AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type:</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>06-08-1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>City of Charlotte, City Clerk’s Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6-8-92 - Council Briefing.

Mayor
Campbell
Clodfelter
Hannigan
McCorny
Majied
Matsum
Martin
Patterson
Reid
Scarbrough
Wheeler

5:10

Mayor White
Joe Stone - CMUD Rightsizing
Majied - What would be savings in dollars?

Stone $400,000 12 positions (benefits & all)

Majied
Stone
Majied
Stowe
Scarborough
Stowe
Scarborough
Stowe - Results by 2nd week imply
Scarborough - Like proactive approach
Clofelter
Stowe - do not assume
Clofelter
Stowe
Clofelter
Stowe - Would not reflect in rate last
year

Clofelter
Stowe
White
Mangum
Stowe
Reid
Stowe - 660 authorized positions
Reid
Stowe - left 30 vacant
Reid
Stowe
Reid
Stowe
Reid
Stowe
Reid
Stowe
Syfert
Reid
Stowe
Reid
Stowe
Reid
Stowe
Martin

5:50 Recess
6:00 - Reconvene

Schmacher - Video on Stormwater
Clooofeltz
Video
Side 2 - 6:08

Martin
Schmacher: dollars shown were for Capital - not Staff
Martin
Schumacher
Martin
Wheeler
Schumacher
McCory
Schumacher
McCory
Schumacher
Mangum
McCory
Mangum
McCory
Clodfelter
Schumacher
Clodfelter
McCory
McCory
Schumacher
McCory
Martin
Clodfelter
Schumacher: 1500 Commercial properties w/detention controls
Martin
Schumacher
Morgan
Clothfel ton
Martin
Schumacher
Vinroot - do clerk's

Wendell 4/18
7:30 - 9:00 or lunch
12:00 to 1:30

Wheeler
White
Wheeler
Coomer
McCormick
ClothfeIt
Freze
Vinroot
Cloth
Vinroot

McCormick
Reid
Leffit - Vinroot

Morgan
Scarborough
Adjourn 6/37
COUNCIL MEETING 6/8/92

MAJOR
CAMPBELL
CLODFELTER
HAMMOND
MCCRARY
MAJEED
MANGUM
MARTIN
PATTERSON
REID
SCARBOROUGH
WHEELER

6:35

Vinroot
Rev. Denny Turner
Vinroot

Wayne Shucko
Bill Shotwell
Burt Dellman
Scarbrough - Private Funding
Dellman - Food & Beverages
Reid
Dellman
Reid
Dellman
Wheeler
Venrost
80 mil for Tower
Dellman
Wheeler
Dellman
Wheeler
Dellman
Tower open by 1996
Aquarium 3 years later
Wheeler
Dellman
Majeed
Dellman
Morgan
Dellman
Hammond
Dellman
Hammond
White
Hammond
White
Hammond
McCraig
Peter Ikens
Cloydell
Campbell
Majed
McCory
Vinroot

7:10 p.m.
7:10 p.m.

#2
Morgan / Wheeler - App. Unanimous

#3
Hammond / Patterson E/e King Unan.
Scarborough / Wheeler App Rest - Unan.
Pull 15D F, 17, 19, 20 A/C, 21, 22

#15D
Martin - How many Neighborhood Centers
Martin / Patterson App

#15F
Martin
Borgedorf
Martin / Wheeler App

Borgedorf in July
Vote - Unan

#17
Martin
Syfert
Martin / Wheeler App.

Unan.
#19
Martin
Syfert
Ciladfelty
Reid
Syfert
Hammond/Wheeler
App.
Majeeed
Syfert
Majeeed
Syfert
Majeeed
Unan.

Another motion to approve:
Martin/Wheeler did not need.

#20A - Vinroot
Brian Carr - wants 60 day extension
Borgsdorf -
Ciladfelty City was to perform
storm drain improvements & we
didn't.

Carr
Ciladfelty
Borgsdorf
Ciladfelty
McCrosby
Carr
McCrosby
App demo + if contact
we will hold demo.
Berzdorf
Clodfelter
Berzdorf
Benzol
McCrosby
Martin
Clodfelter
Underhill
Clodfelter
Martin
Hammond
Clodfelter
@ Hammond

/ Reid Subst. 60 day
deferral if no contract
or significant work done,
then demolish.

Majeed
Benzol
Martin

Vote-

NO McCrosby

McCrosby
Berzdorf
McCrosby

20c Bernard Jameson Requests 60 days lost job in Feb.
Martin
Jamison - needed new roof, windows, and flooring

Martin
Jamison - bath floor, all rooms painted

Bergadorf
McCreary/Reid

City staff recommendation

Subst. give to

Scarborough/Martin
Martin + I have staff verify what

Martin
Mr. Janison says he's already done

Scarborough

Cloffeters

Scarborough

Janison
Reid

Bergadorf
Reid

Janison

Vincent

Scarborough

VOTE

Subst. - yes, scar, camp, path

Martin: no others
#21
Cloofelter / Martin
Tzan

#22a
Cloofelter / Mangun App.
Majied

VOTE - Tzan

#22D - Cloofelter / Wheeler

VOTE - Tzan

#5
Scarborough

Hunts - Scarborough & McCray are

Hammond excused from this item.

Dr. Jim Horton

Cloofelter

Horton

Wheeler/Hammond - Referral to Planning Committee

#6 - Cloofelter / Scarborough Exceze Hammond

Tzan
Vinrood - Instruct Stan & Cynde
Clorefter
Lynn Purnell - TCC & CDOT Staff
Recommends Alt. E

Mangun
Mayor Seattle, Med. C. Eq.

Mangun
Vinrood
Mangun
Vinrood
Mangun
Mayor Bobbie Ross
App.
Clorefter/Patt
Alt. E

#7 Clorefter/Scarborough defer to tomorrow night in conjunction with budget.

Vinrood
Clorefter
Vote - Tenan.

#8A Mangun/Scarborough App.
Clorefter
Sydert
Clorefter
Sydert

Marvin Wilson
Scarborough
Wilson
Scarborough
Hammond  2/3 of gross?
Syfert - yes
Hammond
Wilson
Scarborough
Vote - No - Majeed

MB Mangum/Hammond app.
Reid
Underhill
Reid
Underhill
Reid
Martin
Venroo
Reid
Venroo
Majeed
Venroo
Majeed
Martin
Majeed
Majeed
Vinroot
Ljed
Scarborough
Hammond
Clothfett
Sifert
Majed
Mangum
Vinroot
Martin

Subject: Scarborough/Clothfett defen
No - Mangum, Martin, McCray
Hammond
Clothfett - We need to see the ordinance to change the City Code

#7 Scarborough/Wheeler

Hammond
Scarborough -
Hammond
Majed
Scarborough
Majed
McCrory
Scarborough
McCrory
Scarborough
Reid
Scarborough
Reid
Scarborough
Martin
Scarborough
Martin
Scarborough
Hammond
Scarborough
Hammond
VOTE: TENAN
$20 McCrory
Scarborough
#10 Patterson / Scarborough
TENAN
#11 Patterson
Alexander
Patterson
Alexander
Patterson / Wheelie Apps
Scarborough
Alexander
Scarborough
Alexander
Vote - Unen.

#12 Morgan / Wheeler App

Unen.
Morgan

#13
White
Pattison
Scarborough / Patt -
Unen.

Amendment of Clerk
Vinoot
McCrosy /
Clodfelter / Wheeler - NO - Scarborough,
McCrosy
Scarborough / Wheeler
Hammond / Sear
Clodfelter - Amends to include
another etc. - NO
McCrosy
Henderson / Wheeler  Maj. B
Wheeler / Sears  adjourn
8:50 p.m.
MAYOR'S SCHEDULE
June 8, 1992

6:30 p.m. CITIZENS' HEARING

1. Wayne Bickstaff - 1240 E. Garden Rd.
   Burt Gellman, 330 North Tryon Street - 332-3663 - Inspire

2. Bill Shotwell, 1505 E. 4th Street - 372-8880 - Inspire

3. Doris Wilson, 10430 Albemarle Road - 525-8810 - City Growth

4. Sam Hubbard, 426 North Tryon Street - 529-2929 - Special Transportation

5. Peter Burns, Brian Carr

7:00 P.M. Meeting

1. Invocation by Rev. Denny Turner, Oakhurst Baptist Church.

2. Announcements

   Tuesday, June 9, 5:00 p.m. City Council/Budget Workshop.

   Wednesday, June 10, 4:00 p.m. City Council Transportation Committee will meet in CMGC Room 270.

   Thursday, June 11, 3:30 p.m. City Council Planning Committee will meet in Room 270.

3. The following requests to speak to agenda items have been received:

   (a) Agenda Item No. 6 - Stumptown Road Alignment

      (1) Mayor Bobbie Ross (Huntersville) - 876-6541

   (b) Agenda Item No. 8 - Personnel Rules and Regulations

      (1) Marvin Wilson, 4419 Monroe Road - 331-9515

   (c) Agenda Item No. 20-C - Demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1201 Louise Avenue

      (1) Bernard C. Jamison, 1908 Renner Street - 376-3435
EXECUTIVE SESSION MOTION

I move that the City Council hold an Executive Session for the purpose of conducting a performance evaluation of the City Manager on JUNE 18TH, at 7:30 A.M. as permitted by G.S. § 143-318.11(a)(b).
Meetings in June '92

THE WEEK OF JUNE 1 - 5

1, Monday
12:00 Noon  PLANNING COMMISSION - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room
3:30 p.m.  CITY COUNCIL PERSONNEL & FINANCE COMMITTEE - CMGC, Room 271
4:00 p.m.  PLANNING COMMISSION/Planning Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room
5:00 p.m.  CITY COUNCIL/Workshop - CMGC, Conference Center

4, Thursday
3:30 p.m.  CITY COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE - CMGC, Room 270

THE WEEK OF JUNE 8 - 12

8, Monday
5:00 p.m.  COUNCIL/MANAGER DINNER - CMGC, Conference Center
6:30 p.m.  CITIZENS HEARING - CMGC, Meeting Chamber (Televised Live on Cable Channel 32)
7:00 p.m.  CITY COUNCIL MEETING - CMGC, Meeting Chamber (Televised Live on Cable Channel 32)
7:00 p.m.  HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION - Law Building, 730 E. Trade St., Suite 100

9, Tuesday
2:00 p.m.  HOUSING AUTHORITY - Administrative Office, 1301 South Boulevard
3:00 p.m.  HOUSING APPEALS BOARD - CMGC, 5th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.  AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMITTEE - Airport, Main Terminal, Conference Room A
5:00 p.m.  BUDGET WORKSHOP (Optional) - CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room

10, Wednesday
7:30 a.m.  PLANNING COMMISSION/First Ward Committee - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room
8:00 a.m.  CLEAN CITY COMMITTEE - CMGC, Conference Room 270
8:30 a.m.  CIVIL SERVICE BOARD - CMGC, 7th Floor Conference Room
3:00 p.m.  HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room
3:30 p.m.  CLEAN CITY COMMITTEE/Business Beautification Awards - CMGC, Conference Room 271
4:30 p.m.  CITIZENS CABLE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE - CMGC, 7th Floor Conference Room

11, Thursday
3:30 p.m.  CITY COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE - CMGC, Conference Room 270
4:00 p.m.  CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ART COMMISSION - CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room

(CONTINUED ON BACK)
### THE WEEK OF JUNE 15 - 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15, Monday</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL/Long Range Planning</td>
<td>CMGC, Room 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>COUNCIL/_MANAGER DINNER</td>
<td>CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL MEETING/Zoning Hearings</td>
<td>CMGC, Meeting Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, Tuesday</td>
<td>12:00 Noon</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL, COUNTY COMMISSION, SCHOOL BOARD LUNCHEON</td>
<td>CMGC, Conference Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE</td>
<td>CMGC, Conference Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, Thursday</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>CMGC, Room 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, Friday</td>
<td>7:30 a.m.</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Planning Liaison Committee</td>
<td>CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THE WEEK OF JUNE 22 - 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22, Monday</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Executive Committee</td>
<td>CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Zoning Work Session</td>
<td>CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>COUNCIL/_MANAGER DINNER</td>
<td>CMGC, Conference Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>CITIZENS HEARING</td>
<td>CMGC, Meeting Chamber (Televised Live on Cable Channel 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL MEETING</td>
<td>CMGC, Meeting Chamber (Televised Live on Cable Channel 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, Tuesday</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>CIVIL SERVICE BOARD/Hearing</td>
<td>CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>CMUD ADVISORY COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Dept., 5100 Brookshire Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, Wednesday</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL</td>
<td>CMGC, Room 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>CIVIL SERVICE BOARD/Hearing</td>
<td>CMGC, Room 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Quasi Judicial Hearing-Subdivision Variance</td>
<td>CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, Thursday</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>CITY COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>CMGC, Room 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ART COMMISSION</td>
<td>CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION/Quasi Judicial Hearing-Subdivision Variance (Continued)</td>
<td>CMGC, 8th Floor Conference Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JUNE 29 - 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30, Tuesday</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>CIVIL SERVICE BOARD/Hearing</td>
<td>CMGC, Meeting Chamber Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>AUDITORIUM-COLISEUM-CONVENTION CENTER AUTHORITY</td>
<td>Convention Center, VIP-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>Hal Marshall Ctr., 700 N. Tryon St., Bldg. Standards Training Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These organizations will not meet in June:
- Advisory Energy Commission
- Div. of Insurance & Risk Mgmt.
- Firefighters Retirement Board
- Parade Permit Committee
- Youth Involvement Council
Monday, June 8, 1992 City Council Agenda
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Council Agenda

Monday, June 8, 1992

5:00 p.m. - Council-Manager Dinner
  • CMUD Rightsizing
  • Stormwater Video

6:30 p.m. - Citizens Hearing

7:00 p.m. - Council Meeting

ITEM NO.

