<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type:</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>07-25-1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBJECT**

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office
Meetings in July ‘89

THE WEEK OF JULY 1 - JULY 8

3 Monday, 12 Noon
PLANNING COMMISSION/Work Session - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

4 Tuesday
INDEPENDENCE DAY - All City offices closed

5 Wednesday, 3 00 p.m.
CULTURAL STUDY COMMITTEE - CMGC, Conference Center, Room 271

5 Wednesday, 6 00 p.m.
CHARLOTTE ADVISORY PARKS COMMITTEE - CMGC, Conference Center, Room 271

6 Thursday, 10 00 a.m.
PARADE PERMIT COMMITTEE - CMGC, 6th Floor Conference Room

THE WEEK OF JULY 9 - JULY 15

10 Monday, 8 30 a.m.
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ART COMMISSION - CMGC, Meeting Chamber

Monday, 12 Noon
PLANNING COMMISSION/Zoning Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

Monday, 7 30 p.m.
HISTORIC PROPERTIES COMMISSION - 1221 S. Caldwell Street

11 Tuesday, 2 30 p.m.
HOUSING APPEALS BOARD - CMGC, 5th Floor Conference Room

Tuesday, 4 00 p.m.
PLANNING COMMISSION/Planning Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

12 Wednesday, 8 30 a.m.
CIVIL SERVICE BOARD - CMGC, 7th Floor Conference Room

Wednesday, 9 30 a.m.
CIVIL SERVICE BOARD - CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room

Wednesday, 4 00 p.m.
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION - CMGC, 6th Floor Conference Room

Wednesday, 4 30 p.m.
CITIZENS CABLE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE - CMGC, Room 119

13 Thursday, 5 00 p.m.
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ART COMMISSION/Executive Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

THE WEEK OF JULY 16 - JULY 22

17 Monday, 4 00 p.m.
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ART COMMISSION/Sharon Regional Public Library Ad Hoc Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

Monday, 5 00 p.m.
COUNCIL/MANAGER DINNER - CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room

Monday, 6 00 p.m.
CITY COUNCIL MEETING (Zoning Hearings) - CMGC, Meeting Chamber

18 Tuesday, 2 00 p.m.
HOUSING AUTHORITY - 1301 South Boulevard

Tuesday, 2 00 p.m.
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ART COMMISSION/CMUD Ad Hoc Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

Tuesday, 3 00 p.m.
CULTURAL STUDY COMMITTEE - CMGC, Conference Center, Room 271

Tuesday, 4 00 p.m.
PLANNING COMMISSION/Planning Committee (Tour) - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

19 Wednesday, 7 30 a.m.
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

20 Thursday, 8 00 a.m.
CLEAN CITY COMMITTEE - CMGC, Conference Center, Room 267

Thursday, 7 00 a.m.
CHARLOTTE TREE ADVISORY COMMITTEE - 4910 Carmel Park Drive

21 Friday, 7 30 a.m.
PLANNING LIAISON COMMITTEE - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

(Continued on back)
### THE WEEK OF JULY 23 - JULY 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12 Noon</td>
<td>COUNCIL/MANAGER LUNCHEON - CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>2:00 p.m</td>
<td>CITIZENS HEARING - CMGC, Meeting Chamber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>2:30 p.m</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL MEETING - CMGC, Meeting Chamber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>4:30 p.m</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Zoning Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2:00 p.m</td>
<td>CITY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - Agricultural Extension Service, Large Conference Room, 700 North Tryon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3:00 p.m</td>
<td>COMMUNITY FACILITIES COMMITTEE - CMUD, 5100 Brookshire Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>4:00 p.m</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Planning Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3:00 p.m</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ADVISORY BOARD FOR CITIZENS WITH DISABILITIES - CMGC, Room 11t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>4:00 p.m</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ART COMMISSION/Executive Committee - 619 South Cedar Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>5:00 p.m</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ART COMMISSION/Board Meeting - 619 South Cedar Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THE WEEK OF JULY 30 - JULY 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4:00 p.m</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Executive Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These organizations will **not** meet in July:

Municipal Information Advisory Board
Specialized Transportation Advisory Committee
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Council Agenda

Tuesday, July 25, 1989

1 00 PM
2 00 PM
2 30 PM

Council-Manager luncheon
Citizens Hearing
Council Meeting

ITEM NO

1

Invocation

2

Consider approval of minutes of June 19 Zoning Meeting,
June 26 Special Meeting and June 26 Regular Meeting

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3

A Conduct a public hearing to abandon a portion of an
alleyway between East Independence Boulevard and North
Torrence Street

B Recommend adoption of a resolution to close a portion of an
alleyway

Petitioner Joe Barkley, Inc

Right-of-Way to be Abandoned A portion of an alleyway

Location Between East Independence Boulevard and North
Torrence Street

Reason To incorporate right-of-way into adjoining parcels
for sale and future development The property is zoned B-2

Clearances City departments and private utility companies
No objection Cherry Community No response

Funding No City funds are involved

Map Attached

Attachment No 1
POLICY

4 Decision on Petition No. 89-37 by the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission for a change in zoning from B-2 and O-6 to R-9 and O-6 for that portion of the petition along Lyon Court which contains the remaining lots of this petition requiring Council action.

A protest petition has been filed and found sufficient to invoke the 3/4 rule requiring affirmative votes of 3/4 of the Mayor and Council, not excused from voting, in order to rezone the property.

The Zoning Committee recommends that the petition be approved.

Council requested this item be placed on this agenda at the July 17 zoning meeting. Additional information will be sent to Council prior to the Council meeting.

Attachment No. 2

5. Recommend approval of a policy framework for expending Innovative Housing Funds not allocated to the Housing Partnership

Innovative Housing History

On April 6, 1987, City Council adopted a Housing Policy Plan which advocated development of housing units using public/private partnerships. Since 1986, $8,100,000 has been appropriated for innovative housing projects and $5,084,034 has been expended to date. This leaves $3,015,966 in the Innovative Housing Fund for carryover into the FY90 budget. These carryover funds will be reviewed with City Council separately from the recommended policy framework (see attached status report).

$4.5 million has been approved for the FY90 year and $2 million will be available to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership.

$2 Million to Housing Partnership

On June 26, 1989, City Council approved a contract between the City and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership, Inc. and allocated $2 million to the Partnership to provide for the development of 100 additional housing units through public/private ventures targeted to families earning 60% or less of median income. Prior to the approval of the Partnership contract, Council
approved several revisions to the Housing Policy Plan on May 22, 1989. These revisions affected the specific roles of the City, the Charlotte Housing Authority, and the Housing Partnership. The City's mission was defined as "reducing the number of households living in substandard, overcrowded, or unaffordable housing conditions." The City's priority is to provide housing assistance to those households earning 40% and less of median income and to provide opportunities for economic self-sufficiency to assisted families.

Council is requested to approve a policy framework for spending $2.5 million from a total budget of $4.5 million per year to be allocated as follows:

1) $1,500,000 to be funded on the basis of competitive Request for Proposals being recommended by the Innovative Housing Committee and approved by City Council. These proposals will create 50-75 new housing units with preference being given to proposals complying with the RFP criteria established as part of the policy framework.

2) $500,000 to be used to fund a local voucher program, City Housing Assistance Payment Program (CHAPP), for 25 families. The Housing Voucher Program is a rental assistance program whereby a family relocated chooses a rental unit in the private market which meets City Housing Code.

The gross rent is not subject to the HUD Fair Market Rent (a rental maximum established by HUD for different size families) as in the Section 8 Certificate Program (a maximum of 30% of the renter's income). The Housing Authority determines a payment standard to calculate the subsidy. The payment standard may be equal or less than the Fair Market Rent. Families may choose housing that rents above the payment standard. If so, the family will have to pay more than 30% of its adjusted monthly income toward their housing cost.
3) $500,000 to be a source of funding small housing proposals on a case by case basis for property owners, small businesses, or non-profit corporations on an optional basis

**Innovative Housing Committee**

Request for Proposals (RFP’s) will be sent to all known developers and ads will be run in local and regional newspapers. All RFP’s and optional housing proposals will be reviewed by the Innovative Housing Committee. The composition of that Committee will include:

- Assistant City Manager for Policy and Evaluation
- Assistant City Manager for Development Services
- Director, Community Development Department
- Director, Planning Department
- 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 Council.

**Evaluation of RFP’s**

Competitive RFP’s will be developed during the first quarter of each fiscal year and as needed thereafter with the responding proposals being evaluated on the following basis:

1) Priority assistance is to be provided to families earning less than 40% of median income and living in substandard, overcrowded, or unaffordable housing, or are residing in public housing, or 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 in a ratio with total replacement cost and the term of the City loan in regard to payback of City funds for reuse within the Innovative Housing Fund,

7) Private funds committed with financial sources or tax credit allocation by the State Housing Finance Agency should be committed by letter;

8) Design compatibility with the neighborhood, and the provision of necessary amenities for children, available public transportation, and assurance of a good maintenance program

Funds
City Innovative Housing Fund

Clearances
City Council approved Housing Policy Plan on May 22, 1989 with consensus of the CD and Housing Committee

Attachment No 3

6 The following are items proposed for the August 7, 1989 Council workshop

Sister Cities - report on China trip and policy direction - (5 00 - 5 45)
Belmont Task Force implementation strategies - (6 00 - 7 00)
Convention Center - (7:00 - 7:30)
Water and sewer extension policy discussion - (7 30 - 8 00)
Development Fees Request for Proposal Reviews - (8 00 - 8 10)
A  Adopt a budget ordinance for $312,102 for retroactive separation benefits for 22 retired police officers.

B  Adopt a budget ordinance for $50,484.09 for retroactive separation allowance benefits for an additional nine officers.

22 Officers
On April 24, 1989 Council approved retroactive separation benefits for certain police officers (those who retired prior to the State legislature mandating a separation allowance for police officers who retired on or after January 1, 1987 with 30 years of service or had five years of service and had reached the age of 55.) The April 24 minutes are attached. The action in A funds the retirement benefits for those 22 officers. There is a one time cost of $312,102 for back pay and an estimated annual cost of $129,145. This annual cost will decrease as these officers reach the age of 62.

This was an item on the June 26, 1989 agenda and received a 5-5 vote. That agenda item and the minutes of the discussion are attached.

9 Officers
The action in B is for Council's consideration in funding benefits for an additional nine officers. These officers were not considered in the April 24 discussion, but were brought to Council's attention in the June 26 agenda item. These officers are now 62 but had not reached that age when the law became effective. The one time cost for back pay is $50,484.09.

Funds
General Fund Fund Balance

Clearances
The Police Department, Budget and Evaluation, and the City Manager's Office have reviewed this request.

Attachment No 4
Recommend approval of a contract for loan of $400,000 to renovate and equip the West Trade-Beatties Ford Area Business Incubator contingent upon bids being within budget or additional private funds being raised.

**History of Business Incubator Project**

The City Council, at its May 11, 1987 meeting, unanimously approved negotiations with the West Trade-Beatties Ford Area Merchants Association (Merchants Association) to develop a business incubator (see Exhibits 1 and 2). The Council selected this option rather than a Request for Proposals. At that time, the Merchants Association was proposing a $955,000 project to acquire City-owned land and construct a new facility. The project then consisted of:

- Private Donation: $150,000
- City (Building): 400,000
- City (Land): 170,000
- State Grant: 235,000

Total: $955,000

The project no longer involves City land or a State grant. It is now budgeted at $550,000 ($150,000 private donations and $400,000 City loan), for the renovation of a 10,000 square feet building owned by Johnson C Smith University and located at 617 North Summit Avenue. Up to twenty service-oriented businesses could be housed in the 7100 net leasable square feet. The Merchants Association has raised $150,000 in cash ($79,000) and pledges ($71,000) and has requested the City to commit $400,000.

**$400,000 Loan**

The West Trade-Beatties Ford Merchants Association is requesting a loan of $400,000 to be used for the renovation and equipping of a building owned by Johnson C Smith University (JCSU). JCSU and the Merchants Association have signed a lease for the building at $1 per year for a term of 20 years. There is an option to extend the lease for additional four consecutive periods of 20 years each at the same lease terms.

**Use of City Loan**

The City's loan will be used for the renovation of the building and, if funds remain after renovation, up to $40,000 may be used to purchase furniture.
Repayment

The term of the loan will be 20 years with no interest during the first 5 years. During the remaining 15 years, repayment will be at 3% interest. To help the incubator, repayment of the loan will be amortized over a 30 year period, with a balloon at the end of the term. As part of the loan, there will be a goal to create forty jobs by the end of the fifth year.

Protection of Funds

In order to protect the City's funds, the lease between the Merchants Association and JCSU allows an assignment of the lease to the City should the Merchants Association be in default. In addition, the City will obtain a security interest in all furniture and equipment purchased by the Merchants Association.

The sources and uses of funds for the Business Incubator are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Loan</td>
<td>Building $400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>Capital 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furn/Fixt/ Equip 50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$550,000

In addition to these funds, $55,000 of in-kind services will be contributed by Arthur Andersen ($25,000) and JCSU ($30,000).

Business Plan Analysis

The leadership of the Merchants Association has done a good job in moving this project forward. They have scaled the project down, obtained a $1 a year lease on the building, and have enlisted the support of the community, both financially and with pledges of technical assistance.

The renovation package has been completed and the project is out to bid. Final costs will be known in August.

Should the project not succeed, the City will have the right to sublease the building for the remaining term of the lease and use the equipment and furnishings purchased by the Merchants Association.
This is, however, a start-up business. Success depends upon hiring a capable Executive Director. To support the incubator, fundraisers are required both prior to start-up and during five years of operation. This is equivalent to providing new equity in a business at each of these periods. Occupancy rates are forecast to start at 40% during the first year and rise to 95% in the fifth year.

**Recommended Action**
Approve the loan for $400,000 to renovate and equip the building, contingent on bids being within budget or additional private funds being raised.

**Funds**
Development and Revitalization Fund (DARF)

**Clearances**
Economic Development, Community Development, Budget & Evaluation, City Attorney.

**Attachment No 5**

**Recommend**
(1) entering into two loan agreements with Neighborhood Housing Services of Charlotte, Inc for
(a) $234,000 to provide housing rehabilitation loans, purchase/rehabilitation/resale and down payment assistance and
(b) $181,660 for in-fill housing in the Wilmore neighborhood
and (2) authorize the use of $415,660 from the Innovative Housing Fund.

**Funding Requested**
At City Council's citizens' hearing on February 27, 1989, Stuart Pope, Executive Director of Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc, requested funding from the City for an additional three years for projects in the Wilmore neighborhood. Budget and Evaluation was requested to advise Mr. Pope of the avenues available for requesting funding. Mr. Pope was advised by Budget and Evaluation that the Innovative Housing Fund would be the most appropriate program.

**Two Loans Recommended**
Mr. Pope presented his proposal to the Innovative Housing Committee on May 3, 1989. Since that time, the Budget & Evaluation, Finance and Community Development Departments have been working with NHS on program evaluation and project proposal refinement. The Innovative Housing Committee met again on July 5, 1989 and agreed that NHS should have two separate loan agreements with the City.
$234,000 Loan
The first proposed loan agreement of $234,000 calls for NHS to provide

1 rehabilitation loan assistance for 14 residential properties at a planned expenditure of $168,000,

2 purchase, rehabilitation and resale of one residential structure at a planned expenditure of $50,000,

3 down payment assistance for four qualified tenants who desire to become homeowners in the Wilmore area at a planned expenditure of $16,000,

$181,660 Loan
The second loan agreement of $181,660 calls for NHS to provide for the construction of four affordable new in fill houses on land they currently own with architectural styling to blend in with surrounding homes

Repayment
NHS further proposes that the $181,660 for the four new in fill houses will be repaid to the City upon closing the sales, hence the need for two separate loan agreements. The additional $234,000 will be repaid with monthly installments of $900 to $1,000 ($10,800 to $12,000 per year) based on loan proceeds from their mortgage portfolio. NHS, through its own fundraising efforts, will raise at least $125,000 during the proposed contract period for operational costs

NHS Wilmore History
A short history of NHS's involvement in Wilmore is attached.

Funds
Innovative Housing Funds

Clearances
The loan was approved by the Innovative Housing Review Committee on July 5, 1989. All criteria for qualifying for financial assistance have been met by the applicant in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Housing Policy Plan

Attachment No 6
10

**Recommend approval of a loan agreement for $250,000 between the City of Charlotte and Delta Medical Properties, Inc to provide loan funds for the construction of a medical office building.** The loan is proposed at 6% interest for five years.

**Project Description**

Delta Medical Properties, Inc is the proposed owner of a new medical office building which will house Mecklenburg Dialysis Center, Inc and Carolina Nephrology P.A.

Mecklenburg Dialysis Center is an out-patient dialysis center for patients suffering from kidney failure. The owners of Mecklenburg Dialysis also operate units in Monroe and Matthews. These units have been the first to offer a new technology that reduces a patient's treatment time from 4 to 2.5 hours. The units also incorporate the most complete indigent care policies available including free van service to and from the clinics.

Carolina Nephrology, P.A is a subspecialty practice with physicians primarily trained in the treatment of hypertension and various kidney diseases. Delta Medical Properties will own the building and lease specially upfitted space to Mecklenburg Dialysis and Carolina Nephrology. The second floor space is designed for expansion of the first floor businesses in subsequent years, however, it may be upfitted for short term leases to help offset costs. The principals of Mecklenburg Dialysis Center, Inc and Carolina Nephrology, P.A created Delta Medical Properties, Inc solely for the acquisition and development of this project. The principals are Kenneth L. Holt, Michael J. Bruce, Dr. Stan Vermillion and Dr. Edward Friedland.

**$250,000 DARF Loan**

The developer is requesting a $250,000 loan from the Development and Revitalization Fund to complete the financing needed to develop a 17,331 square foot medical office building at West Morehead and Wilkinson Boulevard. First Union National Bank has provided a firm loan commitment of $1,100,000, and the bank's loan is contingent upon the City's loan. The location of the project on West Morehead Street does not provide the bank with sufficient collateral in terms of lease comparables with other similar medical office buildings.
"But For" The "but for" justification is based upon the fact that a financing gap exists between the bank, the owner's investment, and the total funds of $1.6 million needed to complete the project.

Funds The sources and uses of funds based on the bank's commitment are as follows:

Source of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Union National Bank</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>(68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City DARF Loan</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Investment</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uses of Funds

Building and Land $1,600,000

Mecklenburg Dialysis Center, Inc. is to enter into a 10-year master lease agreement with Delta Medical Properties for the entire space available at an amount sufficient to amortize the First Union term loan. The N C Department of Human Services has issued a Certificate of Need for the facility.

Public Purpose Attached is additional information on the loan including public purpose and the creation of 60 new jobs.

Funds Development and Revitalization Fund

Clearances The Economic Development Review Committee approved the loan on June 6, 1989, and the Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund Committee approved the loan on July 12, 1989.

Attachment No 7

Recommend approval of a contract for $113,491 with the Charlotte Housing Authority to fund the Authority's Crime Prevention Program.

Crime Prevention Program The City had a contract for several years with the Charlotte Housing Authority to provide crime prevention strategies and programs in the City's public housing communities. For FY90, Council recommended funding for the Crime
Prevention Program with certain contract revisions aimed at increasing the program's effectiveness. Monies dedicated for this program are in Council's approved FY90 budget.

**FY90 Contract**

It is requested that Council approve the FY90 contract with the Charlotte Housing Authority for $113,491. The contract funds 85% of the program, the Authority funds 15%. The program funding will be disbursed quarterly based on contract performance by the Housing Authority. All changes discussed during the budget workshop have been incorporated in the FY90 contract including:

- Status reports submitted by the Housing Authority to Budget and Evaluation and to the Police Department will be submitted on a quarterly basis and will coincide with the Housing Authority's quarterly requests for reimbursement. Reimbursement will be made upon receipt of status reports indicating satisfactory performance.

- Exhibit A of the contract, attached, contains the scope of services and objectives.

**Attached** is the Housing Authority's response to the recent Budget and Evaluation report.

**Program Objectives**

Below are the objectives for the Crime Prevention Program:

- Maintain and enhance the building captain (neighborhood watch) program in each program site and have 75% of the buildings in each development represented.

- Conduct monthly meetings with resident organizations and incorporate programs, activities and information that will make residents more knowledgeable of methods to protect lives and property.
- Provide assistance to 90% of residents who have been victimized in program sites to insure they follow up with the prosecution (i.e. warrants, court appearances and hearings)

- Design and conduct quarterly crime prevention workshops for other neighborhoods in conjunction with the Crime Prevention Unit of the Police Department

- Provide technical assistance and support whenever activities or crime patterns emerge requiring development of concentrated crime prevention strategies in other sites

- Develop educational/referral programs which focus on issues such as drug trafficking and abuse, alcohol trafficking and abuse, child abuse, vandalism and defensive living

- Coordinate with the Police Department the implementation of traditional crime prevention programs such as Operations I D , Female Security, Home Security, Security Surveys, Child Safety and Crime Stoppers

- Document the results/outcome of follow-up assistance provided to the victims and witnesses of crimes in at least 80% of the cases, and transmit this information to the Police Department

- Cooperate with the Community Relations Committee in providing services in each of the three sites and successfully mediate 50% of the disputes targeted for referral to this program, as an alternative to court action or police intervention

- Develop educational/referral programs on domestic violence

Funds  General Fund Non-Departmental Account
Clearances  Budget and Evaluation and Police Department
Attachment No  8
Recommend adoption of a resolution continuing in FY90 the Charlotte Department of Transportation's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goals for projects funded by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

13% Goal Recommended

A complete report on CDOT's DBE utilization will be presented in early fall as part of the annual report from the Minority Business Enterprise Program. Based upon CDOT's DBE utilization to date, no change is anticipated for FY90. The CDOT and the MBE Liaison Officer recommend that Council set the same 13% goal for FY90.

Goals

Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) regulations require the annual submittal of Disadvantaged Business Enterprise goals for the coming Federal fiscal year. This goal applies only to purchases that will use some UMTA funds, and does not affect the city-wide goals for Minority Business Enterprise activities. Fuel, tires, bus parts, and the repair of buses make up most of these operating costs. Other possibilities lie within the areas of office supplies, janitorial services, printing, uniforms, etc. Transit-related capital purchases are predominantly for transit vehicles and ancillary equipment, but vehicles are exempted from the goal calculations.

For 1984, UMTA determined that a goal of 10% was the minimum acceptable goal for DBEs. No minimum was set for women. In 1985, UMTA established a 3% minimum for Women's Business Enterprises (WBEs). Then, in late 1987, UMTA consolidated DBEs and WBEs into one goal.

Since these regulations were enacted, the City has consistently met its goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBE/WBE</td>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>10/3</td>
<td>10/3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/15</td>
<td>19/29</td>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(projected)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other cities in NC receiving UMTA funds have set similar goals.

Clearances

The City Attorney has approved the resolution as to form.
Recommend approval of a request from United Way of Central Carolinas, Inc to transfer the obligation to repay a $500,000 City grant used to purchase the homeless shelter site at 1210 North Tryon Street to the Men's Emergency and Transitional Center.

