located on the northeasterly corner of

Eastway Dr and Biscayne Dr

ZONING MAP NO. 100, 101, 112, 113

PROPERTY PROPOSED FOR CHANGE
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Sue Myrick and City Council Members

FROM: Richard Vinroot

DATE: February 1, 1990

SUBJECT: "World Cup" Soccer-1994

As you may have read in yesterday's Observer, Charlotte is one of several U.S. cities (Washington, D.C., Miami and San Diego are others I've heard about) being considered as sites for the World Cup Soccer competition that will come to this country for the first time in 1994. On a worldwide scale, this is equivalent to the Super Bowl, World Series, Final Four and Kentucky Derby rolled into one event -- it is a very big deal! I'm enclosing some material I have secured from Rich Melvin, the man who brought all of this to my attention, for your further reference.

In this regard, the director of "World Cup USA" has apparently expressed a strong interest in Charlotte because (a) he is a Wake Forest graduate, (b) it is anticipated we will have a 70,000-plus-seat NFL stadium by 1994, (c) soccer is becoming very big in the Carolinas (UNC's women have won the NCAA soccer championship for six or seven of the last eight years, and Duke and Clemson are perennial contenders for the NCAA championship on the men's side, as well), and (d) Charlotte is an ideal mid-east location between New York/Washington and Miami, etc.

In order to improve our chances at being selected -- which could be a "sporting bonanza" in the summer of 1994 right after we have hosted the Final Four in college basketball that spring -- it has been suggested that Charlotte host some of the preliminary competition this spring and in the next couple of years in Memorial Stadium. However, to qualify, it will be necessary that Memorial have enough sideline space to meet minimum World Cup Soccer standards, which it does not do in its present configuration. The problem is that the elliptical footprint creates four "corner" locations that require widening (as indicated on an attached rough drawing I have prepared for illustration), which will necessitate removal of small portions of stone wall and seating at a cost estimated to be between $40,000 and $90,000, depending on whether it is done by city staff or private contractors.
I have discussed this with Wendell White, Marvin Billups, the Chamber of Commerce, the Convention and Visitors Bureau, and Mark Richardson, all of whom have an interest and stake in it; and all are extremely supportive of our proceeding, for slightly different reasons. The Chamber and Convention and Visitors Bureau are interested because it will leverage Charlotte into the World Cup picture, and help us bring "world class" sporting events here, Mark is interested because if it happens, he'll have a major non-football use for their new NFL stadium, and Wendell and Marvin are interested for all these reasons plus the fact that it will enhance Memorial Stadium as a venue for international and other soccer competition without regard to whether the World Cup ultimately selects Charlotte.

Accordingly, I would like to encourage us to approve these stadium improvements, and to do so without delay. If we are to host soccer competition this year, it will begin as early as April, and we must authorize Wendell and Marvin to take whatever steps are appropriate to have this work done immediately.

I hope you will agree to consider this and act on it during our retreat; if that is not feasible, I ask that you permit me to add it to our workshop agenda Monday, for brief discussion at that time.

Thanks.

RAV:ltl
Attachment and portfolio
WORLD CUP CHRONOLOGY

In the Spring of 1987, United States Soccer Federation President Werner Fricker informed FIFA of its intention to bid for the 1994 World Cup tournament. The Federation formed World Cup USA 1994, Inc., a non-profit organization, and immediately set out to secure first-rate professional help for the bid. A political consulting firm and a publicist were hired to work with Federation officials in preparing the bid, provide specially needed logistical services to the effort, and thereby avoid pulling Federation personnel from other projects.

The first order of business was preparing the official U.S. application which satisfied FIFA's World Cup Terms of Reference. The Terms include requirements ranging from stadium measurements and seating capacity to security and telecommunications facilities.

As part of the application, over 100 stadiums all across the country had to be considered. In all, 33 stadiums were personally surveyed in the spring and summer by the World Cup technical staff and the number of potential sites was narrowed down to 18. These surveys included complex negotiations which resulted in stadium officials agreeing to remove all advertising during the games and renovate their playing fields to meet FIFA's required measurements.

To become financially self-sufficient, money had to be raised over the months to offset the costs, which were estimated at $1.2 - $1.5 million. The funds came from a number of sources including: sale of t-shirts and posters, contributions from soccer communities and 1994 Charter Club members, corporate sponsors, and 94 Founders' Club members. Fundraising for the bid effort remains a major project line until the end of August, 1988.

