AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type:</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>06-14-1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Charlotte, City Clerk’s Office
COUNCIL MEETING 6/14/93

Mayor
Campbell
Clodfelt
Hammond
McCraw
Majeed
Mangum
Martin
Patterson
Reid
Scarborough
Wheeler

6:30

Vivrost - Introductions & instructions

1. Invocation - Rev. Fields
2. Recognition of Dave Shinn
3. Recognition of Scott Dick & Charlotte Sikes
4. Recognize Donna Savage for Tree Appeal
5. Awards
6. Vivrost

5. Steve Miller - Friends of Elmwood Cemetery

Vivrost
# Youth of the Month
Dan Clohessy - April (2)
Majed - May
Martin - June
Wheeler - July
Harmon - August
Vinroot

7/15

Item #1 - Stormoost Public Hearing
Vinroot
Schumacher
Asst. Co. Mgr. Wanda Joler
Vinroot
Martin - Iowa can choose not to participate?
Joler - Yes
Martin
Joler - Yes
Mangum
Joler - Idaho all costs are recouped in property tax
Mangum
Joler
Vinroot
Rev. Charles Touchee
Michael Jackson - Merrill Lynch
Walton
Linda Stueker
John
Stueker
John
Vinceet
Hammond / Wheeler
Clee King
Martin - 2 exceptions only
Schumacher - RR Tracks (Ron Ross)
& NCDOT Highways.

Vote - Aman.
Vinceet
Co - Scher / Kinsey - Clee King.

Maugan / Parker. Hollow - Make recommendations

Adopt new

Doug Booth.
Booth (Scher - Commission requests
Council to add #32 to billing.

Maugan / Hammond - Approve added #32.
No - Wheeler, Campbell, Reid

7:30 p.m.
Citizens Hearing Continued

#7 Rich Sanders
#8 David Jolland
#9 Mixu Chen
#12 Marvin Wilson
#11 Ronnie Rash

Vinroot

#14 Gerald Collins

Vinroot

Mike Boyd

Collins

Vinroot

Collins

#15 Hubert Craig

Vinroot

Patterson

Craig

Patterson

Hammond

Vinroot

Hammond

Mary Narby

Wanda Knox

Wanda Deese

Mary Narby
Hammond
Narley
Hammond
Vinroot
White
Narley
Vinroot
Patterson
Vinroot
Nancy Jones
Lauren Steele
Hammond
Boyd
Clodfelter
Hammond
Clodfelter
Boyd
Vinroot
Hammond - Develop
White
McCray
Patterson
Vinroot
Jon Kline
Vinroot
Vinroot
Scarborough / Martin
Move to #1, #2 + #3

#13
Vinroot
Walton
Maggie Freeman
Herb Shakelford
David Dale
Vinroot
Scarborough / Wheeler
Tenan.

#14. Scarborough / Patterson
Reid
Vote
Tenan.

#15 Scarborough / Martin
Vinroot
Mangum
Vote
Tenan.

Vinroot
#2 Patterson / Wheeler
Tenan.
Westert 27 T
Conant Freeze 20f
McCray/Patterson remove 20# from agenda

Wheeler/Patterson App.
all but 20F, 24B, 24T + 26

26 Reid
Scarborough/Hammond

Borgdorff
Reid

Borgdorff
Reid

J.W. Walton
Reid

Walton
Reid

Walton

Burr d

Subst. Coldfield/Wheeler Dreef

Hammond

Martin

Walton

Scarborough

McCray
Reid
Vinroot
Vote - Subst. - Dofer
24B - Vinroot - Temp. Services
Reid
Vinroot
Reid
Vinroot
Syfert
Vinroot
Syfert
Reid
Syfert
Hammond / Morgan
No - Campbell & Reid

#20F
Wheeler / Martin
Wheeler / Hammond

#24 I - Vinroot
Jed Kratt, Metric Constructors
Withdraw protest of awarding contract to Cecil Malone Co.
Campbell - Correctly
Boyd - Yes
Campbell
Boyd
Campbell
Boyd
Majeed
Hammond
Vinroot
Scarborough
Cloofeltin
Mike High, MWBE Coordinator
Cloofeltin
High, Majeed
Ted Kratt
Majeed
Kratt
Majeed
White - 2nd Bid
Vintoes
VOTE - Subst. - App.
YES - Majeed & Reid
Orig. - app. Law
No - Majied  + Reid

#4  McCory / Wheeler  App.

#5  Patterson / Wheeler  Unan.

#6  Scarborough / Patterson  app.

VOTE - No Majied  + Reid

#7  Wheeler / Hammond  Approve
Unan

#8  Pott / Wh  app
Unan

#9  Wheeler / Patterson  app
Unan
#10 - Campbell / Martin
Richard Martin Div. entered statement of
Reid
Mangum
White
Reid
Vimoot
Alexander
Patterson
Alexander
5 YEAR REMUNERABLE
Reid
Alexander
Reid
Alexander
Reid
Martin
VOTE - Unanim.

#11 Eagle Village Campbell / Scarborough App.

#12 Wheeler Reid
Mangum App.

Vimoot
Reid
Walton
Reid
Walton
Reid
Vernost
Hammond
Vote - No Reid

#16
Vernost
White - Recommending Option 1
Frank Mansfield
Hammond / Patterson App
Option 1
Unan.

#17 Patterson / Wheeler App.
Vernost
Bergadonf
Vote - Unan.

#18 Hammond / Wheeler App
Unan.

#19 Wheeler App.
Reid
Vote - No - Reid

Morgan / Wheeler
Adjourn 9:40
Denver Briefing
Mayor Vincent
Campbell
Cloedfelter
Hammond
McCreery
Majeed
Morgan
Martin
Patterson
Reed
Scarborough
Wheeler

June 17, 1973

5:25

Mayor
David Ward - Chairman (Centralina Council of Governments)
(Lee Armour) - Formed in 1968
in 1970 State dedicated districts.

LRO -

Mayor
Martin
Lee Armour
Vinroot
Jim Schumacher
Left - existing rate
32.84
35.82 in

table is correct

Hearing - change to rate

Vinroot - will interrupt citizens
Hearing at 7:00 to allow
County Commission to have hearing

and leave

Schumacher -
Vinroot

Schumacher 32¢ will be same

Vinroot
Schumacher
Vinroot
Wheeler

Schumacher
Charles Wheeler
Schumacher
Wheeler

Batterson

Schumacher
Vinroot
Martin
Schumacher - RR Tracks (Iron Rails)
Martin
Schumacher - NCDOT Highway
Majeed
Schumacher - If retention pond reduces the impervious area 100%, they get 100% credit.
Majeed
Schumacher - Older facilities could not meet offset. New development
Mangum - they can retrofit and get more credit
Schumacher
Majeed
Schumacher
Vinroot
Schumacher - Requests for service
Lot of requests out there - Backlog of projects to be done.
Mangum: Getting ready to start telling people 57 years
Schumacher
Mangum
Schumacher - Decision would have to be made in 2 weeks for bond referendum
McCroy
Schumacher - Interested in plastic pipe - no heavy equipment needed - may be able to use back workers who are sentenced by courts for community service.

Working now on high priority projects - safety hazards, flooding of homes

McCroy
Majeed - David Hilles has never had a drainage system - the older neighborhoods

Schumacher
White
Majeed
Reid

Schumacher
Vinroot
White
Reid
White
Martin - 50/50 Cost Share
Schumacher
Clodfelter - Pay attention - We will get a lot of calls.
Morgan
Vinroot
White
Vinroot
Scarborough 13, 14, 15
Vinroot
Majeed
Vinroot
Clodfelter
Mark
White
Scarborough
Vinroot
McGeary
Scarborough
Vinroot
Adjourn 6:20
Meetings in June '93

JUNE 1 - 4

2, Wednesday
8:30 a.m. CIVIL SERVICE BOARD - CMSC, 7th Floor Conference Room
9:30 a.m. CIVIL SERVICE BOARD/Hearing - CMSC, Room 118
5:00 p.m. CITY COUNCIL/Operating Budget Workshop - CMSC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room

3, Thursday
2:00 p.m. NEIGHBORHOOD MATCHING GRANTS CITYWIDE REVIEW TEAM - CMSC, 8th Floor Conference Room

THE WEEK OF JUNE 7 - 11

7, Monday
8:00 a.m. MAYOR'S INTERNATIONAL CABINET - CMSC, Room 118
12:00 Noon PLANNING COMMISSION/Work Session - CMSC, 8th Floor Conference Room
2:00 p.m. PLANNING COMMISSION/Planning Committee - CMSC, 8th Floor Conference Room
5:00 p.m. CITY COUNCIL/Operating Budget Workshop - CMSC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room
7:00 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING ON BUDGET - CMSC, Meeting Chamber (Televised Live on Cable Channel 32)

8, Tuesday
2:30 p.m. HOUSING APPEALS BOARD - CMSC, 5th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m. AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMITTEE - Charlotte/Douglas International Airport, Conference Rooms A & B

9, Wednesday
8:00 a.m. CLEAN CITY COMMITTEE - CMSC, Room 270
3:00 p.m. HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION - CMSC, 8th Floor Conference Room
5:00 p.m. CITY COUNCIL/CIP Workshop - CMSC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room

THE WEEK OF JUNE 14 - 18

14, Monday
5:00 p.m. COUNCIL/MANAGER DINNER - CMSC, Conference Center
6:30 p.m. CITIZENS HEARING - CMSC, Meeting Chamber (Televised Live on Cable Channel 32)
7:00 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MEETING - CMSC, Meeting Chamber (Televised Live on Cable Channel 32)
7:00 p.m. HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION - 500 N Tryon St, Suite 200

(Continued on back)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE WEEK OF JUNE 14 - 18 (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, Monday</td>
<td>4 00 p m</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - CMGC, Room 271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, Tuesday</td>
<td>6 00 p m</td>
<td>HOUSING AUTHORITY - Piedmont Courts, 831 Seagle Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, Wednesday</td>
<td>5 00 p m</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL/Budget Workshop - CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, Thursday</td>
<td>2 00 p m</td>
<td>CMUD ADVISORY COMMITTEE - Utility Department, 5100 Brookshire Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE WEEK OF JUNE 21 - 25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, Monday</td>
<td>4 00 p m</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Executive Session - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p m</td>
<td>COUNCIL/MANAGER DINNER - CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 00 p m</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL MEETING/Zoning Hearings - CMGC, Meeting Chamber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, Wednesday</td>
<td>7 45 a.m</td>
<td>PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL - CMGC, Conference Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 00 a.m</td>
<td>AUDITORIUM-COLISEUM-CONVENTION CENTER AUTHORITY - New Convention Center Office, 2400 One First Union Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, Thursday</td>
<td>4 30 p.m</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMITTEE - CMGC, Room 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, Saturday</td>
<td>10 00 a.m</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE TREE ADVISORY COMMISSION/Yearly Retreat - 4910 Carmel Park Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNE 28 - 30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28, Monday</td>
<td>4 30 p.m</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Zoning Work Session - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 00 p.m</td>
<td>COUNCIL/MANAGER DINNER - CMGC, Conference Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 30 p.m</td>
<td>CITIZENS HEARING - CMGC, Meeting Chamber (Televized Live on Cable Channel 32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 00 p.m</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL MEETING - CMGC, Meeting Chamber (Televized Live on Cable Channel 32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, Tuesday</td>
<td>1 00 p.m</td>
<td>ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - Hal Marshall Center, 700 N Tryon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These organizations do not have meetings scheduled in June:

- Advisory Energy Commission
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg Art Commission
- Citizens Cable Oversight Committee
- Community Relations Committee
- Firefighters Retirement Board
- Insurance & Risk Mgmt Advisory Board
- Parade Permit Committee
MAYOR'S SCHEDULE
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6:30 p.m CITIZENS' HEARING

1. Invocation by **Stan Fields**

2. Recognition of George Shinn and Charlotte Hornets for meeting their commitment to City of Charlotte.

3. Recognize Scott Gill and present proclamation for Charlotte Sonics.

4. Recognize Donna Savage - Tree Commission to present Tree Appreciation Awards.

5. Recognize Steve Miller - 5915 Gate Post Road - 364-3356, Founder of Friends of Elmwood Cemetery - Mayor will present Certificate.

6. Recognize "Youth of the Month" for April, May, June, July and August.

   - April - Amika Spears, North Mecklenburg and Vipul Lakhani, West Charlotte.

   - May - Lisa Beth Delhafen - Providence Day and Dacovan Cloud, Providence High School.

   - June - Carmen Denise Smith - Myers Park and John Edward Burton, Jr., West Charlotte

   - July - Jeni Leeds, North Mecklenburg and Robert Brian Purser East Mecklenburg

   - August - Debbie Leigh Shivar, West Mecklenburg and Nicholas Anthony Harrell, West Charlotte

7. **Rick Sanders**, 825 East Fourth Street, 336-4181 - Employee Benefits

8. **David Holland**, 10448 Surrey Court, 336-7897 - Employee Benefits

9. **Moy Chun**, 4100 West Tyvola Road, 357-6064 - Employee Benefits

10. **Ronald McLeod**, 4100 West Tyvola Road, 357-6064 - Employee Benefits

11. **Ronnie Rash**, 12103 Bailey Road, 872-8740 - Employee Benefits

12. **Marvin Wilson**, 4419 Monroe Road, 331-9515 - Budget

13. **Mike Spath**, 4419 Monroe Road, 331-9515 - Budget

14. **Gerald Collins**, 1000 Lakehill Road, 392-9217 - Property taxes, Lake and annexation.

15. **Hubert Craig**, 6800 Folger Drive, 366-3954 - Water Sewer Rates.

16. **Paul Sieres**, 1001 East 35th Street, 375-5756 - Concern about loop holes that allow any bar to convert to toplless bar in residential areas.

17. **Mary Narby**, 6401 Clinton Road, 3786-0938 - Spay-Neuter Legislation.


Referral to Nancy Jones: Claire O'Neal, 3811 Saxonbury Way, 549-5859 - Spay-neuter legislation.

Nancy Jones, 2521 Croyden Road, 377-5345 - Wants Council to amend the law on zoning matters referring to Group Homes, so the land could be grandfathered.

Lauren Steele, 2522 Selwyn Avenue, 551-4551 - Mecklenburg Autistic Group Home.

Mrs. Gilbert Hambley, 1120 Queens Road West, 334-5627 - Restriction on Group Homes.

Tom Kalin, 3000 East Independence Boulevard, 377-1501 - 3% room tax - Hotel occupancy.

Maggie Freeman, 1700 Cliffwood Place, Apt. A, 372-0670 - Community Center for Wilmore.

7:00 p.m. - CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Announcements

Wednesday, June 16 - 5:00 p.m. Budget Workshop - CMGC Chamber Conference Room.

1. The following request to speak to agenda items have been received:

(a) Agenda Item No. 1 - Public Hearing on County Storm Water Fee.

   (1) Rev. Charles Poushee, 7700 Tuckaseegee Road - 399-5934
   (2) Michael Jackson, 6024 Ryder Ave, 542-7816

(b) Agenda Item No. 15 - Grier Heights Economic Foundation Loan

   (1) George A. Wallace, 201 Fannie Circle - 375-5812
   (2) John Highfill, 700 North Tryon Street - 336-4109
   (3) Pam East, 227 West Trade Street, 342-2505
   (4) Sis Kaplan, 714 Edgehill Road - 375-4238
   (5) Troy Watson, East Stonewall Street - 335-1665
   (6) Jack Bullard, 817 East Trade Street - 336-2424

(c) Agenda Item No. 16 - Emergency Shelter Grant

   (1) Martha Brown, 500 Spratt Street - 334-7288

(d) Agenda Item No. 24-I - Consent Agenda, Convention Center Finishes.

   (1) Ted Kratt, 6135 Park South Drive - 551-1103
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The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, convened for a briefing on Monday, June 14, 1993, at 5:25 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Richard Vinroot presiding. Councilmembers present were Stan Campbell, Dan Ciodfelter, Ann Hammond, Pat McCrory, Nasif Majeed, Tom Mangum, Hoyle Martin, Cyndee Patterson, Don Reid, Ella Scarborough and Lynn Wheeler.

**ABSENT:** None

---

**CENTRALINA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT (COG)**

Mayor Vinroot stated a few weeks ago several Councilmembers asked questions about COG and why we are a member, should we be a member, and all of that. We thought we should have folks here from COG to tell us what we do as a member of COG and to answer any questions you may have.

David Ward, Chairman of COG, stated he also a member of the Gaston County Board of Commissioners. Being an elected official he knows the constraints you are going through and the problems. He is in his ninth year in government and has a little experience under his belt and assures Council it does not get any easier as you go through this process. Staff members with him taught to answer any questions are Lee Armour, Executive Director of COG, and Charles Phillips, Centralina's Business Manager. Thank you for giving him the opportunity to come before you and to explain the services which COG provides to the citizens of Charlotte.

COG was formed in 1968, and is a voluntary association of local governments owned and governed by our membership. In 1970, the State delineated boundaries of multi-county planning and development regions. In 1971, COG was designated as one of 17, now 18 lead regional organizations or LRO's, as they are known in North Carolina. Our purpose is to establish goals and objectives, serve as the regional agent in dealing with State and Federal agencies, and to promote intergovernmental cooperation, communication and planning. COG provides services not only to member governments, but to other jurisdictions in both North and South Carolina. Examples of work conducted in South Carolina include serving as staff to the Lake Wylie Marine Commission of which he is a member and has been a charter member of that Commission, and the Catawba River Corridor Study, both of which involve York County. The annual contribution of each member government is based on the budget adopted for the year and is assessed on each member's population. COG dues are 17 cents per capita, the lowest of any LRO in the State. The next lowest is 21 cents per capita. The State average is about twice the COG rate.

David Ward stated he will now review the services which COG provides to the citizens of Charlotte. The four service categories are service programs, regional forums, regional planning efforts, and technical assistance. The service programs are aging grants, emergency services activities and solid waste activities. For services to older adults in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, COG provides funding to the following agencies: Mecklenburg Division of Social Services, including in-home aid, transportation, congregate meals, and home delivered meals. Mecklenburg Health Department in-home aid, Charlotte Mecklenburg Senior Center Operations and Out Reach, and Legal Services for the elderly. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Youth Counsel provides employment for older adults. Of the 17 hot lunch sites located in Mecklenburg, 14 are within Charlotte's City limits and serve predominately City residents. Aging staff works with groups and task forces who have City employees as representatives from the City's Special Transportation Department and the Housing Authority. COG's ombudsman advocates for residents of nursing and domiciliary homes. The major part of staff time is spent working with Charlotte Mecklenburg residents, staff and families to resolve grievances, to provide information on facilities and to advocate for resident rights. One major emphasis of the program is to tell the State of the need for more nursing home beds in the City. COG's Emergency Services Section administers a regional grant for emergency medical services which impact all the citizens of Charlotte. The grant program supports a number of specific local projects, as well as regional efforts to improve emergency response. Some of these projects include providing training through EMS grant funds for emergency medical dispatch courses for Mecklenburg County Police Telecommunicators, who under consolidation will become City...
employees Staffing the regions communication group which coordinates emergency communication region wide. Sponsoring the regions critical incident stress debriefing team, which is available to all emergency responders in the region. Providing equipment on a regular basis to hospitals and other emergency responders in Charlotte for advance training. The staff also publishes a monthly training calendar and fund other training opportunities for emergency responders through community colleges such as CPCC. Also, staffing the Metrolina Trauma Forum which provides continuing education on trauma care for physicians and nurses. This is heavily attended by people from Charlotte hospitals.

Mr. Ward continued, Centralina Development Corporation (CDC) helps provide financing to small business owners. The CDC has helped finance 37 projects within Charlotte which have created 690 new jobs, increased the City's tax base by over $30 million, and generates over $228,000 annually in City property taxes alone. Centralina Solid Waste Services was started two years ago. Our staff serves as a liaison between Solid Waste agencies and the region, and provides education and training to solid waste and recycling officials. COG administers the Marine Commission for Lake Norman and Lake Wylie. The commission works with the County Police on the lake's water safety issues. As police consolidation comes about, other activities which may involve the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police are joint safety operations, and emergency services coordination. COG regularly conducts forums with City and County Managers, planning officials, emergency services communications directors, emergency medical services directors, law enforcement executives, and solid waste and recycling personnel. In these meetings, officials from around the region discuss their work and explore ways to coordinate services better.

Mr. Ward stated to meet the need of coordinating planning activities and communications on a regional level, COG is the lead agency in the following regional planning initiatives: the Bi-States Catawba River Task Force, The Catawba River Corridor Study, The "Our Region Tomorrow" Regional Strategic Plan which we announced recently, and The Regional Building Permit Tracking System. The Bi-State Catawba River Task Force which includes representatives from North and South Carolina is staffed by COG. In this group government agencies, utilities and private citizens discuss river related issues and problems, and then identify solutions. The Catawba River Corridor Study is a strategic plan that will examine the status of a river and identify issues and strategies for the river from Lake Norman to Lake Wylie. This study is important to Charlotte because growth is moving closer to the lake and Mountain Island Lake is a source of water to City residents. COG is coordinating a regional strategic plan entitled "Our Region Tomorrow" to examine regional issues of concern. Representatives appointed by Charlotte and other local governments will determine strategies local governments may take to maintain and improve the region's quality of life and economic vitality. The study will identify achievable goals, objectives, and policies local governments may adopt and may examine topics such as recreation, environmental issues, public safety, needs of special population groups and government services. COG is collecting building permit information on the census track level from the 13 county Charlotte region. This data, which is available on a regional basis only from COG, is important to Charlotte as growth in the surrounding areas impacts local planning decisions.

Mr. Ward continued, furthermore it is a valuable tool to market the region as markets do not stop at political boundaries. Assisting in this effort is Dr. Al Stewart of UNCC. The COG has a regional geographic information system which collects and displays data ranging from general population statistics to detailed development activity. Data collected and displayed includes population and housing patterns, labor and employment information, and key socio-economic indicators. Our GIS displays the data and assists in the analysis of patterns and trends occurring in the region. Current applications include Catawba River Corridor Study, Regional Building Permit Tracking System, Regional Atlas and Regional Strategic Plan. Future plans for system include a regional data base of infrastructure and land use information. COG operates a large technical assistance program. It increases the quality of planning and public administration within the region, and pays a large portion of our overhead to keep member dues low. While Charlotte uses this service less than some members, it provides real benefits to Charlotte. Technical assistance provided to Charlotte recently includes the following. COG has provided relocation services since 1989 to over 200 households affected by noise and runway expansion at Charlotte-Douglas International Airport. These services include initial screening and...
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orientation, individual needs and analysis, advisory services in coordination with moving
companies during the actual relocation and claims reimbursement administration. The focus
2010 project uses COG employees to serve as meeting facilitator and reporter COG provided
the greatest number of staff persons in this capacity COG staff has assisted the City in
inputting data into their computer mapping system.

Mr. Ward said in conclusion, he feels the services COG provides are vital to the continued well
being of Charlotte and this region. We have all talked about regionalism in the last few years
Mayor Vinroot has been very strong on regionalism and he believes in it also. As Charlotte
continues to grow, the need to reflect on issues of a regional nature will increase and our
abilities to address local problems will increasingly require cooperation among local
governments COG is the designated lead regional organization for the Charlotte area, and
continued support of COG by Charlotte is essential. Mr. Hoyle Martin is your delegate and he
really enjoys working with Mr. Martin. He has been an asset to the board since he has been
with COG. You have an excellent representative on the board. We always look forward to
seeing Mr. Martin at our meetings. If you have any questions, Mr. Armour or Mr. Philips will
be glad to answer them for you.

STORM WATER

Mr. Jim Schumacher, Engineering Department stated in the agenda packet there are two
numbers that do not agree. In the text of the description of the hearing tonight it notes the
existing storm water rate for non-single family properties is $32.84. In the table on the next
page it shows the rate at $35.82, which is the correct number. Briefly he will touch on the
hearing on the agenda for tonight. This hearing is to consider a change to the rate itself.

Mayor Vinroot said he was going to interrupt the Citizens Hearing sharply at 7:00 p.m. when
he presumes the County Commissioners will be there. They are in the middle of their own
meeting. He will stop the Citizens Hearing because we have a long list of people and go ahead
and have the public hearing on this item at 7:00 p.m., which is ok in accordance with our public
notice given of that. When we finish with that, there is only one speaker signed up on that item.
He suspects we will be in a position to resolve that matter and go back to the Citizens Hearing
and pick up where we left off.

Mr. Schumacher said that will work just fine. He doesn’t have anything to say except to briefly
review how we got to this point. The purpose of the hearing is to consider a change to the fee
that would accommodate the activities by Mecklenburg County inside the City. The City and
the County do different things. Inside the City, the County is responsible for the large streams,
those with the water shed grade of one-eighth of one square mile. The City handles what you
would call the urban drainage system. The tributary systems, the storm drains, culverts, catch
basins, and ditches that carry the water to those large streams. The rate we begin charging in
January inside the City was designed to fund those small streams, those drainage system
activities. The 32 cents proposed by the County to add to that charge would fund their large
stream activities. They currently pay for those activities out of their general fund and their
intent as he understands it is to transfer those activities from the general fund to this fee revenue,
thereby removing that charge from the general fund.

Mayor Vinroot asked do we know at this point the County charge for the other county storm
water services in the County? He assumes the same 32 cents.

Mr. Schumacher answered the 32 cents would be the same and the other charges are proposed
to be the same. When the County did their rates study, they went through the same rate study
process we did, which is to calculate how much money they needed based on their needs, divide
that by the impervious area they expected to find in order to calculate a rate. They came up
with a number that was within pennies of the rate we had already adopted. We all sat around
a table and said it makes sense, the tolerance in these numbers is at least that great, it makes
sense to adjust their number a few pennies so it would be consistent throughout the County.

Mayor Vinroot asked can you explain why they are that close? He would have thought there

bbm
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are fewer tax payers there so the volume of the funds, the amount of money generated, would be considerably lower He had the impression these storm water problems were urban City problems and therefore almost non-existent in the County where the land had not been developed

Mr Schumacher stated remember the County includes the six towns Their numbers include providing those services in the six towns

Mayor Vinroot asked even so, that is a fairly small geographic area by comparison

Mr Schumacher stated he can't answer other than to say when they went through the process of calculating the revenue needs they would have, that was a lower number than ours The revenue they can generate is also a lower number It happened to come out very close

Councilmember Wheeler asked how are duplexes factored in? A lady called today and asked that question Are they commercial or residential about their rate?

Mr Schumacher answered remember there are not two different rates A single family home pays the same rate as other types of properties The difference is single family homes are put into two categories Below the 2,000 square feet and above 2,000 square feet Duplexes were considered non-single family for purposes of calculating rates, primarily because the Tax Office has them classified as non-single family Our data base was created from the information from the Tax Office They had duplexes and triplexes segregated from single family homes and that is the way it ended up in our data base What that means is a duplex that has the same impervious as the average single family home would pay the same fee

Ms Wheeler stated the lady in the duplex is paying $4 and something

Mr Schumacher stated that means she has more impervious area than the average single family home Her impervious area has been measured and multiplied out in the rate and that is why it is coming up a little higher

Ms Wheeler stated when the lady called the Storm Water Department she was told that was commercial property

Mr Schumacher said it is commercial in the sense the rate is applied to the actually square footage rather than falling into the two tier categories single family homes do A duplex that has 2,600 square feet of impervious area, and a single family home that has 2,600 square feet, would pay the same exact figure

Councilmember Patterson said the lady actually gets a better deal, perhaps

Mr Schumacher stated if we were charging based on residential units, she would be paying the $5 20 As it is, she is paying on the actual square footage she has which comes out to $4

Councilmember Martin said he has had a lot of people call and complain They feel like the 2,600 square feet above and the 2,600 square feet below is not fair Some of them throw out some wealthy person's name who lives in a big mansion and wonder why their rates are not higher Is it correct no one and no organization is exempt from this fee, hospitals, libraries, schools, and churches?

Mr Schumacher answered there are two exemptions in the ordinance One is railroad tracks, the actual track It does not make sense to try calculate the impervious area of a railroad track Other railroad facilities, their buildings and parking lots, if they are operated by the railroad then they are charged the rate, just the track itself is exempt The second exemption is the North Carolina DOT highways The judgement there was the maintenance of the drainage system, and remember, there are storm drains under the State maintained streets If we charge them a fee, then that means we end up maintaining their storm drainage Operationally, it did not make sense for us to be responsible for the pipes that are under their streets Then the State would be responsible for the streets themselves That is the same judgement we made in organizing
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Our Street Maintenance Division maintains the street, when we came to the
question should Streets Maintenance continue to be responsible for the storm drainage in the City
streets or should Engineering begin to take that over because of storm water. The answer was no. Operationally, it makes sense for the Street Maintenance people to continue to do that in the street. What we are doing with our contractors through Engineering is doing the work on private property in people's front yard, backyard and so forth. That is why the ordinance included the State highways. Other than those two, there are no other exemptions. All public and private properties are levied the charge.

Councilmember Majeed asked Mr. Schumacher to share with him based on what he is hearing about the highways, if a private entrepreneur has a retention pond why don't they get a 100% credit against what they pay if they have provided the detention process for dealing with storm water?

Mr. Schumacher answered if their detention pond reduces the impact of their development 100%, then they do get 100% credit. The credit they get is proportional to how well their detention basin offsets the impact of their development. If you take a piece of vacant property that has a small amount of water that runs off of it, then you develop it, there is a much higher amount of water. The closer you get back to the amount of water running off that existed naturally, the more credit you get. If you can get all the way back, then you would get a 100% credit. It is based on the three criteria of the peak rate of run off, the volume of the run off, and the pollution content in that run off.

Mr. Majeed said this is a very definitive type of analysis you are stating. He has heard some people say only 30%. You are saying something quite different, you can get 100%. In other words, he doesn't have to pay 100% of that fee. Is that written off in that way?

Mr. Schumacher answered that policy you adopted allows for up to 100% Any of the older detention basins don't accomplish what it takes to get 100%. Somebody who is going to develop a piece of property today is likely to design their detention basin to meet the standards and get the maximum credit they can. The older facilities that were built years ago are not going to accomplish that. The standards we required in years past did not require them to meet that 100% offset. If they did only what we required them to do in the past, then their facility does not warrant the full credit.

Councilmember Mangum stated those people can bring those up to standards.

Mr. Schumacher stated they can go back and retrofit those basins in order to get a larger credit. Of course, that is an economic thing. It costs x dollars to go back and retrofit it in exchange for more credit. The economics of what kind of return you get from doing that is independent to each site.

Mr. Majeed asked have you had quite a number of people who have requested upgrades, and for the Engineering Department to come out and evaluate a site for these specific types?

Mr. Schumacher answered no, they apply for the credit. Their engineer will apply for the credit to go through the calculations based on existing facilities and standards, and determine how much their credit amount should be, then they submit that. It is very similar to the way new development occurs. When a new development occurs, and they have to install a basin, the property owner uses an engineer to design that facility. Then it is reviewed by the Engineering Department.

Mr. Schumacher continued, the one remaining thing to cover is the level of service we are experiencing in terms of request for service and how we expect to deal with those. There is good news and bad news. The good news is we were right, there is a large backlog of problems out there that need to be repaired. The bad news is that means we have a backlog of projects that will take years to eliminate. There are basically two kinds of projects. A remedial repair is making a repair to the existing drainage system. We have pipes, culverts, and ditches that have been out there since the land was originally developed. They have fallen into disrepair over the years. So a repair project simply goes and repairs that existing pipe, dredges that ditch.
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or whatever. On the other hand, a Capital Improvement Project would be a major reconstruction of an existing facility or even the construction of a new facility. You might equate it to roads and thoroughfares. We maintain, we go patch five holes or perhaps do a little widening on existing thoroughfares, that is a maintenance, a repair. When we go and construct a new project, that is a Capital Project. We are trying to look at the storm water projects in the same way. The projected backlog a year and a half ago when we were trying to decide what the level of demand would be for these services and everybody set the rate. We projected there would be enough projects out there today that would take us ten years just to do them all. One of the policy statements that came from your task force and ultimately was adopted was setting a goal of eliminating that backlog in ten years. When the rubber meets the road it is what we are getting to today and that is actually telling a citizen, yes, you have a drainage problem, it qualifies for us to fix it, and we will be there as soon as we can, which is five, seven or ten years from now. We have not yet started telling people that. So far we have gotten away with saying it is a new program and we are still measuring how long it takes to make various repairs and as soon as we can calculate that, we will be back in touch with you. It is time for us to get truthful with the citizens and start giving them a realistic expectation of when we can do that. While we don’t have a problem we didn’t expect, we have just raised the caution flag and let you know that we are getting ready to do that. That is no doubt going to start generating some comments and concerns from the general public.

Mr. Mangum asked is that based strictly on the rates for collection?

Mr. Schumacher stated our original plan was to basically operate on a pay as you go strategy in the first four to five years while we assessed the overall needs, particularly for those large capital projects. Then in years five or six, look at a bond referendum that would give us a large sum of money where we could go out and start addressing some of those large projects. The rate we have right now was not intended to accommodate bonds. Of course, some of those pay as you go dollars could be redesignated to cover bond debt which would allow a bond package during those first five years if that was your choice. That is one option. That is one way to try and shorten the waiting period for these people. Take some of the pay as you go dollars, covert it to debt and have more dollars up front.

Mr. Mangum asked are you staffed in order to be able to handle that if that were tangible?

Mr. Schumacher answered your first opportunity, and that opportunity is nearly gone, is this fall to have a bond referendum. If we put bonds on this fall and they pass we would be in a situation where we could gear up and start that very quickly. That decision would have to be made in the next two weeks to make this fall’s bond.

Councilmember McCrory asked is the County in some shape with major streams, will it take them that long, too?

Mr. Schumacher answered the needs they have identified will take many years. Yes, they have a several year backlog on the major streams. They are going to be in the same situation on the minor streams outside the City with their backlog. Let me go through very quickly some of the things we thought of to try and address, and do some of these things quicker. One is new products such as plastic pipe. The traditional way to install storm drainage and lake pipe is to use concrete pipe and occasionally we would use corrugated metal pipe. Those require heavy equipment to install. When you are working in someone’s backyard or between two homes in the side yard where there may be on 20 - 25 feet between the homes, that can get very difficult. We are really interested in plastic pipes. It is a corrugated plastic pipe that has a smooth lining. Two men could carry 20 feet of it and throw it in the hole. We are real optimistic that will be a good solution for us and will let us do things quicker. Another thing is the community service crew. We have been talking with the County about providing us with people who have been sentenced to community service who we would put out doing hand work in the drainage system. A problem somewhere that requires some cleaning of silt, debris, and vegetation at the end of a channel. It is primarily hand work. For us to pay a contractor would be relatively expensive. If we can put a crew of three, four or five of these type folks out there, we are in essence getting free labor. All it costs us is the foreman to oversee what they are doing. That is something we have been looking at and probably can begin very quickly. The reallocation of
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dollars, our program has a balance between making the repair projects and making the County’s projects. One solution is to say let’s do fewer capital projects which enables us to do more of the maintenance and repair projects. That steps on that short term solution. The capital projects are very important and there are a number of those capital projects that just have to be done and could not be deferred. While that is an option, it is not one he would particularly recommend to Council. You have already touched on the last one, which is additional dollars. The one way to get additional dollars within the existing rate is sometime in the coming years, leverage some of the money through a bond referendum. That would enable us to step up either the repairs, the capital, or both without affecting the rating.

Mr. Schumacher continued the other issue we are going to be looking at is how to prioritize these projects. Right now we are working on high priority projects, those that involve structural damage. If somebody’s home is already experiencing or is about to experience some kind of structural damage because of a failing storm drain or erosion, if the flooding of the living space, flooding of the home or if there is some specific safety hazard, those types of things are being given priority. Once we work through those, and there is somewhere in the neighborhood of 75 to 100 of those which is not occupying the rest of this year, what we are left with is the less severe problems. We have to decide how are we going to do those. Are we going to do them in the order they were requested? In the order the citizens called and asked for service? Or, are we going to pick a particular neighborhood and go and say do everything in that neighborhood that needs to be done. Should we pick a stream and start at the bottom and work up? There are some real technical reasons to start at the bottom of the stream and work up. There are some efficiencies in going to a neighborhood and doing everything you find to do there instead of hopping around from site to site all over town. Those are some of the issues we are trying to focus on right now. He believes the Manager is going to suggest we bring these issues to the Planning Committee for some further review and eventual recommendations.

Mr. Majeed said some of the older neighborhoods in his district such as Druid Hills have never had a drainage system put in. We have gone back to days when there was no representation on this body that could address those issues. We are not responsible for that but we inherit that condition. In the cases of the older neighborhoods, where these amenities are absent as far as basic drainage, are they going to get priority? People for a long time have been waiting for some sort of basic services as far as drainage, simple things. It’s a tough situation but is there someway the old neighborhoods can get prioritized as far as hierarchy for getting things done.

Mr. Schumacher answered that certainly is a factor to include in the list we try to sort through.

Mr. White said it is also true that in many of the older neighborhoods is where the more serious problems are. So there will be parallel areas we can work through some of those issues to tackle it. The main concern we are expressing to you is the resources are not going to be there to do this work in a timely basis. What he has suggested we do is to alert you to that which is being done. Then we will develop a strategy and come back to you with a more quickly developed action plan to tackle some of those problems earlier than we first thought. It could include borrowing money to accelerate getting into some of the major issues.

Mr. Majeed said he appreciates the Manager’s focus on this, but somehow that means in between getting those types of jobs done, we could facilitate more communications because people are having expectations. They are paying $230 or whatever the fee, and they are having expectations. That means from the staffing viewpoint we are going to have to facilitate more touching bases with these communities. There are going to have to be lines of communications.

Councilmember Reid said when he read the prioritization, he noticed with interest we got a Thumbs Up letter recently from a Senior Vice President of Royal Insurance about solving his storm water over there off Colvard Road. He thought he would ride over and take a look and see how we are prioritizing these things. That street through there is relatively new and it does have some drainage problems, but it seems to him it could have been anticipated by the builder and we shouldn’t be paying for that kind of thing. He wondered how this person got elevated to the top of the list when we supposedly have a lot of life-threatening water problems around the City.
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Mr. Schumacher said he was not familiar with that project specifically.

Mayor Vinroot said that is one where he basically paid it himself.

Mr. White said it could be where it was a 50-50 cost share. If you would like a report on that we can get it.

Mr. Reid stated he would like a report.

Mr. Martin stated the 50-50 cost share is causing him some concern. He hopes we don’t get into a mode where those that can afford to pay 50% get on the top of the list and get service, and those that can’t afford to pay it get on the long waiting list. He understands also that with the 50-50 cost that is a way to cut down the list. He hopes we eventually balance those two kinds of situations.

Mr. Schumacher stated the policy Council adopted limited the amount of money each year that could go that way.

Councilmember Clodfelter stated we need to pay attention to what Mr. Schumacher and Mr. White said to us. This is going to be a long haul and we are going to get a lot of calls in the next five to seven years. One of the things we are going to have to learn how to do is communicate what a long haul this is. He wants to share one perspective he has used with some folks to help them understand what this is all about. If you can imagine being in a City of 400,000 people, and every house in the city is on a well and septic tank, and all of a sudden we discover one day about 15-20% of your wells or septic tanks are going dry and you decide that day to put in a public water and sewer system. How long do you think, how many years would it take to get all the lines laid and all the streets and people hooked up. That is the magnitude of the task. It calls on us to be real patient and explain to folks why, even though they have to start paying today, we are building the system from absolute scratch. We didn’t build a water and sewer system or a road system from scratch. We need to listen to what Mr. Schumacher says because we are going to start getting phone calls and they are going to call every month.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Brenda R. Freeze, City Clerk

---

Length of Meeting 1 Hour, 5 Minutes
Minutes Completed July 23, 1993
The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, convened for a briefing on Monday, June 14, 1993, at 5:25 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Richard Vinroot presiding. Councilmembers present were Stan Campbell, Dan Clodfelter, Ann Hammond, Pat McCrory, Nasif Majeed, Tom Mangum, Hoyle Martin, Cyndee Patterson, Don Reid, Ella Scarborough and Lynn Wheeler.

ABSENT: None

* * * * * *

CENTRALINA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT (COG)

Mayor Vinroot stated a few weeks ago several Council members asked questions about COG and why we are a member, should we be a member, and all of that. We thought we should have folks here from COG to tell us what we do as a member of COG and to answer any questions you may have.

David Ward, Chairman of COG stated he also a member of the Gaston County Board of Commissioners. Being an elected official he knows the constraints you are going through and the problems. He is in his ninth year in government and has a little experience under his belt and assures Council it does not get any easier as you go through this process.

Staff members with him tonight to answer any questions are Lee Amour, Executive Director of COG, and Charles Phillips, Centralina’s Business Manager. Thank you for giving him the opportunity to come before you and to explain the services which COG provides to the citizens of Charlotte. COG was formed in 1968, and is a voluntary association of local governments owned and governed by our membership. In 1970, the State delineated boundaries of multi-county planning and development regions. In 1971, COG was designated as one of 17, now 18 lead regional organizations or LRO, as they are known in North Carolina. Our purpose is to establish goals and objectives, serve as the regional agent in dealing with State and Federal agencies, and to promote intergovernmental cooperation, communication and planning.

COG provides services not only to member governments, but to other jurisdictions in both North and South Carolina. Examples of work conducted in South Carolina include serving as staff to the Lake Wylie-Marine Commission of which he is a member and has been a charter member of that Commission, and the Catawba River Corridor Study, both of which involve York County. The annual contribution of each member government is based on the budget adopted for the year and is assessed on each member’s population. COG dues are 17 cents per capita, the lowest of any LRO in the State. The next lowest is 21 cents per capita. The State average is about twice the COG rate.

Mr. Ward stated he will now review the services which COG provides to the citizens of Charlotte. The four service categories are: Service programs, regional forums, regional planning efforts, and technical assistance. The service programs are aging grants, emergency services activities, and solid waste activities. For services to older adults in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, COG provides funding to the following agencies: Mecklenburg Department of Social Services, including in-home aid, transportation, congregate meals, and home delivered meals, Mecklenburg Health Department in-home aid, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Senior Center Operations and Out Reach, and Legal Services for the elderly. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Youth Counsel provides employment for older adults. Of the 17 hot lunch sites located in Mecklenburg, 14 are within Charlotte’s City limits and serve predominately City residents. Aging Staff works with groups and task forces who have City employees as representatives from the City’s Special Transportation Department and the Housing Authority. COG’s ombudsman advocates for residents of nursing and domiciliary homes. The major part of staff time is spent working with Charlotte-Mecklenburg residents, staff and families to resolve grievances, to provide information on facilities and to advocate for residents’ rights. One major emphasis of the program is to tell the State of the need for more nursing home beds in the City. COG Emergency Services Section administers a regional grant for emergency medical services which impact all the citizens of Charlotte. The grant program supports a number of specific local projects, as well as regional efforts to improve emergency response. Some of these projects include providing training through EMS grant funds for emergency medical dispatch courses for Mecklenburg County Police Telecommunicators, who under consolidation will become City...
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employees staffing the regions communication group which coordinates emergency communication region wide. Sponsoring the region’s critical incident stress debriefing team, which is available to all emergency responders in the region. Providing equipment on a regular basis to hospitals and other emergency responders in Charlotte for advance training. The staff also publishes a monthly training calendar and fund other training opportunities for emergency responders through community colleges such as CPCC. Also, staffing the Metrolina Trauma Forum which provides continuing education on trauma care for physicians and nurses. This is heavily attended by people from Charlotte hospitals.

Mr. Ward continued, Centralina Development Corporation (CDC) helps provide financing to small business owners. The CDC has helped finance 37 projects within Charlotte which have created 690 new jobs, increased the City’s tax base by over $30 million, and generates over $228,000 annually in City property taxes alone. Centralina Solid Waste Services was started two years ago. Our staff serves as a liaison between Solid Waste agencies and the region, and provides education and training to solid waste and recycling officials. COG administers the Marine Commission for Lake Norman and Lake Wylie. The commission works with the County Police on the lake’s water safety issues. As police consolidation comes about, other activities which may involve the Charlotte Mecklenburg Police are joint safety operations, and emergency services coordination. COG regularly conducts forums with City and County Managers, planning officials, emergency services communications directors, emergency medical services directors, law enforcement executives, and solid waste and recycling personnel. In these meetings, officials from around the region discuss their work and explore ways to coordinate services better.

Mr. Ward stated to meet the need of coordinating planning activities and communications on a regional level, COG is the lead agency in the following regional planning initiatives, the Bi-State Catawba River Task Force, The Catawba River Corridor Study, the "Our Region Tomorrow" Regional Strategic Plan which we announced recently, and The Regional Building Permit Tracking System. The Bi-State Catawba River Task Force which includes representatives from North and South Carolina is staffed by COG. In this group government agencies, utilities and private citizens discuss river related issues and problems, and then identify solutions. The Catawba River Corridor Study is a strategic plan that will examine the status of a river and identify issues and strategies for the river from Lake Norman to Lake Wylie. This study is important to Charlotte because growth is moving closer to the lake and Mountain Island Lake is a source of water to City residents. COG is coordinating a regional strategic plan entitled "Our Region Tomorrow" to examine regional issues of concern. Representatives appointed by Charlotte and other local governments will determine strategies local governments may take to maintain and improve the region’s quality of life and economic vitality. The study will identify achievable goals, objectives, and policies local governments may adopt and may examine topics such as recreation, environmental issues, public safety, needs of special population groups and government services. COG is collecting building permit information on the census track level from the 13 county Charlotte region. This data, which is available on a regional basis only from COG, is important to Charlotte as growth in the surrounding areas impacts local planning decisions.

Mr. Ward continued, furthermore it is a valuable tool to market the region as markets do not stop at political boundaries. Assisting in this effort is Dr. Al Stewart of UNCC. The COG has a regional geographic information system which collects and displays data ranging from general population statistics to detailed development activity. Data collected and displayed includes population and housing patterns, labor and employment information, and key socio-economic indicators. Our GIS displays the data and assists in the analysis of patterns and trends occurring in the region. Current applications include Catawba River Corridor Study, Regional Building Permit Tracking System, Regional Atlas and Regional Strategic Plan. Future plans for system include a regional data base of infrastructure and land use information. COG operates a large technical assistance program. It increases the quality of planning and public administration within the region, and pays a large portion of our overhead to keep member dues low. While Charlotte uses this service less than some members, it provides real benefits to Charlotte. Technical assistance provided to Charlotte recently includes the following, COG has provided relocation services since 1989 to over 200 households affected by noise and runway expansion at Charlotte-Douglas International Airport. These services include initial screening and
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orientation, individual needs and analysis, advisory services in coordination with moving
companies during the actual relocation and claims reimbursement administration. The focus
2010 project uses COG employees to serve as meeting facilitator and reporters. COG provided
the greatest number of staff persons in this capacity. COG staff has assisted the City in
inputting data in their computer mapping system.

Mr. Ward said in conclusion, he feels the services COG provides are vital to the continued well
being of Charlotte and this region. We have all talked about regionalism in the last few years.
Mayor Vinroot has been very strong on regionalism and he believes in it also. As Charlotte
continues to grow, the need to reflect on issues of a regional nature will increase and our
abilities to address local problems will increasingly require cooperation among local
governments. COG is the designed lead regional organization for the Charlotte area, and
continued support of COG by Charlotte is essential. Mr. Hoyle Martin is your delegate and he
really enjoys working with Mr. Martin. He has been an asset to the board since he has been
with COG. You have an excellent representative on the board. We always look forward to
seeing Mr. Martin at our meetings. If you have any questions, Mr. Armour or Mr. Phillips will
be glad to answer them for you.

STORM WATER

Mr. Jim Schumacher, Engineering Department stated in the agenda packet there are two
numbers that do not agree. In the text of the description of the hearing tonight it notes the
existing storm water rate for non-single family properties is $32.84. In the table on the next
page it shows the rate at $35.82, which is the correct number. Briefly he will touch on the
hearing on the agenda for tonight. This hearing is to consider a change to the rate itself.

Mayor Vinroot said he was going to interrupt the Citizens Hearing sharply at 7:00 p.m. when
he presumes the County Commissioners will be there. They are in the middle of their own
meeting. He will stop the Citizens Hearing because we have a long list of people and go ahead
and have the public hearing on this item at 7:00 p.m., which is OK in accordance with our public
notice given of that. When we finish with that, there is only one speaker signed up on that item.
He suspects we will be in a position to resolve that matter and go back to the Citizens Hearing
and pick up where we left off.

Mr. Schumacher said that will work just fine. He doesn't have anything to say except to briefly
review how we get to this point. The purpose of the hearing is to consider a change to the fee
that would accommodate the activities by Mecklenburg County inside the City. The City and
the County do different things. Inside the City, the County is responsible for the large streams,
those with the water shed grade of one-eighth of one square mile. The City handles what you
would call the urban drainage system. The tributary systems, the storm drains, culverts, catch
basins, and ditches that carry the water to those large streams. The rate we began charging in
January inside the City was designed to fund those small streams, those drainage system
activities. The 32 cents purposed by the County to add to that charge would fund their large
stream activities. They currently pay for those activities out of their general fund and their
intention as he understands it is to transfer those activities from the general fund to this fee revenue,
thereby removing that charge from the general fund.

Mayor Vinroot asked do we know at this point the County charge for the other county storm
water services in the County? He assumes the same 32 cents.

Mr. Schumacher answered the 32 cents would be the same and the other charges are proposed
to be the same. When the County did their rates study, they went through the same rate study
process we did, which is to calculate how much money they needed based on their needs, divide
that by the impervious area they expected to find in order to calculate a rate. They came up
with a number that was within pennies of the rate we had already adopted. We all sat around
a table and said it makes sense, the tolerance in these numbers is at least that great, it makes
sense to adjust their number a few pennies so it would be consistent throughout the County.

Mayor Vinroot asked can you explain why they are that close? He would have thought there
are fewer tax payers there so the volume of the funds, the amount of money generated, would be considerable lower. He had the impression these storm water problems were urban city problems and therefore almost non-existent in the County where the land had not been developed.

Mr Schumacher stated remember the County includes the six towns. Their numbers include providing those services in the six towns.

Mayor Vinroot asked even so, that is a fairly small geographic area by comparison.

Mr Schumacher stated he can't answer other than to say when they went through the process of calculating the revenue needs they would have, that was a lower number than ours. The revenue they can generate is also a lower number. It happened to come out very close.

Councilmember Wheeler asked how are duplexes factored in? A lady called today and asked that question. Are they commercial or residential about their rate?

Mr Schumacher answered remember there are not two different rates. A single family home pays the same rate as other types of properties. The difference is single family homes are put into two categories. Below the 2,000 square feet and above 2,000 square feet. Duplexes were considered non-single family for purposes of calculating rates, primarily because the Tax Office has them classified as non-single family. Our data base was created from the information from the Tax Office. They had duplexes and triplexes segregated from single family homes and that is the way it ended up in our data base. What that means is a duplex that has the same impervious as the average single family home would pay the same fee.

Ms Wheeler stated the lady in the duplex is paying $4 and something.

Mr Schumacher stated that means she has more impervious area than the average single family home. Her impervious area has been measured and multiplied out in the rate and that is why it is coming up a little higher.

Ms Wheeler stated when the lady called the Storm Water Department she was told that was commercial property.

Mr Schumacher said it is commercial in the sense the rate is applied to the actually square footage rather than falling into the two tier categories single family homes do. A duplex that has 2,600 square feet of impervious area, and a single family home that has 2,600 square feet, would pay the same exact figure.

Councilmember Patterson said the lady actually gets a better deal, perhaps.

Mr Schumacher stated if we were charging based on residential units, she would be paying the $5.20. As it is, she is paying on the actual square footage she has which comes out to $4.

Councilmember Martin said he has had a lot of people call and complain. They feel like the 2,600 square feet above and the 2,600 square feet below is not fair. Some of them throw out some wealthy person's name who lives in a big mansion and wonder why their rates are not higher. Is it correct? No one and no organization is exempt from this fee, hospitals, libraries, schools, and churches?