On May 23, 1988, City Council approved an agreement with United Way of Central Carolinas, Inc in which the City granted $500,000 to United Way to apply toward the purchase price of the homeless shelter property at 1210 North Tryon Street. A portion of the grant agreement provided that United Way would use the property continuously as a shelter for the homeless, and in the event the property was used for any other purpose than a Homeless Shelter, United Way was required to repay to the City the entire sum of $500,000 within 30 days, plus a prorata share of any equity obtained in any subsequent sale of the property.

Recently, United Way informed us of its desire to deed the property to the Men's Emergency and Transitional Center. As part of the transaction, United Way also wished to transfer its obligation to repay the $500,000 City grant if at anytime in the future the property was not used as a homeless shelter.

City staff has reviewed United Way's request and has no objection to the transfer of the obligation to the Men's Emergency and Transitional Center.

It is recommended that the City Council approve the request of United Way of Central Carolinas, Inc to transfer its obligation to repay the $500,000 City grant if at anytime in the future the property located at 1210 North Tryon Street is not used as a homeless shelter. The obligation in question would be assumed by the Men's Emergency and Transitional Center who would also receive title to the real property. If this request is approved by the City Council, the City's Legal Department will ensure that the appropriate legal documents are prepared to protect the City's interest in the repayment.

Funding: None

Clearances: City Manager's Office, City Attorney's Office
14 Recommend approval of amendments to the City-County interlocal agreement which will transfer funding of the Historic Properties Commission to the County and funding of the Community Relations Committee to the City, and, to deed the Dowd House to the County.

Council Action
This action transfers funding responsibility for the Historic Properties Commission to the County effective July 1, 1989, transfers funding responsibility for the Community Relations Committee to the City effective July 1, 1989, and transfers the deed to the Dowd House to the County.

The out of pocket financial impact of this arrangement would be an average cost over the next two years of $15,000 to the City. This would be partially offset by in-kind labor contributions we have made to the Dowd House in the past that we would no longer be making. We did similar arrangements several years ago and reaction of the organizations to the improved reporting relationship was very positive. Appointments to both boards remain the same.

The County Commission approved these amendments on July 10.

Funds
None

Clearances
City Attorney, Budget and Evaluation

---

The City Attorney advises that agenda items no. 15 through 33 may be considered in one motion. However, any member of Council may request that an item be divided and voted on separately.

---
BUDGET ORDINANCE

15  Recommend adoption of a budget ordinance appropriating $13,292,500 for construction of the Independence Boulevard HOV facility

Grant Amendment  The Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) has amended a grant for the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) facility within the median of the State’s US74 (Independence Boulevard) Freeway/Expressway. The grant amendment provides UMTA funding for construction of the project. The original UMTA grant provided funds of $930,000 for planning and design.

Funds  Adoption of this budget ordinance will appropriate an additional $12,270,000 from UMTA as well as $1,022,500 in 1988 Street Improvement bonds as half of the City’s matching funds requirement.

Clearances  The Budget and Evaluation Department and the City Attorney have approved this ordinance.

BUDGET ORDINANCE/CONTRACT AMENDMENT

16  Recommend (a) adoption of a budget ordinance appropriating $100,000 to the Spirit Square Capital Account (b) approve amendment to Spirit Square contract dated April 1, 1988

$100,000  Mecklenburg County Board of Commissioners approved $100,000 in the County’s 1989-90 fiscal year budget for Spirit Square to be used for the installation of an expanded energy management system.

Recommendation  Council is requested to

Adopt an ordinance appropriating the $100,000 to be obtained by Spirit Square from Mecklenburg County, and

Approve an amendment to the contract dated April 1, 1988 to increase the project amount from $5,940,265 to $6,040,265 to accommodate $100,000.

Clearances  Finance, Legal, Budget and Evaluation, and Engineering Departments and Spirit Square
ORDINANCE AMENDMENT/BUDGET ORDINANCE

17 Recommend adoption of amendments to the local Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Ordinance, and adopt a budget ordinance for $5,000 to authorize the use of civil penalties for local training.

Erosion Control Amendments

The State dictates that local erosion control ordinances be at least as restrictive as State requirements and it is therefore recommended that Council adopt amendments to our ordinance that will be in accord with changes made to the State ordinance in early 1989. Existing wording and proposed changes to the ordinance are attached. The Engineering Department feels all changes will benefit the local program.

Key Changes

The key changes are:

1) Right of Jurisdiction - The local program is to have jurisdiction over contribution by any agency licensed by the State or the United States. For example, if a project is being constructed locally through the private sector that is in some way associated with the State or Federal government (for example, a post office), the project is still under jurisdiction of the local erosion control program. This does not relate to projects funded and constructed by the State or United States such as road projects.

2) North Carolina agent required - Anyone submitting a plan for approval who is not a resident of North Carolina must have an agent in North Carolina for the purpose of receiving notices of compliance and non-compliance.

3) Penalties - Any person failing to secure a grading permit prior to grading may be assessed a one time penalty of not more than $1,000. We continue to have the ability to fine violators of program requirements $100 per day for certain other offenses.
During the past year a task force representing various government agencies and the building industry reviewed local administration of erosion control requirements and recommended the basic process remain the same as it is with some coordination and communication improvements. A copy of the task force report is attached.

The task force representatives of the building industry recommended the City provide training for local designers, contractors and developers on erosion control requirements to be funded with penalties collected from violations supplemented with workshop fees. The State sponsors such workshops funded in this way and encourages a like program for local jurisdictions.

Adoption of the budget ordinance will authorize the use of civil penalties, estimated to be from $5,000 to $10,000 per year, to fund a local training program.

Legal, Budget and Engineering

Attachment No 9

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 800 Megahertz Radio System
(Various Radio Equipment)

By The Purchasing Director and the Police Chief that this radio system be purchased from the existing County Contract #9355 with Motorola, Inc., Charlotte, N. C., in the amount of $2,974,788.00. Contract #9355 was awarded to Motorola, Inc. by the Board of County Commissioners on September 6, 1988.

This radio equipment comprises an 800 MHz trunking system that will relieve the present overcrowded, congested, and noisy radio system.

Capital Equipment Fund - (Police Department)
B Extension of Parking Lot for Dobbs House In-Flight Catering Kitchen Facility

Recommendation. The Aviation Director recommends that the low bid from Crowder Construction Company in the amount of $189,105.40 be accepted for award of contract on a unit price basis.

Project Description. The City has agreed to finance and construct the proposed 24,000 square foot addition to the existing in-flight catering facility under the terms of the lease with Dobbs. Dobbs agreed to lease the completed facilities at a rental rate sufficient to amortize all project costs plus land rental and airport services fee. This contract provides additional employee parking and fencing in order to accommodate the additional facilities and to meet City building requirements.

Source of Funding: Airport Capital Improvement Fund - (In Flight Catering Facilities - Airport Operating)

C Custodial Service Contract for City and public space at Charlotte/Douglas International Airport

Recommendation. The Aviation Director recommends that the low bid by Associated Cleaning Consultants and Service Inc. in the amount of $475,004.00 per year be accepted for award of the contract for a one year period.

Project Description. This is a required service for the upkeep and overall janitorial needs of the terminal facility.

Source of Funding: Airport Operating Fund - (Operating Expenses)

D Westerly Hills Park Rehabilitation

Recommendation By the City Engineer that the low bid of $94,979.50, as submitted by United Construction, be accepted for award on a unit price basis.

Project Description. This project involves improvements to Westerly Hills Park playground area and existing picnic areas. Also included in this project are proposed playground equipment, relocation and removal of existing
equipment, channel improvements, excavation and grading, and other related items

Source of Funding. General Capital Improvement Fund - (Improvements to Existing Parks)

E Purser Drive Sidewalk Engineering Improvement

Recommendation. By the City Engineer that the low bid of $279,004.08, as submitted by Dakota Contracting Co., be accepted for award on a unit price basis

Project Description. The project is part of the sidewalk bond program that funds the construction of sidewalk in residential neighborhoods. There is a great deal of pedestrian traffic on Purser Drive due to its location in the vicinity of Garinger High School and Methodist Home Park.

This project consists of providing storm drainage and curb and sidewalk along Purser Drive beginning at the Sugar Creek and Eastway intersection to Finchley Road.

Source of Funding. General Capital Improvement Fund - (Sidewalk Program 1987 Street Improvement Bonds)

F Water Distribution Project Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department
12-Inch and 16-Inch Water Mains along Mallard Creek Church Road and U S Highway 29

Recommendation. Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department recommends that the low bid by Wright & Lopez, Incorporated of Charlotte, North Carolina, in the amount of $742,997.34 be accepted for award of contract on a unit price basis.

Project Description. Construction of this project would extend water service to the Mallard Creek Church Road/U S Highway 29 area.

Source of Funding. Water and Sewer Capital Improvement Fund - (Water Main Along U S 29 North to Mallard Creek Church Road) Water and Sewer Construction Fund - (Withrow Developers)
G  Water Distribution Project
16-Inch Water Mains Along
Providence Road, McKee Road,
Providence Road West, and
12-Inch Water Main Along
Elm Lane West

Recommendation. Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility
Department recommends that the low bid by Sanders Brothers,
Incorporated of Charlotte, North Carolina, in the amount of
$736,128.92 be accepted for award of contract on a unit
price basis

Project Description. Construction of this project would
extend water service to the Providence Road, McKee Road,
Providence Road West and Elm Lane West areas.

Source of Funding: Water and Sewer Capital Improvement
Fund - (Water Mains along Providence Road West and Elm
Lane). Water and Sewer Capital Improvement Fund - (Water
Main along NC 16 to Providence Road West). Water and
Sewer Construction Fund - (First Mark Development
Corporation).

H  Sanitary Sewer Construction
Long Creek Outfall Phase V-B

Recommendation. Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility
Department recommends that the low bid by Bryant Electric
Company, Incorporated of High Point, North Carolina in the
amount of $424,109.37 be accepted for award of contract on
a unit price basis.

Project Description. Construction of this project would
extend sewer service in the I-77/NC 115 area.

Source of Funding. Water and Sewer Capital Improvement Fund
- (Long Creek Outfall Phase V)
The following bids are for renovation of City Hall. The roof has been replaced and the windows will be replaced under contracts previously approved by City Council.

The general construction portion of the contract involves the restoration of the ceilings, new floor finishes and new restroom facilities. Entire new mechanical equipment, electrical distribution and lighting and plumbing systems are incorporated into the design.

I General Construction Contract
for City Hall renovation

Recommendation. By the General Services' Director that the project be awarded to Moretti Construction Inc., Charlotte, NC, the low bidder, in the amount of $938,500.00

Source of Funding: General Capital Improvement Fund - (City Hall Renovations - Capital Facilities Lease Purchase)

J Electrical Construction Contract
for City Hall Renovation

Recommendation. By the General Services Director that the project be awarded to Watson Electric Construction Co., Wilson, NC, the second low bidder, in the amount of $318,965.00. The low bidder, Robinson Electric Company, Charlotte, NC did not submit a bid bond. State bidding laws do not allow acceptance of this bid.

Source of Funding: General Capital Improvement Fund - (Building Improvements - Pay As-You-Go Funding)

K Plumbing Construction Contract
for City Hall Renovation

Recommendation. By the General Services Director that the project be awarded to Piping Plumbing Mechanical Contractors, Inc., Harrisburg, NC, in the amount of $94,163.00.

Source of Funding: General Capital Improvement Fund - (City Hall Renovations - Capital Facilities Lease Purchase)
Mechanical Construction Contract for City Hall Renovation

Recommendation. By the General Services Director that the project be awarded to Piping Plumbing Mechanical Contractors, Inc., Harrisburg, NC, in the amount of $545,626.00. Source of Funding: General Capital Improvement Fund - (Building Improvements - Pay-As-You-Go Funding).

BOND COUNSEL

19. Recommend extension of Smith, Helms, Mullis & Moore and Ferguson, Stein, Watt, Wallas & Adkins as City's bond counsel for an additional two years.

Using the Council approved selection process, on July 27, 1987 Council selected the Smith, Helms, Mullis & Moore and Ferguson, Stein, Watt, Wallas, & Adkins law firms as our bond counsel for a two year period. Based on the actual start date of the two firms, the two year period will expire in September, 1989. It is recommended the agreement be extended two years.

Reason for Extension

The Smith Helms and Ferguson Stein law firms have performed capably over the initial term of their engagement. It takes a new firm some time to complete the transition process because of the continuing nature of much of the work of bond counsel there is a learning curve cost which is difficult to spread over a two year engagement. We also have found that City staff time expenditures are greater during the learning phase. For these reasons, we are recommending that we extend the current bond counsel engagement for two years.

DEPUTY CITY CLERK

20. Recommend confirmation of Brenda R. Freeze as Deputy City Clerk.

Brenda R. Freeze will assume the position of Deputy City Clerk on July 26, 1989 following the retirement of Mrs. Menta Allen. This action will authorize Mrs. Freeze to act as Clerk to the City Council in the absence of the City Clerk.
LEASE

21 Recommend approval of a lease and operating agreement with Discovery Place for a ten-year period to begin upon the execution of the agreement.

Amendment This action amends the current Discovery Place lease by adding appropriate bond provisions as advised by bond counsel to protect the tax exempt status of bonds which were issued for the expansion and remodeling of Discovery Place. The lease will expire ten years from the date of its execution.

Funds Not applicable

Clearances This contract has been cleared by the Legal Department, bond counsel, Division of Insurance and Risk Management, Budget Department, Engineering Department, Manager's office, Finance Department, General Services Department and Discovery Place.

CONTRACT

22 Recommend approval of contract not-to-exceed $75,000 with J C Morgan to provide review appraisals for the Airport's FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program and technical assistance as expert witness in pending noise litigation.

Contract Council is requested to approve a contract with J C Morgan to provide both the review appraisals for the FAR Part 150 Program and the needed technical assistance as an expert witness for pending litigation.

Clearances The City's attorney and Aviation Director concur in this request.
CONTRACT AMENDMENT

23

Recommend approval of Amendment No. 2 to the contract with Kimley-Horn and Associates for $276,200.00 for additional engineering services for the Park Road/Johnston Road Widening/Sharon Road West intersection project.

Contract Amendment
Kimley-Horn and Associates has provided planning, public involvement and design services for the Park Road/Johnston Road project. This contract amendment is recommended because of their knowledge of this project. This amendment will provide: (1) planning, design, and bidding phase services for the South Boulevard/Sharon Road West intersection, (2) a preliminary engineering and geotechnical assessment of Sharon Road West between Little Sugar Creek and Sharonbrook to determine whether any design improvements are necessary to improve the ride on this segment of Sharon Road West; (3) testing of two bridges (one on Johnston Road and one on Sharon Road West) which was inadvertently omitted from the scope of services in the original contract.

Funds
Park Road Widening Capital Account

Clearances
The amendment has been reviewed by appropriate City Engineering Department staff.

CHANGE ORDER

24

Recommend approval of Change Order No. 1 for $61,079 to the contract with Hall Contracting Corporation for Sardis Road Water Storage/Re-Pump Facility.

Contract: Sardis Road Water Storage/Repump Facility
Contractor: Hall Contracting Corporation
Date of Award: June 12, 1989
Original Contract Amount: $1,778,880
Change Order: $61,079
Project: To provide additional water service to southeast Charlotte

Change Order
On June 12, 1989 Council awarded a bid for construction of the Sardis Road water storage/repump facility. Alternate #1 for an additional pump was inadvertently omitted from the request submitted for Council action. This change order will correct this omission and will allow
installation of the additional pump which will provide standby emergency pumping capacity as well as future pumping capacity

**Funds**

Funds for this work are available in Account 63664, Fund 2071.

**Clearances**

The Utility Director approved this change order request

B  Recommend approval of Change Order No. 3 for the Electrical Construction Contract with Watson Electric Company for USAir Aircraft Maintenance Hangar in the amount of $757,914.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>USAir/Piedmont Maintenance Facility Aircraft Hangar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Watson Electric Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Contract Amount</td>
<td>$2,037,032 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Change Orders</td>
<td>$  13,040 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Order Number 3</td>
<td>$  757,914 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Contract Amount</td>
<td>$2,807,986 00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change Order**

This change order is necessary to provide the fire alarm and detection system for the aircraft maintenance hangar and stock distribution building in accordance with USAir's requirements. USAir's insurance and technical representatives have approved this change order.

**Funds**

All costs associated with this project are borne by USAir through the Airport Special Facility Lease Agreement. Funds have been budgeted for this work in the overall project.

**Clearances**

Odei Associates, Inc., architect, and Day and Zimmermann, Inc., project manager, and USAir concur in this change order.
GRANT APPLICATION

25        Recommend approval of a resolution authorizing City Manager to file applications with the Urban Mass Transportation Administration and the North Carolina Department of Transportation for a planning assistance grant for FY90 and adoption of a budget ordinance of $48,600.

Grant
This grant will fund a research project that will analyze transit demand in targeted areas in north, northeast and south Charlotte, as well as the central business district. The data will be used to design transit service and will be incorporated into service expansions, reductions or reroutings.

Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UMTA</td>
<td>$43,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDOT</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City (in kind)</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearances
City attorney has approved resolution as to form and Grant Review Committee concurs in this request.

ENCROACHMENT AGREEMENTS

26        Recommend adoption of a resolution authorizing an encroachment agreement with Southern Railway Company for construction and maintenance of grade crossing and the installation of flashing light signals at Orr Road near Old Concord Road.

Road Widening
The City is widening the road and improving the drainage system along Southern Railway Company's tracks at Orr Road. Southern Railway System has requested an encroachment agreement for the construction and maintenance of the widening located along Orr Road.

The portion of the grade crossing between the rails in the track to the outside ends of the crossties will be constructed by the railroad at a cost of $8,800.00 for which the City will reimburse the railroad. The installation of automatic flashing signals with bells will be installed by the railroad at a cost to the City of $102,060.00. These will be maintained by the railroad. State law requires the City pay these expenses.
Funds
Safer Roads Demonstration Capital Account

Clearances
Insurance and Risk Management Agency, Legal Department, and Engineering/Real Estate Division concur in this request. State law requires the City pay these expenses.

B Recommend adoption of a resolution authorizing an encroachment agreement with Norfolk Southern Railway Company for construction of an 8 inch water main extension on John Price Road.

Water Main
The Mecklenburg County Health Department has requested that the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department install an 8 inch water main along John Price Road because of a serious contaminated well problem in the area.

Norfolk Southern Railway Company's requires a one time administrative fee of $50.00 for this encroachment.

Funds
Water and Sewer Operating Budget

Clearances
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department, Insurance and Risk Management Agency, Engineering/Real Estate Division, and Legal Department concur with this request.

SETTLEMENT

27 Recommend settlement of City v. Leighton for the condemnation of a park and ride lot for a total amount of $288,000.00, plus interest, requiring adoption of a budget ordinance appropriating $65,000 to pay the settlement and real estate costs.

Proposed Settlement
The City Attorney's Office recommends settlement of this condemnation for a total of $288,000.00 plus interest. A settlement in this amount requires the City to appropriate an additional $65,000. The Federal grant which was first proposed to finance this project has been exhausted, funds are available to pay the proposed settlement from transit bonds.

Funds
1981 Transit Facility Bonds
Clearances  
This proposed settlement has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Transportation, the Real Estate Division, and the Budget and Evaluation Department.

AMENDED CONDEMNATION RESOLUTION

28. Recommend adoption of an amended resolution authorizing further condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of certain real property owned by Dewitt Currie, et al for the construction of Westinghouse Boulevard - Phase II.

Condemnation  
On May 22, 1989, City Council adopted a resolution authorizing condemnation proceedings against the property owned by Dewitt Currie and Frances T Currie for the appraised amount of $36,400.00. The resolution omitted authorization for the City to acquire the necessary permanent drainage easement and the permanent planting, utility, and guardrail easement.

Amendment  
The condemnation amount of $36,400 included all areas needed and remains unchanged. Adoption of the amended resolution is a technicality to correct the omission from the May 22, 1989 resolution in order for construction to proceed.

Funds  
CIP Accounts - Westinghouse Boulevard Extension Public/private donations

Clearances  
The Legal Department, Engineering Department

TAX REFUND

29. Recommend the adoption of a resolution authorizing the refund of certain taxes in the total amount of $1,481.55 which were assessed through clerical error or illegal levy against 10 tax accounts.

SET PUBLIC HEARINGS

30. Recommend adoption of a resolution of intent to abandon a portion of Palmer Street and Pitcher Street and set a public hearing for August 28, 1989.
B Recommend adoption of a resolution calling for public hearings on Monday, September 18, 1989, at 6:00 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber, 600 East Fourth Street, on Petitions 89-67 through 89-76 for zoning changes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

31 Recommend adoption of a motion to hold an executive session upon the conclusion of the meeting for the purpose of receiving legal advice from the City Attorney and to consider the engagement of an independent contractor pursuant to G.S. 143-318.11.

UTILITY CONTRACTS

32 Recommend approval of contracts between the City of Charlotte and the applicants listed below.

These are extension contracts for new development in accordance with the Water/Sewer Extension Policy. They are 5-year reimbursable contracts (construction by public bids). The applicants deposited 10% of the estimated construction cost. The remaining 90% will be deposited prior to construction. There is no cost to the City and no funds are needed.

1 Bristol Development Corporation, to construct 3,400 linear feet of 16-inch water main to serve Plantation Market Shopping Center on Waddington Road, outside the Charlotte City Limits. Estimated Cost - $140,000.00
   Water Contract No. 300-89-032

2 East-West Partners Of N.C., Inc., to construct 3,550 linear feet of sanitary sewer trunk to serve East-West Property (David Cox Road), located east of N.C. Highway 115, and west of Browne Road, outside the Charlotte City Limits. Estimated Cost - $266,000.00
   Sanitary Sewer Job No. 300-88-602
PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

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

1. **Project:** Back Creek Sanitary Sewer Outfall  
   **Owner(s):** J Thomas Johnson  
   **Property Address:** 11815 University City Boulevard  
   **Property to be acquired:** 126,630 sq ft (2.91 ac)  
   **Price:** $27,000 00  
   **Remarks:** Presently used as a farm; price includes damage to pasture and fencing, loss of hardwood trees.

2. **Project:** Beatties Ford Road Widening  
   **Owner(s):** Odell Beasley and wife, Mary L Beasley  
   **Property Address:** 2706 Newland Road  
   **Property to be acquired:** 3,052 sq ft (0.070 ac) plus temporary construction easement  
   **Price:** $15,000 00  
   **Remarks:** Included is compensation for loss of parking spaces which reduced the desirability of the remainder. The property is zoned B-1 and is presently used as a funeral home.

3. **Project:** Beatties Ford Road Widening  
   **Owner(s):** Charles W McClure and Johnetta McClure  
   **Property Address:** 2924 Beatties Ford Road  
   **Property to be acquired:** 4,075 sq ft (0.093 ac) plus temporary construction easement  
   **Price:** $12,600 00  
   **Remarks:** Property is zoned O-6 and vacant. The acquisition will adversely impact future commercial use.

4. **Project:** Beatties Ford Road Widening  
   **Owner(s):** The Bounty Corporation  
   **Property Address:** 3101 Beatties Ford Road  
   **Property to be acquired:** 2,477 sq ft (0.057 ac) plus temporary construction easement  
   **Price:** $15,000 00  
   **Remarks:** Property is zoned B-1 and presently used as a strip shopping center; price includes payment for one sign and air pump, one brick flag support and two concrete piers.