1. Invocation by Rev. Denny Turner of Oakhurst Baptist Church.

2. Consider approval of minutes of May 18 Zoning Meeting, May 19 Budget Workshop and Budget Public Hearing and May 21 Budget Workshop.

PUBLIC HEARING

3. A. Conduct a public hearing on the negotiated sale of land to Mrs. Mary H. Stratton in the Third Ward Neighborhood Strategy Area, located at the corner of Victoria Avenue and West Fourth Street, for a price of $20,000.00.

B. Recommend approval of the sale of land to Mrs. Mary H. Stratton.

Staff Resource: Julie Burch

Council Action

A public hearing prior to the sale of land is required by N.C. General Statute 160-A457(4).

After the public hearing, City Council is requested to approve the sale of tax code numbers 073-213-22, 24, 25, 27 and 28 located at the corner of Victoria Avenue and West Fourth Street in the Third Ward Neighborhood Strategy Area to Mrs. Mary H. Stratton for $20,000.
Background

Third Ward Plan

- The Redevelopment Plan for Third Ward provides for the disposal of acquired land for development by public or private parties.

- The total appraised value of the property is $20,000 as determined by the Real Estate Division.

- On September 25, 1991 a proposal was received by Mrs. Mary H. Stratton to purchase five adjacent properties owned by the City for a buffer to be utilized in conjunction with her existing residence at 911 W. 4th Street.

- Mrs. Stratton has agreed to purchase these parcels representing a total of 38,507 sq.ft. for the $20,000 appraised value.

- Disposal of these parcels will assist in meeting the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan for the Third Ward Neighborhood Strategy Area.

Clearances: Engineering/Real Estate and Community Development concur in this request. The Mandatory Referral was approved by the Planning Commission on April 6, 1992.

A map and the mandatory referral are attached.

Attachment No. 1

VOTE ON CONSENT ITEMS

Agenda items 14 through 22 may be considered in one motion except for those items removed from the consent agenda as a result of a Council member making such a request of the City Clerk prior to the meeting.

Staff Resource: Pam Syfert
POLICY

Presentation and acceptance of report on Mountain Island watershed regulations and referral to Planning Committee.

Dr. Jim Horton, chairman of the Watershed Study Committee, will make a presentation at the Council meeting. The report is attached.

Attachment No. 2

Consider alternative alignments for the extension of Stumptown Road from I-77 to NC 73 and direct the City's representative to the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) on alignment selection for Thoroughfare Plan amendment.

Staff Resource: Lynn Purnell

Council Action

City Council is requested to:

- Consider alternative alignments for the proposed extension of Stumptown Road from I-77 to NC 73.
- Direct City's representative to the MPO to vote (on July 15) to amend the Thoroughfare Plan to indicate the preferred alignment.

Purpose:
- To amend the Thoroughfare Plan to reflect the preferred alignment for this proposed roadway.
- To protect the right-of-way for Stumptown Road Extension along the preferred alignment as development occurs.

Alternate E - Recommended Alignment Alternatives:

- The Mecklenburg County Engineering Department developed five alternates for Stumptown Road Extension. Attachment 1 shows the location of the alternates, and Attachment 2 summarizes the impacts of each alignment.
- The Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) recommends Alternate E because it provides the straightest connection between NC 73 and the existing segment of Stumptown Road near I-77. Alternates A through D create "tee" intersections with NC 73.
- The Town of Huntersville also prefers Alternate E for Stumptown Road Extension.

Citizen Involvement:
- Proposed thoroughfares in the northern part of Mecklenburg County were presented at a public meeting in the summer of 1988 during preparation of the 1988 Thoroughfare Plan. Stumptown Road Extension was one of the proposed additions to the plan.
- County Engineering held a public meeting on September 12, 1991 to present three alignments for Stumptown Road Extension. Approximately 60 persons attended.
- Based on citizen comments at the September 12 meeting, County Engineering developed two more alignments. Five alternative locations were shown at a January 23, 1992 public meeting attended by about 60 citizens.

Background:
- The 2005 Generalized Land Plan (adopted in 1985) recommended an extension of Stumptown Road to NC 73 to provide additional thoroughfare network in northern Mecklenburg County.
- The 1988 Charlotte-Mecklenburg Thoroughfare Plan (adopted by the MPO in November 1988) included Stumptown Road Extension as a minor thoroughfare. The road would be constructed within a 70-foot right-of-way.
- Stumptown Road Extension accommodates the demand for local east/west travel in the area between Sam Furr and Gilead Roads. Based on "suburban build-out" population estimates for northern Mecklenburg, future traffic volumes on Stumptown Road Extension range from 8,000 to 15,000 vehicles per day.
- Stumptown Road Extension is located within Huntersville's sphere of influence.

Funding:
The proposed road is not in the Charlotte City limits. Future funding of the road will be considered by the State.

Attachment No. 3
7. Recommend adoption of the recommendations of the Council Planning Committee concerning storm water rates and fee credits.

Staff Resource: Julie Burch

Planning Committee Recommendations

The Policy Statement recommendations of the Storm Water Task Force adopted by City Council on March 23 include provisions for simplified storm water rates for single family properties, and fee credits for commercial properties that have on-site storm water controls.

The Planning Committee has developed recommendations for the implementation of these policies as follows:

A. Single family homes with less than 2,000 square feet of impervious area

   Single family homes with 2,000 or more square feet of impervious area

Commercial, industrial, and other non-single family rates that correspond to the above

With these rates, all properties are paying the same costs per square foot of impervious area. Single family homes are less only because they have less impervious area than other properties.
B. Commercial, industrial, multi-family, and residential homeowners' associations who provide storm water controls in accordance with City standards to mitigate runoff impacts on the drainage infrastructure shall be credited portions of the storm water service charge proportional to the extent those controls match undeveloped conditions on the property. Portions of the service charge shall be available for credit as follows:

- peak flow 50%
- volume of flow 25%
- water quality 25%

Properties which maintain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water permit from the State of North Carolina or USEPA will receive all of the available credit for the water quality portion of the fee.

**Rate Background**

Single family rates - A common practice for storm water programs, which are funded through service charges, is to simplify the calculation of rates for single family homes.

- This saves considerable cost in the collection of impervious area data and in database upkeep without unduly changing the equity of the fee.
- The most simplified rate is to charge each single-family residence the same fee, based on the median value established by actually measuring a sample of parcels.
- This recommended median value in Charlotte, based on a sample of 351 randomly selected parcels, is 2,613 square feet.
- However, a single flat rate has the disadvantage that it does not "appear" to treat the owners of small homes and the owners of large homes consistent with the basic rate methodology of charging based on contribution of runoff.
• The proposed rate structure addresses these concerns by creating more than one category of single-family residence.

• The recommended two tier structure provides for homes with less than 2,000 square feet of impervious area (rooftops, pavement, etc.) to pay one-third less of the variable portion of the rate.

• Approximately ten percent of single family homes will be in the lower category, using data from the Mecklenburg County Tax Appraiser's files.

Revenue

The proposed rates, to be effective January 1993, are calculated to generate all revenue for the City's storm water services. The General Fund will be contributing $2,523,283 to the program through a payment for the impervious area of City maintained streets.

The Manager's recommended budget includes an option to charge $1.5 million in services to storm water fees. These services are currently being supported by the General Fund.

Fee Credits

Urban development impacts the drainage system in three major ways: increased peak flow rates, increased flow volumes and increased pollution of runoff.

• The total costs of the storm water program can be allocated to services which are associated with these three impacts.

• Storm water controls on private property that decrease any of these impacts should result in a fee credit - that is, a reduction of the fee.

• Such controls can be used effectively on most commercial, industrial and multi-family properties, earning credits up to a maximum of 100%.
- Single family subdivisions where controls are used on a neighborhood basis will also be eligible. A credit is granted only when on-site storm water controls are constructed and maintained to City of Charlotte standards.

The following personnel actions are recommended for approval by Council's Personnel and Finance Committee. Item A. is recommended by a unanimous vote of the four members present; item B. is recommended by a vote of 3 to 1.

8. A. Recommend adoption of a resolution amending the Personnel Rules and Regulations, Rule IV, Leave of Absence; Section 3, Injury Leave with Pay.

Staff Resource: Pam Syfert

Committee Recommendation

The Council Personnel and Finance Committee reviewed costs associated with the City's escalating liabilities related to accidents and injuries and recommends that Council approve the change to the Personnel Rules and Regulations decreasing the amount of the City's supplement for Worker's Compensation. The committee also suggested that worker's compensation be reviewed by the Mayor's Compensation Committee. Attached is information that was presented to the Council committee.

Details of the Policy

Current Policy

- As provided by State law, an employee incapacitated and absent from work due to an on-the-job injury is paid two-thirds of the employee's wages (tax-free) up to a maximum of $426 per week.

- In addition, and based on current personnel policy, the injured employee is eligible to receive from the City a supplemental payment equal to one-third of the employee's gross wages for 250 workdays.
The original intent was that an injured employee remain "whole" while being absent from work. The primary problem is that this provides the employee little incentive to return to work.

Due to the "tax-free" payment mandated by State law, plus the manner in which the supplement is calculated, an employee can receive more take-home wages than if at work. The current policy is therefore contributing to the City's Workers' Compensation costs.

Revised Policy

Under the revised policy, the City will no longer pay for the first seven days of injury. Instead, employees may opt to use accrued vacation or sick leave, or leave without pay, during the seven day period.

From the eighth to the 30th day of injury, employees will receive Workers' Compensation payments equal to two-thirds gross salary up to the limit established by the North Carolina Industrial Commission and may opt to supplement the Workers' Compensation payments with accrued vacation or sick leave.

From the 31st to the 365th calendar day of injury, the City will supplement the Workers' Compensation payments, up to an amount equal to the employee's normal net earnings. (Normal net earning is defined as the employee's gross salary minus deductions for federal and state taxes, FICA, and retirement.)

The revised policy is more in line with private sector policies and other local governments.
Projected Results of Changes

With the recommended revisions, the City would still be in compliance with State law on Workers' Compensation payments; however, the proposed revisions will reinforce the City's commitment to safety and loss prevention, reduce incentives for workers to prolong injury leave and serve as a deterrent to the repeated claims. In addition, these changes will save the City approximately $150,000 a year and will also reduce other costs associated with Workers' Compensation.

Implementation

It is recommended that the changes be effective immediately. It is further recommended that employees currently on Workers' Compensation leave be grandfathered under the current policy and that the revised policy apply to employees who become injured on or after the date on which revisions to the policy are approved.

Attachment No. 4

B. Recommend adoption of an ordinance to amend Chapter 2 of the City Code to enable the City Manager to establish and revise Personnel Rules and Regulations.

Staff Resource: Pam Syfert

Recommendation

The ordinance will delegate authority to the City Manager to approve changes to the City's Personnel Rules and Regulations. Examples of the types of revision the City Manager would be authorized to make are:

- Expand the definition of such leave, in order to respond to circumstances similar to the action recently taken by Council regarding the request of a Police Officer.
- Revise the promotional process to respond to rightsizing efforts.
- Revise the section on Safety to reflect current practices.
All such changes would conform to the requirements of the City Charter, Section 4.41 and would not apply to employee issues such as group insurance, awards for length of service or approval of pay plan structures or general pay increases.

**Background:**

Although City Council has recently approved several changes to the Personnel Rules and Regulations, over time these rules will require on-going revisions to incorporate future rule interpretations, improve rule clarity, and add or delete rules to improve the management of the City's workforce.