Mr Schumacher answered there are two exemptions in the ordinance. One is railroad tracks, the actual track. It does not make sense to try calculate the impervious area of a railroad track. Other railroad facilities, their buildings and parking lots, if they are operated by the railroad then they are charged the rate, just the track itself is exempt. The second exemption is the North Carolina DOT highways. The judgement there was the maintenance of the drainage system, and remember, there are storm drains under the State maintained streets. If we charge them a fee, then that means we end up maintaining their storm drainage. Operationally, it did not make sense for us to be responsible for the pipes that are under their streets. Then the State would be responsible for the streets themselves. That is the same judgement we made in organizing.
our own operation. Our Street Maintenance Division maintains the street, when we came to the question should Streets Maintenance continue to be responsible for the storm drainage in the City streets or should Engineering begin to take that over because of storm water. The answer was no. Operationally, it makes sense for the Street Maintenance people to continue to do that in the street. What we are doing with our contractors through Engineering is doing the work on private property in people's front yard, backyard and so forth. That is why the ordinance included the State highways. Other than those two, there are no other exemptions. All public and private properties are levied the charge.

Councilmember Majeed asked Mr. Schumacher to share with him based on what he is hearing about the highways, if a private entrepreneur has a retention pond why don't they get a 100% credit against what they pay if they have provided the detention process for dealing with storm water?

Mr. Schumacher answered if their detention pond reduces the impact of their development 100%, then they do get 100% credit. The credit they get is proportional to how well their detention basin offsets the impact of their development. If you take a piece of vacant property that has a small amount of water that runs off of it, then you develop it, there is a much higher amount of water. The closer you get back to the amount of water running off that existed naturally, the more credit you get. If you can get all the way back, then you would get a 100% credit. It is based on the three criteria of the peak rate of run off, the volume of the run off, and the pollution content in that run off.

Mr. Majeed said this is a very definitive type of analysis you are stating. He has heard some people say only 30%. You are saying something quite different, you can get 100%. In other words, he doesn't have to pay 100% of that fee. Is that written off in that way?

Mr. Schumacher answered that policy you adopted allows for up to 100%. Any of the older detention basins don't accomplish what it takes to get 100%. Somebody who is going to develop a piece of property today is likely to design their detention basin to meet the standards and get the maximum credit they can. The older facilities that were built years ago are not going to accomplish that. The standards we required in years past did not require them to meet that 100% offset. If they did only what we required them to do in the past, then their facility does not warrant the full credit.

Councilmember Mangum stated those people can bring those up to standards.

Mr. Schumacher stated they can go back and retrofit those basins in order to get a larger credit. Of course, that is an economic thing. It costs x dollars to go back and retrofit it in exchange for more credit. The economics of what kind of return you get from doing that is independent to each site.

Mr. Majeed asked have you had quite a number of people who have requested upgrades, and for the Engineering Department to come out and evaluate a site for these specific types?

Mr. Schumacher answered no, they apply for the credit. Their engineer will apply for the credit to go through the calculations based on existing facilities and standards, and determine how much their credit amount should be, then they submit that. It is very similar to the way new development occurs. When a new development occurs and they have to install a basin the property owner uses an engineer to design that facility. Then it is reviewed by the Engineering Department.

Mr. Schumacher continued, the one remaining thing to cover is the level of service we are experiencing in terms of request for service and how we expect to deal with those. There is good news and bad news. The good news is we were right, there is a large backlog of problems out there that need to be repaired. The bad news is that means we have a backlog of projects that will take years to eliminate. There are basically two kinds of projects. A remedial repair is making a repair to the existing drainage system. We have pipes, culverts, and ditches that have been out there since the land was originally developed. They have fallen into disrepair over the years. So a repair project simply goes and repairs that existing pipe, dredges that ditch.
June 14, 1993
City Council Briefing
Minutes Book 102, Page 234

or whatever. On the other hand, a Capital Improvement Project would be a major reconstruction of an existing facility or even the construction of a new facility. You might equate it to roads and thoroughfares. We maintain, we go patch five holes or perhaps do a little widening on existing thoroughfares, that is a maintenance, a repair. When we go and construct a new project, that is a Capital Project. We are trying to look at the storm water projects in the same way. The projected backlog a year and a half ago when we were trying to decide what the level of demand would be for these services and everybody set the rate. We projected there would be enough projects out there today that would take us ten years just to do them all. One of the policy statements that came from your task force and ultimately was adopted was setting a goal of eliminating that backlog in ten years. When the rubber meets the road it is what are we getting to today and that is actually telling a citizen, yes, you have a drainage problem, it qualifies for us to fix it, and we will be there as soon as we can, which is five, seven or ten years from now. We have not yet started telling people that. So far we have gotten away with saying it is a new program and we are still measuring how long it takes to make various repairs and as soon as we can calculate that, we will be back in touch with you. It is time for us to get truthful with the citizens and start giving them a realistic expectation of when we can do that. While we don't have a problem we didn't expect, we have just raised the caution flag and let you know that we are getting ready to do that. That is no doubt going to start generating some comments and concerns from the general public.

Mr Mangum asked is that based strictly on the rates for collection?

Mr Schumacher stated our original plan was to basically operate on a pay as you go strategy in the first four to five years while we assessed the overall needs, particularly for those large capital projects. Then in year five or six, look at a bond referendum that would give us a large sum of money where we could go out and start addressing some of those large projects. The rate we have right now was not intended to accommodate bonds. Of course, some of those pay as you go dollars could be redesignated to cover bond debt which would allow a bond package during those first five years if that was your choice. That is one option. That is one way to try and shorten the waiting period for these people. Take some of the pay as you go dollars, covert it to debt and have more dollars up front.

Mr Mangum asked are you staffed in order to be able to handle that if that were tangible?

Mr Schumacher answered your first opportunity, and that opportunity is nearly gone, is this fall to have a bond referendum. If we put bonds on this fall and they pass we would be in a situation where we could gear up and start that very quickly. That decision would have to be made in the next two weeks to make this fall's bond.

Councilmember McCrory asked is the County in some shape with major streams, will it take them that long, too?

Mr Schumacher answered the needs they have identified will take many years. Yes, they have a several year backlog on the major streams. They are going to be in the same situation on the minor streams outside the City with their backlog. Let me go through very quickly some of the things we thought to try and address, and do some of these things quicker. One is new products such as plastic pipe. The traditional way to install storm drainage and take pipe is to use concrete pipe and occasionally we would use corrugated metal pipe. Those require heavy equipment to install. When you are working in someone's backyard or between two homes in the side yard where there may be on 20 - 25 feet between the homes, that can get very difficult. We are really interested in plastic pipe. It is a corrugated plastic pipe that has a smooth lining. Two men could carry 20 feet of it and throw it in the hole. We are real optimistic that will be a good solution for us and will let us do things quicker. Another thing is the community service crew. We have been talking with the County about providing us with people who have been sentenced to community service who we would put out doing hand work in the drainage system. A problem somewhere that requires some cleaning of silt, debris, and vegetation at the end of a channel. It is primarily hand work. For us to pay a contractor would be relatively expensive. If we can put a crew of three, four or five of these type folks out there, we are in essence getting free labor. All it costs us is the foreman to oversee what they are doing. That is something we have been looking at and probably can begin very quickly. The reallocation of
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Our program has a balance between making the repair projects and making the County's projects. One solution is to let's do fewer capital projects which enables us to do more of the maintenance and repair projects. That stems on that short term solution. The capital projects are very important and there are a number of those capital projects that just have to be done and could not be deferred. While that is an option, it is not one we would particularly recommend to Council. You have already touched on the last one, which is additional dollars. The one way to get additional dollars within the existing rate is sometime in the coming years, leverage some of the money through a bond referendum. That would enable us to step up either the repairs, the capital, or both without affecting the rating.

Mr. Schumacher continued the other issue we are going to be looking at is how to prioritize these projects. Right now we are working on high priority projects, those that involve structural damage. If somebody's home is already experiencing, or is about to experience some kind of structural damage because of a failing storm drain or erosion, if the flooding of the living space, flooding of the home or if there is some specific safety hazard, those types of things are being given priority. Once we work through those and there is somewhere in the neighborhood of 75 to 100 of those which is not occupying the rest of this year, what we are left with is the less severe problems. We have to decide how are we going to do those. Are we going to do them in the order they were requested? In the order the citizens called and asked for service? Or, are we going to pick a particular neighborhood and go and say do everything in that neighborhood that needs to be done. Should we pick a stream and start at the bottom and work up? There are some real technical reasons to start at the bottom of the stream and work up.

There are some efficiencies in going to a neighborhood and doing everything you find to do there instead of hopping around from site to site all over town. Those are some of the issues we are trying to focus in on right now. He believes the Manager is going to suggest we bring these issues to the Planning Committee for some further review and eventual recommendations.

Mr. Majeeed said some of the older neighborhoods in his district such as Druid Hills have never had a drainage system put in. We have gone back to days when there was no representation on this body that could address those issues. We are not responsible for that but we inherit that condition. In the cases of the older neighborhoods, where these amenities are absent as far as basic drainage, are they going to get priority? People for a long time have been waiting for some sort of basic services as far as drainage, simple things. It's a tough situation but is there someway the old neighborhoods can get priority as far as hierarchy for getting things done.

Mr. Schumacher answered that certainly is a factor to include in the list we try to sort through.

Mr. White said it is also true that in many of the older neighborhoods is where the more serious problems are. So there will be parallel areas we can work though some of those issues to tackle it. The main concern we are expressing to you is the resources are not going to be there to do this work in a timely basis. What he has suggested we do is to alert you to that which is being done. Then we will develop a strategy and come back to you with a more quickly developed action plan to tackle some of those problems earlier than we first thought. It could include borrowing money to accelerate getting into some of the major issues.

Mr. Majeeed said he appreciates the Manager's focus on this, but somehow that means in between getting those types of jobs done, we could facilitate more communications because people are having expectations. They are paying $2 30 or whatever the fee, and they are having expectations. That means from the staffing viewpoint we are going to have to facilitate more touching bases with these communities. There are going to have to be lines of communications.

Councilmember Reid said when he read the prioritization, he noticed with interest we got a Thumbs Up letter recently from a Senior Vice President of Royal Insurance about solving his storm water over there off Colvard Road. He thought he would ride over and take a look and see how we are prioritizing these things. That street through there is relatively new and it does have some drainage problems, but it seems to him it could have been anticipated by the builder and we shouldn't be paying for that kind of thing. He wondered how this person got elevated to the top of the list when we supposedly have a lot of life threatening water problems around the City.
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Mr. Schumacher said he was not familiar with that project specifically.

Mayor Vinroot said that is one where he basically paid it himself.

Mr. White said it could be where it was a 50-50 cost share. If you would like a report on that we can get it.

Mr. Reid stated he would like a report.

Mr. Martin stated the 50-50 cost share is causing him some concern. He hopes we don't get into a mode where those that can afford to pay 50% get on the top of the list and get service, and those that can't afford to pay it get on the long waiting list. He understands also that with the 50-50 cost that is a way to cut down the list. He hopes we eventually balance those two kinds of situations.

Mr. Schumacher stated the policy Council adopted limited the amount of money each year that could go that way.

Councilmember Clodfelter stated we need to pay attention to what Mr. Schumacher and Mr. White said to us. This is going to be a long haul and we are going to get a lot of calls in the next five to seven years. One of the things we are going to have to learn how to do is communicate what a long haul this is. He wants to share one perspective he has used with some folks to help them understand what this is all about. If you can imagine being in a City of 400,000 people, and every house in the city is on a well and septic tank, and all of a sudden we discover one day about 15-20% of your wells or septic tanks are going dry and you decided that day to put in a public water and sewer system. How long do you think, how many years would it take to get all the lines laid and all the streets and people hooked up? That is the magnitude of the task. It calls on us to be real patient and explain to folks why, even though they have to start paying today, we are building the system from absolute scratch. We didn't build a water and sewer system or a road system from scratch. We need to listen to what Mr. Schumacher says because we are going to start getting phone calls and they are going to call every month.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Brenda R. Freeze, City Clerk

Length of Meeting 1 Hour, 5 Minutes
Minutes Completed July 23, 1993

bbm
The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for their regular session on Monday, June 14, 1993, at 8:30 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center, with Mayor Richard Vinroot presiding. Councilmembers present were Stan Campbell, Dan Clodfelter, Ann Hammond, Pat McCrory, Nastif Majeed, Tom Mangum, Hoyle Martin, Cyndee Patterson, Don Reid, Ella Scarborough and Lynn Wheeler

ABSENT None

PUBLIC HEARING ON COUNTY STORM WATER FEE

Mayor Vinroot introduced Mr. Parks Helms, Chairman of the Mecklenburg County Commission, and Commissioners Patsy Kinsey, Doug Booth, Lloyd Scher, Ann Schrader, Edna Churco, and Bob Walton. They are here with Council to hold a public hearing on the County Storm Water Fee being proposed in the City of Charlotte.

Jim Schumacher, Civil Engineer/Storm Water Utility, introduced Wanda Towler and she gave a brief review of the County's program and the proposed fee.

Wanda Towler, Assistant County Manager, said last fall the City County and adopted a joint resolution relating to the joint operation of a single storm water system in this community for our areas of jurisdiction. Based on that resolution, the city began charging fees this past January for part of the storm water services cost for the city's program. Those fees were based on the amount of the impervious cover on a piece of property as opposed to being based on the value of the property. Also according to that joint resolution, beginning in January, 1994 when the county also intends to move to that same fee system to cover all or a portion of the cost of our storm water services program, the city would be agreeing to add the rates requested by the Board of County Commissioners, your existing storm water fees. That is why we are here tonight for this joint hearing on that addition and the amount that we will be asking the board to add to your fee will be 32 cents per equivalent residential unit.

Ms. Towler continued, the County basically responsible for operation and maintenance activities relating to regulated floodways, this community those large creeks with more than a one square mile water shed. The Council is responsible for minor systems relating to the smaller streams, the pipes and ditches and things like that. They are two programs that are separate and distinct and they are not duplicative.

Ms. Towler said in operating and maintaining the regulated floodway, we have five major program activities. One is to master plan these drainage areas and based on those master plans to construct regional drainage facilities to undertake major stream bank stabilization projects or stream channelization projects. We intend to provide the funding for that particular activity through bonds as we do today, and only a minor portion of those costs would be recovered through this fee. We also have a program component the ongoing operation and maintenance of those stream banks. Currently we regulate approximately one third of the regulated floodway. In the future we will be moving to take on the other two thirds of that area. We are also responsible for enforcing the regulated flood way ordinance throughout the community. Because these large creeks flow throughout the community and across major jurisdictional boundaries, we feel it is more appropriate and have had a program for a number of years in which this single entity had that responsibility. The county is also the local agency for the community rating system program. This particular program is one in which the residents and businesses in the area that participate in this program are potentially eligible to receive reductions in their insurance premiums for flood insurance. Currently the City of Charlotte, Pineville, Mint Hill, and the unincorporated areas of this community participate in this program and the residents and businesses of that area enjoy approximately a 5% reduction in insurance premiums for flood insurance. We would estimate that would rise to approximately 30% in approximately 3 years based on the improvements that this program will bring about. The final area that we are responsible for are the BMP's in the water sheds covered by county policies. As part of the master planning effort, we identify or construct BMP's to serve regional detention needs. Also within the Mountain Island Lake water shed, the Board of County Commissioners has adopted policies that would allow for the county to potentially operate and maintain BMP's on private property as well in order to protect the quality of the drinking water in that area. To
Mr. Martin said one of the statements in the agenda says the charge would be made to those towns which "choose to participate." Do they have an option, can they choose not to participate?

Ms. Towler said yes, just as you are responsible for storm water maintenance within the City limits of Charlotte, the towns also have the responsibility for storm water maintenance within the towns. Council has chosen to cooperate with the county through this joint resolution to continue the program that has both the city and the county providing services, with the county services focusing on the regulated floodway. The towns have that same option.

Mr. Martin said they would have the option to cooperate with the county the way the city is cooperating.

Ms. Towler said that is correct.

Mr. Mangum asked if the county was still charging those towns for the upkeep maintenance for the large tributaries that run through their towns in the county's capital improvement or the regular operating budget, other than the fee this way? Because they're contributing the run off in the county.

Ms. Towler said today all of our costs are recouped through the property tax. In the future we are hoping that all six of those towns will sign on for us to continue these services and use this different fee based approach for recouping those costs.

Mr. Mangum said but if they don't, you're still going to collect fees through property tax.

Ms. Towler said if they don't they will then have the responsibility for doing that.

**Reverend Charles Foushee, 7700 Tuckasegee Road,** said over the past 14 years he has made several appeals to our elected city officials. Most of these appeals have been ignored. In June of 1979, both his church and home were invaded by noise which resulted from the opening of a new runway at Charlotte Douglas International Airport. Over these past 14 years, very few city officials have responded to his plea for help. Mr. Hoyle Martin is the only elected city official who has shown a genuine interest in trying to remedy this problem and because of his efforts and those of aviation director Jerry Orr, new windows and doors have been installed in the church in the past 90 days. This has been a tremendous help. My home, however, is located by the church and continues to be badly affected by airport noise. Also on May 7, 1993, he mailed a letter to the Mayor and each of the City Council members concerning another problem which involves his church. The so-called storm water fee in his opinion is nothing more than another tax. Churches for the first time are called upon to pay a tax. The only request to his response was a letter from Don Reid. It is his request that this item be placed on an agenda for consideration in the near future and Council vote to exempt churches from this tax. He didn't realize the County Commissioners would be there, but he would mention this and include the County Commissioners, to any of you elected officials that have voted or will vote to impose a tax on churches, he promises that by God's help, he will use any influence he has to help get them removed from office during the next election.

**Michael Jackson, 6024 Ryder Ave.,** said he lives in district 7. There used to be a fast food commercial that talked about chicken and it had a line that became the subject of a lot of late night jokes, that said parts are parts. The same thing could be said about this storm water utility fee, taxes are taxes. It doesn't matter if the President calls them investments or if the City Council and County Commission call them fees, taxes are taxes. The storm water utility fee,
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rain water tax, illustrates a lot of government problems. First we’re told about all the critical problems and maintenance backlogs that this fee will help address. His question is why didn’t these problems receive attention before now. Surely the maintenance of existing capital structures is a high priority item. It is much more economical to properly maintain a structure than it is to repair neglect. The city and county should explain to the citizens why that has not been done. Second, the city and county are taking the responsibility from individuals and businesses to comply with the appropriate regulations and now taxpayers must shoulder that burden. Thirdly, there is the issue of government property that accounts for approximately 40% of the impervious area within the city. Streets are linear structures tied directly to the storm water systems and account for more of the problem than the 40% might indicate. Why is this predominate percentage of the impervious surface area allocated to individuals, businesses and churches as a fee? The impact on churches deserves special attention and there are many other issues of fairness and appropriateness. Finally, by calling this tax a fee, Council has imposed an additional 35% or higher premium on taxpayers in Mecklenburg and the City of Charlotte for the service. Because it is a fee, taxpayers can not deduct it from their state and federal taxes, and he for one does not want to pay any additional taxes to Washington or Raleigh, just because our local government wants to avoid the hard choices, and do not understand taxes are taxes. He urges Council to avoid penalizing taxpayers with these fees. That includes waste collection fees or any other future fees. Council may consider. Look closely at the budget and all of its components. Look closely at how this rain water tax is being budgeted, look closely at privatization, but most importantly, understand that taxes are taxes, and that as taxpayers we will hold you accountable to that standard.

Linda Shuler, Property Management Company, said they have been dealing with this since October for budgetary purposes trying to determine the amounts that they need to budget for their Homeowners Association for this tax. The city is not billing per residential unit on commercial properties, so how would that affect all the condominiums, town homes, homeowners associations, because you are billing on impervious area, not per unit.

Mr. Towler said this is the same thing as the City’s fee structure. It is assumed that you have a typical home and the equivalent residential unit is what is equivalent to approximately 2,000 square foot home. For commercial purposes it would be equivalent to every 2,613 square feet of impervious cover that you have, that would be an equivalent residential unit.

Ms. Shuler said so it’s 32 cents per 2,613 square feet?

Ms. Towler said yes, of impervious cover.

Mr. Martin said he thinks it would be helpful to the citizens if Mr. Schumacher would explain that there are two exceptions to this policy on storm water fee and why.

Mr. Schumacher said the two exceptions to the charge that Council included in the ordinance that Council adopted in December are one, railroad tracks, the actual iron rails. It didn’t seem reasonable to try and calculate the impervious areas associated with those rails and the cross ties probably don’t affect the amount of water that soaks into the ground anyway. The second exception is those highways and streets in the city that are maintained by the State DOT. The reason for that is, it is that it does not operationally make sense for the city to be responsible for the storm drainage beneath those streets and the State to be responsible for the street itself, the pavement, curb and the other features of the street.

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Hammond, seconded by Councilmember Wheeler.]
[ and carried unanimously, to close the public hearing ]

[ Motion was made by Commissioner Scher, seconded by Commissioner Kinsey, and ]
[ carried unanimously, to close the public hearing ]

Park Helms, Commissioner, said the procedure at this time is that the County needs to make a recommendation to Council as to the appropriate action to implement the storm water fee. He recognized Commissioner Doug Booth for that purpose.

Commissioner Booth said he would move that the commission respectfully request that the City Council take the necessary action to add 32 cents per equivalent residential unit to its storm
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water fee and make that addition effective January 1, 1994, all in accordance with the joint resolution that both of our bodies passed last year

[ Motion was made by Commissioner Booth, seconded by Commissioner Scher, and carried unanimously, to request Council to add $ 32 to billing for stormwater fees ]

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Mangum, seconded by Councilmember Hammond, to adopt the County’s fee ]

The vote was taken on the motion and carried as follows

YEAS Councilmembers Clodfelter, Hammond, McCrory, Majeed, Mangum, Martin, Patterson and Scarborough
NAYS Councilmembers Campbell, Reid and Wheeler

ITEMS MOVED UP ON AGENDA

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Scarborough, seconded by Councilmember Martin and carried unanimously, to move Items #13, #14, and #15 to this point in the agenda ]

WILMORE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION LOAN

Maggie Freeman, 1700 Chiffwood Place, Apt. A, said as president of the Wilmore Association, it is with great delight that we come before you tonight. We came to Council in May, 1992 to request a center that we could own and operate. Council gave us that privilege. We have worked diligently on it, and brought it back to Council. Tonight we ask you to give us consideration in approving our project and our package. Wilmore is a thriving community. We’re proud of our community. We are the first to have a scholarship, a community wide clean up, the opportunity to serve Charlotte with the Charlotte Green, vegetables that were grown and brought to us from Philadelphia. We’re thriving and doing well with that. We have policemen on bikes that have made a great difference in Wilmore. Now as our motto says, "without a vision, people perish." Ms. Freeman asked all of the people that are concerned about Wilmore to stand. Ms. Freeman asked, could we be better represented?

Pastor Herb Shakelford, Mt. Olive Presbyterian Church and a resident of Wilmore community said he is glad to be here for this occasion. Our neighborhood is excited and enthused about this opportunity. As you know, our neighborhood has been plagued with crime, unemployment, substandard housing, poor academic achievement, and we had no facilities in our immediate neighborhood to help or enhance it and bring it up to where it should be. However now this offers us an opportunity. We have not been just waiting on this opportunity, we have been working all along. During the period of time from when we first came before Council up until now, we have instituted crime watch, we have policemen on bikes, and we’ve had various other organizational activities to help us do what needs to be done. This center that we propose will serve not only the Wilmore community, but all the communities around, especially low income families. We plan to have tutoring, parenting, senior citizen programs, employment referral, social services information, adult education. We plan to have some rites of passage for our young men and women. The facility will provide some inter generational contact which will give the children who come in contact with the older adults, some morals and values that they so badly need and many times not able to have because of the environment and situation in which they live. We hope that this particular center will help us touch the basic fabric of the children in our community, and help them to move to a point where this whole city might be proud of who you are and what we stand for. He was very impressed by the young men and women who came before Council, and part of his dream is some time after this community center comes up that one of those young people might even come from Wilmore, and might be the kind of person where Council can say the money they spent is well spent. We have established a board that will oversee our activities. We have everything from bankers to lawyers, to little old ladies from church who will pray on you if you don’t do what they need done. So we hope and pray that Council will take a good look at what we have proposed here. In 90 days we have raised an inordinate amount of money and worked diligently to do what needs to be done. We pray that Council will look at this particular proposal, take it into
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consideration and approve it If you do so, we promise Council that they will enhance our neighborhood and we will give back to you in partnership For we are not just asking for something If Council gives to us, we have something to give back to Council

David Dulin, Wilmore Association Board of Directors, said he is also a member of Myers Park United Methodist Church Over the past eight years, his church has been in partnership with the Wilmore Neighborhood Association in pursuing a set of shared goals and objectives We have been helping these residents help themselves through their own vision for their own neighborhood and community Why has our church spent so much time, talent, resources and money? Because they’re special and they have special needs They are a neighborhood that has many problems, but most importantly these people have been working for the past 13 years in improving their neighborhood They have committed their time, energy, talent and resources to do this Not only to improve for Wilmore for themselves, but for their children and grandchildren that are here tonight This positive change has come from within We use the term community regeneration, and that’s what’s going on This community center can be the focal point for the needed services to take place not just for Wilmore, but for adjacent neighborhoods Over the past year he has been on a special team of residents, community people and a planning process for the center since we came to Council on May 26, 1992 A year of hours of meetings, of planning budget meetings, fund raising, a long term operational plan that’s been put into place Everyone we’ve talked to for donations of time, money, equipment, and resources, has been very supportive He is here to tell Council that there is a broad base of community support for this, the church community, banks, corporations, individuals, foundations, and community groups They do want to be a part of this dream They want to be a community partner of Wilmore He has been amazed and overwhelmed in the last 90 days we have been involved in a short term fund raising process to come up with our first year operating budget of $115,000 In 90 days, we raised $72,000 We know we’ve only just begun, but we have the momentum to carry on Those who haven’t committed have been very positive and have made the comment that, “after you get City Council’s approval, come back and see us” We have put together an executive board of directors that reflects a cross section of business, church, community minded people, who will then meet shortly after approval, we hope, and hire an executive director and put our long term operational plan in motion

Mr Dulin continued, this plan of support includes permanent community partnership with banks, corporations, churches, individuals, along with grants and foundations Tonight we ask that Council grant our proposal This strategy will work, this community partnership works It’s an incredible opportunity, not one of charity It is a large investment, but a needed one to impact the lives of a whole community It’s a long term investment for this community and future generations

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Scarborough seconded by Councilmember Wheeler, ]
[ and carried unanimously, to approve the loan ]

* * * * *

RESOLUTION BETWEEN THE CITY AND REID PARK ASSOCIATES TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN PROPERTIES IN THE REID PARK COMMUNITY AND ADOPT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATIONS

1 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION OF 7,500 SQUARE FEET AT 2916 AMAY JAMES AVENUE FOR $7,000 FROM JACK NORMAN REALTY

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 73-74

2 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION OF 7,500 SQUARE FEET AT 2920 AMAY JAMES AVENUE FOR $17,000 FROM JACK NORMAN REALTY

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 75-76

3 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION OF 26,600 SQUARE FEET AT 3313 AMAY JAMES AVENUE FOR $8,500 FROM JACK NORMAN REALTY
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The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 77-78

4 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION OF 7,800 SQUARE FEET AT 2929 MORNING DRIVE FOR $1,600 FROM JOHN GHOLSTON

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 79-80

5 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION OF 6,300 SQUARE FEET AT 2923 ROSS AVENUE FOR $4,000 FROM HEIRS OF MAGGIE AIKEN

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 81-82

6 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION OF 7,500 SQUARE FEET AT 3301 ROSS AVENUE FOR $10,000 FROM MARSHALL WATKINS

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 83-84

7 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION OF 13,300 SQUARE FEET AT 2701-03-05 MAYFAIR AVENUE FOR $32,000 FROM ROBERT WHITE AND MICHAEL TODD

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 85-86

8 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION OF 11,300 SQUARE FEET AT 3340 AMAY JAMES AVENUE FOR $3,500 FROM VERA C. CROWDER

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 87-88

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Scarborough, seconded by Councilmember ]
[ Patterson, and carried unanimously, to approve the above resolutions ]

* * * * * *

GRIER HEIGHTS ECONOMIC FOUNDATION LOAN

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Scarborough, seconded by Councilmember Martin, ]
[ and carried unanimously to approve the loan ]

* * * * * *

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Patterson, seconded by Councilmember Wheeler, ]
[ and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of April 5 Council Workshop, April 12 ]
[ Briefing, Citizens Hearing and Regular Meeting, April 19 Zoning Meeting and April 20 ]
[ Joint City/County/School Board Meeting ]

* * * * * *

ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA

[ Motion was made by Councilmember McCrory, seconded by Councilmember Patterson, ]
[ and carried unanimously to remove Item No 20H from the agenda ]

* * * * * *

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Wheeler, seconded by Councilmember Patterson, ]
[ and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as presented with the exception ]
[ of Item Nos 20-F, 24-B, 24 1 and 26 ]
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1 Award of Contracts

a) Contract to lowest bidder, State Utility Contractors, Inc in the amount of $5,159,160 for General Construction Contract B1 - Liquid Stream Improvements - McAlpine Creek Wastewater Management Facility Modifications and Expansions, for C-MUD

Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Utility Contractors, Inc</td>
<td>Monroe, N C</td>
<td>$5,159,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamer Construction Company</td>
<td>Norcross, Ga</td>
<td>$5,292,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Construction Company</td>
<td>Charlotte, N C</td>
<td>$5,307,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowder Construction Company</td>
<td>Charlotte, N C</td>
<td>$5,506,675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haren Construction Company</td>
<td>Etowah, TN</td>
<td>$6,989,550.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Contract to lowest bidder, Tompkins Johnson Company in the amount of $9,250 for HVAC - Contract B2 - Liquid Stream Improvements, McAlpine Creek Wastewater Management Facility Modifications and Expansions for C-MUD

Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins Johnson Company</td>
<td>Matthews, N C</td>
<td>$9,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Z Price &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Charlotte, N C</td>
<td>$14,780.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Contract to the lowest bidder Ind-Com Electrical Company in the amount of $749,700 for Electrical Contract for McAlpine Creek Wastewater Management Facility Modifications and Expansions for C-MUD

Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind-Com Electrical Company</td>
<td>Charlotte, N C</td>
<td>$749,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Electric Company</td>
<td>Madison, N C</td>
<td>$754,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Contract to lowest bidder McDaniel Construction Company in the amount of $943,284.75 for sanitary sewer and water main construction, FY 93 Contract No 14 - Street Main Extensions for C MUD

Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel Construction Company</td>
<td>Charlotte, N C</td>
<td>$943,284.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS, Inc</td>
<td>Richfield, N C</td>
<td>$974,581.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R H Price, Inc</td>
<td>Charlotte, N C</td>
<td>$976,425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W M Paris &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Charlotte, N C</td>
<td>$998,469.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellinger, Inc</td>
<td>Monroe, N C</td>
<td>$1,081,712.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Contract to lowest bidder R H Price in the amount of $328,194.62 for Water Main Construction - 12-inch water main along Shopton Road from Beam Road to Dixie Road for C-MUD

Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R H Price, Inc</td>
<td>Charlotte, N C</td>
<td>$328,194.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders Brothers, Inc</td>
<td>Charlotte, N C</td>
<td>$337,590.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDR, Inc</td>
<td>Stanfield, N C</td>
<td>$343,404.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Utility Contractors, Inc</td>
<td>Monroe, N C</td>
<td>$382,695.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel Construction Company</td>
<td>Spindle, N C</td>
<td>$386,489.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W M Paris &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Charlotte, N C</td>
<td>$392,918.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS, Inc</td>
<td>Richfield, N C</td>
<td>$400,636.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellinger, Inc</td>
<td>Monroe, N C</td>
<td>$430,433.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor Plumbing Company</td>
<td>Davidson, N C</td>
<td>$459,609.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Contracting</td>
<td>Charlotte, N C</td>
<td>$469,886.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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f) Contract to lowest bidder Stockhausen in the amount of $311,000 for Polymer for C-MUD

Summary of Bids
Stockhausen was the only bidder

g) Contract to the lowest bidder United Construction of Charlotte in the amount of $257,539 80 for curb replacement FY93, for Street Maintenance

Summary of Bids
United Construction $257,539 80
Blythe Development $280,519 13
Ferebee Corp $293,168 40
Showalter Construction $334,998 60

h) Contract to the lowest bidder the Shaw Group of Charlotte in the amount of $108,384 15 for Thrift/Tuckasegee Road sidewalk for Engineering

Summary of Bids
The Shaw Group $108,384 15
Showalter Construction $128,100 00
Ferebee Corporation $133,485 98
Cardinal Construction $147,650 48
United Construction $149,184 00
Blythe Development $151,518 94

i) Contract to lowest bidder Ferebee Corporation of Charlotte in the amount of $293,604 28 for Wilkinson Boulevard Phase III demonstration area side strip improvements for Engineering

Summary of Bids
Ferebee Corporation $293,604 28
Blythe Development $304,748 62
Showalter Construction $355,597 20
United Construction $391,349 53
Crowder Construction $427,647 86

j) Contract to lowest bidder Blythe Development in the amount of $305,933 19 for Genesis Park Neighborhood Reinvestment for Engineering

Summary of Bids
Blythe Development $305,933 19
Sherrill & Associates $314,949 74
Ferebee Corp $332,685 50
Crowder Construction $351,623 94
Showalter Construction $361,972 50
Dakota Construction $376,178 04
United Construction $434,036 52

2 Ordinance No 3568-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling at 1704 Pegram Street

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 43, at Page 82
June 14, 1993
Minute Book 102, Page 245

3 Ordinance No 3569 X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to repair the dwelling at 2000 Renner Street

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 43, at Page 83

4 Ordinance No 3570-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling at 2643 Mayfair Avenue

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 43, at Page 84

5 Resolution authorizing the refund of certain taxes assessed through clerical or assessor error in the amount of $47,876 36

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 89

6 Ordinance No 3571 to lower the speed limit on Burnt Umber Drive from Plott Road to dead end from 35 miles per hour to 25 miles per hour

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 43, at Page 85

7 Award of Contracts

a) Contract to Public Works Equipment Company in the amount of $51,074 for pothole patcher for Street Maintenance

Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Equipment Company</td>
<td>Monroe, N C</td>
<td>$51,074 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruder-Sharpe, Inc</td>
<td>Monroe, N C</td>
<td>$50,198 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bruder Sharpe did not meet all the specifications

b) Contract to the lowest negotiated bidder Vomar Products of Sepulveda, CA in the amount of $328,721 for New Convention Center Signage for Engineering

Summary of Bids

Vomar Products                      $328,721 00*
Sims Corporation                   $339,150 00
Andco Industries                  $344,072 00
Belsinger Sign Works             $361,519 00
Cornelius Architectural Products $402,731 58
Architectural Graphics           $443,249 00

*Negotiated from $330,761 to $328,721

c) Contract to the lowest negotiated bidder Stultz Manufacturing Company in the amount of $830,843 for Convention Center Millwork and Cabinets

Summary of Bids

Stultz Manufacturing Company       $ 830,843*
Southern Architectural Woodwork   $1,316,828
Nacoma Consolidated Ltd           No Bid

*Negotiated from $1,125,664 to $830,843

d) Contract to the lowest negotiated bidder Joseph Shisko, Inc in the amount of $2,787,290 for New Convention Center Storefront and Curtainwall for Engineering
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Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Shiski, Inc</td>
<td>$2,787,290*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltck, Inc (withdrawn)</td>
<td>$2,466,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pritchard Paint &amp; Glass</td>
<td>$3,309,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour City Architectural</td>
<td>$3,572,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norment Industries/WSA, Inc</td>
<td>$4,019,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Negotiated from $2,842,666 to $2,787,290

e) Contract to the lowest negotiated bidder Long Communications Group in the amount of $1,006,531 for New Convention Center Audio/Visual for Engineering

Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Communications Group</td>
<td>$1,006,531*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Communications Consultants</td>
<td>$1,115,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWP Electronic Systems</td>
<td>$1,274,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Negotiated from $1,049,531 to $1,006,531

f) Contract to the lowest bidder Jones Grading & Fencing in the amount of $149,940 for Convention Center Site Demolition 2 for Engineering

Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones Grading &amp; Fencing, Inc</td>
<td>$149,940 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowder Construction Company</td>
<td>$176,970 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-J, Inc</td>
<td>$195,840 00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) Contract to the lowest negotiated bidder Dixie Roofing, Inc in the amount of $2,117,112 for New Convention Center Roofing for Engineering

Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Roofing, Inc</td>
<td>$2,117,112 00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed Systems</td>
<td>$2,553,865 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weldon Roofing</td>
<td>$3,585,300 00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Negotiated from $2,341,512 to $2,117,112

h) Contract to the lowest negotiated bidder, American Overhead Doors in the amount of $572,176 for New convention Center Overhead Doors for Engineering

Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Overhead Doors</td>
<td>$572,176 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Door Company/Piedmont</td>
<td>$687,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Door Sales</td>
<td>$1,119,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxson &amp; Associates</td>
<td>$1,178,063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Negotiated from $672,792 to $572,176

i) Contract to lowest bidder Spillars Contract Interiors in the amount of $70,830 for AllSteel Workstations for C-MUD

Summary of Bids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spillars Contract Interiors</td>
<td>$70,830 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac Thift</td>
<td>$78,863 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q G Penegar (did not meet labor specifications)</td>
<td>$69,737 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Contract to HDR Engineering, Inc in the amount of $65,000 for Taxiway "C" for Aviation

9 Amendment No 1 to Professional Services Contract with Hazen & Sawyer, P C in the amount of $175,500 to provide contract administration and construction inspection services for sanitary sewer construction - Four Mile Creek Parallel Outfall for C-MUD

10 Professional services contract with Concord Engineering and Surveying, Inc not to exceed $500,000 for surveying and design services for water and sanitary sewer street main extensions

11 Amendment No 4 in the amount of $564,003 to Authorization No 1 with Black & Veatch for professional engineering services related to the Mallard Creek and McDowell Creek Wastewater Treatment Plants

12 Amendment No 2 in the amount of $499,471, to authorization No 3 with Black & Veatch for professional engineering services to the North Service Area Residual Management Study

13 Property Transactions
   a) Acquisition of Church of God Property at 3435 East Willow Lane from Linda L Clark for $25,000 for F A R Part 150 Land Acquisition
   b) Acquisition of 2 128 acres off Dixie Road from Beatrice C Brown for $38,900 for Airport Master Plan Acquisition
   c) Acquisition of 654 acres plus a 3 bedroom house at 3029 Moores Lake Drive from Ronald L Allen and Janice Allen Futrell for $75,800 for F A R Part 150 Land Acquisition
   d) Acquisition of 444 acres plus a 3 bedroom house at 6420 Teresa Avenue from Delmas L Hilton and wife, Betty for $82,500 for F A R Part 150 Land Acquisition
   e) Acquisition of 436 acres plus a 3 bedroom house at 6321 Teresa Avenue from Donald M McSwan and wife, Nancy for $68,500 for F A R Part 150 Land Acquisition
   f) Acquisition of 618 acres at Whippoorwill Drive from Sanford Grant and wife, Pauline for $14,000 for F A R Part 150 Land Acquisition
   g) Acquisition of 420 acres plus a two story duplex at 2142 Boyer Street from Nancy S Taylor for $59,000 for F A R Part 150 Land Acquisition
   h) Acquisition of 54,512 square feet (1 2514 acres) of permanent sanitary sewer easement plus 48,674 square feet (1 1174 acres) of temporary construction easement at 4300 Piper Glen Drive from Tournament Players Club at Piper Glen, Inc for $10,770 for Four Mile Creek Parallel Outfall, Parcel No 14

* * * * * *

REPLACEMENT HOUSING CONTRACT

Mr Reid said here are two people who obviously need some help, but he questions spending $69,000 for a house when there are so many people in this city who pay all their taxes, get no help and 35% of the people in Charlotte who live in their own homes don't own a house that cost $69,000 Council has an obligation to furnish a safety net for people who can't help themselves, but this seems to be going above and beyond the call of duty, when we have 7,000 families on a waiting list supposedly for housing. We are spending $69,000 for a 1600 square foot new house for two people, it's more than we should be doing
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Ms Patterson asked if it was that expensive because they wanted to stay on the existing site?

Del Bergsdorf, Assistant City Manager, said the price of the home is based on the competitive proposals that were submitted and approved earlier and then applied to that particular site, so that the price is competitive in terms of new construction. The question he heard was a policy question, as to whether the program is appropriate. The price is competitive and the policy is built around the obligation to replace housing that has to be demolished based on city code enforcement activity.

Mr Reid said apparently these folks have been living there since 1920. They have the income to afford a new house. How did they let their house get so dilapidated that we’re having to condemn it and then replace it?

Jay Walton, Director of Community Development, said those are very good questions, however, the Charlotte Historic District has some control over this particular area. This house is in Dilworth, and we didn’t recommend demolition, they recommended demolition. Therefore we have a responsibility in accordance with federal regulations to provide these individuals with replacement housing. That is the minimum house they would allow us to build back there, then the city has to look towards its future resale of the house.

Mr Reid said the Historic District has the authority to condemn a house, irrespective as to whether Mr Walton or the city feels it’s okay, and then we have the responsibility to build something to suit the Historic District, apparently 1600 square feet, because two people don’t need 1600 square feet, a new house, when a good part of the city tax payers in this city who own homes don’t have a house that mee and are paying for it. It doesn’t make any sense to him at all, and he doesn’t see how in the world we could vote for that.

Mr Walton said the Historic District Commission, from his understanding, does have some control over the renovations that occur in the Dilworth area. He doesn’t know if any of Council live in Dilworth, but it is his understanding that what he is reporting to Council is accurate and that they recommended the demolition. They would not allow the repairs and we’re obligated to replace this house. We put out bids to 12 bidders, and we only received the one bid and they approved the plans.

Mr Reid said he hears the process, he understands the procedure, not blaming Mr Walton, but based on any equitable solution the people who are paying for it, the taxpayers, compared to what other people have in the city and live in, this just doesn’t seem to be just, and he wonders if there isn’t a better solution? He certainly would want to help these people and would like for them to stay where they are, but should we use taxpayer’s money to go this far? They could sell their property if that were the case, and move into some other property, especially if we’re paying for it. It just isn’t fair.

Mr Walton said the family is going to repay this loan, as indicated, they really can’t afford this house, this is a part principal interest repayment and part is deferred. This family is on social security, they’re over 70 years old, both of them, and we are required by federal regulation to provide them with replacement housing. Otherwise they would be displaced.

[ Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Clodfelter, seconded by Councilmember ]
[ Wheeler, to defer and get a response from the Historic District Commission ]

Mr Martin asked Mr Walton, from his standards in the CD department, was the structure rehabilitative?

Mr Walton said yes.

Ms Hammond said she sees the cost to in Rem repair to codes standards, she wonders if he could include the cost to repair to Historic District’s standards.
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Ms Scarborough said she was going with the motion.

Mr McCrory said he wanted to thank Mr Reid for bringing up this question. He thinks it is a good question.

The vote was taken on the substitute motion and carried unanimously.

TEMPORARY PERSONNEL SERVICES

Mr Reid said with regard to the convention center and other things that we've bid recently, he thinks they are adamently stuck to awarding things to the lowest bidder, and every time he questioned that, money has been the driving force, and he understood that. Here is a case of temporary services. We have three companies that gave a 16% lower bid, two of these companies are nationally recognized companies. He wanted to know why we elected to pay $432,000 for a service that we can get for $371,000?

Pam Syfert, Deputy City Manager, said this is a RFP process for a service, so part of what you go out and request is an array of services. We had a joint City/County staff group that helped write the specs and then evaluated the bids that came in and there were certain services they were looking for in terms of the training that the firms would do, the kind of billing, the reporting that we would get, so the evaluation of the contract was both on the lowest price and what firm they felt could best provide those services. It was a combination of the services we were asking for as well as the price.

Mayor Vinroot said asked if this was like when we hire lawyers, architects, other personal services, where other things than just the cost go into that selection?

Ms Syfert said yes. We try to get the service that we want for the best price.

Mr Reid said he understands that, and he understands that in every case when we award a contract service has something to do with it. He assumes that we feel companies we ask to bid can provide the service, otherwise we wouldn't ask them. Based on the way we've handled previous convention center contracts and others, we've gone back to the low bidder and even renegotiated the bid based on what we could pay, or other aspects of the bid. Did we go back to these people and see if they would provide the service? They were the low bidder. Did we go ask them if they would or could provide the services as determined by your RFP?

Ms Syfert said she is not sure if they went back and negotiated with them, because part of it was that some of the services that we asked for, such as the way people would bill us or the reporting, some of them couldn't necessarily apply that range of services. When we go for a service contract as opposed to a fairly detailed specification for a commodity, there is a little more subjectivity involved in it and we ask a lot of people to bid. Normally Council could defer this if they had some problems with it, but the county just did approve it for their side at their last meeting, so we would like for Council to approve it.

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Hammond, seconded by Councilmember Mangum.]
[ to approve the contract for temporary personnel services ]

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Clodfelter, Hammond, McCrory, Majeed, Mangum, Martin, Patterson, Scarborough, and Wheeler

NAYS: Councilmembers Campbell and Reid

* * * * * * *
NEW CONVENTION CENTER FINISHES CONTRACT

Ted Kratt, 6135 Park South Drive, said he is representing Metric Constructors. Metric Constructors, not wanting to impede the progress of the construction of the convention center, would like to withdraw our protest to the award of the convention center finishes package to Cecil Malone Company. We would, however, like to ask the city to be consistent in the execution of the bid and award process on future city projects. A stricter adherence to process set forward by the city will promote healthier competition resulting in fewer occasions of interruptions or waivers or irregularities in the bid process. He would like to thank the city manager, the city engineering department and members of the Council to whom we’ve expressed our concern over the past few weeks. As a part of a Charlotte based corporation having been here for 103 years, we’re very much looking forward to the successful realization of the Charlotte Convention Center.

Councilmember Major said it appears that there seems to be some obligations as far as paper work that should have been submitted in this package. Based on his understanding of the history of the convention center, and in all due fairness, Metric was confronted with a similar problem on the concrete package where in the eleventh hour after the bids had been open, someone left out something in the addendum to a MWBE package. It so happens at this time they submitted all of their paper work and the other company didn’t, and they are confronted with the same situation again. He thinks in all due fairness this is a disservice to Metric, and he could understand their benevolence in withdrawing, but he thinks that under the constraints of the package, they submitted all the paper work and in all fairness they should be the one to get the package.

Mr. McCrory said we just had a speaker who previously talked about the group homes and they couldn’t build a group home because of some newer technicality on how bureaucracy had written something. In this case he doesn’t think Council should sacrifice almost a million dollars of taxpayers money because of bureaucratic confusion over paper work on what was submitted and what was not submitted. He thinks Council should go ahead, the appeal has been withdrawn, we should move on and save taxpayers as much money as possible on this project.

Mr. White said it is very difficult to administer these contracts and make sure that you’re fair, but the specifications allow for us to review particularly the provisions having to do with minority and contracting and so there is nothing that has been done that is outside that review. If Council would like we could have that discussed in detail here or we could do it later. He doesn’t want to get in the details of the Metric proposal, but it too has questions that would have to be discussed. The nature of your motion would award this contract as was mentioned, not only with some similar problems that we would have to resolve in either case, but the price would be such that we would have to recommend that we would not award the contract that we rebidded, which then throws us off schedule. He doesn’t know how much explanation Council needs this evening, and he doesn’t want to take up their time needlessly, but your perception and our analysis did not reach the same conclusion at all.

Ms. Patterson said this project has been really important from the very beginning. We made a commitment to job training dollars so that this project would have significant participation for the community and its work force and for the MWBE community. She thinks they send the wrong signal, even if it’s allowed under our rules of operation. She is not sure that she wants to back up tonight, she would say that in either case, since they have told Council on every other contract that they are negotiating this down to the budget number with whom ever they award the contract to. She doesn’t buy that what we do tonight is more expensive in reality, because
if they weren't going to negotiate the contract down to whom ever they awarded the bid to, they would have thrown all the bids out and started over any way. Those are sort of the only options at this point. She just wants to make sure that we are really careful about the signal we send about how important our MWBE program is to us, particularly on a project of this scope, a project of this visibility in our community.

Mr. White said we are going to exceed our goals in terms of minority business in this particular project by about 6%. The low bidder is well within those guidelines.

Mr. Reid said all he knows is what he read there. He didn't know about the other complications, but from what he read, one company apparently complied with the rules as written and the low bidder didn't. Therefore, he thinks staff could have elected, if they had wanted to, to throw it out on that basis. A more important thing to him, if his first statement is correct, is here we have a local company that's going to spend $10 million in the Charlotte area, as opposed to a company that's going to take it down to Atlanta, and although he loves Atlanta, he thinks the impact here in Charlotte would more than offset, well you pick the dollars. We sold the convention center based on an impact of four dollars for every one spent, so we could say that the $10 million here or there invested would be a $40 million impact on our local economy. In his mind there should be something if they could possibly do it legally, some credit given to our local suppliers who live, eat, work and support our city with taxes and everything else. If we can do that he thinks they should. That would be his concern about this whole bid process.

Mr. Clodfelter said he shares the point about consistency. He is concerned about it because he could recall a couple of instances where we've been very harsh on someone who was a low bidder and didn't submit the documentation. There is a question about expectations and bidder's right to expect that they'll play by the same rules and we've had complaints where we've thrown out low bids because the documentation wasn't there on the MBE issue and taken a higher bid. When he came in, he was prepared to vote to deny the Malone bid as non-responsive, for consistency's sake. He thinks there is some importance in consistent administration rules. They have given him some concern about that, and he is not real sure now about what he wants to do, so he wants to ask a couple of questions to get educated.

Mr. Clodfelter continued. If the Malone bid was non-responsive and we rejected it, you wouldn't accept the second bid either, you would rebid? He asked the Manager if he was going to be doing any renegotiation with the Malone company to negotiate their bid down? There has been discussion of that.

Mr. White said this is going to take a few minutes. There is no way to avoid it, so it is going to take a few minutes.

Mr. Clodfelter said he knows the schedule is critical. We have a regular meeting for budget purposes on Wednesday evening. In the next 48 hours, could you work up some answers on some of the questions that Council may have and have Council vote on this contract Wednesday evening?

Mr. White said he rather go ahead and answer those questions now. The view from the manager's perspective and the staff's perspective is that the low bidder was responsive, and the low bidder does comply, so that's why we stayed with the low bidder. In answer to Mr. Clodfelter's question about the budget, he is going to ask Billy Crockett and Benny Aldridge to explain to Council our policy regarding the bids. He doesn't want to get into evaluating the Metroc bid, that does not seem appropriate, but on the other hand it wouldn't be simple to simply go to the second bid. Benny is the contracts administrator in the engineering department and reviewed the bid. He will tell Council what happened there and Billy will tell Council what we have been doing in terms of the low bid and the changes that have taken place.

**Benny Aldridge, Engineering Department**, said just as a brief history of what occurred when we took bids, the apparent low bidder, Malone, submitted the incorrect MWBE form. We asked the representative from Malone at the close of the bid opening what had occurred and he said that in the confusion of the last minute of preparing his bid, he was unsure about which form to submit. In order to appreciate that situation, think about preparing an $8 or $9 million bid,
and hundreds of subcontract prices coming in. So it's easy to see that someone could make a mistake. Immediately after the bid opening, within an hour, Malone hand delivered the appropriate form with the MWB participation in it. We verified that his efforts were performed prior to the bid opening, and that is the requirement of the MWBE program. That's where the consistency thing comes in. On the previous bids that you've been asked to reject where there was no documentation or the documentation was inadequate, we've gone back and found that the bidder had not made appropriate efforts prior to the bid opening. In this case we verify not only with the successful subcontractors that Malone listed, but also with the number of firms that he requested quotes from that were not successful and without exception they all verified that the efforts were prior to the bid opening. With that being done, considering that he did bring in a significant amount of participation, we looked at the difference between the two bids, Metrc's bid being $830,000, and we also again reviewed the consistency thing. This is not a precedent. You have in the past waived other situations where a bidder made a simple mistake and we were able to resolve it prior to the award. So that in terms of consistency is where we are.