5. **Project:** Beatties Ford Road Widening  
   **Owner(s):** Metrolina Funeral Service, Inc.  
   **Property Address:** 3715 Beatties Ford Road  
   **Property to be acquired:** 8,926 sq ft (0.204 ac)  
   **Price:** $13,800 00  
   **Remarks:** Property is zoned B-1 and currently being used as funeral home.
6 Project. Beatties Ford Road Widening
Owner(s) H J Properties
Property Address Corner of Beatties Ford Road and Griers
Grove Road
Property to be acquired. 12,195 sq ft ( 280 ac) plus
temporary construction easement
Price $19,200 00
Remarks Zoning is B-1

7 Project Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon
Amity
Owner(s) NCNB National Bank of North Carolina, Trustee
for First National Bank of Boston
Property Address 112 South Sharon Amity
Property to be acquired 1,715 sq ft ( 039 ac) plus
4,635 sq ft ( 106 ac) temporary construction easement
Price $16,300 00
Remarks The property is zoned B-1 and is the site of
Cotswold Mall Parking is impacted

8 Project. Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon
Amity Road
Owner(s) Angelo Politis and wife, Sophia Politis
Property Address 120 North Sharon Amity Road
Property to be acquired 903 sq ft ( 021 ac) plus
temporary construction easement
Price $15,700 00
Remarks The property is zoned O-6 and is the site of a
Pizza Hut restaurant Price includes payment for a trade
sign and landscaping

9 Project. Intersection Improvements - Central
Avenue/Hawthorne Lane
Owner(s) The Salvation Army, a Georgia Corporation
Property Address 1015 Central Avenue
Property to be acquired 4,549 sq ft ( 104 ac) plus
4,055 sq ft temporary construction easement
Price $26,200 00
Remarks Property is zoned B-2 and used as religious
organization

10 Project. Intersection Improvements - Central
Avenue/Eastway Drive
Owner(s) Morrison Investment Company
Property Address 3800 Central Avenue
Property to be acquired 2,183 sq ft ( 05 ac) plus
temporary construction easement
Price $41,266 00
Remarks Property is zoned B-1 and being used as a Shell
service station Price includes payment for
landscaping, lights, asphalt, display sign
11 **Project:** Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon Amity  
**Owner(s):** John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company  
**Property Address:** 4516 Randolph Road  
**Property to be acquired:** 89 sq ft (0.002 ac) plus temporary construction easement  
**Price:** $10,300  
**Remarks:** The compensation includes damages to the six foot brick wall at the entrance which must be replaced to match existing wall. The property is zoned R12MF and is the site of an apartment complex.

12 **Project:** Fire Station Site #28  
**Owner(s):** John F M Beard and wife, Marie Withers Beard  
**Property Address:** 8015 Old Statesville Road  
**Property to be acquired:** 20,037 sq ft (459 ac)  
**Price:** $25,000  
**Remarks:** To acquire additional space needed for fire station #28. Included in purchase price is the cost for relocating a mobile home.

**CONDEMNATIONS**

13 **Project:** Stewart Creek Outfall  
**Owner(s):** John White, Jr, Sinclair Howze, Eva Howze, Grafton Prophet, Eugene Prophet, and any other parties of interest  
**Property Address:** 301 Salewood Drive  
**Property to be condemned:** 506 55 sq ft (0.011 ac)  
**Price:** $300  
**Reason for condemnation:** Unable to locate all the heirs. Legal recommends that condemnation to get clear title to easement.

14 **Project:** Beatties Ford Road Widening  
**Owner(s):** Joe F Fisher and any other parties of interest  
**Property Address:** 2828 Beatties Ford Road  
**Property to be condemned:** 1460 sq ft (0.033 ac) plus temporary construction easement  
**Price:** $5,100  
**Reason for condemnation:** Property owner wants to get own appraisal. Would not give counteroffer. Zoned B-2. Used for business (cast iron parts repair). Condemnation is requested in order to avoid delay in construction.
15 **Project.** Beatties Ford Road Widening  
**Owner(s).** Joe F Fisher and any other parties of interest  
**Property Address.** 2828 Beatties Ford Road  
**Property to be condemned.** 3,966 sq ft (0.091 ac) plus temporary construction easement  
**Price.** $6,000.00  
**Reason for condemnation.** Property owner wants to get own appraisal. Would not give counteroffer. Zoned office. Land is vacant. Condemnation is requested in order to avoid delay in construction.

16 **Project.** Monroe Road Widening  
**Owner(s).** Richard L Barnes and wife, Mamie B Barnes and any other parties of interest  
**Property Address.** 1448 Painter Place  
**Property to be condemned.** 252.45 sq ft (0.006 ac) of permanent utility easement plus temporary construction easement  
**Improvements.** Fence and shrubs  
**Price.** $2,400.00  
**Reason for condemnation.** Owners are not satisfied with the City's offer. Condemnation is requested in order to meet the construction schedule.

17 **Project.** Monroe Road Widening  
**Owner(s).** Kenneth M Rhyne and wife, Jane P Rhyne and any other parties of interest  
**Property Address.** 1453 Fox Run Drive  
**Property to be condemned.** 347.70 sq ft (0.008 ac) of permanent utility and down guy easement plus temporary construction easement  
**Price.** $2,000.00  
**Reason for condemnation.** Owner has agreed with the City's offer but has not returned the agreement as promised. Numerous attempts have been made to obtain the documents. Condemnation has been requested in order to avoid a delay in construction. Price includes payment for fence and shrubs.

18 **Project.** Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon Amity  
**Owner(s).** Costas N Melissaris and wife, Nicolette Melissaris and any other parties of interest  
**Property Address.** 200 North Sharon Amity  
**Property to be condemned.** 773 sq ft (0.018 ac) of R/W and 1,604 sq ft (0.0368 ac) of temporary construction easement  
**Price.** $17,300.00
Reason for condemnation. Request for condemnation made to clear title (unsatisfied judgment against owner) and owner wants at least one year's rental (amount unspecified) alleging the tenant is moving due to the construction. The property is zoned O-6 and is the site of WeCare Distributors. Condemnation is requested in order to avoid a delay in construction. Price includes payment for landscaping.

19. **Project**: Beatties Ford Road Widening  
**Owner(s)**: Alexander Rusak and any other parties of interest  
**Property Address**: 2925 Beatties Ford Road  
**Property to be condemned**: 1,808 sq ft. (0.042 ac) plus temporary construction easement  
**Price**: $49,500.00  
**Reason for condemnation**: Property owner feels that the City should pay him at least $100,000 for loss of business. Current use is newspaper distribution center; no parking spaces will remain as a result of this acquisition. Zoning is B-1. Condemnation is recommended to avoid delay in construction.

20. **Project**: Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon Amity  
**Owner(s)**: B P Oil, Inc., and any other parties of interest  
**Property Address**: 4474 Randolph Road  
**Property to be condemned**: 2,842 sq ft. (0.065 ac) of right-of-way and 2,275 sq ft. (0.052 ac) of temporary construction easement  
**Price**: $127,400.00  
**Reason for condemnation**: The property is zoned B-1 and is the site of a service station. Condemnation is requested in order to prevent a delay in construction. Price includes compensation for landscaping, service island, parking spaces and brick wall.

21. **Project**: Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon Amity  
**Owner(s)**: The American Oil Company #1 and any other parties of interest  
**Property Address**: 4475 Randolph Road  
**Property to be condemned**: 2,034 sq ft. (0.048 ac) plus temporary construction easement  
**Price**: $34,900.00  
**Reason for condemnation**: The City's offer seemed to be acceptable, but various out-of-state corporate officials must approve settlement. Numerous attempts have been made to obtain the executed documents but they have not yet been returned. Price includes compensation for planter, light standards, trade sign. Condemnation is necessary to avoid a delay in construction.
22 **Project:** Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon Amity  
**Owner(s):** Kaiser Foundation Health Plan of NC and any other parties of interest  
**Property address:** 2 88 + acres in the 200 block of South Sharon Amity  
**Property to be condemned:** 4,928 sq ft (113 ac) of right-of-way plus temporary construction easement  
**Price:** $53,600 00  
**Reason for condemnation:** Owner would not provide counteroffer to the appraisal amount and has not returned five telephone calls regarding negotiations. The property is zoned 0-15 and is vacant.

23 **Project:** Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon Amity  
**Owner(s):** John T Belk, Jr, and wife, Martha G Belk and any other parties of interest  
**Property Address:** 200 block of South Sharon Amity Road  
**Property to be condemned:** 2,578 sq ft (0.059 ac) of right-of-way plus temporary construction easement  
**Price:** $54,000 00  
**Reason for condemnation:** Owners' counteroffer was $84,699 based on appraisal they obtained. We haven't been able to reach a mutually acceptable amount. The property is zoned 0-15 and is vacant. Condemnation is requested in order to prevent a delay in construction.

24 **Project:** Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon Amity  
**Owner(s):** Kaiser Foundation Health Plan of NC and any other parties of interest  
**Property address:** 4500 block of Randolph Road  
**Property to be condemned:** 202 sq ft (0.004 ac) of right-of-way plus temporary construction easement  
**Price:** $3,200 00  
**Reason for condemnation:** Property owner would not provide counteroffer and has not returned five telephone calls regarding negotiations. The property is zoned B-1 and is vacant. Condemnation is requested in order to prevent a delay in construction.

25 **Project:** Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon Amity  
**Owner(s):** Exxon Corporation  
**Property Address:** 4501 Randolph Road  
**Property to be condemned:** 2,954 sq ft (0.067 ac) of right-of-way plus temporary construction easement  
**Price:** $34,000 00
Reason for condemnation. Executed documents have been promised and have not been received in time to avoid delaying the project schedule. The property is zoned B-1 and is the site of an Exxon service station. Price includes compensation for trade sign, retaining wall, landscaping and planter.

26 Project. Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon Amity
Owner(s). Bayrock Investment Company and any other parties of interest
Property address. 119 North Sharon Amity Road
Property to be condemned. 4008 sq. ft (092 ac) plus temporary construction easement
Price. $71,500.00
Reason for condemnation. Property owner won't give counteroffer amount, only says appraisal amount of $71,500.00 is not enough for the damages they will incur. Price includes compensation for trade sign, directional signs, 3 - 5 parking spaces and landscaping.

Property is zoned B-1 and is the site of a Wendy's restaurant. Condemnation is requested in order to prevent a delay in construction.

27 Project. Monroe Road Widening
Owner(s). Charlotte Eastchase Associates, Ltd., and any other parties of interest
Property Address. 1624 Chasewood Drive
Property to be condemned. 2797 sq ft (064 ac) plus temporary construction easement
Price. $8,000.00
Reason for condemnation. Owner is receptive to the City's offer. Numerous approvals are needed from other corporation officials. However, the executed agreements cannot be obtained in a timely manner so as to maintain the construction schedule. Price includes compensation for shrubbery and landscaping.

28 Project. Intersection Improvements - Randolph Road/Sharon Amity
Owner(s). D H & S Associates and any other parties of interest
Property address: 4500 Randolph Road
Property to be condemned: 4,955 sq ft (0113 ac) right-of-way plus temporary construction easement
Price. $100,500.00
Reason for condemnation. There are substantial liens on this property requiring releases from mortgage holders. Condensation is requested to obtain clear title and avoid a delay in construction. This site is the location of Petro Express service station. Price includes three light standards, 2 landscape planters, retaining wall, relocation of trade sign.

29 Project: Beatties Ford Road Widening
Owner(s): Village Townhouses, Ltd., and any other parties of interest.
Property Address: 1801 Griers Grove Road
Property to be condemned: 469 sq ft (0.011 ac) plus temporary construction easement
Price: $900.00
Reason for condemnation. Property owner failed to respond to many phone calls, four letters, and another letter sent by certified mail and return receipt signed as received June 8, 1989. Property is zoned R-12 MF and is improved with apartments.

30 Project: Beatties Ford Road Widening
Owner(s): Mary Malcolm Ward and any other parties of interest.
Property Address: 3608 Beatties Ford Road
Property to be condemned: 3,228 sq ft (0.071 ac) plus temporary construction easement
Price: $12,900.00
Reason for condemnation. The owner has refused all offers and made a counteroffer of $23,000 based on moving the house back on the property. The property is zoned B-1 and requires a minimum setback of 20 feet. The residential structure will be 20 feet back from the new road right-of-way.

31 Project: Beatties Ford Road Widening
Owner(s): Ed L. Perry and any other parties of interest.
Property Address: 2136 "A" Avenue
Property to be condemned: 698 sq ft (0.016 ac) of permanent drainage easement plus temporary construction easement
Price: $800.00
Reason for condemnation. Property owner is residing out of town - no phone number, will not respond to three letters and one certified letter mailed 6/2/89. Property is zoned R-9 and vacant. Condensation is recommended for City to get a clear title to property.
32 Project: Beatties Ford Road Widening  
Owner(s): McDaniel Jackson and wife, Miriam S Jackson and any other parties of interest  
Property Address: Beatties Ford Road  
Property to be condemned: 10,359 sq ft (237 ac) of right-of-way plus temporary construction easement  
Price: $14,000 00  
Reason for condemnation: Property owner has been contacted three times, sent certified letter, and left several messages for him to return calls. He has not counteroffered or made any indication for settlement. Property is zoned B-1 and is vacant and wooded. Condemnation is recommended so project will not be delayed.

33 Project: Monroe Road Widening  
Owner(s): Joanne M Vohden and any other parties of interest  
Property Address: 7010 Monroe Road  
Property to be condemned: 1,874.82 sq ft (0.043 ac) plus temporary construction easement  
Price: $6,500 00  

34 Project: Monroe Road Widening  
Owner(s): East Baptist Church  
Property Address: 6850 Monroe Road  
Property to be condemned: 4,722.77 sq ft (0.108 ac) of right-of-way plus temporary construction easement  
Price: $3,100 00  
Reason for condemnation: Trustees counteroffered with $7,000 00, however, could not get before congregation before project deadline. Condemnation is requested in order not to delay construction of project. Zoned R-12, used as a church.

35 Project: Monroe Road Widening  
Owner(s): Leo E Gaudreau and wife, Olivia Gaudreau and any other parties of interest  
Property Address: 7727 Monroe Road  
Property to be condemned: 827.54 sq. ft. (.018 ac) plus temporary construction easement.  
Price: $2,600 00  
Reason for condemnation: Property owners have not accepted the City's offer since they feel the loss of trees that buffer the house will cause substantial loss of privacy and diminish the property values.
36  **Project:** NC Hwy 51 Widening - Phase III  
**Owner(s):** Butterfly Seven, Ltd, Inc, and any other parties of interest  
**Address of Property:** Northwest corner, Pineville-Matthews Road at Rea Road  
**Property to be condemned:** 430 square feet (0.010 ac) plus 92 square feet (0.002 ac) of permanent drainage easement and 4,683 square feet (0.108 ac) of temporary construction easement.  
**Price:** $3,100.00  
**Reason for condemnation:** Property owner signed option but refused to sign releases at closing that would transfer a clear title. Legal has recommended condemnation to avoid delaying construction on project. Property is zoned R-15 and used as residential.

*****  *****  *****

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSION**

34  **Adoption of a motion to recess the meeting for the purpose of going into executive session to consider the qualifications of the following nominees and to cast ballots making the appointments in accordance with G.S. 143-318.**

The City Clerk will announce the results of the balloting when the meeting is reconvened.

A  **Charlotte-Mecklenburg Art Commission:** The following nominations have been made for one three-year term:

a) Daphne Dwyer, nominated by Councilmember Patterson  
b) Esther Page Hill, nominated by Councilmember Dannelly  
c) Brenda Noel, nominated by Councilmember Scarborough  
d) James Brucki, nominated by Councilmember S. Campbell

Attachment No 10

B  **Certified Development Corporation:** The following nominations have been made for one position in the Business Organizations category, for an unexpired term ending April 30, 1991:

a) Warren Linde, Jr, nominated by Councilmember S. Campbell  
b) Todd Johnson, nominated by Councilmember Vinroot

Attachment No 11
C. **Historic District Commission** - The following nominations have been made for the appointment of a Dilworth Resident/Owner for a three-year term.

a) Kirk D. Williams, nominated by Councilmember Scarborough.
b) Roger Dahnert, nominated by Councilmember Woollen.

Attachment No. 12

D **Advisory Board to the Youth Involvement Council** - The following nominations have been made for two two-year terms

a) Randy Harris, nominated by Councilmember Scarborough
b) Kevin Patterson, nominated by Councilmember Clodfelter
c) David L. Grier, nominated by Councilmember Danneely
d) Frank Aycock, nominated by Councilmember Vinroot

Attachment No. 13

**NOMINATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

35. **A Certified Development Corporation** - One unexpired term ending April 30, 1991. Appointee is to represent a Community Organization

Attachment No. 14

B **Civil Service Board** - One appointment for a three-year term. Appointee must be an elector (registered voter) of the City of Charlotte. The following nomination was made at the June 26th meeting, but nominations remain open:

a) Regan Miller, nominated by Councilmember Clodfelter.

Attachment No. 15
DATE:      May 22, 1989

PETITION NO.:  89-37

PETITIONER(S):  Charlotte-Hecklenburg Planning Commission

REQUEST:  Change from B-2 and 0-6 to B-1, 0-6, and R-9

LOCATION:  Approximately 7.9 acres located on the south side of
Central Avenue along Lyon Court, Morningside Drive and
Ivey Drive.

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

Nays:  None.

REASONS

This petition is involved with implementation of the Chantilly-
Commonwealth Small Area Plan. It includes approximately 7.9 acres
located south of Central Avenue along Lyon Court, Morningside Drive,
and Ivey Drive. Properties included within the petition are currently
zoned a combination of B-2 and 0-6. The rezoning request at hand seeks
B-1, 0-6, and R-9. The portion of the subject property which fronts
Central Avenue is petitioned for rezoning from B-2 to B-1 to establish
more compatible zoning on the edge of the established neighborhood.
The properties are developed with commercial, office, and residential
uses.

The petition seeks a change from B-2 to 0-6 for two parcels on the east
side of Ivey Drive which are developed with a single family house. It
also proposes a change from B-2 to 0-6 for three lots on the west side
of Ivey Drive, two lots on either side of Morningside Drive, and two
lots on either side of Lyon Court. These lots form a strip behind the
proposed B-1 lots and are presently occupied by single family uses
except for the two lots on Lyon Court which contain office uses. The
balance of the petition is requested for rezoning to R-9. These
parcels are occupied by single family residences with the exception of
one lot on Lyon Court which contains an office use. The Zoning
Committee recommends approval of the petition.

STAFF OPINION

The staff agrees with the Zoning Committee recommendations.
PETITIONER  Charlotte-Wecklenburg Planning Commission

PETITION NO. 89-37  HEARING DATE April 17, 1989

ZONING CLASSIFICATION, EXISTING  B-2 & O-6  REQUESTED  B-1, O-6, & R-9

LOCATION Approx. 7.984 acres located on the south side of Central Ave. along both sides of Lyon Ct., Morningside Dr. and Ivey Dr.

ZONING MAP NO. 101  SCALE 1" = 400'
## INNOVATIVE HOUSING FUND STATUS REPORT AS OF July 17, 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECTS FUNDED</th>
<th>DATE APPROVED</th>
<th># OF UNITS</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF CITY</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF PRIVATE PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>LEVERAGE RATIO (Private to City)</th>
<th>CITY COST PER UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summit Avenue Second Mortgages (Homeownership)</td>
<td>6-23-86</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$1,693,765</td>
<td>$443,765</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>2.8:1</td>
<td>$18,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalom Homes (Rehab/Sale)</td>
<td>11-10-86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>64,346</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park Feasibility Study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grier Heights Economic Foundation (Foundations for relocation of houses)</td>
<td>7-11-88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85,727</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskins Mill (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>7-11-88</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>8,055,000</td>
<td>2,355,346</td>
<td>5,699,654</td>
<td>2.4:1</td>
<td>12,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winman Park (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>9-13-88</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>523,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>373,000</td>
<td>2.5:1</td>
<td>8,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity (Homeownership)</td>
<td>9-26-88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>276,850</td>
<td>52,850</td>
<td>224,000</td>
<td>4.6:1</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpine Terrace/Stonehaven (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>1-17-89</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7,709,820</td>
<td>500,000**</td>
<td>7,209,820</td>
<td>5.2:1</td>
<td>9,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity (Homeownership)</td>
<td>4-24-89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>1,200,000*</td>
<td>2,000,000+</td>
<td>1.6:1</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Park (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>4-24-89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>435,000</td>
<td>2.0:1</td>
<td>10,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** | **504** | **$22,108,435** | **$5,084,034** | **$17,191,401** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>City Participation</th>
<th>Private Participation</th>
<th>Leverage Ratio</th>
<th>City Cost Per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summit Avenue Second Mortgages</td>
<td>6-23-86</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$1,693,765</td>
<td>$443,765</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>2.8:1</td>
<td>$18,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalom Homes (Rehab/Sale)</td>
<td>11-10-86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>64,346</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park Feasibility Study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grier Heights Economic Foundation (Foundations for relocation of houses)</td>
<td>7-11-88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85,727</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskins Mill (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>7-11-88</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>8,055,000</td>
<td>2,355,346</td>
<td>5,699,654</td>
<td>2.4:1</td>
<td>12,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winman Park (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>9-13-88</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>523,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>373,000</td>
<td>2.5:1</td>
<td>8,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity (Homeownership)</td>
<td>9-26-88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>276,850</td>
<td>52,850</td>
<td>224,000</td>
<td>4.6:1</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpine Terrace/Stonehaven (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>1-17-89</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7,709,820</td>
<td>500,000**</td>
<td>7,209,820</td>
<td>5.2:1</td>
<td>9,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity (Homeownership)</td>
<td>4-24-89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>1,200,000*</td>
<td>2,000,000+</td>
<td>1.6:1</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Park (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>4-24-89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>435,000</td>
<td>2.0:1</td>
<td>10,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** | **504** | **$22,108,435** | **$5,084,034** | **$17,191,401** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>City Participation</th>
<th>Private Participation</th>
<th>Leverage Ratio</th>
<th>City Cost Per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summit Avenue Second Mortgages</td>
<td>6-23-86</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$1,693,765</td>
<td>$443,765</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>2.8:1</td>
<td>$18,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalom Homes (Rehab/Sale)</td>
<td>11-10-86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>64,346</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park Feasibility Study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grier Heights Economic Foundation (Foundations for relocation of houses)</td>
<td>7-11-88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85,727</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskins Mill (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>7-11-88</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>8,055,000</td>
<td>2,355,346</td>
<td>5,699,654</td>
<td>2.4:1</td>
<td>12,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winman Park (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>9-13-88</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>523,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>373,000</td>
<td>2.5:1</td>
<td>8,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity (Homeownership)</td>
<td>9-26-88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>276,850</td>
<td>52,850</td>
<td>224,000</td>
<td>4.6:1</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpine Terrace/Stonehaven (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>1-17-89</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7,709,820</td>
<td>500,000**</td>
<td>7,209,820</td>
<td>5.2:1</td>
<td>9,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity (Homeownership)</td>
<td>4-24-89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>1,200,000*</td>
<td>2,000,000+</td>
<td>1.6:1</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Park (Private Rental Housing)</td>
<td>4-24-89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>435,000</td>
<td>2.0:1</td>
<td>10,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** | **504** | **$22,108,435** | **$5,084,034** | **$17,191,401** |

### APPROPRIATIONS TO INNOVATIVE HOUSING FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY86 General Revenue Sharing</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY87 General Revenue Sharing</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY88 Pay-As-You-Go Capital</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY89 Pay-As-You-Go Capital</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY88 Community Development Block Grant</td>
<td>1,200,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | **$8,100,000**

### CURRENT FUNDS AVAILABLE IN INNOVATIVE HOUSING FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Appropriations</td>
<td>$8,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures to Date</td>
<td>-$5,084,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$3,015,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmore-NHS - Proposed</td>
<td>-$415,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Crosland Co. - Pending</td>
<td>-$1,240,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | **$1,359,901**

**City subsidy required after construction: 1st Year Maximum $300,000 - Yearly Maximum $275,000**
Mr. J. Campbell asked Mr. White if he had any replies to the productivity study committees which he will be presenting?