Along with fundraising, a major organizational and communication effort was launched to spread the word about World Cup USA. Letters were sent to every Governor and state legislature requesting a resolution or proclamation in support of the bid. The Mayors and city councils of small, medium, and large communities across the country received similar requests.
Nearly 450 resolutions and proclamations came in and were a part of the World Cup bid, which included at least one endorsement from each of the 50 states. Furthermore, as part of the bid, President Reagan signed a letter of support and both Houses of Congress passed a resolution endorsing World Cup USA.

During the last days of the summer of 1987 Federation and World Cup staff put the finishing touches on the bid book which was formally submitted to FIFA, in Zurich, on September 30th. Two key events, at the end of the year, finished off the successful bid phase for 1987.

The reigning President of international soccer, Dr. Joao Havelange, visited the U.S. in November and was given the royal treatment. This included a personal visit with President Reagan at the White House who made a pitch for hosting the World Cup.

Several weeks later, in December, World Cup and Federation officials flew to Zurich to make an informal presentation to FIFA's Executive Committee, which would vote on the designation of a host nation. A video was produced in three languages illustrating the growth of the game in the United States, the excitement for and ability to host the tournament, plus a large display that identified the origin of all the official proclamations and other signs of support were presented.

In January 1988, World Cup USA began to focus on the important tasks that remained to be finished before the July 4th host nation designation decision by FIFA officials. The official headquarters was opened in Washington, D.C. and Federation Treasurer Paul A. Stiehl was named Director of World Cup USA 1994, Inc.

A test that was essential to the bid's success was the planning and execution of a week-long tour by a FIFA delegation charged with inspecting the stadiums, hotels, security, and communications facilities presented in the bid. Fourteen of the fifteen cities selected as potential sites were toured by the delegation in April 1988. Federation contacts in each city were vitally important in the preparation and coordination of the whirlwind tour.

When FIFA's representatives were not measuring playing fields during the tour, they were being treated to elegant receptions, first-class accommodations, and even a trip to Disney World. In kind contributions covered all expenses of the tour. Along the way, the FIFA officials received an enthusiastic welcome at each stop. The preparations that went into the April tour were enormous, but FIFA was once again reassured that the Federation was well organized and certainly capable of hosting the 1994 tournament.
Following the tour, two more trips by World Cup and Federation officials to Zurich were necessary, including a business meeting in May to discuss plans for the staging of the event should our nation be designated. The last trip came on July 4th when Federation officials made the final presentation to the FIFA Executive Committee and the U.S. was voted the 1994 tournament host.

The credit for this historic feat goes to the officers and staff of World Cup USA and U.S. Soccer Federation, and to soccer supporters around the nation who threw their total energies behind this effort.

Hosting the World Cup will give American soccer the chance it needs to gain respect and popularity in this country and throughout the world. One goal has been reached. There is an opportunity to accomplish much, much more - and with your support we will!
By Paul Kennedy

Italia '90 has not yet begun, but work on the 1994 World Cup has already moved into full swing as organizers are actively pursuing potential sites for the month-long competition.

The demands are great: World Cup '94 organizers will require contracts with everyone from stadium owners to vehicle licensing authorities and more details on everything from a stadium's drainage system to the local tax base. But they believe that the rewards in terms of increased civic pride — at least a nominal tourist dollar — will be enough to convince local leaders to take the plunge.

Following is an outline of the bid process as presented in the World Cup '94 Organizing Committee's proposals sent Jan. 10 to 22 cities:

CITIES

As few as eight may be chosen

The World Cup '94 Organizing Committee sent what they call "invitation packages" to 22 cities, including seven that were not included in the US-based Short List that includes 26 cities bidding for the '94 finals that was accepted by FIFA in 1982.

The seven cities — or venues, as the World Cup organizers call them — include New York/New Haven, Conn. (Yale Bowl); Boston/Foxboro Mass.; (Sullivan Stadium, home of the National Football League's New England Patriots); Buffalo N.Y. (now being constructed for 1993 World University Games); Toronto, Ont.; Detroit-Ann Arbor Mich.; and Chicago, Ill. (the proposed site for a stadium in the Chicago area that is being considered).

The 22 cities give the World Cup '94 organizers an even geographic distribution from which to match up sites (or in the case of Miami and Las Vegas, two stadiums within one city) within potential sites. There are seven in the Northeast and five each in the South Midwest and Far West.