Mr. White asked Mr. Aldridge if it was true that our specifications permit us to allow this to occur.

Mr. Aldridge said that is correct. The MWBE program and the contract provisions state something to the effect that any irregularities or informalities in the documentation may be waived as a technicality if they can be resolved prior to award of the contract. In this case we were able to do it immediately.

Mr. White said he concludes that if we had not been doing exactly what Benny described immediately after that bid, then we would not have been administering the process appropriately. The specifications for this particular activity permit this to occur, and we would have not been diligent if we did not do it. In terms of your second question, it is a different kind of question but it is complex as well in terms of what Billy Crockett has done to bring the project back into budget, and it involves not only this bid, but another one. Therefore we anticipate there will be more money spent in this particular activity than we originally estimated because of some of those changes. Mr. Crockett will explain that.

Billy Crockett, Project Manager, said we sit down with the low bidder and go through the bid documents in great detail and talk about changes that could be made to lower the price. We can change from one material to another material without degrading the quality of the building and it could be cheaper to be performed that way. We go through that and every little detail for each one of these bid packages. In the Finishes packages, we've got targeted close to half a million dollars worth of saving in that package alone. We dealt with a low bidder so that it could be done. Then we transferred some money from the city's contingency into the construction contingency and made some changes in the FF&E budget. That's how we got it back in budget.

Mr. McCrory said if you have a lower bid and you have to down price it to a number which is not your budget, if the lower the bid the less you have to make changes in materials and everything else because you have already reviewed the material specifications on all the bids and compared them and so forth. If the bid is $9 million and your budget is $8 million, and the other bids were $10 million, to go down to $8 million you only have to go down to $1 million, therefore, you won't have to make as many changes and modifications and materials and everything else with this as compared to other higher bids? Is that a correct statement?

Mr. Crockett said we still have to change materials to get it down to that budget, but once we're down to that budget, then we're home free. That's where we are and we are back into budget.

Mr. Aldridge said in answer to that too, the state law allows us to negotiate with the low bidder to reduce the price. As Mr. White said, in this case we felt that Malone is the lowest responsive bidder.

Mr. Campbell asked Mike Boyd, City Attorney's Office, if he concurs with the manager's statement in what we have done is correct in terms with the law.
Mr Boyd said yes

Mr Campbell said number two, are you also then saying that Malone's bid is a legal bid, and our acceptance of it was correct?

Mr Boyd said opening it was certainly correct and Council has the authority to award it to Malone if it chooses to do that.

Mr Campbell said in the awarding of that bid have we deviated at all from our legal procedures? In other words, from what he's saying we had leeway to accept the paper work an hour later because of an technicality. Is there anything in a court of law if Malone came back and sued us now for not accepting their bid, which was legally low bid, because of a whim of some folks we then have legal exposure.

Mr Boyd said Malone can always institute some legal proceeding, but it is our opinion that if they did, we would win Council does have the discretion to waive Malone's failure to submit the required form.

Mr Campbell said if we choose not to accept the technicality, technically they are in some way shape or form in default?

Mr Boyd said their bid was not in accordance with the contract documents, so Council would have to waive that as a technicality before you could award it to Malone.

Mr Majeed said of all the options that are available, they exercised within parameters their legal ground the contract to award it regardless of the irregularity to Malone. The thing is that Council has the ultimate judgement and we can exercise based on our understanding and based on some input from Malone or Metric and he thinks this is where the buck stops. In view of some of the things that Councilman Reid stated, in view of that last minute input on Malone, which he thinks somehow, even though it is stated that they can do that, he thinks the spirit and the principle is violated in this case, and that's why he is asking for Council's consideration for Metric.

Ms Hammond said there is no question that she would like to find a reason that she could intellectually accept to award the bid to a local company, with assurance in her head that we could negotiate that bid down within budget. However, having been through a lot of bid awards in the past, if this kind of error in the application was shown to be in fact a technicality rather than an error of substance or an error of omission, she is concerned that Council would be inconsistent if we said in this case this was a substantive area rather than a technicality. She heard the staff say that there was supporting documentation that Malone had done all the work required to not only exercise a good faith effort to have minority participation, but had been successful in that effort and could produce a document that had minority subcontractors, and they failed to turn in the right piece of paper, but could provide that piece of paper and all the supporting documentation within an hour or so, and that you all checked that out. To her an absence of the piece of paper is a technicality, even though she would like to use that as a hook to work with the local contractor. Her concern is, if we don't find a consistent way to deal with the awarding of bids, we will not have people bidding on city work. It's expensive to prepare one of these bids. She hopes Council is being consistent, her recollection is based on having done this for a few years, that this represents a consistent application of the city's practices. She is concerned that in this project there is such a divergence in the amounts of the bids, all of them way over budget. The vast difference between the low bidder and the second and third low bidders, and only three companies bidding on this huge piece of work. She thinks there must be some fault somewhere based on the speed in which we're trying to rush this project through, or something. It doesn't ring true to her. If she was a contractor she would be concerned about bidding on this work. She thinks the city should take a look at the way the bid documents are prepared for projects, because she doesn't think the city should have just three bidders and be that far apart.

Ms Scarborough said she didn't want to continually hop on the consistency, but she thinks that is very important. We wouldn't be here if the bidder had put into the contract the information on the MWBE. Her real concern is that we are continually consistent, and that we don't send kjwt
a message out there to the public that they can leave things out of a bid and then come back and do it. Dealing with this kind of money you can't afford to make that kind of mistake. However, she doesn't want to see Council lose a bid just because someone forgot to do something, but she is real concerned about Council making this a habit; it can't be one. This project is too important to have a mistake like this, and she is real sorry that Council is here discussing this. She thinks that given the circumstances she could not put on the citizens of Charlotte an extra million dollars.

Mr Clodfelter thanked Mr White and Mr Aldridge for their answers. They have turned him around from where he started out and they were helpful for that reason. One final question on the issue that is troubling him. He knows that we have our MWBE coordinator here. It is not a question of permission to waive technicalities, he knows Council has that. The question is the application of that waiver. Is waiving these circumstances consistent with the way we've waived things in the past and the kind of circumstances where we waived the requirement in the past? The thing that impressed him was that when they did check they found out that it was not an after the fact after fault of trying to go out and get participation. They had already gotten the participation before they submitted the bid. That's an important fact. Is that the kind of circumstance where we waived in the past?

Mike High, MWBE Coordinator, said that's exactly what we look at, whether it is a technicality or not. The intent of the program is that the efforts are done prior to the bid, and we check with the bidders and with the MWBE firms that receive solicitation from this bidder. We verify, and they will tell us that yes, in fact we did receive solicitation from that prime bidder, in this case Cecil Malone, prior to the bid, and he did have conversation with him. We have faxes where Cecil Malone received the bid from FPAL and High Tech before the bid date, because the fax puts the date and the time on it. So we have verification that these items did take place and we feel that is substantial.

Mr Clodfelter asked Mr High if he was comfortable that a waiver in these circumstances would be consistent with the way we have acted in the past?

Mr High said yes.

Mr Majeed said he has a question for Mr Kratt. He wants him to understand on the $1 million that Ms Scarborough was talking about, everybody is going to be asked to bring that down to the $81 or $8.8 million that is required by the budget. They were confronted with a situation like this last minute on the concrete package which was substantially more than this, which dealt with the same type scenario, so they've been consistently burned twice.

Mr Kratt said this is our second time around on this issue on the concrete package. There was an addenda problem and he stands corrected on the size of the contract concrete package one, he thinks it was $3 or $4 million, but addenda 2-9 was acknowledged by a bidder out of Ohio. Addenda one was the MWBE requirements and it was waived because he didn't acknowledge that one. We were the second low bidder on that too and tightening has kind of struck us twice in the same place here.

Mr Majeed said he also understands that is negotiated down to whatever bid price came in and MWBE aspects of your package also can be within those parameters of increase also. We have a local firm here and he thinks they deserve better, being most consistent.

Mr White said Metric's bid has not been analyzed, and it would go through the same scrutiny.

[ Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Majeed, seconded by Councilmember ]

[ Red, to approve Metric Constructors ]

The was taken on the motion and failed as follows:

YEAS Councilmembers Majeed and Reid
NAYS Councilmembers Campbell, Clodfelter, Hammond, McCrory, Mangum, Martin, Patterson, Scarborough and Wheeler
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[ Motion was made by Councilmember McCrory, seconded by Councilmember Mangum, ]
[ to approve Finishes Contract to Cecil Malone Company ]

The vote was taken on the motion and carried as follows

YEAS Councilmembers Campbell, Clodfelter, Hammond, McCrory, Mangum, Martin,
Patterson, Scarborough and Wheeler
NAYS Councilmembers Majeed and Reid

* * * * * *

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON FIRE INVESTIGATION
TASK FORCE - LEAVE AS A DIVISION OF THE FIRE DEPARTMENT.

[ Motion was made by Councilmember McCrory, seconded by Councilmember Wheeler, ]
[ and carried unanimously, to approve the Public Safety Committee's recommendation ]

* * * * * *

WIND-UP ORDINANCE FOR FY93 BUDGET

ORDINANCE NO. 3568-X REFLECTING CHANGES TO THE ANNUAL ORDINANCE
ADOPTED IN JUNE, 1992 AND REFLECTING ACCOUNTING CHANGES NECESSARY
TO COMPLY WITH GENERALLY ACCEPTED ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Patterson, seconded by Councilmember Wheeler, ]
[ and carried unanimously, to approve the above ordinance ]

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 43, at Page 86-88

* * * * * *

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING INSTALLMENT PAYMENT FINANCING OF THE
CITY'S PORTION OF THE NEW POLICE HEADQUARTERS, ALSO AUTHORIZING
THE RELATED FORM OF VARIOUS FINANCING DOCUMENTS. THE AMOUNT OF
THE CONTRACT WILL NOT EXCEED $14 MILLION

Mr. Reid said he and some other members of this Council ran a campaign of not voting or
allowing building a building of any kind of magnitude without a lot of people to vote on it. This
was after our two situations where we bid on the convention center. He remembers some of
Council doing it along with him, therefore he can't vote for it. It's not that he is particularly
opposed to the LEC, but he is opposed to the way it is financed.

Mr. McCrory said Council had an overall vote on COPS about three weeks ago. Mr. Reid,
himself and several other Councilmembers lost that vote, so it already has been decided on the
COPS

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Scarborough seconded by Councilmember Patterson ]
[ to approve the above resolution ]

The vote was taken on the motion and carried as follows

YEAS Councilmembers Campbell, Clodfelter, Hammond, McCrory, Mangum, Martin,
Patterson, Scarborough and Wheeler
NAYS Councilmembers Majeed and Reid

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 91-96

* * * * * *
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR "COMMITTEE OF 100" TRANSPORTATION/TRANSIT PLAN.

[ Motion made by Councilmember Hammond, seconded by Councilmember Patterson, and ]
[ carried unanimously, to approve the Implementation Plan ]

* * * * * *


[ Motion was made by Councilmember Patterson, seconded by Councilmember Wheeler, ]
[ and carried unanimously, to approve the above resolution ]

The Finance Director placed the Statement of Debt into the record

The resolution was recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 97-100

* * * * * *

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING STAFF TO PROCEED WITH A REFINANCING OF ALL OR PART OF THE CITY’S 1991 INSTALLMENT PURCHASE CONTRACT (CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION, SERIES 1991) USED TO FINANCE THE NEW CONVENTION CENTER. THE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZES THE NECESSARY STEPS AND DOCUMENTS

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Wheeler, seconded by Councilmember Patterson, ]
[ and carried unanimously, to approve the above resolution ]

The resolution was recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 101 103

* * * * * *

RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY93-97 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND BALLANTYNE DEVELOPMENT WATER AND SEWER CONTRACT

Mr Reid asked, what is the unfunded project?

Mr White said it is a new outfall

Mr Reid asked why is this coming to floor right now? Is it something that we forgot to fund or is it something that has suddenly taken on emergency proportions, or where are we with it

Mr White said it wasn’t in our capital program and it has moved up, so it requires us to come to get the amendment and all of it in order

Mr Reid said he went to a meeting that was chaired by Hoyle Martin over in Paw Creek about a week in a half a ago. The situation over there is pretty terrible. The cancer rate, you can pick whatever figure you want to. The water is contaminated, and Mr Martin asked the question how many of the residents were not on City water, and about half the 200 families present were not on City water. He talked with the people after the meeting and the bottom line is most of those people can’t afford to be on City water. Before we go on with some unfunded projects, unless it is absolutely essential, he thinks Council should find a way to put these folks on City water, or fast track it, and figure out a way to pay for it later. He thinks it is outrageous that they are over there dying of cancer. Not blaming Council, he is saying that it is outrageous to allow it to continue when we fund something else that may not be nearly as important.

Mayor Vinroot said it’s not funded, but it will be a self funding project. Water and sewer projects are funded by the developers themselves.

kjm
VI Alexander, Budget Director, said there are three things. If people have contaminated water, we have a program by which they could be hooked up without the fees and cost. There is a public health hazard program to correct those problems, so if someone in that neighborhood has documented that they have a public health problem, they just need to get to the utility department. The second part of the issue is the six mile creek outfall would have come up in your CIP and it's just a matter of moving the timing up and amending it to do that. The third point is Ballantyne is on a five year reimbursable, and they tie in together, but actually there are three different things here if you add the contamination point.

Ms Patterson said she thinks Ms Alexander needs to explain the five year reimbursable

Ms Alexander said the five year reimbursable is where we have a unfunded project that is in the capital needs document that the developer wants to build, and they can do that by putting the cash up front to advance the project and then we reimburse them over a five year period.

Mr Reid said and we reimburse?

Ms Alexander said we reimburse from the utility fund because what you get is the project in early

Mr Reid said he doesn't argue with that, but what he is saying is that Council should have the Paw Creek problem on the agenda. We can get Ballantyne on the agenda, and we can reimburse, and do whatever is necessary to accommodate things down south when big developers need it. The guy came to Council and bought a big jug of gasoline out of the well the other day. He thinks Council needs to take affirmative action and go over there and do it for them. Mr Reid asked Mr Martin if he agrees with that?

Mr Martin said yes, but that's in motion. He didn't want to get into that tonight, but things are already moving, and would talk with Mr Reid later about that.

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Campbell, seconded by Councilmember Martin, ]
[ and carried unanimously, to approve the above resolution ]

The resolution was recorded in full in Resolution Book 31, at Page 104-105

* * * * * *

EARLE VILLAGE REVITALIZATION

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Campbell, seconded by Councilmember ]
[ Scarborough and carried unanimously to approve the Earle Village Urban Revitalization ]
[ Demonstration Program ]

* * * * * *

HOUSING REHABILITATION LOAN AGREEMENT

Mr Reid said how can someone on a $800 a month income afford a $63,000 house? It is the same situation that he brought up before

Mayor Vinroot said Mr Walton will answer that

Mr Reid said we have a family who obviously needs some help, he doesn't deny that. He knows that when you oppose something like this, you're branded almost as an uncaring character and that's not true. When we spend $60 to $70,000 furnishing houses to people who are on welfare, then we have a problem. The taxpayers are paying the bill and most of them or many of them are providing homes that are better than the ones they have and he doesn't understand why we continue to do that.

Mr Walton said it's part of our program mandate. In this particular case, we're only spending approximately $16,000 for the rehabilitation of this house. In order to secure the city's monies
and to enable this family to be able to pay this debt, we're paying off the first and second mortgage, and we're making a low interest loan. This is why this family is able to afford this. This family is currently paying over $600 in these two mortgages. We're putting this family in a better financial position, and in turn we're putting the city in a better financial position to get our money back, and this is part of the community development mandate so mandated by the federal government, that we utilize these funds to assist individuals who earn less than the median income.

Mr. Reid said his question is, is there a way to do it without refinancing $63,000? Couldn't we do it a cheaper way, provide these people a place to live where they could pay part of it or all of it and not spend this much money? We're putting people on welfare in better houses than those who are paying the bills for these people to be on welfare. That is just imminently unfair.

Mr. Walton said in this particular case the family is continuing to live in the house that they already live in. We're not putting them in a better house, we're improving their living conditions. We're eliminating the slum and blight in neighborhoods. If we want to talk about improving our neighborhoods and police protection in those neighborhoods, we're going to have to improve the housing stock in those neighborhoods.

Mr. Reid said he would not deny that, he was just talking about the extent of it.

Ms. Hammond said bear in mind that this is a loan, this is not a gift.

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Wheeler, seconded by Councilmember Mangum, ]
[ to approve the Housing Rehabilitation Loan ]

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

YEAS Councilmembers Campbell, Clodfelter, Hammond, McCrory, Majeed, Mangum, Martin, Patterson, Scarborough and Wheeler
NAYS Councilmember Reid

* * * * * *

EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANT

Mr. White said staff is recommending Option 1.

Frank Manfield, 735 East Kingston Ave., said he is the director of the George Shinn Center, and it is his privilege to serve as one of the officers of the homeless services network. Council has a recommendation to approve a homeless services network joint proposal for the expenditure of the McKinney Act money for Emergency Shelter Grant programs and we are grateful to the staff for recommending that proposal. We have sat down with the five agencies working in this area to see how we could best use the money, and we are working towards efforts of collaboration as we talk to each other about our needs and how to best use the resources we have. These resources are diminishing and we are trying to make the best use of them to continue the programs that we have.

We know staff looked at another option that would have not served all five agencies, so we think this is a good way to use the federal resources that are provided through the city.

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Hammond seconded by Councilmember Patterson ]
[ and carried unanimously, to approve Option 1 ]

* * * * * *

AMENDMENT TO INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT ON MAINFRAME COMPUTERS

Mr. Majeed said his question is based on the scenario that the county will be making the purchase, and we just share 36%, will we have an input on purchasing at all?

Dale Borgsdorf, Assistant City Manager, said it will a joint selection process. The county
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will issue the RFP but the committee will consist of the MIS director from the city and from the county, and the decisions will be made jointly

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Patterson, seconded by Councilmember Wheeler, ]
[ and carried unanimously, to approve the amendment ]

* * * * * *


[ Motion was made by Councilmember Hammond, seconded by Councilmember Wheeler, ]
[ and carried unanimously, to approve the grant ]

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 43, at Page 89

* * * * * *


Mr Reid said he knows that this is a little bit of money, but aren't we're sending the wrong message when we start printing things in Spanish, Vietnamese and Laotian. We have high schoolers who are graduating who can't read English. It seems to him that it would be better to take our money and spend it there if we are going to spend it. His real opposition to this, even though it is a small amount of money, is that about the only thing left in this society that is holding us together is the English language. Here we are printing things in foreign languages to distribute to people which is going to discourage them from doing the very thing that needs to be done. Now in Miami we see the results of immigrants coming in and not being required to change the law. In Quebec and Canada they have a bad situation. He thinks it is unfair to the taxpayers to spend our money to print things in Spanish, Vietnamese and Laotian when we should be teaching at the very worse. Someone had to sponsor these people to come to Charlotte, it is their responsibility to teach them English or at least help them along. He don't know how we could spend the taxpayer's hard earned money for this purpose.

Mayor Vinroot said he disagrees with Mr Reid at 180 degrees. He wrote a letter to the Governor last week asking him to give people the opportunity here to take the driving test in Spanish, because there are so many Spanish people here who can't work because they can't get a driver's license and the Governor is moving to do that. We are certainly not changing our teaching methods, we're simply doing some things to deal with some problems that need education on the front before Rome burns. He thinks it's a good idea, and hopes Council will pass it.

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Martin, seconded by Councilmember Hammond, to ]
[ approve the grant ]

The vote was taken on the motion and carried as follows

YEAS Councilmembers Campbell, Clodfelter, Hammond, McCrory, Majeed, Mangum, Martin, Patterson, Scarborough and Wheeler

NAYS Councilmember Reid

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 43, at Page 90

* * * * * *
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ADJOURNMENT

[ Motion was made by Councilmember Mangum, seconded by Councilmember Wheeler, ]
[ and carried unanimously, to adjourn the meeting ]

Brenda R Freeze, City Clerk
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Earle Village Revitalization</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation Loan Agreement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
<td>Attachment No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Wilmore Neighborhood Association Loan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Reid Park Associates Contract and Condemnation Resolution</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Grier Heights Economic Foundation Loan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Emergency Shelter Grant</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Amendment to Interlocal Agreement on Mainframe Computers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Governor’s Crime Commission Grant-Drug Enforcement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Governor’s Crime Commission Grant-Crime Prevention Literature</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSENT I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Various Bids:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Liquid Stream Improvements - General Construction</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Liquid Stream Improvements - HVAC</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Liquid Stream Improvements - Electrical</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Construction</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Water Main Construction - Shopton Road</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Water Main Construction - McGuire Nuclear Station</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Polymer - CMUD</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Bulk Lime System - CMUD</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Curb Replacement</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Sidewalk Construction - Thrift\Tuckasegee</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Wilkinson Boulevard Phase III Improvements</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Genesis Park Neighborhood Reinvestment</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>In Rem Remedy Action</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>1704 Pegram Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>2000 Renner Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>2643 Mayfair Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Tax Refunds</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Speed Limits</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSENT II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Attachment No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Various Bids:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Pothole Patcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Temporary Personnel Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>New Convention Center Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>New Convention Center Millwork &amp; Cabinets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>New Convention Center Storefront &amp; Curtainwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>New Convention Center Audio\Visual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>New Convention Center Site Demolition - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>New Convention Center Roofing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>New Convention Center Finishes</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>New Convention Center Overhead Doors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Allsteel Workstations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Taxiway &quot;C&quot; Contract</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Replacement Housing Contract</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Amendment to Hazen &amp; Sawyer Contract - CMUD</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
<td>Attachment No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Concord Engineering and Surveying Contract - CMUD</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Amendment to Black &amp; Veatch Contract - Mallard Creek and McDowell Creek</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Amendment to Black &amp; Veatch Contract - North Service Area Residual Management Study</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Property Transactions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Hearing on County Storm Water Fee

Action Requested:  
A) Conduct a joint public hearing with the Mecklenburg County Board of Commissioners on increase of the storm water service charge;  
B) Adopt a revised storm water charge to be effective January 1, 1994.

Explanation of Request:

As part of the resolution adopted by the City Council and Board of County Commissioners last fall, the City agreed to assess and collect a fee (amount set by the County) to pay for the County's large stream activities inside the City. The City must currently levy the fee due to limitations included in state authorizing legislation that prevent more than one local government storm water charge in a given area.

A public hearing is required by state law before changing the storm water fee. The joint hearing is required by the resolution adopted last fall.

A monthly charge of 32 cents per single family home, and $5.33 per impervious acre for non single family properties, for large stream activities is proposed by the County. This charge would be collected both inside the City and in the unincorporated areas, and in the towns who choose to participate. With this increase, the revised storm water charge would be:

- $2.22 per month for single family homes with less than 2,000 square feet of impervious area (current City charge $1.90).
- $2.92 per month for single family homes with 2,000 square feet or more of impervious area (current City charge $2.60).
- $41.15 per month for non-single family properties for one acre of impervious area (current City charge $32.84).
The combination of the monthly charges inside the City is illustrated in the following chart.

### MONTHLY CHARGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single Family Properties* (2,000 Sq Ft. or more impervious area)</th>
<th>Non Single Family Properties (for one acre impervious area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large streams</td>
<td>Drainage system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte charge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County charge</td>
<td>$0.32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Single family homes with less than 2,000 square feet would be charged $1.90 plus $0.32 = $2.22

### Background:

The County is planning to implement a storm water utility next January to:

- provide maintenance and improvement of large streams county-wide (currently provided by the County through property taxes); and
- provide maintenance and improvement of small streams and storm drains in the unincorporated areas and towns (currently provided by Charlotte inside the City and not provided outside the City).

The Board of County Commissioners conducted a public hearing on May 3 concerning the assessment of storm water fees in the unincorporated areas and small towns.
2. Approval of Minutes of: April 5 Workshop
   April 12 Briefing
   April 12 Citizens Hearing and Regular Meeting
   April 19 Zoning Meeting, and
   April 20 Joint City/County/School Board Meeting

CONSENT ITEMS

3. Agenda items 20 through 31 may be considered in one motion except for those items removed from the consent agenda as a result of a Councilmember making such a request of the City Clerk prior to the meeting.

POLICY

4. Public Safety Committee Recommendation on Fire Investigation Task Force

   Action: Leave Fire Investigation Task Force as a Division of the Charlotte Fire Department

   Staff Resource: Don Steger

   Explanation of Request: The Public Safety Committee recommends leaving the Fire Investigation Task Force as a division of the Fire Department.

   Background: At the January Council retreat, this issue was identified as a potential for cost reduction. The Task Force is already a division of the Fire Department and involves participation by City, County, State, and Federal agencies. Given current experience, the Police Chief and Fire Chief recommended that the present structure, with fire investigation in the Fire Department, be retained. The Public Safety Committee unanimously agreed.
5. Wind-Up Ordinance for FY93 Budget

Action: Adopt the Fiscal Year-End Ordinance Reflecting Changes to the Annual Ordinance Adopted in June, 1992 and Reflecting Accounting Changes Necessary to Comply with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles

Staff Resource: Vi Alexander

Explanation of Request:

- Sections 1 and 2 appropriate private contributions to Discovery Place ($163,686) and to the Performing Arts Center ($670,909).

- Section 3 transfers the State Rideshare Grant from the General Fund to the Public Transportation Fund.

- Section 4 appropriates $250,000 from General Fund Fund Balance for the demolition of Plato Price School.

- Section 5 appropriates $50,139 in parking revenues from the lot on the New Police Headquarters site to the New Police Headquarters construction account.

- Section 6 appropriates the Emergency Shelter grant of $59,000 to Community Development.

- Section 7 appropriates $10,000 from General Fund Fund Balance for a Pearson Fellow from the U.S. State Department. The $10,000 is the City’s only fee. The State Department pays the $65,000 salary. This program will begin August 2, 1993 for a period of one year. This position will assist the Mayor’s International Cabinet and staff in preparing and implementing an international strategic plan for Charlotte.
Item No.

- Section 8 appropriates $70,000 from General Fund Fund Balance for repair of the pond and fountain basin in Marshall Park.

- Sections 9 through 13 make technical accounting changes to the Community Development and General CIP Funds, as well as the January 25, 1993 annexation ordinance.

Background:

Near the conclusion of each fiscal year, City Council is requested to consider an ordinance adjusting for changes which have occurred since adoption of the annual ordinance last June. Most of these corrections are technical accounting changes. Others distribute private contributions, grants and interest earnings to the appropriate accounts.

6. New Police Headquarters

Action: Adopt a resolution that authorizes installment payment financing of the City’s portion of the new Police Headquarters. The resolution also authorizes the related form of various financing documents. The amount of the contract will not exceed $14 million.

Staff Resource: Del Borgsdorf

Explanation of Request: In order for staff to proceed with the June 30, 1993 sale date for this financing, Council must approve the resolution that authorizes the City to enter into the form of various financing documents including the following:

- Installment Payment Contract
- Trust Agreement
- Preliminary Official Statement (and subsequent official statement)
- Deed of Trust
The Underwriters, the Contract of Purchase and Related Letter of Representations.

The June 30, 1993 sale date allows the City to proceed with the new Police Headquarters on a schedule that will not delay Mecklenburg County’s new Intake and Detention Facility.

On April 26, 1993, Council authorized staff to proceed with actions necessary to secure installment payment financing for the new Police Headquarters in an amount not to exceed $14 million. On May 10, 1993, Council conducted a public hearing concerning the financing. Council has also previously committed to the following:

- Conveyance of the current LEC to Mecklenburg County
- Construction of a new Police Headquarters at the site bounded by East Trade, Alexander, East Fifth and Davidson Streets
- Acceptance of Property from Mecklenburg County for the site of the new Police Headquarters
- Award of architect and construction manager contract

Implementation Plan for "Committee of 100" Transportation/Transit Plan

Action:

1) Approve the implementation plan for the transportation/transit process, as recommended by the Transit Liaison Committee, and

2) Submit nominations for the "Committee of 100" by June 28.

Staff Resource: Boyd Cauble
The elements of the implementation plan are as follows:

A) 16-month work program (See Attachment).

B) Profile of "Committee of 100" membership (See Attachment).

C) Process for selecting "Committee of 100".
   - 50 nominations from both City and County
   - Mayor will appoint 10 of city's 50 nominees.
   - Mayor and County Commission Chairman jointly appoint "Committee of 100" chair.
   - "Committee of 100" chair and Transit Liaison Committee appoint 12-person Steering Committee for larger group
   - All appointments consider diversity by age, race, sex, and geography to ensure broad-based representation.

D) Charges/Roles for: (See Attachment)
   - Liaison Committee.
   - Steering Committee for the "Committee of 100".
   - Staff Task Force.

E) Consultant assistance requiring an estimated $225,000.
   - For evaluation of existing transit system and preparation of public information program.
   - North Carolina Department of Transportation will contribute $50,000 toward consultant contracts.
   - Remaining cost will be shared equally by City and County.
If the implementation plan is approved, submit nominations for "Committee of 100" membership by June 28.

**Background:**

- On April 26, Council approved a strategic process for building community consensus on future transportation/transit needs.

- On May 20, the joint City/County Transit Liaison Committee approved a work program, "Committee of 100" profile, and charges/roles for various committees involved in transportation/transit strategic process. The Liaison Committee forwarded their recommendations to Council and the County Commission on May 26.

**Attachment 1**

---

### 8. Refinancing of Public Improvement and Water & Sewer Bonds

**Action:** Approve a resolution that fulfills the requirements necessary to refinance all or part of the principal amounts of one or more of the City's 1989, 1990 and 1991 Public Improvement and Water & Sewer Bonds.

**Staff Resource:** Del Borgsdorf

**Explanation of Request:** Approval of the resolution accomplishes the following:

- Introduces a bond order that authorizes the refunding bonds.

- Designates June 28, 1993 as the date for a public hearing on the bond order and directs the City Clerk to publish the required notice.
- Designates the Finance Director, Deputy Finance Director or the City Treasurer as the official to prepare and file the Sworn Statement of Debt.

The current interest rate environment gives the City an opportunity to realize substantial debt service savings (approximately $4 million present value savings) by refinancing its 1989, 1990, and 1991 Public Improvement/Water and Sewer General Obligation Bonds. To accomplish this the City will sell refunding bonds to pay-off the older bonds that have higher interest rates. This action by Council is the first of two that are necessary to complete this transaction.

Background. On June 27, 1989 and October 10, 1990 and August 20, 1991, the City closed on bond issues of $53,965,000, $81,210,000 and $40,745,000 respectively. These issues have interest rates that are higher than prevailing rates making refinancing feasible. The savings on this refinancing is very sensitive to market conditions. The Finance Department will continue to monitor various market factors and will either reschedule or cancel the sale if rates are not favorable to the City.

9. New Convention Center Refinancing

Action: Approve a resolution authorizing staff to proceed with a refinancing of all or part of the City's 1991 Installment Purchase Contract (Certificates of Participation, Series 1991) used to finance the new Convention Center. The resolution authorizes the necessary steps and documents. These include the following:

- City Manager and Finance Director are authorized to negotiate on behalf of the City.
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• Authorizes the Finance Director to file an application with the Local Government Commission.

• Authorizes appointment of the underwriting team and counsel.

Staff Resource: Del Borgsdorf

Explanation of Request: The current interest rate environment gives the City an opportunity to realize debt service savings (present value savings of approximately $4 to $5 million) by refinancing the Convention Center Installment Purchase Contract. To accomplish this the City will sell refunding certificates of participation to pay-off the older certificates of participation. This requires authorization to negotiate various documents.

Background: On July 2, 1991, the City sold $167,643,940 certificates of participation to fund the construction and acquisition of the new convention center.

The outstanding principal balance is currently $167,643,940. This transaction will refinance a major portion of the remaining principal balance.

Resolution Amending the FY93-97 Capital Improvement Program and Ballantyne Development Water and Sewer Contract

Action: A) Approval of a resolution amending the FY93-97 Capital Improvement Program to revise an existing project and to add an unfunded project.

B) Approval of a reimbursable water and sewer contract between the City of Charlotte and Ballantyne Development Corporation.

Staff Resource: Barry Gullet
### Explanation of Request:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A)</strong></td>
<td>The resolution revises the Six Mile Creek Outfall, Lift Station, and Force Main Project to exclude construction of a new outfall along the McAlpine Creek Tributary. The resolution also adds a new Outfall (1-A) along the McAlpine Creek Tributary as an unfunded project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B)</strong></td>
<td>The reimbursable contract with Ballantyne Development Corporation provides for the design and construction of 8,900 linear feet of sanitary sewer and 7,400 linear feet of 24-inch water main. Estimated cost is $600,000 and $575,000 for the water main. It is a funded project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Six Mile Creek

The scope of the Six Mile Creek project is proposed to be changed as follows (map attached):

- Move the lift station from Marvin Road to the county border with Union and Lancaster Counties. This land is already owned by Mecklenburg County;
- Revise the alignment of the receiving outfall that discharges into McAlpine Creek Outfall to allow for less difficult and less costly construction;
- Parallel approximately 4000' of McAlpine Creek Outfall. The existing McAlpine Creek Outfall is nearing capacity. It could accept initial flows from Six Mile but not future expected flows. This parallel will also provide for more flexibility for possible future regional options.

### McAlpine Creek

The Outfall along McAlpine Creek Tributary provides the following (map attached):

- Sanitary sewer service to a rapidly developing area. The Ballantyne Development is located in this area. It will include both residential and commercial land uses.
U.S. 521

- When completed, the U.S. 521 Water Main will consist of 15,000 linear feet of 24 inch pipe from the McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant to the intersection of providence Road West and U.S. 521.

- This project was originally scheduled for construction in FY97. Participation by the Ballantyne Development Corporation in development of the main will allow for acceleration of approximately half of the project beginning with construction of 7,400 linear feet of main from the McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant to the Ballantyne development.

- The FY94-FY98 Capital Improvement Program includes funding for the remaining 7,600 linear feet of the main with construction proposed for FY98.

Ballantyne

- This is a 5-year reimbursable contract to serve the Ballantyne Development. The applicant has deposited 10% of the estimated project cost with the remaining 90% to be deposited prior to construction.

- Future development of the Ballantyne property would impact the capacity of the flow into the existing McAlpine Creek Outfall. To provide adequate and sufficient treatment of future flow, it is desirable to expedite the Six Mile Creek project to meet projected demands. However, the water and sewer contract for development of the Ballantyne property is not contingent upon approval of acceleration of the Six Mile Creek project.

11. Earle Village Revitalization

Action: Approve the Charlotte Housing Authority’s (CHA’s) plan of implementation for Earle Village using the Urban Revitalization Demonstration Program.

Staff Resource: Del Borgsdorf

Explanation of Request:

- The Charlotte Housing Authority (CHA) submitted a Revitalization Demonstration (URD) Grant Application on May 24, 1993 to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for $34.7 million to revitalize Earle Village.

- One of the requirements of the URD Grant Application is the local governing body’s approval of the CHA’s plan of implementation. This approval must be sent to HUD before July 20, 1993. The plan is attached.

- The budget includes:
  - $15.8 million to renovate 245 units, demolition of 150 units and construction of a Community Service Center.
  - $12.9 million for 239 units of replacement housing for the demolished units and units proposed for conversion to home ownership.
  - $6 million for a 5-year program of comprehensive support services and a Community Service Program, both designed to promote resident self-sufficiency.

- Part of the URD Grant Application is a Matching Requirement which states the City must provide contributions for supportive services in an amount equal to at least 15% of the grant.
funds. This requirement will be met through in-kind and supportive services contributions from the City and County, including:

- Police
- Social Services
- Health
- Employment and Training
- Parks and Recreation

- Grant Application includes street improvements in Earle Village which CDOT has agreed, in concept, to permit CHA to do (at no cost to City):
  - Installation of median on Davidson Street between 6th and 10th Streets and reduction of 4 current lanes to 2.
  - Installation of pedestrian crossing on 7th Street between Davidson and McDowell Streets.

- CHA has commitments of $4,891,786 over five years from non-federal sources to support the program. This amounts to 40% of the total expenditures -- well above the required 15% match.

- CHA made presentations to City Council at its April 12 and 26, 1993 dinner meetings about the URD Grant and proposed revitalization of Earle Village. See attachments for additional background.

Attachment 2
12. Housing Rehabilitation Loan Agreement

Action: Approve entering into a Housing Rehabilitation Loan Agreement in the amount of $63,200 to rehabilitate and refinance a house at 6511 Woodfield Drive.

Staff Resource: J. W. Walton

Explanation of Request: Mr. and Mrs. Cramer Miller were referred to the rehabilitation loan program by the Program for Accessible Living (PAL). Rehabilitation of the property will bring the house at 6511 Woodfield Drive into compliance with the City's Housing Code. The refinancing of their existing indebtedness in the amount of $46,100 will allow the City to be in a first lien position and will reduce the City's risk to foreclosure.

The breakdown of the total costs are

- Rehabilitation Cost: $15,350
- Contingency: $1,535
- Attorney Fees/Closing Costs: $215
- Refinancing Existing Indebtedness: $46,100
- Total Loan Amount: $63,200

Attachment 3

13. Wilmore Neighborhood Association Loan

Action: Approve a Tri-Party Agreement between the City, Wilmore Neighborhood Association (WNA) and Crosland Contractors that contains:

A) a loan in the amount of $120,000 to WNA to acquire a parcel of land on West Boulevard on which 2 quadruplexes are located;
Item No. -16-

B) a loan in the amount of $399,388 to WNA to rehabilitate the 2 quadruplexes; and

C) a grant in the amount of $23,400 to WNA to fund professional design and engineering services for the quadruplexes.

Staff Resource: J. W. Walton

Explanation of Request:

The Tri-Party Agreement contains:

- A $120,000 25-year deferred payment loan at 0% interest to WNA with funds being used to acquire 2 quadruplex structures at 501 and 531 West Boulevard and vacant land between the 2 structures from DJT Properties.

  The acquisition costs are as follows:

  $30,500 for 501 West Boulevard
  72,500 for 531 West Boulevard
  17,000 for the vacant land
  $120,000

- A $399,388 25-year deferred payment loan at 0% interest to WNA with funds being used for the rehabilitation of the 2 quadruplex structures, site work, fees, project landscaping, a new parking lot, a greenhouse and furnishings in the community center. WNA will contract with Crosland Contractors, which is a division of The Crosland Group, for a turn-key project.

  The rehabilitation costs are as follows:

  $280,484 - Convert 501 West Boulevard into a community center.

  $118,904 - Rehabilitate 531 West Boulevard as a quadruplex rental apartment building.
net cash flow from the 4 rental apartments will provide a portion of the cash required to operate the community center.

$23,400 - Grant to WNA to contract for design and engineering services.

Attached is a Tri-Party Agreement between the City, WNA and Crosland Contractors describing the scope of services for each entity and includes the land purchase option.

WNA will own, operate and manage the community center. The City will not fund the community center’s administrative and operating expenses.

WNA, a nonprofit neighborhood-based organization and owner of the community center, will raise sufficient financial resources through yearly fundraising activities to underwrite the community center’s program and operating annual budget.

Since March 1993, the WNA has been actively engaged in a 10-month fundraising effort. To date WNA has successfully raised approximately $70,000 in corporate and neighborhood contributions/donations and pledges.

Attachment 4

Exhibit A - Tri-Party Agreement (available in City Clerk’s Office)

Exhibit B - Community Center’s First Year Operating Budget
14. Reid Park Associates Contract and Condemnation Resolution

Action:

A) Approve a contract between the City and Reid Park Associates to acquire certain properties in the Reid Park community, and, if following:

B) Adopt resolutions authorizing condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of certain real property in the Reid Park community.

Staff Resource: J. W. Walton

Explanation of Request:

The Reid Park property consists of 10 housing units (7 single-family properties and 1 triplex multi-family property).

Condemnation authorization is needed in the event City staff is not able to successfully negotiate the acquisition of the properties.

HUD Grant:

Reid Park Associates will apply for a HUD HOPE III grant in mid-June to purchase these 10 units from the City, which will then be rehabilitated and sold to create homeownership opportunities for lower-income persons. The HOPE III grant requires that Reid Park...
Associates acquire a minimum of 10 units from the City or other governmental entities, such as FHA or VA repossessions.

In the event that Reid Park Associates is not awarded the HOPE III grant, the contract between Reid Park Associates and the City requires that Reid Park Associates acquire the properties from the City utilizing funds set aside for Reid Park Associates in First Union National Bank’s Community Real Estate Fund. The Community Real Estate Fund is a source of interim acquisition funds until Reid Park Associates can find a permanent source of financing.

Once the properties have been acquired by the City through negotiation and/or condemnation, City Council will be requested to approve the sale of the properties to Reid Park Associates.

Attachment 5

15. Grier Heights Economic Foundation Loan

Action:

(A) Approve a $101,600 increase in Development and Revitalization funds for the Bank of Mecklenburg to have sufficient City Within a City (CWAC) funds for a loan to Grier Heights Economic Foundation (GHEF);

(B) Approve using $102,600 from the Development and Revitalization Fund as 20% matching funds for a 80% CWAC loan for $410,400 to be made by the Bank of Mecklenburg to GHEF to finance construction of a daycare center;

(C) Approve an exemption to the Bank’s 10-year maximum loan term under the CWAC Loan Program.

Staff Resource: J. W. Walton
• GHEF proposes to construct a daycare center on Billingsley Road at a total cost of $618,000.

• Proposed Project Funding:
  - Bank of Mecklenburg Loan $410,400
  - City’s CWAC Loan 102,600
  - GHEF Contribution 105,000
  - $618,000

• CWAC Loan Program used because GHEF’s $105,000 contribution was not sufficient equity. (Only 17% of total project cost.)

• CWAC loan makes transaction viable.

• Bank of Mecklenburg loan will not be approved without City’s CWAC loan.

• Job Creation:
  - 20 total jobs to be created
  - At least 11 jobs will be created within 2 years for low-moderate income persons from CWAC area.
  - Possibility all 20 jobs will be filled by low/moderate income persons from CWAC area.

• Daycare center will be located in 6,700 square foot building on 1.6 acres of land.

• Land owned by Mecklenburg County and will be leased by GHEF for $1.00 per year.

• Mecklenburg County will enter into agreement with GHEF whereby, if GHEF defaults on its loan, the County will:
  - purchase 85% of the outstanding principal balance on the bank and City loans to GHEF.
- pay down 90% of bank loan and remaining funds would pay down City loan.

Attachment 6

16. Emergency Shelter Grant

Action: Recommend approval of Homeless Services Network Joint Proposal for the City's Emergency Shelter Grant of $59,000.

Staff Resource: Del Borgsdorf

Explanation of Request:
A Request for Proposals was sent out in April. Five collective responses were received from those homeless service providers currently receiving funds from the City under the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) program.

Staff recommends Option I, the distribution proposed collectively by the Homeless Services Network as a way of sharing reduced grant funds among the five agencies currently providing services with ESG funds.

Option I

The allocation would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Emergency Housing</td>
<td>$12,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Assistance</td>
<td>$10,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>$6,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveler's Aid Society</td>
<td>$6,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown Day Shelter</td>
<td>$21,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Request</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 2

An alternative, Option 2, would allocate funds to two rather than all five eligible agencies on the basis of unmet community needs identified in the City’s Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS).

Divide the $59,000 grant among two agencies.

(a) Provide $41,300 (70% of grant) to Charlotte Emergency Housing for operations ($30,400), administration ($5,900) and essential services ($5,000).

(b) Provide $17,700 (30% of grant) to Crisis Assistance Ministry for rent and security deposit subsidies (homeless prevention activities).

Attachment 7

17. Amendment to Interlocal Agreement for Shared Use of an IBM Mainframe Computer and Supporting Software

Action: Approve an amendment to the Interlocal Agreement with Mecklenburg County to provide for shared use of an IBM mainframe computer and supporting software.

Staff Resource: Dick Passine

Explanation of Request:

- The City and County computer departments have analyzed their mainframe needs for the next three years and have determined that an IBM 3090 model 200 J computer is needed. The County requires 64% and the City 36% of the computing resources of the targeted machine.
- The County will procure the proposed equipment after joint review of vendor responses to an RFP for lease of the equipment under a 36-month agreement. The County will be contractually responsible for the shared hardware and supporting IBM software including all payments.

- The City will pay the County 36% of the cost associated with these resources via the interlocal agreement. Use of the shared computer will double the City’s mainframe processing power for approximately $36,700 per month ($440,400 annually) which is $100,000 less per year than the cost incurred to upgrade our own computer.

- Shared use of the single computer will also position the City and County to consolidate their operations staff and to effect savings in the future through reduced staffing levels.

- The amendment to the Interlocal Agreement was approved by the Board of Commissioners on May 3, 1993.

Background:

The City and County data centers have been co-located in the same facility of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center since 1988. Both jurisdictions use IBM mainframe computers and are compatible with their hardware and system software environment. Although some sharing of peripheral equipment occurs, the data centers are essentially independent and vendor contracts are negotiated and funded by each jurisdiction.

Both computers currently require upgrading to accommodate expanding needs. The CIS Department and the Mecklenburg County Data Processing Department have studied the merits of sharing a processor and propose to replace their present mainframe with a single larger mainframe which will be shared between the two jurisdictions. The
proposed computer can be partitioned so that the City and County operations staff can run their work independent of each other as if they were on separate computers.

18. Governor’s Crime Commission Grant - Drug Enforcement

Action: Approve a grant application to the Governor’s Crime Commission to fund a community policing drug enforcement initiative and approve a budget ordinance appropriating $15,835 in assets forfeiture funds to provide the City’s match.

Explanation of Request:
This one year grant will fund a pilot program in the Charlie One District which will pair Neighborhood Coordinators with officers from Vice and Street Drug Interdiction to systematically target neighborhoods for drug enforcement. The project activity will include both intensive enforcement efforts and soliciting neighborhood involvement in reducing drug activity. If the project is successful, the model will be used in other districts that have implemented community policing.

The grant will fund surveillance equipment and advanced drug enforcement training for project personnel. Total project cost is $63,340, of which $47,505 is federal money and $15,835 is the City match, to be covered through assets forfeiture funds.

19. Governor’s Crime Commission Grant - Crime Prevention Literature

Action: Approve a grant application to the Governor’s Crime Commission to fund the translation and printing of crime prevention literature into foreign languages and approve a budget ordinance appropriating $6,175 in assets forfeiture funds to provide the City match.
This grant will fund the translation and printing of several crime prevention publications into Spanish, Vietnamese, and Laotian. The literature will include a general brochure about the Police Department, apartment security, personal security and a booklet for children. The program is part of the Police Department's on-going outreach effort to reach Charlotte’s ethic communities. The literature may be adopted by the Crime Commission for statewide use.

Total project cost is $24,700, of which $18,525 is federal funding and $6,175 is assets forfeiture funds to cover the City match.
F. Collect "test"

As a result, it would lead to a new budget of $130,000 from savings on the "test plant". 

Renovations.

145, 241, 26
The consent portion of the agenda is divided into two sections: Consent I and Consent II.

Consent I consists of routine items that have been approved in the budget, are within the budget estimate, and have met M/WBE criteria.

Consent II consists of items that have also been approved in the budget, but which may require additional explanation.

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.

CONSENT I

20. VARIOUS BIDS

A. General Construction - Contract B1 - Liquid Stream CMUD Improvements - McAlpine Creek Wastewater Management Facility Modifications And Expansions

Recommendation: Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department recommends that the low bid by State Utility Contractors, Inc. of Monroe, NC in the amount of $5,159,160 be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWBE Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. HVAC - Contract B2 - Liquid Stream Improvements

- McAlpine Creek Wastewater Management Facility Modifications & Expansions

Recommendation: Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department recommends that the low bid by Tompkins-Johnston Co., Inc. of Matthews, NC in the amount of $9,250 be accepted. The contractor solicited quotes from two WBE contractors. They were not interested in such a small job. Project MWBE goal is 1%.

C. Electrical - McAlpine Creek Wastewater Management Facility Modifications And Expansions

Recommendation: Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department recommends that the low bid by Ind-Com Electrical Company of Charlotte, NC in the amount of $749,700 be accepted. The Contractor complied with the MWBE contract provisions which allow him to perform all the work with his own forces. Project MWBE goal is 1%.

D. Sanitary Sewer And Water Main Construction - CMUD

FY 93 Contract No. 14 - Street Main Extensions

Recommendation: Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department recommends that the low bid by McDaniel Construction Company of Charlotte, NC in the amount of $943,284.75 be accepted. WBE participation is 100%.

E. Water Main Construction - 12-Inch Water Main - CMUD

Along Shopton Road - From Beam Road To Dixie Road

Recommendation: Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department, recommends that the low bid by R. H. Price, Incorporated of Charlotte, NC in the amount of $328,194.62 be accepted. WBE participation is 99.85%.
Water Main Construction - 12-Inch Water Main
Along N.C. 73 To McGuire Nuclear Station

Recommendation: Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department recommends that the low bid by Trans-State Construction Co. of Denver, NC in the amount of $145,531.89 be accepted. The Contractor has complied with the MWBE contract provisions which allow him to perform all the work with his own forces.

G. Polymer

Recommendation: Director Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department recommends that the low bid by Stockhausen of Greensboro, NC in the amount of $311,000 be accepted. There is no known MWBE vendor.

The bid process for Polymer requires that vendors pre-qualify their product. This requires extensive time and testing (8 weeks) on City equipment. Due to this requirement, the option to renew the current contract an additional year at the same unit price is requested, provided funds are made available by City Council.

H. Bulk Lime System

Recommendation: Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department recommends that the low bid by Combs and Associates of Charlotte, NC in the amount of $124,850 be accepted. There is no known MWBE vendor.

I. Curb Replacement FY93

Recommendation: Director of the Department of Transportation recommends that the low bid by United Construction of Charlotte, NC in the amount of $257,539.80 be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWBE Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>$257,539.80</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J. Thrift\Tuckaseegee Road Sidewalk

Recommendation: The City Engineer recommends that the low bid by The Shaw Group of Charlotte, NC in the amount of $108,384.15 be accepted.

MWBE Status: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$108,384.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$108,384.15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proj Goals: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. Wilkinson Boulevard Phase III Demonstration Area Side Strip Improvements

Recommendation: The City Engineer recommends that the low bid by Ferebee Corporation of Charlotte, NC in the amount of $293,604.28 be accepted.

MWBE Status: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proj Goals: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L. Genesis Park Neighborhood Reinvestment

Recommendation: The City Engineer recommends that the low bid by Blythe Development of Charlotte, NC in the amount of $305,933.19 be accepted. The Contractor has complied with the MWBE contract provision which allows performance of all work with contractor’s own forces.

21 In Rem Remedy Actions

A. 1704 Pegram Street

Action: Adopt an ordinance authorizing the use of the In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling at 1704 Pegram Street (Belmont Neighborhood) which is located in the City Within a City boundaries.

Attachment 8
B. 2000 Renner Street

Action: Adopt an ordinance authorizing the use of the In Rem Remedy to repair the dwelling at 2000 Renner Street (McCroy Heights Neighborhood) which is located in the City Within a City boundaries.

Attachment 9

C. 2643 Mayfair Avenue

Action: Adopt an Ordinance authorizing the use of the In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 2643 Mayfair Avenue (West Boulevard Neighborhood) which is located in the City Within a City boundaries.

Attachment 10

22. Tax Refunds

Action: Recommend adoption of a resolution authorizing the refund of certain taxes assessed through clerical or assessor error in the amount of $47,876.36.