Mr. White stated they would send to Council a brief report, or review from the Committee’s point of view and would clarify and list some questions—tell them what they plan to work on and also suggest that Council needs to make some decisions. That is the part that is heavy.

The Mayor suggested that everyone on Council read the reports and mark things they want to bring up so they can save some time by being prepared ahead of time.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

RETROACTIVE SEPARATION ALLOWANCE BENEFITS FOR POLICE OFFICERS, APPROVED.

Councillor Patterson stated she had called Assistant City Manager, Don Steger about the actual number of people who will be impacted, who have 30 years of experience, and are less than 62 years old so they could put to rest once and for all the discussion of who else this might impact. There are 12 to 13 at the most.

[Motion was made by Councillor Patterson, seconded by Councillor Scarborough to give those people the separation allowance.]

Johnny Helms, 14700 Pleasant Hill Road, stated he was a retired Police Officer with the Charlotte Police Department, and he would like to introduce Council to 13 men with about 400 years of Police service that made it happen. He stated they tried to contact everyone to let them know how they felt about this. He read in the agenda that several retired Police Officers had approached the City about making this fund retroactive to their retirement in early 1986. He stated this is not true—they never said it or even thought it. What they are saying is start them out when everyone else started out. They got their thirty years and they did not know this was going to take place. This is a social security supplement, not retirement.

Mr. Helms stated he did not know who City staff was as he has never talked to them, but somehow they have gotten bad information as to these officers going back and picking up everybody. At first they wanted to use him and a couple other. He retired in January and February 1986, but their point is, they built them 30 years and even if they went out in 1984 or 1985, they have got 30 years so include them because they have paid their dues.

Councillor Matthews stated he does not quite understand the total of what they have been asked to do and he does believe there is a considerable difference between what the gentlemen are asking for and what staff is assuming or presenting. He stated he recalls some numbers and asked if those figures were not retroactive to the time of the passage of the act?

Councillor Patterson stated you have to have two things in order to get this supplement. It is a social security supplement and it is for people who are under 62 years of age and have at least 30 years of service. According to Mr. Steger, almost nobody has been hired and trained and is on the street as a Police Officer in this City under 20 or 21 years of age. If you add up all the numbers, there would only be people from about 1978 to present who could fall into this category of having the two requirements—30 years service and be under 62 years of age now. When Mr. Steger checked into this, there were only this group of men and it is retroactive for them. They are all at this point in time under 62 years of age, however, some are very near going over 62.

Ms. Patterson stated she considered this as a fairness issue and was concerned, based on staff’s original information to Council, that there might be hundreds of these people out there. Further investigation proved that there were not even 30 of them.
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Mr. Matthews stated he was not sure how he feels about this, and when he gets his questions answered he will have to make up his own mind real quick. The retroactive portion is back to the date of the act in 1986 and that is the only retroactive pay that is included. He is concerned about the number of the people involved.

City Manager, Wendell White stated the total they are dealing with now is apparently 43 people and that is costing the City $350,000 each year, not including these.

Ms. Patterson asked if those are the people they were already paying this for, to which the Manager replied that is right.

Mr. White stated he is merely saying that there are that many who came in under it. It is their feeling and it was well known that the City as, well as other cities across the State, was opposed to this because of the impact on local budget. As far as he knows everyone knew that. Certainly some of the City's officers were lobbying for this and had been. It was an individual decision to decide to wait, or go ahead and retire. There is nothing to prevent others from coming to Council and saying "why not go back to when the state officers were receiving this", which would not be large numbers, but it is an unknown number.

Ms Patterson asked if that was a different category than what they were looking at, to which Mr. White stated it is the same principle. State officers were included with this kind of provision a few years before the City's officers were able to get this through to affect them. The only magic about this, is what this group is asking for - they have earned their time based on when this became effective for the local officers. There could be argument made that there are others who have put in their 30 years beforehand, and why should not they receive that supplement that others have done and that these officers will.

Mr. Matthews stated what you are saying is that they may logically or illogically come back and say they want the retroactive pay from the time they retired until the time they are 62 because, in effect, they are making something special which brings him to another question. How does this relate or tie into the other employees program? They are talking fairness and he wants to be fair across the board. He does not know if it has repercussions wider outside the Police Force or do they have similar situations which could occur within the general employees?

Mr. White stated the action already taken is making a special case for this professional group. Whether or not they might argue that other groups of employees should get similar benefits - he does not think would be justified, but on the issue of fairness, depending on who you are and what your work is - others might argue that.

Councilmember Clodfelter asked if there are any other situations where the law changed and some folks found themselves in a gap?

Mr. White stated he does not consider that they have found themselves in a gap period.

Mr. Clodfelter stated this group considers they have found themselves in the gap period and asked if there were any other City employees who could consider themselves in a comparable position because of a change of the law?

Mr. White stated .... retirees whom he would think would.

Mr. Clodfelter asked, who were affected by this law?

(Mr. White's response was not on the tape.)

Mr. Clodfelter stated he thought it only affected law enforcement officers, to which Mr. White replied it does, but that is not the thrust of Mr. Matthews question. The question as he understood it, are there other employees who would feel this is special compared to them?

mpl
Mr. Matthews stated that is basically his question and in fact that they may have a basis of law to base that on.

Mr. White stated he does not think there would be that kind of a basis.

Councilmember Vinroot asked if anyone would tell him how much money they were talking about giving these 13 men who range in 0 years to 62 to 7 years to 62 by his calculations. How much they are talking about spending over how many years at $53,000 per year - does anyone have the total figure they are talking about committing if they vote for this?

Don Steger, Assistant City Manager stated the figures they have calculated on the formula, (which is 0.8 of one percent, times the average of their last four years of service, times the number of years of service they have with the department), the back pay for those 13 the 2 years, (1987 and 1988) would equal $154,500. The continuing amount, which is the current amount for this year and the succeeding years was estimated at $60,000 per year.

Mr. Vinroot asked for how many years, to which Mr. Steger stated he did not figure the years. The department figured the years, but he does not have those numbers with him. That would depend on the age of the youngest member in the group and he does not have that information. The longest anyone in this group could possibly get this would be for 9 years which is the estimate he made using the figures the department gave him. Logically, if you just look at the group, and he knows many of them, some of them would fall out of this system as they become 62 and some will become 62 before others will.

Mr. Vinroot stated it sounds like $154,000 for sure and $60,000 times 9 or less. They are talking about roughly half million to 3/4 of a million and probably less than that. The issue is not that it seems to him. He stated he has a problem with Johnny’s position and he believes this is also the Manager’s point. It is simply one they have to decide they are willing to face. The position taken by Don Steger, he assumes the Chief of Police, makes him feel like it is not the City’s responsibility. It was well publicized, and people were making conscious decisions to retire and gambling that this might or might not be available. He assumes, if he understands it correctly, it had not been passed previously by the legislature and there was some feeling that it would not pass again so many folks went ahead and made their retirement decisions, perhaps gambling that it wouldn’t happen this time. Well, it did happen. The legislature did adopt it and within months of Johnny’s and perhaps others’ retirement this benefit was available. The Council can cure that by voting for this and it may cost the City half-million over the next 7 years. There are bound to be other decisions made by other governments with respect to retirement benefits. There are bound to be other employees, whether they be firemen, policemen or staff or City Council members, who would come and say they retired just two or three months before some government made those benefits available. If they had stayed three more months, they would have been better off. He asked if they wished to create the precedent which this creates to basically say that they did care enough about these 13 policemen at this time to do it, and they certainly do care about them. Therefore, they will have a difficult time deciding that they too will be responsible for those notch officers or firemen or staff people at some future time. He believes that is the concern, and that is almost persuasive with him. That concerns him enough to vote against what they are being asked to do as much as he thinks of Johnny and the other people.

Councilmember Dannelly stated he does not see anywhere in the State statute where any other person would be eligible. This was made for local law enforcement officers and was made only for them. These 13 happen to be notch officers and there are no more because if there were any before them, they would already be 62 or without 30 years of service. Certainly, there are no more to come after them except those already identified. This would be the end because there are no new laws to include anyone else at this point.
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Mr. Vinroot stated surely there will be, at some point in time, someone who
will enhance retirement benefits, whether it is the federal government and
social security or the State government. There will be some enhancements
somewhere down the road and there will be people who will retire before
their retirement date who are denied those enhancements because they
retired two months earlier, whether it is this specific type officer or
specific type benefit or not.

Mr. Dannelly stated he agrees and that is a supposition that may or may not
happen. It would then be the duty of the sitting Council at that time to
make that decision, not this Council at this time.

Councilmember Rousso stated he would support the retroactive benefits. It
is very difficult for him to comprehend that these officers would have
retired earlier if they had known what the ramifications would be. If they
had fully known that, they would have delayed their retirement. He
believes it is a matter of fairness that they extend this to these
officers. It is not forever and he hopes these officers live to be 99
years old. It is unfortunate that they have this. They have to worry about
these things and agonize over them, but he feels it is just fair that they
pass this.

Councilmember Scarborough stated with reference to the statement that other
Councils would have to deal with this, this Council is digging up rules
that previous Councils made so why are they worrying about what another
Council is going to do. They bring up issues every day that former
Councils have already dealt with so that point to her is just mute.

Mr. Matthews stated he was still struggling with the fairness issue. He
does not see it as a fairness issue. This came about because the State law
said this be done, and the law specifically said for people who retire on
or after a certain date. Had the intent of the law been to cover all
retired police officers, it would have included that. If they are
thinking these are unfairly excluded from the law, then they are second
guessing the law, and perhaps that issue was debated, and probably was and
did not get included. Somebody has got to say something different from
what he has heard to convince him that it is a fairness issue. In the face
of the fact that staff has over and over taken the position that there
should have been, and probably was, adequate information, and notification
and discussion within the department to have alerted these people. There
were 6 people who retired in 1986, one who retired in May 1986 with the law
in the State House being debated. Even if you were going to apply it to
people within three months or six months of the effective date of the law,
that might be more fair than just simply applying it as a blanket to
everybody who retired from the system. He really does not see this as a
fairness issue and is almost wishing someone would say something that would
convince him.

Mr. Coddlester stated he was still trying to understand and perhaps talking
out loud helps so the Council can tell him if his words are making sense.
As he has read the State law it looks like the intent was to say that if
you are over 55 and you have got more than 30 years when you retire, they
want you to have the benefit of the supplemental social security payment,
just as if you were already 62. Folks who were already 62 when they
retired get this so he is not worrying about those. The State was trying to
say to officers who were over 55 when they retired and have this long
period of service, they wanted them to be in the same position as the folks
who are 62 and have the same benefit. That was their intent and they did
day, but when they picked the effective date, they wanted to make people
who were 62 and over 55, but not yet 62 in the same position. When they did
day, by picking the effective date, they left 13 people out of being in
the same position. He understands what they were trying to do when they
put the statute together, but 13 people fell through the cracks, otherwise
everybody would have been on the same footing because of the effective
date. There can only be 13 people and he can see a fairness issue in that
and he is persuaded by that.
April 24, 1989
Minute Book 93 - Page 11

Mr. Clodfelter stated he did not know how to speculate other change in
other laws at other times because he needs to wait and see what the facts
are on those, how they all fit together and what the package is like,
whether someone was unintentionally left out, or whether they were
intentionally left out. He cannot decide or speculate about another
situation down the road, but he is persuaded that there is a fairness issue
here and will support the motion.

Mayor Myrick stated she agrees with Mr. Clodfelter.

Mr. Matthews stated if they do this, he feels they need to understand that
it is not something they are doing to correct the law, but something that
is a local gesture which has nothing to do with the law. That is something
that still divides him as it might relate, not necessarily to other people
getting caught in it, but it relates to other employees and somehow there
is not a balance there.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried as follows:

YEAS    Councilmembers S. Campbell, Clodfelter, Dannelly, Penning,
Patterson, Rousseau and Scarborough.

NAYS    Councilmembers J. Campbell, Matthews, Vinroot and Woollen.

* * * * *

ALTERNATE B ALIGNMENT AND SCHEDULE FOR IDLEWILD ROAD/IDLEWILD ROAD NORTH
INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, APPROVED.

Warren B. Rogers, Jr., 4336 Idlewild Road North, stated he was there to
speak in support of the recommendation to Council for Alternate B of the
alignment which is the alignment for the widening on the west side of the
street. He stated he would be the most damaged homeowner if the street
were widened on the east side which is Alternate A. It is his basic
believe that in this type of project, it is more than just curbs and
curbers, sidewalks and alignments. There are things behind the sidewalks
such as homes and neighbors and friends, therefore he believes a project of
this type should get on site inspection prior to putting lines on paper.
If an on site inspection had been conducted, they would have seen that the
sidewalk would be approximately 22 feet from his front door. Prior to the
Council meeting convening, which was a long time ago, he paced it 25
feet is approximately the distance from where he is standing to Mayor
Myrick's desk. That is how close his house would be to the street. In
addition to that the sidewalk is two feet higher than his porch so he would
have a gully. For reference to what this looks like on a street, if you
will look at Independence Boulevard where Pecan crosses and you see the
houses sitting right on the street. That is what he is talking about here.
The 12 trees in his front yard which are used for shade and sound abatement
would be gone. There would not be enough room to replace these trees
because behind the sidewalk, Duke Power Company has a 7200 volt power line
and there is not enough room between the right-of-way required for the
power line and the front of his house to replace trees.

Mr. Rogers stated an on site inspection would have also shown on the east
side the extensive landscape plantings at Meadowdale Lane would all be
gone. These are crepe myrtles, holly, juniper and red tips. He got an
estimate that it would take over $10,000 to replace these plantings which
would be gone and no provision to restore them. The traffic noise from the
projected 45,000 cars per day would be about 25 feet from his handicapped
daughter's bedroom which would make it impossible for her to live there.
The safety of cars that close without any trees as barriers would make it
too unsafe to live there. He stated he had lived in this neighborhood
for 15 years and has lived on this site for 12 years. The house is exactly
where he wanted it and provides what he wanted in preparing for the time
when his daughter would be surviving him when he would have to provide a
place for someone to come in and care for her.

Mr. Rogers stated either alignment yields a safe street. The cost are
equal within a margin of error. The traffic flow into and out of his church
will be impacted the same fashion regardless of which option is selected,
mpl.
area. Reservations to use this space will be through the Parks and Recreation Department.

Charlotte Outdoor Adventure Center
Charlotte Outdoor Adventure Center has been leasing the basement of the main building, training tower, and surrounding grounds for its self-confidence and team building training program. Their present program will continue in the basement, tower and surrounding grounds. Their lease is for 3,522 square feet at $3.00 per square foot for an annual rental of $10,566 payable at $880.50 on the 1st of each month. This lease has been signed by their organization.

Metrolina Native American Association
The Metrolina Native American Association proposes to lease the first floor for office and display area and will function as an Urban Indian Center. The Center will be dedicated to increase knowledge and preservation of the Native American Culture. Their desire is to lease the 4,500 square feet at $1.00 per year. It is the Parks Advisory Board and staff's recommendation that the fair economic rent be applied which is $5.00 per square foot for an annual rental of $22,500 payable at $1,875 on the first of each month. The first floor has seen very little use during the last several years and will need some repairs to the heating, plumbing, and electrical systems. Repairs and renovations would be approved in advance by the Director of the Parks and Recreation Department, and all approved improvements would be credited toward the lease payments. Their lease hasn't been executed by them at this time.

Funds
There will be no cost to the City.

Clearances
Parks and Recreation Department; Parks Advisory Board; Engineering Department.

21. Recommend adoption of a budget ordinance for $312,102 for retroactive separation allowance benefits for retired police officers.

Separation Allowance Benefits
On April 24, 1989, Council considered a request to grant separation allowance benefits to police officers who retired prior to the State legislature mandating a separation allowance for
police officers who retired on or after January 1, 1987 with 30 years of service or had five years of service and had reached the age of 55. The separation allowance is calculated by a formula which multiplies the officer's number of years of service by his base salary at the time of retirement by 0.0085. The separation allowance is paid from the date of the officer's retirement until he either reaches the age of 62 and is eligible for social security benefits or dies.

**Benefits Extended**

The initial request covered only officers who retired in 1986, the year the separation allowance was under consideration. At that time the cost of making the benefit retroactive to January, 1986 was estimated at $173,680 for back pay and $53,500 per year thereafter. During the discussion of the issue, Council expressed the intent of extending the benefit to all officers who had retired with 30 years of service but who had not reached the age of 62 by January 1, 1987 when the law became effective.

**Two Groups Eligible**

Given those parameters, two groups of officers eligible for all or part of the benefit have been identified. There are 22 officers who retired with 30 years of service who have not yet reached the age of 62 and would be eligible for both back pay and monthly benefits. There are an additional nine officers who are now 62 but who had not reached that age when the law became effective. They would receive no monthly payments but Council may wish to consider back pay for the period between January 1, 1987 and the 62nd birthday of these officers (Benefit information is attached).

**Budget Ordinance**

Adoption of a budget ordinance for $312,102 covers the retroactive separation allowance benefits for the 22 officers who have met all of the eligibility requirements for the benefit and are still under 62 years of age. This amount will cover the back pay for the period between January 1, 1987 through June 30, 1989. The monthly separation allowance for these 22 officers is $10,762.14 per month or $129,145.44 per year.

There are an additional nine officers who met the eligibility criteria for the separation allowance at the time it became effective but who have now reached the age of 62. If Council elects to give these officers retroactive benefits from the time
the separation allowance became effective until the time they reached age 62, the cost would be $50,484.09. Monthly benefit payments in FY90 will be made from the Police Department Operating Budget.

All of these costs are contingent upon the Local Government Retirement System's verification of the years of creditable service for each affected officer.

**Funds**

FY89 General Fund Contingency (Balance $324,644).

**Clearances**

The Police Department, Budget and Evaluation, and the City Manager's Office have reviewed this request.

Attachment No. 18

---

**BUDGET ORDINANCE/AGREEMENT**

22. **A.** Recommend adoption of a budget ordinance for $4,800,000.00 for the construction, surveying, inspection, testing and landscaping of Westinghouse Boulevard Extension from Old Nations Ford Road to South Boulevard.

**B.** Recommend approval of an agreement for construction surveying services with Concord Engineering and Survey, Inc. of Concord, North Carolina for 112,600.00.

**Budget Ordinance**

Adoption of the budget ordinance will provide funds for:

Construction surveying...$ 112,600.00
(Concord Engineering and Surveying, Inc.)
### Officers eligible for monthly Separation Allowance and back pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Monthly Rate</th>
<th>Annual Rate</th>
<th>Back Pay Thru 6/89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officer #1</td>
<td>356 05</td>
<td>$ 4,272 60</td>
<td>$ 10,325 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #2</td>
<td>340 20</td>
<td>4,082 40</td>
<td>9,865 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #3</td>
<td>353 28</td>
<td>4,239 36</td>
<td>10,245 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #4</td>
<td>382 90</td>
<td>4,594 80</td>
<td>11,104 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #5</td>
<td>530 98</td>
<td>6,371 76</td>
<td>15,398 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #6</td>
<td>509 18</td>
<td>6,110 16</td>
<td>14,756 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #7</td>
<td>477 00</td>
<td>5,724 00</td>
<td>13,833 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #8</td>
<td>317 27</td>
<td>3,807 24</td>
<td>9,200 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #9</td>
<td>489 72</td>
<td>5,876 64</td>
<td>14,201 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #10</td>
<td>429 30</td>
<td>5,151 60</td>
<td>12,449 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #11</td>
<td>448 22</td>
<td>5,378 64</td>
<td>12,998 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #12</td>
<td>604 92</td>
<td>7,259 04</td>
<td>17,542 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #13</td>
<td>548 87</td>
<td>6,586 44</td>
<td>15,917 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #14</td>
<td>508 28</td>
<td>6,099 36</td>
<td>14,740 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #15</td>
<td>492 90</td>
<td>5,914 80</td>
<td>14,294 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #16</td>
<td>649 37</td>
<td>7,792 44</td>
<td>18,831 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #17</td>
<td>701 05</td>
<td>8,412 60</td>
<td>20,330 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #18</td>
<td>560 39</td>
<td>6,724 44</td>
<td>16,251 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #19</td>
<td>469 05</td>
<td>5,628 60</td>
<td>13,602 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #20</td>
<td>656 28</td>
<td>7,875 36</td>
<td>19,032 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #21</td>
<td>318 00</td>
<td>3,816 00</td>
<td>9,222 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #22</td>
<td>618 93</td>
<td>7,427 16</td>
<td>17,948 97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Monthly $ 10,762 14
Total Annual $ 129,145 44
Total Back Pay $ 312,102 06
Officers who were eligible for the Separation Allowance in January, 1987 but who have now reached the age of 62

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer #</th>
<th># of Months</th>
<th>Approx / Amt of Back Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officer #1</td>
<td>18 Months</td>
<td>$ 9,942.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #2</td>
<td>5 Months</td>
<td>$2,896.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #3</td>
<td>18 Months</td>
<td>$5,760.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #4</td>
<td>5 Months</td>
<td>$1,373.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #5</td>
<td>11 Months</td>
<td>$5,552.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #6</td>
<td>24 Months</td>
<td>$12,719.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #7</td>
<td>8 Months</td>
<td>$3,828.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #8</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
<td>$1,080.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer #9</td>
<td>25 Months</td>
<td>$7,331.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Back Pay $50,484.09
DISCUSSION REGARDING RETROACTIVE SEPARATION ALLOWANCE BENEFITS FOR RETIRED POLICE OFFICERS.

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Dannelly, seconded by Councilmember ]
[ Clodfelter, to adopt the proposed budget ordinance. ]

Johnny Helms, 14700 Pleasant Hill Road, stated he wanted to thank the Council for their consideration in the April 24 Meeting. He stated he had briefly seen the report put out by the City Manager and feels it is a terrific report. He just ask Council to vote their conscious.

Councilmember Matthews asked if this includes the additional 9 officers?