- Currently, the City Charter provides that City Council establish, through appropriate ordinances, a system of personnel administration governing such issues as appointment, promotion, transfer, removal, discipline and welfare of City employees.

- In a dynamic organization such as the City of Charlotte, our personnel administration system needs to be able to respond rapidly and effectively to changes. In addition, employees and supervisors need a set of rules and regulations that accurately reflect up to date personnel practices.

Consider the request of the Convention and Visitors Bureau that the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Convention and Visitors Bureau be dissolved.

**CCVB Citizens Advisory Committee**

Attached is a letter dated January 9, 1992 from Wayne Shusko, chairman of the Charlotte Convention and Visitors Bureau (CCVB) stating that the CCVB Citizens Advisory Committee has fulfilled its charge and the CCVB requests its dissolution.

The CCVB Executive Committee supports the recommendation that the Board of Directors amend its bylaws to allow City Council to appoint two individuals to the Board of Directors to provide citizen input.

**Clearances:** City Attorney and City Clerk.

Attachment No. 5
B U S I N E S S

10. Recommend: (A) an increase of $40,000 in the City's contribution to the City Within a City Loan/Equity Pool Program because of the addition of Republic Bank and Trust Company to the program and (B) authorize the City Manager to enter into a participation agreement with Republic Bank and Trust Company.

Staff Resource: Del Borgsdorf

Council Action

What is Council being asked to approve?

A. Approve an increase of $40,000 in the City's contribution to the City Within a City Loan/Equity Pool Program because of the addition of Republic Bank and Trust Company to the program. The City's contribution of $1,300,000 will be increased to $1,340,000.

B. Authorize the City Manager to enter into a participation agreement with Republic Bank and Trust Company.

Purpose

Why is the City doing this?

The purpose of the City Within a City Loan/Equity Pool Program is to create a public/private venture which would increase lending opportunities for targeted areas of the City of Charlotte thereby providing expanded economic development opportunities, particularly the creation of jobs.

- Republic Bank and Trust Company advised City staff of their $200,000 commitment to participate in the City Within a City Loan/Equity Pool Program after City Council's approval on October 28, 1991 of using $1,300,000 in City funds to create an equity fund with participating banks contributing $6,500,000.

- In order for the City to provide a 20% match for Republic Bank & Trust Company's $200,000, City Council is requested to increase the City's contribution by $40,000.

- The participating banks' contribution will increase from $6,500,000 to $6,700,000 for a total loan/equity pool of $8,040,000.
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Cost: How much will this cost?
An additional $40,000 from the Development and Revitalization Fund. City Council has already approved the use of $1,300,000 from the Development and Revitalization Fund for the City's contribution to the City Within a City Loan/Equity Pool Program.

Citizen Input: What is citizen input on this issue?
The City Within A City Loan/Equity Pool Program resulted from a need identified by the West Side Economic Development Task Force, which was appointed by the Mayor.

Background: See Attachment

Attachment No. 6

11. Recommend adoption of a resolution authorizing staff to proceed with the necessary actions to secure an installment purchase contract (lease/purchase) to fund equipment requirements for FY93. The amount of the contract will be approximately $6.25 million. (Equipment list attached).

Staff Resource: Del Borgsdorf

Council Action: Tax exempt financings require that the governing board take an official action that allows staff to negotiate a transaction.

- The transaction is then presented to Council again for final approval.
- Council is currently scheduled to consider the final approval on June 22, 1992.

Lease/Purchase: Since 1982 the City has used some type of lease/purchase agreement to fund its annual capital equipment purchases. The FY93 Operating Budget that has been presented to Council includes funds to make payments on previous years' agreements, as well as the first year's interest payment for the FY93 installment purchase contract.

Funding: FY93 Installment Purchase Agreement.

Clearances: Finance and Bond Counsel.
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TO BE READ TO COUNCIL:

City Council has been requested to approve the refinancing of the City's Airport Revenue Bonds, Series 1985 with a series of refunding bonds. Required actions will involve the consideration and adoption of three resolutions:

1. The first makes certain technical modifications to the 1985 Bond Order and is entitled:


(Wait for Vote)

2. The second approves up to $107,900,000 of the new bonds, the redemption of the 1985 Bonds, the sale of the new bonds after delivery and the various agreements in connection with the new bonds and is entitled:


(Wait for Vote)

3. The third authorizes the contract by the City which will fix the interest rate on the new bonds and is entitled:

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION, DELIVERY AND PERFORMANCE OF SWAP AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA AND AIG FINANCIAL PRODUCTS CORP.

(End)
12. Recommend approval of actions required to refinance approximately $103 million in 1985 Airport Revenue Bonds, and adoption of a budget for $4,511,610 to cover issuance costs.

Staff Resource: Del Borgsdorf

Council Action

Council is requested to:

- Approve amendments to the 1985 Revenue Bond Order.
- Approve the 1993 Airport Revenue Bond Series Resolution and the issuance of Refunding Bonds by July 1, 1993.
- Approve the redemption of the 1985 Airport Revenue Bonds.
- Approve the Interest Rate Agreement.
- Approve the necessary contracts for the financing team.
- Approve the contract for bond insurance.

Council is also requested to adopt an ordinance appropriating $4,511,610 to pay the issuance cost of the refinancing (call premium, underwriters spread and bond insurance). These funds are part of the refinancing.

Savings

The refinancing transaction is expected to save approximately $27 million.

Background

The airlines, particularly USAir, will be the primary beneficiaries of the savings. An agreement has been entered into with the airlines that authorizes the refinancing. The Local Government Commission approved the transaction on June 2, 1992.
Recommend amendment of the contract with the Charlotte Uptown Development Corporation (CUDC) and adoption of a budget ordinance appropriating $40,000 from the fund balance of Municipal Service District I.

Staff Resource: Del Borgsdorf

**Council Action**

- Council is requested to:
  - Approve an amendment to the City's contract with CUDC increasing their contract budget by $40,000. The City Manager will execute this within his authority.
  - Adopt a budget ordinance appropriating $40,000 from the fund balance of Municipal Service District I and, in addition, a total of $109,301 from the three fund balances of the Municipal Service District Funds to comply with the City's contracts with CUDC and CCD.

**CUDC**

The Charlotte Uptown Development Corporation (CUDC) recently acquired the Dillard's Building at 127 North Tryon Street. Because of this, there are significant new expenses such as insurance and building maintenance. There are insufficient funds in this year's contract for CUDC to meet their financial obligations through June 30th.

Council also needs to appropriate funds to make up for a shortfall in tax collections in the Municipal Service District funds.

**Increase CUDC's FY'92 Contract Amount**

CUDC has requested the City amend their contract to increase their $357,100 contract by $40,000 to be provided from the fund balance of Municipal Service District I. An appropriation from fund balance will leave the fund balance with sufficient funds for CUDC's contract and reserves for FY 93.
City’s Contract Obligation

The contracts for both CU DC and the Chamber’s Central Charlotte Division (CC D) oblige the City to provide full funding for their contracts if funds are available in each of the three Municipal Service District Funds. Due to a shortfall in tax collections, shown in Attachment 1, $109,301 needs to be appropriated from the fund balances of the Municipal Service Districts. At the May 21 budget workshop, Council affirmed by a 5-2 straw vote their intent to fund the shortfall from the fund balances of the Municipal Service Districts rather than providing some or all of the funding from the General Fund. The options Council considered are shown in Attachment 1.

Funding: Municipal Service Districts 1, 2, and 3 fund balances.


Attachment No. 8

CONSENT

BUDGET ORDINANCE

Recommend adoption of a budget ordinance to appropriate $2,015,839.60 for utility relocation expense at McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Council Action

This action appropriates funds of $2,015,839.60 from the North Carolina Department of Transportation as payment for relocation of sewer mains.

- NCDOT has a road construction project (Charlotte Outer Loop) underway which conflicts with existing sewer mains on McAlpine plant property.
- The NCDOT has agreed to pay for relocation of the sewer main per a utility relocation agreement dated March 18, 1992.
- Bid item A. in the following bid section recommends award of a contract to Yates Construction Company. In addition to relocating the lines, the bid price includes costs for improvements to the lines.
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- NCDOT will pay only for the costs associated with the relocation; CMUD will be responsible for costs for improvements to the lines ($306,887.40).

**Funding:** The budget ordinance appropriates $2,015,839.60 from NCDOT.

Improvements to the sewer mains will be funded from the Sewer Main Relocation Capital Account.

**Clearances:** CMUD Director.

**BID LIST**

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

**A. Sanitary Sewer Construction**

Sanitary Sewer Relocations

For Charlotte Outer Loop

**Recommendation:** Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department recommends that the low bid by Yates Construction Company of Stokesdale, North Carolina in the amount of $2,322,726.66 be accepted for award of contract on a unit price basis.

**Project Description:** The N.C. Department of Transportation is currently constructing the Charlotte Outer Loop. Existing sewer lines are in conflict with the proposed road construction across McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant property. Construction of this project will allow for relocation and improvements to the subject sewer lines.

**MWBE Status:** The contractor has submitted MWBE participation of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MWE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>PERCENT OF TOTAL PROJECT COST</th>
<th>PROJECT GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>$1400.00</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Utility Department has verified through references that the contractor has the capability and typically self performs projects of this type.

The contractor did solicit MWBE quotations in an effort to bring MWBE participation to this project, but determined many to be non-competitive.

Though the contractor received no quotes from MWBE's he solicited for concrete work prior to the bid, he is accepting quotes from interested MWBE's in an effort to include MWBE's.

The MWBE Program Director concurs in this determination.

Source of Funding: Water and Sewer Capital Improvement Fund - (Sewer Main Relocation for Street Improvements). Water and Sewer Capital Improvement Fund - (Utility Relocations for the Charlotte Outer Loop, McAlpine Plant).

| Estimated Cost:   | $2,572,190.10 |
| Low Bid:         | 2,322,726.66  |
| Difference:      | $249,463.44 (10%) |

B. Polymer, McAlpine
Wastewater Treatment Plant

Recommendation: By Purchasing Director and Utility Director that the low bid, Stockhausen, Inc., Greensboro, N. C., in the amount of $311,000.00 be accepted for award of contract on a unit price basis.

Project Description: Polymer will be used with the sludge thickening and dewatering centrifuges at McAlpine Wastewater Treatment Plant. Polymer vastly improves the efficiency of the centrifuges.

The bid process for Polymer requires that vendors pre-qualify their product. This requires extensive time and testing (eight weeks) on City equipment. Due to this requirement a contract for a period of one year with the option to renew for an additional year at the same unit price is requested.
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MWBE Status: No known MWBE vendors.

Source of Funding: Water and Sewer Operating Fund -
(McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant - Chemicals for Water Treatment).

C. Street Sweeper, Vacuum Type

Recommendation: By Purchasing Director and Director of Aviation that the low bid, Public Works Equipment and Supply, Inc., Monroe, N. C., in the amount of $102,480.00, be accepted for award of contract.

Project Description: This proposed purchase is for one vacuum type street sweeper that will be used to clean pavement areas around the Airport and aircraft operational area.

MWBE Status: No known MWBE available for this purchase.

Source of Funding: Airport Operating Fund.

D. Janitorial Services

1) Alexander Street Center
2) Greenville Center
3) Amay James Center
4) Belmont Center

Recommendation: By Purchasing Director and Neighborhood Centers Director that the low bidder, Complete Cleaning Co., Charlotte, N.C., be awarded a contract for Alexander Street Center and Greenville Center in the amount of $51,984.00 per year; and, the low bidder, Better Cleaning Janitorial Service, Charlotte, N.C., be awarded a contract for the Amay James Center and Belmont Center in the amount of $48,000.00 per year.
Project Description: The proposed contracts will cover cleaning of four centers for the upcoming year. Another bid was submitted by Joe's Janitorial & Cleaning, Charlotte, N.C. but did not meet specifications since the bid proposal was not signed as required.

These proposed contracts will be awarded for three years with an option to renew for two additional one year periods. A pre-bid conference was held April 27, 1992. There will be approximately 1% decrease in cost with the award of these contracts.

MWBE Status: Both companies being recommended are minority companies.

Source of Funding: General Fund - (Neighborhood Centers/Miscellaneous Contractuals.)

E. Cast Iron or Ductile Pipe Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department

Recommendation: By Purchasing Director and Utility Director that the low bid, Griffin Pipe Products Co., Lynchburg, Va. in the amount of $190,110.40 be accepted for award of contract on a unit price basis.

Project Description: Cast iron or ductile pipe is used by the Utility Department to extend and repair the water distribution system.

Source of Funding: Water and Sewer Operating Fund - (Water Distribution - Inventory).