Attachment 11

23. Speed Limits

Action: Request adoption of ordinance to lower the speed limit on Burnt Umber Drive (from Plott Road to dead end) from 35 miles per hour to 25 miles per hour.
CONSENT II

24. Various Bids

A. Pothole Patcher

Recommendation: Directors of the Purchasing Department and Department of Transportation recommend the bid by Public Works Equipment Co of Monroe, NC in the amount of $51,074 be awarded. There is no known MWBE vendor for this equipment.

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Equipment Co</td>
<td>Monroe, NC</td>
<td>$51,074.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruder-Sharpe, Inc.</td>
<td>Monroe, NC</td>
<td>$50,198.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Cost Difference:

1. The radiant heat method used by Bruder-Sharpe did not keep the asphalt warm overnight or weekends. One purpose of this unit is to eliminate using cold patches on "emergency" calls. The cold patches must be redone, thus doubling the costs.

2. Bruder-Sharpe did not comply with parts availability warranty. This warranty has been very effective in assuring vehicle uptime.

3. Bruder-Sharpe offered a one year parts and service warranty vs the specified two year warranty.

4. Bruder-Sharpe did not comply with burner shut off during spraying which is a safety hazard.

5. Bruder-Sharpe can not supply an anti-bridging device as required.

B. Temporary Personnel Services

Staff Resource: Gregory Spearman

Recommendation: The Purchasing Director recommends that the bid by Corporate Personnel Services of Charlotte, NC of $432,225 be accepted with option to renew for two additional periods of 12 months each.
MWBE Status: Project Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>432,225</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description: This is the first time the City and County have jointly received bids for Temporary Personnel Services. The Temporary Personnel Services contract is designed to provide (on an as needed basis) temporary employees for City departments to ensure that services are delivered when salaried employees are out for various reasons. This contract will provide different skill levels of temporary employees at fixed hourly rates. The contract is based on projected use. The City will only pay for actual hours used.

This contract will lower overall internal and external costs, simplify the placement process, streamline billing and payment and provide a management tool for tracking and monitoring the use of temporary personnel service within the City.

This bid was developed to provide a broad spectrum of temporary personnel services needs covering City job classifications.

The criteria for the bid included:

- the ability to service the City’s account
- reference evaluation
- commitment to subcontract with MWBE firms
- price
- method of placing temporary employees, and
- training temporaries to meet City expectations.

The evaluation criteria also included a site visit to the top ranked firms. The firm selected as most suited in providing the best combination of price and services was Corporate Personnel Services, Inc.

The use of Corporate will provide additional advantages for the City, which include:

- A single customized/itemized bill from one service provider vs. multiple individual separate billings from several different service providers;
- Monitoring trends for temporary personnel service use by department, skill, season, etc.;

- Requirement for Corporate to subcontract with other temporary firms in meeting City needs;

- Assessment of temporary assignment requests prior to job placement to maximize job and skill match for temporary position filled;

- The City’s right to not make payment for unproductive temporary employees

Attachment 12
Summary of Bids

CONVENTION CENTER
PROJECT SUMMARY

- This agenda includes eight contracts, items C through J, to be awarded for work on the Convention Center.

- With the approval of the items, all contracts will have been awarded except the Final Sitework package.

- The Final Sitework package will be broken down into several packages and awarded at a later date.

- The construction is currently ahead of schedule.
CONSTRUCTION BUDGET $94,243,400

CONSTRUCTION BUDGET SUMMARY

CONTRACTS AWARDED $68,898,414
(PRIOR TO 6/14/93)

CONTRACTS AWARDED 6/14/93 $17,365,313

CHANGE ORDERS TO DATE $ 2,389,619

TOTAL (AS OF 6/14/93) $88,653,346*

*This includes Construction Manager's contract and all change orders to date.

C. New Convention Center Signage

Recommendation: The City Engineer recommends that the low negotiated bid of $328,721 by Vomar Products of Sepulveda, CA be accepted. The Contractor has complied with the requirements of the MWBE program by electing to perform 100% of the work.

Project Description: Contract scope consists of all interior and exterior signage and site directional signs.

Summary of Bids:

VOMAR PRODUCTS $328,721.00(*)
SIMS CORPORATION $339,150.00
ANDCO INDUSTRIES $344,072.00 (Corrected)
BELSINGER SIGN WORKS $361,519.00
CORNELIUS ARCHITECTURAL PRODUCTS $402,731.58
ARCHITECTURAL GRAPHICS $443,249.00

* The low bid was negotiated from $330,761 to $328,721.

Explanation: Negotiation included providing on-site storage of materials for the Contractor, which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $328,721.
The original bid of $330,761 is 32.2% under the Construction Manager's estimate of $487,555, representing a difference of $156,794. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is $510,000. Overruns against the project budget in other packages necessitated negotiations of all bid amounts by incorporating cost reduction items. The negotiated bid sum of $328,721 is $181,279 lower (35.5% less) than the original Design Development estimate.

Attachment 13
Project Budget Update

D. Convention Center Millwork & Cabinets (Re-Bid) Engineering

Recommendation: The City Engineer recommends that the low negotiated bid of $830,843 by Stultz Manufacturing Co. of Kansas City, KS be accepted.

MWBE Status: Amount % of Project Proj Goals
MBE $34,786.00 4.2% 11%
WBE $5,000.00 0.6% 5%

The Contractor is pursuing additional MWBE subcontracting opportunities.

Project Description: Contract scope consists of all wall and base cabinets, the cafe bar, information desks and wood paneling.

Summary of Bids:

STULTZ MANUFACTURING CO. $830,843*
SOUTHERN ARCHITECTURAL WOODWORK $1,316,828 (Corrected)
NACOMA CONSOLIDATED LTD. NO BID

* The low bid was negotiated from $1,125,664 to $830,843.

Explanation: Negotiation included deleting millwork and wood paneling from the building and simplifying construction materials on cabinet tops and wood base which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $830,843.

The original bid of $1,125,664 is 9.9% under the Construction Manager’s estimate of $1,249,024, representing a difference of $123,360. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is
$713,523 and this overrun against the budget necessitated negotiation of the bid amount by incorporating cost reduction items. The negotiated bid sum of $830,843.00 is $117,320 higher (16.4% more) than the original Design Development estimate.

E. New Convention Center Storefront & Curtainwall Engineering

Recommendation: The City Engineer recommends that the negotiated bid of $2,787,290 by Joseph Shisko, Inc of Charleston, SC be accepted. The Contractor has complied with the requirements of the MWBE program by electing to perform 100% of the work.

Project Description: Contract scope consists of the entire glass curtainwall system, interior and exterior storefront, stainless steel entrance doors, aluminum meeting room doors, custom metal framed skylight (oculus), special architectural louvers, and associated support steel.

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH SHisko, INC.</td>
<td>$2,787,290 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTEK, INC</td>
<td>$2,466,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRITCHARD PAINT &amp; GLASS</td>
<td>$3,309,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOUR CITY ARCHITECTURAL</td>
<td>$3,572,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMENTS INDUSTRIES, WSA, INC.</td>
<td>$4,019,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The low bid was negotiated from $2,842,666 to $2,787,290.

Explanation: The original bid amount of $2,842,666 has been negotiated. Negotiations included providing fabrication areas inside the building for the work and acceptance of alternates to change the finishes of public entrance doors and exterior louvers, which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $2,787,290.

The original bid of $2,842,666 is 12.3% under the Construction Manager’s estimate of $3,242,800, representing a difference of $400,134. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is $2,654,870 and this overrun against the budget necessitated negotiation of the bid amount by incorporating cost reduction items. The negotiated bid sum of $2,787,290 is $132,420 higher (5.0% more) than the original Design Development estimate.
F. New Convention Center Audio/Visual Engineering

Recommendation: The City Engineer recommends that the low negotiated bid of $1,006,531 by Long Communications Group of Winston-Salem, NC be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWBE Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>$240,348.00</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Bids:

- LONG COMMUNICATIONS GROUP $1,006,531(*)
- AUDIO COMMUNICATIONS CONSULTANTS $1,115,889
- JWP ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS $1,274,215

* The low bid was negotiated from $1,049,531 to $1,006,531.

Project Description: Contract scope consists of a complete Audio Visual system.

Explanation: Negotiation includes the acceptance of a bid alternate to delete a character-generator system and TV monitors, which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $1,006,531.

The original bid of $1,049,531 is 1.1% under the Construction Manager’s estimate of $1,060,689, representing a difference of $11,157. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the Work is $817,392 and this overrun against the budget necessitated negotiation of the bid amount by incorporating the bid alternate item. The negotiated bid sum of $1,006,531 is $189,139 higher (23.1% more) than the original Design Development estimate.

G. Convention Center Site Demolition-2 Engineering

Recommendation: The City Engineer recommends that the low bid of $149,940 by Jones Grading & Fencing of Charlotte, NC be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWBE Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>$149,940.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item No. -38-

Project Description: Contract scope consists of the total removal of existing buildings, foundations, walls pavement and trees within the parking lot area.

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JONES GRADING &amp; FENCING, INC.</td>
<td>$149,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROWDER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>$176,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L - J, INC.</td>
<td>$195,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: The original bid amount of $149,940 is a corrected sum, due to miscalculation of the hazardous soil allowance against the base bid. This scope of Work includes removal of hazardous material not originally anticipated at Design Development.

The original bid of $149,940 is 4.0% under the Construction Manager's estimate of $156,261, representing a difference of $6,321. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is $138,834. The bid sum of $149,940 is $11,106 higher (8.0% more) than the Design Development estimate.

H. New Convention Center Roofing Engineering

Recommendation: The City Engineer recommends that the low negotiated bid of $2,117,112 by Dixie Roofing, Inc. of Lafollette, TN be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWBE Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description: Contract scope consists of a complete and warranted single-ply membrane and standing seam roofing system, roof pavers, roof hatches, plastic unit skylights, manufactured roof specialties, and associated blocking and firestop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIXIE ROOFING, INC.</td>
<td>$2,117,112.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUARANTEED SYSTEMS</td>
<td>$2,553,865.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELDON ROOFING</td>
<td>$3,585,300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The low bid was negotiated from $2,341,512 to $2,117,112.
Explanation: Negotiations included the use of an alternate standing-seam metal roof system, elimination of insulation fasteners, use of shop-fabricated coping and simplified roofing details, which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $2,117,112.

The original bid amount of $2,341,512 is 36.7% over the Construction Manager’s estimate of $1,481,019, representing a difference of $860,493. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is $1,558,246 and this overrun against the budget necessitated negotiation of the bid amount by incorporating cost reduction items. The negotiated bid sum of $2,117,112 is $636,093 more (30.0% over) than the original Construction Manager’s estimate.

I. New Convention Center Finishes

Recommendation: The City Attorney, MWBE Program Director, and the City Engineer recommends waiving as a technicality the failure of the low bidder to submit the MWBE Compliance Form with its bid and award the Finishes Contract to Cecil Malone Company of Atlanta, GA in the amount of $9,572,700. The low bidder promptly submitted the completed form immediately after the bid opening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWBE Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>$673,624</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>49,345</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description: Contract scope consists of all drywall partitions and gypsum ceilings, lath and plaster, acoustical ceilings, flooring systems, hollow metal doors and frames, wood doors, glass and glazing, painting and wall coverings, operable walls, architectural specialties and accessories.

Summary of Bids:
- CECIL MALONE COMPANY $ 9,572,700(*)
- METRIC CONSTRUCTORS $10,402,980
- BONITZ CONTRACTING $10,470,300
Item No. -40-

Explanation:

1. Malone made an honest mistake in submitting the wrong form and immediately rectified the mistake by submitting the correct form with significant MWBE participation.

2. The verified MBE participation in his bid is 7% or $673,624, and WBE participation is .5% or $49,345.

3. Malone’s bid is $830,000 lower than the bid submitted by the second low bidder, Metric Constructors.

4. The actual MBE participation submitted by Metric is 0% MBE and .2% or $17,000 WBE. Metric has submitted a participation by a material supplier of 2.5% or $240,000, however, participation by material suppliers cannot be counted toward MWBE goal attainment according to the MWBE plan.

5. This bid package is on the critical path of the construction schedule, therefore if work does not begin on this project according to schedule the completion date of the Convention Center may be delayed.

6. The MWBE provisions and state law provide the City legal authority to waive informalities and technicalities in bidding in order to protect the interest of the taxpayer in the event of a mistake by a bidder.

The second low bidder, Metric Constructors has submitted a protest against award of the contract to Malone. City staff has reviewed their protest and found it to be without merit. Attached is a position paper from Metric Constructors supporting their bid protest.

Attachment 14

J. New Convention Center Overhead Doors Engineering

Recommendation: The City Engineer recommends that the low negotiated bid of $572,176 by American Overhead Doors of Stanfield, NC be accepted. The Contractor has complied with the requirements of the
MWBE program, by electing to perform 100% of the work.

Project Description: Contract scope consists of all horizontal sliding doors, dock levelers, and rolling doors and grilles.

Summary of Bids:

AMERICAN OVERHEAD DOORS/
ATLAS ROLL-LITE DOOR CORPORATION $ 572,176*
OVERHEAD DOOR CO./PIEDMONT $ 687,884
INDUSTRIAL DOOR SALES $1,119,429
MAXSON & ASSOCIATES $1,178,063

* The low bid was negotiated from $672,792 to $572,176.

Explanation: Negotiation included deleting sliding doors and replacing with roll-up doors, deleting counter doors and dock levelers, and changing grille finishes, which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $572,176.

The original bid of $672,792 is 12.3% over the Construction Manager’s estimate of $599,252, representing a difference of $73,540. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is $378,460 and this overrun against the budget necessitated negotiation of the bid amount by incorporating cost reduction items. The negotiated bid sum of $572,176 is $193,716 higher (51.2% more) than the original Design Development estimate.

K. AllSteel Workstations

Justification: During rightsizing implementation, CMUD went to the team concept in the Engineering Division. In order for team members to be in close proximity to each other the utilization of modular work stations is necessary. The use of modular work stations will also enable the CMUD Engineering Division to best utilize the building space.

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spillars Contract Interiors</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$70,830.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacThrift</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$78,863.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.G Penegar (Did not meet labor specifications)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$69,737.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Taxiway "C" Contract

Action: Award contract for engineering design services for the reconstruction of Taxiway "C" to HDR Engineering, Inc. of North Carolina for the amount of $65,000.

Explanation of Request: The reconstruction of the north portion of Taxiway "C" is necessary due to the unreliable functional condition of the asphalt pavement. This project will replace the asphalt with portland cement concrete which is more conducive to heavy air carrier traffic.

Initially, HDR proposed a Lump Sum Fee of $96,677. After negotiation, a lump sum fee of $65,000 which is 4.3% of estimated construction costs, was agreed upon based on previous experience and detailed analysis of fees. This fee includes all reimbursables.

Background: March, 1992 - A selection committee with representatives from Aviation, Engineering, and Budget selected 5 engineering firms to perform design services for various airfield projects. HDR Engineering, Inc. was one of the five selected in that process.

26. Replacement Housing Contract

Action: A) Approve a Tri-Party Agreement between the City and the developer, New Vision Homes, Inc., to build and finance a new house and to purchase the new replacement house;
**Item No. 43**

**B)** Approve a $63,304 construction loan to New Vision Homes, Inc. to construct a new house and

**C)** Approve a $69,268 permanent loan from the Replacement Housing Program.

**Explanation of Request:**

These actions are needed in order to provide Mr. and Mrs. Charles Jones with affordable, standard housing.

Mr. and Mrs. Jones came on the City's relocation workload in November 1991 due to code enforcement action at their house at 328 E. Worthington Avenue. Because the cost to repair the house exceeded the tax value of the house by more than 65%, the house was ordered to be demolished. Also, a rehabilitation cost vs. new construction analysis was prepared by Community Development staff, and the analysis indicated that the house should be demolished because it was more economically feasible to build a new house. (See Exhibit A and picture of 328 E. Worthington Avenue.) A rendering of the new house to be constructed is attached as Exhibit B.

Additional background information is included with the attachments.

**Attachment 15**

---

**27. Amendment to Hazen & Sawyer, P.C. Contract**

**Action:** Approve Amendment No. 1 To Professional Services Contract With Hazen & Sawyer, P.C. in the amount of $175,500 to provide contract administration and construction inspection services for Sanitary Sewer Construction - Four Mile Creek Parallel Outfall.
Explanation of Request:

- Amendment No. 1 will exercise the option included in the original contract to have Hazen & Sawyer provide contract administration and construction inspection services.

- This amendment also authorizes compensation to Hazen & Sawyer for additional design and survey services that were necessary for completion of the project, but which were outside the scope of the original contract.

- Amendment No. 1 will increase the "not to exceed" limit from $372,500 to $548,000, an addition of $175,500.

Background:

- CMUD contracted with Hazen & Sawyer, P.C. on May 13, 1991 to design a sanitary sewer outfall to supplement or replace the existing Four Mile Creek Outfall between McAlpine Creek and Providence Road for a cost not to exceed $372,500.

- The existing Four Mile Creek Outfall from McAlpine Creek to the Raintree Community was built in the early 1970's by Mecklenburg County under a contract with the Raintree developer. It was later extended to eliminate the Matthews Treatment Plant under an EPA Program.

- Due to funding limitations, the outfall was not sized to accommodate full development of the basin. Because of rapid development in this basin in recent years, the flow in the outfall south of Providence Road is now nearing design capacity. In certain areas, overflows occur during heavy rain events.
- Hazen & Sawyer was selected by a competitive process based on qualifications and experience, according to the City's approved consultant selection process. Construction of this project is important to eliminate overflows and to provide improvements of the facilities to meet projected sewer flows.

28. Concord Engineering and Surveying Contract

Action: Approve Professional Services contract with Concord Engineering and Surveying, Incorporated to provide surveying and design services for water and sanitary sewer street main extensions not to exceed the amount of $500,000.

Explanation of Request: This professional services contract will allow CMUD to assign the surveying and design of some of the water and sewer street main extensions to Concord Engineering and Surveying, Inc.

Background:

- The Street Main Extension Policy was approved by City Council in May 1992, and revised in March 1993. The revision made water and sewer service more affordable to applicants. The demand for service increased dramatically.

- CMUD's goal is to provide service to an applicant within six months after application. With two in-house teams, CMUD has not been able to meet this goal on a consistent basis. Therefore, a third team utilizing a consultant for surveying and design should be added.

- Concord Engineering & Surveying, Inc. was selected by a competitive process based on qualifications and experience, according to the City's approved consultant selection process.
29. Amendment to Black & Veatch Contract - Mallard Creek and McDowell Creek

Action: Approve Amendment No. 4 to Authorization No. 1 with Black & Veatch for professional engineering services related to the Mallard Creek and McDowell Creek Wastewater Treatment Plants - $564,003.

Explanation of Request: This amendment will provide for continued and additional design services, environmental assessments, and construction phase services brought about by changes in federal and state building codes and regulations and owner authorizations to both Mallard Creek and McDowell Creek Wastewater Treatment Plants.

Background:

• Due to the growth in the North Mecklenburg service area, expansion and upgrade of two CMUD wastewater treatment plants was recognized and addressed by contracting for professional engineering services and funding by municipal bonds. The first expansion and upgrade is underway at the Mallard Creek plant site. The McDowell Creek Plant work has been delayed due to changing conditions in that service area which will affect the final design.

• The City Council approved a professional services agreement with Black & Veatch to study the expansion and upgrade of both Mallard Creek and McDowell Creek Plants on July 27, 1987.

• The City Council approved Authorization No. 1 for services for a 3 MGD expansion of the Mallard Creek Plant on December 12, 1988.

• The City Council approved Authorization No. 2 on November 14, 1989 for services to study a new plant site on Rocky River.

• The City Council approved Amendment No. 1 on April 23, 1990 for design due to permit changes.
- The City Council approved Amendment No. 2 on February 11, 1991 to design and construct Mallard Creek Plant Phase II.

- In March 1991, the City Council approved Amendment No. 3 for an improvements study update for both treatment plants.

30. Amendments to Black & Veatch Contract - North Service Area Residual Management Study

Action: Approve Amendment No. 2 to Authorization No. 3 with Black & Veatch for professional engineering services to the North Service Area Residual Management Study - $499,471.

Explanation of Request: The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department (CMUD) has need for specific engineering services to assist CMUD in complying with the new Section 503 Sludge Regulations which were imposed on municipalities by the Environmental Protection Agency in February 1993.

Background:
- The solid materials in wastewater and those solids which form due to the treatment of liquid wastewater must be managed and beneficially used in accordance with new federal regulations.
- To develop the existing CMUD residuals management program to a higher level, engineering services are required beyond the capabilities of the CMUD staff.
- One service will help develop a long term residuals management plan for three technical options now available to CMUD: land application, composting and lime stabilization.
- Another service will help develop a marketing plan for the three technical options to insure consistent, environmentally sound distribution outlets.

- Black & Veatch was approved by the City Council on July 27, 1987 to provide professional engineering services for the Mallard and McDowell Wastewater Treatment Plants.

- On March 25, 1991, the City Council approved the North Service Area Residuals Management Study as Authorization No. 3 to the Black & Veatch agreement.

- On October 14, 1991, the City Council approved the Amendment No. 1 to Authorization No. 3 specifically for a demonstration project to lime stabilize solids.

31. Property Transactions

For Aviation Property Transactions item #A through item #G, the purchase price was determined by an independent appraiser and a review by a second appraiser. Each appraiser takes into consideration specific quality and size of the house. Residential property is acquired per Federal Guidelines 49CFR Part 24 of The Uniform Acquisition and Relocation Act of 1970. Owners are eligible for relocation benefits. Acquisition and relocation costs are eligible for Federal Aviation Administration reimbursement.

A. Project: F.A.R. Part 150 Land Acquisition  
Owner(s): Linda L. Clark  
Property Address: 3435 East Willow Lane  
Property to be acquired (Church of God property)  
Improvements: 3 bedroom, 1 bath, ranch, brick  
Tax Value: N/A  
Purchase Price: $25,000.00
Remarks: Purchase price was determined by an independent appraiser and finalized by Court Order.

B. **Project:** Airport Master Plan Acquisition  
**Owner(s):** Beatrice C. Brown  
**Property Address:** Off Dixie Road  
**Property to be acquired:** 2.128 acres  
**Improvements:** Vacant Land  
**Tax Value:** $18,300.00  
**Purchase Price:** $38,900.00  
**Remarks:** Purchase price was determined by two independent appraisers and a review by a third appraiser. The tax value is determined on a more generic basis and will be higher or lower for property with certain attributes. This property was acquired under Airport Master Plan Land Acquisition guidelines.

C. **Project:** F.A.R. part 150 Land Acquisition  
**Owner(s):** Ronald L. Allen and Janice Allen Futrell  
**Property Address:** 3029 Moores Lake Drive  
**Property to be acquired:** .654 acres  
**Improvements:** 3 bedroom, 2 bath, brick, ranch  
**Tax Value:** $60,710.00  
**Purchase Price:** $75,800.00  
**Remarks:** The Tax Department has lowered the evaluations in Moores Park due to "economic obsolescence" (proximity to the Airport).

D. **Project:** F.A.R. Part 150 Land Acquisition  
**Owner(s):** Delmas L. Hilton and wife, Betty  
**Property Address:** 6420 Teresa Avenue  
**Property to be acquired:** .444 acres  
**Improvements:** 3 bedroom, 2 bath, brick ranch  
**Tax Value:** $73,750.00  
**Purchase Price:** $82,500.00  
**Remarks:** The Tax Department has lowered the evaluations in Moores Park due to "economic obsolescence" (proximity to the Airport).
E. **Project:** F.A.R. Part 150 Land Acquisition  
   **Owner(s):** Donald M. McSwain and wife, Nancy  
   **Property Address:** 6321 Teresa Avenue  
   **Property to be acquired:** .436 acres  
   **Improvements:** 3 bedroom, 1.5 bath, brick, ranch  
   **Tax Value:** $63,230.00  
   **Purchase Price:** $68,500.00  
   **Remarks:** The Tax Department has lowered the evaluations in Moores Park due to "economic obsolescence" (proximity to the Airport).

F. **Project:** F.A.R. Part 150 Land Acquisition  
   **Owner(s):** Sanford Grant and wife, Pauline  
   **Property Address:** Whippoorwill Drive  
   **Property to be acquired:** .618 Acres  
   **Improvements:** Vacant Land  
   **Tax Value:** $12,150.00  
   **Purchase Price:** $14,000.00

G. **Project:** F.A.R. Part 150 Land Acquisition  
   **Owner(s):** Nancy S. Taylor  
   **Property Address:** 2142 Boyer Street  
   **Property to be acquired:** .420 acres  
   **Improvements:** Duplex, 2 story, stucco, 3 bedroom, 2 bath  
   **Tax Value:** $58,850.00  
   **Purchase Price:** $59,000.00

H. **Project:** Four Mile Creek Parallel Outfall, Parcel No. 14  
   **Owner:** Tournament Players Club at Piper Glen, Inc.  
   **Property Address:** 4300 Piper Glen Drive  
   **Property to be acquired:** 54,512 sq.ft. (1.2514 ac.) of Permanent Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 48,674 sq.ft. (1.1174 ac.) of Temporary Construction Easement  
   **Improvements:** Trees, Fairway, Grass and Sprinkler Irrigation Systems
Item No.

Price: $10,770.00
Remarks: Required Right-of-Way Easements needed for the construction of the CMUD Four Mile Creek Parallel Outfall Sanitary Sewer Project.
Zoned: R-15 CD / R-15 MFC
Use: Residential

## TRANSPORTATION / TRANSIT STRATEGIC PROCESS
### IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>liaison committee</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>council &amp; commission</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>steering committee</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>committee of 100</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>all committees perform work program</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>committee of 100</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>approves charge &amp; profile for committee</em></td>
<td><em>approves process implementation</em></td>
<td><em>approves charge for &quot;committee of 100&quot;</em></td>
<td><em>reviews land use &amp; transit vision</em></td>
<td><em>possible subcommittee assignments</em></td>
<td><em>meets consensus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>approves process</em></td>
<td><em>adopts &quot;committee of 100&quot;&quot; members</em></td>
<td><em>approves agenda for 1st meeting of &quot;committee of 100&quot;</em></td>
<td><em>reviews land use &amp; transit vision</em></td>
<td><em>consultant &amp; public information analysis</em></td>
<td><em>recommends funding option(s)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>requests committee nominations from council &amp; commission</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>reviews implementation plan for vision</em></td>
<td><em>financial evaluation</em></td>
<td><em>recommends mechanism</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>staff task force</strong></td>
<td><strong>activities</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>excludes project needs</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>reviews funding needs</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city of charlotte</td>
<td>&quot;reviews process and roles&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>lists issues to be analyzed</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mecklenburg county</td>
<td>&quot;develops profile of &quot;committee of 100&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manager's office</td>
<td>&quot;suggests potential members&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cdo</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>charlotte transit</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>finance</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>planning commission</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>budget &amp; evaluation</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>city attorney</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>public service &amp; information</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carolina transportation compact &amp; mecklenburg chamber</td>
<td>uptown transportation council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charlotte chamber</td>
<td>n.c. department of transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mecklenburg town staff</td>
<td>regional city staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Light Rail Study

**Charlotte-Mecklenburg 2015 Transportation Plan**

**Charlotte-Mecklenburg 2015 Land Use Plan**

**Land Use & Transportation Studies From Regional Jurisdictions**
PROFILE OF "COMMITTEE OF 100" MEMBERSHIP

♦ MAJOR EMPLOYERS
  • Hospitals
  • Hotel/Motel Association
  • Restaurant Association
  • Universities/Colleges/Schools
  • Uptown Charlotte
  • Sport Facilities
  • Employer Associations (Arrowood, University Area, SouthPark, etc.)

♦ SMALLER EMPLOYERS
  • Fast Food Restaurants
  • Convenience Stores
  • Small Manufacturers
  • Grocers Association

♦ SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS
  • United Way
  • Goodwill Industries
  • Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services
  • Nevin Center
  • Special Population Interest Groups, such as Marian Diehl and Senior Centers

♦ CIVIC AND SOCIAL GROUPS
  • Civic Groups (Lions, Rotary, Civitans, etc.)
  • Mecklenburg Ministries
  • Clergy Association

♦ COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS
  • Johnston YMCA
  • Neighborhood Organizations

♦ MECKLENBURG CITIES/TOWNS

♦ MECKLENBURG LEGISLATIVE DELEGATION

♦ N.C. BOARD OF TRANSPORTATION
  • Members
  • NCDOT Staff
PROFILE OF "COMMITTEE OF 100" MEMBERSHIP
(continued)

♦ INDIVIDUAL EXPERTS
  • Air Quality
  • Transit
  • Communications

♦ LAND DEVELOPMENT
  • Residential, including Realtors and Apartment Associations
  • Commercial
  • Industrial
  • Finance

♦ APPOINTED BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS
  • Planning Commission
  • Transit Advisory Committee
  • Mecklenburg County Environmental Advisory Council
  • Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Authority
  • Carolinas Urban Coalition
  • Carolinas Transportation Compact
  • Uptown Transportation Council
  • Charlotte Uptown Development Corporation
  • Airport Advisory Committee
  • Charlotte Chamber
  • Carolinas Partnership
  • Mecklenburg/Union Metropolitan Planning Organization

♦ TRANSIT USERS
  • Local Service
  • Express Service
  • Commuter Service (Rock Hill CommuteRide)
  • Vanpool
  • Special Transportation Service
  • Mecklenburg County Transportation
**Proposed Charges/Roles**

**Liaison Committee**
- Review and approve the proposed charge for the Committee of 100.
- Review the proposed profile of membership for the Committee of 100.
- Offer guidance to staff for issues to direct to the Committee of 100.
- Serve as liaison between the two elected bodies and the Committee of 100.
- Serve as ex officio member of Steering Committee of the Committee of 100.

**Steering Committee**
- Review and direct work program and agendas for the Committee of 100.
- Insure that key target dates for the process are met.

**Committee of 100**
- Review and verify Transit Vision, proposed implementation plan, and land use assumptions associated with the Vision.
- Provide direction and identify issues to be addressed by the consultant's review of the transit system.
- Develop community consensus for the Transit Vision and recommend a funding method and a mechanism to implement the vision.
- Review the inter-relationships between roads and transit, with regard to land use and development, environment and air quality, quality of life, and financing.
- Provide guidance in the development of the public information program.

**Staff Task Force**
- Develop and recommend profile for Chair, Steering Committee and Committee of 100.
- Suggest potential Chair and members of Steering Committee and Committee of 100.
- Provide staff support to the Committee of 100.
- Develop and coordinate the public information program, including public forums and public surveys.
- Develop the RFP for consultant's review of the transit system to include comparison with other systems, service/routing alternatives, refinement of Barton-Aschman Associates recommendations, and a survey of users.
- Assemble and summarize the past work related to transit funding alternatives.
- Present financing and funding alternatives to Committee of 100 for consideration and recommendation to Council.
BACKGROUND

- In January 1993 HUD announced a new Demonstration Program called Urban Revitalization Demonstration (URD) for the purpose of revitalizing severely distressed public housing.

- HUD has set aside $300 million for competitive awards to up to 15 public housing authorities.

- Eligible applicants include the 40 largest housing authorities in the country of which is one.

- URD Grant Applications were to be submitted to HUD by May 26, 1993.

- The Charlotte Housing Authority (CHA) submitted an Urban Revitalization Demonstration Grant Application to HUD on May 24, 1993 to revitalize the Earle Village public housing units.

- Earle Village is one of the CHA’s largest developments consisting of 409 units. It is also one of the most visible public housing developments because of its proximity to the Central Business District. Construction of the units were completed in 1967. The only modernization which has occurred during the past 26 years was through $750,000 received from the City in the mid-1980s for landscaping and porch enhancements. Despite the need for major renovations of the unit interiors, the structures are generally sound and provide a solid base for renovation.

- An Executive Summary of the CHA’s proposal is attached as Exhibit C.
q. Plan for Implementation

The following dates relate to the accomplishing the physical renovation of the Earle Village units and completion of demolition.

Notification from HUD Central of URD Grant award  August 26, 1993

Award of first Architectural/Engineering Contract: December 1, 1993

Submission of demolition/disposition request to HUD: February 15, 1994

Bid Advertisement for first Construction Contract: May 1, 1994

Award of Construction Contract: July 1, 1994

Date by which all Construction Contracts are awarded: September 16, 1994

Completion of all Contracts: March 1, 1996
BACKGROUND

- In January 1993 HUD announced a new Demonstration Program called Urban Revitalization Demonstration (URD) for the purpose of revitalizing severely distressed public housing.

- HUD has set aside $300 million for competitive awards to up to 15 public housing authorities.

- Eligible applicants include the largest housing authorities in the country's 40 most populous cities.

- URD Grant Applications were to be submitted to HUD by May 26, 1993.

- The Charlotte Housing Authority (CHA) submitted an Urban Revitalization Demonstration Grant Application to HUD on May 24, 1993 to revitalize the Earle Village public housing units.

- Earle Village is one of the CHA's largest developments consisting of 409 units. It is also one of the most visible public housing developments because of its proximity to the Central Business District. Construction of the units were completed in 1967. The only modernization which has occurred during the past 26 years was through $750,000 received from the City in the mid-1980s for landscaping and porch enhancements. Despite the need for major renovations of the unit interiors, the structures are generally sound and provide a solid base for renovation.

- An Executive Summary of the CHA's proposal is attached as Exhibit C.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Earle Village is Charlotte’s largest and most visible public housing development. Its visibility stems from its proximity to uptown Charlotte (within four blocks of the Central Business District) and its notoriety as a drug and crime infested neighborhood.

Earle Village’s juxtaposition with Charlotte’s thriving CBD which has become the banking center of the Southeast serves as Charlotte’s reminder of our society’s inability to provide opportunity for a portion of our population. The contrasts are significant – box-like red brick buildings with leaky roofs and deteriorating interior walls set against gleaming new skyscrapers with air conditioned and carpeted offices; families struggling to eke out a living on less than $6,000 per year looking out over acres of new cars which cost many times what they earn in a year; an unemployment rate of 67% in contrast to Charlotte’s official rate of 5%. The residents of Earle Village have little or no prospect for gaining the skills required to access the opportunity offered by Charlotte’s growing economy without significant changes in their environment and the way we offer services to the community.

Physically, the revitalization program will reduce the total number of units and the sheer geographic size of the development. It will soften the impact of the major city thoroughfares which dissect the neighborhood, making it seem like a real neighborhood once again. It will reconfigure, reorganize and realign the site’s current mix of family and elderly units. It will provide opportunities for homeownership within the framework of the community and provide a transition from subsidized housing to private market housing.

Socially, the revitalization program will be even more dynamic. Earle Village will be positioned to take advantage of the opportunities presented by its location near the Central Business District. The majority of families (170) who live in Earle Village after revitalization will be enrolled in the Family Self-Sufficiency program aimed at helping them acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully compete in the economic market place. Another 65 families will be working toward owning their own home in Earle Village as well as enhancing their competitive position through additional training and counseling. Sixty-eight elderly households will also be served in a three-story low rise elevator building which offers them security and access to a new Community Services Center to be located on site.

Supportive and community services components are designed to ensure that families receive the assistance necessary for them to achieve upward mobility. These services include adequate case management, health care and child care on the site. They address each of the conditions which brought about the social and family despair that is chronicled in the body of the proposal. The community assistance program provides opportunities for community service through developing a cadre of residents who are trained in the early detection of substance abuse and other problems that serve to keep people from full participation in Charlotte’s opportunities.

Under the Urban Revitalization Demonstration Program we will demonstrate clearly that when people have hope and believe they can be successful, there is no room for despair. When people believe they can succeed, they invest more time and energy in maintaining their environment and exercising control than when they believe nothing can or will be done to improve the quality of life in their community.
BACKGROUND

- Applicant: Cramer Miller and wife, Rosalee
- Address: 6511 Woodfield Drive
- Age: 51, 40 respectively
- Family Composition: Cramer and Rosalee Miller
  Daughter, age 5
- Monthly Income: $818
- Source of Income: Social Security
  (Mr. Miller is disabled)
  (Mrs. Miller is a homemaker)
- % of Household Income: 27% of the median income for a family of three.

Analysis of Household Income:

Gross Monthly Income $818.00
Less Federal Taxes 0
   $818.00
   x30%

Available for Housing $245.40
Less Taxes & Ins. (Est.) -108.84
Available for Loan Payment $136.56

A family is to pay no more than 30% of their gross monthly income, less federal
taxes, toward housing expenses. (Housing expenses are defined as principal and
interest payments, real estate taxes and insurance.)

- Type of Assistance:

  Loan Amount $24,605
  Interest Rate 3%
  Term 20 Years
  Monthly Payments (P & I) $136.56

  Deferred Payment Loan Amount $38,595
  Interest Rate 0%
  Term 20 Years or due and payable upon death
  of the owner or the sale, rental or
  refinancing of the house.
# WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER

Proposed First Year Operating Budget

## OPERATING INCOME & REVENUE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Flow From 4-Plex</td>
<td>$5,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Flow From Greenhouse Sales</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate/Other Contributions</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Kind Donated Services</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Revenues**: $115,364

## OPERATING EXPENSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Dir. &amp; Admin. Assist.</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringes - 18% of Above</td>
<td>$8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Training</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Expenses:</strong></td>
<td>$54,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, Water, Gas</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAX</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copier Rental</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Utility Expenses:</strong></td>
<td>$15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning/Janitorial Contract</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting; Plumbing; HVAC; etc.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Maintenance Expenses:</strong></td>
<td>$8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General &amp; Programming Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; Other Prof. Services</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/Promo Mailing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies/Stationary</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage-Gen. Office Uses Only</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships/Dues</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Exp. Allowance</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General &amp; Programming Expenses:</strong></td>
<td>$27,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Contingency**: $8,364

**Total Expenses**: $115,364

**Cash Flow**: $0
## WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER DONATION RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS/PHONE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>AMOUNT DONATED</th>
<th>AMOUNT PLEDGED</th>
<th>CASH OR CHECK</th>
<th>THANK-YOU NOTE</th>
<th>BILLED FOR PLEDGE</th>
<th>PLEDGE RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Bellamy</td>
<td>1756 Wilmore Drive</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delores Sheets</td>
<td>1612 South Tryon Street</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grover &amp; Shirley Gatewood</td>
<td>809 West Boulevard</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert &amp; Louise Shackleford</td>
<td>1908 Wood Dale Terr.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Wiggins</td>
<td>1225 Spruce Street</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie Coleman</td>
<td>313 Westwood Avenue</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Grier</td>
<td>535 Spruce Street</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Freeman</td>
<td>1700 A Cliffwood Place</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Glenn</td>
<td>2018 Wood Dale Terr.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R is for resident
# WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER DONATION RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS/PHONE</th>
<th>AMOUNT DONATED</th>
<th>AMOUNT PLEDGED</th>
<th>CASH OR CHECK</th>
<th>THANK-YOU NOTE</th>
<th>BILLED FOR FEE</th>
<th>PLEDGE RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Arthur Moore</td>
<td>1711 Merriman Avenue</td>
<td>R 25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jannie Putman</td>
<td>401 Westwood Avenue</td>
<td>R 5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce L. lineburger</td>
<td>304 Westwood Avenue</td>
<td>R 5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Killian</td>
<td>400 Westwood Avenue</td>
<td>R 10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam Calaham</td>
<td>1740 Merriman Avenue</td>
<td>R 25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Money Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hamilton</td>
<td>1941 Woodcrest Street</td>
<td>R 25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester Shaw</td>
<td>1916 Cliffwood Place</td>
<td>R 5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard McIlwaine</td>
<td>1520 Wilmore Drive</td>
<td>R 25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Frank</td>
<td>527 Spruce Street</td>
<td>R 10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R is for Resident
NB is for Neighborhood Business
NC is for Neighborhood Churches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address/Phone</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amount Donated</th>
<th>Amount Pledged</th>
<th>Cash or Check</th>
<th>Thank-You Note</th>
<th>Billed For</th>
<th>Pledged</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Apple Foods</td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Spruce &amp; Cliffwood Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Tent &amp; Awning</td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Truitt Wood Works, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510 Cliffwood Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Corporation/Industrial Valve</td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 West Summit Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Galilee Baptist Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-30-93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 West Park Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonelle, Ledout</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-12-93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805 East Tremont Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-15-93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David &amp; Oma McConwell</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-15-93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$700.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R is for Resident
NB is for Neighborhood Business
NC is for Neighborhood Churches
AL is for Absentee Landlord

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amount Donated</th>
<th>Amount Pledged</th>
<th>Cash or Check</th>
<th>Thank-you Note</th>
<th>Billed for Pledges</th>
<th>Pledges Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Hamilton</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary United Methodist Church</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. William Brown Lee</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raven Type, Inc. 101 West Worthington Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Designer Showroom 101 West Worthington Ave</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Pipe Foundry Mr. Edward H. Hardison</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel C. Hair P. O. Box 6222 28207</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-13-93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | | **$250.00** | **$12,000.00** |
# WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER DONATION RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS/PHONE #</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>AMOUNT DONATED</th>
<th>AMOUNT PLEDGED</th>
<th>CASE OR CHECK</th>
<th>TRANE-YOU NOTE</th>
<th>BILLED FOR PLEDGE</th>
<th>PLEDGE RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucille Giles</td>
<td>376-1293</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736 Hempstead Place 28207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Liz Francis</td>
<td>366-2865</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6218 Sardis Road 28270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Sullivan</td>
<td>364-4324</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2327 Red Fox Trail 28211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. William Shull</td>
<td>375-7335</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 Hempstead Place 28207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Douglas</td>
<td>2110 Radcliffe Avenue 28207</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Candy Furr</td>
<td>1515 Stanford Place</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Dulin</td>
<td>556-7606</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3009-C Hemstead Place 28210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucile B. Dulin</td>
<td>1657 Sterling Road 28209</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers Park's Charlotte Green Plant sale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cissay Shull</td>
<td>251 Hempstead Place 28207</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>700.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$21,840.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,800.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER DONATION RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS/PHONE #</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>AMOUNT DONATED</th>
<th>AMOUNT PLEDGED</th>
<th>CASH OR CHECK</th>
<th>THANK-YOU NOTE</th>
<th>BILLED FOR</th>
<th>FLEXIBLE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte M. Hawthorne</td>
<td>937 Granville Road 28207</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah H. Snider</td>
<td>964 Granville Road</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David &amp; Janet Dulin</td>
<td>1601 Jameson Drive 28209</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td></td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van L. Weatherspoon</td>
<td>135 Perrin Place 28287</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow &amp; Kitty Bauknight</td>
<td>311 Cherokee Place</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td></td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert M. Cushman</td>
<td>308 Dollar Circle 28270</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPUMC Circle # 3</td>
<td>2040 Hillsdale Avenue 28209</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. T. McLaughlin</td>
<td>3808 Foxcroft Road 28211</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda K. Hawfield</td>
<td>c/o NationBank 28202-4003</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$610.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MP is for Myers Park United Methodist Church Members*
MP is for Myers Park United Methodist Church Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address/Phone #</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amount Donated</th>
<th>Amount Pledged</th>
<th>Cash or Check</th>
<th>Thank-you Note</th>
<th>Pledge Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Smith</td>
<td>375-1190</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1959 Queens Road West 28207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rufus Dalton</td>
<td>377-3832</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>267 Hemstead Place 28207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Edwin Jones</td>
<td>373-0526</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1214 Waneham Court 28207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. A. P. Harris</td>
<td>2222 Selwyn Avenue 28207 #8-602</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. J. &amp; Francis Dulin</td>
<td>2222 Selwyn Avenue #408</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Russel M. Robinson</td>
<td>3829 Bonwood Drive 28211</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyee L. Dunaway</td>
<td>Circle #7</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>04-22-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2237 Malvern Road 28207 Amy Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. J. Hawthorne</td>
<td>937 Granville Road 28207</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td>04-23-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy R. Chanon</td>
<td>3272 Foxcroft Road 28211-2626</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td>04-24-93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount Pledged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>905.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER DONATION RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS/PHONE #</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>AMOUNT DONATED</th>
<th>AMOUNT PLEDGED</th>
<th>CASH OR CHECK</th>
<th>THANK-YOU NOTE</th>
<th>BILLED PLS # PLEDGE</th>
<th>PLEDGE RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Doris N. Dukes</td>
<td>553-0146 2834 Eastburn Road 28210</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-02-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. P. Latimer, Wachovia Director</td>
<td>822 Cherokee Road 28207</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-10-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Methodist Women Myers Park United Methodist Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-11-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia P. Urey</td>
<td>3432 Fox Croft Road 28211</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-12-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers Park United Methodist Church P. O. Box 6161</td>
<td></td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-14-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. T. A. Baugh, Jr.</td>
<td>537-5393 1171 Brighton Place 28205 Circle #4</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-17-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy S. Grigg</td>
<td>2308 Vernon Drive</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-17-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. L. George</td>
<td>4036 Beresford Road</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-17-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers Park United Methodist Church Congregation</td>
<td></td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check #26669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,780.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*MP is for Myers Park United Methodist Church Members*
MP is for Myers Park United Methodist Church Members

# WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER DONATION RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS/PHONE #</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>AMOUNT DONATED</th>
<th>AMOUNT Pledged</th>
<th>CASH OR CHECK</th>
<th>THANK-YOU NOTE</th>
<th>BILLED FOR PLEDGE</th>
<th>PLEDGE RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard &amp; Jane Wells</td>
<td>1001 Turnbridge Road</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ray Swink</td>
<td>537-9200</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $200.00
# WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER DONATION RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS/PHONE #</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>AMOUNT DONATED</th>
<th>AMOUNT PLEDGED</th>
<th>CASH OR CHECK</th>
<th>THANK-YOU NOTE</th>
<th>BILLED FOR PLEDGES</th>
<th>PLEDGES RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Neal Leach</td>
<td>1901 Sterling Road 28209</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert &quot;Bob&quot; Davis</td>
<td>422 South Church Street 28242-0001</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Crown</td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Power Company/ Dock Kornegay</td>
<td>422 South Church Street 28242-0001</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Jerry L. Price</td>
<td>240 Colville Road 28207</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Pad</td>
<td>1171 Steele Creek Road P. O. Box 7525 28241</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-18-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. R. H. Leake</td>
<td>1407 Ovis Street</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-18-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. L. M. Parks</td>
<td>1436 Kimberly Court</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05-18-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Wallace Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-15-93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TOTAL                       |                               |        | $10,700.00     |                | Check         |                 |                     |                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>AMOUNT DONATED</th>
<th>AMOUNT PLEDGED</th>
<th>CASE OR CHECK</th>
<th>THANK-YOU NOTE</th>
<th>BILLED FOR</th>
<th>PLEDGE RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Kendall</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-15-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty Huffman</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-15-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641 Dilworth Road West</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-15-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claretha Wallace</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-15-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Dellinger</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-15-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cammie R. Hauptfuhrer</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-15-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Alexander</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-15-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NationsBank/Mr. Joseph Martin</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nations Bank Corporate Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-21-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 N. Tryon Street, 57th Fl 28255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilworth United Methodist Church</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>700.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-21-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605 East Blvd. 28203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Carolina Bank</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$13,700.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Wilmore Community Center

## Proposed Monthly Events Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activity or Service</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Set-Up</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy Counseling</td>
<td>Amay James Center</td>
<td>9am - 1pm</td>
<td>Office #1</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Tracy Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Counseling</td>
<td>Charlotte Area Fund</td>
<td>9am - 4pm</td>
<td>Office #2</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer Counseling</td>
<td>Family Housing</td>
<td>2pm - 5pm</td>
<td>Office #1</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Service</td>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>9am - 9pm</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult Basic Education</td>
<td>CPCC</td>
<td>1pm - 3pm</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Cynthia Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutoring Program</td>
<td>C/M Schools</td>
<td>3:30pm - 5pm</td>
<td>Classroom/Library</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Philip Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Group Meeting</td>
<td>Wilmore Association</td>
<td>7pm - 9pm</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soft Recreation</td>
<td>County Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>9am - 9pm</td>
<td>Community Room</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Jim Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children's Readiness Program</td>
<td>C/M Schools</td>
<td>8am - 11am</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Philip Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substance Abuse Counseling</td>
<td>County Outreach</td>
<td>9am - 4pm</td>
<td>Office #1</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Ahmad Daniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment &amp; Training</td>
<td>City Employment &amp; Training</td>
<td>9am - 4pm</td>
<td>Office #2</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Service</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>9am - 9pm</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutoring Program</td>
<td>C/M Schools</td>
<td>3:30pm - 5pm</td>
<td>Classroom/Library</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Philip Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting Class</td>
<td>C/M Schools</td>
<td>6pm - 8pm</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Philip Cole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Wilmore Community Center
### Proposed Monthly Events Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activity or Service</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Set-Up</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Activities</td>
<td>Park &amp; Rec. Senior Center</td>
<td>9am - 4pm</td>
<td>Community Room</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Meeting Group</td>
<td>Wilmore Association</td>
<td>6pm - 9pm</td>
<td>Community Room</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Maggie Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children's Readiness Program</td>
<td>C/M Schools</td>
<td>8:30am - 11am</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Philip Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong></td>
<td>Advocacy Counseling</td>
<td>Amay James Center</td>
<td>9am - 1pm</td>
<td>Office #1</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Tracy Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Counseling</td>
<td>Charlotte Area Fund</td>
<td>9am - 4pm</td>
<td>Office #2</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer Counseling</td>
<td>Family Housing</td>
<td>2pm - 5pm</td>
<td>Office #1</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Service</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>9am - 9pm</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children's Readiness Program</td>
<td>C/M Schools</td>
<td>8am - 11am</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Philip Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutoring Program</td>
<td>C/M Schools</td>
<td>3:30pm - 5pm</td>
<td>Classroom/Library</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Philip Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soft Recreation</td>
<td>County Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>9am - 9pm</td>
<td>Community Room</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Jim Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong></td>
<td>Substance Abuse Counseling</td>
<td>County Outreach</td>
<td>9am - 4pm</td>
<td>Office #1</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Ahmad Daniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Opportunities</td>
<td>Housing Partnership</td>
<td>9am - 4pm</td>
<td>Office #2</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Service</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>9am - 9pm</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children's Readiness Program</td>
<td>C/M Schools</td>
<td>8:30 am - 11am</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Philip Cole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Wilmore Community Center
## Proposed Monthly Events Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activity or Service</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Set-Up</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Senior Activities</td>
<td>Park &amp; Rec. Senior Center</td>
<td>9am - 4pm</td>
<td>Community Room</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Jim Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutoring Program</td>
<td>C/M Schools</td>
<td>8:30am - 5pm</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Philip Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Meeting Group</td>
<td>Wilmore Association</td>
<td>6pm - 9pm</td>
<td>Community Room</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Maggie Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narcotics Outreach Ministry</td>
<td>Mt. Sinai Baptist Church</td>
<td>7pm - 9pm</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Rev. G. Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Library Service</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>9am - 9pm</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children's Readiness Program</td>
<td>C/M Schools</td>
<td>8:30am - 11am</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Philip Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcoholism Counseling</td>
<td>Alcoholics Anonymous</td>
<td>9am - 4pm</td>
<td>Office #1</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports League Meeting Group</td>
<td>Greater Galilee Baptist Church</td>
<td>6pm - 8pm</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>4 Tables/20 Chairs</td>
<td>Rev. W. Mckissick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teen/Young Adult Program</td>
<td>Wilmore Association</td>
<td>7pm - 9pm</td>
<td>Community Room</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Maggie Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Community Newspaper 3rd Qtr.</td>
<td>Charlotte Post</td>
<td>9am - 5pm</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>G. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blood Pressure Check 1st Qtr.</td>
<td>Nurse's Association</td>
<td>10am - 1pm</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>T. Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westover Comm. Meeting 2nd Qtr.</td>
<td>Westover Neighbor. Assoc.</td>
<td>10am - 1pm</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>G. Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>Non-Profit Groups</td>
<td>2pm - 9pm</td>
<td>Classroom/Comm. Room</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT D

BACKGROUND

- At City Council’s Citizens’ Hearing on May 26, 1992, Mrs. Maggie Freeman, President of the Wilmore Neighborhood Association, Inc (WNA), requested that the City Council assist them by providing staff expertise to evaluate the feasibility of rehabilitating a boarded-up quadraplex structure into a community service center for Wilmore neighborhood residents. City Council approved the community center’s concept presented by the WNA and directed the City’s Community Development Department staff to work with WNA to acquire, rehabilitate and retrofit the existing 4-plex structure located at 501 West Boulevard into a community center.