Councilmember Vinroot stated there is an extra $50,000 item which he does not believe is covered by the heading. He believes the budget ordinance is for $312,102 and these additional 9 costs another $50,000 so it is roughly $362,000. The question is, does the motion include the $362,000.

Councilmember J. Campbell stated the agenda material states this $324,644 will come out of the contingency fund and asked if that is before or after.

Budget Director Vi Alexander answered from the audience and could not be picked up on the tape.

Mr. Clodfelter stated he would suggest that they vote on this as two pieces, first the ratification of the action they took on April 24 and then the extension of it to 9 additional officers which they did not vote up or down on the 24th.

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Clodfelter, seconded by Councilmember ]
[ Patterson, to approve the $312,102. ]

Mr. Matthews stated he voted against this to start with and has no reason to vote for it now because he does not think it is an equity issue which it was presented to be. He believes the addition of the 9 officers which ties to it is evidence that you can continue this as far as you want to. It is just as equitable to go all the way back and pick out any officer who retired before they were 62 and pay them - no matter how far back you go.

Mr. Vinroot stated he agrees with Mr. Matthews.

The vote was taken on the motion to approve the $312,102 and was recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers S. Campbell, Clodfelter, Dannelly, Patterson and Scarborough.
NAYS: Councilmembers J. Campbell, Penning, Matthews, Vinroot and Woollen.

The vote ended in a tie, therefore it will be brought back at a later meeting.

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Clodfelter, seconded by Councilmember ]
[ Patterson, and carried unanimously to defer the question regarding the ]
[ nine additional officers. ]

Mr. Vinroot stated he felt the whole matter was going to be deferred.

Mr. Clodfelter stated he had just made the motion to ratify what they did on April 24 and did not pick up the nine additional officers.
To the City Council
From the City Manager

Request City Council at its May 11, 1987 meeting to determine if the City should participate in the development of a business incubator. If yes, choose an option: (A) negotiate the development of a business incubator with the West Trade-Beatties Ford Area Merchants Association or (B) develop the business incubator using the Request for Proposal process.

Community Development

This request should be organized according to the following categories: Background, Explanation of Request, Source of Funding, Clearances, Bibliography.

BACKGROUND: The incubator concept was formulated as early as 1979 and since that time has experienced much growth. Its primary goal is to help fledgling businesses get started by offering centralized services and other advantages not readily available in traditional business facilities. Some of the services provided by an incubator are:

A. Below market rent;
B. Management technical and financial assistance;
C. Shared secretarial, clerical, physical labor services;
D. Moral support, business from other occupants;
E. Employee training, placement service.

Incubators are designed to shelter young enterprises, providing support services and low overhead until they are ready to go out on their own. Although an estimated 70% of small businesses fail in their first five years, studies suggest a 70% success rate for firms launched from incubators. It is a national consensus that most future economic growth will come from small businesses thereby making incubators and other small business-oriented programs major job generators. Some of the types of businesses attracted to an incubator are light manufacturing, trucking, specialty foods, software, artists, signmaking, woodworking, building maintenance, and other service-oriented professions.

The West Trade Beatties Ford Area Merchants Association (Merchants Association) has proposed to develop a business incubator and presented its proposal to City Council at the public hearing on the use of Community Development Block Grant Funds at West Mecklenburg High School on April 9, 1987. The Merchants Association's Business Incubator is projected as a single story structure of 19,240 gross square feet.

(A)
APPROVED BY CITY COUNCIL
MAY 11 1987
Pat Sharkey
City Clerk
For Office Use Only

Date Submitted: May 4, 1987
Agenda Date Requested: May 11, 1987
Consequences if Agenda Date is Delayed or Action is Deferred: Unable to proceed with development of the business incubator.

Contact Person for Questions from the City Manager’s Office: J. W. Walton, Director

Authorized by: [Signature]
Department Head

Approved by: [Signature]
Assistant City Manager

List Attachments
The entrance and service area comprises approximately 2,100 square feet and is located in the center of the building. Two parallel wings extend symmetrically from the core area and constitute the 14,240 square feet which can be leased to prospective tenants/entrepreneurs. Of the 14,240 square feet of net leasable area, approximately 10,000 is allocated to offices ranging from 200-300 square feet and approximately 4,240 is allocated to light manufacturing and assembly.

The amenities provided in the central area include; conference rooms, a lunch area, reception area, library, and a computer room. Moreover, the incubator will provide the following basic services which will be charged to tenants on a per unit basis or included in the base rent:

- Reception - included in base rent
- Mail delivery - included in base rent
- Telephone answering $50.00 per month
- Copying $.08 per copy
- Typing $3.00 per page
- Postage/Federal Express - per item
- Public Relations - included in base rent
- Technical assistance - included in base rent

Utilities, maintenance, security, and trash pickup are also included in the rent.

The facility will provide a full-time manager for operational purposes and to link the entrepreneur with technical assistance comprised of educational and service agencies. In addition, commitments for $55,000 of in-kind contributions have been received; $25,000 in accounting services from Arthur Anderson and Company, CPA, and $30,000 as technical and management assistance from Johnson C. Smith University.

The Merchants Association is proposing to purchase a 2.6 acre City-owned tract of land for the Incubator Center with a market value of $170,000. This site is located near the intersection of Statesville Road and Graham Street in the Greenville Redevelopment Area. If Council approves the incubator development and decides to negotiate its development with the Merchants Association, a request for approval of the land sale will be made at a later date.

The Merchants Association has estimated the total cost of the incubator will be $955,000. In addition to land and construction costs of $775,000, it is projected that $180,000 will be needed to purchase furniture, fixtures, and equipment and provide $100,000 in working capital for the first four to five years of operation.
If the City should decide to negotiate the incubator development with the Merchants Association, it will be requested to allocate $400,000 to assist in construction and will be requested to sell the land in the Greenville Redevelopment Area at a cost of $170,000. It is anticipated that the City will take back a mortgage in this amount and repayment will be a function of ability to pay.

In addition to the $400,000 requested from the City, the Merchants Association is applying for a grant from the North Carolina Technological Development Association in the amount of $235,000.

The sources and uses of funds are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>USES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City (land)</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City (construction)</td>
<td>Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private donation</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grant</td>
<td>FF&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amount of the City’s financial participation may, in whole or in part, be secured by a first Deed of Trust on the land and building which has a projected cost of $720,000.00. There will be more than ample security for the amount of the City’s participation.

Repayment of any funds advanced by the City would be based on the Merchants Association’s ability to repay from rental income generated. It is estimated that the incubator should reach 80% occupancy in the fourth year. This is considered to be the break even point with some possible repayment beginning in the fifth year of operation.

Negotiation of this development with the Merchants Association will assist the City in accomplishing the following objectives:

a. Establish a success-oriented environment and provide technical management assistance to new and existing businesses;

b. Create job opportunities. Based upon the square footage of the building and number of businesses expected to occupy the facility, at least 40 jobs should be created;
c. Increase actual tax revenues collected by the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated taxes (Real estate)</td>
<td>$9,660.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current taxes</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase per year</td>
<td>9,660.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should the City decide to participate in the development of a business incubator but not negotiate only with the Merchants Association, Community Development Department staff could request proposals for the development of an incubator project. This process which includes preparing proposals, advertising for developers, receipt of Request for Proposals by City staff, developer interviews, developer selection, an advertised notice of a public hearing, and the actual public hearing/developer designation by City Council will take approximately four months.

**EXPLANATION OF REQUEST:** Request City Council to determine if the City should participate in the development of a business incubator. If yes, choose an option: (A) negotiate the development of a business incubator with the West Trade-Beatties Ford Area Merchants Association or (B) develop the business incubator using the Request for Proposal process.

**SOURCE OF FUNDING:** Development and Revitalization Loan Fund

**CLEARANCES:** Community Development staff, Economic Development Review Committee, and Roger Frankhoff of the National Development Council

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Copies of the West Trade-Beatties Ford Area Merchants Association Incubator Proposal are available in the Community Development Department. Also available is general information about the advantages and disadvantages of the incubator concept.
Mr. Leeper stated the discussion has really been helpful for him and he will support the motion. He stated he voted against taking Carmel Road off and at the time the staff came to Council there were three routes which were proposed in that particular area, Carmel, Johnston and Park Road and basically they had neighborhood opposition to extending Carmel Road and the Council in its wisdom decided to take it off.

He stated what bothered him the most on this was staff's concern about the additional traffic on US 521 that would ultimately go on NC 51 and possibly at some point in time cause a problem at the interchange. He stated Mr. Finger helped him work through this process. He would like to make US 521 the kind of route that would carry that traffic directly through because it is the corridor that should be handling the number of cars they are talking about rather than a minor thoroughfare particularly through a substantially developed neighborhood. On the basis that they have an alternative and it will cause some additional problems on a road that is designed to carry this kind of traffic, he will support the motion. He supports the motion with a caveat that says the Transportation and Thoroughfare Plan is very important and he will review each one on the basis of whether it is going to have a significant impact on carrying traffic and help to reach their goal of at least accommodating the traffic to the degree they can, and balance that with trying to preserve neighborhoods to the degree they can.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried as follows:

**YEAS**
- Councilmembers Fenning, Hammond, Leeper, P. Patterson, Roussos and Trosch.

**NAYS**
- Councilmembers Dannelly, Matthews, C. Patterson, Vinroot and Woollen.

Meeting recessed and reconvened.

The meeting was recessed at 10:00 p.m. and reconvened at 10:10 p.m.

CITY PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A BUSINESS INCUBATOR, (A) NEGOTIATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A BUSINESS INCUBATOR WITH THE WEST TRADE-BEATTIES FORD ROAD AREA MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION OR (B) DEVELOP THE BUSINESS INCUBATOR USING THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL PROCESS.

Motion was made by Councilmember Dannelly, seconded by Councilmember C. Patterson, to choose Option A.

Councilmember Vinroot stated the only thing he finds new about the way it is listed in the agenda is that they might do it in some sort of an RFP process. He stated he had not heard any discussion on Option B, but assumes there is some reason for suggesting that as an alternative. He stated that everyone knows that the West Trade-Beatties Ford Road Merchants Association has been the mother of this all along. He asked staff if there was some reason for suggesting Option B?

City Manager Wendell White stated they could have Option C also in case they did not want to do A or B, but B is there simply to indicate that if there was anything about the proposal that caused concerns, they could open it up and ask for proposals and they might get one that would do more for the community than this would.

Mr. Vinroot asked what the tradeoff would be and what would they lose if they take Option B?

Councilmember Leeper stated the difference in this and the Performing Arts Center is that they had a group to study the Performing Arts Center, but this is a proposal that someone is bringing to Council and Council has not had anything to do with originating it.

Mr. Vinroot stated he understands that, but what are the costs of Option B as opposed to Option A?
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Mr. Leeper stated the cost is the time frame. The people have initiated efforts with people in the private sector who are going to be involved with it and with the state who is considering a possible grant. All of these are working on a critical time frame that may impact on whether they get some or the other funds or not. The most important thing is that the City has developed economic development as a very key ingredient which they want to do for this year and he if by some indication that they are not inclined to support something like this, it may impact on whether the other funding sources would be willing to support it.

Robert L. Davis, Jr., 1925 Arnold Drive, stated he was Chairman of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Black Political Caucus and would like for Council to endorse the incubator idea. He stated the West Trade Street/Beatties Ford Merchants Association presented the caucus with an update on Project Incubator at a recent meeting. They were highly impressed with the unique creative business venture and the caucus went on record endorsing Project Incubator and he urged Council to do the same.

Masif R. Majeed, 5401 Rupert Lane, stated the West Trade/Beatties Ford Road Area Merchants Association appreciates the opportunity to speak before Council as they make their final decision on the incubator proposal. He stated they have worked with Bob Hinon in Economic Development and the Community Development staff on this project. Over the past two years they have ironed out many obstacles in this process. He stated they will continue to work with staff to overcome any weaknesses which may be perceived by Council. He believes the selection of an Executive Director is critical to the success of this project and it will take a lot of careful consideration by the board of directors and that is why two board positions be filled by City Council members. He feels this will facilitate continuity of information and assist in the decision making process. He stated Council’s approval of this is imperative less they risk losing their State funding source which is essential for the success of this project. A deferred vote will imply that this is not considered a viable proposition or priority by the Council. The Citizens Forum designed Project Catalyst to promote economic and community revitalization in the northwest. The business incubator’s role in this development is considered a critical element in the revitalization process. This business incubator will realize success because of the support of the boost business and community leadership. He stated if Council is truly committed to helping the northwest communities become more self sufficient, economically viable and job and revenue generating with a renewed spirit of pride and hope they will vote yes.

Mr. Vinroot asked Mr. Majeed if he had an aversion to Option B and if so why?

Mr. Majeed stated he would not consider Option B at this point with the guidelines and restrictions and with the kind of in depth study they have done on it. He feels that would not be the best way to get the type of effect they want and get the maximum utilization of the tax dollar.

Mr. Vinroot stated he does not understand that because Mr. Majeed’s proposal may be the only proposal they get, but there may be two others which would be competitive and are better and can do more for the community that he wants to serve. He does not understand how that would be a problem.

Mr. Majeed stated that holding up the project now will create a problem with the NCDTA which is a very critical consideration at this time. If the process could have been moved back a week it would have been better.

Councilmember P. Patterson stated she had some questions about this when it came to Council originally because they do have another business incubator. It is interesting to her that when they did the study with the Chamber any kind of an incubator was something that was not considered. They have one in existence that came out of a coalition with some business developers in the community and UNCC and now they have another one. Because they meet different needs they are both in targeted areas where they want to encourage reuse of land and economic development. She feels this is a very important concept and believes it has been well thought through. She stated she had talked with the Executive Director of the other incubator and he has given some expertise to these people in getting organized, looking for other
Getchel Caldwell, 100 Beaties Ford Road, stated he was part of the incubator committee and they are looking at small office spaces, but on the same hand, they are looking at light industrial space also. It is a mixture, primary 70/30 meaning 70 percent light office and 30 percent light industrial.

Mr. Trosch asked if just anyone would be able to go in - a small business person or a professional and have one of these? She feels everyone just starting out would like to have low rent, but she feels it has to have a greater public meaning to her.

Mr. Caldwell stated they had given a lot of thought to the selection process and when they presented this to Council originally, that was one of their concerns. He stated in the proposal they submitted to the North Carolina Technological Development Authority, they spoke very frankly about the selection process - a process that would try to target people who are going into business who would not go into business without the support system. They also want to get people who would have some commitment to locate their business along the northwest corridor in terms of trying to revitalize the impact on the economic situation in that sector of the City. When they look at selecting persons for the incubator, it is not all interested come and participate by no means. There has to be a criteria developed where it people will have to meet that criteria and a selection committee composed which will be an outgrowth of the board of directors will make the decision. They will look for people who will locate in that area and who do not have the support system in place that other business persons might have.

Ms. Trosch asked at what point does Council have an ability to say they concur or do not concur with the people who are targeted? That obviously something has been sent to the North Carolina Technological Authority which Council does not have. It seems it is an incubator for anyone except that someday there will be a group to select and that is too squasy for her.

Mr. Caldwell presented to Council additional information which they had not seen previously.

Ms. Trosch stated she was concerned that Council does not have that kind of data when something gets on the agenda. This is almost half million dollars of public money on their part and she wants to know where it is going.

Mr. Caldwell stated they forwarded the same thing to Council that they sent to the North Carolina Technological Authority.

Ms. Trosch asked if the information Mr. Caldwell just handed to Council was the same thing they received earlier, to which he said no, this was additional information. Ms. Trosch stated she read what she received earlier.

Mr. Caldwell stated this was the 3rd package they should have received.

Ms. Trosch asked if the criteria was linked to Council's approval? She wants to be sure what they are approving.

Mr. White stated Council would be indicating by their action if they concurred in the proposal that they are generally in agreement with this and it would authorize the Manager's staff to negotiate with the West Trade/Beaties Ford Area Merchants Association on Council's behalf. He stated, if Council has serious questions about this they should not do it, or if they want to see what else is available perhaps they should not do it. He stated if this is in keeping with what they are trying to do, then he would suggest the
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proceed and they would answer some of the questions in negotiations. He stated the people who would finally make the decision on who would be the tenants would be the Board of Directors.

Ms. Trosch asked if would be on criteria, to which Mr. White replied no. Mr. White stated the Board would establish the criteria which would have to be acceptable to staff and to Council.

Ms. Trosch stated she wanted to know that there is a step in here and they are not saying - she feels there is a lot of value in the group that had the initiative to do this and in the fact that it has a broader group who has a bigger vision, but she also needs to know that there is going to be some specificity in negotiations that they are going to make sure it meets the criteria in the new economic development policy and those things which are important before the money is distributed. She asked Mr. White if he was assuring her that that is what occurs in the negotiation process?

Mr. White stated part of the concern is the amount they are talking about and in fact what they have been talking about in terms of policies. His own feeling is that this sort of thing is in the spirit of what Council has said they wanted to do. To say this specifically gets it, he does not want to go that far right now.

Ms. Trosch stated she was confused as to what the Manager’s recommendation is or is not to the Council on this proposal and is confused as to what criteria will be applied. She feels she is getting mixed messages because the amount is a problem, but not really a problem. She would like to know professional what the Manager is saying about the proposal that is before them.

Councilmember Dennelly stated he needs an interruption of something that is in the agenda and is not trying to block the answer. He understands what Ms. Trosch is asking – they had three alternatives and the motion he made was for staff to negotiate. Whatever the concerns are and whenever they come, that is what the staff does or Council with something. He stated he was not worried about that as long as the Manager knows their concerns because he knows how to negotiate it.

Mr. White stated the staff has taken this matter on the behalf of Council for quite a distance so they qualify that for Council in order that they will know they have other alternatives if they want to pursue them. In fairness to this group, what has been described is accurate – they have been working and well was it is in harmony with what the Council has been trying to accomplish. He pointed out in the agenda what the negotiations would be based on.

Ms. Trosch asked who the job opportunities would be for, to which Mr. White stated they were trying to help businesses that probably could not get started without coaching and without some assistance on the site. Ms. Trosch asked if the emphasis would be on minorities, locations and people that income wise do not have a support system.

Mr. White stated it would be those in minorities, or women or even others who would not normally have a chance to start a business without this kind of coaching and assistance.

Ms. Trosch asked if there would be a certain period of time and then it would come back before Council. Mr. White stated anything they wanted could come back to Council.

Mr. Caldwell stated the proposal indicated that the length of time a business would have in the incubator is in line with the policy established by the North Carolina Technological Development Authority. That time frame is two years - you have to graduate within the two years after you are accepted.

Councilmember C. Patterson stated that she first heard about this idea about two years ago from Mr. Majeeed. He was very excited about an idea for something like and not long after that he sent her a draft an idea and it was really rough. It had a lot of holes in it and she talked to Bob Hinson about it and he begin to meet with Mr. Majeeed and some of his groups and what they
have structured is a way to set up the incubator that includes City Council people, people from the Chamber and some of the merchants as a board that will then establish certain criteria. She stated their basic goals meet what they are trying to do - they are trying to target folks who would not be offered an opportunity through SBA or any other way to get into business for themselves. They are targeting economic development in a corridor where Council really wants economic development, for folks who will plan to establish their business in that corridor. There is a direct link back into the project catalyst task force which is where she first got involved with the whole thing. The important thing is that they are trying to establish a board that will help them through experience, and who will have some other contact in the community outside the West Trade Street Merchants Association. They have leaned heavily on City staff to learn how to move this forward and the criteria which Council can also make input to it.

Ms. Patterson stated she feels very positive about this and if they do not move forward the project cannot move forward without help from both the Council and the State. The State will probably be reluctant if Council had implied they do not feel that this is not what they want. She feels this is exactly what they want and the specificity needs to come from the Board of Directors which cannot be created until Council approves the incubator. That right now they are between a rock and a hard place. Council is making for specificity and they are saying they need a Board of Directors before they can give specificity, and right now they do not have anything to have a Board of Directors of. She stated she had talked to Bob Hinson again and he feels this is exactly what Council wants.

Mayor Gantt asked Mr. Majeed if he had heard anything from the North Carolina Technological Development Association and what were their response to the request for assistance?

Mr. Majeed stated they had indicated that they were waiting on Council's decision. He sent some additional information to them last Friday and they have not made a decision as of yet. Based on the briefing to NCTDA Selection Committee the two cities they are competing with (Dunn and High Point), he feels Charlotte was much more attractive. He believes they have not made a decision because there are some incompletes as far as questions about those particular proposals. He feels they are in a good position to get funded.

Mayor Gantt asked what happens if they do not get funded and Mr. Majeed stated they go to the November cycle.

Mr. Vinroot asked if the City Manager had a preference between A and B, to which Mr. White stated he did not, but J. Walton has worked with this group and he would probably prefer that they move forward with this.

Mr. White stated he wants to make sure that Council realizes that this was not the only alternative they have and it is a considerable amount of money, but he has no reservations about it at this point.

Mr. Caldwell stated they would be in objection to the RFP process because the persons involved in this whole effort are broad. They have involvement from business persons that have invested in the community and already own existing businesses and are wanting to look at the economic health of the westside corridor. They have also the involvement of an educational institution which is very needed for the success of an incubator as it relates to the kinds of technical assistance that will be needed for its success.

Mr Vinroot stated he does not want to debate it all night and if there is something to be lost with time he understands that, but he really does not understand how anyone would object to winning something through a competitive process and therefore legitimizing the validity of that particular suggestion as opposed to simply coming in without any competitive process and winning it by default.

Louise Sellers, 118 Martin Street, stated she was appalled because the Mayor made the statement that he had three speakers and asked the Councilmembers to listen to the speakers comments before making their comments, but they went on and made their comments anyway.
She stated it had been a pleasure working with J. Walton and his staff and thanked them for appointing Mr. Walton as director of Community Development.

Ms. Sellers stated they know the incubator needs project catalyst and project catalyst needs the incubator. They need to support each other. She stated that 70 percent of small businesses fail within five years and 70 percent succeeds after been launched by an incubator. She stated she could use herself as an example in her small business, for the past four years they have struggled trying to get ahead and with the help of people from the incubator she feels a lot of businesses such as hers could succeed.

Councilmember Fanning stated there is a statement in the agenda which says "repayment of any funds advanced by the City would be based on the Merchants Association ability to repay from rental income generated and this would probably start in the fifth year." She asked if there was any definite amount on this as this seems to be a lot of money to have such a general statement made about repayment.

Roger Frankoff, Director National Development Counsel, stated they have a form which is based on some preliminary numbers and in the fifth year they start off with a base rate of $8.00 per square foot and that continues for four years, then they have an increase of $9.25 in the fifth year. That even with that takes the four years of leasing up from 25 percent occupancy to 80 percent for the project to break even. If there is debt service that will be burdened onto the project in addition to that then that increase will have to be passed on in the form of rent. They want to give the tenants some period of time to become stable to get up to their break even point and then they can readjust it based on the occupancy and what the market rate ends up being. There is a number of fine tuning adjustments that need to be made relative to staff and whether there is an executive director and a number of costs that come in.