F. Belmont Neighborhood Reinvestment Phase II Engineering

Recommendation: By the City Engineer, based on the recommendation of the consultant, HDR Engineering, that the low bid of $1,181,420.70, as submitted by Ferebee Corporation, be accepted for award on a unit price basis.

Project Description: In FY90 City Council approved the Neighborhood Reinvestment Program which provides for new or reconstructed infrastructure in areas of the City where substandard or no infrastructure exists.
The first phase of the Belmont project was the rehabilitation of existing sidewalk and curb and gutter. Phase II includes construction of curb and gutter, sidewalk, and storm drainage for Parson Street, Umstead Street, 19th Street, 20th Street, and Alexander Street in the Belmont neighborhood.

MWBE Status:

The contractor has committed M/WBE participation of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>PERCENT OF TOTAL PROJECT COST</th>
<th>PROJECT GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>$114,610.00</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>$148,418.00</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contractor has met the requirements of the M/WBE program by exceeding the goals set for the project.

The MWBE Director concurs in the recommendation for award.

Source of Funding: General Capital Improvement Fund - (Neighborhood Reinvestment - Pay-As-You-Go Debt Service).

Estimated Cost: $1,525,000.00
Low Bid: $1,181,420.70
Difference: $343,579.30 (23%)

G. Bridge Repair Engineering

Recommendation: By the City Engineer, based on the recommendation of the consultant, Thompson, Gordon, & Shook, that the bid submitted by J. L. Manta, Inc. be rejected due to improper license and the negotiated bid of $303,960.00, as submitted by Crowder Construction Company, be accepted for award on a unit price basis.

Project Description: The work includes repairs to 29 City bridges (see attachment).

The repairs were identified in a bi-annual inspection report on July 10, 1990 done by Thompson, Gordon & Shook Engineers.
The North Carolina Licensing Board has informed us that the bid by J. L. Manta, Inc. cannot be considered because they do not hold a North Carolina General Contractor's Highway License. The City Attorney's office has rendered an opinion that the low bid must be rejected due to improper licensing.

Source of Funding: Powell Bill Fund - (Bridge Repairs).

Estimated Cost: $257,994
Negotiated Bid: 303,960
Difference: $45,966 (-18%)

The increased cost is due to extra measures required in the removal and disposal of lead-based paint on the bridges which was not included in the estimate.
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H. Sanitary Sewer Construction
1991 Annexation Area 5 - Beam Road

Recommendation: Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department recommends that the low bid by Sanders Brothers, Incorporated of Charlotte, North Carolina in the amount of $1,055,558.79 be accepted for award of contract on a unit price basis.

Project Description: Construction of this project will extend sewer service to the Beam Road area and would fulfill the City's legal annexation requirements for extension of sewer to the area.

MWBE Status:

The Utility Department has reviewed the contractor's good faith effort, and his capabilities to self perform all aspects of this project with his own forces and determined the contractor to be in compliance with the MWBE policy.

The MWBE Program Director concurs.

Source of Funding: Water and Sewer Capital Improvement Fund - (Beam Road Sewer Main.)
16. Recommend approval of an engineering services contract for $2,362,523 with Black & Veatch for: 1) engineering study of raw water intake on Lake Norman and preliminary plant design of North Mecklenburg water filter plant, and 2) preliminary design study of alum sludge facilities at Franklin, Vest and North Mecklenburg filter plants.

Approval of this engineering contract will support CMUD's program of meeting the future water demands of northern Mecklenburg and to meet new effluent limits on the discharge of alum into the sanitary sewer system.

Award of this contract is based on the following:

- Letters of interest for design of these projects were sent to over 90 firms.
- 22 firms responded.
- A short list of four firms was selected.
- Thorough evaluation of qualifications of the four firms was conducted according to City procedure.
- Black & Veatch was selected by a competitive process based on qualifications and experience.

Funding: North Mecklenburg Water Treatment Plant Capital Account.

Clearances: Utility Director.

**Claims**

The Finance Department, Division of Insurance and Risk Management (DIRM), is charged with the responsibility of adjusting claims for liability or damages for the City, County and Board of Education.

- DIRM staff processes and settles the bulk of the liability and workers' compensation claims.
- A third party administrator (TPA) claims service firm is needed to assist DIRM in resolving a small percentage of claims.
- A TPA is required because there are some claims that are not cost effective to adjust with City staff because they are too complex and time consuming (e.g. - transit bus accidents).

**Recommendation**

After a thorough review of area companies, DIRM recommends James C. Greene as the better provider of TPA services for the City, County and School Board.

- This decision is based on a consideration of cost, quality of service, experience of personnel, type of information systems and reporting capabilities.
- James C. Greene is a regional claims service company which has operated successfully since 1932.
- This business will be handled out of the Charlotte office.
- The executive board for the three participants has concurred in this choice.

**Cost:**

The estimated annual cost is $200,000 based on volume.

**Funding:**

Division of Insurance and Risk Management Operating Budget.

**Clearances:**

Finance/DIRM.
CONTRACT AMENDMENT

18. Recommend approval of Amendment No. 3 to the contract with Sverdrup & Parcel for $139,500 for design and construction support of the Sugar Creek outfall sewer.

Council Action
City Council is requested to approve Amendment No. 3 for $139,500 to the professional services contract with Sverdrup & Parcel which will provide payment for design and construction support of the Sugar Creek outfall sewer.

Repairs Needed
Sverdrup has completed a study of deteriorated sections of the existing Sugar Creek sewer outfall line.

- Based on their findings, the 54-inch sewer line must be repaired. Repair will consist of a new lining inserted into the existing 54-inch pipe.
- One section of the 78-inch pipe needs to be replaced.

Amendment
Amendment No. 3 will provide:
- Detailed design of the lining of the 54-inch pipe.
- Detailed design for replacement of the 78-inch pipe.
- Construction support, including preparation of bid documents, site visits, project resident engineer, construction advisement, and record drawings, etc.

The Sugar Creek outfall line is a major influent line to the McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment plant. Without correction, the damaged sections could result in pipe collapse, sewer backup, and overflow.

Funding: Sanitary Sewer Line Replacement Capital Account.

Clearances: The Utility Director.
LEASE AGREEMENT

19. Recommend approval of an agreement with Ontario Investments, Inc., for $166,104, for the lease of computer equipment to be used for the inventory of the storm water infrastructure.

Approval of a lease agreement with Ontario Investments, Inc. of New York, an incumbent City lessor, will provide a SUN 670MP file server and IPX workstations for the inventory of the storm water infrastructure. A monthly rate of $6,921 over 24 months will result in a total payment of $166,104.

This equipment is required to computerize the inventory data, which will then be used to plan and manage storm water maintenance, improvement, and water pollution programs.

- This cost was included in the recent comparison of completing the inventory in-house versus completion of the inventory of the storm water consultant.

- Over $250,000 in savings will occur by conducting the inventory in-house.

Funding: Storm Water Services Capital Account.

Clearances: Engineering, CIS, and Budget and Evaluation.

CODE ENFORCEMENT

Detailed information is attached for each of the following code enforcement actions. Funds are available and liens will be placed against the properties for the costs incurred.

A. Recommend adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1704 Pegram Street.

Attachment No. 10

B. Recommend adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1006 Allen Street.

Attachment No. 11
C. Recommend adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1201 Louise Avenue.

Attachment No. 12

D. Recommend adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1016 Allen Street.

Attachment No. 13

E. Recommend adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1810 West Boulevard.

Attachment No. 14

F. Recommend adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 842 Reliance Street.

Attachment No. 15

G. Recommend adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 3404-06 Boyd Street.

Attachment No. 16

H. Recommend adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 227 West Todd Lane.

Attachment No. 17

I. Recommend adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the dwelling located at 3400 Boyd Street, #1 and #2.

Attachment No. 18
SET PUBLIC HEARING


PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

22. Recommend adoption of the following condemnation resolutions.

CONDEMNATIONS

A. Project: Non-System Residential Street Program - Patton Street, Parcel #6
   Owner(s): Wilbert Alexander and any other parties of interest
   Property address: 3603 W. Sugar Creek Road
   Property to be condemned: 829 sq.ft. (0.019 ac.) fee
   Improvements: None
   Price: $1.00
   Reason for condemnation: Mr. Alexander would not be able to convey clear title due to several heirs being omitted during the latest deed conveyance.

   Total Area: = 9,797 sq.ft. (0.225 ac.)
   Area To Be Acquired: = 829 sq.ft. (0.019 ac.)
   Remaining Area: = 8,968 sq.ft. (0.206 ac.)
   Zoned: R6 Use: Residential
   TAX VALUE: $19,940 TAX CODE: 043-032-11

B. Project: Non-System Residential Street Program - Patton Street, Parcel #14
   Owner(s): Kenneth B. Whitmire, Rosemarie Menninger Whitmire and any other parties of interest
   Property address: 3531 W. Sugar Creek Road
   Property to be condemned: 451 sq.ft. (0.01 ac.) fee
   Improvements: None
   Price: $1.00
   Reason for condemnation: Mr. Whitmire has not responded to any of our correspondence requesting that he donate the 451 sq.ft. for the above project. He lives in Greensboro, N.C.
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Total Area: = 9,969 sq.ft. (0.229 ac.)
Area To Be Acquired: = 451 sq.ft. (0.01 ac.)
Remaining Area: = 9,518 sq.ft. (0.219 ac.)

Zoned: R6 Use: Vacant
TAX VALUE: $2,200 TAX CODE: 043-031-09

C. Project: Non-System Residential Street Program - Patton Street, Parcel #5
Owner(s): Benjamin Davis, Catherine Davis and any other parties of interest
Property address: 5625 Patton Street
Property to be condemned: 1,116 sq.ft. (0.026 ac.) fee
Improvements: None
Price: $1.00
Reason for condemnation: Mr. & Mrs. Davis are not living together and Mr. Davis does not want to include her in this matter. In addition there are two years of back taxes totaling $554.90 due plus a possible judgement lien of $2,346.00 in favor of First Union Bank.

Total Area: = 24,409 sq.ft. (0.56 ac.)
Area To Be Acquired: = 1,116 sq.ft. (0.026 ac.)
Remaining Area: = 23,293 sq.ft. (0.534 ac.)

Zoned: R6 Use: Residential
TAX VALUE: $26,450 TAX CODE: 043-032-10
22 D. PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS FOR JUNE 8, 1992 AGENDA

   Owner(s): Mary K. Snodgrass
   Property Address: 3221 Barry Drive
   Charlotte, N. C. 28214
   Property to be acquired: .377 acres
   Improvements: 3 bedrooms, 1 bath, ranch
   Tax Value: $50,310.00 Purchase Price: $60,300.00
   Remarks: Purchase price was determined by an independent appraiser and a review by a second appraiser. Each appraisal takes into consideration specific quality and quantity of the house. The tax department has lowered the evaluations in Moores Park due to "economic obsolescence" (proximity to the Airport). Residential property acquired per Federal Guidelines 49 CFR Part 24 of the Uniform Acquisition and Relocation Act 1970. Owners eligible for relocation benefits. Acquisition and relocation costs eligible for Federal Aviation Administration reimbursement.
DATE: April 7, 1992

TO: Mr. Kent Winslow
    Real Estate Department

FROM: Martin R. Cramton, Jr., Planning Director

SUBJECT: - Mandatory Referral Report No. 92-6 -

Attached is a copy of Mandatory Referral Report No. 92-6 for the sale of .783 acres in the Third Ward Neighborhood. The Planning Committee unanimously approved this report at their meeting on April 6, 1992.

If additional information is needed, please let us know.

mmc

5/1/92

To C.P. for reginal signature & the mtg. 
Mr. Winslow June 8, 1992 draft agenda -
Advisd Dick Woolard City

APR 8 1992
City of
MANDATORY REFERRAL REPORT NO. 92-6
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
SALE OF VACANT PROPERTY
MARCH, 1992

PROJECT PROPOSAL AND LOCATION

This proposal consists of vacant parcels which is part of the Third Ward Neighborhood Strategy Area which they are now offered for sale by the Community Development Department through the City Real Estate Division. The parcels (073-213-22, 24, 25, 27 and 28) under consideration for sale total .783 acres. Two of the properties front on West Fourth Street, two face on Victoria Street while one is only accessed by two alley ways.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The subject properties are small remnant parcels that the Community Development Department has no interest in developing. From a land use perspective these parcels would be appropriate for infill development. However, due to their size and the terrain the only way these parcels could accommodate infill development, as recommended in the Third Ward Special Project Plan, would be through assembling parcels with other landowners. An adjacent property owner (073-213-26), through an attorney, has expressed interest in purchasing these properties to clean up and landscape as an amenity to her property. It is possible that assemblage of property for infill development is what the perspective purchasers have in mind in the long term.