- City staff helped WNA to appraise the property’s value, negotiate an option to purchase the property and obtained the assistance of a private construction company and architect to provide a capital cost quote for rehabilitating the project. Also, City staff resolved zoning issues related to the project, completed a topographic survey and prepared an environment assessment.

- The Community Development staff supports the Wilmore community center concept and proposes to finance the acquisition and rehabilitation of the facility. Also, it is proposed that the quadraplex, located on the same parcel and known as 531 West Boulevard, be acquired and rehabilitated and that the net income derived from renting the 4 apartments be utilized to partially fund the center’s program activities.

- There are not sufficient City resources available to fund day-to-day operations of the community center on an ongoing basis; therefore, administrative and operational costs will not be a part of the City’s effort and must be raised in the community by WNA. The community center’s start-up costs and projected operating budget for the first year is $115,364. (See Exhibit B, Community Center’s First Year Operating Budget, for breakdown of costs.)

- On March 15, 1993 WNA kicked off an aggressive fundraising campaign, and currently have raised approximately $70,000 in donations and pledges. Contributions and pledges have been received from churches, in particular, members of Myers Park United Methodist Church, local banks, neighborhood business owners and Wilmore residents. WNA is also soliciting $25 from each of Wilmore’s 501 households, for which 25 shares of stock will be issued in the center’s ownership. (A record of the donations/pledges received is shown in Exhibit B-1.)

- Based on WNA members’ contact with potential contributors, they are confident that the remaining operating budget balance for the first year ($45,364) will come forth quickly, once City funding is approved to acquire and rehabilitate the property.
Due to WNA’s success in its short-term fund raising efforts, it is felt that WNA has demonstrated the ability to raise the needed administrative and operational funds to operate the community center. Also, through WNA’s broad-based community support, a strong diverse Board for the community center is being assembled of ecumenical, corporate and community-minded people who will oversee the community center’s operations and staff. The community center’s director (when hired) will report on a monthly basis to the Wilmore Community Center’s Board of Directors. Members of the community center’s Board will organize annual fundraising activities and govern the management of the financial affairs of the community center. (Exhibit E lists the Board of Directors of the Wilmore Community Center and outlines the operation and administration of the Wilmore Community Center.)

One of the goals of the Board is to have sufficient funds raised prior to the beginning of the operating year. It is anticipated that the first year’s fundraising efforts will be $255,000 which will provide sufficient operating funds for the first and second years.

The community center will be a facility to help solve poor academic achievement, teenage pregnancy, reduce crime and provide job training in the Wilmore neighborhood. The Wilmore community is an inner-City neighborhood bordered on the west by I-77, on the east by Camden Road, on the south by West Tremont and on the north by West Summit Avenue. It is a neighborhood plagued by problems of crime, unemployment, substandard housing, at-risk children and families, school drop-out and teenage pregnancy with no community facilities. A community center is viewed by Wilmore residents to be the vehicle for long-term investment to bring together the needed resources for positive change from which other community-based programs will be launched.

The proposed operating hours of the community center will be 9:00 a.m. - 9:00 p.m., Monday through Friday (with the exception of opening on Tuesdays at 8:00 am.); 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. on Saturday and special events can be scheduled on Sunday from 2:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. (Refer to Exhibit B-1, Proposed Monthly Events Schedule of the Wilmore Community Center.)

City staff is proposing that the City make a total loan of $519,388 to WNA to acquire and rehabilitate 2 quadraplex structures at 501 & 531 West Boulevard. The loan is to provide acquisition costs for the land and 2 quadraplexes ($120,000) and to rehabilitate the 2 quadraplexes ($399,388).

The property to be purchased is currently owned by DJT Properties (consisting of Doris Miller and her sons, John and Tom Miller). An Option to Purchase agreement between WNA and the owners was signed January 25, 1993 and WNA has received an extension until July 8, 1993 to exercise the Option.
- An appraisal was prepared by Charles M. Creech, Jr. and the appraised value of the land and 2 quadraplexes is $186,100.

- WNA will contract with Crosland Contractors to rehabilitate the 2 quadraplexes which will include converting 501 West Boulevard into a neighborhood community center and delivering the facility as a turn-key development ready to serve the Wilmore neighborhood and rehabilitating the 4-unit rental structure at 531 West Boulevard. The rehabilitation phase of the project is anticipated to be completed in 11 months (projected completion May 1994). Also Crosland Contractors will construct a greenhouse on the land which will serve as an ongoing source of income for WNA. Crosland Contractors will also assist WNA in setting up the rental management for the 4 apartments at 531 West Boulevard. (See Exhibit F which outlines Crosland Contractors scope of services to WNA.)

- The loan to WNA is structured as a 25-year deferred payment loan. As long as WNA uses both structures for the intended uses (501 West Boulevard as a community center for Wilmore and vicinity residents earning 80% or less of the Charlotte area’s median income and 531 West Boulevard as a lower-income rental property for local residents earning 60% or less of the median income), the City at its discretion can refinance the loan and extend the loan for another 25 years. There will be annual inspections of the structures; and, if the facilities are not being maintained to meet the City Housing Code and WNA is unwilling or unable to remedy such code violations, the City may, at its discretion, call the entire loan due and payable in 90 days. (See 25-Year Proforma attached as Exhibit G.)

- The funds for the $519,388 loan to WNA is from two sources. The source of funds for the loan to acquire and rehabilitate the community center is Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. The source of funds to acquire and rehabilitate the 4-plex rental units is HOME funds. With the use of these Federal funds, the appropriate Federal requirements related to rehabilitation will be adhered to and stipulated in the tri-party agreement, as well as other requirements which may be mandated by the City. The City will monitor the project for regulatory compliance for the life of the loan.

- The grant from the City to WNA in the amount of $23,400 is for WNA to contract with an architect and landscape designer to provide professional design and engineering services and construction administration of the rehabilitation work. The architect will approve construction draw payment requests for work in place. The City is proposing a grant of $23,400 from the Innovative Housing Fund; however, WNA has applied for a Neighborhood Matching Grant for the same amount. In the event the Neighborhood Matching Grant is funded, the grant from the Innovative Housing Fund will be negated.
## WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Meredith Thompson</td>
<td>Myers Park United Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jean Sullivan</td>
<td>Myers Park United Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul Hemphill</td>
<td>Attorney-At-Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Miller Jordan</td>
<td>Attorney-At-Law (Representative Of Dilworth Community Development Assoc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Kitty Huffman</td>
<td>Community Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Johnnie Wallace, Jr.</td>
<td>Director Of Amy James Neighborhood Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Phillip Cole</td>
<td>Social Worker - Charlotte/Mecklenburg Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sandra Heartley</td>
<td>Mechanics and Farmers Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gerald Johnson</td>
<td>The Charlotte Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Hinton</td>
<td>Vice-President Of Power Delivery Duke Power Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert L. Davis</td>
<td>Nations Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Ben Wilson</td>
<td>Black Political Caucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend George Cook</td>
<td>Calvary United Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend James Miller</td>
<td>Greater Mt. Sinai Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Doug Little</td>
<td>Covenant Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David H. Dulin</td>
<td>Owner, Little Hardware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maggie Freeman</td>
<td>At Large Board Member - Wilmore Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Louise Shackleford</td>
<td>President, Wilmore Neighborhood Assoc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other Wilmore Neighborhood Association officers, as well as residents of Wilmore will be on the Board of Directors.

* We will also be putting in place an Advisory Board made up of an accountant who will do audits, as well as other people who will lend expertise to specific work areas.

May 27, 1993
OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION
OF THE
WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The Wilmore Community Center will be owned and operated by the Wilmore Neighborhood Association (a tax exempt non-profit neighborhood group). The Center shall be governed by a Board of Directors consisting of a cross section of individuals, including (but not limited to) members of the neighborhood association, neighborhood business owners, representatives of churches, corporations, and community services. These persons shall serve voluntarily on rotating terms. They shall have no employment in the Center or accept payment for rendered services.

DUTIES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. It shall be responsible for the business, management, and programs at the Center.

2. It shall maintain the continuity and identity of the agency in the neighborhood and the Charlotte community.

3. It shall determine, set forth, review and revise the policies which guide the work of the Center.

4. It shall employ the Executive Director of the neighborhood center. The Executive Director will provide the day-to-day management of the Center and Greenhouse.

5. It shall obtain finances, determine the financial plan or budget, and authorize periodic audit of funds.

6. It shall represent the Center in the community and develop informed interest and support.

7. It shall review programs and services to meet the neighborhood needs.

8. It shall do long-term planning, financially and programatically.

9. It shall secure members of the Board of Directors and fill vacancies.

10. It shall meet routinely at a time and place determined by the Board.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The Executive Director shall be responsible for carrying out the program at the Center, under the policies and directives of the Board of Directors and shall give staff leadership to all meetings of the Board. The Executive Director attends all board meetings, but does not have voting empowerment. He or she shall supervise other staff members.
WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER ADVISORY BOARD

There shall be a category termed WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER ADVISORY BOARD. These individuals shall be made up of persons available to advise and give consultation to the Board committees and Executive Director. They shall receive meeting notices and may attend Board meetings. They shall have no voting empowerment. They shall be approved by the Board of Directors on an annual basis.

OFFICERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The officers shall be elected from the membership of the Board and shall serve as officers of the Board of Directors. These officers shall be President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer.

DUTIES OF OFFICERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

The President carries the major responsibility for the Center in the community. The President shall give leadership to the Board as it carries out the tasks necessary to achieve the purpose of the Center. The President works with the Executive Director to prepare an agenda for Board meetings.

Vice-President

The Vice-President, in the absence of the President, shall perform the duties of the President. The Vice-President assumes specific tasks assigned by the Board.

Secretary

The Secretary is responsible for recording the proceedings of the meetings of the Board, keeping records of attendance, issuing notices of meetings, maintaining accurate minutes of meetings for distribution to Board members, and seeing that permanent documents are in safe-keeping.

Treasurer

The Treasurer is responsible for seeing that funds received and expended are handled with good business practices and within the policies authorized by the Board. The Treasurer works out (with the Executive Director) the procedures necessary to maintain an accurate accounting and reporting system so the Board can be assured that reports are accurate and within the policies of the Board.

Other responsibilities include: seeing that financial monthly reports, annual reports, annual budget, the annual audit, and the financial reports are sent to the appropriate office in the national division and to other appropriate funding groups; assumes the responsibility for signing checks as one of the designated persons; serves on the Financial Committee (but not serving as its chairperson); and being bonded.
STANDING COMMITTEES

The Board of Directors shall set up standing committees to carry out the work of the Board, including (but not limited to) the following:

1. Program Committee
   Advising and studying the needs and resources to meet these needs that can be provided by the Center.

2. Property Committee (Buildings, Grounds, And Vehicles)
   Shall work with the Executive Director on matters of building maintenance, repairs, and construction. This includes the Center, greenhouse, and rental quadriplex. This committee will make periodic studies to assure compliance with safety, health and fire regulations. The property committee makes recommendations to the Board for approval and implementation.

3. Finance/Fundraising Committee
   Shall recommend to the Board policies which will govern the management of the financial affairs of the agency and provide adequate funds for carrying out the program of direct services and social actions approved by the Board.

   Capital fund accounts and the operating budget accounts shall be maintained separately. Each shall be audited annually by a Certified Public Accountant who is not a member of the Board. It shall assume the responsibility for fund raising, income producing events, and formulation of the budget.

4. Public Relations Committee
   It shall be responsible for recommending to the Board ways of adequately interpreting the purpose and program of the Center to the church and business community, as well as the community that the Center serves. It shall help the Finance/Fundraising Committee with publicity through a newsletter and other publicity (TV, newspaper, radio, etc.).
A PROPOSAL FOR:

THE WILMORE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

AND

QUADRUPLEX REHABILITATION

AT A CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AMOUNT OF

$399,388

JUNE 3, 1993
June 3, 1993

Ms. Maggie Freeman
1700 A Cliffwood Place
Charlotte, NC 28203

Dear Ms. Freeman:

We are pleased to submit a construction quote to you in the amount of $399,388.

1) Rehabilitate the boarded up quadplex building at the corner of Cliffwood and West Blvd. into a Neighborhood Center for the Wilmore Neighborhood, and

2) Rehabilitate the next door quadplex to return all 4 units to service as attractive, affordable housing.

Our proposal includes the rehabilitation work in both buildings, our fees, site work, project landscaping, a new parking lot, a greenhouse, and furnishings in the Community Center. Details about the scope of work, allowances, concept designs, etc. on which our proposal is based are included in the materials attached. We believe our work will be completed within 8 months after our architects complete their designs, and they obtain the approvals required for us to obtain building permits.

Our proposal does not include property acquisition, design fees or an allowance for construction interest. We assume you will manage and pay for the design work, and site acquisition independently and provide monthly progress payments to us as the work proceeds. Before our contracting work on the project begins, we expect to execute a construction contract with you using a standard AIA format containing the customary terms and conditions for a project of this nature and scope.

We look forward to working with you on this exciting community project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Justin F. Little
President

RML:bw

cc: Steve Blair, Crosland Contractors
Roger Lewis, Crosland Properties

Post Office Box 11797
Charlotte, North Carolina 28220
Telephone (704) 525-3562
Fax (704) 525-3562
Wilmore Neighborhood Center and Quadruplex Rehabilitation

The proposal which follows is for the rehabilitation of the residential quadruplexes at 501 West Boulevard and the neighboring 531 West Boulevard. Both structures were built 38 years ago as a portion of the Westgate Apartments. Only two of the eight 2 bedroom units in the two buildings are presently serviceable and occupied.

Construction Cost and Contract

Based on our analysis, we propose to rehabilitate both buildings for a construction contract amount of $399,388.

Crosland Contractors will contract to do the construction on the quadruplex and community building for the amount shown above, if requested by the City, in a timely manner and assuming the execution of a construction contract by the parties consistent with the standards of the industry and subject to the approval of both parties.

Rehabilitation Concept - 501 West Boulevard The Neighborhood Center

The rehabilitation concept for 501 West Boulevard envisions an extensive rehabilitation of this quadruplex structure saving only the roof, floor and outer walls. The 4795 S.F. existing structure under roof and 338 S.F. of new stairs and elevator will be transformed from four 2 bedroom apartments on two floors into a two story activity center for the residents of Wilmore and other nearby neighborhoods.
Space will be provided, as shown on architect Bruce Keith’s enclosed floor plans, for:

- Assembly for about 80 people on the ground floor for neighborhood meetings, educational activities, covered dish suppers and the like;

- A kitchen using residential components suitable to support covered dish suppers, provide food preparation and training, as well as refreshments for all visitors to the Center;

Parking for the Center will be accommodated by a new parking lot for 23 cars. The lot next to 521 West Boulevard will be redeveloped into a parking lot for 5 cars, providing 28 total spaces to support the 4795 S. F. Community Center.
Rehabilitation Concept - 531 West Boulevard Quadplex

The rehabilitation concept includes relocating the two existing tenants, then rehabilitating the four apartment units as follows:

- New HVAC systems including four individual air conditioning and gas heat units;
- New plumbing and bath fixtures (except tubs, which can be reused);
- New wiring;
- New roof;
- New kitchen cabinets, sink and appliances, including dishwasher, refrigerator, disposal, and washer/dryer hookups;
- New energy efficient windows;
- New doors;
- New floor coverings throughout, including wall to wall carpet and pads, except vinyl in kitchens and baths;
- Mini blinds throughout; and
- Repaved parking area for 5 spaces

This level of rehabilitation will make these four units meet contemporary apartment standards for systems, features, fits and finishes. This work will ensure the customer appeal of these units and their serviceability for many years without major capital spending, assuming responsible operating management.
Capital Costs

Our projections of the capital costs to rehabilitate both buildings and furnish and equip the Community Center total $399,388.

Construction contract amounts include contractor overhead and profit for the two respective buildings. Numerous neighborhood volunteers have offered to contribute the labor for some construction tasks without charge. Therefore, there may be some cost savings to the extent these free services can substitute for services by some subcontractors contained in the estimates. Because we know of no responsible way to forecast the amount of these possible savings, we assumed that all the work would be paid to subcontractors as shown on the attached schedules.

The projected total construction contract allowance for the Community Center includes $4,000 allowance for landscaping and an $11,833 construction management fee, equivalent to 5% of the work.

The projected total construction contract for the quadruplex renovation of includes a $1,600 allowance for landscaping and an $5,210 construction management fee, equivalent to 5% of the work.

Detailed cost estimates for both buildings are attached.
Other Costs and Key Allowances

Based on Crosland Properties' experience in furnishing apartment clubhouses and activity centers in several recent affordable projects, we have provided an allowance of $25,000 for furniture and equipment for the Community Center. Items to be purchased include: office, conference room and assembly space furnishings; office mechanicals (typewriter, fax, etc.); initial stationery and office supplies; phones, window blinds; and the like. Also included are the services of a decorator to select, purchase, and manage the installation of these items. In addition, the program includes an allowance of $8,000 for a prefabricated greenhouse, which Crosland Contractors will assemble on site. This proposal includes a $2,500 allowance for lease-up expenses to provide for initial costs of lease-up assistance.

We expect the costs to provide computers, programming materials, study aids and related equipment for the Parenting Center will be provided by the Board of Education, which will use major portions of the Community Center for the Parenting Center.

Exclusions

Not included in our proposal are costs for:

1) Design, Engineering and support services such as soil borings, survey, and the like, if any.
2) Site acquisition and closing costs.
3) Construction interest, if any.
4) Costs beyond the allowances noted elsewhere for those items.
5) Plan reproductions, assumed to be the responsibility of the architect.

Project Schedule

The following schedule indicates that the Community Center and Rehabilitated Quadrplex can both be expected to be in service eleven (11) months after City Council’s approval of the project’s capital funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month 0</td>
<td>City Council approval of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Plan preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Plan approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontractor buyout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month 4 - 9</td>
<td>Construction underway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7
Months 9 - 11

Construction completed

Furniture and equipment installed

Community Center grand opening
LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1  A. Wilmore Community Site Plan
          B. Quadrplex Floor Plan
          C. Community Center Floor Plan, 1st Floor
          D. Community Center, 2nd Floor

Exhibit 2  Reserved

Exhibit 3  Construction Costs for the Community Center

Exhibit 4  Construction Costs for the Quadrplex Rehabilitation

Exhibit 5  Community Center Work Outline

Exhibit 6  Construction Schedule- Note: the construction schedule attached show a 6 -
          month cycle beginning in June 1993. Because approvals will delay the
          construction start until fall of 1993, we believe 8 months is a more realistic
          projection for this time of year.

Exhibit 7  Neighborhood Tax Map

Exhibit 8  Photographs

Exhibit 9  Architect’s Proposal
Wilmore Community Center
# Exhibit 3 - Construction Costs for the Community Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILEAGE</th>
<th>OTHER LABOR</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>SUB-CONTRACT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>COST PER SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPervision</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>$84.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Clean</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$88.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Toilet</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>$37.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Elec</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$41.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Phot</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$41.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Water</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blueprint</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Tools</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefab</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$41.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>$12,100</td>
<td>$41.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubSpace Rental</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$13.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Trailer</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td>$11.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIV 1 TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$22,910</strong></td>
<td><strong>$82.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Asbestos Removal | $2,374 | $2,374 | $2,374 | **$10,780** | **$37.99** |
| Demolition/Clean-Up | $91,254 | $91,254 | $91,254 | **$462,564** | **$172.00** |
| Grading | $2,000 | $2,000 | $2,000 | $7,000 | **$25.00** |
| Cure & Butter | $3,000 | $3,000 | $3,000 | $10,000 | **$35.00** |
| Painting | $6,350 | $6,350 | $6,350 | **$25,400** | **$89.00** |
| General Labor/Hand | $670 | $670 | $670 | $2,680 | **$96.00** |
| Steel Off | $3,760 | $3,760 | $3,760 | **$15,040** | **$52.00** |
| Chair Link Fence | | | | **$97,723** | **$33.00** |
| **DIV 2 TOTAL** | | | | | **$22,910** |

| Patch Concrete | ST34 | ST34 | ST34 | **$134** | **$0.00** |
| Foundation Vents | $86 | $86 | $86 | **$344** | **$0.00** |
| Foundations | $91 | $91 | $91 | **$364** | **$0.00** |
| Clean Brick | $3,000 | $3,000 | $3,000 | **$12,000** | **$41.67** |
| Point Up Stairs | $65 | $65 | $65 | **$260** | **$0.90** |
| Elevator Shaft | **$1,104** | **$1,104** | **$1,104** | **$4,416** | **$14.76** |
| State Shaft | **$5,100** | **$5,100** | **$5,100** | **$20,400** | **$70.00** |
| **DIV 3 TOTAL** | | | | **$21,605** | **$77.00** |

| Steel Stairs | **$1,200** | **$1,200** | **$1,200** | **$4,800** | **$0.00** |
| **DIV 4 TOTAL** | | | | **$4,800** | **$0.00** |

| Interior Framing | **$3,000** | **$3,000** | **$3,000** | **$12,000** | **$41.67** |
| Ceilings | **$6,400** | **$6,400** | **$6,400** | **$25,600** | **$88.00** |
| Clear Span Piers | **$1,500** | **$1,500** | **$1,500** | **$6,000** | **$20.00** |
| Center Columns | **$1,200** | **$1,200** | **$1,200** | **$4,800** | **$16.00** |
| Roof | **$2,200** | **$2,200** | **$2,200** | **$8,800** | **$30.00** |
| IRC Standards | $900 | $900 | $900 | **$3,600** | **$12.00** |
| Currents | $3,200 | $3,200 | $3,200 | **$12,800** | **$44.00** |
| Shelves | $100 | $100 | $100 | **$400** | **$0.00** |

**Total** | | | | **$99,210** | **$33.00** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WILMORE</th>
<th>OTHER LABOR</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>SUB-CONTRACT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>DIVISION TOTAL</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PER SQFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERIOR TRIM</td>
<td>9400</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>8800</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>81,600</td>
<td>$29,760</td>
<td>90.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREATED DECK</td>
<td>91,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>82,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOFING</td>
<td>93,320</td>
<td></td>
<td>83,530</td>
<td>83,530</td>
<td>83,330</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRIFICATION</td>
<td>81,776</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,776</td>
<td>81,776</td>
<td>81,966</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMBING</td>
<td>8223</td>
<td></td>
<td>8223</td>
<td>8223</td>
<td>82,230</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINTERIOR DOORS</td>
<td>8523</td>
<td></td>
<td>8523</td>
<td>8523</td>
<td>85,230</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERIOR DOORS</td>
<td>86,056</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,056</td>
<td>86,056</td>
<td>86,056</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOREFRONT</td>
<td>94,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>94,500</td>
<td>94,500</td>
<td>94,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENTH FLOOR</td>
<td>91,400</td>
<td>8300</td>
<td>81,700</td>
<td>81,700</td>
<td>81,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSSING</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSSING</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td></td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>8330</td>
<td></td>
<td>8330</td>
<td>8330</td>
<td>8330</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>83,330</td>
<td></td>
<td>83,330</td>
<td>83,330</td>
<td>83,330</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>81,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,100</td>
<td>81,100</td>
<td>81,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>91.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>8220</td>
<td></td>
<td>8220</td>
<td>8220</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td></td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>96,434</td>
<td></td>
<td>96,434</td>
<td>96,434</td>
<td>96,434</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>825,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>825,900</td>
<td>825,900</td>
<td>825,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>88,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>88,900</td>
<td>88,900</td>
<td>88,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>85,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>85,900</td>
<td>85,900</td>
<td>85,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>85,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>85,900</td>
<td>85,900</td>
<td>85,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR REPAIRS</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>VILMORE</td>
<td>OTHER LABOR</td>
<td>MATERIAL</td>
<td>SUB- CONTRACT</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>PER SFT</td>
<td>COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV 17 TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>913,529</td>
<td>69,433</td>
<td>941,362</td>
<td>916,053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>811,269</td>
<td></td>
<td>811,269</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST RENT PER %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8234.654</td>
<td></td>
<td>8234.654</td>
<td></td>
<td>844.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECTED COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8248.464</td>
<td></td>
<td>8248.464</td>
<td></td>
<td>846.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST PER RENTABLE SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>851.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST PER GROSS SFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>846.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 4 - Construction Costs for the Quadruplex Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quadruplex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTS</strong></td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LABOR</strong></td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-CONTRACT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$3,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LABOR</strong></td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCUPANCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCUPANCY</strong></td>
<td>$1,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LABOR</strong></td>
<td>$134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PATCH CONCRETE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PATCH CONCRETE</strong></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LABOR</strong></td>
<td>$315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POINTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POINTER</strong></td>
<td>$1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LABOR</strong></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCUPANCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCUPANCY</strong></td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LABOR</strong></td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERIOR TRIM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERIOR TRIM</strong></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LABOR</strong></td>
<td>$612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCUPANCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCUPANCY</strong></td>
<td>$810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LABOR</strong></td>
<td>$2,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$3,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSULATION</strong></td>
<td>$223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLUMBING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLUMBING</strong></td>
<td>$468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GUTTERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GUTTERS</strong></td>
<td>$289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW WINDOWS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW WINDOWS</strong></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECTRICAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECTRICAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERIOR DOORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERIOR DOORS</strong></td>
<td>$1,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLASTER REPAIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLASTER REPAIR</strong></td>
<td>$2,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td>$999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallpaper</td>
<td>$458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Repair</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Blinds</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Rods</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tub Repair</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath Accessories</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$7,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliances</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>$220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$16,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contingency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9,472</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Cost</strong></td>
<td>$15,914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost Rent Per SqFt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost Per Rentable SqFt</th>
<th>Cost Per Gross SqFt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25.59</td>
<td>$22.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Center Work Outline

We are pleased to quote the rehabilitation of a building into a community center consisting of the following:

1. One two story existing building approximately 30 years old.
2. Approximately 4,795 SF on two floors.
3. Reconstruction of existing retaining walls.
4. A new 6,500 square foot asphalt parking lot allowing 21 spaces.
5. A 4' x 8' garbage can pad.
6. A 4' x 8' garbage can.
7. Patch all existing concrete.
8. 440 feet of curb and gutter and a curb cut.
9. An allowance of $4,000 for a wood deck.
10. An allowance of $8,000 for a greenhouse.
11. A two stop elevator along with shaft based on the use of an Otis elevator - Approximately $32,000 complete.
12. A stair shaft with steel stairs and hand rails.
13. Cleaning approximately 6,400 SF of brick.
15. Installation of approximately 420' of gutters and downspouts.
16. Removal and replacement of 340' of 1 x 6 fascia.
17. Pressure wash and repaint all eave overhangs and porches with two coat system.
18. Removal of all existing windows and replacing with new aluminum windows.
19. Demolition of all interior walls on the first and second floor.
20. Shorten existing floors and ceilings.
21. Installation of approximately 130 LF of 2 x 4 studs and 5/8" drywall on the first floor.
22. Installation of approximately 216 LF of 1" exterior wall styrofoam insulation on exterior walls of first floor and then 3/8" drywall glued and screwed.
23. Installation of approximately 2,346 SF of 3/8" drywall glued and screwed to the ceiling.
24. Installation of piers and necessary framing in crawl space to support new walls.
25. New center columns and ceiling framing are necessary for second floor.
26. Installation of four exterior doors.
27. Installation of approximately 13 interior prehung 1-3/4" solid doors on first floor in knock down hollow metal frames with standard hardware.
28. A kitchen and ice machine allowance of $2,500 for equipment.
29. One pass through window and counter.
30. Approximately 2,165 SF of VCT on first floor.
31. Approximately 400 LF of vinyl base on first floor.
32. Approximately 21 SY of carpet on first floor.
33. Installation of two sets of toilet partitions and hardware on first floor.
34. Installation of closets with shelves.
35. An allowance of $4,504 for 60' of movable partitions on the first floor.
36. Complete painting of first floor.
37. Mini blinds on first floor.
38. Approximately 100 LF of wood stud wall with 5/8" drywall on second floor.
39. Installation of 1" of insulation in drywall on the second floor as per first floor.
40. Installation of new ceiling over existing ceiling on the second floor.
41. Installation of a 3'0" x 7'0" store front entrance on the second floor.
42. Installation of 9 doors and frames on the second floor as per the first floor.
43. Approximately 92 SF of VCT on the second floor.
44. Installation of approximately 259 SY of carpet on the second floor.
45. Installation of approximately 304 LF of vinyl base on the second floor.
46. A movable partition allowance of $1,370 for a 16' movable partition on the second floor.
47. Complete painting on the second floor.
48. Mini blinds on the second floor.
49. Installation of ceiling insulation on the second floor of R-30.
50. An allowance of $8,000 for a residential sprinkler system.
51. Electrical on the first and second floor as required.
52. Plumbing on the first and second floor as required.
53. Gas heat and electric air - New throughout.
54. Complete supervision.
55. Complete clean up.
56. Temporary toilets.
57. Temporary electric.
58. Temporary phone.
59. Permits.
60. Insurance.
61. Dumpsters and hauling off all old material and demolished material.
62. Security is necessary.
63. Necessary testing for concrete and soils.
64. An on site office trailer.
65. Allowance of $8,000 for landscaping.
66. Security system with contacts on first floor door and second floor door.
68. Outlet for pay phone - Pay phone by others.
69. 29 LF of counters and cabinets in kitchen.
70. 32 LF of counter in library.
71. 96 LF of shelves in library.
72. A 6' chain link fence on the back of the site.
73. 8 spot lights on the building.
74. Hose bib at greenhouse.
75. Add $2,178 for Payment Performance Bond.
76. No rock excavation or removal of unsuitable soils.
## Exhibit 6 - Construction Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARLY START</th>
<th>EARLY FINISH</th>
<th>ORIG DUR</th>
<th>JUNE 1993</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
<th>NOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/JUN/93</td>
<td>07/JUN/93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PERMITS</td>
<td>ASBESTOS REMOVAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/JUN/93</td>
<td>21/JUN/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>DEMOLITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/JUN/93</td>
<td>06/JUL/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROOFING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/JUN/93</td>
<td>12/JUL/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROOFING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/JUL/93</td>
<td>15/JUL/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLEAN UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/JUL/93</td>
<td>22/JUL/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXT SHEETMETAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/JUL/93</td>
<td>07/AUG/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MASONRY-ELEVATOR SHAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/JUL/93</td>
<td>37/JUL/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROUGH MASONRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/AUG/93</td>
<td>08/AUG/93</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SITE WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/AUG/93</td>
<td>30/AUG/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLUMBING ROUGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/AUG/93</td>
<td>05/SEP/93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINKLER ROUGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/AUG/93</td>
<td>03/OCT/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>HVAC ROUGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/SEP/93</td>
<td>10/OCT/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELECTRICAL ROUGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/OCT/93</td>
<td>10/OCT/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>SECURITY SYSTEM ROUGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/OCT/93</td>
<td>10/OCT/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/OCT/93</td>
<td>13/OCT/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>INSULATION AND INSPECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/OCT/93</td>
<td>27/OCT/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>SHEET METAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/OCT/93</td>
<td>02/NOV/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERIOR TRIM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/NOV/93</td>
<td>18/NOV/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERIOR PAINTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/NOV/93</td>
<td>31/DEC/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>CABINET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/DEC/93</td>
<td>02/JAN/94</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>DATA VENTIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/JAN/94</td>
<td>18/JAN/94</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>INSTALL ELEVATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/FEB/94</td>
<td>30/FEB/94</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELECTRICAL/HVAC TRIM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/MAR/94</td>
<td>08/MAR/94</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>INSPECTIONS AND METERING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/MAR/94</td>
<td>15/MAR/94</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>CARPET AND VAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/MAR/94</td>
<td>19/MAR/94</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>INSPECTION AND CLEANUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/NOV/94</td>
<td>21/NOV/94</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FINAL PAINT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/NOV/94</td>
<td>01/JAN/95</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O C AND OWNER ACCEPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/JAN/95</td>
<td>30/JAN/95</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **DEADLINE**
- **MILESTONE**
- **CRITICAL**
- **PROGRESS**

---

**RUN DATE** 07/JUN/93  **COMMENTS**

**START DATE** 07/JUN/93  **DATA DATE** 07/JUN/93

**FINISH DATE** 01/JAN/95  **WILMORE COMMUNITY CENTER**
501 West Blvd.
## 25-Year Pro Forma Financial Statements

For: Wilmore Neighborhood Associates Inc. ($325 Scenario)

FY 1994 – 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Revenue</strong></td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>16,068</td>
<td>16,550</td>
<td>17,047</td>
<td>17,558</td>
<td>18,085</td>
<td>18,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less: Vacancy (5%)</strong></td>
<td>(780)</td>
<td>(803)</td>
<td>(828)</td>
<td>(852)</td>
<td>(876)</td>
<td>(904)</td>
<td>(931)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus: Misc. Income</strong></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Revenue</strong></td>
<td>14,964</td>
<td>15,413</td>
<td>15,875</td>
<td>16,352</td>
<td>16,842</td>
<td>17,347</td>
<td>17,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Per Unit Cost

**Less: Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental Expenses</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Exp.</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Fee</td>
<td>(375)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Exp.</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>2,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Exp.</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>1,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>(450)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>2,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace. Reserve</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,888</td>
<td>10,185</td>
<td>10,490</td>
<td>10,805</td>
<td>11,129</td>
<td>11,463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Operating Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,364</td>
<td>5,525</td>
<td>5,691</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>6,037</td>
<td>6,218</td>
<td>6,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19,186</td>
<td>19,762</td>
<td>20,354</td>
<td>20,965</td>
<td>21,594</td>
<td>22,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(959)</td>
<td>(988)</td>
<td>(1,018)</td>
<td>(1,048)</td>
<td>(1,080)</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,404</td>
<td>18,956</td>
<td>19,525</td>
<td>20,110</td>
<td>20,714</td>
<td>21,335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>2,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>2,768</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>3,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>2,492</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>2,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>738</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>738</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>369</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,807</td>
<td>12,161</td>
<td>12,526</td>
<td>12,902</td>
<td>13,289</td>
<td>13,687</td>
<td>14,098</td>
<td>14,521</td>
<td>14,956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2001 | 6,597 | 6,795 | 6,999 | 7,209 | 7,425 | 7,648 | 7,877 | 8,114 | 8,357 |
## 25-Year Pro Forma Financial Statements

For: Wilmore Neighborhood Associates Inc. ($325 Scenario)

**FY 1994–2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>25,033</td>
<td>25,784</td>
<td>26,558</td>
<td>27,355</td>
<td>28,175</td>
<td>29,021</td>
<td>29,891</td>
<td>30,788</td>
<td>31,712</td>
<td>566,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,252)</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>2,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>963</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,405</td>
<td>15,867</td>
<td>16,343</td>
<td>16,834</td>
<td>17,339</td>
<td>17,859</td>
<td>18,395</td>
<td>18,946</td>
<td>19,515</td>
<td>178,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,608</td>
<td>8,866</td>
<td>9,132</td>
<td>9,406</td>
<td>9,688</td>
<td>9,979</td>
<td>10,278</td>
<td>10,586</td>
<td>10,904</td>
<td>367,027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND

- The City is authorized under the City Charter to exercise its eminent domain powers under certain conditions to provide housing for low and moderate income persons. One of the conditions is when structures (houses) have been found to contain certain housing code violations that the property owner has failed or refused to correct within a reasonable time. (The City may not file an eminent domain action until after the property owner has had 150 days, from the date of the order finding violations of the City Housing Code, to correct the violations.)

- The City is authorized to provide housing for low and moderate income persons or contract with public or private entities to provide such housing.

- The Community Development Department has been working with Reid Park Associates, a neighborhood-based Community Development Corporation, to identify properties in the Reid Park community which have housing code violations that the owners have failed to correct.

- Reid Park Associates is going to apply for a HUD HOPE III grant in August 1993 to purchase 10 housing units from the City to rehabilitate and sell them to lower-income persons for homeownership. (The HOPE III grant requires that Reid Park Associates acquire a minimum of 10 units from the City or other governmental entities, such as FHA or VA repossessions.)

- To be consistent with the City Charter, the City will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Reid Park Associates to acquire identified property in the Reid Park community (See Exhibit A and tax maps), to rehabilitate the units for resale to lower-income persons, and to set forth the provision for Reid Park Associates to purchase the properties from the City with funds from First Union National Bank’s Community Real Estate Fund in the event they are not successful in obtaining the HOPE III grant from HUD.

- Prior to City Council’s adoption of resolutions to authorize condemnation of the subject properties, the owners will be notified; and, after City Council’s action the property owners will again be notified of the City’s intent to acquire the property through eminent domain (condemnation) proceedings. (See Exhibit B - Action Steps to Acquire Property and Convey to Reid Park.)

- The City’s Real Estate staff will attempt to negotiate with the owners during this process in hopes of acquiring the properties through negotiations. However, the City must have demonstrated its intent to acquire these properties in order for Reid Park Associates to include these properties in their grant application.
Once the properties have been acquired by the City through negotiation and/or condemnation, City Council will be requested to approve the sale of the properties to Reid Park Associates.
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

This Memorandum of Understanding dated the ___ day of June, 1993 between the City of Charlotte (City) and Reid Park Associates, Inc. (Reid Park) sets forth the following agreements and understandings:

1. The City is authorized, under the City Charter, to acquire property and to exercise its eminent domain powers under certain conditions if necessary to provide housing for low-to-moderate income persons. One of the conditions is that the City has the power of eminent domain to acquire property when the structures(s) have been found to contain housing code violations that the property owner has failed or refused to correct within a reasonable time. In addition, the City must adopt a plan to use condemned property for low-to-moderate housing.

2. Based on Section 7.81 of the City Charter, the City (through its Community Development Department) has been working with Reid Park to identify properties in the community which have housing code violations that the owners have failed to correct. (See attached list - Exhibit C-1). Reid Park and/or the City has attempted to negotiate the purchase of these properties for the City but has been unsuccessful.

3. Reid Park has requested by letters dated December 21, 1992 and March 22, 1993, that the City use its condemnation powers to acquire certain property as shown on Exhibit C-1.

4. Reid Park will apply for a HUD HOPE 3 grant in mid June, 1993 to purchase from the City and rehabilitate each of the properties listed in Exhibit A, which will then be resold to create homeownership opportunities for low-income persons. In the event that Reid Park is not awarded the HUD HOPE 3 grant, then Reid Park agrees to purchase these properties at their appraised value plus any additional costs that the City incurs to acquire these properties with funds provided by the Community Real Estate Fund created in January 1990 by First Union National Bank.

5. Once the property has been acquired by the City through condemnation and the sale of the properties to Reid Park approved by City Council, Reid Park will purchase the identified properties in order to develop affordable homeownership opportunities for lower-income persons.
6. Reid Park will rehabilitate each of these properties. The houses will then be sold to lower-income persons upon completion of the rehabilitation. As required by the Charter, the City adopts this use of the subject properties as its plan to use the condemned properties for low-to-moderate housing.

REID PARK ASSOCIATES, INC.

__________________________________________
Executive Director

WITNESS:

__________________________________________

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

__________________________________________
City Manager

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
City Clerk

Approved as to form:

__________________________________________
City Attorney

Approved as to form:

__________________________________________
City Attorney

Attest:

__________________________________________
City Clerk
### EXHIBIT A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY OWNER</th>
<th>PROPERTY ADDRESS</th>
<th>APPRAISED</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heirs, Jack D. Norman</td>
<td>2916 Amay James Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Code 145-181-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Heirs, Jack D. Norman</td>
<td>2920 Amay James Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Code 145-181-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Heirs, Jack D. Norman</td>
<td>3313 Amay James Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Code 145-172-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. John Gholston</td>
<td>2929 Morning Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Code 145-183-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Heirs, Maggie Aiken</td>
<td>2923 Ross Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Code 145-123-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Marshall Watkins</td>
<td>3301 Ross Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Code 145-179-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Robert White and Michael Todd</td>
<td>2701-03-05 Mayfair Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Code 115-015-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Heirs, Vera C. Crowder</td>
<td>3340 Amay James Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Code 145-171-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$83,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) 2916 Amay James
(2) 2920 Amay James
(4) 2929 Morning Dr.
ACTION STEPS TO ACQUIRE PROPERTY AND CONVEY TO REID PARK

Step 1 - Final Negotiations With Owner(s). Notify Owner(s) on May 31, 1993 of the Requested Action of the City Council

Step 2 - Request City Council Adopt Resolutions Authorizing Condemnation Proceedings for Acquisitions of Certain Real Property in the Reid Park Community - June 14, 1993

Step 3 - "30-day Notice of Intent to File Condemnation" sent to property owners - July 15, 1993

Step 4 - File Condemnation and Deposit Just Compensation With Superior Court - July 16, 1993. (Only for properties not successfully negotiated)

Step 5 - Serve Notice to Owner (certified mail and advertisement) - July 23, 1993.

Owner has 120 days to Respond to Action After Service of Action (Assumed to be served by Post Office 5 working days or by July 30th)

Step 6 - Title Vested to City Upon One of the Following:
(1) Owner Files Answer to Action not Challenging City's Right to Condemn;
(2) Failure of the Owner to Respond Within the 120-day time period. (November 27, 1993 if served on July 30, 1993)
(3) Owner draws down the funds deposited with the Court. (At any time after funds deposited with Court and prior to 120-day time period)

Step 7 - City Council requested in November 1993 to authorize the sale of properties to be vested to City to Reid Park.

Step 8 - If Action challenged by owner, then title does not vest until a Judge rules on the taking (would take 3-6 months to get on Judge's docket).

Step 9 - City Council Requested to Approve Sale of Land to Reid Park - (May 1994 based on 6-month estimate to have title vest with the City)

Note: This schedule assumes that there will be no delays or errors in the process. If some delays or errors occur, the above process will be longer.
BACKGROUND

On October 28, 1991 City Council approved the use of $1,300,000 in City funds to create the City Within a City (CWAC) Loan/Equity Pool Program, with participating banks contributing $6,500,000. Since that time City Council has approved the use of an additional $100,000 in Development and Revitalization Funds to add four banks to the CWAC Loan/Equity Pool bank group. Currently, the banks' contribution to the program is $7,000,000 for a total Loan/Equity Pool of $8,400,000.

The purpose of the CWAC Loan/Equity Pool Program is to create a public/private venture which will increase lending opportunities for targeted areas of the City of Charlotte, thereby providing expanded economic development opportunities, particularly the creation of jobs. This program allows the banks, in partnership with the City, to make marginal loans that would not have been made without the use of the public/private venture funds being provided by the City.

Loans are to be made to individuals earning 80% or less of the median income for Charlotte or to companies or persons that will employ individuals within the CWAC boundary earning 80% or less of the median income for Charlotte. The minimum loan amount will be $15,000, and one job is to be created for each $10,000 in City Development and Revitalization funds loaned.

The bank loans will be made to targeted borrowers for new businesses or the expansion of existing businesses. All loans are made with 80% bank contribution and 20% City contribution (with City funds being subordinated to bank debt). The City funds will be available to the banks at a 0% interest rate. This arrangement (subordinated, 0% interest loans) will enable the banks to view these funds as equity, thereby enhancing borrowing opportunities for targeted applicants.

The total cost to finance the construction of the daycare center is $618,000 of which $102,600 is being requested from the City as its 20% matching funds. Bank of Mecklenburg's 80% loan amount will be $410,400 and GHEF will contribute equity in the amount of $105,000.

Bank of Mecklenburg's original commitment to the CWAC Loan/Equity Pool Program was $100,000 and the City's 20% matching funds were $20,000. Bank of Mecklenburg has funded one loan which utilized $19,000 of the $20,000 set aside for the Bank; leaving a $1,000 balance. Therefore, City Council is being requested to approve an additional $101,600 to be set aside as matching funds for the Bank of Mecklenburg; bringing the City's matching CWAC funds for the Bank of Mecklenburg to $102,600.
The sources and uses of the funds for this project are as follows:

**Sources**

- Bank of Mecklenburg: $410,400
- City of Charlotte: $102,600
- GHEF’s Contribution: $105,000
- **Total**: $618,000

**Uses**

- Project Construction: $570,000*
- Contingency: $48,000
- **Total**: $618,000

*Includes $1 per year land lease payment

**Terms of Loans**

- **Bank of Mecklenburg**
  - Amount: $410,400
  - Rate: 7.75% (fixed rate)
  - Term: 9 months - interest only
  - 19 Years and 3 months
  - Payments: $3,100

  (See Bank of Mecklenburg’s commitment letter - Exhibit A)

- **City of Charlotte**
  - Amount: $102,600
  - Rate: 0%
  - Term: 22 Years and 9 months
  - (33 months longer than bank loan)
  - Payments: $3,100

The bank’s maximum loan term permitted under the CWAC Loan Program is 10 years; therefore, an exemption to the bank’s term is being requested. GHEF is a nonprofit organization; therefore, to ensure GHEF has adequate cash flow a bank loan term of 20 years is needed.

**Security**

Bank of Mecklenburg and City of Charlotte loans will be secured as follows:

Assignment of leasehold interest in approximately 1.6 acres of land on Billingsley Road. Assignment of lease between GHEF and Bright Horizons Children’s Center, Inc.
The assignment of the above mentioned lease and leasehold improvements have no monetary value; however, if GHEF defaults on its loan, the Bank and City will have the authority to assume and operate the daycare center until another daycare operator is found. As indicated, Mecklenburg County will own the land on which the daycare center will be constructed. The County, therefore, has a strong interest in the ultimate use of the property, especially since it hopes to have County employees in the Billingsley Road area be major users of the daycare center, along with Grier Heights residents. To ensure that the County maintains control of not only the land, which it will lease, but also the facility itself, the County will enter into an agreement whereby, if GHEF defaults on its loans, the County will purchase 85% of the outstanding principal balance on the loans of the bank and the City to GHEF with 90% of the bank's loan being paid down and the remaining funds being used to pay down the City loan.

An example of how the County payoff would work is as follows:

| Bank of Mecklenburg Loan          | $410,400 |
| City of Charlotte's CWAC Loan    | 102,600  |
|                                  | $513,000 |
|                                  | 85%      |
| Bank Pay Down ($410,400 @ 90%)    | -369,360 |
| City Pay Down                     | -66,690  |

Based on this example the Bank and City loans will be paid down to the following amounts:

| Bank of Mecklenburg Loan          | $410,400 |
| County Pay Down                   | -369,360 |
| Remaining Bank Loan Balance       | $ 41,040 |
| City of Charlotte’s CWAC Loan    | $102,600 |
| County Pay Down                   | -66,690  |
| Remaining CWAC Loan Balance       | $ 35,910 |

As evidenced above if the GHEF goes into default, the County will step in to significantly pay down both the Bank and City loans.

The collateral positions will be as follows:

1st lien position - Bank of Mecklenburg
2nd lien position - City of Charlotte
Jobs to be Created Over a Two Year Period

The GHEF's daycare center will create 20 jobs as a result of this loan. At least 11 jobs will be created for low-to-moderate income persons from the CWAC area as required by contract, with the possibility that all 20 jobs will be filled by low-to-moderate income persons from the CWAC area. The jobs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$27,000/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17,017/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14,616/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,962/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.00/hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Asst.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.00/hr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWAC Loan Program Status Report

The CWAC Loan Program Status Report is attached as Exhibit B.
April 19, 1993

Mr. George A. Wallace
President
Grier Heights Economic Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 32242
Charlotte, NC 28232

Dear George:

Bank of Mecklenburg ("the Bank") agrees to provide funding to Grier Heights Economic Foundation, Inc. ("Grier Heights") for the construction and permanent financing of the proposed Grier Heights Day Care Center ("Project") to be built on County land at Billingsley Road in Charlotte. This commitment will be in 2 parts, as set out below:

Construction Financing

Amount: Up to $410,400, not to exceed 70% of project costs
Term: Up to 9 months
Interest: 7.75%, payable monthly
Fee: None
Collateral: Assignment of Leasehold interest in approximately 1.6 acres of land on Billingsley Road.

Assignment of Lease between Grier Heights (Lessor) and Bright Horizons Children's Centers, Inc. (Lessee).

Assignment of Escrow account of Grier Heights Economic Foundation (to be in form of deposit at Bank of Mecklenburg) with initial balance of $48,000.

Security Agreement covering all personal property of borrower related to this project (furniture, fixtures, etc.).

Draws: Available monthly during construction of building based on architect certified draw requests from contractor on standard AIA document G702.

Prior Conditions to be met:

1. Grier Heights will have entered into a ground lease with Mecklenburg County, the terms of which are satisfactory to the Bank.
2. Grier Heights will have entered into a lease and operating agreement with Bright Horizons to operate the day care center, such lease and operating agreement to be satisfactory to the Bank.

3. Grier Heights will deposit 10% of the projected costs of the day care center into an Escrow Account at the Bank, to be used as equity in the project and disbursed prior to any Bank or City loan funds.

4. City of Charlotte ("the City") will commit to lend Grier Heights to $102,600, not to exceed 20% of projected cost, for permanent secondary financing for this project. This loan will be made under the "City Within A City" Loan Program and will bear interest at 0% and begin to amortize when the Bank's loan is repaid in full. The City loan will be disbursed into an Escrow Account at the Bank at closing. The Bank will monitor the progress of construction and make payments on construction draw requests from the Escrow Account. Grier Heights equity money will be disbursed first, then the City's loan funds, and then the Bank's loan.

5. Grier Heights or Bright Horizon will enter into a construction contract for the day care center. Such contract will not exceed $570,000 and will either be a fixed price contract or cost plus with a guaranteed maximum. The Bank reserves the right to approve the contractor or to require a payment and performance bond to assure completion of the project.

6. Prior to construction, the county will have entered into an agreement with the Bank and the City whereby the county will purchase, under certain conditions, the leasehold interest assigned to the Bank and the City for 85% of the outstanding principal balance on the loans of the Bank and the City to Grier Heights.

7. The Bank and the City will have entered into an agreement whereby of total monies paid by the County to purchase the leasehold interest, the Bank will be paid a sum to retire 90% of it's loan, with the remainder to be used to retire the City loan.

8. Grier Heights agrees to maintain all of its deposit accounts at Bank of Mecklenburg during the loan.

9. Grier Heights agrees to allow a sign at the
construction site saying "Financing Provided by Bank of Mecklenburg".

**Permanent Loan**

- **Amount:** 70% of project costs, not to exceed $410,400
- **Term:** 20 years
- **Interest Rate:** 7.75% for 9 years and 3 months; Rate to be adjusted at that time to then current market rate. The formula for setting the rate shall be the then current yield on 10 year U.S. Government Securities plus 200 basis points.
- **Collateral:** Same as above
- **Repayment:** 111 payments of approximately $3,372; then payments adjusted to amortize balance over remaining life at then current market rate; 300 payments in total.
- **Prepayment Penalty:** None

**Prior Conditions to be met:**

1. All conditions outlined in construction loan section.

2. Grier Heights Agreement that escrow account assigned to the Bank will grow to a minimum of $75,000 by the end of the fifth year after the day care center opens.

3. Grier Heights agrees to reimburse Bank for attorneys' fees in connection with this transaction.

If this commitment is satisfactory, please sign the attached copy and return to me in the enclosed envelope.

Sincerely,

Frank W. Ix
Senior Vice President

Accepted and Agreed to this 20 day of April, 1993.

Grier Heights Economic Foundation, Inc.