Much more significant than the World Cup '94 committee's decision to target 22 sites is a decision to have open the possibility of working with as few as eight venues. Since the World Cup was expanded from 16 to 24 teams for the 1982 World Cup the number of cities and stadiums that organizers have had to use has increased considerably.

The Spanish organizers of the 1982 World Cup and no fewer than 14 cities and 16 stadiums for the 25-game schedule, but the work that needed to be done left local clubs and municipalities as significant debtors.

While Miami was able to get by with five stadiums in five cities for the 16-team World Cup in 1990, it had to expand to 13 sites in one city in 1990.

Finally Italy will use 12 stadiums in 12 sites to host the 1994 World Cup, but builders have been asked to submit bids for the $46 million stadium that is to be built on the site of the old stadium in Rome in 1994.

The demands, of course, is that every city that wants to host the 1994 World Cup has to own, build or secure a suitable stadium to satisfy the requirements of the national and international governing bodies.

If the World Cup '94 organizers choose fewer than 12 venues, they will have several problems. Most significant, World Cup '94 will be able to reduce security costs much of which, at least a and around the stadium, it will have to pay for itself if it gone with eight instead of 12 sites.

If the World Cup organizers choose fewer than 12 venues, they will solve several problems. Most significant, World Cup '94 will be able to reduce security costs much of which, at least a and around the stadium, it will have to pay for itself if it gone with eight instead of 12 sites.

If the World Cup organizers choose fewer than 12 venues, they will solve several problems. Most significant, World Cup '94 will be able to reduce security costs much of which, at least a and around the stadium, it will have to pay for itself if it gone with eight instead of 12 sites.

CRITERIA

From field size to crowd potential

While selecting the sites for the major international events such as the World Cup is no exact science, World Cup '94 organizers have to take much of the guesswork out of the process or as the very least, keep the bidding process clean and avoid the charges of predator minimal arrangements or back-door deals that have followed the selection of host cities or midsize cities for several of the recent Olympic Games.

LeTteller hopes to be able to see a macti site ranked each venue in the eight venue spectrum categories that his organization will use as criteria.

The most important of the criteria will be the condition of the stadium that a venue submits to use the kind of support that the city and government leaders intend to give. Without a doubt the stadium issue will be the most critical. The city has been considered unsuitable for a period of three months (thereby excluding baseball stadiums) is one of a stadium that will have a natural surface measuring at least 100 meters by 100 meters and containing an additional six-meter perimeter around the field to accommodate signage, team benches and photographers.

Perhaps the biggest legal issue will concern existing stadium advertising and luxury box contracts, as each stadium operator will have to give the World Cup organizers free and clear use of its stadium and obtain waivers from existing stadium advertisers or negotiate windows in future stadium advertising.

Most stadiums will not require the waiver agreements that have been made by the four main organizers that will probably have to be expanded to the armed forces and public, the stadium will reach as many cities as possible in 1994.

The other six criteria are soccer interest and support (proposed and existing potential crowd potential) parks and metropolitan community infrastructure (stadium airports transportation systems and training facilities for organizing committees and local organizing committees); natural and environmental conditions.

Each city will have to submit an agreement with the host, which will be able to make the 12 sites be able to make a 30-minute oral presentation about their project to the World Cup organizers. The 30-minute oral presentation about their project will be made by a 30-minute oral presentation about their project to the World Cup organizers.

The ultimate decision of which venues will host the finals will be made by FIFA and not World Cup '94.

World Cup '94 organizers will submit recommendations but the final decision will be made by FIFA after each of its World Cup organizing committee in April and May 1991.

The earliest time for the announcement of which venues will host the finals is June 1991. The second earliest time for the announcement of which venues will host the finals is December 1989.
Soccer America presents
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Willeto, a first-year coach at the University of Florida, lost his job earlier this season. He was fired after a 1-1-1 start and replaced by a former assistant coach, Lefteris. Willeto is a former assistant coach at the University of Florida, where he helped guide the team to a national championship in 1991.

"I'm not surprised," Willeto said. "It's been difficult to get started." He attributed his team's struggles to lack of experience and poor play on defense. "We need to improve our defense if we're going to have a chance," Willeto said.

Lefteris, who has taken over as head coach, has been with the team for three years. He was an assistant coach under Willeto before being promoted to head coach last fall.