PROJECT IMPACT

The land proposed for sale is presently vacant. It is zoned UR-1. Single family homes surround the property to the south while there is multi-family on the north side of West Fourth Street. The Third Ward mini park is a triangular piece of property adjacent to parcels 073-213-27 and 28. This is a small park that contains one public bench. It is mainly a City-maintained open space.

The City Park and Recreation Department has advised that they have no desire to add the two adjacent parcels to the mini park as Frazier Park is just down the street. All five of the subject parcels are maintained by the Landscape Division of City Parks and Recreation and the cost of this maintenance is not justified by the cost of the land which has a combined appraised value of $20,000.00.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROJECTS

None exist.
PROJECT COST

| Legal       | $1,000.00 |
| Administration | $1,000.00 |
| Advertising  |    150.00 |

Total Cost Estimate $2,150.00

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission staff recommends approval of the sale of these five properties in Third Ward. If the City is not interested in pursuing assemblage of other properties for development or additional park land, then it is appropriate to return these subject parcels to the tax rolls to generate additional revenue.

PLANNING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Committee unanimously approved staff recommendation at a meeting on April 6, 1992.
1. INTRODUCTION -- Described below is the Mountain Island Lake Watershed Protection Plan developed by sixteen volunteer citizens collectively known as the Stakeholders Committee. The Committee believes that the plan (a) adequately meets the Board of County Commissioners' watershed protection policy statement, as amended February 17, 1992, balancing water quality and economic development and (b) exceeds or meets the minimum WS-IV standards contained in the Water Supply Rules adopted by the North Carolina Environmental Management Commission on February 13, 1992. The Committee expects that the EMC will designate the entire Mountain Island Lake Watershed as WS-IV in June 1992.

This plan provides direction on all major issues affecting the development of the watershed. However, it is a plan and not an ordinance. The Committee anticipates that the watershed protection ordinance(s), as developed, will address in more detail many of the specific issues covered below. The Committee recognizes that each of Mecklenburg's major watersheds are unique and require tailored plans which will protect water quality and allow appropriate development. The plan for Mountain Island Lake is specific to its geography, topography, current development and current water quality. While certain principles may be transferable to Lakes Norman and Wylie, any specific plans for Norman and Wylie would have to be developed for each.

The plan is organized as follows:

* Land Acquisition -- Lands recommended for removal from development through acquisition by the County, City or State.

* General -- Requirements, comments and recommendations applicable to the entire watershed, such as endorsement of other plans, future initiatives, prohibitions and allowable uses.

* Area Specific Requirements -- Uses specific to defined areas in the watershed such as development density, buffering, structural BMPs and prohibited and allowable uses. The plan defines each area's
approximate boundaries and displays them on the attached map.

This plan is recommended by consensus of the Stakeholders Committee except for one issue. The Committee was not able to achieve consensus as to whether the area east of Kearns Road in the Upper Gar Creek Critical Area should have 12% allowable impervious coverage (approximately one dwelling unit per acre) or 24% (two dwelling units per acre). This issue is discussed further in section 4.

2. LAND ACQUISITION -- The County, City, and/or State should acquire by gift, purchase, or other means, including transfer of development rights, land that is available in the Mountain Island Lake Watershed to provide maximum protection to the Watershed. These acquisitions should be completed by January 1, 1995, except for greenways along Gar, McDowell, and Torrence Creeks and the 20-year program in 2.F. These acquisitions are critically important for the other aspects of the plan to be effective. Condemnation should be avoided if possible.

Land that should be acquired includes:

A. The County should acquire the park land in this Watershed that was approved by the voters in the November 1991 bond referendum. Estimated acreage: 1,050

B. The County should request that the City acquire through the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department (CMUD) all available land adjacent to the present water intake. Estimated acreage: 80

C. The County should make the greenways along Gar Creek, McDowell Creek, and Torrence Creek a priority, establishing them as soon as possible. Estimated acreage: 571

D. The County should acquire the first 200 feet of available (undeveloped) shoreland along Gar Creek Cove just east of Mountain Pointe. Estimated acreage: 10

E. The County should acquire the 1,000-feet-wide corridor along Mountain Island Lake north of the Water Fowl Refuge to Cowan's Ford Dam, as allowed under Federal Energy Regulatory Commission requirements. Most of this land is currently owned by Crescent Resources, Inc. and leased to the North Carolina Wildlife Commission. The Mecklenburg County Board of Commissioners should request that the Gaston and Lincoln County Commissioners acquire the corresponding 1,000-feet corridor within their jurisdictions along
Mountain Island Lake. Estimated acreage in Mecklenburg County: 576

F. The County should request that the City should undertake through CMUD a 20-year program to acquire all available land within one-fourth of a mile of Mountain Island Lake. Funding should be provided through bonds to be repaid by the water users. Mecklenburg County Commissioners should request Gaston and Lincoln Counties to take similar action with funding provided by the water users. Estimated acreage: 1,236 (This estimate excludes Latta Plantation Park, the Water Fowl Refuge, greenways and the 1,000 feet corridor around the Lake.)

G. The County should utilize Farmland Preservation Bonds for all eligible farms west of Beatties Ford Road within the Watershed. Estimated acreage: 1,200

H. The County should request that Gaston and Lincoln Counties join with Mecklenburg in pursuing State funding to establish a regional state park in Gaston, Lincoln, and/or Mecklenburg County in the Mountain Island Lake Watershed. Estimated acreage: 5,000 - 7,500 (Some of this acreage could include parcels identified in A. through G.)

3. INDUSTRIAL AND WASTEWATER DISCHARGES -- There should be no new industrial process discharges into any stream in the Mountain Island Lake Watershed, with the exception of the McDowell Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. This plant may expand, but the pollutant load shall not be increased beyond its present permitted limits. CMUD should accelerate plans for effluent filtration and evaluate alternatives to chlorine disinfection to reduce potential toxicity. Nothing in this statement precludes conveying wastewater from the Mountain Island Lake Watershed to approved plants outside this Watershed.

There shall be no new privately owned wastewater treatment plants requiring NPDES permits in the Mountain Island Lake Watershed that directly discharge into the Lake or any of its tributaries. Existing, privately owned wastewater treatment plants may expand, but the pollutant load shall not be increased beyond their presently permitted limits.

Septic tanks may be used in the Watershed in compliance with State and local laws and regulations. CMUD should make the provision of public sewers in the Mountain Island Lake Watershed a priority to eliminate the need for septic tanks. CMUD should evaluate future wastewater treatment needs for
this area under the density restrictions of this watershed protection plan.

4. CRITICAL AREA -- No high density option is allowed in the critical area. The critical area boundaries and maximum allowable densities are outlined in the chart and referenced to the map of the Watershed. Maximum allowable densities are expressed in percentage of impervious cover (%), with approximate equivalent dwelling units per acre (DU/Ac) shown for illustration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Maximum Allowable Density (Approximate Housing Density)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Gar Creek</td>
<td>From the Lake to Beatties Ford Road (which is approximately 1 mile upstream) and to the ridge line along either side of the Creek</td>
<td>6% (1 DU/2 Ac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Area of Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Gar Creek</td>
<td>From Beatties Ford Road to the limits of the Creek drainage basin and to the ridge line along either side of the Creek</td>
<td>12% (1 DU/1 Ac)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Area of Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDowell Creek Basin</td>
<td>From the Lake to approximately 1 mile upstream and to the ridge line along either side of the Creek</td>
<td>12% (1 DU/1 Ac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Area of Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of the Lake Front</td>
<td>1/2 mile from the Lake</td>
<td>24% (2 DU/1 Ac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** At the last meeting of the Stakeholders, three committee members voted to change the density in the Upper Gar Creek area east of Kearns Road to 24% (2 DU/1 Ac). Twelve committee members voted to keep the density at 12% (1 DU/1 Ac). One member who had left the meeting before the vote indicated that he could support 24% (2 DU/1 Ac) as a compromise. Discussion on both sides of this issue centered around whether more development in this area would affect water quality.
The critical area shall have only the following uses:

A. Those uses permitted by right in R-3, R-4, R-6, and R-8 districts, and

B. The following specified uses are permitted under prescribed conditions in R-3, R-4, R-6, and R-8 districts:

1. Adult care homes
2. Bus stop shelters
3. Cemeteries
4. Child care homes
5. Duplex dwellings
6. Elementary and secondary schools
7. Equestrian oriented subdivisions
8. Government buildings up to 12,500 square feet
9. Open space recreational uses
10. Outdoor recreation
11. Public utility structures
12. Public utility transmission and distribution lines
13. Religious institutions up to 750 seats
14. Subdivision sales offices
15. Temporary buildings and storage of materials

5. PROTECTED AREA -- The protected area for Mountain Island Lake extends from the outer boundaries of the critical area to approximately 5 hydrological miles from the Lake and is represented as the blue area on the Watershed Map. Clustering is encouraged in this area. High density development is allowed with the use of wet detention ponds. Requirements relating to wet detention ponds and other structural best management practices (BMPs) are contained in Section 7.

For residential development, low density portions of this area are restricted to 2 DU/1 Ac or 24% impervious cover. High density portions are restricted to 4 DU/1 Ac or up to 50% impervious cover with the use of on-site wet detention ponds or in areas upstream of regional wet detention ponds.

Non-residential development is restricted to 24% impervious cover if wet detention ponds are not used. High density development is restricted to up to 50% impervious cover with the use of wet detention ponds.

To the extent that any other areas within the Mountain Island Lake Watershed are included as protected areas in the State program, the State regulations will apply.

MIL - 5
6. BUFFER REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CRITICAL AND PROTECTED AREAS

Buffers are required along the lake front and perennial streams in the Mountain Island-Lake Watershed. Buffer sizes and allowable uses are outlined in this chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Buffer Size</th>
<th>Allowable Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower and Upper Gar Creek and McDowell Creek Critical Areas</td>
<td>The greater of 100 feet or the 100-year flood plain boundary</td>
<td>Uses allowed in State regulations. Non-impervious hiking paths in the buffer would be allowed to the extent permitted in the State regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of the Lake Front Critical Area</td>
<td>Minimum of 100 feet</td>
<td>Same as for Lower and Upper Gar Creek and McDowell Creek Critical Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Perennial Streams in the Protected Area from their confluence with Gar and McDowell Creeks to the limits of the Protected Area</td>
<td>Minimum of 50 feet for low density and 100 feet for high density development</td>
<td>For the first 30 feet of the buffer, State regulations will apply. Additional land in the buffer beyond the first 30 feet should have no impervious surface but could be used for recreational development purposes. Non-impervious hiking paths allowed to the extent permitted in the State regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>To the extent that it does not conflict with law, 100 feet in the Critical Areas and 50 feet in the Protected Area</td>
<td>Activities allowed in the State regulations, including livestock use of streams for watering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the outer boundaries of the Protected Area to the limits of the Watershed</td>
<td>State guidelines will govern, which are currently 30 feet for low density and 100 feet for high density</td>
<td>State guidelines will apply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the buffer areas adjacent to the Critical Areas of Gar and McDowell Creeks and the Lake Front, no trees larger than 2 inches caliper are to be removed. Trees less than 2 inches in caliper and undergrowth may be removed to be replaced by an effective stabilizing and filtering ground cover. Paths in this area must be constructed to effectively control runoff and erosion. Plans for shore stabilization must receive County approval prior to construction. The County should develop guidelines on acceptable stabilizing and filtering techniques and materials.

In the buffers of the entire Watershed, the County can require enhancement of the buffer when development is being expanded so that the buffer effectively performs its filtering and absorption functions.

The County should begin an education program for property owners and users of the Mountain Island Lake Watershed regarding potential problems with fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides. Within the Watershed buffers, fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides should only be used as recommended by the County Cooperative Extension agent.

7. ENGINEERED DEVICES AND OTHER BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

-- Mecklenburg County should use a combination of site specific and regional wet detention ponds and other best management practices (BMPs) as a set of tools to protect water quality at build-out of the Mountain Island Lake Watershed as permitted by this proposed watershed protection plan.

The public should have ultimate responsibility for permitting, inspecting, operating, and maintaining wet detention ponds and other BMPs. The County should develop an equitable, stable and adequate source of funding to provide for the construction of regional BMPs and the operation and maintenance of BMPs after they are constructed. All those who benefit from water quality should bear the responsibility for this funding.

Mecklenburg County should develop a set of design and operational guidelines for BMPs for use by engineers and property owners. It is critically important that the guidelines and ordinances relating to BMPs be in effect before engineered devices are built in the Watershed.