**By:** Wallace
President
**CWAC Loan and Program Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borrower</th>
<th>Loan Amount</th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Jobs to Be Created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Darlene Adams</td>
<td>$11,000/$ 44,000</td>
<td>Wachovia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Floyd's Restaurant</td>
<td>6,000/ 24,000</td>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) CrossRoads Restaurant</td>
<td>19,000/ 76,000</td>
<td>Bank of Meck.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Evans Financial Group</td>
<td>10,700/ 42,800</td>
<td>First Union</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Mr. &amp; Mrs. Lankford</td>
<td>8,000/ 32,000</td>
<td>First Union</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Ms. Karen A. Shaw</td>
<td>54,800/ 219,200</td>
<td>Nations Bank</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Charlotte Climbing Center</td>
<td>6,000/ 130,000</td>
<td>Southern National</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) A &amp; E Commercial Hskp.</td>
<td>6,000/ 24,000</td>
<td>United Carolina Bk.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Jaz-Mek's Hair Salon</td>
<td>32,149/ 127,000</td>
<td>Southern National</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Kevin Campbell</td>
<td>64,000/ 256,000</td>
<td>Nations Bank</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$217,649/ 875,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND

The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Acts of 1987 and 1988 authorized the Federal Emergency Shelter Grant Program, which provides funds to states and local governments to support programs targeted to homeless families and individuals. The funds may be used for the following eligible activities:

- Renovation of facilities for emergency shelter
- Provision of essential services (up to 30% of the total grant)
- Payment of maintenance, operations and insurance.
- Homeless prevention activities (up to 30% of the total grant)
- Staff costs for operations (up to 10% of the total grant)

From 1987 to 1991 the City contracted with Mecklenburg County for the administration and distribution of the ESG funds. Mecklenburg County then contracted with eligible local homeless care providers to carry out eligible ESG activities. In 1992 the County requested that it be removed from the contractual commitment with the City to administer and distribute the funds. Because of the short time frame to commit the FY92 funds, staff recommended and Council approved 5 contracts with agencies in amounts recommended by the County as follows:

- Uptown Shelter $32,000
- Salvation Army Women and Children's Shelter $10,000
- Charlotte Emergency Housing $18,200
- Traveler's Aid Society $10,000
- Crisis Assistance Ministry $15,800

Total $86,000

Staff also recommended Request for Proposals for the next year.

On February 8, 1993 City Council approved the grant application for ESG funds in the amount of $59,000 which is $27,000 less than the previous year's due to a reduction in the overall appropriation of ESG funds nationally by the U. S. Congress. This action also provided for Request for Proposals to be issued by the City in order to allow eligible homeless service providers to compete for the reduced ESG funds. In response, 5 service providers made the following request:

- Charlotte Emergency Housing $12,485
- Crisis Assistance Ministry $10,840
- Salvation Army $6,860
- Traveler's Aid Society $6,860
- Uptown Shelter $21,955

$59,000
What follows is a summary of funds provided by or requested of Mecklenburg County for agencies providing homeless assistance. The sources of County funding are ABC profits, beer and wine tax, and hotel/motel taxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>County Funds Approved FY 91-92</th>
<th>County Funds Approved FY 92-93</th>
<th>County Funds Requested FY 93-94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Assistance- Counseling Office</td>
<td>$242,000</td>
<td>$255,662</td>
<td>$274,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Assistance- Clothing, Furniture, Appliance Ministry</td>
<td>67,192</td>
<td>70,247</td>
<td>75,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Emergency Housing</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>60,892</td>
<td>79,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army- Women's, Children, Family Shelter</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>74,328</td>
<td>74,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army- Transitional Housing (New Request)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown Shelter- George Shinn Center</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>163,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveler's Aid- Family Resettlement Program</td>
<td>32,443</td>
<td>33,784</td>
<td>102,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community Works- (New Request)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$562,635</strong></td>
<td><strong>$634,913</strong></td>
<td><strong>$897,570</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attached as Exhibit 1 is a matrix which outlines each of the 5 responding agencies competing for City ESG funds and detailed criteria relating to eligibility and the functions of services provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ELIGIBLE CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Improves the quality of existing emergency shelters for homeless. (24CFR 576.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Fund additional emergency shelters. (24CFR 576.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Help meet the costs of operating emergency shelters. (24CFR 576.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Provides certain essential social services to homeless individuals. Only 30% of the total entitlement can be used for essential services. (24CFR 576.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCIES FUNCTION</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Emergency Housing operates Plaza Home which provides emergency transitional shelter (up to 90 days) for women and families. This is the only program in Charlotte-Mecklenburg which serves intact families and where this facility is full, eligible families must either split up between two shelters, or remain in potentially unsafe living situations. The program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Assistance Ministry uses McKinney-ESO funding to prevent homelessness. These funds are used as a &quot;last resort&quot; funding source after all other funds for which the client could qualify have been depleted. ESO funds &quot;must not support existing prevention funding&quot; in the community. Last year, in order to stretch resources as many clients as possible, a $200 spend-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army Women and Children's Shelter provides emergency and transitional shelter for homeless families. In 1992, The Salvation Army Women and Children's Shelter provided 20,732 nights of emergency shelter to 1,230 unaccompanied women and children. Of the 647 single women that came to the shelter, 51% or 323 only needed the shelter for one or two nights.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveler's Aid Society (TAS) provides emergency financial assistance and crisis management social work services to working poor individuals and families relocating to Charlotte who have lost jobs and housing in areas of the country experiencing economic depression or recession. When clients arrive, they are homeless. Most live in shelters, motels, or doubles up with family or friends. Some even</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of the Uptown Shelter/George Shinn Center is to provide comprehensive, non-explosive services and temporary shelter in up to 188 beds for homeless men. The primary purpose is to help homeless men get off the street and back to the mainstream of life. The Shelter expects to serve 1,227 (unemployed county) homeless men in 1993-94, with 60,445 bednights of service, an increase from over 54,730 bednights in 1992.
AGENCIES
FUNCTION
Charlotte Emergency Housing also includes a 24-hour
daycare/home (Rainbow Room) for
preschool children of the residents.
Supportive services include intensive
case management and educational
programs.
In 1991, Charlotte Emergency Housing moved into a new, larger facility,
doubling the capacity to serve homeless
women and families. Currently, there are 14 bedrooms, which typically serve
ten families and up to 8 single women.
Case management and supportive counseling is provided by one social worker
who sees 1800 referrals each year. With this support, residents have a strong record of successful transition
to permanent housing. Upon leaving
Plaza House, 82% of the residents have secured employment and permanent
housing.

SAVING ARMY
WOMEN'S & CHILDREN'S SHELTER

Of the 252 families with 451
children that came seeking shelter, 48% are
families needing the shelter for seven
(7) days or less. Therefore, most of the
women and their children need only short
term emergency shelter. Access to other
services are available through a network
of service providers.

TRAVELERS AID

Live in their own. Social workers assist
newcomers for up to 90 days to help them
develop suitable relocation plans. In
the process, TAB provides financial
assistance as well. The goal is to prevent
recurring episodes of homelessness.

UP TOWN SHELTER

TRAUTH CENTER

PLA, in a safe and sanitary shelter. Access to
other services and resources is facilitated
through a network of service providers who
extend services at the Shelter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ES O funding requested from the City</th>
<th>Utilities $4,000</th>
<th>Supplies, Repairs &amp; Service $4,985</th>
<th>Rent &amp; Deposits $10,880</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance, Operations and Insurance</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>Rent Controls $2,140</td>
<td>Insurance $4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities $11,412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities $21,921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### CHARLOTTE EMERGENCY HOUSING

#### Funding Sources
  - United Way $58,786
  - Mecklenburg County 54,946
  - State ESG 5,891
  - City ESG 14,800
  - Private Donations 44,899
  - Program Fees $44,427
  - **TOTAL** $215,005

#### Administration & Supportive Services
- **Services**: $181,709
- **Program Expense**: 27,201
- **Reg. Expense**: 23,324
  - **TOTAL**: $232,234

#### Uses
- **Administration & Supportive Services**: $543,672
- **Prevention**: 15,800
- **Energy**: 520,140
- **Crisis Intervention**: 174,309
- **General Assistance**: 414,102
  - **TOTAL**: $2,105,813

#### City's ESG as a % of Total Funding
- 8%

#### Clients Served
- **Individuals Served**: 284
- **Children Served**: 2,271
- **Shelter Nights**: 13,781

### CRISIS ASSISTANCE MINISTRY

#### Funding Sources
- **July 1, 1992 - June 30, 1993**
  - United Way $235,846
  - Mecklenburg County 309,292
  - State ESG 18,534
  - City ESG 15,800
  - City of Charlotte 85,309
  - Private Donations 1,455,058
  - **FEMA**: 174,309
  - General Assistance 469,044
  - Delta Power 151,034
  - **TOTAL**: $3,058,653

#### Administration & Supportive Services
- **Services**: $360,050
- **Food Services**: 47,840
- **Rent & Utilities**: 41,220
  - **TOTAL**: $449,110

#### Uses
- **Administration & Supportive Services**: $228,990
- **Client Assistance**: 114,209
  - **TOTAL**: $343,199

#### City's ESG as a % of Total Funding
- 2%

#### Clients Served
- **Individuals/Families Served**: 43,247
- **Women & Children Served**: 1,330

### SALVATION ARMY WOMEN'S & CHILDREN'S SHELTER

#### Funding Sources
- **July 1, 1993 - June 30, 1993**
  - United Way $291,991
  - Mecklenburg County 74,334
  - State ESG 15,000
  - City ESG 10,000
  - Private Donations 111,331
  - **TOTAL**: $2,925,479

#### Administration & Supportive Services
- **Services**: $215,000
- **FEMA**: 23,794
- **City ESG**: 10,000
- **Total Raising**: 17,451
- **Grants**: 40,114
  - **TOTAL**: $2,925,479

#### Uses
- **Administration & Supportive Services**: $228,990
- **Insurance (General)**: 15,483
- **Utilities**: 19,995
- **Transportation**: 7,272
  - **TOTAL**: $428,120

#### City's ESG as a % of Total Funding
- 3%

#### Clients Served
- **Individuals/Families Served**: *1,264
  - **Note**: *323 were families with small children

### TRAVELER'S AID

#### Funding Sources
- **July 1, 1991 - June 30, 1993**
  - **Public Support & Contributions**: $457,672
  - **City ESG**: 33,000
  - **TOTAL**: $490,672

#### Administration & Supportive Services
- **Services**: $363,164
- **Insurance (General)**: 15,683
- **Utilities**: 39,995
- **Transportation**: 7,272
  - **TOTAL**: $426,120

#### Clients Served
- **Individuals/Families Served**: 1,227

---
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BACKGROUND

IN REM DEMOLISH - 1704 PEGRAM STREET

- Owner: Jerome G. Ginger
(Previous owner - Brian Carr d/b/a B & K Enterprises)

- Census Tract: #8 (Concentrated Code Enforcement Area)

- Council District: #1

- Neighborhood: Belmont

- Date of Inspection: 9/19/90

- Reason for Inspection: Field Observation

- Owner Notified of Hearing: 9/21/90

- Hearing Held: 10/17/90

- Owner ordered to demolish structure since the estimated cost to repair is more than 65% of the estimated value.

- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling by: 11/17/90 (mail returned)

- Title search received in September 1990 revealed a party in interest to the property

- Findings of Fact and Order advertised in the Mecklenburg Times because the owner could not be served by certified mail.

- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling by: 2/4/91

- The owner, Brian Carr, requested permission to repair the property on 2/5/91. A Supplemental Order to repair the property was issued to the owner with the repairs to be completed by 5/5/91.
- Mr. Carr was granted a 6-month extension (from 5/5/91 to 11/5/91) because he was unable to complete the repairs to the house due to storm drainage problems which were beyond his control. (The Director of the Community Development Department is authorized to grant up to a 6-month extension to an absentee owner in order to correct Housing Code violations.)

- On 12/9/91 City Council approved a 7-month extension from 11/5/91 for the owner to repair the structure. The extension was requested because a storm drainage problem was causing foundation damage to the structure and the owner did not want to make repairs to the foundation while the storm drainage problems still existed. During the extension of time, the storm drainage improvements on Pegram Street were to be made by the City and the owner was to correct the Housing Code violations. The extension expired on 6/5/92.

- Since the owner had made no repairs to the structure, City Council was requested at its June 8, 1992 meeting to adopt an ordinance to use the In Rem Remedy to demolish the structure. Brian Carr appeared before City Council and asked that the action be deferred.

- City Council deferred the In Rem action for 60 days and stated that if no contract or significant work was done within 60 days, City staff should proceed with demolition of the structure.

- At the end of 60 days, no repairs had been made to the structure nor had the owner presented a contract for the work.

- Prior to going back to City Council for approval of the In Rem ordinance to demolish the structure, Community Development staff learned from the Engineering Department that significant delays were being experienced in the Pegram Street storm drainage improvements and that the estimated completion date was mid-November 1992. It was decided by staff to postpone the In Rem demolition request to City Council until the improvements were complete.

- The storm drainage improvements on Pegram Street were completed in early 1993.

- An updated title report received in March 1993 revealed that 1704 Pegram Street had been sold in July 1992 to Jerome G. Ginger. Since Lis Pendens had been filed with the Clerk of Court on this property, Mr. Ginger became responsible for the code enforcement action and the civil penalty when he purchased the property.

- Community Development staff has advised Mr. Ginger of the Order to demolish the structure and the civil penalties which are accumulating. Mr. Ginger has not demolished the structure and the structure remains open and vacant.

- Structure Occupied: No
- Repairs include major structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing

- Feasibility to Save or Demolish the Structure:
  An Acquisition/Disposition Analysis has been performed by Community Development staff (see Exhibit A). It has been determined it is not feasible to preserve this structure. In this case, demolition is being recommended because: (1) the estimated In Rem Repair cost of $16,610 is 241.8% of the $6,870 tax value of the structure and (2) the estimated cost of $81,947 to acquire and rehabilitate the structure makes it not economically feasible to do.

- Demolition cost is $3,000. Funds are available in the General Fund-In Rem Account.

- Lien will be placed on the property for the cost of demolition.

- The owner will be notified of this In Rem action being presented to City Council on June 14, 1993.
EXHIBIT A
DATE 5-13-92

NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION PROGRAM EVALUATION GUIDE
ADP ANALYSIS

ADDRESS 1704 Pegram Street Census #

I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order: In Rem Repair
Demolition

- Effective Year
Structure Built 1927
Style Inad/Brach
# Bedrooms 3
Sq. Ft. (House) 125
Civil Penalty N/A

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $ 6,870
B. Land Value $ 10,300

SUB-TOTAL TAX VALUE $ 17,170

C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair
to Code Standards $ 16,610

TOTAL $33,780

D. % of C divided by A 24/8 %< 65% of Value Yes ___ No __

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to HDS.

Name
Date Completed 5-13-92

II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property

Information received from HRS II Date 5-13-92

1. Negotiated Acquisition (Tax Value) $ 17,170
2. Rehabilitation (Substantial) $ 33,777
(based on average cost of CD rehabilitation x sq.ft. in house)
125/ sq.ft. x $27.00 per sq.ft.)
3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $ -0-
4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $ 30,000

TOTAL $ 81,947

Is Total > $50,000 Yes ___ No ___
III. Amount of Civil Penalties

IV. Course of Action

A. Proposed recommendation(s) (to be completed by NDS)

1. Acquire
   a. If checked yes, forward to Rehabilitation Chief for work write-up and cost estimate

2. In Rem Repair

3. Demolish

   If either #2 or #3 is checked yes, return to appropriate HRS II.
   If either #2 or #3 is checked yes, the process is completed unless we are interested in acquiring the land.
   If we are interested in acquiring the land, the two processes (code and acquisition) simultaneously continue.

Name: Wallace
Date Completed: 5-13-92

B. Proposed Use (to be completed by NDS)

1. Sell to Interested Purchaser Externally

2. Retain for Use Internally

3. Explain Proposed Internal Use of House

   NOTE: Outstanding loan on property and rehabilitation costs will make cost to acquire above Community Development replacement cost average for providing affordable housing to lower income persons. Also, when structure is demolished, vacant lot cannot be used to build another residential structure due to current zoning.

4. Explain Proposed External Sale of House

   NOTE: Did not solicit interest from the two nonprofit in the Belmont area because it is not likely either would be interested. Belmont CDC does not have any money to operate now and Hospital is purchasing land in $10,000 with a structure on it for reusing on the lot. Also, the storm drainage system has not been repaired yet.
D. Comments: Owner has not been successful with obtaining a bank loan to repair property. He is interested in "rehabilitating the best alternative to preserve the "status" of rental rehabilitation here.

However, he is aware of the limited funding available in private investments from city. He plans to request another city council meeting on the code action or sell property to a buyer who can afford to.

Name: 

Date Completed: 5-13-42

V. Rehabilitation Feasibility/New Construction

A. Rehabilitation Chief advises NDS of cost to rehabilitate house.

(to be completed by Rehabilitation Chief)

1. Cost to Rehabilitate $__________
2. Negotiated Acquisition $__________
3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $__________
4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $__________

TOTAL $__________

Is it feasible to rehabilitate? Yes ____ No ____
If yes, complete the following section.

B. Cost to Replace Vs. Cost to Preserve (to be completed by NDS)

Replacement Value: sq. ft. of structure x replacement cost per sq. ft. (based on average cost of CD new construction)

_____ sq. ft. x $______ $__________

Plus Land Value $__________

TOTAL $__________

Is it feasible to rehabilitate vs. replacement house cost?

Yes ____ No ____

Name ___________________________

Date Completed ___________________

If yes, NDS notifies the HRS II and the code enforcement process stops.

If no, the acquisition process stops and the code enforcement process is completed.
VI. Community Development Director Approval 

Decline 

Signature

Director's Comment/Concerns:

[Signature]

[Comment/Concerns]
BACKGROUND

IN REM REPAIR - 2000 RENNER STREET

- Owner: Home Federal Savings & Loan Association
  (Previous Owner - Gary Watts Realty)
- Census Tract: #48 (Concentrated Code Enforcement Area)
- Council District: #2
- Neighborhood: McCrorey Heights
- Date of Inspection: 12/17/91
- Reason for Inspection: Field Observation
- Owner Notified of Hearing: 3/17/92
- Hearing Held: 4/16/92
- Owner ordered to repair the structure since the estimated cost to repair was less than 65% of the estimated value.
- Owner Ordered to Repair Dwelling by: 5/16/92
- Title search received in October 1992 revealed parties in interest to the property. Parties in interest have been notified of the code enforcement action.

- On 11/25/92 Home Federal Savings & Loan Association took title to the property from the previous owner, Gary Watts Realty. The Order to Repair the property was filed in Lis Pendens with the Clerk of Court, therefore, Home Federal Savings & Loan Association became responsible for repairing the structure and the civil penalty. To date no repairs have been made.

- Structure Occupied: No

- Repairs include repairing walls and ceilings throughout house, painting walls and ceilings throughout house, repairing or replacing any missing or damaged water pipes, installing a smoke detector, repairing defective flooring and sub-flooring, repairing or replacing damaged electrical fixtures, repairing and adjusting interior doors, sealing the fireplace, repairing the furnace, installing attic access door,
repairing or replacing sills and joists, repairing or replacing vinyl siding, painting porch deck, replacing front and rear exterior doors, repairing windows, repairing porch flooring, installing screens and screen doors, repairing steps and insulating the attic.

- Feasibility to Save or Demolish the Structure:
  An Acquisition/Disposition Analysis has been performed by Community Development staff (see Exhibit A). It has been determined it is feasible to preserve this structure. In this case, repair is being recommended because the estimated In Rem Repair cost of $9,115 is 32.2% of the $28,280 tax value of the structure.

- Repair cost is $9,115 Funds are available in the General Fund-In Rem Account

- Lien will be placed on the property for cost of repairs.

- The owner will be notified of this In Rem action being presented to City Council on June 14, 1993.
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION ANALYSIS PROGRAM (ADAP)
EVALUATION GUIDE

ADDRESS 2000 Renner St, Census #: 48

I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order: In Rem Repair / Demolition

Effective Year
Structure Built 1963
Style 1R00
# Bedrooms 2
Sq. Ft. (House) 958
Civil Penalty
Amount 1430
Date 4-14-93

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $28,280
B. Land Value $3,500

SUB-TOTAL TAX VALUE $31,780

C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair to Code Standards $9115

TOTAL $40,895

D. % of C divided by A 72.2%
< 65% of Value Yes No

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to HDS.

F. Comments/Mitigative Concerns
   - No repair by current owner
   - Based on 12/17/93 inspection

Name: W. Jenkins
Date Completed 4-14-93
G. Preservation Manager or Development Manager Comments


Date Completed

II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property

A. Information received from HRS II Date 4/17/93

1. Negotiated Acquisition or Tax Value $31,780

2a. Rehabilitation (Substantial) $25,810
   (based on average cost of CD rehabilitation x sq.ft. in house)
   958 sq.ft. x $27.00 per sq.ft.

2b. Actual Cost/Cost Estimate

3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $0

4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $5750

Sub-Total $63,394

Outstanding Loans/Liens $5750

TOTAL $57,644

Is Total > $50,000 Yes No

B. Amount of Civil Penalties $1450

III. Rehabilitation Feasibility vs. Replacement Housing

A. Is it feasible to rehabilitate? Yes No

If yes, complete the following section.

B. Cost to Replace Vs. Cost to Preserve (to be completed by HDS)

Replacement Value: sq. ft. of structure x replacement cost per sq.ft. (based on average cost of CD new construction)

958 sq. ft. x $41.45 $39,709.10

Plus Land Value $25,800

TOTAL $42,209.10

C. Is it feasible to rehabilitate vs. replacement house cost?

Yes No

Name

Date Completed 4/31/93
IV. Course of Action

A. Proposed recommendation(s) (to be completed by NDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acquire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only forward to Rehabilitation Chief for work write-up and cost estimate after concurrence with CD Director of internal use purchase.

If we are interested in acquiring the land, the two processes (code and acquisition) simultaneously continue.

2. In Rem Repair

3. Demolish

If #1 is checked yes, NDS notifies the HRS II and the code enforcement process stops.

If either #2 or #3 is checked yes, the code enforcement process is continued by updating cost estimate and preparing City Council agenda item.

Name: 
Date Completed: 4-21-93

B. Proposed Use (to be completed by NDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Retain for Use Internally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explain Proposed Internal Use of House

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Sell to Interested Purchaser Externally

Explain Proposed External Sale of House

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Comments

See attached note

Name
Date Completed

v. Community Development Director

Approval

Decline

Signature 4-23

Director's Comment/Concerns:

In need of repair
BACKGROUND

IN REM DEMOLISH - 2643 MAYFAIR AVENUE

- Owner: Robert F. Wilson
- Census Tract: #39.02 (Concentrated Code Enforcement Area)
- Council District: #3
- Neighborhood: West Boulevard
- Date of Inspection: 1/18/91
- Reason for Inspection: Councilmember’s Complaint
- Owner Notified of Hearing: 1/28/91
- Hearing Held: 2/18/91
- Owner Ordered to Repair Dwelling by: 3/31/91

- Owner requested and was granted two extensions of time to complete the repairs with the compliance date extended to 6/1/91
- Title report received in July 1991 revealed parties in interest to the property.
  - Parties in Interest Notified of Hearing: 9/20/91
  - Hearing Held: 10/21/91
  - Parties in Interest Ordered to Repair Dwelling by: 12/5/91
  - Updated title report received in January 1992 revealed a change in ownership and one party in interest which had not been notified.
  - Owners Notified of Hearing: 1/22/92
  - Hearing Held: 2/7/92
  - Owners Ordered to Repair Dwelling by: 3/23/92
- Updated title report received in June 1992 revealed another change in ownership.

- Supplemental Findings of Fact and Order issued to the new owners on 10/26/92 to demolish the structure because additional violations had been identified due to the structure being open and vacant. (The estimated cost to repair the structure is more than 65% of the estimated value; therefore, the structure was ordered to be demolished.)

- Owners Ordered to Demolish
  Dwelling by: 11/23/92

- Findings of Fact and Order was advertised in the Mecklenburg Times on 12/11/92 because of being unable to serve one party in interest by certified mail.

- Owners Ordered to Demolish
  Dwelling by: 1/10/93

- Structure Occupied: No

- Repairs include major structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing.

- Feasibility to Save or Demolish Structure:
  An Acquisition/Disposition Analysis has been performed by Community Development staff (see Exhibit A). It has been determined it is not feasible to preserve this structure. In this case, demolition is being recommended because. (1) the estimated In Rem Repair cost of $22,155 is 68% of the $32,690 tax value of the structure and (2) the estimated cost of $192,009 (which includes $82,000 for loans/liens) to acquire and rehabilitate the structure makes it not economically feasible to do.

- Demolition cost is $4,000. Funds are available in the General Fund-In Rem Account.

- Lien will be placed on property for cost of demolition.

- The owner will be notified of this In Rem action being presented to City Council on June 14, 1993.
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION PROGRAM EVALUATION GUIDE
ADP ANALYSIS

ADDRESS 2643 Mayfair Avenue Census # 3901

I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order: In Rem Repair
Demolition

Effective Year
Structure Built 1970
Style Apartment
# Bedrooms 6
Sq. Ft. (House) 2695
Civil Penalty Yes
Amount $4070
Date 4-7-93

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $32,490
B. Land Value $31,450

SUB-TOTAL TAX VALUE $32,340

C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair to Code Standards $22,155

TOTAL $54,495

D. % of C divided by A 65% < 65% of Value Yes No

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to HDS.

F. Comments/Mitigating Concerns

One unit has been damaged by fire and the other two have been unoccupied. The condition makes the value of the structure less than in showing.

Name
Date Completed 4-7-93
G. Preservation Manager or Development Manager Comments


Date Completed

II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property

A. Information received from HRS II Date

1. Negotiated Acquisition or
   Tax Value $36,340
2a. Rehabilitation (Substantial) $72,765
   (based on average cost of CD rehabilitation x sq.ft. in house)
   2,195 sq.ft. x $30
   2b. Actual Cost/Cost Estimate $44,000
3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $904.70
4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $82,000

Sub-Total $192,009.70
Outstanding Loans/Liens $92,000
TOTAL $110,099.70

Is Total > $50,000 Yes ☑ No __

B. Amount of Civil Penalties $4070

III. Rehabilitation Feasibility vs. Replacement Housing

A. Is it feasible to rehabilitate? Yes ☑ No ☐
   If yes, complete the following section.

B. Cost to Replace Vs. Cost to Preserve (to be completed by NDS)

Replacement Value: sq. ft. of structure x replacement cost per sq.ft. (based on average cost of CD new construction)

2,195 sq.ft. x $41.45 $111,707.75
Plus Land Value $31,500
TOTAL $113,207.75

C. Is it feasible to rehabilitate vs. replacement house cost? Yes ☑ No ☐

Name
Date Completed 4-12-93
IV. Course of Action

A. Proposed recommendation(s) (to be completed by NDS)

1. Acquire

   _Yes_   _No_

   Only forward to Rehabilitation
   Chief for work write-up and cost
   estimate after concurrence with
   CD Director of internal use purchase.

   If we are interested in acquiring the
   land, the two processes (code and
   acquisition) simultaneously continue.

2. In Rem Repair

   _Yes_   _No_

3. Demolish

   _Yes_   _No_

   If #1 is checked yes, NDS notifies the HRS II
   and the code enforcement process stops.

   If either #2 or #3 is checked yes, the code
   enforcement process is continued by updating
   cost estimate and preparing City Council
   agenda item.

   Name ____________________________
   Date Completed 4-13-93

B. Proposed Use (to be completed by NDS)

1. Retain for Use Internally

   _Yes_   _No_

   Explain Proposed Internal Use of House

   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________

2. Sell to Interested Purchaser

   _Yes_   _No_

   Explain Proposed External Sale of House

   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
C. Comments

Even though the cost to buy/ Rehab is 15749.05 cheaper than new construction, there could be hidden costs that increase the rehab cost that the contractor might find during rehab. New construction would ensure that the property was structurally sound.

Name:
Date Completed 4-13-98

V. Community Development Director

Approval

Decline

Signature

Director's Comment/Concerns:

[Handwritten text not legible]
A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE REFUND OF CERTAIN TAXES

Reference is made to the schedule of "Taxpayers and Refunds Requested" attached to the Docket for consideration of the City Council. On the basis of that schedule, which is incorporated herein, the following facts are found

1. The City-County Tax Collector has collected certain taxes from the taxpayers set out on the list attached to the Docket.

2. The City-County Tax Collector has certified that those taxpayers have made proper demand in writing for refund of the amounts set out on the schedule within the required time limits.

3. The amounts listed on the schedule were collected through either a clerical or assessor error.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, in regular session assembled this 14th day of June, 1993 that those taxpayers listed on the schedule of "Taxpayers and Refunds Requested" be refunded in the amounts therein set out and that the schedule and this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

Approved as to form:

City Attorney

Read, approved, and adopted by the City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, in a regular session convened on the __________ day of ________________, 199__, the reference having been made in Minute Book ______________ and recorded in full in Resolution Book ______________, page(s) _______________.

Brenda Freeze
City Clerk
TAXPAYERS AND REFUNDS REQUESTED
LESS THAN $100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount of Refund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homesley, William Jackson</td>
<td>$27.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guild, Matthew Joseph</td>
<td>41.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lippard, Robin Michelle</td>
<td>32.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stidwell, Andrew Julius</td>
<td>27.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickey, Elizabeth P.</td>
<td>12.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowd, William Carey IV</td>
<td>35.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goad, Elmer R.</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goad, Elmer R. &amp; Wf.</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goad, Elmer R. &amp; Wf.</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitten, Daniel Mark</td>
<td>28.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Park Apts.</td>
<td>45.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesing International</td>
<td>25.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodyear, Wynne E., MD</td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowards, Howard D.</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne smith, Mary Richardson</td>
<td>29.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnhardt, Susan Hardy</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$480.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TAXPayers AND Refunds Requested 
MORE THAN $100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount of Refund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crosland-Erwin-Merrifield</td>
<td>$34,930.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosland-Erwin-Merrifield</td>
<td>4,894.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa Mart</td>
<td>136.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa Mart</td>
<td>168.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa Mart</td>
<td>202.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa Mart</td>
<td>216.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa Mart</td>
<td>236.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Resources Corp</td>
<td>183.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodso Corp</td>
<td>926.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Investors Inc.</td>
<td>4,557.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Welders Supply</td>
<td>277.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Welders Supply</td>
<td>224.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Welders Supply</td>
<td>283.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Welders Supply Co. Inc.</td>
<td>349.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantage Network</td>
<td>287.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,876.36</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENDOR NAME</td>
<td>CITY/COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORPORATE PERSONNEL SERVICES</td>
<td>$864,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Services</td>
<td>$742,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U S. Personnel</td>
<td>811,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforce</td>
<td>837,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower</td>
<td>874,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADIA Personnel</td>
<td>886,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TempWorld</td>
<td>886,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AccuStaff</td>
<td>888,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Additions</td>
<td>891,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsten Staffing</td>
<td>891,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Temporaries</td>
<td>891,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Choice</td>
<td>898,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Personnel</td>
<td>905,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Employment</td>
<td>910,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Personnel</td>
<td>913,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate Temporary</td>
<td>925,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablest Temporary</td>
<td>925,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Tree</td>
<td>926,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Personnel</td>
<td>926,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrell Services</td>
<td>938,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today’s Temporary</td>
<td>974,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot-Withers</td>
<td>1,096,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kelly Services, U S Personnel and Uniforce were not selected as the recommended bidder for contract award because they did not rank as high as Corporate Personnel in providing the best combination of price and services. Recommend annual contract award with option to renew for two additional periods for twelve months each.
## Charlotte Convention Center
### Total Project Budget Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracts Awarded</th>
<th>November 1991 Estimate</th>
<th>Prior to Bidding</th>
<th>Awarded Low Bid</th>
<th>Contract Change Orders to Date</th>
<th>Current Savings (Overrun) From 11/91 Estimate (A C D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Manager</td>
<td>$7,481,750.00</td>
<td>$7,481,750.00</td>
<td>$7,481,750.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Office</td>
<td>$82,672.00</td>
<td>$89,672.00</td>
<td>$85,303.70</td>
<td>$1,097.30</td>
<td>$3,271.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Demolition</td>
<td>$457,844.00</td>
<td>$456,844.00</td>
<td>$418,777.10</td>
<td>$51,400.00</td>
<td>$2,249,007.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Mart Demolition</td>
<td>$1,053,750.00</td>
<td>$1,053,750.00</td>
<td>$1,053,750.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,269,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Grading</td>
<td>$5,105,221.00</td>
<td>$8,677,370.00</td>
<td>$5,822,332.42</td>
<td>$1,286,031.57</td>
<td>$5,84,053.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Steel</td>
<td>$12,182,029.00</td>
<td>$12,182,029.00</td>
<td>$10,851,878.00</td>
<td>$1,798,451.00</td>
<td>$5,083,039.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>$3,403,390.00</td>
<td>$3,242,060.00</td>
<td>$3,235,380.00</td>
<td>$1,909,000.00</td>
<td>$3,235,380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterproofing</td>
<td>$876,610.00</td>
<td>$1,906,307.00</td>
<td>$1,460,820.00</td>
<td>$8,541.50</td>
<td>$2,300,049.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireproofing</td>
<td>$895,050.00</td>
<td>$91,050.00</td>
<td>$594,640.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$521,560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators &amp; Escalators</td>
<td>$2,741,760.00</td>
<td>$2,741,760.00</td>
<td>$1,728,940.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,016,820.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$1,778,838.00</td>
<td>$1,842,258.00</td>
<td>$2,763,529.00 (a)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,004,380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls &amp; Building Automation System</td>
<td>$1,388,251.00</td>
<td>$1,086,231.00</td>
<td>$1,239,707.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$346,454.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$7,360,080.00</td>
<td>$7,401,608.00</td>
<td>$7,765,343.00 (a)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,405,237.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>$8,110,081.00</td>
<td>$8,343,374.00</td>
<td>$8,762,874.00 (a)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,826,105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete 2</td>
<td>$4,492,832.00</td>
<td>$5,021,263.00</td>
<td>$5,230,556.00 (a)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,727,424.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>$1,185,712.00</td>
<td>$1,481,087.00</td>
<td>$1,267,705.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,111,993.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen &amp; Food Service Equipment</td>
<td>$1,189,347.00</td>
<td>$1,209,618.00</td>
<td>$1,123,645.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$354,922.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Metals</td>
<td>$1,622,562.00</td>
<td>$2,606,263.00</td>
<td>$2,755,044.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,135,882.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>$3,869,323.00</td>
<td>$5,153,454.00</td>
<td>$3,061,683.00 (a)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$814,740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precast Concrete</td>
<td>$3,425,714.00</td>
<td>$3,504,403.00</td>
<td>$2,585,381.00 (a)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$640,222.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>$3,554,248.00</td>
<td>$1,481,087.00</td>
<td>$1,267,705.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$558,886.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Paint &amp; Curtainwall</td>
<td>$2,634,270.00</td>
<td>$2,632,600.00</td>
<td>$2,787,890.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,123,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio/Visual</td>
<td>$817,382.00</td>
<td>$1,080,689.00</td>
<td>$1,066,531.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$169,136.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishes</td>
<td>$6,454,150.00</td>
<td>$8,216,600.00</td>
<td>$5,572,700.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,118,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Doors</td>
<td>$378,450.00</td>
<td>$586,232.00</td>
<td>$572,178.00 (a)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$183,716.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>$510,000.00</td>
<td>$447,055.00</td>
<td>$328,721.00 (a)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$181,276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Demolition 2</td>
<td>$155,834.00</td>
<td>$156,281.00</td>
<td>$149,040.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$11,108.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwork &amp; Cabinets</td>
<td>$773,323.00</td>
<td>$1,248,024.00</td>
<td>$850,843.00 (a)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$117,320.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | TOTALS | $62,025,127.00 | $81,571,347.00 | $88,263,727.28 | $2,369,019.01 |

**Note:**

- **Original Budget (NOV 91):** $62,025,127.00
- **Current Revised Budget:** $88,263,727.28

### Footnotes

1. **Negotiated low bid**
2. **Construction Manager's estimate as of 20MAY93**
3. **Other Project Costs Include such items as the Architect's Fee Project Contingency Furniture & Equipment, Professional Testing Services City Administration and the Art Fund**
4. **Includes Council action item**
METRIC CONSTRUCTORS, INC.

POSITION PAPER

RELATED TO THE PUBLIC BID FOR

BID PACKAGE 090 "FINISHES"

CHARLOTTE CONVENTION CENTER

METRIC CONSTRUCTORS, a general contractor, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of J.A. Jones, Inc., a construction entity headquartered in Charlotte for 103 years.

Metric was one of 9 or 10 contractors prequalified to submit a competitive bid for Bid Package 090 "Finishes". The published budget estimate by the City for this work was $8.1 M. The bid was to be submitted to the City by 2:00 P.M. on April 28, 1993. Approximately five weeks were allowed by the City from the date of the release of the bid documents to the prequalified contractors to the April 28th bid date.

The bid specifications provided to the competing contractors by the City set the requirement that three (3) documents be turned in at the appointed date and time. The three documents required
by the City's specifications were:

- Bidder's Form of Proposal and Certification
- Bid Bond or Bidder's Security
- M/WBE Utilization Commitment

The specifications further states that "Failure to provide the documents listed above at the time and on the date of the bid submissions may render the bid nonresponsive".

Also, with regard to the "M/WBE Utilization Commitment" document, there exist at the base of this form a paragraph which reads (in bold print):

"NOTE: If the bidder intends to subcontract any portion of the work of the project, this form must be completed and submitted with the bid."

Three contractors did, in fact, submit a bid to the City for Bid Package 090 "Finishes" at 2:00 P.M. on April 28, 1993. These contractors and their bids for the Work were as follows:

- Cecil Malone Co. (Atlanta, Ga.) $9,572,700
- Metric (Charlotte, N.C.) $10,402,980
- Bonitz (Greenville, S.C.) $10,470,300

During the course of the opening of the bids, the City revealed that Cecil Malone Co., the apparent low bidder, had not submitted one of the documents required by the specifications - the
"M/WBE Utilization Commitment" form. Malone had instead included with his bid a form entitled "Letter of Intent To Perform As A Subcontractor Or Provide Materials Or Services". It should be noted that not only was the correct form, as required by the City's specifications, absent from Malone's bid submission, but the incorrect form that was provided was totally blank, with the exception of the signature of Malone's president and the date.

As a result of Malone's failure to provide one of the three documents required by the City's specifications at the time of the bid opening, Metric's position is that the City should have at that point declared Malone's bid as being non-responsive and should have rejected it on that basis.

Instead, the City, after acknowledging the deficiency in Malone's bid, instructed Malone to take the next hour or so to complete the heretofore absent "M/WBE Utilization Commitment" form and then return it to the City's construction manager. In other words, the City offered Malone relief and remedy to cure the deficiency of their bid after the bid opening and in a method which is outside of the City's specified instructions to bidders.

Metric further asserts that all competing contractors had, during the five week period prior to the bid date, equal time and opportunity to insure that each of the three documents required at bid time be accurate and complete.

To extend the prescribed time period to one contractor and not the others, as was done in this case by the City, in order that he might then comply with the City's specifications is not fair and does not constitute an even consideration of the efforts expended by the competing firms to
comply with the rules set forth by the City itself.

Compounding the issue of "the Owner reserves the right to waive any irregularities", the latitude extended to Cecil Malone Co. for the purpose of bringing its bid into compliance after the fact is that Malone's submission was deficient related to the matter of M/WBE participation. Had any bidder not submitted at the time of the bid opening either the bid form itself or the accompanying bid bond or security, the City would have indeed immediately rejected the bid on the basis of being non-responsive per the specifications. Granted, these two aforementioned documents are required for inclusion by state law, but in true practice the message sent by the easy willingness of the City to forgive, on the basis of oversight, technicality, or irregularity, the fact that the M/WBE requirement at the time of bid was not met, and yet offered by the City a remedy to fix, exhibits a lesser priority and concern on behalf of the City with regard to M/WBE participation with the Convention Center or any other City of Charlotte project.

Metric reminds the City that it was the second low bidder on the Convention Center's Bid Package 031 "Concrete 1". The apparent low bidder failed in his bid to acknowledge receiving Addendum No. 1 to this bid package. He did, however, acknowledge receiving Addenda 2 through 9. Addendum No. 1, the one not acknowledged, concerned commitment to M/WBE participation. Metric expressed its belief at that time to the City that the apparent low bidder was non-responsive because he had not acknowledged receiving all relevant addenda to the bid package. The City decided to forgive the apparent low bidder by giving him the benefit of the doubt that he had received Addendum No. 1 and therefore awarded him the contract for the Work.
Returning to the matter at hand, Bid Package 090 "Finishes", all competing contractors were over the City's budget estimate of $8.1 M. Metric has observed that with previous Convention Center bid packages the City has, when bids are received which are over their budget estimate, negotiated with the low bidder to reconcile the work scope with the pricing activity in order to get within the set budget number.

Since the April 28 bid date to the present and in spite of the City's documented knowledge of Metric's protest pertaining to the non-responsiveness of Cecil Malone's bid, the City has nevertheless been engaged in an ongoing negotiation with Malone for the purpose of achieving work scope equal to $8.1 M. The City is prepared to present to Council on June 14, 1993 the request of Council to consent to award Bid Package 090 "Finishes" to Cecil Malone.

Metric is disappointed that the City entered into negotiations with Cecil Malone before the issues related to the non-responsiveness of Malone's bid had been resolved. Metric notified the City by registered mail within 24 hours of the bid opening expressing its strong felt position. Metric did not receive a response from the City attorney until May 12, 1993 (via fax) 13 days after receiving Metric's letter of protest. Metric has sound reason to believe that the City was, by May 12, well into its negotiation with Malone.

Metric intends to make its case before City Council on Monday, June 14. Metric asserts that any activity or negotiation which took place between the City and Malone, with the objective being to achieve the City's budget estimate of $8.1 M, prior to the resolution of determining the responsiveness and acceptability of Malone's bid by Council, is done at the City's and Malone's
respective risks and expenses. Metric should not be placed in the position of appearing to inhibit or retard the process of the construction of the Convention Center.

To summarize, Metric simply asks the following question of the City of Charlotte:

If the City is going to set the rules by which the competition will be governed for the procurement of construction services for its projects, is the City going to enforce those rules in a fair and consistent manner?

Metric request that City Council determine that the apparent low bidder be recognized for the deficiency with his bid as related to submitting the required documents at the time of the bid opening. Upon such recognition, Metric asks that the City reject Malone's bid and enter into negotiation with Metric to achieve the project budget of $8.1 M.

Metric thanks the City Manager and the City Engineering Department for this opportunity to express our position.
BACKGROUND

- Mr. and Mrs. Jones were placed on the relocation workload on November 7, 1991 through code enforcement.

- Due to the deteriorated condition of the house and the costly repairs needed, Community Development staff determined that the structure should be demolished.

- Mrs. Jones has lived at 328 E. Worthington Avenue since around 1920 and she wishes to remain on her current site. Because of the structural requirements of the Charlotte Historic District Commission (CHDC) new construction was recommended.

- Proposals from 14 developers were solicited through a Request for Proposals process with a submission date of March 26, 1993.

- One proposal was submitted; that being New Vision Homes, Inc

- The house was designed to meet the CHDC and site requirements, and the plan was reviewed and approved by the CHDC. The new house will contain 1,600 square feet.

- Family Composition:
  - Charles Jones - age 72
  - Charlee H. Jones - age 73

- Gross Monthly Household Income: $1,317

- Source of Income: Social Security

- % of Household Income: 49% of median income for a family of two

- Analysis of Household Income:

  Gross Monthly Income: $1,317.00
  Less: Federal Taxes: -0-
  Net Monthly Income: $1,317.00
  % Available for Housing: $395.10
  Less Taxes & Ins. (Est.): $109.17
  Available for Loan Payment: $285.93

- Council’s approved Selective Rehabilitation Loan Program states that a family is to pay no more than 30% of their gross monthly income, less federal taxes, toward housing expenses. (Housing expenses are defined as principal and interest payments, real estate taxes and insurance).
- Type of Assistance (based on 30% rule):
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loan Amount</td>
<td>$69,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>30 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Payment (P &amp; I)</td>
<td>$256.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Breakdown of Total Costs:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost &amp; Demolition</td>
<td>$63,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinance 1st Mortgage w/City</td>
<td>4,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney Fees/Closing Costs</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Loan Amount</td>
<td>$69,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Financing.
    The construction loan to New Vision Homes, Inc. will be $63,304 at 0% and will be repaid to the City through the permanent financing of the house using the City’s Replacement Housing Program. New Vision Homes, Inc. will be required to provide the City with an Irrevocable Letter of Credit for $63,304 to guarantee the construction of the house. The permanent loan to Charles Jones and wife, Charlee H. Jones, will be in the amount of $69,268.
EXHIBIT A

DATE

SELECTIVE REHABILITATION LOAN VS. REPLACEMENT HOUSING COST ANALYSIS

ADDRESS 328 E. Worthington Avenue

I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order: In Rem Repair

Demolition

Effective Year

Structure Built 1900

Style Traditional

# Bedrooms 6

Sq. Ft. (House) 2890

Civil Penalty

Amount N/A

Date

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $38,960.00

B. Land Value $66,000.00

SUB-TOTAL TAX VALUE $104,960.00

C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair to Code Standards $26,775.00

TOTAL $131,735.00

D. % of C divided by A < 65% of Value Yes 69% No

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to HDS.

F. Comments/Mitigative Concerns


Name

Date Completed
II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property (To be completed by Loan Agent)

A. Information received from HRS II

1. Negotiated Acquisition or Tax Value $48,960.00
2. Rehabilitation (Actual) $78,034.00
   
   18,034.00 \div 2890

   Actual Rehab Cost $27.00
   Cost Per Sq. Ft.

3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $300
4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $4,194.00

   Sub-Total $82,194.00
   Outstanding Loans/Liens
   TOTAL $78,034.00

Is Total > $50,000 Yes No

B. Amount of Civil Penalties $40

III. Rehabilitation Feasibility/Replacement Housing

A. Cost to Replace Vs. Cost to Preserve (to be completed by L.A.)

1. Replacement Value: sq. ft. of structure x replacement per sq.ft. (based on average cost of CD new construction)

   2890 sq. ft. x $41.45 = $119,916.00

2. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $300
3. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $4,194.00

   TOTAL $123,915.00

B. Rehabilitation Cost Vs. Replacement Housing Cost

1. Rehabilitation Cost $78,034.00
2. Replacement Cost $123,915.00

C. Is it feasible to rehabilitate vs. replacement house cost? Yes No

Name:
Date Completed 3/8/73
Deduct Another Plank From Convention Halls of Dreams

Only a few years ago, the civic pooh bahs of America saw an incredible opportunity. Perhaps 40 million times a year, U.S. residents traveled to some kind of convention, trade show or seminar. They would stay in an overpriced hotel, be wined and dined and maybe take in some name entertainment or championship golf. Because it was nearly all business, the federal government would countenance a full income tax deduction. What a party! Why not thought each pooh bah put my grand old town on the circuit? And so, in the name of the taxpayers, great convention halls were built — and, if the right financing could be swung guest rooms for the visiting multitudes as well.

But the picture began to change even before the concrete was dry. The employers who spawned the hordes of nomadic conventioners came under market pressure and started sending their (re naming) people instead, to smaller and more targeted gatherings — for 100 instead of 1,000 or 10,000. Meantime, the trade show crowds proved choosy about where they dined to go. And federal lawmakers began to peer back the deductibility of meals and entertainment expenses.

This last they are doing again in the tax bill approved by the House of Representatives last week. It would reduce the write-off to 50% from 80%. That would more than double the real cost to the participants (or their companies) of a good part of the convention fun.

Until the late 1980s, the decade had seen an explosion in the big event business says Thomas Gorski an official of the American Society of Association Executives. It just went wild. Some (in the disgust) went from having one show to having a dozen. But then recession brought matters to a head. Attendance at trade association conventions fell to 6.6 million in 1991 from 13.6 million in 1989 and there's been little uptick since.

The top meeting sites — especially for trade shows in booming industries — have continued to prosper. But in humdrum American cities convention-center occupancy rates are caving in, says David Petersen managing director for Price Waterhouse who follows this field. His firm finds that attendance at centers in major U.S. destination spots (more than 20,000 hotel rooms) will increase 16% this year. In middle rung cities (10,000-20,000 rooms) the convention rolls will drop 16%.

In those lesser drawers public officials have pushed new facilities after meeting planners cited a shortage of space as a reason for not coming. But this was a fib — the cruel truth was that few would pay to visit South Succotash, whatever its hall of dreams. Mayors of such places aren't going to be able to lure hotels back downtown no matter how many ribbons they throw — but still the conventions go on.

Now comes a tax move that could make more municipalities sorry they got into this game. Normally cities are all for closing federal loopholes (except those for local bonds and taxes). They figure it may not be worth the effort for the downs to figure out how to make good that break. But this change could bring more trouble for one of their splashiest development schemes.

The pooh bahs plight is actually a good argument for dispensing with this deduction. The tax break helps to prop up a niche of the hospitality industry. The cavernous halls and high rise hotels that are chasing this trade come at the expense of other investment, elsewhere in the economy. Yes wonder so little ruckus has been made outside of the narrow interest groups about curbing this break.

The meal-and-entertainment inducement for convention going as for the three martini lunch closer to home, is of only symbolic note fiscally. The change that Bill Clinton and Congress have in mind would raise less than $15 billion a year and they would probably waste that. But the microeconomic imperative to end the distortion (for frivolity yet) remains.

The Denver based Trade Show Bureau estimates each delegate to these usually four-day affairs spends nearly $1,000 a day arriving. Most of that goes for rooms, an expense that will still be deductible. Likewise the registration fee isn't regarded as covering meals and entertainment although it sometimes does. But that still leaves 25% to be affected by the tax change. At only half deductibility, playtime wouldn't be so cheap.

What ancillary activity is involved? A tax guide from accountants Grant Thornton notes that conventioners can deduct entertainment expenditures for business associates and their spouses at night clubs theaters, ball games and similar places and events provided you can establish that the entertainment is associated with conducting your business. That association, the booklet says can mean it takes place shortly before or shortly after the actual business discussion. Hey, what better way to see San Francisco? Than with the refrigeration folks.

However stringent any new limits are, they will only add to the case that technology is already making against unnecessary business travel. The onset of interactive video complete with graphic images so lifelike that it becomes less necessary to kick the tires on a rep's selection of samples, ought to mean that buyer and seller need to be close enough to shake on it.

Of course, we can't overlook the social hour of any good convention when people network for better jobs than the ones that brought them there. Maybe the cocktail chatter of the future could take place instead over an electronic bulletin board, or, for hot gossip, via E-mail.

If we're in the twilight of the mass meeting, the top venues will apparently be the last to go dark. The big shows in the flashiest cities — and those near a major business hub, with loads of room to exhibit and sleep plus good airline connections — just keep expanding.

Carlotta Gulla, the publisher and editor of Tradeshow Week points to Atlanta's Georgia World Congress Center whose growth permitted in turn the expansion of the sporting goods Super Show by 57% in square footage this year over last. The International Woodworking Machinery and Furniture Supply Fair there was up 17% The average trade show nation wide took only 3% more space in 1993.

As this happens, the lesser lights grow dimmer. Of the 50% increase in meeting facilities in North America over the last decade and the even faster expansion in floor space a lot took place in smaller cities ambitious to go big time. They've displaced their trust in trend lines of the past.

Maybe there will be enough new traffic to support the new facilities in St. Louis, Charlotte, Dallas and a dozen other cities. More likely, however, is that the roster of second tier sites now starring into an abyss — see Winston Salem, Kansas City, Hartford, San Jose, Portland and Milwaukee — will strengthen.