Councilmember Hammond stated she will support this without an RFP because she believes this has been under development for quite a long time. It is special because it is grass roots effort. It is supported by the active business leaders from the area and has been developed by them. She feels if they put out an RFP at this time the length of time it would take to give anyone else a shot at developing a competitive proposal would be unrealistic and would jeopardize their chance of moving ahead. She stated this is in the pipeline and she is comfortable with going ahead like it is, however, a general comment that somewhat contradicts that on economic development and their role in.

Councilmember Fanning stated she feels they are blundering into setting aside a pot of money and then waiting to see who comes and ask for it - be it loans, grants or whatever and she feels this is probably a mistake. She sees this later on in the economic loan proposals which she does not have a problem with themselves, but has a problem with the process. If they have a pot of money from whatever source which they can allocate to economic development activities, they should be saying what do they want to accomplish with that money and then they should be writing RFP's or whatever is necessary to get interest from the private sector to respond for the public purposes they have identified, not that other people are coming in and asking for money to accomplish.

Going back to the whole economic development approach, they are not setting the rules, but are in a reactionary position and she does not feel that is a real good way to make sure they are getting the most out of those economic dollars.

Councilmember Matthews stated he is interpreting this that Council will have an opportunity to say yes or no after the negotiations, to which Mr. White replied yes.

Councilmember Woollen stated she agrees with Mr. Hammond and has felt that same way and she will support this only because she feels the leadership in that community has spent a lot of time and they want people in the community to feel like everyone has an opportunity at a business. She stated she has some real problems with things that are not spelled out because so many times they trap themselves into an ongoing role of supporting something they do not
Mr. Gantt stated he feels the majority is going to support the non-RFP proposal and that is good. He commended the community, and the business leaders, both in the community and outside who are supporting it. He feels the concerns expressed by Council are legitimate which has to do with raising the level of expectation which he is very concerned about. When they put dollars into something they all want it to be successful. If you asked the question what is an incubator, it is a place to hatch millionaires. They actually form businesses in the community that will stay in the community that will cause the dollars to turn over to generate true economic development. That is his bottom line and what he would like staff to take into the negotiations when they start talking what is going to happen.

He stated that incubators are working in Charlotte right now and the West Morehead Street area is an interesting example of that. The development on Cedar Street is another example. They are flexible space and if he had any criticism of what they are doing it would be that they are not building it enough flexibility to accommodate any and every kind of thing that may want to happen. They may be setting up an accountant's office, an architect's office and there may be some real legitimate concern as to whether those businesses could not start on their own in other places, but even if they could not there is a lot of good reason to suggest an incubator which ties the occupant to some commitment to locating in our community, even if it is five more doctors, or a pharmacist. It will be important to that community because of the ability to generate that turn over of the dollar that will create jobs.

He stated to the Manager, that while the message coming from staff was mixed and not quite enthusiastic, hopefully the message they are getting to night is that the Council is interested in this, do want a little more specificity, for his more flexibility and the bottom line is that they want to generate businesses that will make money and create jobs in that area.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION ENDORSING CONSTRUCTION OF A HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANE IN THE MEDIAN OF THE STATE'S US 74 FREEWAY/EXPRESSWAY PROJECT, AND AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO APPLY FOR A SECTION 3 CAPITAL ASSISTANCE GRANT FROM THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION AND THE NC DOT TO FUND THIS PROJECT.

Motion was made by Councilmember P. Patterson seconded by Councilmember Dannelly, and carried unanimously, to adopt the subject resolution.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 23, at Page 301.
NHS WILMORE CONTRACT HISTORY

On February 11, 1985, City Council approved a $35,000 planning contract with the Neighborhood Housing Services of Charlotte, Inc. (NHS) for the development of a NHS program in the Wilmore neighborhood. In the contract, the City made a commitment to provide up to $100,000 per year for three years.

Since 1986, City Council has approved three contracts with Neighborhood Housing Services totaling $300,000 to provide housing rehabilitation loans, down payment assistance, exterior house painting and beautification projects in the Wilmore neighborhood for low and moderate income families. The last contract expired on January 31, 1989. During the past three years, the Wilmore NHS has assisted 98 units with City funds which exceeds their contracted amount. This includes the following projects completed to date:

- Rehabilitation Loans 17
- Down payment Assistance 8
- Acquisition, Rehab & Resale 5
- Exterior Painting 15
- Interior Painting 9
- Winterization 34
- Landscaping 10
- 98
Addendum to Request For Council Action

Project Cost

Construction of Building $1,600,000

Source of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Union National Bank</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City DARP Loan</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Medical Properties, Inc.</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(First Union's loan is contingent upon approval of the City's loan)

Terms of Loans

1) First Union National Bank
   Rate - Prime Rate + 1%
   Term - 5 years

2) City of Charlotte
   Rate - 6%
   Term - 5 years

Security

1) First Union National Bank - a) first deed of trust on the new real estate
   b) personal guaranty by:
      - Kenneth L. Holt
      - Michael J. Bruce
      - Dr. Stan Vermillion
      - Dr. Edward Friedland

The Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund Committee determined that the City would be adequately secured on the City loan with a security interest in the real estate as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>$1,600,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Union Loan</td>
<td>&lt;1,100,000&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Loan</td>
<td>&lt;250,000&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                  | $250,000   | Excess value over cost for City security

The personal guaranties of the four principals of Delta Medical Properties, Inc. will also provide adequate collateral for the City's loan.
Public Purpose of Delta Medical Loan

The West Morehead Street site location was chosen by the developer because it provides easy access from two interstate highways as well as the beltway and downtown area and because of the large concentration of dialysis patients on Charlotte's west side.

The City loan was determined as an appropriate action due to the findings of the public purpose review by the Planning Department as follows:

The request as submitted by Delta Medical, Inc. falls within the Development and Revitalization Loan Policy framework by:

1) Creating 60 new jobs to be available to persons residing in the Pocket of Poverty and in the Wilkinson Boulevard area. This would be in keeping with the public purpose statement within the Policy Framework by benefiting low income, unemployed, and underemployed persons, while also providing an opportunity for upward mobility;

2) Being consistent with the general reinvestment strategies outlined in the 2005 Generalized Land Plan; and

3) Promoting revitalization efforts in an area targeted by public policy (The Pocket of Poverty and the Wilkinson Boulevard Special Project Plan).

The applicant, Delta Medical Properties, Inc., is offering 60 new jobs for the City loan. A representative from the Employment and Training Department has met with the applicant and determined that the potential jobs presented in this proposal offer low/moderate income persons good job wages and a better than average chance of job upward mobility due to the nature and demand for the type of jobs created by the project. The City loan would create one new job for each $4,166 in City funds. The city's loan legally requires the borrower to hire at least the number of persons specified in the loan application. A Hiring Schedule is attached to the City's loan agreement as part of the legal documentation for closing the loan.

To qualify as a "permanent hire", an individual must be both a resident of the economic development assisted area and have income certified as low to moderate according to definitions under the Community Development Block Grant Program. For CDBG, an individual is considered to be of low income only if he or she is a member of a household whose income would qualify as low or moderate income under the most current Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program. Applicants must be certified as to income level by the City's Employment and Training Department.
The required hiring of low to moderate income persons is completed before the expiration of the Promissory Note or as prescribed. The borrower agrees to provide the city with affidavits, payable vouchers, tax documents or other evidence adequate to establish that the hiring obligation has been fulfilled within 90 days of each hire.

If the borrower fails to fulfill the hiring obligation, which is stated in the Loan Agreement, he will be in default, and the City must declare the Note to be due and payable.

The new jobs to be created are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>$10.50 - $17.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech/Lab</td>
<td>7.00 - 10.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio/Med Tech</td>
<td>8.50 - 12.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office Asst.</td>
<td>7.00 - 9.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>6.00 - 8.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing Clerk</td>
<td>6.50 - 9.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. Asst.</td>
<td>8.00 - 12.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recpt.</td>
<td>5.50 - 7.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>3.50 - 10.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>8.50 - 10.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietician</td>
<td>12.00 - 18.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>11.00 - 15.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse/Other</td>
<td>5.50 - 8.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60
DEVELOPMENT AND REVITALIZATION FUND (DARF)

Purpose: To provide public resources to invest in partnerships for the purpose of promoting economic development in four approved redevelopment areas (Beatties Ford Road, Wilkinson Boulevard, South Boulevard, and West Morehead Street) and the Pocket of Poverty when such partnerships do not incur a negative long-term liability on tax dollars and when such partnerships directly benefit one of the following targeted groups:
- Low income, unemployed, or underemployed county residents;
- Minority and/or women small business enterprises;
- Unique of indigenous enterprises which have significant economic value to the community.

Primary Objectives:
- To create jobs which have the potential for upward mobility, and for adequate pay which allows an individual or family to become self-sustaining;
- To promote revitalization efforts in areas targeted by public policy to include but not be limited to:
  1. Enterprise areas from the 2005 Plan
  2. The Pocket of Poverty;
  3. Approved area plans which include a commercial focus.
- To promote the development of projects which support redirection of growth policies;
- To retain a unique or indigenous enterprise;
- To participate in the funding of business projects that offer a significant number of employment opportunities.

General Policies:
- The City seeks to finance a business project based on the following financing mix:
  1. 50% from a private lender (banks, savings and loan, etc.)
  2. 40% from the City
  3. 10% from the applicant
- The interest rate is negotiable from 3% to 9% based on ability to repay.
- The term is negotiable based on need and ability to repay.
- The City requires a clear demonstration that "But For" the DARF loan, the project could not take place.

**"But For" is a term that is taken from the Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG), a federally funded program that is intended to assist cities in developing new jobs and an increased tax base. It must be clearly demonstrated that "But For" the DARF funds the project could not be financed. In other words a financial gap exists, i.e.:**
Financing Gap

Project size $800,000
Debt capacity $600,000
Financing Gap $200,000

Financial assistance with favorable terms is needed from the City for $200,000 in order for the project to be feasible.

Eligible Activities/Applicants:

- Acquisition of real property;
- Construction, rehabilitation, or installation of:
  1) Commercial or industrial buildings and structures;
  2) Equipment and fixtures which are part of the real estate;
  3) Commercial industrial property improvements.
- Applicant must meet at least one of the following:
  1) Either operate or want to operate a business in an area eligible for assistance;
  2) Live in an area eligible for assistance and either operate or want to operate a business outside the eligible area;
  3) Operate a business located close enough to provide services and jobs to low and moderate income citizens living in eligible areas;
  4) Create jobs that pay adequate wages and offer upward mobility and advancement.

Source of Funding:

A total of $3 million was allocated by City Council from Urban Development Action Grant repayment funds for use in promoting economic development in four redevelopment areas and the Pocket of Poverty. Urban Development Action Grant funds are allocated from the Federal government.

Clearances:

The Policy Framework for this program was approved by City Council on June 8, 1987.

Economic Development Review Committee* which is made up of several City department directors, the Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund Committee, and City Council approvals are required.

*The Economic Development Review Committee is comprised of the following departments: Budget & Evaluation, Finance, City Manager's Office, Planning, Employment & Training, Community Development, and Economic Development.
Overall the evaluation was fairly positive and constructive, in spite of the press statements. Although, the staff review feels that the staff does a good job overall, they did find several exceptions and findings which need to be addressed. As with every evaluation or review, there are often differences in perceptions and interpretations which give rise to issues and criticisms which are not jointly shared.

Below is our response to each of the exceptions and findings:

A. The following exceptions to the overall performance were found:

1. We transferred staff without full approval from the City. We moved a coordinator from Piedmont Courts to help at Earle Village when crime rates had fallen significantly at Piedmont Courts and we had persistent crime and personnel problems at Earle Village. At that time, we moved staff to Dalton Village to combat a rising crime rate there. Although these changes were discussed and deemed reasonable, we did not obtain the formal written amendments which were required. This was an oversight on our part and any adjustments in the future will be handled according to the contract.

2. Work beyond the scope of the contract. This has been referred to by some as having our staff engage in maintenance work. In reality, the evaluation states that the range of the role was engaged in routine managerial support, including responding to resident's complaints of litter and unsightly trash, abandoned cars, etc. In addition, Crime Prevention staff took applications for housing at the Housing Authority's main office for a two-week period in May, 1989. The evaluation argued that this was an amendment to the contract, but no formal amendment was made.

Our view is that the staff role in investigating complaints concerning trash and litter and abandoned cars does fall within their role definition. The job descriptions for the staff require them to 'Keep the manager informed of any problems or conditions which might affect the quality of life in the community.' Crime prevention, from a community crime prevention perspective, begins with pride in the community and environment, taking control of that environment. If the environment is enjoyable and positive, people will take control and not let foreign elements degrade that environment.

In addition, many times the trash is caused by drug dealers and users hanging in an area, by investigating those complaints they surreptitiously obtain information concerning those activities. Moreover, trash and litter around a house or apartment are often good indicators of illegal activities or similar behavior within the unit. Similarly, abandoned cars become hiding places for drugs and other illicit activities. Staff have discovered stolen cars and have assisted in preventing crime by engaging in these activities. Staff have also accompanied managers on home visits and inspections in order to discuss crime prevention while they have the opportunity. These activities are consistent with community crime prevention and encourage a strong positive relationship between residents, staff and management.

We viewed the activities of staff associated with the recent application process as that of informing potential new residents of the Authority's efforts to control crime and the programs we offer. It was designed to let them know about the Safe Neighborhood Awareness Program before they became residents. Of course, they did help families complete their applications and we understand the concern. If it is viewed as outside their contracted role with the city, then we will not permit such activities in the future.

3. Reporting. Two criticisms were made:

1) Reimbursement requests for expenditures have not occurred quarterly as required by the contract – On May 22, 1989 the received...
a request for the period from October, 1988 through March, 1989 2) Monthly status reports have not been received for Calendar 1989

A Quarterly Status Report was submitted with the applications for funding in April, 1989, in lieu of the monthly reporting as we had in the previous year. We agree with the criticism and will submit quarterly budget requests and status reports as suggested in the report.

Personnel turnover in the Accounting Department caused the quarterly request for reimbursement to be overlooked at the first of the year. We feel that by combining the Status Report with the Financial Reimbursement Report and Request, such oversights will be avoided in the future.

B Major Findings:

1) Time Sheets Staff do not fill out time sheets in the field, however, they do keep a daily log of their activities and call into the Central Office when they arrive or leave. Time Sheets are kept by the Main Office to insure accuracy of reporting and are checked against the daily activity log if discrepancies arise and for auditing purposes. We feel this is the most accurate method for recording actual time working by staff since they often lack direct supervision from management staff in the developments. The impression that they do not keep time sheets of any type is erroneous and should not be considered a significant finding.

2) Reports Submitted by Staff

a) One criticism was that the staff does not have a written set of personnel procedures. However, the staff is governed by the same personnel procedures as is the Authority Staff and this was not mentioned by the report. Each staff person has been given a copy of these policies and several staff meetings have been spent going over these policies. This is an erroneous finding.

b) A second criticism was that the staff did not fully adhere to the reporting procedures in their manuals. The staff review only spoke with two of the onsite coordinators at two sites. The longest conversation was with a staff person who is on probation for poor job performance based on our annual personnel evaluations completed in April, 1989. We are aware of some problems in reporting and have taken actions to correct it over the past several months. However, we would appreciate more concrete examples of failures to complete reports in order that we may take corrective actions if other deficiencies have been found.

c) There are implications of poor supervision in the report. These implications are inappropriate in our mind. The Field Coordinator, a retired police officer, has been working closely with the residents who serve as staff to improve their reporting and insure adequate job performance. He spends at least one day per week with the staff in the field and reviews their paper work regularly.

3 Compilation of Crime Statistics

The report suggests that the police department should be more active in compiling crime data rather than leaving it up to the Authority staff. This would help us tremendously. However, we will still need to pull police reports in order to insure that we are following up on all incidents which occur in our developments. Moreover, we compile statistics regarding whether or not the victims and offenders live in the developments where the incidents occur and whether or not they are actually on the lease. In addition, we compile statistics on the number of persons using Authority addresses who are suspects.
or victims of crime outside of the public housing neighborhoods where they say they live. These additional statistics cannot be compiled by the police department and are vital to our efforts to control crime in our neighborhoods.

4 Relations between the Police Department and the Program

The report suggests that the police need to take a more active role in the crime prevention program at all levels. This is something which we have been requesting since the beginning of the program. It is, of course, important to recognize that we already enjoy full support from the Adam 1 Team and Crime Prevention in Earle Village. Charlie 2 and Crime Prevention are active along with Vice in Piedmont Courts. Adam 2 and Crime Prevention have supported activities in Dalton Village and Piedmont Courts.

From an administrative level, we enjoy very positive relations with all divisions in the Police Department. Vice, Investigations, Patrol and Crime Prevention actively communicate with the program and staff. In spite of this, the relationship can be stronger and more effective.

5 Identity of the Crime Prevention Program

The report expressed concern over the name changes which have occurred. The Safe Neighborhood Awareness Program emerged after a workshop with residents in which the "SNAP" theme was suggested by the residents themselves. We continue to use Resident Safety and Crime Prevention interchangeably, but are trying to push the SNAP logo since residents have expressed more comfort with that logo. We have no difficulty maintaining the Crime Prevention title if that is viewed as more effective from the Council.

C Recommendations

1 Redefinition of the scope of the program to correspond to the format used in the City's Budget Program

We have no problem with this recommendation. If fact, it may assist us in formulating staff reports more accurately.

2 Strict enforcement of the terms of the contract.

We agree with the intent of this recommendation.

3 The Police Computer should be Programmed to Identify Reports in Public Housing

We agree with and support the intent of this recommendation, however, it will not eliminate the need for the Crime Prevention Records Clerk to sort through all incidents at the Police Department without additional expense to the Police Department. It is more economical to retain the current practice until an economical alternative is available.

4 Crime Statistics should be Compiled by the Police Department

We fully agree with this recommendation. We have long argued that our data is subject to error due to the difficulties in searching through the reports on a daily basis. There are problems, however, in identifying those incidents which actually occur in the developments and those which do not. There are significant errors in the coding of census tract and sub-census tract information on the police computer and many of these
boundaries do not correspond to the public housing boundaries. Thus, while we are in agreement with the recommendation, we fear that the collection of adequate crime statistics by the Police Department will be more costly and as inaccurate as the data the Authority currently collects and publishes.

5 Evaluation of the Job Performance of the Crime Prevention Staff

We have an elaborate evaluation system for employees which we feel is adequate. On the other hand, we welcome and will conduct periodic internal audits of office procedures and practices to help staff improve their practices.

6 The Role of the Crime Prevention Staff

We feel that the role of the staff is clear and that they perform an adequate service for the community. We will retain the Public Housing Crime Prevention Program as the primary name but feel that the SNAP logo is important because "Crime Prevention is a SNAP if the community is fully involved".

There also appears to be some confusion over the nature of our program activities and how they relate to crime prevention. It must be remembered that the unique and fundamental approach to crime prevention practiced by this program is community crime prevention and not the traditional approaches to crime prevention found within police departments. Victim assistance deters crime because traditionally the offenders have been able to intimidate victims and witnesses in low income areas such that they would not appear in court or come forward as witnesses, effective crime prevention in low-income, high crime neighborhoods must overcome that intimidation and fear. Job training and referral help crime prevention because it is people without adequate employment who are committing offenses against those who are employed within these communities, people with a stake in the society and community are less likely to commit criminal acts than are those excluded from it.

These issues arise because of a confusion between traditional law enforcement based crime prevention and community crime prevention after which this program is modeled. The most complete explanations of our goals and strategies is found in our original proposal submitted on May 24, 1984 and in a follow up letter to Wendell White dated June 20, 1984. These documents are attached.

The Staff Report concludes that the report is the result of a condensed four-day study jointly conducted by the Budget and Evaluation Department and the Charlotte Police Department. It involved brief interviews with most, but not all, of the staff. The impressions obtained from these brief interviews served, then, as a basis for the above findings. In spite of the exceptions and findings, the program has been recommended for continuation funding because the program is successful and the staff is devoted to working within their communities. We hope future reports will provide a more extensive review of the program, rather than the condensed encapsulation found in this report.
The Housing Authority shall continue to implement crime prevention programs at the following housing developments: Piedmont Courts, Earle Village, Boulevard Homes and Dalton Village. The present staffing configuration is as follows: Two full-time Crime Prevention Coordinators at Earle Village (each Coordinator shares responsibility for Piedmont Courts and Earle Village), one full-time Crime Prevention Coordinator at Boulevard Homes, one full-time Crime Prevention Coordinator and one full-time Crime Prevention Aide at Dalton Village. A full-time Crime Prevention Program Field Coordinator and a full-time Records Clerk are located at the Housing Authority's central office with the Program's Director. In order to respond to the varying degrees of criminal activities in these four sites, the Housing Authority may transfer staff between the sites with the written consent of the City of Charlotte.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FY90 BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Settlement and Mediation -</td>
<td>$17,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The residents involved in disputes requiring Police intervention will be offered an opportunity to mediate their disagreements before a mediation panel. The panel will be composed of residents trained by the Dispute Settlement Center (Charlotte- Mecklenburg Community Relations Committee) and the Public Safety Coordinator (Dr. John Hayes).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim/Witness Assistance -</td>
<td>39,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident staff persons will be trained in working with victims and witnesses. One of the chronic problems in public housing is the failure of victims and witnesses to appear in court often due to lack of transportation, lack of adequate notice, and fear of retaliation. The role of the resident staff will be to keep the victims and witnesses informed of court dates, to coordinate transportation and to refer problems and potential retaliation to the Manager, Public Safety Coordinator, and/or Police Department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation I.D., Neighborhood Watch, Carrier Alert, Elderly Watch and Other Crime Prevention Strategies -</td>
<td>28,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implementation of these programs will be primary objectives for all of the developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Court Assistance and Diversion - 5,674
In the case of youthful offenders, the staff will be trained in court assistance and diversion in an attempt to utilize existing community-based alternatives in working with juveniles and their parents. Referrals will be made to the Youth Services Bureau, the Relatives, and other prevention programs in an effort to reduce the likelihood of recidivism among juvenile offenders. Also, relations will be established with the schools to reduce truancy and behavioral problems either at school or on the buses.

Substance Abuse Intervention and Referral - 5,675
Residents will be offered training in recognizing substance abuse problems and making referrals to appropriate agencies. Substance abuse education programs will be started at each site.

Employment Counseling and Referral - 5,675
Resident staff will be trained in employability analysis and referral to appropriate agencies able to either assist the unemployed person overcome barriers to employment or locate adequate employment.

Information and Referral - 11,349
Residents will be trained in the network of helping agencies in the community so that they may make effective referrals when working with other residents.

The approach of the Crime Prevention Program is that of developing the self-help capacity of a network of natural helpers drawn from within the participating developments. The skills of these natural helpers are enhanced through intensive training from and linkages with the network of professionals already existing in the Charlotte community. Within this framework, it is not the intent of the Crime prevention Program to duplicate services already existing in the Charlotte community; rather, the crime prevention program strengthens those programs by assisting in developing a supportive framework for those services. The residents trained in the Crime Prevention Program develop skills in intervention, outreach and referral in a variety of areas and therefore fill a gap in the service delivery system between those most in need and existing human service programs.
OBJECTIVES:

I. In an effort to decrease the incidence of crime in public housing developments, the following objectives will be addressed. These objectives will facilitate activities of the resident organizations and strengthen their role in the Crime Prevention Program.