"It's been a learning experience," Lefteris said. "We're trying to build a winning culture." He added that the team's focus is on improving each player's skills.

Willeto said he is looking forward to watching the team develop under Lefteris. "I'm confident in Lefteris' ability to lead this team," Willeto said. "I think he's got what it takes to be a successful coach."
LAW I. — THE FIELD OF PLAY

The Field of Play and appurtenances shall be as shown in the following plan.
LAW I (continued)

(1) Dimensions. The field of play shall be rectangular its length being not more than 130 yards nor less than 100 yards and its breadth not more than 100 yards nor less than 50 yards. In International Matches the length shall be not more than 120 yards nor less than 110 yards and the breadth not more than 80 yards nor less than 70 yards. The length shall in all cases exceed the breadth.

(2) Marking. The field of play shall be marked with distinctive lines, not more than 5 inches in width, not by a V shaped rut in accordance with the plan the longer boundary lines being called the touch lines and the shorter the goal lines. A flag on a post not less than 5 ft high and having a non pointed top shall be placed at each corner a similar flag post may be placed opposite the half way line on each side of the field of play, not less than 1 yard outside the touch line. A halfway line shall be marked out across the field of play. The centre of the field of play shall be indicated by a suitable mark and a circle with a 10 yards radius shall be marked round it.

(3) The Goal Area. At each end of the field of play two lines shall be drawn at right angles to the goal line 6 yards from each goal post. These shall extend into the field of play for a distance of 6 yards and shall be joined by a line drawn parallel with the goal line. Each of the spaces enclosed by these lines and the goal line shall be called a goal area.

(4) The Penalty Area. At each end of the field of play two lines shall be drawn at right angles to the goal line 18 yards from each goal post. These shall extend into the field of play for a distance of 18 yards and shall be joined by a line drawn parallel with the goal line. Each of the spaces enclosed by these lines and the goal line shall be called a penalty area. A suitable mark shall be made within each penalty area 12 yards from the mid point of the goal line measured along an undrawn line at right angles thereto. These shall be the penalty kick marks. From each penalty kick mark an arc of a circle having a radius of 10 yards shall be drawn outside the penalty area.

### Laws of the Game

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Dimensions</th>
<th>Goal Area</th>
<th>Penalty Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum: 110 x 75 metres</td>
<td>6 yards from each goal post</td>
<td>12 yards from each goal post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum: 100 x 64 metres</td>
<td>6 yards from each goal post</td>
<td>12 yards from each goal post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Decisions of the International Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Measurements</th>
<th>Goal Line</th>
<th>Penalty Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130 yards</td>
<td>120 Metres</td>
<td>120 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 yards</td>
<td>110 Metres</td>
<td>100 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 yards</td>
<td>90 Metres</td>
<td>80 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 yards</td>
<td>75 Metres</td>
<td>70 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 yards</td>
<td>64 Metres</td>
<td>50 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 yards</td>
<td>45 Metres</td>
<td>40 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 yards</td>
<td>35 Metres</td>
<td>30 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 yards</td>
<td>25 Metres</td>
<td>25 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 yards</td>
<td>20 Metres</td>
<td>20 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 yards</td>
<td>15 Metres</td>
<td>15 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 yards</td>
<td>10 Metres</td>
<td>10 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 yards</td>
<td>5 Metres</td>
<td>5 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 yards</td>
<td>4.5 Metres</td>
<td>4.5 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 yards</td>
<td>3.75 Metres</td>
<td>3.75 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75 yards</td>
<td>3 Metres</td>
<td>3 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 yards</td>
<td>2.25 Metres</td>
<td>2.25 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 yards</td>
<td>1.8 Metres</td>
<td>1.8 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 yards</td>
<td>1.44 Metres</td>
<td>1.44 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.44 yards</td>
<td>1.2 Metres</td>
<td>1.2 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 yards</td>
<td>1 Metres</td>
<td>1 yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 yard</td>
<td>0.984 Metres</td>
<td>0.984 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.984 yards</td>
<td>0.882 Metres</td>
<td>0.882 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.882 yards</td>
<td>0.825 Metres</td>
<td>0.825 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.825 yards</td>
<td>0.762 Metres</td>
<td>0.762 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.762 yards</td>
<td>0.706 Metres</td>
<td>0.706 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.706 yards</td>
<td>0.653 Metres</td>
<td>0.653 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.653 yards</td>
<td>0.604 Metres</td>
<td>0.604 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.604 yards</td>
<td>0.558 Metres</td>
<td>0.558 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.558 yards</td>
<td>0.513 Metres</td>
<td>0.513 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.513 yards</td>
<td>0.469 Metres</td>
<td>0.469 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.469 yards</td>
<td>0.427 Metres</td>
<td>0.427 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.427 yards</td>
<td>0.389 Metres</td>
<td>0.389 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.389 yards</td>
<td>0.355 Metres</td>
<td>0.355 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.355 yards</td>
<td>0.326 Metres</td>
<td>0.326 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.326 yards</td>
<td>0.292 Metres</td>
<td>0.292 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.292 yards</td>
<td>0.261 Metres</td>
<td>0.261 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.261 yards</td>
<td>0.233 Metres</td>
<td>0.233 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.233 yards</td>
<td>0.209 Metres</td>
<td>0.209 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.209 yards</td>
<td>0.187 Metres</td>
<td>0.187 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.187 yards</td>
<td>0.167 Metres</td>
<td>0.167 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.167 yards</td>
<td>0.149 Metres</td>
<td>0.149 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.149 yards</td>
<td>0.133 Metres</td>
<td>0.133 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.133 yards</td>
<td>0.12 Metres</td>
<td>0.12 Metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) The 6 yards (for the outline of the goal area) and the 18 yards (for the outline of the penalty area) which have to be measured along the goal line must start from the inner sides of the goal posts.