The new sobriety of corporate America, coupled with an unfestive tax code, will dry up the froth of the convention market. Worthwhile meetings will survive. And that OK — the right kind of gathering fosters entrepreneurship. But in the future we're likely to see more getting down to business at least until noon.
**Politics & Policy**

What Do You Call U.S. Taking Cut of Payrolls? 
It’s on the Tips of Health Reformers’ Tongues

**BY HILARY SOUT**
Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

**WASHINGTON**—It is the tax that does not speak its name.

To administrative officials grappling with the critical issue of how to pay for universal health care, it is a wagers base premium. But to economists and most everyone else, it is a payroll tax, and the decision on whether to impose it could have huge ramifications on the economies and politics of health care reform.

The levy would replace the health insurance premiums that many firms currently pay on behalf of their workers with a tax divided between employer and employee, similar to the taxes that now fund Social Security and Medicare. For those firms that don't now contribute to their employees' health-care costs, it would be a new expense.

President Clinton dropped the idea during his campaign but is now leaning toward it, and a decision could be made as soon as this week.

The proposal has split the president's advisers, with first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and Ir a Magaziner, the head of her health-care team, taking up the idea, while economic aides led by Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen are dubious.

Outside the administration the payroll tax has strong support from, among others, unions, who see it as a more progressive alternative for financing universal health care. We're strongly in support of the wage-based approach as opposed to the traditional premium structure. We believe it's one of the most important things they should do, says Alan Reuther, legislative director for the United Auto Workers.

Besides, Mr. Reuther adds, with a payroll tax "we'd negotiate for the employer to pay the entire amount. For example, if the levy was 7% for the employer and 2% for the employee, a leading formula under consideration, unions would bargain to make the employer pay the entire 9%.

Many businesses are not enthused. A payroll tax is probably the worst of all choices, says John Motley, a lobbyist for the National Federation of Independent Businesses. Among other things, he says, a huge new payroll tax would discourage the creation of precisely the kind of high-paying jobs the administration says it wants to encourage. And for small business especially, he says, you've come up with a tax that is most devastating to your cash flow because it is not based on cash flow.

Moreover, a payroll tax could entail huge political risks for Mr. Clinton, arousing widespread sentiment and reinforcing the political perception that he is a tax and spend liberal bent on big-government approaches.

Unlike the Social Security and Medicare taxes, the money from a health levy would not be earmarked for health care, but would go into a general fund and be used to pay for health care reform if passed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY INCOME</th>
<th>AVERAGE CURRENT PREMIUM</th>
<th>AVERAGE PAYROLL PREMIUM</th>
<th>CHANGE FROM CURRENT POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>$352</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$248</td>
<td>$321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>$566</td>
<td>$349</td>
<td>$217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>$645</td>
<td>$502</td>
<td>$143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>$808</td>
<td>$677</td>
<td>$131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>$974</td>
<td>$871</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>$1,055</td>
<td>$1,208</td>
<td>$151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>$1,059</td>
<td>$1,776</td>
<td>$716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
<td>$1,209</td>
<td>$2,343</td>
<td>$1,134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Winners and Losers

Under one scenario being discussed by the administration employers would be hit by a new 7% payroll tax and workers by a 2% tax. Under such a plan, low- and moderate-income workers might see their health bills go down while more affluent workers would see an increase.

The chief benefit is progressivity: Firms paying high wages, such as rich law firms and Fortune 500 companies, would contribute more than firms paying low wages, such as snack bars and neighborhood laundries.

The tax would be a political complication: the administration doesn't need it. They've got enough head room without it. But he says he would still think, with premium finance, and says that as an unashamed egalitarian who would like to see more income redistribution in the U.S.

Moreover, for all the talk of fairness, there would be clear winners and losers under the payroll tax. It's going to cause a lot of income redistribution, not just among classes but also among regions, industries, companies, in patterns that may not make sense to many people, says Mr. Aaron. For example, a state like Connecticut, with a higher wage base and a lower uninsured rate could effectively end up subsidizing a state like Alabama, with a high rate of uninsured people and a lower wage base. Microsoft would end up subsidizing Seven Eleven.

To avoid such complaints about subsidization, the administration is also considering a system of different payroll tax rates for different states, or even possibly different regions within a state. The rate would be calculated after taking into account the wage base of the area, the number of uninsured and the cost of medical care.

But the varying rates themselves could cause resentment, not to mention making what would be a hugely complicated system even more complex.

For business people, perhaps the most worrisome question is "Will it be enough?" From 1982 to 1992 the country's wage base grew 83% while national health spending jumped at nearly twice that rate. Unless the administration's health plan succeeds in quickly and significantly reducing the rate of increase in health costs, the payroll tax rate might have to be increased year after year to cover the gap.

If the payroll levy is set at 7% how long will it be before it will reach 12% or even higher? warns John Galles, executive vice president of National Small Business United.

Administration officials have talked about guaranteeing that the payroll premium rate never goes beyond a specified level, if the limit didn't prove to be enough, revenue would have to be found by some means other than taxing business. But many business people think that, guarantee or not, the administration inevitably come back to them to make up any shortfall, whether it was called a tax or not.

---

**New Export**

Who Buys What In Mexico

Even now U.S. exporters looking for new business find Mexico an expanding market. NAFTA will provide an even greater edge over European and Asian competitors. The Mexican Importer—a new bi-weekly report reveals for the first time direct imports from competitive economies to the seaports of Vera Cruz, Tampico, Altamira Lazaro Cardenas and Manzanillo. It also identifies importers and their overseas suppliers.

As a special introductory offer get an entire year's subscription for only $395! Call today for an inside look at this growing market for your products.

To order (or for a sample issue) call: Traci Bevacqua, (Tel) 800-222-0386, ext 6696, or Andres Bonventre (Tel) 800-952-3839, (Fax) 212-357-7070.

---

To earn 30% of the commercial aircraft market, we're in the United States.

The United States plays a vital part in Airbus Industrie's long-term global business strategy. Some 500 companies, proportion of vital components for our constantly evolving Airbus family of aircraft: a clear demonstration of the importance we place on our continued co-operation Airbus orders from U.S. airlines, including major deals which are our worldwide sales success.
CITY OF CHARLOTTE
RETIREMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAM

PURPOSE: To provide incentive for employees eligible for retirement to retire earlier than they might have intended in order to provide for savings to the department and City in the Operating Budget.

ELIGIBILITY: Any City employee who is a member of the North Carolina Local Governmental Employees' Retirement System or the Charlotte Firefighters' Retirement System who is eligible for service or early retirement as set forth in the provisions governing each retirement plan. Employees on suspension pending investigation of misconduct are not eligible for this program.

GUIDELINES:
• The program is voluntary.
  • Employees must separate from active service.
  • The Department commits to maintain vacancy for the position vacated or another position as near the same classification level as possible for six months, with a secondary goal of maintaining the vacancy for one year or eliminating the position. Exceptions to maintaining the vacancy pursuant to this commitment will require review and approval by an Assistant City Manager, on a case-by-case basis.
  • It is the responsibility of the Department to use provisions of the City Empowerment Policy and the reassignment of responsibilities to fulfill the duties normally accomplished by the position chosen to be maintained vacant.
  • Effective April 15, 1992, eligible employees will have sixty days to submit a request to retire (Attachment I) under the provisions of this program. The effective date of retirement must occur on or after July 1, 1992, and prior to January 1, 1993, and be approved by the Department Head.
  • Due to budgetary considerations, the City reserves the right to approve the actual retirement date of any employee participating in this program. Should retirement under this program be determined to have a detrimental effect on the City's ability to provide service, the City reserves the right to withdraw the program.
INCENTIVE: Any employee who retires subject to this policy will receive a one time cash payment, pursuant to the following formula. Incentive benefit is the greater of:
- Fifty percent (50%) of annual salary, (weekly base pay annualized)
- Fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000)

- Payment will be made upon retirement and subject to withholding in accordance with applicable payroll deduction provisions. Employees may elect to defer payment until January, 1993 if desired.

- Employees retiring under this program who are granted a monthly retirement allowance will receive retiree insurance in accordance with the policy provisions in effect as of their retirement date (see Attachment II, eligibility criteria). Employees separating from active service under this program who elect to defer their retirement date with the Retirement System in which they hold membership until after January 1, 1993, or employees electing to withdraw their retirement contributions in a lump sum will not be eligible for this benefit.

- Employees retiring under this program who are granted a monthly retirement allowance will receive at no cost, continuation of the basic group term life insurance coverage (2 X salary to a maximum of $100,000) for one year from their retirement date. Employees may convert the group policy to an individual policy within 31 days from the date the group coverage terminates. Employees separating from active service under this program who elect to defer their retirement date with the Retirement System in which they hold membership until after January 1, 1993, or employees electing to withdraw their retirement contributions in a lump sum will not be eligible for this benefit.

- Retirement counseling will be provided by the City to employees contemplating retirement under this program.

- Financial counselors will also be provided by the City for a specified amount of time to assist employees contemplating retirement under this program.
City of Charlotte

RETIREE MEDICAL INSURANCE

MONTHLY PREMIUMS

Effective 7-1-92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF COVERAGE</th>
<th>* DISABILITY OR 20 OR MORE YEARS OF SERVICE</th>
<th>15-19 YEARS OF SERVICE</th>
<th>10-14 YEARS OF SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Retiree Only</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$134.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Retiree/Dependent</td>
<td>$106.71</td>
<td>$213.42</td>
<td>$348.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Medicare Retiree</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$80.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Medicare Retiree/Dependent</td>
<td>$106.71</td>
<td>$213.42</td>
<td>$294.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Retiree/Medicare Dependent</td>
<td>$40.45</td>
<td>$80.90</td>
<td>$215.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Medicare Retiree/ Medicare Dependent</td>
<td>$40.45</td>
<td>$80.90</td>
<td>$161.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This category also applies to employees who retired prior to 1-1-91 regardless of years of servi
DATE: 1/8/93

FROM: Personnel Department

TO: Retiree
Treasurer's Office

SUBJECT: Group Medical and Life Insurance for Retirees

Name: Ronnie E. Rash
Certificate No. 238-66-8295

Address: 12101 Bailey Rd.
Cherryville, N.C.

Employment Date: 2/21/66
Retirement Date: 11/1/93

Block will indicate coverage or any change of coverage.

Medical Insurance

☐ Add retiree for Group Medical Coverage.

Premium Payment
$106.71

Effective Date
1/1/93

Life Insurance

$1,000 Policy 4/1/61

☐ Add retiree for Group Life Insurance.

Initial payment of $ ________ will cover from ________ to ________.

☐ Delete name from records Conversion available only. Must convert within 31 days. $10,000 - Spouse $5,000 - Children

☐ Add retiree for Waiver of Premium at $ ________ volume of Life Insurance. This amount will reduce to $ ________ at age ________.

☐ YES ☐ NO Equitable/Option 65

I have received a copy of the insurance benefit information and it has been explained to me.

1/8/93

Signature of Retiree

Proper address for payment of Insurance: City of Charlotte
City Treasurer's Office
600 East 4th Street
Charlotte, NC 28202

Retirement incentive plan provided $100,000 of FREE Basic Life Insurance until 12/31.
# RESULTS, SURVEY OF VETERINARIANS, MECKLENBURG COUNTY, MARCH-MAY, 1993

Thirty-nine questionnaires were mailed, which included 5 questions and invited comment. Twenty-two were returned, a response of 56%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 1: Would you offer discounted vaccinations required by spay/neuter clinic 1 day per month?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong> - 54.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 2 - Would you perform early spay/neuter as an alternative to euthanasia at our shelter?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong> - 82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 3 - Would you offer discounted spay/neuter 1 day per month?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong> - 59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 4 - Would you endorse some form of spay/neuter legislation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong> - 73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question # 5 - Would you like more information?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong> - 91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF RESPONDANTS OFFERING PERSONAL COMMENT: 77%
CONSENT I AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: General Construction - Contract B1 - Liquid Stream Improvements - McAlpine Creek Wastewater Management Facility Modifications And Expansions

User Dept: CMUD

Funding: Fund 2071, Ctr. 633 26 - Water/Sewer CIP - McAlpine Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion to 48 MGD - $21,103,151 97.

Description: Work to be performed under this project will include improvements to the South Plant Raw Sewage Pumping Station, flow measurement improvements, trickling filter recirculation, aeration system improvements, effluent filter additions, sodium bisulfite facility, effluent filter pumping station, thickened primary sludge pumping station improvements, breakroom addition at the Administration Building, and miscellaneous yard piping and site structure additions/improvements

Justification: Award of this project will allow improvements and expansion at the McAlpine Creek WWMF which will increase the capacity of the treatment plant from 40 million gallons per day to 48 million gallons per day. Also, these improvements will comply with more stringent treatment requirements which become effective on May 1, 1994

Advertised: March 6, 1993 Bids Rcvd: April 27, 1993 Bids Expire: June 27, 1993

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Utility Contractors, Inc</td>
<td>Monroe, NC</td>
<td>$5,159,160 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamer Construction Co</td>
<td>Norcross, GA</td>
<td>$5,292,270 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Construction Company</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$5,307,060 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowder Construction Company</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$5,506,675 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haren Construction Company</td>
<td>Etowah, TN</td>
<td>$6,989,550.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWBE Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>$150,000 00</td>
<td>2 9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>$109,000 00</td>
<td>2 1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance: Yes - The Utility Department has reviewed the Contractor’s good faith efforts to meet the project goals and determined that he has complied with the requirements of the M/WBE Program. The Contractor has met and will exceed the
project goals.

Program Director Concur: Yes

Est. Cost: $5,987,800.00  % Difference 13.8%  $ Difference: $828,640.00

Consequences If Item Deferred: Subject bids will be valid for sixty (60) days from April 27, 1993. Delay in approval of this contract could prevent CMUD from meeting new treatment requirements which become effective May 1, 1994

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: State Utility Contractors, Inc

Submitted By: ___________________  Approved: ___________________

Contact & Phone If Questions: Henry Forrest - 391-5060
Kathy Freeze - 391-5104
CONSENT I AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: HVAC - Contract B2 - Liquid Stream Improvements - McAlpine Creek Wastewater Management Facility Modifications & Expansions

User Dept: CMUD

Funding: Fund 2071, Ctr. 633.26 - Water/Sewer CIP - McAlpine Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion to 48 MGD - $21,103,151.97.

Description: Work to be performed under this project will include all labor, work, and equipment necessary to perform and complete in a workmanlike manner all heating, ventilation, and air conditioning in connection with liquid stream improvements at the McAlpine Creek WWMF.

Justification: Award of this project will allow construction of a heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system in the proposed breakroom of the Administration Building and an exhaust fan in the Sodium Bisulfite Facility at the McAlpine Creek WWMF.

Advertised: March 6, 1993  Bids Rcvd: April 27, 1993  Bids Expire: June 27, 1993

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins-Johnston Co., Inc.</td>
<td>Matthews, NC</td>
<td>$9,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Z. Price &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>14,780.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWBE Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Project</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Goals</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance: Yes - The Contractor has complied with the M/WBE contract provisions which allow him to perform all the work with his own forces. The Contractor solicited quotes from two WBE electrical contractors (WKG and Driggers Electric). They were not interested in quoting this project since the dollar amount was so small. CMUD staff did not contact any M/WBEs for participation in this project.

Program Director Concur: Yes

Est. Cost: $45,900.00  % Difference 79.8%  $ Difference $36,650.00

Consequences If Item Deferred: Subject bids will be valid for sixty (60) days from April 27, 1993. Delay in approval of this contract could prevent CMUD from meeting
new treatment requirements which become effective on May 1, 1994.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Tompkins-Johnston Co., Inc.

Submitted By: ________________  Approved: __________________

Contact & Phone If Questions: Henry Forrest - 391-5060
Kathy Freeze - 391-5104
CONSENT I AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda:  June 14, 1993

Project:  Electrical - Contract B4 - Liquid Stream Improvements -
McAlpine Creek Wastewater Management Facility Modifications And
Expansions

User Dept: CMUD

Funding: Fund 2071, Ctr. 633.26 - Water/Sewer CIP - McAlpine Wastewater
Treatment Plant Expansion to 48 MGD - $21,103,151.97.

Description: Work to be performed under this project will include all electrical and
instrumentation work required during modifications and expansions at the McAlpine
Creek Wastewater Management Facility.

Justification: Award of this project will allow construction of electrical and
instrumentation work at the McAlpine Creek
work will increase the capacity of the treatment plant from 40 million gallons per day to 48 million gallons per day. Also, these improvements will comply with more stringent treatment requirements which become effective May 1, 1994.

Advertised: March 6, 1993  Bids Rcvd: April 27, 1993  Bids Expire: June 27, 1993

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind-Com Electrical Company</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$749,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Electric Company</td>
<td>Madison, NC</td>
<td>$754,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWBE Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance: Yes - The Contractor has complied with the M/WBE contract provisions which allow him to perform all the work with his own forces. The Contractor did not solicit quotes from M/WBEs nor did CMUD staff contact any M/WBEs for participation in this project.

Program Director Concur: Yes

Est. Cost: $837,300.00  % Difference 10.4%  $ Difference: $87,600.00
Consequences If Item Deferred: Subject bids will be valid for sixty (60) days from April 27, 1993. Delay in approval of this contract could prevent CMUD from meeting new treatment requirements which become effective May 1, 1994.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Ind-Com Electrical Company

Submitted By: ___________________ Approved:_____________________

Contact & Phone If Questions: Henry Forrest - 391-5060
Kathy Freeze - 391-5104
Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Sanitary Sewer And Water Main Construction - FY 93 Contract No 14 - Street Main Extensions User Dept: CMUD

FUNDING: Fund 2071, Ctr. 635 79 Water/Sewer CIP - Street Main Extension Program - Water - $2,917,524.21, and, Fund 2071, Ctr. 633.79 Water/Sewer CIP - Street Main Extension Program - Sewer - $9,481,622.91.

Description: This project consists of approximately 8,000+ linear feet of 8-inch sewer pipe, 1,150+ linear feet of 12-inch water pipe, 2,150+ linear feet of 8-inch water pipe, 3,150+ linear feet of 6-inch water pipe, 2,150+ linear feet of 2-inch water pipe, 30 four foot manholes, 6 fire hydrants and various other appurtenances to be performed within rights-of-way of the North Carolina Department of Transportation and/or Charlotte Department of Transportation and other public road rights-of-way or 15-foot sanitary sewer right-of-way acquired from individually owned properties with varying temporary construction easements throughout the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County

Justification: Construction of these projects will extend sewer and water service to residences which have been determined to be public health hazards, where private wells are faulty, and/or to residences/businesses which have requested connection to the City’s water/sewer system

Advertised: May 1, 1993 Bids Rcvd: May 25, 1993 Bids Expire: July 25, 1993

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel Construction Company</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$943,284.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS, Incorporated</td>
<td>Richfield, NC</td>
<td>974,581 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. H. Price, Inc</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>976,425 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. M. Paris &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>998,469.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellinger, Incorporated</td>
<td>Monroe, NC</td>
<td>1,081,712.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWBE Status: WBE PRIME CONTRACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>$32,200 00</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL WBE - $943,284.75 - 100%
Compliance: Yes - The Utility Department has reviewed the Contractor’s good faith efforts to meet the project goals and determined that she has complied with the requirements of the M/WBE Program. The Contractor has met and will exceed the project goal for WBE participation.

Program Director Concur: Yes

Est. Cost: $920,000.00  % Difference 2.53  $ Difference: $23,284.75

Consequences If Item Deferred: We would be unable to provide service within the six month period outlined in the extension policy.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: McDaniel Construction Contractors

Submitted By: ________________  Approved:__________________

Contact & Phone If Questions: Kathy Freeze - 391-5104
Project: Water Main Construction - 12-Inch Water Main Along Shopton Road - From Beam Road To Dixie Road  
User Dept (CMUD)

FUNDING: Water/Sewer CIP - Water Main Along Shopton from Beam to Dixie - $687,003.

Description: This project consists of approximately 11,831+ linear feet of 12-inch water pipe, 68+ linear feet of 8-inch Ductile Iron Pipe, 52+ linear feet of 6-inch Ductile Iron Pipe, 7 fire hydrants and various other appurtenances to be performed within rights-of-way of Shopton Road, Lebanon Drive, Pinecrest Drive, Sandy Porter Road, and Steele Creek Road.

Justification: Construction of this project will reinforce the water system to meet projected demands as outlined in the Steele Creek Small Area Plan and in the 2005 Generalized Land Plan. This area is targeted for additional residential growth.

Advertised: April 24, 1993  Bids Rcvd: May 18, 1993  Bids Expire: July 18, 1993

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. H. Price, Incorporated</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$328,194.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders Brothers, Inc.</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>337,590.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDR, Incorporated</td>
<td>Stanfield, NC</td>
<td>343,404.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Utility Contractors, Inc.</td>
<td>Monroe, NC</td>
<td>382,695.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel Construction Contractors</td>
<td>Spindale, NC</td>
<td>386,489.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W M. Paris &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>392,918.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.R S., Inc.</td>
<td>Richfield, NC</td>
<td>400,636.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellinger, Incorporated</td>
<td>Monroe, NC</td>
<td>430,433.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor Plumbing Company</td>
<td>Davidson, NC</td>
<td>459,609.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Contracting</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>469,886.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-State Construction Co</td>
<td>Denver, NC</td>
<td>687,711.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWBE Status: WBE PRIME CONTRACTOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>$12,100.00</td>
<td>3.69%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL WBE - $327,694.62 - 99.85%
Compliance: Yes - The Utility Department has reviewed the Contractor’s good faith efforts to meet the project goals and determined that she has complied with the requirements of the M/WBE Program.

Program Director Concur: Yes

Est. Cost: $340,045.00  % Difference 3 5%  $ Difference: $11,850.38

Consequences If Item Deferred: Bids would be valid for sixty days beyond May 18, 1993.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: R. H. Price, Incorporated

Submitted By: ______________________  Approved: ______________________

Contact & Phone If Questions: Kathy Freeze - 391-5104
CONSENT I AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Water Main Construction - 12-Inch Water Main Along N.C. 73 To McGuire Nuclear Station  User Dept: CMUD

FUNDING: Duke Power Company $145,531.89 - Under 15-year reimbursable contract. Repayment will come from 35% of the revenue the new line generates.

Description: This project consists of approximately 6,874+ linear feet of 12-inch water pipe, 64+ linear feet of 8-inch water pipe, 3 fire hydrants and various other appurtenances to be performed within rights-of-way of Beatties Ford Road, N C Highway 73, Brown Mill Road, and Hubbard Road.

Justification: Construction of this project provide water service to the McGuire Nuclear Station located on N C Highway 73.

Advertised: May 1, 1993  Bids Rcvd: May 25, 1993  Bids Expire: July 25, 1993

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trans-State Construction Co.</th>
<th>Denver, NC</th>
<th>$145,531.89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDR, Incorporated</td>
<td>Stanfield, NC</td>
<td>155,633.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronny Turner Construction</td>
<td>Conover, NC</td>
<td>163,828.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Spindale, NC</td>
<td>165,263.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Utility Company</td>
<td>Concord, NC</td>
<td>179,012.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. H. Price, Inc.</td>
<td>Spindale, NC</td>
<td>188,729.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.R.S , Inc.</td>
<td>Concord, NC</td>
<td>192,823.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neill Grading &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Hickory, NC</td>
<td>196,081.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.M. Paris &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>197,266.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellinger, Inc.</td>
<td>Monroe, NC</td>
<td>199,894.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probst Construction Company</td>
<td>Concord, NC</td>
<td>203,717.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. F Shinn Contractor</td>
<td>Concord, NC</td>
<td>242,059.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWBE Status: Amount  % of Project  Proj Goals

| MBE     | $0  | 0%  | 2% |
| WBE     | $0  | 0%  | 2% |

Compliance: Yes - The Contractor has complied with the M/WBE contract provisions which allow him to perform all the work with his own forces. Trans-State did not solicit quotes from M/WBEs nor did CMUD staff contact any M/WBEs for participation in this project.
Program Director Concur: Yes

Est. Cost: $182,912.52  % Difference 20.44%  $ Difference: $37,380.63

Consequences If Item Deferred: Bids would be valid for sixty days beyond May 25, 1993. The Applicant, Duke Power Company, will be unable to meet their schedule for use of the proposed water main.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Trans-State Construction Company

Submitted By: ___________________  Approved:_________________

Contact & Phone If Questions: Kathy Freeze - 391-5104
Council Agenda: 6/14/93

Project: Polymer User Dept: Utility

FUNDING: Water/Sewer Operating - McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant - Chemicals for Water Treatment - $450,000

Description: Polymer, McAlpine Waste Treatment Plant

Justification: Polymer will be used with the sludge thickening & dewatering centrifuges at McAlpine Wastewater Treatment Plant. Polymer vastly improves the efficiency of the centrifuges.


Summary of Bids:

| Stockhausen | Greensboro, NC | $311,000.00 |

Request permission to extend contract for an additional 12 months at the same price ($1.00 per pound) as provided in original contract (#82-154) approved by City Council 6/8/92

MWBE Status:  Amount  % of Project  Proj Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance: No known MWBE provider available.

Program Director Concur: Yes

Est. Cost: $311,000.00  % Difference 0  $ Difference $0

Consequences if Item Deferred: Polymer must be used with the centrifuges in order for it to operate at maximum efficiency.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Yes

Other Information: The bid process for Polymer requires that vendors prequalify their product. This requires extensive time and testing (8 weeks) on City equipment. Due to this requirement, the option to renew the current contract an additional year at the same unit price is requested, provided funds are made available by City Council

Submitted By: Gregory K. Spearman  Approved: Asst. City Manager

Contact & Phone If Questions: Bill Mouchet 336-2932
CONSENT I AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Curb Replacement FY93 User Dept: Street Maint.

FUNDING: Ctr: 523.08 Fund: 0120 Obj. Code: 3518
Balance of Funds: $295,123

Description: Replacement of concrete curb and gutter along Cedar Street, Double Oaks Street, Bland Street, Tippah Avenue, Chambwood Drive, Allen Street, Baylor Drive, Holyday Court, Kentland Land, Wedgewood Drive, Providence Lane, Seacroft Road, J.A. Jones Drive, Fordwood Drive, Lancer Drive, Seneca Place, Fair Valley Drive Birchcrest Drive, and Nottingham Drive southwest of the central business district.

Justification: These locations are identified and prioritized by the Street Maintenance. This project is prepared annually by the Engineering Department.

Advertised: April 4, 1993 Bids Rcvd: May 6, 1993 at 2:00 p.m. Bids Expire: July 6, 1993

Summary of Bids:

United Construction $257,539.80
Blythe Development $280,519.13
Ferebee Corp. $293,168.40
Showalter Construction $334,998.60

MWBE Status: Amount % of Project Proj Goals
MBE $257,539.80 100% 6%
WBE $0 0% 3%

Compliance: United Construction (certified MBE) has complied with the requirements and intent of the M/WBE program.

Program Director Concur: Yes

Est. Cost: $225,000 % Difference 14.4% (over) $ Difference: $32,540
Consequences If Item Deferred: Delay in award
Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Award to United Construction

Submitted By: ________________  Approved: ____________________

Contact & Phone If Questions: Dee Hoover at 336-3634
CONSENT I AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Thrift\Tuckasegee Road Sidewalk  User Dept: Engineering

FUNDING: General Capital Improvement Fund (Sidewalk Program - Street Bonds) - $1,436,449.

Description: Construction of new sidewalk through existing residential neighborhoods at Thrift and Tuckasegee Road. The work locations are bordered by Berryhill Road, Ambassador Road and Freedom Drive, Southwest of the central business district

Justification: This program is a part of the ongoing sidewalk construction program FY-83. These locations are from the priority list maintained by CDOT

Advertised: April 15, 1993 Bids Rcvd: May 13, 1993 Bids Expire: July 11, 1993

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Shaw Group</td>
<td>$108,384.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showalter Construction</td>
<td>$128,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferebee Corporation</td>
<td>$133,485.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal Construction</td>
<td>$147,650.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Construction</td>
<td>$149,184.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blythe Development</td>
<td>$151,518.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWBE Status Amount % of Project Proj Goals
MBE $0 0% 6%
WBE $108,384.15 100% 5%

Compliance: The Shaw Group is in compliance with the M/WBE Program and is a certified WBE.

Program Director Concur: YES

Est. Cost: $120,000 % Difference 9 7% (Under)  $ Difference $11,615 85

Consequences If Item Deferred: Delay in award

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Award to The Shaw Group
Submitted By: C D. Readling, City Engineer

Contact & Phone If Questions: Tariq F. Aziz, 336-7924

ENGBID3.614
C O N S E N T  I A G E N D A  I T E M

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Wilkinson Boulevard Phase III Demonstration Area Side Strip Improvements

User Dept: ENG

FUNDING: General Capital Improvement Fund (Business Corridor Revitalization - Street Bonds) - $3,032,769.

Description: This project will construct two eight foot wide planting strips, separated by a four foot wide sidewalk, on either side of Wilkinson Boulevard between Westerly Hills Drive and Ashley Road.

Justification: This project is part of the Business Corridor Revitalization program. This program provides public improvements for depressed business corridors to stimulate private investment. The need is evident by the poor visual quality and declining economic vitality.


Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferebee Corporation</td>
<td>$293,604.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blythe Development</td>
<td>$304,748.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showalter Construction</td>
<td>$355,597.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Construction</td>
<td>$391,349.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowder Construction</td>
<td>$427,647.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWBE Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance: Ferebee Corporation has complied with the requirements and intent of the M/WBE Program

Program Director Concur: YES

Est. Cost: $325,000 % Difference 10.7% $ Difference: $31,395.72

Consequences If Item Deferred: Bids will expire before next Council Meeting.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Award to Ferebee Corporation
Submitted By: ______________________________
                  C.D. Readling, City Engineer

Contact & Phone If Questions:  Dee Hoover 336-3634

ENGBID4.614
CONSENT AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: JUNE 14, 1993

Project: GENESIS PARK NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT  User Dept: ENG

FUNDING: General Capital Improvement Fund (Neighborhood Reinvestment - Pay-As-You-Go) - $4,340,808.

Description: This project will provide drainage, new concrete sidewalk, driveways, curb and gutter, curb ramps, and retaining walls on Bruns Avenue, State Street, Katonah Avenue and Sumter Avenue in the Seversville / Smallwood Neighborhood.

Justification: In FY90 City Council approved the Neighborhood Reinvestment Program which was merged with the Small Area Plan in FY92. This program provides for new or reconstructed infrastructure in areas where sub-standard or no infrastructure exists.


Summary of Bids:
Blythe Development $ 305,933 19
Sherrill & Associates $ 314,949 74
Ferebee Corp. $ 332,685 50
Crowder Construction $ 351,623 94
Showalter Construction $ 361,972 50
Dakota Construction $ 376,178.04
United Construction $ 434,036 52

MWBE Status Amount % of Project Proj Goals
MBE $ 0 0 % 7%
WBE $ 0 0 % 4%

Compliance: Blythe Development has complied with M/WBE contract provision which allows performance of all work with contractor's own forces

Program Director Concur: YES

Est. Cost: $335,000 % Difference 9.2 % (Under) $ Difference: $ 30,952 41

Consequences If Item Deferred: DELAY IN AWARD

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Award to Blythe Development
Submitted By: ________________________________
C.D. Readling, City Engineer

Contact & Phone If Questions: Dee Hoover @ 336-3634

ENGBID2.614
CONSENT II AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: 6/14/93

Project: Pothole Patcher  User Dept: Street Maintenance


Description: Truck-mounted Pothole Patcher

Justification: Approved in FY93 budget. Equipment is needed to repair streets. It will be especially useful after hours, because it will keep asphalt warm for long periods.

Advertised: 3-15-93  Bids Rcvd: 4-14-93  Bids Expire: 6-15-93

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Equipment Co</td>
<td>Monroe, NC</td>
<td>$51,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruder-Sharpe, Inc.</td>
<td>Monroe, NC</td>
<td>$50,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWBE Status:  Amount  % of Project  Proj Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance: No known MWBE's for this equipment.

Program Director Concur: Yes

Est. Cost: $95,000 Including chassis 5.26%  $ Difference: ($5,000)

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Lowest responsible bidder.

Consequences If Deferred: The current equipment has been discontinued by the manufacturer. The City has rebuilt old equipment for the last two years. Reliability will continue to deteriorate and downtime will increase

Submitted By:_________________  APPROVED:_________________

Gregory K Spearman

Contact & Phone If Questions: Fred Stallings, 336-5667

Factors Affecting MWBE: None
Explanation of Cost Difference:
1. Users stated that radiant heat method used by Bruder-Sharpe did not keep the asphalt warm overnight or weekends. One purpose of this unit is to eliminate using cold patches on "emergency" calls. The cold patches must be redone, thus doubling the costs.
2. Bruder-Sharpe did not comply with parts availability warranty. This warranty has been very effective in assuring vehicle uptime.
3. Bruder-Sharpe offered a one year parts and service warranty vs. the specified two year warranty.
4. Bruder-Sharpe did not comply with burner shut off during spraying - a safety hazard.
5. Bruder-Sharpe can not supply an anti-bridging device as required.

Consequences If Item Deferred:
Bids will expire  Budget will have to transfer funds to next FY. Chassis has already been ordered.

Project History:

Other:
CONSENT II AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Temporary Personnel Services User Dept: City Departments


Description: Temporary Personnel Services - Annual Contract.

Justification: This is the first time the City and County have jointly received bids for Temporary Personnel Services. The Temporary Personnel Services contract is designed to provide (on an as needed basis) temporary employees for City departments to ensure that services are delivered when salaried employees are out for various reasons. This contract will provide different skill levels of temporary employees at fixed hourly rates.

Advertised: 2-10-93 Bids Rcvd: 3-9-93 Bids Expire: 7-9-93

Summary of Bids:

See attached Summary of Bids.

MWBE Status: Amount % of Project Proj Goals
MBE 0 0 10%
WBE 432,225 100% 5%

Compliance: Yes

Program Director Concur: Yes

Est. Cost: $700,000 % Difference 38% $ Difference $267,000

Consequences If Item Deferred: City departments will continue to make individual arrangements for selecting temporary personnel service needs at substantially higher costs. The savings achieved by consolidating requirements through the competitive request for proposal process will not be realized. The administrative cost of placing an order for a temporary employee as well as the payment process will also continue to be at higher cost for the City.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Yes

Other Information: Over the previous fiscal year, the City spent approximately $700,000 for temporary personnel services. The use of temporary personnel service providers is required when an injured or ill employee is unable to come to work and
perform their daily job duties. The use of temporary employees involves laborers, clerical support and various skilled positions throughout the City. In other instances, temporary employees are used because the expense of full time employees is not feasible nor practical. The anticipated usage under this contract will be equivalent to approximately ten (10) full time employee positions.

This bid was developed to provide a broad spectrum of temporary personnel services needs covering City job classifications. The contract is available for meeting needs, which are based on short term requirements. The criteria for the bid included the ability to service the City’s account, reference evaluation, commitment to subcontract with MWBE firms, price, method of placing temporary employees, and training temporaries to meet City expectations. The evaluation criteria also included a site visit to the top ranked firms. The firm selected as most suited in providing the best combination of price and services was Corporate Personnel Services, Inc.

The use of Corporate will provide additional advantages for the City, which include:

- A single customized/itemized bill from one service provider vs. multiple individual separate billings from several different service providers,
- Tracking temporary personnel used by departments, and job skills;
- Monitoring trends for temporary personnel service use by department, skill, season, etc.,
- Requirement for Corporate to subcontract with other temporary firms in meeting City needs;
- Assessment of temporary assignment requests prior to job placement to maximize job and skill match for temporary position filled;
- The City’s right to not make payment for unproductive temporary employees

This is the first contract of this nature for the City, which should lower overall internal and external costs, simplify the placement process, streamline billing and payment and provide a management tool for tracking and monitoring the use of temporary personnel service within the City.

Submitted By: ______________________  Approved: ______________________
Gregory K. Spearman
### SUMMARY OF BIDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR NAME</th>
<th>CITY/COUNTY</th>
<th>CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORPORATE PERSONNEL SERVICES</td>
<td>$864,445</td>
<td>$432,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Services</td>
<td>$ 742,905</td>
<td>$371,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Personnel</td>
<td>811,935</td>
<td>405,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforce</td>
<td>837,594</td>
<td>418,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower</td>
<td>874,909</td>
<td>437,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADIA Personnel</td>
<td>886,227</td>
<td>443,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TempWorld</td>
<td>886,589</td>
<td>443,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AccuStaff</td>
<td>888,398</td>
<td>445,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Additions</td>
<td>891,366</td>
<td>445,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsten Staffing</td>
<td>891,926</td>
<td>445,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Temporaries</td>
<td>891,926</td>
<td>445,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Choice</td>
<td>898,980</td>
<td>449,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Personnel</td>
<td>905,776</td>
<td>452,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Employment</td>
<td>910,943</td>
<td>455,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Personnel</td>
<td>913,734</td>
<td>456,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate Temporary</td>
<td>925,796</td>
<td>462,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablest Temporary</td>
<td>925,932</td>
<td>462,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Tree</td>
<td>926,435</td>
<td>463,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Personnel</td>
<td>926,583</td>
<td>463,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrell Services</td>
<td>938,400</td>
<td>469,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today's Temporary</td>
<td>974,385</td>
<td>487,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot-Withers</td>
<td>1,096,810</td>
<td>548,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kelly Services, U.S. Personnel and Uniforce were not selected as the recommended bidder for contract award because they did not rank as high as Corporate Personnel in providing the best combination of price and services. Recommend annual contract award with option to renew for two additional periods for twelve months each.

Assistant City Manager

**Contact & Phone If Questions:** Gregory K Spearman, Purchasing Director, 336-2933
CONSENT II AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Convention Center Signage  User Dept: Eng

Funding: Convention Center Fund (Convention Center Project - Certificates of Participation) - $33,508,761.

Balance of Funds: See Total Project Budget Update (Attachment)

Description: Contract scope consists of all interior and exterior signage and site directional signs

Justification: Contract is part of construction program for the New Convention Center

Advertised: 07MAR93  Bids Rcvd: 05MAY93  Bids Expire: 03AUG93

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOMAR PRODUCTS</td>
<td>$328,721.00 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMS CORPORATION</td>
<td>$339,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDCO INDUSTRIES</td>
<td>$344,072.00 (Corrected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELSINGER SIGN WORKS</td>
<td>$361,519.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORNELIUS ARCHITECTURAL PRODUCTS</td>
<td>$402,731.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURAL GRAPHICS</td>
<td>$443,249.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Low bid negotiated from $330,761.00 to $328,721.00 (see Bid Summary on Additional Information Sheet).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWBE Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance: The Contractor has complied with the requirements of the MWBE Program by electing to self-perform 100% of the work.

Program Director Concur: Yes
Est. Cost: *$487,555.00 % Under: 32.6% $ Difference: $158,834.00 *

*See Explanation of Cost Difference on Additional Information Sheet.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Yes

Consequences If Deferred: The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

Submitted By: ______________
C.D. Readling, City Engineer

Contact & Phone If Questions: B.E. Aldridge, Ext. 3633 FOR QUESTIONS
**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**Bid Summary:** The original bid amount of $330,761.00 has been negotiated. Negotiation included providing on-site storage of materials for the Contractor, which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $328,721.00.

**Factors Affecting MWBE:** Originally, the Contractor submitted documentation to 100% self-perform. Presently the Contractor is negotiating with two (2) MBE electrical contractors to provide electrical services. (See MWBE Documentation)

**Explanation of Cost Difference:** The original bid of $330,761.00 is 32.2% under the Construction Manager’s estimate of $487,555.00, representing a difference of $156,794.00. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is $510,000.00. Overruns against the budget in other packages necessitated negotiations of all bid amounts by incorporating cost reduction items. The negotiated bid sum of $328,721.00 is $181,279.00 lower (35.5% less) than the original Design Development estimate.

**Consequences If Item Deferred:** The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

BFF/BEA/lac
CONSENT II AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Convention Center Millwork & Cabinets (Re-Bid) User Dept: Eng

Funding: Convention Center Fund (Convention Center Project - Certificates of Participation) - $33,508,761.

Balance of Funds: See Total Project Budget Update (Attachment)

Description: Contract scope consists of all wall and base cabinets, the cafe bar, information desks and wood paneling.

Justification: Contract is part of construction program for the New Convention Center.

Advertised: 07MAR93 Bids Rcvd: 10MAY93 Bids Expire: 08AUG93

Summary of Bids:

STULTZ MANUFACTURING CO. $ 830,843.00*
SOUTHERN ARCHITECTURAL WOODWORK $1,316,828.00 (Corrected)
NACOMA CONSOLIDATED LTD. NO BID

* Low bid negotiated from $1,125,664.00 to $830,843.00 (see Bid Summary on Additional Information Sheet).

MWBE Status: Amount % of Project Proj Goals
MBE $34,786.00 4.2% 11%
WBE $ 5,000.00 0.6% 5%

Compliance: The Contractor has complied with the requirements and intent of the MWBE Program.

Program Director Concur: Yes
Est. Cost: *$1,249,024.00 %Under:33.5%* $ Difference:  $418,181.00 *

*See Explanation of Cost Difference on Additional Information Sheet.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Yes

Consequences If Deferred: The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

Submitted By: _______________________________

C.D. Readling, City Engineer

Contact & Phone If Questions: B.E. Aldridge, Ext. 3633 FOR QUESTIONS

* SEE ATTACHED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SHEET *
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Bid Summary: The original bid amount of $1,125,664.00 has been negotiated. Negotiation included deleting millwork and wood paneling from the building and simplifying construction materials on cabinet tops and wood base which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $830,843.00.

Factors Affecting MWBE: The Contractor is presently pursuing additional MWBE subcontracting opportunities. (Back-up will follow)

Explanation of Cost Difference: The original bid of $1,125,664.00 is 9.9% under the Construction Manager’s estimate of $1,249,024.00, representing a difference of $123,360.00. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is $713,523.00 and this overrun against the budget necessitated negotiation of the bid amount by incorporating cost reduction items. The negotiated bid sum of $830,843.00 is $117,320.00 higher (16.4% more) than the original Design Development estimate.

Consequences If Item Deferred: The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

BFF/BEA/lac
Council Agenda: June 14, 1993


Funding: Convention Center Fund (Convention Center Project - Certificates of Participation) - $33,508,761.

Balance of Funds: See Total Project Budget Update (Attachment)

Description: Contract scope consists of the entire glass curtainwall system, interior and exterior storefront, stainless steel entrance doors, aluminum meeting room doors, custom metal framed skylight (oculus), special architectural louvers, and associated support steel.

Justification: Contract is part of construction program for the New Convention Center.

Advertised: 11OCT93  Bids Rcvd: 25MARS93  Bids Expire: 23JUN93

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH SHISKO, INC.</td>
<td>$2,787,290.00 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTEK, INC.</td>
<td>$2,466,777.00 (Withdrawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRITCHARD PAINT &amp; GLASS</td>
<td>$3,309,017.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOUR CITY ARCHITECTURAL</td>
<td>$3,572,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMENT INDUSTRIES, WSA, INC.</td>
<td>$4,019,820.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Low bid negotiated from $2,842,666.00 to $2,787,290.00 (see Bid Summary on Additional Information Sheet).

MWBE Status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWBE Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance: The Contractor has complied with the requirements of the MWBE Program by electing to perform 100% of the Work.

Program Director Concur: Yes
Est. Cost: *$3,242,800.00* %Under: *14.0%* $ Difference: *$455,510.00*

*See Explanation of Cost Difference on Additional Information Sheet

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Yes

Consequences If Deferred: The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

Submitted By:__________________________
C.D. Readling, City Engineer

Contact & Phone If Questions: B E. Aldridge, X3633, FOR QUESTIONS
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Bid Summary: The original bid amount of $2,842,666.00 has been negotiated. Negotiation included providing fabrication areas inside the building for the Work and acceptance of alternates to change the finishes of public entrance doors and exterior louvers, which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $2,787,290.00.

Factors Affecting MWBE: The Contractor is continuing efforts to identify MWBE’s for possible subcontracting opportunities. (See MWBE Documentation)

Explanation of Cost Difference: The original bid of $2,842,666.00 is 12.3% under the Construction Manager’s estimate of $3,242,800.00, representing a difference of $400,134.00. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is $2,654,870.00 and this overrun against the budget necessitated negotiation of the bid amount by incorporating cost reduction items. The negotiated bid sum of $2,787,290.00 is $132,420.00 higher (5.0% more) than the original Design Development estimate.

Consequences If Item Deferred: The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

BFF/BEA/lac
CONSENT II AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Convention Center Audio/Visual User Dept: Eng

Funding: Convention Center Fund (Convention Center Project - Certificates of Participation) - $33,508,761.

Balance of Funds: See Total Project Budget Update (Attachment)

Description: Contract scope consists of a complete Audio Visual system.

Justification: Contract is part of construction program for the New Convention Center.

Advertised: 07MAR93 Bids Rcvd: 19APR93 Bids Expire: 18JUL93

Summary of Bids:

LONG COMMUNICATIONS GROUP $1,006,531.00(*)
AUDIO COMMUNICATIONS CONSULTANTS $1,115,889.00
JWP ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS $1,274,215 00

* Low bid negotiated from $1,049,531.04 to $1,006,531.00 (see Bid Summary on Additional Information Sheet).

MWBE Status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>WBE</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$240,348.00</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance: The Contractor has complied with the requirements and intent of the MWBE Program.

Program Director Concur: Yes
Est. Cost: $1,060,689.00  % Under: 5.1%  $ Difference: $54,158.00  *

* See Explanation of Cost Difference on Additional Information Sheet

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Yes

Consequences If Deferred: The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

Submitted By: ___________________________
C.D. Readling, City Engineer

Contact & Phone If Questions: B E. Aldridge, Ext 3633 FOR QUESTIONS
**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**Bid Summary:** The original bid amount of $1,049,531.04 has been negotiated. Negotiation includes the acceptance of a bid alternate to delete a character-generator system and TV monitors, which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $1,006,531.00.

**Explanation of Cost Difference:** The original bid of $1,049,531.04 is 1.1% under the Construction Manager’s estimate of $1,060,689.00, representing a difference of $11,157.96. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the Work is $817,392.00 and this overrun against the budget necessitated negotiation of the bid amount by incorporating the bid alternate item. The negotiated bid sum of $1,006,531.00 is $189,139.00 higher (23.1% more) than the original Design Development estimate.

**Consequences if Item Deferred:** The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

BFF/BEA/1ac
CONSENT II AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Convention Center Site Demolition-2 User Dept: Eng

Funding: Convention Center Fund (Convention Center Project - Certificates of Participation) - $33,508,761.

Balance of Funds: See Total Project Budget Update (Attachment)

Description: Contract scope consists of the total removal of existing buildings, foundations, walls pavement and trees within the parking lot area

Justification: Contract is part of construction program for the New Convention Center

Advertised: 07MAR93 Bids Rcvd: 06MAY93 Bids Expire: 04AUG93

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JONES GRADING &amp; FENCING, INC</td>
<td>$149,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROWDER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>$176,970.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L - J, INC.</td>
<td>$195,840.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWBE Status:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>$149,940.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance: The Contractor has complied with the requirements and intent of the MWBE Program

Program Director Concur: Yes
Est. Cost: $156,261.00%  %Under: 4.0%  $ Difference: $6,321.00

*See Explanation of Cost Difference on Additional Information Sheet.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Yes

Consequences if Deferred: The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

Submitted By: C.D. Readling, City Engineer

Contact & Phone If Questions: B.E. Aldridge, Ext 3633 FOR QUESTIONS
**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**Bid Summary:** The original bid amount of $149,940.00 is a corrected sum, due to miscalculation of the hazardous soil allowance against the base bid. This scope of Work includes removal of hazardous material not originally anticipated at Design Development.

**Explanation of Cost Difference:** The original bid of $149,940.00 is 4.0% under the Construction Manager's estimate of $156,261.00, representing a difference of $6,321.00. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is $138,834.00. The bid sum of $149,940.00 is $11,106.00 higher (8.0% more) than the Design Development estimate.

**Consequences If Item Deferred:** The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

BFF/BEA/lac
CONSENT II AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Convention Center Roofing  User Dept: Eng

Funding: Convention Center Fund (Convention Center Project - Certificates of Participation) - $33,508,761.

Balance of Funds: See Total Project Budget Update (Attachment)

Description: Contract scope consists of a complete and warranted single-ply membrane and standing seam roofing system, roof pavers, roof hatches, plastic unit skylights, manufactured roof specialties, and associated blocking and firestop.

Justification: Contract is part of construction program for the New Convention Center.

Advertised: 11OCT92  Bids Rcvd: 25MAR93  Bids Expire: 23JUN93

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Project</th>
<th>Proj Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIXIE ROOFING, INC</td>
<td>$2,117,112 00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUARANTEED SYSTEMS</td>
<td>$2,553,865 80</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELDON ROOFING</td>
<td>$3,585,300 00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Low bid negotiated from $2,341,512.00 to $2,117,112.00 (see Bid Summary on Additional Information Sheet).

MWBE Status.  Amount  % of Project  Proj Goals
MBE          10,000  0.5              4
WBE          8,000   0.4              4

Compliance: The Contractor has complied with the requirements and intent of the MWBE Program.

Program Director Concur: Yes
Est. Cost:*$1,481,019.00  %Over: 36.7%  * Difference:$860,493.00 *

* See Explanation of Cost Difference on Additional Information Sheet

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Yes

Consequences If Deferred: The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

Submitted By _______________________
C.D. Readling, City Engineer

Contact & Phone If Questions: B. E. Aldridge, X3633 FOR QUESTIONS

*SEE ATTACHED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SHEET*
**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**Bid Summary:** The original bid amount of $2,341,512.00 has been negotiated. Negotiations included the use of an alternate standing-seam metal roof system, elimination of insulation fasteners, use of shop-fabricated coping and simplified roofing details, which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $2,117,112.00.

**Factors Affecting MWBE:** The Contractor is negotiating with two (2) MWBE contractors to provide additional subcontracting opportunities in the area of rough carpentry and is utilizing an MWBE material supplier for $43,900.00 (See MWBE Documentation).

**Explanation of Cost Difference:** The original bid amount of $2,341,512.00 is 36.7% over the Construction Manager’s estimate of $1,481,019.00, representing a difference of $860,493.00. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is $1,558,246.00 and this overrun against the budget necessitated negotiation of the bid amount by incorporating cost reduction items. The negotiated bid sum of $2,117,112.00 is $636,093.00 more (30.0% over) than the original Construction Manager’s estimate.

**Consequences If Item Deferred:** The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

BFF/BEA/lac
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

**Action Requested:** That City Council approve the following actions on Bid Package 090 - Finishes for the Charlotte Convention Center

1. Waive the low bidder’s submittal of the wrong MWBE form as an informality.

2. Approve the low bid of $9,572,700 00 submitted by Cecil Malone Company for award.

**Explanation of Request:** The following bids were received for this package on April 26, 1993:

Cecil Malone Company $ 9,572,700 00  
Metric Constructors $ 10,402,980 00  
Bonitz Contracting $ 10,470,000 00

The Architect, Contract Manager and the Engineering Department recommend award of the contract to the low bidder, Cecil Malone Company

**Source of Funding:** Ctr. 37100 Fund: 22013 Obj Code: 30531

**Clearances:** The City Attorney’s office has reviewed and approved these recommendations.

**Background:**

When the bids were received and opened on April 26, it was noted during the bid opening that the apparent low bidder, Cecil Malone had submitted the wrong MWBE form. The discrepancy was discussed with the low bidder immediately after the bid opening and he stated that he had been confused about which form to submit and that he did in fact have significant MWBE participation in his bid. He was requested to provide the information on MWBE participation in his bid as quickly as possible. He returned to his office and had the appropriate MWBE form with a commitment of 7% MBE and .5% WBE faxed to us approximately one hour after the bid opening.
CONSENT II AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: June 14, 1993

Project: Convention Center Overhead Doors User Dept: Eng

Funding: Convention Center Fund (Convention Center Project - Certificates of Participation) - $33,508,761.