- To maintain and enhance the building captain (Neighborhood Watch) program in each program site and have 75% of the buildings in each development represented.
- To conduct monthly meetings with resident organizations and incorporate programs, activities and information that will make residents more knowledgeable of methods to protect lives and property.
- To provide assistance to 90% of residents who have been victimized in program sites to insure they follow-up with the prosecution (i.e. warrants, court appearances and hearings).
- To design and conduct quarterly crime prevention workshops for other neighborhoods in conjunction with the Crime Prevention Unit of the Police Department.
- To provide technical assistance and support whenever activities or crime patterns emerge requiring development of concentrated crime prevention strategies in other sites.

II. In an effort to decrease the number of incidents involving residents both within and outside their development, the following objectives will be addressed:

- To develop educational/referral programs which focus on issues such as drug trafficking and abuse, alcohol trafficking and abuse, child abuse, vandalism and defensive living.
- To coordinate with the Police Department, the implementation of traditional crime prevention programs such as Operations I.D., Female Security, Home Security, Security Surveys, Child Safety and Crime Stoppers.
- Document the results/outcome of follow-up assistance provided to the victims and witnesses of crimes in at least 80% of the cases, and transmit this information to the Police Department.

III. In an effort to reduce the number of repeat neighborhood dispute calls to the Police, the following objectives will be addressed:
o To cooperate with the CRC in providing services in each of the three sites and successfully mediate 50% of the disputes targeted for referral to this program, as an alternative to court action or police intervention.

o To develop educational/referral programs on domestic violence.

IV. Maintain a database from which to develop a report on 1) the type and frequency of offenses occurring in the program sites; and 2) the number of residents arrested both within and outside the developments.

V. To submit quarterly reports on the status of objective achievements to the Charlotte Police Department and to the Budget and Evaluation Department.
Report of
Erosion Control Task Force

Introduction

On October 24, 1988, City Council voted to continue the Charlotte Erosion Control Program through June 30, 1989. The Council instructed the City Manager to appoint a task force representing the City Engineering Department, County Engineering Department, N. C. Department of Natural Resources, Mecklenburg Soil Conservation District, and the local building industry, which would work for a consensus on changes to the local City and County Erosion Control Programs. The task force met in December and February and submits this report to City Council. Included are recommendations for the administration of erosion control regulations in Charlotte-Mecklenburg.

Background

During consideration of the FY89 operating budget, City Council voted to eliminate the local Erosion Control Program and return jurisdiction to the State level. The budget was adopted with adequate funds to continue the program up to six months into the fiscal year to provide a transition period to State jurisdiction. Several representatives of the local building industry contacted Council members and advised the City to maintain a local program, and in fact, indicated the industry was willing to pay higher permit fees to accomplish that. The August 22, 1988 City Council agenda included an item to continue the Charlotte Program. Several industry representatives spoke at that time and related a change of position, one of returning jurisdiction to the State level and implementing a "pilot program" proposed by Secretary of Natural Resources, Tommy Rhodes. Subsequent review of the pilot program revealed it was fraught with legal and administrative problems. On October 24, 1988, City Council adopted a budget ordinance to extend funding for the Charlotte program through June 30, 1989. This would allow time for City and County staff, State staff, the local building industry and other interests to work for a consensus on changes to the local programs.

Task Force Members

The members of the Erosion Control Task Force are: Jim Humphrey - Assistant City Engineer, Jim Schumacher - City Engineering Department, Bobby Shields - Deputy Director of Mecklenburg County Engineering, Fred Gore - County Engineering Department, Owen Puruseth - Mecklenburg County Soil and Water Conservation District, Bruce Wilson - U.S. Conservation Service, Harlan Britt - N. C. Department of Natural Resources, Wayne Harris - Building Industry, Spiro Hondros - Building Industry.
Discussion and Recommendations

The task force makes the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. Pilot Program: The "pilot program" proposed by Secretary Tommy Rhodes in August is not practical. There are several administrative problems such as identifying the qualified engineers who would receive automatic plan approval, the perceived inequity that gives some designers a competitive advantage, and a probable increase in enforcement needs. The program does not provide the "plan review" required by current local ordinances and the State model ordinance. Changes to the State model ordinance would be necessary and the Sedimentation Control Commission has indicated they are not interested in making such changes. Local Soil and Water Conservation District officials oppose the pilot program primarily because it represents a fundamental shift in regulatory philosophy from one of prevention, to one of correction.

Recommendation: Dismiss the pilot program proposed by Secretary Tommy Rhodes and continue the local Erosion Control Programs with improved communication between the industry and administrators.

2. Communication. The building industry feels that there is a lack of information regarding "standards". They feel that the City and County regulatory staff make decisions that are inconsistent and inflexible.

Recommendation. (a) Local administrators should provide training workshops for designers, Engineering staff and contractors. Such workshops can be funded with civil penalties collected from violations, as is done at the State level, and possibly a workshop fee. (b) Begin use of the recently published State Design Manual which provides basic standards to work from. (c) The City and County staffs should jointly produce a plan checklist for use by designers. (d) Give plan reviewers latitude emphasizing a "what will work" philosophy. It is recognized that the State manual sets a standard which should be used by the designer as a basis for the design of the erosion control measures. The task force feels that erosion control plans should be approved based on standard practices or "approved with a performance reservation". The success and failure of "experimental" measures should be evaluated and publicized. (e) Local administrators should make available a preliminary plan or sketch plan conference with the designer.

3. Level of Service: The building industry desires a high level of service in the plan approval process; that is, a quick review and approval of erosion control plans. Operating in an environment where quick action is necessary and delays are costly, the building industry complains that the review
process is unresponsive to the intensity of building activity. The local government regulatory staff has no control over the workload that is related to the development intensity and is constrained by a lengthy government budget process to respond to changes in demand for service.

Recommendation: City and County staffs should investigate ways to minimize the time required for plan review and approval. The building industry should insist that designers submit thorough and complete plans for the first review. Better communications as discussed should improve overall service.

4. Appeals Board: The only recourse currently available to the building industry when there is disagreement over a design or field practice is to take the issue through the chain of command of the respective Engineering Department, then to the Drainage Advisory Board for the County or to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission for the City.

Recommendation: To date there have been no disputes that have required negotiation, except by the inspector or plan review engineers. The question of an appeals board shall be further considered by City staff as needed.

5. Consolidation: Both the City and County administer local erosion control programs. There are naturally minor differences in the day to day operations of these parallel programs.

Recommendations: Any investigation of consolidation of site review and/or building permit functions should consider erosion control related responsibilities.
CHANGES TO THE SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL ORDINANCE

SET FORTH BELOW ARE THE SECTIONS OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL ORDINANCE WHICH ARE BEING REVISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CHANGES MADE BY THE NORTH CAROLINA SEDIMENTATION CONTROL COMMISSION TO THE MODEL ORDINANCE ON FEBRUARY 8, 1989. INCLUDED FOR EACH SECTION AN EFFECT IS THE CURRENT LANGUAGE AND THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE AS SET FORTH BY THE COMMISSION. NEW LANGUAGE IS UNDERLINED.

CURRENT LANGUAGE: I. SECTION 4(d): THIS ORDINANCE SHALL APPLY TO LAND DISTURBING ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY ANY PERSON, WITH THE FOLLOWING EXCLUSIONS:

(d). LAND-DISTURBING ACTIVITY OVER WHICH THE STATE, BY STATUTE, HAS EXCLUSIVE REGULATORY JURISDICTION, WHICH INCLUDES:
(1) CONDUCTED BY THE STATE;
(2) CONDUCTED BY THE UNITED STATES;
(3) CONDUCTED BY PERSONS HAVING THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN;
(4) CONDUCTED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT;
(5) LICENSED BY THE STATE OR THE UNITED STATES;
(6) FUNDED IN WHOLE OR IN PART BY THE STATE OR THE UNITED STATES

PROPOSED LANGUAGE: (d) LAND-DISTURBING ACTIVITY OVER WHICH THE STATE HAS EXCLUSIVE REGULATORY JURISDICTION AS PROVIDED IN G.S.113A-56(a).

CHANGES: THE LIST OF EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES IS REMOVED FROM THE ORDINANCE AND REFERENCED TO THE APPLICABLE STATE STATUTE. ITEM 5 (LICENSED BY THE STATE OR UNITED STATES) IS NOT INCLUDED IN THE STATUTE.

II. SECTION 17(c):


III. SECTION 20A PENALTIES

1. ANY PERSON WHO VIOLATES ANY OF THE PROVISIONS OF THIS ORDINANCE, OR RULES OR DIRECTIVES ISSUED PURSUANT TO THIS ORDINANCE, OR WHO INITIATES OR CONTINUES A LAND DISTURBING ACTIVITY FOR WHICH AN EROSION CONTROL PLAN IS REQUIRED EXCEPT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TERMS, CONDITIONS, AND PROVISIONS OF AN APPROVED PLAN, OR WHO FAILS TO MAINTAIN PERMANENT EROSION CONTROL MEASURES AND TEMPORARY MEASURES AFTER SITE DEVELOPMENT IS COMPLETED, SHALL BE SUBJECT TO A CIVIL FINE OF NOT MORE THAN $100. NO FINE SHALL BE ASSESSED UNTIL THE PERSON ALLEGED TO BE IN VIOLATION HAS BEEN NOTIFIED OF THE VIOLATION BY REGISTERED OR CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED OR OTHERWISE. THE NOTIFICATION SHALL SPECIFY A REASONABLE FINE PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE VIOLATION MUST BE CORRECTED, AND WARN THAT FAILURE TO CORRECT THE VIOLATION WITHIN THE TIME PERIOD WILL RESULT IN THE ASSESSMENT OF A CIVIL PENALTY OR OTHER ENFORCEMENT ACTION. EACH DAY OF CONTINUING VIOLATION SHALL CONSTITUTE A SEPARATE VIOLATION.

I. FORCIBLE ENTRY: (1) ANY PERSON WHO VIOLATES ANY OF THE PROVISIONS OF THIS ORDINANCE, OR FAILS OR ODORES ANY OF THE ORDINANCE, OR WHO INITIATES OR CONTINUES A LAND-DISTURBING ACTIVITY FOR WHICH AN EROSION CONTROL PLAN IS REQUIRED EXCEPT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TERMS, CONDITIONS, AND PROVISIONS OF AN APPROVED PLAN, OR WHO FAILS TO MAINTAIN OR MAINTENANCE EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL MEASURES AND FACILITIES AFTER SITE DEVELOPMENT IS COMPLETED SHALL BE SUBJECT TO CIVIL PENALTY OF NOT MORE THAN $100. EXCEPT THAT THE PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO SUBMIT AN EROSION CONTROL PLAN SHALL BE AS PROVIDED IN SUBDIVISION (3) OF THIS SUBSECTION. NO PENALTY SHALL BE ASSESSED UNTIL THE PERSON ALLEGED TO BE IN VIOLATION HAS BEEN NOTIFIED OF THE VIOLATION BY REGISTERED OR CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED OR OTHER MEANS. THE NOTICE SHALL DESCRIBE THE VIOLATION WITH REASONABLE PARTICULARITY, SPECIFY A REASONABLE TIME PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE VIOLATION MUST BE CORRECTED, AND WARN THAT FAILURE TO CORRECT THE VIOLATION WITHIN THE TIME PERIOD WILL RESULT IN THE ASSESSMENT OF A CIVIL PENALTY OR OTHER ENFORCEMENT ACTION. EACH DAY OF CONTINUING VIOLATION SHALL CONSTITUTE A SEPARATE VIOLATION.


(3) ANY PERSON WHO FAILS TO SUBMIT AN EROSION CONTROL PLAN FOR APPROVAL AS REQUIRED BY THIS ORDINANCE SHALL BE SUBJECT TO A SINGLE, NON-CONTINUING CIVIL PENALTY OF NOT MORE THAN ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS ($1,000). ANY
PERSON WHO IS SUBJECT TO A CIVIL PENALTY UNDER THIS SUBDIVISION MAY BE SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF ANY OTHER PROVISION OF THIS ORDINANCE, OR RULES OR ORDERS ADOPTED OR ISSUED PURSUANT TO THIS ORDINANCE.

CHANGE:

THIS ADDS AN INSTANT ONE TIME PENALTY OF $1,000 FOR GRADING OVER ONE ACRE WITHOUT A PERMIT.
# Appointments to Boards and Commissions

## Information on Nominees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Profession/Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-M Art Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. James E. Brucki, Jr.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>V-P, Interstate Securities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Daphne Dwyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. Professor of Visual Arts - UNCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Esther Page Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-employed, Ubiquitous Gallery, Curator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Brenda E. Noel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Appointed by City
Mayor (1); Council (2)
3 Appointed by County
3 Appointed by Arts & Science Council

CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ART COMMISSION
(9 Members)

Membership - Terms for initial appointees were staggered - three for one year terms; three for two-year terms; and three for three-year terms. Thereafter, all appointments shall be for three years. No member shall serve more than two consecutive three-year terms. The Commission shall elect a chairperson among the members to serve for a one-year term.

Responsibilities - Established by joint resolution of City Council (November 23, 1981) and the County Commission (February 15, 1982) to accept the responsibility for expanding experience with visual art by directing the inclusion of works of art in public projects of the City and County; examining the condition of such works of art annually and reporting to the two governing bodies with recommendations for their care, maintenance, improvement, documentation, appraisal, security, etc.; and, encouraging and helping obtain additional grants and gifts from outside sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>BUSINESS/ PROFESSION</th>
<th>ORIGINAL APPTMT.</th>
<th>RE-APPTMT.</th>
<th>TERM EXPIRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Robert Cheek W/M</td>
<td>6  Art Counselor &amp; Appraiser</td>
<td>7/12/82</td>
<td>7/11/83</td>
<td>7/31/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/11/86</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Carol Hoetener W/F</td>
<td>2  Sales Associate, Touchberry Realtors</td>
<td>8/06/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>7/31/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Pam Patterson W/F</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/22/88</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>7/31/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Brayboy B/F</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/21/83</td>
<td>7/25/86</td>
<td>3 yrs. 7/31/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Murchison, Jr. W/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famedia A Stowe W/F</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/18/88</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>7/31/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Killion W/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/31/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo Malic W/F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Anderson W/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 7, 1989

Members of the Charlotte City Council
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2853

Dear Council Member:

Having reviewed the applications of people wanting to be appointed by the City Council to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Art Commission, we, present members of the Art Commission, recommend that you appoint Esther Hill.

Esther is qualified in three essential areas to serve on the Art Commission.

She is an artist and art professor at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte. Her knowledge of art, its history and current role in society is strong. Effectively and thoughtfully, Esther shares that expertise with the Art Commission as a volunteer consultant.

She is a long time resident of Charlotte. Living in Charlotte for almost forty years, Esther knows this community and its history. She sees its emergence as an important urban center and knows it has a future of increased national and international prominence.

She is a citizen of the best kind. Esther is committed to this community. She uses her talents to affect positively the city's quality of life by working with many civic and cultural organizations including The Children's Theatre of Charlotte, WBTV Black Advisory Board and Cities in Schools. She is honest and dedicated in her community involvement.

Please consider our recommendation and appoint Esther Hill as the City Council's representative to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Art Commission. Thank you.

cc: Pat Sharkey,
City Clerk

[Signature]
Mary Cote
Chairman

[Signature]
Carol H. Hodge

[Signature]
Ralph(indentation) H. Goodwin
# City of Charlotte
## Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink.

**Committee, Commission, Board or Authority:** Charlotte-Mack Art Commission  

**Name:** James E. Brucki Jr  
**Sex/Race/m/c:**  
**District No.:** 7  

**Home Address:** 2034 Manor Mill Rd  
**Phone No.:** 304-2505  
**Business Address:** 2700 NCNB Plaza  
**Phone No.:** 379-5283  

**Education:** B.S. - 1966 High Point College  

**Present Employer:** Interstate Securities  

**Job Title:** Vice President  
**Duties:** Manager Sales and Trading Department  

**Business & Civic Experience:** Mint Museum Sponsor, Discovery Plaza Sponsor, Very active in securities industry affairs  

**Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise:** Active collector of master carvings, Supporter of various art extracurriculars  

**Comments:** I believe my experience and contacts would benefit the Art Commission.

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only.

**Date:** 4/1/85  
**Signature of Applicant:**

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to:

Office of the City Clerk  
600 East Trade Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

OR c. 1988

**RECEIVED**

A personal contact with the Mayor’s Office or a City Councilmember is recommended

**Office of City Clerk**

City Clerk  
1983

**PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES**
City of Charlotte
Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: ARTS COMMISSION

Name: Dr. Esther Page Hill  Sex/Race: F/B  District No.: 2

Home Address: 1624 Madison Ave., Charlotte, N.C. 28216  Phone No.: 704-334-4802

Business Address: University of North Carolina at Charlotte  Phone No.: 704-647-4479

Education: Ph. D., Florida State University, Art Education; M.A., Columbia University, Fine Arts and Fine Arts Education; B. S., Columbia University, S. S.

Present Employer: Visual Arts' Department, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Job Title: Associate Professor of Visual Arts  Duties: Art Education

Coordinator, Instructor of Art Education Methods Courses, and Foundations, Supervise Student teachers; Major Advisor and Academic Advisor to students.


Skills: Workshop Leader and Lecturer in Arts and Aesthetics, Art Instructor in Textiles/Batik, Speakers Bureau, NCERA, Consultant and Planner for Arts Meetings and Symposia, Judge for Art Exhibits; Interests: Research in arts and aesthetics for schools and community, Fiber arts and painting, talking to people and children, support networking for young Black males; Traveling to Third World countries.

Comments: The opportunity to participate further in the process of discussion, and decisions on securing public art works for the Charlotte/Mecklenburg community will be immensely satisfying. I would be most pleased if elected or appointed to the Arts Commission.

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only.

Date: 2/28/91  Signature of Applicant: [Signature]

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to

City Clerk’s Office
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC)
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202-2857

A personal contact with the Mayor’s Office or a City Councilmember is recommended.

Office of City Clerk

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES

City Clerk
1988
City of Charlotte  
Application for Appointment  

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink.

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Art Commission

Name: Noel, Brenda E.  
Sex/Race: Female  
District No.: 2  
African-American

Home Address: 311 Settlers Lane  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28204  
Phone No.: 342-3678

Business Address: 1936 East 7th Street  
Charlotte, N.C. 28204  
Phone No.: 376-6944

Education:  
- C.W. Post Center of Long Island University  
- B.C.C. of City University of New York

Present Employer:  
Self-employed  
Ubiquitous Gallery

Job Title: V.P. / Curator  
Duties: acquire present & market fine art.

Business & Civic Experience:  
- Spirits square Women's Auxiliary  
- Y.W.C.A Nominating Committee  
- Afro-American Cultural Center Youth Advisory Board  
- C.A.S.T. volunteer  
- Actively supported political candidates

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise:  
- Interest: Visual art, performing art, public relations, politics  
- Area of expertise: Procuring & promoting fine art by black artist

There is a psychology to visual perceptions & I feel that often what is not exhibited has as great an impact on the psyche as what is. My emphasis is on broadening the scope of works available for selection by including reknown artist of color.

Comments:  
I'm a native New Yorker who was fortunate to be exposed to the finest visual, visual, theatrical and musical art forms in the nation. After considerable travel, nationally and internationally, I chose Charlotte as the city I would relocate to and create 'home'. Here, I'm a place to contribute to as well as receive support from and I'm certain that Ubiquitous Gallery has

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only  

Date:  
Signature of Applicant: 

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to:  

City Clerk’s Office  
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC)  
600 East Fourth Street  
Charlotte, NC 28202-2857

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

A personal contact with the Mayor’s Office or a City Councilmember is recommended contributed in playing an integral role in broadening as well as defining the fine art offerings for the City of Charlotte. Since my arrival in January of 1988 I have been warmly received and supported. I'm pleased with my decision to make Charlotte 'home'.

Please do not submit resumes.

JUL 13 1989

City Clerk  
1989
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certified Development Corporation</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Profession/Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Warren H Linde, Jr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>V-P, investments Paine Webber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Membership - Members must be residents of the City of Charlotte or Mecklenburg County, of legal voting age, be of good character and reputation, have never been convicted of a criminal offense other than a minor motor vehicle violation, and not under indictment, on parole or probation. Terms are for three years (following the expiration of the initial terms which were made on a staggered basis). Membership shall include participation by the following four groups: (a) local government, (b) private lending institutions, (c) community organizations, and (d) business organizations.

Responsibilities - The purpose of the company is to stimulate the growth and expansion of small businesses in the community by assisting such businesses to obtain long-term financing for capital improvements and fixed assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER &amp; CATEGORY</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>ORIGINAL APPTMT.</th>
<th>RE-APPTMT.</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>EXPIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Gus Psohadakis W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11/14/88</td>
<td>Unexp.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Lending Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(C) L. R. Miller, Jr. W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5/14/84</td>
<td>4/06/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) H. Clayton Howze W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3/11/85</td>
<td>4/11/88</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Consuela Chavis Miller B/F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Titus Ivory B/M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/05/86</td>
<td>5/18/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Melvin White B/M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6/17/88</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Peggy Jennings W/F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1/23/89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unexp.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Jerry W. McMurray W/M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/27/87</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Clayton Lovell B/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10/08/84</td>
<td>4/06/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Mitchell Aberman W/M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/09/88</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Gregory Finnican W/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Walter Denning B/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Robert S. Cunningham B/M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8/22/88</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Spencer Thompson B/M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/26/85</td>
<td>3/11/85</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) A. Ray Biggs W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/11/88</td>
<td>4/11/88</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Lem Long, Jr. B/M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/31/84</td>
<td>5/18/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Ismael H. Walters W/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) David R. Krug W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6/08/87</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Appointments - Expiring 4/30/89

Michael Blair W/M
Michael Patrick W/M
City of Charlotte
Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink.

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: Certified Development Corporation

Name Charles W. (Todd) Johnson Sex/Race M/W District No. 5

Home Address 2517 Sherwood Avenue Phone No. 375-4330

Business Address 2223 Executive Street Phone No. 392-0311

Education Bachelor of Arts Degree from UNC-Chapel Hill

Masters of Business Administration from Wake Forest University

Present Employer Paragon Group, Inc.

Job Title Vice President-Residential and Retail Development Duties Responsible for all residential and retail development activities for Virginias and the Carolinas

Business & Civic Experience Worked previously to Paragon with First Union as commercial Loan Officer, providing financing for both short term working capital needs as well as long term needs. Currently on Board of Directors of Charlotte Apartment Association. Currently on Committee formed by County Commission to assist Mecklenburg County in disposing of property in Northeast Charlotte.

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise Have a strong interest in small business, having been involved in financing small businesses with First Union, as well as currently being involved in working for a small business. As a result of this background, understand the nuts and bolts of what is necessary in order for small businesses to qualify for long term financing.

Comments Would like very much to become involved in serving the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County.

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only.

April 5, 1984 Charles W. (Todd) Johnson

Date Signature of Applicant

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to Office of the City Clerk:

600 East Trade Street
Charlotte North Carolina 28202

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Councilmember is recommended.