8. EXISTING DEVELOPMENT

-- Grandfathering provisions of State law and local ordinances shall apply. In general, these allow existing residential uses to expand and previously subdivided lots to be developed. Restricting conditions of the watershed protection plan are:
A. Within the Critical and Protected Areas, any existing residential uses may be expanded without restrictions from these watershed protection requirements but the expansion shall not encroach into the required buffer.

B. Within the Critical Area, existing institutional uses may expand subject to watershed protection plan regulations, but other existing non-residential uses shall not expand. Public utilities may expand in accordance with State regulations.

9. PREVIOUSLY APPROVED DEVELOPMENT -- Grandfathering provisions of State law and local ordinances shall apply.

10. PROHIBITIONS -- Within the Mountain Island Lake Watershed, no new landfills are allowed. Additionally, no treatment or disposal of petroleum contaminated soils shall be allowed. In the Critical Areas, underground and above ground storage tanks of petroleum products or hazardous materials as a principal use are not permitted.

11. ENDORSEMENT OF OTHER PLANS -- To ensure long-term development patterns consistent with watershed protection goals, endorse the County's plan to retain the rural character of Beatties Ford Road (i.e., two lanes) and roads west of Beatties Ford Road, south of N.C. 73 and north of Mount Holly-Huntersville Road. The County should adopt an overlay district for this corridor. Endorse the North and Northwest District Plans regarding historic corridors and road designs that eliminate curbs and gutters.

12. FUTURE INITIATIVES -- The County should consider undertaking all of these future initiatives for more effective watershed protection:

A. Complete the Storm Water Management Study for the McDowell Creek Basin and accelerate the recommended protection plans.

B. Effectively coordinate Planning, Environmental Protection, Health and Engineering staffs to implement and enforce the Watershed Protection Plan. Consider designating a single entity for watershed protection administration.

C. Pursue jointly with Gaston and Lincoln Counties (consistent with requirements of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) and/or seek State legislation to limit the number of boat access areas and/or marinas; to limit the sizes of boats and boat motors; to encourage electric and battery powered boats; to form a Mountain Island Lake Marine Commission.
D. Develop comprehensive spill protection and response program. For specific high risk areas, such as Gar Creek Cove, construct containment areas for potential spills.

E. Promote water conservation to increase the longevity of the McDowell Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant's capacity.

F. Conduct a study on creation of a tree preservation/conservation program. Best forestry management practices should be required for clear cutting activities.

13. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WATERSHED PROTECTION PLAN -- This Watershed Protection Plan shall be implemented through the amendment of applicable zoning and/or subdivision ordinances. Overlay districts should be used where feasible.
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## ESTIMATED ACREAGE AND TAX VALUE

FOR LAND IDENTIFIED FOR ACQUISITION IN THE MOUNTAIN ISLAND LAKE WATERSHED PROTECTION PLAN STAKEHOLDERS COMMITTEE'S PROPOSED PLAN

### LAND IDENTIFIED FOR ACQUISITION BY JANUARY 1, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Value</th>
<th>Estimated Acreage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,600,000</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>Park land in Watershed approved by voters in November 1991 bond referendum (Latta Plantation Park expansion and Water Fowl Refuge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>First 200 feet of undeveloped shore along Gar Creek Cove just east of Mountain Pointe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634,000</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>The 1,000 feet wide corridor along Mountain Island Lake north of the Water Fowl Refuge to Cowan's Ford Dam on the Mecklenburg side of the Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,334,000</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>Subtotal for Land to be Acquired by County by January 1, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,009,810</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Proposed CMUD acquisition of land adjacent to the eastern boundary of the water intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unknown)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed CMUD acquisition of land adjacent to the western boundary of the water intake, which is an undetermined portion of an 826 acre tract owned by Crescent Resources with a total tax value of $4.7+ million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,343,810</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>Subtotal for land to be acquired by County and CMUD by January 1995, which represents approximately 5.7% of the total acreage in the Watershed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LAND IDENTIFIED FOR DONATION AS PART OF DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

- 570 Greenways along Gar, McDowell, and Torrence Creeks
- $9,343,810 2,286 Subtotal, which represents approximately 7.6% of the total acreage in the Watershed
### LAND IDENTIFIED FOR ACQUISITION AS AVAILABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Value</th>
<th>Estimated Acreage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$12,360,000</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>Proposed 20-year CMUD acquisition of available land within one-fourth of a mile of Mountain Island Lake (Note 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Farms west of Beatties Ford Road within the Watershed, using Farmland Preservation Bonds (Notes 1 and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$24,360,000</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>Subtotal for Land to be Acquired as Available, which represents approximately 8% of the total acreage in the Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$33,703,810</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>TOTAL LAND TO BE ACQUIRED BY THE COUNTY AND CMUD PER PROPOSED STAKEHOLDERS' PLAN, WHICH REPRESENTS APPROXIMATELY 15.6% OF THE TOTAL ACREAGE IN THE WATERSHED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1** -- An estimate of $10,000 per acre was used for any land that was not specifically identified by tax parcels.

**Note 2** -- The total bond authorization for Farmland Preservation is $10 million. This authorization expires in November 1993. The County's next bond sale is not anticipated until fall 1993.
# LOCAL WATERSHED PROTECTION PLAN SCHEDULE

**PROJECTED AS OF MAY 18, 1992**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 1992</td>
<td>County Commissioners receive as information the draft of proposed local plan (policy statement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1992</td>
<td>Educational workshops held in the Cornelius and Huntersville areas for the public to learn about the proposed local plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June/July 1992</td>
<td>County Commissioners hold public hearing. Appointed boards (Planning Commission, Environmental Protection Commission, Drainage Advisory Board) forward recommendations to County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1992</td>
<td>County Commissioners set standards for watershed protection and provide guidance for staff to proceed with development of ordinance language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff develops ordinances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Commission reviews ordinances and sets date for public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Commissioners hold public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1992</td>
<td>County Commissioners adopt ordinances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Staff that will be developing ordinances will consist of representatives of Planning, County Engineering, Environmental Protection, CMUD, and the County Attorney)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATE</th>
<th>COLOR</th>
<th>STRUCTURES IN RIGHT-OF-WAY AND/OR EASEMENT</th>
<th>STREAM/CREEK CROSSINGS</th>
<th>LENGTH (MILES)</th>
<th>OTHER IMPACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>0/Residential 0/Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-Crosses historic property. -Crosses gas pipelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>0/Residential 0/Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-Crosses historic property. -Crosses gas pipelines -Lines up with Brown's Cove Park entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>2 Residential 0/Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-Runs along historic property line. -Crosses gas pipelines -Lines up with Brown's Cove Park entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Magenta</td>
<td>0/Residential 0/Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-Crosses historic property. -Crosses gas pipelines -Runs along CMUD sanitary sewer line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>0/Residential 0/Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-Runs along historic property line. -Crosses gas pipelines -Intersects proposed Vance Road Extension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CITY OF CHARLOTTE
WORKERS' COMPENSATION
CURRENT SYSTEM
AND
RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO WORKERS' COMPENSATION PROGRAM
JUNE 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT POLICY</th>
<th>8 DAYS - 365 DAYS</th>
<th>BEYOND 365 DAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST 7 DAYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Compensation payment = 0</td>
<td>Workers Compensation payment = 2/3 salary*;</td>
<td>Workers Compensation pay. = 2/3 salary*;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City supplements = full salary and restores vacation/sick leave</td>
<td>City supplement = 1/3 salary;</td>
<td>City supplement = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee pays 0;</td>
<td>Employee pays 0;</td>
<td>Employee may use partial vacation/sick leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 21 days, WC pays for first seven days*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO WORKERS' COMP PROGRAM</th>
<th>31 DAYS - 365 DAYS</th>
<th>BEYOND 365 DAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST 7 DAYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Compensation payment = 0</td>
<td>Workers Compensation payment= 2/3 salary*;</td>
<td>Workers Compensation pay. = 2/3 salary*;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City supplement = 0</td>
<td>City supplement = 0</td>
<td>City supplement = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee uses vac/sick/leave w/o pay</td>
<td>Employee may use partial vac/sick leave</td>
<td>Employee may use partial vacation/sick leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee pays 0;</td>
<td>Employee pays 0;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 21 days, WC pays for first seven days*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*mandated by NC State Industrial Commission (upto a max of $426)
### Police Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekly Gross Pay</strong></td>
<td>$547.41</td>
<td>$547.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekly Take Home Pay</strong></td>
<td><strong>$369.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>$369.81</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less standard deductions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYEE ON WORKER'S COMP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3 Worker's Comp Pay</td>
<td>$364.94</td>
<td>$364.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Supplement*</td>
<td>$145.81</td>
<td>$487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Take Home Pay</td>
<td><strong>$510.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>$369.81</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Regular Take Home Pay</td>
<td>138%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NC Police WC Supplement</strong></td>
<td>+ $60 00***</td>
<td>+ $60 00***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sanitation Crew Chief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekly Gross Pay</strong></td>
<td>$304.82</td>
<td>$304.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekly Take Home Pay</strong></td>
<td><strong>$228.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>$228.54</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less standard deductions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYEE ON WORKER'S COMP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3 Worker's Comp Pay</td>
<td>$203.22</td>
<td>$203.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Supplement*</td>
<td>$93.83</td>
<td>$25.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Take Home Pay</td>
<td><strong>$297.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>$228.54</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Regular Take Home Pay</td>
<td>130%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Proposed that the new City supplement be paid after 30 days. Employee can use sick or vacation leave during first 30 days for no deduction in net pay.

** Current City supplement provides employees with 1/3 gross salary. With Worker’s Comp payments of 2/3 of gross salary, City employees receive the equivalent of full gross salary. This has resulted in take home salaries that are substantially higher than normal net pay because taxes and retirement are not paid on Worker’s Comp payments.

*** NC Police Worker’s Comp Supplement increases to $140.00 while a Police Officer is in the hospital.
January 9, 1992

Mayor Richard Vinroot  
Charlotte City Council  
600 East Fourth Street  
Charlotte, NC 28202

Dear Richard:

The Convention & Visitors Bureau Citizens Advisory Committee was created in 1984 to provide advice and counsel to the CCVB Board of Directors, especially during the Bureau's formative years. The committee was extremely helpful as the Board developed its operating policies and as the staff created its marketing programs.

Today, however, the committee's charge has largely been fulfilled. With both a City Council Member and the City Manager serving on our Board of Directors, and with the close working relationship that exists between both Bureau and City staffs, the need for the Advisory Committee has significantly decreased.

At our January 3 Executive Committee meeting, Council Member Scarborough suggested that we recommend the discontinuation of the Advisory Committee and amend our bylaws to allow City Council to appoint two individuals to our Board to provide additional citizen input. The Executive Committee asked me to communicate its support for this recommendation to you.

Thank you for the excellent support you have provided us in our efforts to market Charlotte. Have a safe and happy 1992.

Best regards,

Wayne Shusko, Chairman
CCVB Board of Directors

WS

cc: CCVB Executive Committee  
Wendell White

Note: Individually mailed to Charlotte City Council members.
The City Within a City Loan/Equity Pool Program will allow the participating 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 "City Within a City" 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 funds loaned. If the $1,340,000 of City funds is committed, at a minimum 134 jobs will be created. At minimum wage of $4.25 per hour, these 134 jobs will create an annual payroll of $1,184,560.

Each bank will have its committed funds available to be used in conjunction with the City funds to make loans to eligible borrowers. 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).

This program is an innovative approach to providing loans for targeted areas in that marginal loans that the banks might not have made will be approved by the banks (with the use of City funds as quasi-equity).

There are risks involved in this program since the City funds are subordinated to the bank funds, and the City funds would be written off before the bank funds. However, risk is somewhat mitigated in that the bank will not use relaxed approval guidelines but will utilize their standard underwriting criteria when approving loan, thereby assuring high quality loans are approved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Front Loader - 4 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Catch Basin Sewer Cleaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Backhoe, Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Backhoe, Heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dump Truck - 8 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4X4 Vehicle - 8 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pick Up - 8 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pick Up - 4 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dump Truck - 8 Cyl. GVV14501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lawnmower - 3 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tractor - 52 HP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Police Cars - Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fire Engines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Computer Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sedan - 8 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sedan - 4 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Garbage Packers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Animal Control Trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stepvan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pick Up - 6 Cyl. GVV6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cargo Van - 6 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cargo Van - 8 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bucket Truck - 8 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pick Up - 8 Cyl. GVV8600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pick Up - 8 Cyl. GVV6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4X4 Vehicle - 4 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Station Wagon - 4 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Passenger Van - 6 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Passenger Van - 8 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Utility Truck - 8 Cyl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT YEAR MUNICIPAL SERVICE DISTRICTS

REVENUE SHORTFALL

ISSUE

CUDC and CCD are experiencing revenue shortfalls in the FY92 revenues due to successful appeals

to the recent property revaluation and to the general economic climate. The shortfall will have to be

made up primarily from an appropriation from fund balance, but some portion may be recovered from reduced

expenditures. The problem was identified with approximately one-quarter of the fiscal year remaining.