Balance of Funds: See Total Project Budget Update (Attachment)

Description: Contract scope consists of all horizontal sliding doors, dock levelers, and rolling doors and grilles

Justification: Contract is part of construction program for the New Convention Center.

Advertised: 07MAR93 Bids Rcvd: 03MAY93 Bids Expire: 01AUG93

Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN OVERHEAD DOORS</td>
<td>$572,176.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERHEAD DOOR CO./PIEDMONT</td>
<td>$687,884.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL DOOR SALES</td>
<td>$1,119,429.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXSON &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>$1,178,063.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Low bid negotiated from $672,792.00 to $572,176.00 (see Bid Summary on Additional Information Sheet).

MWBE Status: Amount % of Project Proj Goals

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>$32,184.00</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance: The Contractor has complied with the requirements of the MWBE Program by electing to perform 100% of the Work

Program Director Concur: Yes
Est. Cost: *$599,252.00* %Under: **4.5%** $ Difference  $27,076.00 *

*See Explanation of Cost Difference on Additional Information Sheet.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: Yes

Consequences If Deferred: The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

Submitted By: ______________________________
C D. Readling, City Engineer

Contact & Phone If Questions: B E. Aldridge, Ext 3633 FOR QUESTIONS

*SEE ATTACHED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SHEET*
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Bid Summary: The original bid amount of $672,792.00 has been negotiated. Negotiation included deleting sliding doors and replacing with roll-up doors, deleting counter doors and dock levelers, and changing grille finishes, which resulted in a negotiated low bid of $572,176.00.

Factors Affecting MWBE: The Contractor is continuing efforts to identify MWBE’s for possible subcontracting opportunities.

Explanation of Cost Difference: The original bid of $672,792.00 is 12.3% over the Construction Manager’s estimate of $599,252.00, representing a difference of $73,540.00. The Design Development estimate and current budget for the work is $378,460.00 and this overrun against the budget necessitated negotiation of the bid amount by incorporating cost reduction items. The negotiated bid sum of $572,176.00 is $193,716.00 higher (51.2% more) than the original Design Development estimate.

Consequences if Item Deferred: The schedule will be impacted and the project may incur additional cost.

BFF/BEA/lac
CONSENT I AGENDA ITEM

Council Agenda: 6/14/93

Project: AllSteel Workstations  User Dept: Utility

FUNDING: Ctr: 602  Fund: 7101  Obj. Code: 544  Balance of Funds: 77,942.21

Description: AllSteel Workstations

Justification: During rightsizing implementation, CMUD went to the team concept in the Engineering Division. In order for team members to be in close proximity to each other the utilization of modular work stations is necessary. The use of modular work stations will also enable the CMUD Engineering Division to best utilize the building space.


Summary of Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spillars Contract Interiors</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$70,830.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacThrift</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>78,863.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O G Penegar (Did not meet labor specifications)</td>
<td></td>
<td>69,737.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MWBE Status:  Amount % of Project Proj Goals

| MBE  | WBE  | 70,830.00 | 100% | 0 | 0 | 5% | 3% |

Compliance: Yes

Program Director Concur: Yes

Est. Cost: $73,000  % Difference 3.06  $ Difference $2,170.00 less

Consequences if Item Deferred: Delay in approval will delay full implementation and utilization of the team concept that was outlined in rightsizing.

Recommend Award to Low Bidder: (Lowest responsible bidder) Yes

Submitted By: ____________________  Approved: ____________________

Gregory K. Spearman  Assistant City Manager

Contact & Phone If Questions: Ron Weathers 391-5095 or Cindy Conley 336-5668
June 14, 1993
City Council Briefing
Minutes Book 102, Page 229

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, convened for a briefing on Monday, June 14, 1993, at 5:25 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Richard Vinroot presiding. Councilmembers present were Stan Campbell, Dan Clodfelter, Ann Hammond, Pat McCrory, Nasir Majeed, Tom Mangum, Hayle Martin, Cyndee Patterson, Don Reid, Ella Scarborough and Lynn Wheeler.

ABSENT: None

CENTRALINA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT (COG)

Mayor Vinroot stated a few weeks ago several Councilmembers asked questions about COG and why we are a member, should we be a member, and all of that. We thought we should have folks here from COG to tell us what we do as a member of COG and to answer any questions you may have.

David Ward, Chairman of COG stated he also a member of the Gaston County Board of Commissioners. Being an elected official he knows the constraints you are going through and the problems. He is in his ninth year in government and has a little experience under his belt and assures Council it does not get any easier as you go through this process. Staff members with him taught to answer any questions are Lee Armour, Executive Director of COG, and Charles Phillips, Centralina’s Business Manager. Thank you for giving him the opportunity to come before you and to explain the services which COG provides to the citizens of Charlotte. COG was formed in 1968, and is a voluntary association of local governments owned and governed by its membership. In 1970, the State delineated boundaries of multi-county planning and development regions. In 1971, COG was designated as one of 17, now 18 lead regional organizations or LRO, as they are known in North Carolina. Our purpose is to establish goals and objectives, serve as the regional agent in dealing with State and Federal agencies, and to promote intergovernmental cooperation, communication and planning. COG provides services not only to member governments, but to other jurisdictions in both North and South Carolina. Examples of work conducted in South Carolina include serving as staff to the Lake Wylie Marine Commission of which he is a member and has been a charter member of that Commission, and the Catawba River Corridor Study, both of which involve York County. The annual contribution of each member government is based on the budget adopted for the year and is assessed on each member’s population. COG dues are 17 cents per capita, the lowest of any LRO in the State. The next lowest is 21 cents per capita. The State average is about twice the COG rate.

Mr. Ward stated he will now review the services which COG provides to the citizens of Charlotte. The four service categories are service programs, regional forums, regional planning efforts, and technical assistance. The service programs are aging grants, emergency services activities and solid waste activities. For services to older adults in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, COG provides funding to the following agencies: Mecklenburg Department of Social Services, including in-home aid, transportation, congregate meals, and home delivered meals; Mecklenburg Health Department in-home aid, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Senior Center Operations and Outreach, and Legal Services for the elderly. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Youth Counsel provides employment for older adults. Of the 17 hot lunch sites located in Mecklenburg, 14 are within Charlotte’s City limits and serve predominantly City residents. Aging Staff works with groups and task forces who have City employees as representatives from the City’s Special Transportation Department and the Housing Authority. COG’s ombudsman advocates for residents of nursing and domiciliary homes. The major part of staff time is spent working with Charlotte Mecklenburg residents, staff, and families to resolve grievances, to provide information on facilities and to advocate for residents’ rights. One major emphasis of the program is to tell the State of the need for more nursing home beds in the City. COG’s Emergency Services Section administers a regional grant for emergency medical services which impact all the citizens of Charlotte. The grant program supports a number of specific local projects, as well as regional efforts to improve emergency response. Some of these projects include providing training through EMS grant funds for emergency medical dispatch courses for Mecklenburg County Police Telecommunicators, who under consolidation will become City
employees Staffing the regions communication group which coordinates emergency communication region wide. Sponsoring the region's critical incident stress debriefing team, which is available to all emergency responders in the region. Providing equipment on a regular basis to hospitals and other emergency responders in Charlotte for advance training. The staff also publishes a monthly training calendar and fund other training opportunities for emergency responders through community colleges such as CPCC. Also, staffing the Metrolina Trauma Forum which provides continuing education on trauma care for physicians and nurses. This is heavily attended by people from Charlotte hospitals.

Mr. Ward continued, Centralina Development Corporation (CDC) helps provide financing to small business owners. The CDC has helped finance 37 projects within Charlotte which have created 690 new jobs, increased the City's tax base by over $30 million, and generates over $228,000 annually in City property taxes alone. Centralina Solid Waste Services was started two years ago. Our staff serves as a liaison between Solid Waste agencies and the region, and provides education and training to solid waste and recycling officials. COG administers the Marine Commission for Lake Norman and Lake Wylie. The commission works with the County Police on the lake's water safety issues. As police consolidation comes about, other activities which may involve the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police are joint safety operations, and emergency services coordination. COG regularly conducts forums with City and County Managers, planning officials, emergency services communications directors, emergency medical services directors, law enforcement executives, and solid waste and recycling personnel. In these meetings, officials from around the region discuss their work and explore ways to coordinate services better.

Mr. Ward stated to meet the need of coordinating planning activities and communications on a regional level, COG is the lead agency in the following regional planning initiatives: The Bi-State Catawba River Task Force, The Catawba River Corridor Study, The "Our Region Tomorrow" Regional Strategic Plan which we announced recently, and The Regional Building Permit Tracking System. The Bi-State Catawba River Task Force which includes representatives from North and South Carolina is staffed by COG. In this group government agencies, utilities and private citizens discuss river related issues and problems, and then identify solutions. The Catawba River Corridor Study is a strategic plan that will examine the status of a river and identify issues and strategies for the river from Lake Norman to Lake Wylie. This study is important to Charlotte because growth is moving closer to the lake and Mountain Island Lake is a source of water to City residents. COG is coordinating a regional strategic plan entitled "Our Region Tomorrow" to examine regional issues of concern. Representatives appointed by Charlotte and other local governments will determine strategies local governments may take to maintain and improve the region's quality of life and economic vitality. The study will identify achievable goals, objectives, and policies local governments may adopt and may examine topics such as recreation, environmental issues, public safety, needs of special population groups and government services. COG is collecting building permit information on the census track level from the 13 county Charlotte region. This data, which is available on a regional basis only from COG, is important to Charlotte as growth in the surrounding areas impacts local planning decisions.

Mr. Ward continued, furthermore it is a valuable tool to market the region as markets do not stop at political boundaries. Assisting in this effort is Dr. Al Stewart of UNCC. The COG has a regional geographic information system which collects and displays data ranging from general population statistics to detailed development activity. Data collected and displayed includes population and housing patterns, labor and employment information, and key socio-economic indicators. Our GIS displays the data and assists in the analysis of patterns and trends occurring in the region. Current applications include Catawba River Corridor Study, Regional Building Permit Tracking System, Regional Atlas and Regional Strategic Plan. Future plans for system include a regional data base of infrastructure and land use information. COG operates a large technical assistance program. It increases the quality of planning and public administration within the region, and pays a large portion of our overhead to keep member dues low. While Charlotte uses this service less than some members, it provides real benefits to Charlotte Technical assistance provided to Charlotte recently includes the following: COG has provided relocation services since 1989 to over 200 households affected by noise and runway expansion at Charlotte-Douglas International Airport. These services include initial screening and
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orientation, individual needs and analysis, advisory services in coordination with moving
companies during the actual relocation and claims reimbursement administration. The focus
2010 project uses COG employees to serve as meeting facilitator and reporters. COG provided
the greatest number of staff persons in this capacity. COG staff has assisted the City in
inputting data in their computer mapping system.

Mr. Ward said in conclusion, he feels the services COG provides are vital to the continued well
being of Charlotte and this region. We have all talked about regionalism in the last few years
Mayor Vinroot has been very strong on regionalism and he believes it also. As Charlotte
continues to grow, the need to reflect on issues of a regional nature will increase and our
abilities to address local problems will increasingly require cooperation among local
governments. COG is the designed lead regional organization for the Charlotte area, and
continued support of COG by Charlotte is essential. Mr. Hoyle Martin is your delegate and he
really enjoys working with Mr. Martin. He has been an asset to the board since he has been
with COG. You have an excellent representative on the board. We always look forward to
seeing Mr. Martin at our meetings. If you have any questions, Mr. Armour or Mr. Phillips will
be glad to answer them for you.

* * * * * *

STORM WATER

Mr. Jim Schumacher, Engineering Department stated in the agenda packet there are two
numbers that do not agree. In the text of the description of the hearing tonight it notes the
existing storm water rate for non-single family properties is $32.84. In the table on the next
page it shows the rate at $35.82, which is the correct number. Briefly he will touch on the
hearing on the agenda for tonight. This hearing is to consider a change to the rate itself.

Mayor Vinroot said he was going to interrupt the Citizens Hearing sharply at 7:00 p.m. when
he presumes the County Commissioners will be there. They are in the middle of their own
meeting. He will stop the Citizens Hearing because we have a long list of people and go ahead
and have the public hearing on this item at 7:00 p.m., which is OK in accordance with our public
notice given of that. When we finish with that, there is only one speaker signed up on that item.
He suspects we will be in a position to resolve that matter and go back to the Citizens Hearing
and pick up where we left off.

Mr. Schumacher said that will work just fine. He doesn't have anything to say except to briefly
review how we got to this point. The purpose of the hearing is to consider a change to the fee
that would accommodate the activities by Mecklenburg County inside the City. The City and
the County do different things. Inside the City, the County is responsible for the large streams,
those with the water shed grade of one-eight of one square mile. The City handles what you
would call the urban drainage system. The tributary systems, the storm drains, culverts, catch
basins, and ditches that carry the water to those large streams. The rate we begin charging in
January inside the City was designed to fund those small streams, those drainage system
activities. The 32 cents purpose by the County to add to that charge would fund their large
stream activities. They currently pay for those activities out of their general fund and their
intention as he understands it is to transfer those activities from the general fund to this fee revenue,
thereby removing that charge from the general fund.

Mayor Vinroot asked do we know at this point the County charge for the other county storm
water services in the County? He assumes the same 32 cents.

Mr. Schumacher answered the 32 cents would be the same and the other charges are proposed
to be the same. When the County did their rates study, they went through the same rate study
process we did, which is to calculate how much money they needed based on their needs, divide
that by the impervious area they expected to find in order to calculate a rate. They came up
with a number that was within pennies of the rate we had already adopted. We all sat around
a table and said it makes sense. The tolerance in these numbers is at least that great, it makes
sense to adjust their number a few pennies so it would be consistent throughout the County.

Mayor Vinroot asked can you explain why they are that close? He would have thought there
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are fewer tax payers there so the volume of the funds, the amount of money generated, would be considerable lower. He had the impression these storm water problems were urban City problems and therefore almost non-existent in the County where the land had not been developed.

Mr. Schumacher stated remember the County includes the six towns. Their numbers include providing those services in the six towns.

Mayor Vanroot asked even so, that is a fairly small geographic area by comparison.

Mr. Schumacher stated he can’t answer other than to say when they went through the process of calculating the revenue needs they would have, that was a lower number than ours. The revenue they can generate is also a lower number. It happened to come out very close.

Councilmember Wheeler asked how are duplexes factored in? A lady called today and asked that question. Are they commercial or residential about their rate?

Mr. Schumacher answered remember there are not two different rates. A single family home pays the same rate as other types of properties. The difference is single family homes are put into two categories. Below the 2,000 square feet and above 2,000 square feet. Duplexes were considered non-single family for purposes of calculating rates, primarily because the Tax Office has them classified as non-single family. Our data base was created from the information from the Tax Office. They had duplexes and triplexes segregated from single family homes and that is the way it ended up in our data base. What that means is a duplex that has the same impervious as the average single family home would pay the same fee.

Ms. Wheeler stated the lady in the duplex is paying $4 and something.

Mr. Schumacher stated that means she has more impervious area than the average single family home. Her impervious area has been measured and multiplied out in the rate, and that is why it is coming up a little higher.

Ms. Wheeler stated when the lady called the Storm Water Department she was told that was commercial property.

Mr. Schumacher said it is commercial in the sense the rate is applied to the actually square footage rather than falling into the two categories, single family homes do. A duplex that has 2,600 square feet of impervious area, and a single family home that has 2,600 square feet, would pay the same exact figure.

Councilmember Patterson said the lady actually gets a better deal, perhaps.

Mr. Schumacher stated if we were charging based on residential units, she would be paying the $5.20. As it is, she is paying on the actual square footage she has which comes out to $4.

Councilmember Martin said he has had a lot of people call and complain. They feel like the 2,600 square feet above and the 2,600 square feet below is not fair. Some of them throw out some wealthy person’s name who lives in a big mansion and wonder why their rates are not higher. Is it correct no one and no organization is exempt from this fee, hospitals, libraries, schools, and churches?

Mr. Schumacher answered there are two exemptions in the ordinance. One is railroad tracks, the actual track. It does not make sense to try calculate the impervious area of a railroad track. Other railroad facilities, their buildings and parking lots, if they are operated by the railroad then they are charged the rate, just the track itself is exempt. The second exemption is the North Carolina DOT highways. The judgement there was the maintenance of the drainage system, and remember, there are storm drains under the State maintained streets. If we charge them a fee, then that means we end up maintaining their storm drainage. Operationally, it did not make sense for us to be responsible for the pipes that are under their streets. Then the State would be responsible for the streets themselves. That is the same judgement we made in organizing.
the answer was no Operationally, it makes sense for the Street Maintenance people to continue to do that in the street What we are doing with our contractors through Engineering is doing the work on private property in people's front yard, backyard and so forth That is why the ordinance included the State highways Other than those two, there are no other exemptions All public and private properties are levied the charge

Councilmember Majeed asked Mr Schumacher to share with him based on what he is hearing about the highways, if a private entrepreneur has a retention pond why don't they get a 100% credit against what they pay if they have provided the detention process for dealing with storm water?

Mr Schumacher answered if their detention pond reduces the impact of their development 100%, then they do get 100% credit The credit they get is proportional to how well their detention basin offsets the impact of their development If you take a piece of vacant property that has a small amount of water that runs off of it, then you develop it, there is a much higher amount of water The closer you get back to the amount of water running off that existed naturally, the more credit you get If you can get all the way back, then you would get a 100% credit It is based on the three criteria of the peak rate of run off, the volume of the run off, and the pollution content in that run off

Mr Majeed said this is a very definitive type of analysis you are stating He has heard some people say only 30% You are saying something quite different, you can get 100% In other words, he doesn't have to pay 100% of that fee Is that written off in that way?

Mr Schumacher answered that policy you adopted allows for up to 100% Any of the older detention basins don’t accomplish what it takes to get 100% Somebody who is going to develop a piece of property today is likely to design their detention basin to meet the standards and get the maximum credit they can The older facilities that were built years ago are not going to accomplish that The standards we required in years past did not require them to meet that 100% offset If they did only what we required them to do in the past, then their facility does not warrant the full credit

Councilmember Mangum stated those people can bring those up to standards

Mr Schumacher stated they can go back and retrofit those basins in order to get a larger credit Of course, that is an economic thing It costs x dollars to go back and retrofit it in exchange for more credit The economics of what kind of return you get from doing that is independent to each site

Mr Majeed asked have you had quite a number of people who have requested upgrades, and for the Engineering Department to come out and evaluate a site for these specific types?

Mr Schumacher answered no, they apply for the credit Their engineer will apply for the credit to go through the calculations based on existing facilities and standards, and determine how much their credit amount should be, then they submit that It is very similar to the way new development occurs When a new development occurs and they have to install a basin the property owner uses an engineer to design that facility Then it is reviewed by the Engineering Department

Mr Schumacher continued, the one remaining thing to cover is the level of service we are experiencing in terms of request for service and how we expect to deal with those There is good news and bad news The good news is we were right, there is a large backlog of problems out there that need to be repaired The bad news is that means we have a backlog of projects that will take years to eliminate There are basically two kinds of projects A remedial repair is making a repair to the existing drainage system We have pipes, culverts, and ditches that have been out there since the land was originally developed They have fallen into disrepair over the years So a repair project simply goes and repairs that existing pipe, dredges that ditch
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or whatever. On the other hand, a Capital Improvement Project would be a major reconstruction of an existing facility or even the construction of a new facility. You might equate it to roads and thoroughfares. We maintain, we go patch five holes or perhaps do a little widening on existing thoroughfares, that is a maintenance, a repair. When we go and construct a new project, that is a Capital Project. We are trying to look at the storm water projects in the same way. The projected backlog a year and a half ago when we were trying to decide what the level of demand would be for these services and everybody set the rate. We projected there would be enough projects out there today that would take us ten years just to do them all. One of the policy statements that came from your task force and ultimately was adopted was setting a goal of eliminating that backlog in ten years. When the rubber meets the road it is what we are getting to today and that is actually telling a citizen, yes, you have a drainage problem, it qualifies for us to fix it, and we will be there as soon as we can, which is five, seven, or ten years from now. We have not yet started telling people that. So far we have gotten away with saying it is a new program and we are still measuring how long it takes to make various repairs and as soon as we can calculate that, we will be back in touch with you. It is time for us to get truthful with the citizens and start giving them a realistic expectation of when we can do that. While we don’t have a problem we didn’t expect, we have just raised the caution flag and let you know that we are getting ready to do that. That is no doubt going to start generating some comments and concerns from the general public.

Mr. Mangum asked is that based strictly on the rates for collection?

Mr. Schumacher stated our original plan was to basically operate on a pay as you go strategy in the first four to five years while we assessed the overall needs, particularly for those large capital projects. Then in year five or six, look at a bond referendum that would give us a large sum of money where we could go out and start addressing some of those large projects. The rate we have right now was not intended to accommodate bonds. Of course, some of those pay as you go dollars could be redesignated to cover bond debt which would allow a bond package during those first five years if that was your choice. That is one option. That is one way to try and shorten the waiting period for these people. Take some of the pay as you go dollars, convert it to debt and have more dollars up front.

Mr. Mangum asked are you staffed in order to be able to handle that if that were tangible?

Mr. Schumacher answered your first opportunity, and that opportunity is nearly gone. Is this fall to have a bond referendum. If we put bonds on this fall and they pass we would be in a situation where we could gear up and start that very quickly. That decision would have to be made in the next two weeks to make this fall’s bond.

Councilmember McCrory asked is the County in some shape with major streams, will it take them that long, too?

Mr. Schumacher answered the needs they have identified will take many years. Yes, they have a several year backlog on the major streams. They are going to be in the same situation on the minor streams outside the City with their backlog. Let me go through very quickly some of the things we thought of to try and address, and do some of these things quicker. One is new products such as plastic pipe. The traditional way to install storm drainage and lake pipe is to use concrete pipe and occasionally we would use corrugated metal pipe. Those require heavy equipment to install. When you are working in someone’s backyard or between two homes in the side yard where there may be on 20-25 feet between the homes, that can get very difficult. We are really interested in plastic pipes. It is a corrugated plastic pipe that has a smooth lining. Two men could carry 20 feet of it and throw it in the hole. We are real optimistic that will be a good solution for us and will let us do things quicker. Another thing is the community service crew. We have been talking with the County about providing us with people who have been sentenced to community service who we would put out doing hand work in the drainage system. A problem somewhere that requires some cleaning of silt, debris, and vegetation at the end of a channel. It is primarily hand work. For us to pay a contractor would be relatively expensive. If we can put a crew of three, four or five of these type folks out there, we are in essence getting free labor. All it costs us is the foreman to oversee what they are doing. That is something we have been looking at and probably can begin very quickly. The reallocation of
dollars, our program has a balance between making the repair projects and making the County’s projects. One solution is to say let’s do fewer capital projects which enables us to do more of the maintenance and repair projects. That steps on that short term solution. The capital projects are very important and there are a number of those capital projects that just have to be done and could not be deferred. While that is an option, it is not one he would particularly recommend to Council. You have already touched on the last one, which is additional dollars. The one way to get additional dollars within the existing rate is sometime in the coming years, leverage some of the money through a bond referendum. That would enable us to step up either the repairs, the capital, or both without affecting the rating.

Mr. Schumacher continued the other issue we are going to be looking at is how to prioritize these projects. Right now we are working on high priority projects, those that involve structural damage. If somebody’s home is already experiencing or is about to experience some kind of structural damage because of a failing storm drain or erosion, if the flooding of the living space, flooding of the home or if there is some specific safety hazard, those types of things are being given priority. Once we work through those, and there is somewhere in the neighborhood of 75 to 100 of those which is not occupying the rest of this year, what we are left with is the less severe problems. We have to decide how are we going to do those. Are we going to do them in the order they were requested? In the order the citizens called and asked for service? Or, are we going to pick a particular neighborhood and go and say do everything in that neighborhood that needs to be done. Should we pick a stream and start at the bottom and work up? There are some real technical reasons to start at the bottom of the stream and work up. There are some efficiencies in going to a neighborhood and doing everything in that neighborhood that needs to be done. Should we pick a stream and start at the bottom and work up? There are some real technical reasons to start at the bottom of the stream and work up. Those are some of the issues we are trying to focus in on right now. He believes the Manager is going to suggest we bring these issues to the Planning Committee for some further review and eventual recommendations.

Mr. Majeed said some of the older neighborhoods in his district such as Druid Hills have never had a drainage system put in. We have gone back to days when there was no representation on this body that could address those issues. We are not responsible for that but we inherit that condition. In the cases of the older neighborhoods, where these amenities are absent as far as basic drainage, are they going to get priority? People for a long time have been waiting for some sort of basic services as far as drainage, simple things. It’s a tough situation but is there someway the old neighborhoods can get priority as far as hierarchy for getting things done?

Mr. Schumacher answered that certainly is a factor to include in the list we try to sort through.

Mr. White said it is also true that in many of the older neighborhoods is where the more serious problems are. So there will be parallel areas we can work though some of those issues to tackle it. The main concern we are expressing to you is the resources are not going to be there to do this work in a timely basis. What he has suggested we do is to alert you to that which is being done. Then we will develop a strategy and come back to you with a more quickly developed action plan to tackle some of those problems earlier than we first thought. It could include borrowing money to accelerate getting into some of the major issues.

Mr. Majeed said he appreciates the Manager’s focus on this, but somehow that means in between getting those types of jobs done, we could facilitate more communications because people are having expectations. They are paying $2.30 or whatever the fee, and they are having expectations. That means from the staffing viewpoint we are going to have to facilitate more touching bases with these communities. There are going to have to be lines of communications.

Councilmember Reid said when he read the prioritization, he noticed with interest we got a Thumbs Up letter recently from a Senior Vice President of Royal Insurance about solving his storm water over there off Colvard Road. He thought he would ride over and take a look and see how we are prioritizing these things. That street through there is relatively new and it does have some drainage problems, but it seems to him it could have been anticipated by the builder and we shouldn’t be paying for that kind of thing. He wondered how this person got elevated to the top of the list when we supposedly have a lot of life threatening water problems around the City.
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Mr. Schumacher said he was not familiar with that project specifically.

Mayor Vinroot said that is one where he basically paid it himself.

Mr. White said it could be where it was a 50-50 cost share. If you would like a report on that we can get it.

Mr. Reid stated he would like a report.

Mr. Martin stated the 50-50 cost share is causing him some concern. He hopes we don't get into a mode where those that can afford to pay 50% get on the top of the list and get service, and those that can't afford to pay it get on the long waiting list. He understands also that with the 50-50 cost that is a way to cut down the list. He hopes we eventually balance those two kind of situations.

Mr. Schumacher stated the policy Council adopted limited the amount of money each year that could go that way.

Council member Clodfelter stated we need to pay attention to what Mr. Schumacher and Mr. White said to us. This is going to be a long haul and we are going to get a lot of calls in the next five to seven years. One of the things we are going to have to learn how to do is communicate what a long haul this is. He wants to share one perspective he has used with some folks to help them understand what this is all about. If you can imagine being in a City of 400,000 people, and every house in the city is on a well and septic tank, and all of a sudden we discover one day about 15-20% of your wells or septic tanks are going dry and you decided that day to put in a public water and sewer system. How long do you think, how many years would it take to get all the lines laid and all the streets and people hooked up? That is the magnitude of the task. It calls on us to be real patient and explain to folks why, even though they have to start paying today, we are building the system from absolute scratch. We didn't build a water and sewer system or a road system from scratch. We need to listen to what Mr. Schumacher says because we are going to start getting phone calls and they are going to call every month.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Brenda R. Freeze, City Clerk

Length of Meeting 1 Hour, 5 Minutes
Minutes Completed July 23, 1993
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The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, convened for a briefing on Monday, June 14, 1993, at 5:25 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Richard Vinroot presiding. Councilmembers present were Stan Campbell, Dan Clodfelter, Ann Hammond, Pat McCrory, Nasif Mageed, Tom Mangum, Hoyle Martin, Cyndee Patterson, Don Reid, Ella Scarborough and Lynn Wheeler.

ABSENT: None

* * * * *

CENTRALINA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT (COG)

Mayor Vinroot stated a few weeks ago several Councilmembers asked questions about COG and why we are a member, should we be a member, and all of that. We thought we should have folks here from COG to tell us what we do as a member of COG and to answer any questions you may have.

David Ward, Chairman of COG stated he also a member of the Gaston County Board of Commissioners. Being an elected official he knows the constraints you are going through and the problems. He is in is ninth year in government and has a little experience under his belt and assures Council it does not get any easier as you go through this process. Staff members with him tonight to answer any questions are Lee Armour, Executive Director of COG, and Charles Phillips, Centralina's Business Manager. Thank you for giving him the opportunity to come before you and to explain the services which COG provides to the citizens of Charlotte.

COG was formed in 1968, and is a voluntary association of local governments owned and governed by our membership. In 1970, the State delineated boundaries of multi-county planning and development regions. In 1971, COG was designated as one of 17, now 18, lead regional organizations or LRO, as they are known in North Carolina. Our purpose is to establish goals and objectives, serve as the regional agent in dealings with State and Federal agencies, and to promote intergovernmental cooperation, communication and planning. COG provides services not only to member governments, but to other jurisdictions in both North and South Carolina.

Examples of work conducted in South Carolina include serving as staff to the Lake Wylie Marine Commission of which he is a member and has been a charter member of that Commission, and the Catawba River Corridor Study, both of which involve York County. The annual contribution of each member government is based on the budget adopted for the year and is assessed on each member's population. COG dues are 17 cents per capita, the lowest of any LRO in the State. The next lowest is 21 cents per capita. The State average is about twice the COG rate.

Mr. Ward stated he will now review the services which COG provides to the citizens of Charlotte. The four service categories are service programs, regional forums, regional planning efforts, and technical assistance. The service programs are aging grants, emergency services activities, and solid waste activities. For services to older adults in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, COG provides funding to the following agencies: Mecklenburg Department of Social Services, including in-home aid, transportation, congregate meals, and home delivered meals; Mecklenburg Health Department in-home aid; Charlotte-Mecklenburg Senior Center Operations and Out Reach; and Legal Services for the elderly. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Youth Counsel provides employment for older adults. Of the 17 hot lunch sites located in Mecklenburg, 14 are within Charlotte's City limits and serve predominately City residents. Aging Staff works with groups and task forces who have City employees as representatives from the City's Special Transportation Department and the Housing Authority. COG's ombudsman advocates for residents of nursing and domiciarily homes. The major part of staff time is spent working with Charlotte-Mecklenburg residents, staff and families to resolve grievances, to provide information on facilities and to advocate for residents rights. One major emphasis of the program is to tell the State of the need for more nursing home beds in the City. COG Emergency Services Section administers a regional grant for emergency medical services which impact all the citizens of Charlotte. The grant program supports a number of specific local projects, as well as regional efforts to improve emergency response. Some of these projects include providing training through EMS grant funds for emergency medical dispatch courses for Mecklenburg County Police Telecommunicators, who under consolidation will become City.

* * * * *
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employees Staffing the regions communication group which coordinates emergency communication region wide. Sponsoring the region's critical incident stress debriefing team, which is available to all emergency responders in the region. Providing equipment on a regular basis to hospitals and other emergency responders in Charlotte for advance training. The staff also publishes a monthly training calendar and fund other training opportunities for emergency responders through community colleges such as CPCC. Also, staffing the Metrolina Trauma Forum which provides continuing education on trauma care for physicians and nurses. This is heavily attended by people from Charlotte hospitals.

Mr. Ward continued, Centralina Development Corporation (CDC) helps provide financing to small business owners. The CDC has helped finance 37 projects within Charlotte which have created 690 new jobs, increased the City's tax base by over $30 million, and generates over $228,000 annually in City property taxes alone. Centralina Solid Waste Services was started two years ago. Our staff serves as a liaison between Solid Waste agencies and the region, and provides education and training to solid waste and recycling officials. COG administers the Marine Commission for Lake Norman and Lake Wylie. The commission works with the County Police on the lake's water safety issues. As police consolidation comes about, other activities which may involve the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police are joint safety operations, and emergency services coordination. COG regularly conducts forums with City and County Managers, planning officials, emergency services communications directors, emergency medical services directors, law enforcement executives, and solid waste and recycling personnel. In these meetings, officials from around the region discuss their work and explore ways to coordinate services better.

Mr. Ward stated to meet the need of coordinating planning activities and communications on a regional level, COG is the lead agency in the following regional planning initiatives: the Bi-State Catawba River Task Force, The Catawba River Corridor Study, The "Our Region Tomorrow" Regional Strategic Plan which we announced recently, and The Regional Building Permit Tracking System. The Bi-State Catawba River Task Force which includes representatives from North and South Carolina is staffed by COG. In this group government agencies, utilities and private citizens discuss river related issues and problems, and then identify solutions. The Catawba River Corridor Study is a strategic plan that will examine the status of a river and identify issues and strategies for the river from Lake Norman to Lake Wylie. This study is important to Charlotte because growth is moving closer to the lake and Mountain Island Lake is a source of water to City residents. COG is coordinating a regional strategic plan entitled "Our Region Tomorrow" to examine regional issues of concern. Representatives appointed by Charlotte and other local governments will determine strategies local governments may take to maintain and improve the region's quality of life and economic vitality. The study will identify achievable goals, objectives, and policies local governments may adopt and may examine topics such as recreation, environmental issues, public safety, needs of special population groups, and government services. COG is collecting building permit information on the census track level from the 13 county Charlotte region. This data, which is available on a regional basis only from COG, is important to Charlotte as growth in the surrounding areas impacts local planning decisions.

Mr. Ward continued, furthermore it is a valuable tool to market the region as markets do not stop at political boundaries. Assisting in this effort is Dr. Al Stewart of UNCC. The COG has a regional geographic information system which collects and displays data ranging from general population statistics to detailed development activity. Data collected and displayed includes population and housing patterns, labor and employment information, and key socio-economic indicators. Our GIS displays the data and assists in the analysis of patterns and trends occurring in the region. Current applications include Catawba River Corridor Study, Regional Building Permit Tracking System, Regional Atlas and Regional Strategic Plan. Future plans for system include a regional data base of infrastructure and land use information. COG operates a large technical assistance program. It increases the quality of planning and public administration within the region, and pays a large portion of our overhead to keep member dues low. While Charlotte uses this service less than some members, it provides real benefits to Charlotte. Technical assistance provided to Charlotte recently includes the following: COG has provided relocation services since 1989 to over 200 households affected by noise and runway expansion at Charlotte-Douglas International Airport. These services include initial screening and

bbm
June 14, 1993
City Council Briefing
Minutes Book 102, Page 231

Orientation, individual needs and analysis, advisory services in coordination with moving
companies during the actual relocation and claims reimbursement administration. The focus
2010 project uses COG employees to serve as meeting facilitator and reporters. COG provided
the greatest number of staff persons in this capacity. COG staff has assisted the City in
inputting data in their computer mapping system.

Mr. Ward said in conclusion, he feels the services COG provides are vital to the continued well
being of Charlotte and this region. We have all talked about regionalism in the last few years
Mayor Vinroot has been very strong on regionalism and he believes in it also. As Charlotte
continues to grow, the need to reflect on issues of a regional nature will increase and our
abilities to address local problems will increasingly require cooperation among local
governments. COG is the designated lead regional organization for the Charlotte area, and
continued support of COG by Charlotte is essential. Mr. Hoyle Martin is your delegate and he
really enjoys working with Mr. Martin. He has been an asset to the board since he has been
with COG. You have an excellent representative on the board. We always look forward to
seeing Mr. Martin at our meetings. If you have any questions, Mr. Armour or Mr. Phillips will
be glad to answer them for you.

STORM WATER

Mr. Jim Schumacher, Engineering Department stated in the agenda packet, there are two
numbers that do not agree. In the text of the description of the hearing tonight it notes the
existing storm water rate for non single family properties is $32.84. In the table on the next
page it shows the rate at $35.82, which is the correct number. Briefly, he will touch on the
hearing on the agenda for tonight. This hearing is to consider a change to the rate itself.

Mayor Vinroot said he was going to interrupt the Citizens Hearing sharply at 7:00 p. m. when
he presumes the County Commissioners will be there. They are in the middle of their own
meeting. He will stop the Citizens Hearing because we have a long list of people and go ahead
and have the public hearing on this item at 7:00 p.m., which is ok in accordance with our public
notice given of that. When we finish with that, there is only one speaker signed up on that item.
He suspects we will be in a position to resolve that matter and go back to the Citizens Hearing
and pick up where we left off.

Mr. Schumacher said that will work just fine. He doesn’t have anything to say except to briefly
review how we got to this point. The purpose of the hearing is to consider a change to the fee
that would accommodate the activities by Mecklenburg County inside the City. The City and
the County do different things. Inside the City, the County is responsible for the large streams,
those with the water shed grade of one-eighth of one square mile. The City handles what you
would call the urban drainage system. The tributary systems, the storm drains, culverts, catch
basins, and ditches that carry the water to those large streams. The rate we begin charging in
January inside the City was designed to fund those small streams, those drainage system
activities. The 32 cents proposed by the County to add to that charge would fund their large
stream activities. They currently pay for those activities out of their general fund and their
intent as he understands is to transfer those activities from the general fund to this fee revenue,
thereby removing that charge from the general fund.

Mayor Vinroot asked, do we know at this point the County charge for the other county storm
water services in the County? He assumes the same 32 cents.

Mr. Schumacher answered the 32 cents would be the same and the other charges are proposed
to be the same. When the County did their rates study, they went through the same rate study
process we did, which is to calculate how much money they needed based on their needs, divide
that by the impervious area they expected to find in order to calculate a rate. They came up
with a number that was within pennies of the rate we had already adopted. We all sat around
a table and said it makes sense, the tolerance in these numbers is at least that great, it makes
sense to adjust their number a few pennies so it would be consistent throughout the County.

Mayor Vinroot asked, can you explain why they are that close? He would have thought there
are fewer tax payers there so the volume of the funds, the amount of money generated, would be considerable lower. He had the impression these storm water problems were urban City problems and therefore almost non-existent in the County where the land had not been developed.

Mr. Schumacher stated remember the County includes the six towns Their numbers include providing those services in the six towns.

Mayor Vinroot asked even so, that is a fairly small geographic area by comparison.

Mr. Schumacher stated he can't answer other than to say when they went through the process of calculating the revenue needs they would have, that was a lower number than ours. The revenue they can generate is also a lower number. It happened to come out very close.

Councilmember Wheeler asked how are duplexes factored in? A lady called today and asked that question Are they commercial or residential about their rate?

Mr. Schumacher answered remember there are not two different rates. A single family home pays the same rate as other types of properties. The difference is single family homes are put into two categories. Below the 2,000 square feet and above 2,000 square feet. Duplexes were considered non-single family for purposes of calculating rates, primarily because the Tax Office has them classified as non-single family. Our database was created from the information from the Tax Office. They had duplexes and triplexes segregated from single family homes and that is the way it ended up in our database. What that means is a duplex that has the same impervious as the average single family home would pay the same fee.

Ms. Wheeler stated the lady in the duplex is paying $4 and something.

Mr. Schumacher stated that means she has more impervious area than the average single family home. Her impervious area has been measured and multiplied out in the rate and that is why it is coming up a little higher.

Ms. Wheeler stated when the lady called the Storm Water Department she was told that was commercial property.

Mr. Schumacher said it is commercial in the sense the rate is applied to the actually square footage rather than falling into the two tier categories single family homes do. A duplex that has 2,600 square feet of impervious area, and a single family home that has 2,600 square feet, would pay the same exact figure.

Councilmember Patterson said the lady actually gets a better deal, perhaps.

Mr. Schumacher stated if we were charging based on residential units, she would be paying the $5.20. As it is, she is paying on the actual square footage she has which comes out to $4.

Councilmember Martin said he has had a lot of people call and complain. They feel like the 2,600 square feet above and the 2,600 square feet below is not fair. Some of them throw out some wealthy person's name who lives in a big mansion and wonder why their rates are not higher. Is it correct no one and no organization is exempt from this fee, hospitals, libraries, schools, and churches?

Mr. Schumacher answered there are two exemptions in the ordinance. One is railroad tracks, the actual track. It does not make sense to try calculate the impervious area of a railroad track. Other railroad facilities, their buildings and parking lots, if they are operated by the railroad then they are charged the rate, just the track itself is exempt. The second exemption is the North Carolina DOT highways. The judgement there was the maintenance of the drainage system, and remember, there are storm drains under the State maintained streets. If we charge them a fee, then that means we end up maintaining their storm drainage. Operationally, it did not make sense for us to be responsible for the pipes that are under their streets. Then the State would be responsible for the streets themselves. That is the same judgement we made in organizing.
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our own operation  Our Street Maintenance Division maintains the street, when we came to the
question should Streets Maintenance continue to be responsible for the storm drainage in the City
streets or should Engineering begin to take that over because of storm water  The answer was
no  Operationally, it makes sense for the Street Maintenance people to continue to do that in the
street  What we are doing with our contractors through Engineering is doing the work on
private property in people’s front yard, backyard and so forth  That is why the ordinance included the State highways  Other than those two, there are no other exemptions  All public
and private properties are levied the charge

Councilmember Majeed asked Mr Schumacher to share with him based on what he is hearing
about the highways, if a private entrepreneur has a retention pond why don’t they get a 100% credit against what they pay if they have provided the detention process for dealing with storm
water?

Mr Schumacher answered if their detention pond reduces the impact of their development
100%, then they do get 100% credit  The credit they get is proportional to how well their
detention basin offsets the impact of their development  If you take a piece of vacant property
that has a small amount of water that runs off of it, then you develop it, there is a much higher
amount of water The closer you get back to the amount of water running off that existed
naturally, the more credit you get  If you can get all the way back, then you would get a 100% credit  It is based on the three criteria of the peak rate of run off, the volume of the run off,
and the pollution content in that run off

Mr Majeed said this is a very definitive type of analysis you are stating  He has heard some
people say only 30%  You are saying something quite different, you can get 100%  In other
words, he doesn’t have to pay 100% of that fee  Is that written off in that way?

Mr Schumacher answered that policy you adopted allows for up to 100%  Any of the older
detention basins don’t accomplish what it takes to get 100%  Somebody who is going to develop
a piece of property today is likely to design their detention basin to meet the standards and get
the maximum credit they can  The older facilities that were built years ago are not going to
achieve that  The standards we required in years past did not require them to meet that
100% offset  If they did only what we required them to do in the past, then their facility does
not warrant the full credit

Councilmember Mangum stated those people can bring those up to standards

Mr Schumacher stated they can go back and retrofit those basins in order to get a larger credit
Of course, that is an economic thing  It costs x dollars to go back and retrofit it in exchange
for more credit  The economics of what kind of return you get from doing that is independent
to each site

Mr Majeed asked have you had quite a number of people who have requested upgrades, and
for the Engineering Department to come out and evaluate a site for those specific types?

Mr Schumacher answered no, they apply for the credit  Their engineer will apply for the credit
to go through the calculations based on existing facilities and standards, and determine how
much their credit amount should be, then they submit that  It is very similar to the way new
development occurs  When a new development occurs and they have to install a basin the
property owner uses an engineer to design that facility  Then it is reviewed by the Engineering
Department

Mr Schumacher continued, the one remaining thing to cover is the level of service we are
experiencing in terms of request for service and how we expect to deal with those  There is
good news and bad news  The good news is we were right, there is a large backlog of problems
out there that need to be repaired  The bad news is that means we have a backlog of projects
that will take years to eliminate  There are basically two kinds of projects A remedial repair
is making a repair to the existing drainage system  We have pipes, culverts, and ditches that
have been out there since the land was originally developed  They have fallen into disrepair
over the years  So a repair project simply goes and repairs that existing pipe, dredges that ditch
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or whatever On the other hand, a Capital Improvement Project would be a major reconstruction of an existing facility or even the construction of a new facility You might equate it to roads and thoroughfares We maintain, we go patch five holes or perhaps do a little widening on existing thoroughfares, that is a maintenance, a repair When we go and construct a new project, that is a Capital Project We are trying to look at the storm water projects in the same way The projected backlog a year and a half ago when we were trying to decide what the level of demand would be for these services and everybody set the rate We projected there would be enough projects out there today that would take us ten years just to do them all One of the policy statements that came from your task force and ultimately was adopted was setting a goal of eliminating that backlog in ten years. When the rubber meets the road it is what we are getting to today and that is actually telling a citizen, yes, you have a drainage problem, it qualifies for us to fix it, and we will be there as soon as we can, which is five, seven or ten years from now We have not yet started telling people that So far we have gotten away with saying it is a new program and we are still measuring how long it takes to make various repairs and as soon as we can calculate that, we will be back in touch with you. It is time for us to get truthful with the citizens and start giving them a realistic expectation of when we can do that While we don't have a problem we didn't expect, we have just raised the caution flag and let you know that we are getting ready to do that That is no doubt going to start generating some comments and concerns from the general public.

Mr Mangum asked is that based strictly on the rates for collection?

Mr Schumacher stated our original plan was to basically operate on a pay as you go strategy in the first four or five years while we assessed the overall needs, particularly for those large capital projects Then in year five or six, look at a bond referendum that would give us a large sum of money where we could go out and start addressing some of those large projects The rate we have right now was not intended to accommodate bonds Of course, some of those pay as you go dollars could be redesignated to cover bond debt which would allow a bond package during those first five years if that was your choice That is one option That is one way to try and shorten the waiting period for these people Take some of the pay as you go dollars, convert it to debt and have more dollars up front

Mr Mangum asked are you staffed in order to be able to handle that if that were tangible?

Mr Schumacher answered your first opportunity, and that opportunity is nearly gone, is this fall to have a bond referendum If we put bonds on this fall and they pass we would be in a situation where we could gear up and start that very quickly That decision would have to be made in the next two weeks to make this fall's bond

Councilmember McCrory asked is the County in some shape with major streams, will it take them that long, too?

Mr Schumacher answered the needs they have identified will take many years Yes, they have a several year backlog on the major streams They are going to be in the same situation on the minor streams outside the City with their backlog Let me go through very quickly some of the things we thought of to try and address, and do some of these things quicker One is new products such as plastic pipe The traditional way to install storm drainage and lake pipe is to use concrete pipe and occasionally we would use corrugated metal pipe Those require heavy equipment to install When you are working in someone's backyard or between two homes in the side yard where there may be on 20 - 25 feet between the homes, that can get very difficult We are really interested in plastic pipes It is a corrugated plastic pipe that has a smooth lining Two men could carry 20 feet of it and throw it in the hole We are real optimistic that will be a good solution for us and will let us do things quicker Another thing is the community service crew We have been talking with the County about providing us with people who have been sentenced to community service who we would put out doing hand work in the drainage system A problem somewhere that requires some cleaning of silt, debris, and vegetation at the end of a channel It is primarily hand work For us to pay a contractor would be relatively expensive If we can put a crew of three, four or five of these type folks out there, we are in essence getting free labor All it costs us is the foreman to oversee what they are doing That is something we have been looking at and probably can begin very quickly The reallocation of
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dollars, our program has a balance between making the repair projects and making the County’s projects. One solution is to say let’s do fewer capital projects which enables us to do more of the maintenance and repair projects. That steps on that short term solution. The capital projects are very important and there are a number of those capital projects that just have to be done and could not be deferred. While that is an option, it is not one he would particularly recommend to Council. You have already touched on the last one, which is additional dollars. The one way to get additional dollars within the existing rate is sometime in the coming years, leveraging some of the money through a bond referendum. That would enable us to step up either the repairs, the capital, or both without affecting the rate.

Mr. Schumacher continued the other issue we are going to be looking at is how to prioritize these projects. Right now we are working on high priority projects, those that involve structural damage. If somebody’s home is already experiencing or is about to experience some kind of structural damage because of a failing storm drain or erosion, if the flooding of the living space, flooding of the home or if there is some specific safety hazard, those types of things are being given priority. Once we work through those, and there is somewhere in the neighborhood of 75 to 100 of those which is not occupying the rest of this year, what we are left with is the less severe problems. We have to decide how are we going to do those. Are we going to do them in the order they were requested? In the order the citizens called and asked for service? Or, are we going to pick a particular neighborhood and go and say do everything in that neighborhood that needs to be done? Should we pick a stream and start at the bottom and work up? There are some real technical reasons to start at the bottom of the stream and work up. There are some efficiencies in going to a neighborhood and doing everything you find to do there instead of hopping around from site to site all over town. Those are some of the issues we are trying to focus in on right now. He believes the Manager is going to suggest we bring these issues to the Planning Committee for some further review and eventual recommendations.

Mr. Majeed said some of the older neighborhoods in his district such as Druid Hills have never had a drainage system put in. We have gone back to days when there was no representation on this body that could address those issues. We are not responsible for that but we inherit that condition. In the cases of the older neighborhoods, where these amenities are absent as far as basic drainage, are they going to get priority? People for a long time have been waiting for some sort of basic services as far as drainage, simple things. It’s a tough situation but is there somehow the older neighborhoods can get priority as far as hierarchy for getting things done.

Mr. Schumacher answered that certainly is a factor to include in the list we try to sort through.

Mr. White said it is also true that in many of the older neighborhoods is where the more serious problems are. So there will be parallel areas we can work through some of those issues to tackle it. The main concern we are expressing to you is the resources are not going to be there to do this work in a timely basis. What he has suggested we do is to alert you to that which is being done. Then we will develop a strategy and come back to you with a more quickly developed action plan to tackle some of those problems earlier than we first thought. It could include borrowing money to accelerate getting into some of the major issues.

Mr. Majeed said he appreciates the Manager’s focus on this, but somehow that means in between getting those types of jobs done, we could facilitate more communications because people are having expectations. They are paying $2.30 or whatever the fee, and they are having expectations. That means from the staffing viewpoint we are going to have to facilitate more touching bases with these communities. There are going to have to be lines of communications.

Councilmember Redd said when he read the prioritization, he noticed with interest we got a Thumbs Up letter recently from a Senior Vice President of Royal Insurance about solving his storm water over there off Colvard Road. He thought he would ride over and take a look and see how we are prioritizing these things. That street through there is relatively new and it does have some drainage problems, but it seems to him it could have been anticipated by the builder and we shouldn’t be paying for that kind of thing. He wondered how this person got elevated to the top of the list when we supposedly have a lot of life threatening water problems around the City.
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Mr. Schumacher said he was not familiar with that project specifically.

Mayor Vinroot said that is one where he basically paid it himself.

Mr. White said it could be where it was a 50-50 cost share. If you would like a report on that we can get it.

Mr. Reid stated he would like a report.

Mr. Martin stated the 50-50 cost share is causing him some concern. He hopes we don't get into a mode where those that can afford to pay 50% get on the top of the list and get service, and those that can't afford to pay it get on the long waiting list. He understands also that with the 50-50 cost, that is a way to cut down the list. He hopes we eventually balance those two kinds of situations.

Mr. Schumacher stated the policy Council adopted limited the amount of money each year that could go that way.

Councilmember Clodfelter stated we need to pay attention to what Mr. Schumacher and Mr. White said to us. This is going to be a long haul and we are going to get a lot of calls in the next five to seven years. One of the things we are going to have to learn how to do is communicate what a long haul this is. He wants to share one perspective he has used with some folks to help them understand what this is all about. If you can imagine being in a City of 400,000 people, and every house in the city is on a well and septic tank, and all of a sudden we discover one day about 15-20% of your wells or septic tanks are going dry and you decided that day to put in a public water and sewer system. How long do you think, how many years would it take to get all the lines laid and all the streets and people hooked up? That is the magnitude of the task. It calls on us to be real patient and explain to folks why, even though they have to start paying today, we are building the system from absolute scratch. We didn't build a water and sewer system or a road system from scratch. We need to listen to what Mr. Schumacher says because we are going to start getting phone calls and they are going to call every month.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Brenda R. Freeze, City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 1 Hour, 5 Minutes
Minutes Completed: July 23, 1993
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