Office of the City Clerk

City Clerk

1983
City of Charlotte
Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: Certified Development Corp

Name  WARREN H LINDE JR     Sex/Race - MW    District No.  5

Home Address        4714 WOODLARK LN    CHARLOTTE    Phone No.  365-5248
Business Address     3400 NCNB PLAZA    CHARLOTTE NC  28280    Phone No.  372-3270

Education        WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY - BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Present Employer       PRINCE WEBBER
Job Title            UP INVESTMENTS          Duties HANDLE INVESTMENTS

Business & Civic Experience   HORNETS NEST Kiwanis Club, BOY SCOUTS,
                               N.C. SECURITY TRADERS ASSOC., LOCAL POLITICS

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise        ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Comments       I THINK THE CITY NEEDS DECISION ORIENTED, BUSINESS-MINDED PEOPLE IN ADVISORY CAPACITIES

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only

4/1/88     WARREN H. LINDLE

Date     Signature of Applicant

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to

Office of the City Clerk
600 East Trade Street
Charlotte North Carolina 28202

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Councilmember is recommended

Office of City Clerk

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES

City Clerk
1983
# APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

## Information on Nominees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic District Commission</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Profession/Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Roger A. Dahner</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Architect, Freeman-White Assoc., Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kirk Donald Williams</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Physician</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION - CHARLOTTE

(8 Members)

Membership - One member shall represent the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission and shall be recommended for appointment by that Commission. Each of the historic districts - Fourth Ward and Dilworth - shall be represented by one residential property owner (Council appointments). The membership will be expanded by one (a property owner) for each newly designated district. The Board of Directors of the neighborhood association of each district shall recommend nominations for their position in compliance with the association's by-laws, but such recommendations shall not be binding on the City Council.

In addition, the Dilworth Historic District, because of its make-up, shall be represented by the operator of a business in that district (a mayoral appointment). Business operators in Dilworth may submit no more than three names for consideration, but these recommendations shall not be binding on the Mayor.

If either of the district representatives ceases to be in the respective historic district, that appointee shall not be permitted to continue in his position if more than fifty (50) percent of his term has not been served.

A majority of the membership shall have demonstrated special interest, experience, or education in history or architecture; and all must reside within the corporate limits of the City of Charlotte - both criteria required by State statute. Terms are for three years and no member may serve on the Commission for more than two full consecutive terms.

Responsibilities - To ensure the preservation of any areas, structures, site and objects that are significant elements of the cultural, social, economic, political, or architectural history of Charlotte; to safeguard the heritage of the City through the preservation and conservation of historical areas for the education, pleasure, and enhancement of the residents of the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER &amp; QUALIFICATION</th>
<th>DIST.</th>
<th>BUSINESS/PROFESSION</th>
<th>ORIGINAL APPTMT.</th>
<th>RE-APPTMT.</th>
<th>TERM EXPIRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C) John Knight W/M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/13/83</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Resident-Owner, 4th Ward)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Douglas Burns W/M</td>
<td>12/87</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Mary Anne Hammond W/F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interior Designer</td>
<td>7/11/83</td>
<td>6/09/86</td>
<td>6/30/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) George C. Warren W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>College Hist.Ins.</td>
<td>10/10/83</td>
<td>6/09/86</td>
<td>6/30/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Resident-Owner, Dilworth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Kirkwood Otey W/M</td>
<td>3/29/84</td>
<td>6/15/86 3 yrs 6/30/86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Business-Owner, Dilworth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) Melody Burgess W/F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Property Manager</td>
<td>6/22/87</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>6/30/86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Appointed by Mayor
5 Appointed by City Council
City of Charlotte
Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink.

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: Historic District Commission

Name  Roger A. Dahnert  Sex/Race  M  District No.  6

Home Address  2108 Charlotte Drive, Charlotte, N.C. 28203  Phone No.  333-7657

Business Address  8001 Arrowridge Blvd., Charlotte, N.C. 28217  Phone No. 523-2230

Education  Bachelor of Architecture  Registered Architect

Present Employer  The Freeman-White Associates, Inc.

Job Title  Project Manager  Duties  Project Production Management (Design through Construction Completion)

Business & Civic Experience  Chairman - Dilworth Jubilee - 1987
Chairman - Dilworth Natural Light Criterion - 1988 & 1989

American Institute of Architects, IDP Committee Chairman
Charlotte Chamber of Commerce, Associate Member
Covenant Presbyterian Church Property Committee, Vice Chairman

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise  Interested in helping to preserve and improve Historic Fabric of Charlotte as context from which it has and will continue to grow. Skills in Architectural Design, Types of Materials, Use of Material and Types of Construction.

As an Architect, I have renovation and restoration experience within Historic Districts and with Historic Properties.

Comments  I have lived in Charlotte for 12 years and in Dilworth for 11 years.

I would be honored to use my knowledge and experience to serve the Historic Districts and Charlotte.

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only

2/4/89

Date  Signature of Applicant

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to

City Clerk's Office
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC)
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202-2857

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Councilmember is recommended

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES
City of Charlotte
Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink.

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Name KIRK DONALD WILLIAMS Sex/Race M/AFRICAN
American

Home Address 509 E KINGSTON AVE, CHARLOTTE, N.C. Phone No. 332-6828

Business Address 225 HAWTHORNE LANE, SUITE 405, CHARLOTTE Phone No. 377-7088

Education COLLEGE MEDICAL SCHOOL INTERNSHIP - HOWARD UNIV,

RESIDENCY - GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL

Present Employer SELF EMPLOYED

Job Title PHYSICIAN Duties

EAR, NOSE & THROAT SPECIALIST

Business & Civic Experience NONE - CIVIC EXPERIENCE

MANAGING & DEVELOPING MY OWN SOLO PRACTICE - BUSINESS EXPERIENCE

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise A WILLINGNESS TO SERVE AND

STRONG INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS

Comments I look forward to participating in the historic

preservation of our neighborhoods as we grow as a city.

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only.

Date May 1, 1989 Signature of Applicant KIRK D. WILLIAMS

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to

City Clerk's Office
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC)
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202-2857

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Councilmember is recommended

RECEIVED

MAY 9, 1989

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES

City Clerk
1988
APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Information on Nominees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Involvement Council Advisory Board</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Profession/Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Frank B. Aycock, III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 David L. Grier</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Guidance Counselor - retired, C-M Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Randy Gene Harris</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CAD System Designer, Duke Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kevin L. Patterson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Systems engineering manager, IBM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Appointed by City: Mayor (1); Council (2)
3 Appointed by County Commission
2 Appointed by Chairman, Board of Education
2 Appointed by Chairman, Chamber of Commerce
2 Members of Youth Involvement Council

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT COUNCIL ADVISORY BOARD

(12 Members)

Membership - Appointments are made for two-year terms.

Purpose - To provide counsel, support and assistance to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Youth Involvement Council, as requested, in achieving that organization's goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>DIST.</th>
<th>BUSINESS/ PROFESSION</th>
<th>ORIGINAL APPTMT.</th>
<th>RE-APPTMT. APPTMT. TERM</th>
<th>EXPIR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M)Ella Hand B/F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal Assistant</td>
<td>8/15/84</td>
<td>9/04/86</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)Thomas H. Hunter, III W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Real Estate App.</td>
<td>8/13/84</td>
<td>7/14/86</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)Marjorie R. Belton B/F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ret. Guid. Couns.</td>
<td>8/13/84</td>
<td>7/14/86</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chamber of Commerce
Aubrey Martin B/M
Omega Rushing Autrey B/F
NCNB Int. Banking Office
Dept. of Human Resources

Others
Bob Thompson W/M
Dolly Tate W/F
Johnny Harris W/M
Joan Maultsby W/F
BB&T
Bissell Co.

Revised 8/02/8
City of Charlotte
Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: YOUTH INVOLVEMENT COUNCIL ADVISORY BOARD

Name FRANK BAYARD AYCOCK, III, Attorney
Sex/Race M/W
District No. 6

Home Address 1009-A Mount Vernon Ave. 28203
Business Address 905 Cameron Brown Building 28204

Education Juris Doctorate, University of NC at Chapel Hill, NC

Present Employer Self employed in solo practice of law

Job Title attorney
Duties

Business & Civic Experience Twenty-four years law practice. Member of Covenant Presbyterian Church (Social Issues and Action Committee; Chairman of Men's Club 1989-90), YMCA Fund raising committee 1988.


Comments

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only.

Date Signature of Applicant

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to City Clerk's Office

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC)
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202-2857

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Council Member is recommended

City Clerk
1989

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES
City of Charlotte

Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink.

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: Youth Involvement Council Advisory Board

Name: David L. "D. L." Grier
Sex/Race: Male/Black
District No.: 5

Home Address: 516 Nottingham Drive, Charlotte, NC 28211
Phone No.: (704) 366-0046

Business Address: (Only before Aug. 5) 2600 Elmin St., CLT
Phone No.: 398-0184

Education: Post Graduate (M.S. Ed.)

Present Employer: Charlotte - Mecklenburg Board of Education
Job Title: Guidance Counselor (Middle/ Junior High)
Duties: Counseling


Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise: Counseling, Day Camp, Coaching

Comments: I am interested in the welfare and well being of our youth here in Charlotte as I am concerned for the youth of the world, etc..

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only

Date: July 12, 1989
Signature of Applicant

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to

City Clerk's Office
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC)
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202-2857

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Council member is recommended

City Clerk
1989

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES

RECEIVED
JUL 14 1989
City of Charlotte
Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink.

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: Youth Involvement Council Advisory Board

Name          Randy Gene Harris       Sex/Race  M/B       District No.  2

Home Address  1635 Oaklawn Avenue, Charlotte, NC  28218       Phone No.  (704) 377-1967

Business Address  ECI0317-EC03D       Phone No.  (704) 382-1796

Education  B.S. Limestone College; MBA Pfeiffer College, 1986 - Present

Present Employer  Duke Power Company

Job Title  CAD Systems Designer       Duties  Responsible for technical writing specifications, design work, giving tours and explanation to guest and company officials.

Business & Civic Experience  V.P. Staff 1985; Director of Tours, United Way 1987; Facilitator - Twelve Together Program, 1987/Peer Counseling Group (CMS); Co-Director Will Power Program - CMS 1989-90; Boy Scouts of America - Post Advisor; United Way of Central Carolinas; Power In Education (PIE) - Duke Power Company.

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise  Excellent people skills, expanded capacity for comprehension, talent to make necessary adjustments to new situations, a forward sense of direction. I know the importance of timing, setting priorities, maintaining a sense of humor and integrity.

Comments  I understand and support our local government's involvement with our youth. If nominated I commit to serve, counsel, support and assist in anyway possible.

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only.

7-11-89  [Signature]

Date  Signature of Applicant

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to

City Clerk's Office
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC)
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202-2857

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Councilmember is recommended

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES

City Clerk
1989

RECEIVED

JUL 11 1989
Application for Appointment

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: YOUTH INVOLVEMENT COUNCIL ADVISORY BOARD

Name Kevin L. Patterson Sex/Race Male/African-American

Home Address 3720-3 Selwyn Farms Ln Phone No. 529-0238

Business Address 4601 Park Rd Phone No. 554-5247

Education BA in mathematics, Lincon University

Present Employer IBM

Job Title Systems Engineering Manager Duties Manage 14 employees related to the selling & installation of computers

Business & Civic Experience 12 years with IBM management & technical/Presidential or other office with various boards, ie Focus on Leadership: Afro-American Cultural Center, YMCA, United Way, and others

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise Youth, Leadership, Speaking, Planning, Cultural activities

Comments

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only.

Date 6-20-89 Signature of Applicant

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City Committees. Applications should be sent to City Clerk's Office

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC) 600 East Fourth Street Charlotte, NC 28202-2857

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Councilmember is recommended.  

City Clerk

1989

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CHAIRMAN</th>
<th>MEETING DAY &amp; TIME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT CORP.</td>
<td>Linn R. Miller, Jr.</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>CMCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff A. C. Shull</td>
<td>2310 Beverly Dr</td>
<td>3:00 p.m. Regular, Spec. Bd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. D Dept 336-2410</td>
<td>(28207) 372-8084</td>
<td>12:00 noon Qtr luncheons</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat Purser &amp; Assoc.</td>
<td>372-0999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
(27 Members)

Membership - Members must be residents of the City of Charlotte or Mecklenburg County, of legal voting age, be of good character and reputation, have never been convicted of a criminal offense other than a minor motor vehicle violation, and not under indictment, on parole or probation. Terms are for three years (following the expiration of the initial terms which were made on a staggered basis). Membership shall include participation by the following four groups: (a) local government, (b) private lending institutions, (c) community organizations, and (d) business organizations.

Responsibilities - The purpose of the company is to stimulate the growth and expansion of small businesses in the community by assisting such businesses to obtain long-term financing for capital improvements and fixed assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER &amp; CATEGORY</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>ORIGINAL APPTMT.</th>
<th>RE-APPTMT.</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>EXPIR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Gus Psomadakis W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11/14/88</td>
<td>Unexp.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Lending Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(C) L. R. Miller, Jr. W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5/14/84</td>
<td>4/06/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) H. Clayton Howze W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3/11/86</td>
<td>4/11/86</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Consella Chavis Miller B/F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/19/86</td>
<td>5/18/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Titus Ivory B/M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6/17/88</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Melvin White B/M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1/23/89</td>
<td>Unexp.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Jerry W. McMurray W/M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/27/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Clayton Lovell B/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10/08/84</td>
<td>4/06/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Mitchell Aberman W/M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5/09/86</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Gregory Finnican W/M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/19/88</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Walter Denning B/M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8/06/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Robert S. Cunningham B/M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8/22/88</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Spencer Thompson B/M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/28/85</td>
<td>3/11/85</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Removed - Att.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) A. Ray Biggs W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3/11/85</td>
<td>4/11/88</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Removed - Att.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Lem Long, Jr. B/M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/31/84</td>
<td>5/18/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) James H. Watters W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5/05/86</td>
<td>4/19/88</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) David R. Krug W/M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6/08/87</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>4/30/90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Appointments - Expiring 4/30/89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pradeep K. Patnaik W/M</td>
<td>Michael Blair W/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bullard W/M</td>
<td>Stephen Morris W/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Pride B/F</td>
<td>Robert Shirley W/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Taylor</td>
<td>Lonnie Leible W/F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Appointed by City Mayor (6); Council (9) Appointed by Council (8)
City of Charlotte
Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: Planning Commission, Certified Development Company, Community Relations Comm., Char. Uptown Develop. Co

Name Darryl Antonio Broome Sex/Race M/B District No. 7

Home Address 188 Shady Oak Tr. Charlotte, N.C. 28210 Phone No. 563-1380

Business Address 700 North Tryon Street, Charlotte, N.C. 28202 Phone No. 336-2831

Education B.A. Urban Studies, Johnson C. Smith University

Present Employer Charlotte-Mecklenburg Building Standards Department

Job Title Zoning Inspector Duties Issuance of
Zoning, Building, and Sign Permits, etc. Code Enforcement

Business & Civic Experience Registrar Precinct #58 Member: Concerned Charlotteans, Black Republican Council, Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Focus on Leadership, State Delegate G.O.P. #58, Civic Affairs Director Victory Christian Center

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise Transportation, Housing, City-County Planning, Community Relations, Recreation

Comments I am interested in serving the people of Charlotte to provide equal and quality services.

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only.

4-18-88

Date

Signature of Applicant

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to:

Office of the City Clerk
600 East Trade Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Councilmember is recommended.

City Clerk
1983

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES
Name: Craig D. Germain  
Sex/Race: M/W  
District No.: 7  
Home Address: 4354 Woodglen, Charlotte 28226  
Phone No.: 541-7271  
Business Address: 4601 Charlotte Park Dr., Charlotte 28217  
Phone No.: 525-8006  
Education: BBA (Univ. of Texas at Austin), MBA (North Texas State Univ. at Denton) and Graduate Work (Harvard University at Boston).  
Present Employer: Lormic Development Corporation  
Job Title: Vice President  
Duties: Land Acquisition Development, Marketing, Land Planning and Finance.  
Business & Civic Experience: Chamber of Commerce (Director, Chairman of Membership and Business Development Committees), Founder and Chairman of Arts Board, Chairman Las Colinas Architectural Control Committee, Full Gospel Businessman, Rotary, Realtor, Bank Director.  
Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise: Past Experience included responsibility over 500 people, Administration Budgets of $10,000,000.00, Construction Budgets of $100,000,000+, Writing Policy and Procedures Manual, Written News Articles for Charlotte Realestate Magazine, Negotiating Deals, Nat'l Real-estate exposure.  
Comments: I want to be part of the solution, not part of the problem.  

Signature of Applicant:  
Date: 6-1-88  

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to  
Office of the City Clerk  
600 East Trade Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202  

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Councilmember is recommended.  

City Clerk  
1983  

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CHAIRMAN</th>
<th>MEETING DAY &amp; TIME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIVIL SERVICE BOARD</td>
<td>Jan Thompson</td>
<td>2nd Wednesday (monthly)</td>
<td>Operations Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff     Pat Sharkey</td>
<td>2621 Croydon Rd.</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Conf Rm 7th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Clerk 336-2247</td>
<td>28209 339-0497 (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CMGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>333-0634 (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CI IL SELF-CCE BOARD

(5 Mbers)

Membership - Appointments are for three-year terms and appointees must be electors of the City of Charlotte.

Responsibilities - Principal functions are to establish requirements for applicants for positions in the Police and Fire Departments, to give competitive examinations to such applicants, subject to reasonable limitations as to physical qualifications and moral character, to maintain a register of applicants passing such examinations, which register shall determine the appointments to be made in each of the departments; to hold hearings of an employee against whom charges have been preferred by the Chiefs, and to pass on all promotions and demotions within the departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>BUSINESS/PROFESSION</th>
<th>ORIGINAL APPTMT</th>
<th>RE-APPTMT</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>EXPIRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(L) Jan Thompson W/F</td>
<td>6 TV &amp; Film Producer</td>
<td>4/11/83</td>
<td>5/12/86</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>5/15/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**(L) Albert Hicklin W/M</td>
<td>6 Ret Ins Ece</td>
<td>7/08/85</td>
<td>5/09/88</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>5/15/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(N)</em> George Dily W/N</td>
<td>6 Attorney</td>
<td>6/28/84</td>
<td>8/05/87</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>5/15/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) Sean Miller B/N</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>5/13/86</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>5/15/90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Illoree Y Erwin B/I</td>
<td>2 Airline Reservations Supv</td>
<td>5/11/87</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>5/15/90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Charlotte
Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: CIVIL SERVICE BOARD

Name  WILLIAM L. KENNEDY  Sex/Race  W/M  District No.  5

Home Address  1445 FOX RUN DR.  Phone No.  535-5684
Business Address  2128 COMMONWEALTH AVE.  Phone No. 334-8512

Education  HIGH SCHOOL, 2 YEARS OF COLLEGE = PLUS LAW ENFORCEMENT (COLLEGE ACCREDITED) EQUIVALENT TO A MASTERS DEGREE

Present Employer SELF

Job Title  PRESIDENT  Duties  ADMINISTRATION

Business & Civic Experience  PRESENTED "KEY TO THE CITY" BY THE CITY OF CORAL GABLES, FIA & FIA CITY, FLORIDA FOR WORK IN COMMUNITY. HONORABLY RETIRED FROM ONE OF THE MOST HIGHLY TRAINED POLICE AGENCY IN THE COUNTRY. FOUNDER "POLICE CIVIC ACTION ASSOCIATION," CURRENTLY COLLEGE INSTRUCTOR ON LAW ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION.

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise  ANY AREA IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Comments  I THINK MY 30 YEARS EXPERIENCE ASSOCIATED WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT IS VERY VALUABLE FOR THIS BOARD

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only

2 MAY 1989  William Kennedy  Signature of Applicant

City Clerk's Office
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC)
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202-2857

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Council member is recommended

RECEIVED
JUN 2 1989

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES

City Clerk
1989
City of Charlotte
Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: Civil Service Board

Name Regan A. Miller Sex/Race M/R District No. 1

Home Address 2109 East 8th Street, Charlotte 28204 Phone No. 333-1700

Business Address EEOC 5500 Central Avenue, 28212 Phone No 567-7169

Education J.D. UNC-Chapel Hill

Present Employer EEOC

Job Title Supervisory Trial Attorney Duties Supervise litigation of employment discrimination cases.

Business & Civic Experience Member of Civil Service Board - 1986-89
Former President of Drug Education Center Bd. of Directors
Former VP Legal Services Bd of Directors, Administrative Judge EEOC, Associate - James, McElroy & Diehl, P.A.

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise

Comments

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only

Date 6/9/89 Signature of Applicant

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to

City Clerk's Office
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC)
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202-2557

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Council member is recommended

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES

City Clerk
1989
City of Charlotte
Application for Appointment

Applications should be typed or printed in black ink

Committee, Commission, Board or Authority: CIVIL SERVICE BOARD

Name MARVIN B. SMITH  Sex/Race M - W  District No. 2

Home Address 650 REEVES COURT - 28208  Phone No. 3993198

Business Address RETIRED  Phone No.

Education ELEVEN YRS HIGH SCHOOL

Present Employer RETIRED

Job Title  Duties

Business & Civic Experience 40 YRS LANCE INC - CIVIL SERVICE BOARD
MEMAC (AMBULANCE) AIRPORT BOARD
WESTSIDE ORGANIZATION, WILKENSON BLVD BOARD

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise EMERGENCY SERVICE (COUNTY/CITY)
POLICE & FIRE DEPT.

Comments I would like to serve on the Civil Service Board again

I understand that this application will be maintained in the active file for a period of one year only.

Date April 15, 1989  Signature of Applicant  MARVIN B. SMITH

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to

City Clerk's Office
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC)
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202-2857

A personal contact with the Mayor's Office or a City Councilmember is recommended

Office of City Clerk
PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES

City Clerk
1988
Name: Rudolph Torrence, Sr.  Sex/Race: M/B  District No.: 4

Business Address: 100 Beatties Ford Road  Phone No.: 378-1003

Education: Three (3) years of College/Johnson C. Smith University; Associate Degree in Criminal Justice - Central Piedmont Community College

Present Employer: Johnson C. Smith University

Job Title: Chief/Director of Campus Police  Duties: Director of Security

Business & Civic Experience: Retired Charlotte Police Sergeant; Licensed N. C. Private Investigator and Patrol Business; Served on the Satellite Jail Committee; Presently serving on the Mecklenburg Jail Space Needs Committee

Interests/Skills/Areas of Expertise: Community Involvement - Very Good Management Skills and Leadership Abilities

Comments: If selected, I would consider it an honor to serve on this Board.

Signature of Applicant: Rudolph Torrence, Sr.

Date: April 19, 1989

The Mayor and City Council appreciate the interest of citizens in serving on City committees. Applications should be sent to City Clerk’s Office, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (CMGC), 600 East Fourth Street, Charlotte, NC 28202-2857. A personal contact with the Mayor’s Office or a City Councilmember is recommended.

City Clerk
1988

PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT RESUMES