(6) The space within the inside areas of the field of play includes the width of the lines marking these areas.

(7) All associations shall provide standard equipment particularly in International Matches: when the Laws of the Game must be complied with in every respect and especially with regard to the size of the ball and other equipment which must conform to the regulations.
**Laws of the Game**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAW 1 (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) The Corner Area. From each corner flag post a quarter circle having a radius of 1 yard shall be drawn inside the field of play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) The Goals. The goals shall be placed on the centre of each goal line and shall consist of two upright posts, equidistant from the corner flags and 8 yards apart (inside measurement) joined by a horizontal cross bar the lower edge of which shall be 8 ft from the ground. The width and depth of the goal posts and the width and depth of the cross bars shall not exceed 5 inches (12 cm). The goal posts and the cross bars shall have the same width. Nets may be attached to the posts cross bars and ground behind the goals. They should be appropriately supported and be so placed as to allow the goal-keeper ample room.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnote**

Goal nets. The use of nets made of hemp, jute or nylon is permitted. The nylon strings may however not be thinner than those made of hemp or jute.

---

**Decisions of the International Board**

- All cases of failure to provide standard equipment must be reported to FIFA.
- In a match played under the Rules of a Competition if the cross bar becomes displaced or broken play shall be stopped and the match abandoned unless the cross bar has been repaired and replaced in position or a new one provided without such being a danger to the players. A rope is not considered to be a satisfactory substitute for a cross bar.
- In a Friendly Match, by mutual consent, play may be resumed without the cross bar provided it has been removed and no longer constitutes a danger to the players. In these circumstances, a rope may be used as a substitute for a cross bar. If a rope is not used and the ball crosses the goal line at a point which in the opinion of the Referee is below where the cross-bar should have been he shall award a goal.
- The game shall be restarted by the Referee dropping the ball at the place where it was when play was stopped unless it was within the goal area at that time in which case it shall be dropped on that part of the goal area line which runs parallel to the goal line at the point nearest to where the ball was when play was stopped.
- National Associations may specify such maximum and minimum dimensions for the cross-bars and goal-posts within the limits laid down in Law 1, as they consider appropriate.
- Goal posts and cross-bars must be made of wood, metal or other approved material as decided from time to time by the International F.A. Board. They may be square, rectangular, round, half round or elliptical in shape. Goal posts and cross bars made of other materials and in other shapes are not permitted.
- ‘Curtain-raisers’ to International matches should only be played following agreement on the day of the match, and taking into account the condition of the field of play between representatives of the two Associations and the Referee (of the International Match).
- National Associations, particularly in International Matches should restrict the number of photographers around the field of play.
Mr. Ross Berlin  
Vice President/Venues  
World Cup '94 Organizing Committee, Inc.  
1413 K Street, NW  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20005  

Dear Ross,

The Carolinas NFL Stadium (the "Stadium") is pleased to confirm to you that the City of Charlotte, North Carolina and the stadium would be honored to serve as one of the twelve venue sites for the 1994 World Cup.