An overview of the situation follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>FY92 CONTRACT</th>
<th>FY92 BUDGET</th>
<th>REVISED FY92 REVENUE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>FUND BALANCE AS % OF BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (CUDC)</td>
<td>$357,100</td>
<td>$462,576</td>
<td>$412,032</td>
<td>($50,544)</td>
<td>$171,644 37 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (CCD)</td>
<td>$109,771</td>
<td>$139,246</td>
<td>$138,128</td>
<td>($1,118)</td>
<td>$67,186 48 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (CCD)</td>
<td>$266,868</td>
<td>$363,871</td>
<td>$306,232</td>
<td>($57,639)</td>
<td>$116,900 32 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: General Fund Fund Balance will be just under 9% as of July 1, 1992.

NOTE: Difference between Contract and Budget is the charge for city services.

OPTIONS

Staff suggests three options for Council consideration:

Option 1  Appropriate the shortfall out of tax Districts fund balances

Option 2  Appropriate the shortfall out of General Fund Fund Balance

Option 3  Share the burden between the Districts and the General Fund. A 50/50 split would require CUDC to pay $25,272 from fund balance, CCD to pay $29,379 and the General Fund to pay $54,650.
## LISTING OF BRIDGES TO BE REPAIRED

### DOWNTOWN AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>Route - Across</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>E. 12th St. over Tryon St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Baxter St. over Little Sugar Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Pedestrian Walkway over E. 4th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>Pedestrian Walkway over S. College St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Pedestrian Walkway over S. McDowell St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>Pedestrian Walkway over W. 1st St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA - I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>Route - Across</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Matheson Ave. over Southern RR &amp; Brevard St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Woodward Ave. over Southern RR Spur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Kentbrook Dr. over Little Sugar Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA - II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>Route - Across</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Park Rd. over Little Sugar Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Park Rd. over Briar Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Michael Baker Pl. over Briar Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Archdale Dr. over Little Sugar Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Brandywine Ave. over Little Sugar Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Hillside Ave. over Little Sugar Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>East Blvd. over Little Sugar Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Brunswick Ave. over Little Sugar Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Tyvola Rd. over Little Hope Creek Tributary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA - III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>Route - Across</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Clanton Rd. over Irwin Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Barringer Dr. over Irwin Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Wilmount Rd. over Southern RR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Morris Field Dr. over Southern RR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Westmont Dr. over Southern RR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Old Steele Creek Rd. over Southern RR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA - IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>Route - Across</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Southwest Blvd. over Stewart Creek Tributary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Tuckaseegee Rd. over Stewart Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Tuckaseegee Rd. over Piedmont &amp; Northern RR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA - V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>Route - Across</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Bum Branch Rd. over Gum Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Paw Creek Rd. over Paw Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND

- Property Address: 1704 Pegram Street
- Owner: B & K Enterprises
- Census Tract: #8
- Council District: #1
- Date of Inspection: 9/19/90
- Owner Notified of Hearing: 9/21/90
- Hearing Held: 10/17/90
- 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 was advertised in the Mecklenburg Times because the owner could not be served by certified mail.
- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling by: 2/4/91
- Structure Occupied: No
- Repairs include major structural and mechanical and minor electrical and plumbing.
- The extension was requested because there was a defective storm drain running beneath the house which had caused foundation damage.
- During this seven-month period, the storm drainage problem was to be corrected by the City, and the owner was to correct the Housing Code violations.
- According to the Engineering Department, a bid to repair the storm drain will be presented to City Council on May 26, 1992. Pending Council's approval of the bid, the storm drain repairs should begin within 30 days.
- The owner has made no repairs since City Council's approval of the extension on December 9, 1991.
- Feasibility to Save or Demolish Structure:

As part of the Acquisition/Disposition Program (ADP), an analysis has been performed by CD staff. It has been determined it is not feasible to rehabilitate the structure at 1704 Pegram Street (See Exhibit A). In this case, demolition is being recommended because: (1) the estimated In Rem Repair cost is $16,610, which is 241.8% of the 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.
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION PROGRAM EVALUATION GUIDE
ADP ANALYSIS

ADDRESS 1704 Program Street  Census #

I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order: In Rem Repair
Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Order</th>
<th>Code Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Rem Repair</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective Year

Structure Built

Style

Structure Built

Style

# Bedrooms

3

Sq. Ft. (House)

125

Civil Penalty

N/A

Amount

Date

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $6,870
B. Land Value $10,300
C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair to Code Standards $16,610
D. % of C divided by A < 65% of Value

% 24/8 Yes No

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to NDS.

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) $33,777
   125/ sq.ft. x $27.00 per sq.ft.
3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $-0-
4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $31,000
   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

   NONE. Outstanding loan on property and rehabilitation costs will make it almost impossible to acquire other 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 B1 zoning.

4. Explain Proposed External Sale of House

   NONE. Did not solicit interest from the two non-profits in the Belmont area because it is not likely either would be interested. Belmont CDC does not have any money to operate now and Habitat's purchase price ceiling is $10,000 with a structure in good repair on the lot. Also, the storm drainage problem has not been repaired yet.
D. Comments owner has not been successful with obtaining a bank loan to regain property. He is interested in "dealing the best alternative to preserve the structure, " rental rehabilitation loan. However, he is aware of the limited funding available for private investors from the CA. He plans to request a city council extension on the code for action on self property to a buyer who can afford to make repairs.

Name [illegible]

Date Completed 5-13-92

V. Rehabilitation Feasibility/New Construction

I. 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 [illegible]

Date Completed [illegible]

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  [Signature]  Decline

Director's Comment/Concerns:

[Handwritten notes]
BACKGROUND

- Property Address: 1006 Allen Street
- Owner: Golden Roberts & wife, Emma
- Census Tract: #8
- Council District: #1
- Date of Inspection: 5/1/90
- Case was delayed until October 1990 because the owner applied for rehabilitation assistance. The owner cancelled the loan application; therefore, the code enforcement process resumed.
- Owner Notified of Hearing: 10/29/90 (mail returned)
- Title search received in January 1991 revealed parties in interest to the property.
- Complaint & Notice of Hearing and Findings of Fact & Order were advertised in the Mecklenburg Times because the owner could not be served by certified mail.
- Owner Notified of Hearing: 2/1/91
- Hearing Held: 2/11/91
- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling by: 3/11/91
- Structure Occupied: No
- Repairs include major structural, mechanical and plumbing.
- Feasibility to Save or Demolish Structure:

As part of the Acquisition/Disposition Program (ADP), an analysis has been performed by CD staff. It has been determined it is not feasible to rehabilitate the structure at 1006 Allen Street (See Exhibit A). In this case, demolition is being recommended because the estimated In Rem Repair cost is $8,930, which is 107% of the value of the structure; and, although the estimated cost of $47,136 to acquire and rehabilitate the structure is within the City's replacement cost average, this structure is in such poor condition that the economic life of the structure cannot be extended even with the repairs.
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION PROGRAM EVALUATION GUIDE
ADP ANALYSIS

ADDRESS 1006 Allen St, Census # 8

I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order: In Rem Repair
Demolition

Effective Year
Structure Built 1929
Style
# Bedrooms
Sq. Ft. (House) 1278
Civil Penalty
Amount 452.2
Date

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $83,800
B. Land Value $42,500

SUB-TOTAL TAX VALUE $126,300

C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair to Code Standards

TOTAL $89,300

D. % of C divided by A 107.8% 65% of Value Yes No

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to NDS.

Name
Date Completed 3-10-92

II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property

Information received from HRS II Date 10-28-91

1. Negotiated Acquisition (Tax Value) $12,630
2. Rehabilitation (Substantial) $34,506
   (based on average cost of CD rehabilitation x sq.ft. in house)
   1278 sq.ft. x $27.00 per sq.ft.)
3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $0
4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $0

TOTAL $47,136

Is Total > $50,000 Yes No

* Chief Rehabilitation Specialist's feasibility analysis dated 11-13-91 determined that it was not to repair property because the economic life of the structure would
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: 5-18-92

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

   None

4. Explain Proposed External Sale of House

   Habitat offered to acquire this property if it were donated "cost-free" to them by the owner. The owner is not willing to sell the property.
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.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

APPROVAL ___ DECLINE ___

Signature: 5-18-92

DIRECTOR'S CONCERNS:

Doomsday after what

Consequences and call to halt
BACKGROUND

- Property Address: 1201 Louise Avenue
- Owner: Bernard C. Jamison
- Census Tract: #8
- Council District: #1
- Date of Inspection: 12/10/90
- Owner Notified of Hearing: 12/12/90
- Hearing Held: 1/10/91
- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling by: 2/25/91 (mail unclaimed) 4/25/91 (mail unclaimed)

- Title search received in May 1991 revealed no party in interest to the property.
- The Findings of Fact & Order to demolish the property was advertised in the Mecklenburg Times because the owner could not be served by certified mail.

- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling by: 5/17/91
- Structure Occupied: No
- Repairs include major structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing.
- Feasibility to Save or Demolish Structure:

As part of the Acquisition/Disposition Program (ADP), an analysis has been performed by CD staff. It has been determined it is not feasible to rehabilitate the structure at 1201 Louise Avenue (See Exhibit A). In this case, demolition is being recommended because the estimated In Rem Repair cost is $6,835, which is 102% of the value of the structure; and, although the estimated cost of $34,667 to acquire and rehabilitate the structure is within the City's replacement cost average, this structure is in such poor condition that the economic life of the structure cannot be extended even with the repairs.
EXHIBIT A

4-27-92

DATE

NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION PROGRAM EVALUATION GUIDE
ADP ANALYSIS

ADDRESS: 1201 LOUISIANA

Census # 6

I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order: In Rem Repair

 Demolition

Effective Year

Structure Built 1925

Style

# Bedrooms

Sq. Ft. (House) 910

Civil Penalty

Amount $ 3580

Date

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $ 6710

B. Land Value $ 3000

SUB-TOTAL TAX VALUE $ 9710

C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair to Code Standards $ 6875

TOTAL $ 6875

D. % of divided by 102 %

< 65% of Value Yes No

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to NDS.

Name

Date Completed 4-27-92

II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property

Information received from HRS II Date 4-27-92

1. Negotiated Acquisition (Tax Value) $ 9710 (Habitat offered $ 2000)

2. Rehabilitation (Substantial) $ 34,840

(based on average cost of CD rehabilitation x sq.ft. in house)

920 sq.ft. x $ 27.00 per sq.ft.)

3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $ 117.01

4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $ - 0 -

TOTAL $ 34,667.01

Is Total > $50,000 Yes No
III. Amount of Civil Penalties

$3790 to 5 18-92

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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: C. Wallace
Date Completed: 5-18-92

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

   None other than sell property to Habitat.

4. Explain Proposed External Sale of House

   On 12-3-91, Habitat offered $2000 to buy property and has plans to demolish house. However, beyond Tamara, the owner, refused Habitat's offer and accepted an offer from Willie Patterson. The sale has not closed yet.
D. Comments

Even though the cost to acquire and rehabilitate
structure is within CD replacement cost average, the
physical condition of the structure is very poor (less
than original show). Also, the house has electrical
and plumbing problems and is tainted by an oil lease.

Name  Wallace
Date Completed  5-18-92

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.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

APPROVAL __    DECLINE __

SIGNATURE

5-872

DIRECTOR'S CONCERNS:

Demolish the barn after
which follows for fence

____________________

____________________
- Property Address: 1016 Allen Street
- Owner: Charles B. Tricebock & wife/Constance
- Census Tract: #8
- Council District: #1
- Date of Inspection: 2/21/90
- Owner Notified of Hearing: 5/22/90
- Hearing Held: 6/8/90
- Owner Ordered to Repair Dwelling by: 8/8/90

- Title search received in April 1990 revealed a party in interest to the property.

- No repairs were made as of 8/8/90, therefore, bids were solicited from contractors for repair. All bids received were more than 65% of the tax value of the dwelling. Repair estimates were re-evaluated. The estimated cost to repair exceeded the value of the structure by more than 65%; therefore, the structure was ordered to be demolished.

- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling by: 7/17/91 (mail unclaimed)

- The Findings of Fact and Order to demolish the property was advertised in the Mecklenburg Times because the owner could not be served by certified mail.

- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling by: 9/11/91

- Structure Occupied: No

- Repairs include major structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing.