We are in the process of having a 70,000 seat, open-air, natural grass facility designed by HOK Sports Facilities Group of Kansas City. HOK recently completed Joe Robbie Stadium. The facility will be located within the central business district of Charlotte and designed to accommodate World Cup play. We anticipate completion of our facility in the fall of 1992. Our facility will be privately financed, constructed and owned.

Construction of our facility is contingent upon the selection of the Carolinas as a location for an NFL expansion franchise. We anticipate the NFL forming an expansion committee in 1990 with the expansion franchise beginning play in 1992 or 1993. Therefore, the availability of our facility for the World Cup in 1994 is contingent upon Richardson Sports being selected by the National Football League as the owners of an expansion franchise. While selection is obviously the NFL's decision, the Carolinas has been consistently noted as the premier expansion possibility.

We will be working with the local organizing committee in Charlotte's effort to attract the World Cup. We look forward to working with you and having the World Cup come to Charlotte and the United States.

Sincerely,

Mark S. Richardson

Enclosures

cc: FIFA  
Rich Melvin  
Jerry Richardson
Charlotte In Line For U.S. National Soccer Exhibition

By BRAD JOHNSON
Staff Writer

A proposal to bring a U.S. national soccer team exhibition game to Charlotte — which could pave the way for the city being a host site for the World Cup in 1994 — will be presented to the Charlotte City Council this weekend.

The proposal, offered by The Carolina International Soccer Limited Committee, would bring a match between the national team and an international opponent to Memorial Stadium in the spring.

The United States has qualified for this year's World Cup in Italy, and will host the event in 1994.

Rich Melvin, who heads the committee, feels the match would be crucial to Charlotte's chances of becoming a World Cup site in 1994.

An as-yet undetermined number of cities — reportedly anywhere from eight to 15 — will be sites for World Cup games. Charlotte is one of 22 cities being considered to host the 24-team World Cup, the world's biggest sporting event.

Charlotte, however, would not be considered a site unless it is granted an NFL expansion franchise, and the 65,000-seat stadium that would be built for it.

For now, however, an exhibition game would be played in 24,500-seat Memorial Stadium, which is

See SOCCER Page 5C

Soccer Exhibition In Works

Continued From Page 1C

too narrow for international soccer.

"I have been in contact with the World Cup people and they have indicated that if we get the stadium modified to their standards, we would have a chance to host a national team game here each year prior to the 1994 event," Melvin said. "The World Cup people have indicated they would look favorably to sites that have put on these exhibition matches."

Working with Melvin, a former general manager of the American Soccer League's Carolina Lightning and the United Soccer League's Charlotte Gold, are the Charlotte Chamber's Don Harrow, city councilman Richard Vinroot and Mark Richardson, who is part of an effort to bring an NFL expansion franchise to Charlotte.

Vinroot will present the proposal to the council at its annual retreat this weekend.

The World Cup organization demands that the field be 70 yards wide and 120 yards long. Memorial Stadium lacks the width to be accepted.

"I'm going to present the proposal to the city council about making some fairly inexpensive changes to the stadium with hopes we could be setting the stage for 1994 event," Vinroot said.

"The cost would probably be between $40,000 and $80,000 to reconstruct the stadium. But that is a positive number if it means we will become one of the sites selected for the 1994 World Cup.

"When the World Cup people were in touch with us, they said Joe Robbie Stadium was a prototype stadium and that's what the stadium in Charlotte would be modeled after," Melvin said.

Ross Berlin, vice president of charge of venue sites for the World Cup, will visit Charlotte March 7-8.
Charlotte On List Of World Cup Sites

Observer Staff and News Services

Charlotte, a city now without a stadium suitable for world-class soccer, is among 22 areas which have expressed interest in hosting the 1994 World Cup. But Charlotte would have no chance at landing World Cup games unless it also is awarded an NFL franchise and the stadium that would go with it, according to Charlotte's Rich Melvin.

Melvin, who has been in touch with Ross Berlin, the organizing committee's vice president for venues, is a former general manager of Charlotte's two defunct pro soccer teams, the Carolina Lightnin' and Charlotte Gold.

"It's all contingent on the stadium," said Melvin. "Until we know anything about the stadium, there's no use getting excited about anything." A group headed by former NFL player Jerry Richardson plans to build a 65,000-seat stadium in uptown Charlotte if it is granted an NFL franchise.

Mark Richardson, a spokesman for the Richardson group, could not be reached Friday. The selection process would take at least 10 months. Eight to 12 cities will be picked for the 24-team tournament.


Richardson Encouraged After Super-Bowl Rounds

By RON GREEN
Staff Writer

NEW ORLEANS -- After a Friday night of visiting with a dozen or more NFL owners and Commissioner Paul Tagliabue, Jerry Richardson feels better than ever about his chances of bringing a franchise to the Carolinas.

"I feel the most encouraged I have (felt) in the entire process over a period of three years," said Richardson, a Spartanburg businessman.

"The commissioner told me he's really picking up the pace of the expansion issue. That's some of the best news we've had," Tagliabue announced Thursday that an expansion committee will be in place no later than March and he hopes some expansion will occur in the early 1990s.

Accompanying Richardson in his visits with the commissioner and owners at a party hosted by the NFL were his son Mark, N.C. Gov. Jim Martin, and advisor Mike McCormack.
By DOUG CRESS
Los Angeles Daily News

After more than two decades as a
ill-mannered, insolent outcast, the United
States made its long-awaited return Mon-
day to the fold of international soccer
FIFA, the world governing body of
soccer, broke with more than 50 years
of tradition by awarding the 1994 World
Cup to the United States at a ceremony in
Zurich, thereby breaching the sport's last
frontier.

"The World Cup will give us a clearly
defined goal," said Werner Fricker, presi-
dent of the U.S. Soccer Federation.

"It will give us the opportunity to
develop a major national professional
league. We can no longer say we'll do it
someday, because we must do it now.

"Your first feeling is relief. Your next
feeling is that it's a monumental task, a
big job."

Monday's decision, announced by
FIFA vice-president Harry Cavan after a
secret ballot of the 21-member Executive
Committee, marked the first time the
World Cup has been awarded to a nation
outside of either Western Europe or Latin
America since the quadrennial tourna-
ment began in 1930.

The World Cup, a month-long, 52-
match competition that features teams
from 24 countries, is generally regarded as
the world's biggest sporting event.

An international television audience of
600 million viewed the 1986 championship
match in Mexico, while the tourna-
ment itself grossed roughly $100 million.

The United States stands to receive
many as 3.2 million tourists for the 1994
World Cup and gross as much as $1.5
billion, according to projections released
by the USSF.

"The richest land in the world simply
cannot be allowed to remain a blank spot
on the world map of soccer any longer,"
said Herman Neuberger, president of the
West German Soccer Federation.

The U.S. bid, which cost about $1.4
million to prepare, beat out those submit-
ted by Brazil and Morocco. Chile withdrew
its bid last October.

Although the United States emerged as
a favorite during the past 14 months
because of an abundance of existing stadi-
See U.S. Page 3B
HOUSING CODE

Recommend adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of in rem remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1700 N. Allen Street (Belmont).

Reason For Inspection: Concentrated Code (Field Observation)
Date of Inspection: 8/24/88 (Exterior Only)
Owner(s) Notified of Hearing: 8/29/88
Owner(s) Ordered to Demolish Dwelling By: 10/16/88
Owner(s) Requested Permission to Repair: 9/23/88
Owner(s) Ordered to Repair Dwelling By: 11/11/88
Owner(s) Notified of Civil Penalty: 11/15/88

Due to the original inspector leaving employment in the
Community Development Department in March 1989, the title
search request was delayed until July 14, 1989. The title
search was received in mid-October 1989 and was reassigned to a new inspector.

Date of Inspection: 10/30/89
Owner(s) Notified of Hearing: 11/6/89
Hearing Held: 11/20/89
Owner(s) Ordered to Demolish Dwelling By: 12/20/89

Estimated Value of Dwelling: $1700
Estimated repair (Which Exceeds 65% of Estimated Value): $3175

The repairs include: major structural, plumbing and electrical repairs and minor interior and exterior repairs. This dwelling
is not occupied.

The owner was notified of a Civil Penalty on December 22,
1989. The total penalty as of February 26, 1990 amounts to
$770. The owner has also been notified of this February 26,
1990 Council action.

Funds for this action are available and a lien will be placed
against the property for cost incurred.

Clearances: Community Development Department