- Feasibility to Save or Demolish Structure:

  As part of the Acquisition/Disposition Program (ADP), an analysis has been performed by CD staff. It has been determined it is not feasible to rehabilitate the structure at 1016 Allen Street (See Exhibit A). In this case, demolition is being recommended because: (1) the estimated In Rem Repair cost is $8,470, which is 69.6% of the value of the structure and (2) the estimated cost of $53,240 to acquire and rehabilitate the structure makes it not economically feasible to do.
EXHIBIT A

DATE 3-25-92

NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
ACQUISITION/DISPOSSESSION PROGRAM EVALUATION GUIDE
ADP ANALYSIS

ADDRESS 1016 Allen Street

Census #

I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order: In Rem Repair
Detolition

X

Effective Year
Structure Built
Style
# Bedrooms
Sq. Ft. (House)
Civil Penalty
Amount
Date

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $12,170
B. Land Value $2,500

SUB-TOTAL TAX VALUE $14,670

C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair to Code Standards $8,470

TOTAL $23,140

D. % of C divided by A
< 65% of Value Yes ___ No X

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to NDS.

Name __________ Date Completed 3-25-92

II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property

Information received from HRS II Date 4-22-92

1. Negotiated Acquisition (Tax Value) $14,670
2. Rehabilitation (Substantial) $38,394
   (based on average cost of CD rehabilitation x sq.ft. in house)
   ______ sq.ft. x $27.00 per sq.ft.)
3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $176.78 '91 taxes
4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $2  Note: report available
   as of 5-18-92
   TOTAL $53,240.78

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

Date Completed 5-18-92

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
   None other than sell vacant lot to Habitat.

4. Explain Proposed External Sale of House
   Habitat is interested in the vacant lot. Prior owner of record, Mr. & Mrs. Charles Tracebock, released ownership of this property due to bankruptcy. The current owner of record is shown as Anthony Preston and wife, who are located in Florida. See tax information pulled up on 5-18-92.
D. Comments

House is not vacant; however, occupants are probably squatters. I saw three black males there on 5-17-92. They claim to be renting from Mr. Bruce at 1013 N. Allen St. Sept 1, but Mr. Bruce is not the current owner of record.

Name ____________________________
Date Completed 5-18-92

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  

Director's Comment/Concerns:

demolish after which
following for condemnation I will 
the defendant
BACKGROUND

- Property Address: 1810 West Boulevard
- Owner: Flossie Roper Lynn
- Census Tract: #39.00
- Council District: #3
- Date of Inspection: 9/10/91
- Owner Notified of Hearing: 9/11/91
- Hearing Held: 9/30/91
- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling By: 12/1/91

An update to a previous title report dated February 1991 revealed no other parties in interest to the property.

- Structure Occupied: No
- Repairs include major structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing.
- Feasibility to Save or Demolish Structure:

As part of the Acquisition/Disposition Program (ADP), an analysis has been performed by CD staff. It has been determined it is not feasible to rehabilitate the structure at 1810 West Boulevard (See Exhibit A). In this case, demolition is being recommended because: (1) the estimated In Rem Repair cost is $21,695, which is 172% of the value of the structure and (2) the estimated cost of $74,473 to acquire and rehabilitate the structure makes it not economically feasible to do.
EXHIBIT A

DATE 3-17-92

NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION PROGRAM EVALUATION GUIDE
ADP ANALYSIS

ADDRESS 1810 West Blvd (117-022-08) Census # 3900

I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order: In Rem Repair
Demolition

Effective Year
Structure Built 1941
Style
# Bedrooms 3
Sg. Ft. (House) 864
Civil Penalty
Amount 4310
Date 3-12-92

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $12,600
B. Land Value $714,000
C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair to Code Standards $21,195
D. % of C divided by A 17.8 %
< 65% of Value Yes No

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to NDG.

Name
Date Completed 2-12-92

II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property

Information received from HRS II Date 5-8-92

1. Negotiated Acquisition (Tax Value) $48,460
2. Rehabilitation (Substantial) $21,328
   (based on average cost of CD rehabilitation x sq.ft. in house)
   864 sq.ft. x $27.00 per sq.ft.
3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $2,545
4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $0 (Civil complaint & filed - divorce)

TOTAL $74,473

Is Total > $50,000 Yes No
III. Amount of Civil Penalties

$4,310

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: [Signature]
Date Completed: 5-20-97

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

4. Explain Proposed External Sale of House
   The cost to acquire and rehab exceeds
   CD's replacement housing house.
D. Comments

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

Name
Date Completed____________________

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:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
BACKGROUND

- Property Address: 842 Reliance Street
- Owner: Robert P. Catoe and wife, Betty O.
- Census Tract: #43.02
- Council District: #2
- Date of Inspection: 9/11/91
- Owner Notified of Hearing: 9/12/91
- Hearing Held: 9/30/91
- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling by: 10/30/91
- Title search received in November 1991 and revealed no parties in interest to the property.
- Findings of Fact & Order were advertised in the Mecklenburg Times because of being unable to serve the owner by certified mail.
- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling by: 1/18/92
- Structure Occupied: No
- Repairs include major structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing.
- Feasibility to Save or Demolish Structure:

As part of the Acquisition/Disposition Program (ADP), an analysis has been performed by CD staff. It has been determined it is not feasible to rehabilitate the structure at 842 Reliance Street (See Exhibit A). In this case, demolition is being recommended because the estimated In Rem Repair cost is $7,730, which is 143% of the value of the structure; and although the estimated cost of $39,348 to acquire and rehabilitate the structure is within the City's replacement cost average, this structure is in such poor condition that the economic life of the structure cannot be extended even with the repairs.
ADDRESS 842 Rehaan Staut Census # 4302

I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order: In Rem Repair Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Built</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Bedrooms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq. Ft. (House)</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Penalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>3-17-92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $5420
B. Land Value $5500
C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair to Code Standards $7730
D. % of C divided by A 143% < 65% of Value Yes No

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to NDS.

Name: M. S. Miller
Date Completed: 3-17-92

II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property

Information received from HRS II Date 5-20-92

1. Negotiated Acquisition (Tax Value) $10,920
2. Rehabilitation (Substantial) $28,290
   (based on average cost of CD rehabilitation x sq.ft. in house)
   1049 sq.ft. x $27.00 per sq.ft.
3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $132
4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $0

TOTAL $39,342

Is Total > $50,000 Yes No
III. Amount of Civil Penalties

$1540

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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Date Completed 5-20-92

B. Proposed Use (to be completed by NDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Sell to Interested Purchaser Externally

2. Retain for Use Internally

3. Explain Proposed Internal Use of House

4. Explain Proposed External Sale of House

Mail to the CMHP to see if interested in acquiring and rehabbing for single, affordable housing for low-income families. The CMHP was not interested in the property.
D. Comments
The repairing of the house would not extend the economic life of the house due to its very bad condition.

Name ____________________________
Date Completed ____________________

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 [Signature] Decline ___

Director's Comment/Concerns:
BACKGROUND

- Property Address: 3404-06 Boyd Street
  (AKA 130 Oregon Street)
- Owner: Michael Kirkley & W/Wanda
- Census Tract: #45.00
- Council District: #2
- Date of Inspection: 7/3/91
- Owner Notified of Hearing: 7/11/91
- Hearing Held: 7/25/91
- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling By: 9/5/91
- Letter received on 8/12/91 from owner stating plans to repair the dwelling.
- Supplemental Order to Repair Issued: 9/10/91
- Wmner Ordered to Repair Dwelling By: 10/15/91
- Two Extension of Time Requests were approved extending the compliance date to 12/23/91.
- Title search received in April 1992 revealed parties in interest to the property.
- Parties in interest Ordered to Demolish the Dwelling by: 5/21/92
- Structure Occupied: No
- Repairs include major structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing.
- Feasibility to Save or Demolish Structure:

As part of the Acquisition/Disposition Program (ADP), an analysis has been performed by CD staff. It has been determined it is not feasible to rehabilitate the structure at 3404-06 Boyd Street (aka 130 Oregon Street) (See Exhibit A). In this case, demolition is being recommended because: (1) the estimated In Rem Repair cost is $49,110, which is 862% of the value of the structure and (2) the estimated cost of $55,180 to acquire and rehabilitate the structure makes it not economically feasible to do.
Neighborhood Development Division
Acquisition/Disposition Program Evaluation Guide
ADP Analysis

Address: 3404-06 Boyd Street (D65-127-04) Census #: 45.06

I. Code Enforcement Cost Review (to be completed by HRS II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Order:</th>
<th>In Rem Repair Demolition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Year:</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Built:</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Bedrooms:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq. Ft. (House):</td>
<td>1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Penalty:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount:</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>3-30-92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $57,000
B. Land Value $25,000

**SUB-TOTAL TAX VALUE** $82,000

C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair to Code Standards $49,110

**TOTAL** $57,310

D. % of C divided by A 86.2%
   < 65% of Value Yes No

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to NDS.
   Name: [Blank]
   Date Completed: 3-30-92

II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property

Information received from HRS II Date: 5-28-92

1. Negotiated Acquisition (Tax Value) $8,200
2. Rehabilitation (Substantial) $41,980
   (based on average cost of CD rehabilitation x sq.ft. in house)
3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $0
4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $32,950 on 3400 Boyd Street
   (Outstanding Loan of $32,950 on 3400 Boyd Street)

**TOTAL** $55,180

Is Total > $50,000 Yes No
III. Amount of Civil Penalties

$1070

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></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: [Signature]
Date Completed: 5-20-92

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
   NONE

4. Explain Proposed External Sale of House
   Property sale discussed with Jeanne Robertson, Director of Lakewood CDC in March, 1992. Nonprofit only interested in vacant lot, not repairing damaged structure. Lakewood CDC is requesting funds for acquisition and rehabilitation from CMHP
D. Comments

Pursue purchase of vacant lot; echo Lakemen
CDC has available financial resources

Name: Wallace
Date Completed: 5-20-99

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:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
**BACKGROUND**

- **Property Address:** 227 West Todd Lane
- **Owner:** Clarence Watson and wife, Vera
- **Census Tract:** #60.02
- **Council District:** #2
- **Date of Inspection:** 3/14/90
- **Title search received in September 1990 revealed no parties in interest to the property.**
  - **Owner Notified of Hearing:** 6/19/90 (mail unclaimed)
  - **Hearing Held:** 11/19/90
  - **Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling By:** 12/28/90
  - **Five extensions of time were requested and granted, totaling approximately 8 months.**
  - **Owner Ordered to demolish dwelling by:** 8/15/91
  - **Structure Occupied:** No
- **Repairs include major structural, mechanical and plumbing.**
- **Feasibility to Save or Demolish Structure:**

As part of the Acquisition/Disposition Program (ADP), an analysis has been performed by CD staff. It has been determined it is not feasible to rehabilitate the structure at 227 West Todd Lane (See Exhibit A). In this case, demolition is being recommended because: (1) the estimated In Rem Repair cost is $10,455, which is 1000% of the value of the structure and (2) although the estimated cost to acquire and rehabilitate this structure is $15,840, it cannot be rehabilitated because it would not meet our Housing Code standards regarding room size since the structure contains only approximately 420 sq. ft.
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
ACQUISITION/DISPOSITION PROGRAM EVALUATION GUIDE
ADP ANALYSIS

ADDRESS 227 W. Todd Ave (057014) Census # 6001

I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order:  In Rem Repair
Demolition

Effective Year
Structure Built
Style
# Bedrooms
Sq. Ft. (House)
Civil Penalty
Amount
Date

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $ 0
B. Land Value $ 4,500

SUB-TOTAL TAX VALUE $ 4,500

C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair
to Code Standards $ 10,455

TOTAL $ 14,955

D. % of C divided by A  100% %
< 65% of Value Yes No

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to NDS.

Name McMillan
Date Completed 3-13-92

II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property

Information received from HRS II Date 4-22-92

1. Negotiated Acquisition (Tax Value) $ 4,500
2. Rehabilitation (Substantial) $ 11,340
   (based on average cost of CD
   rehabilitation x sq.ft. in house)
   426 sq.ft. x $27.00 per sq.ft.
3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $ 0
4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $ 6

TOTAL $ 15,940

Is Total > $50,000 Yes No
III. Amount of Civil Penalties

$2,200

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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
Date Completed 4-22-93

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

   New Zion Baptist Church is not down to the property and Rev. Robinson started on 4-21-92. The church is very interested in vacant lot and my family is still debating situation. It sells price is less than the value. I am to send them a package on this property. I believe both parties of the church of action is played by you. Rev. Robinson is

4. Explain Proposed External Sale of House

   Friends with the property and have talked with owners in the past about acquiring it but negotiations never moved forward. In the past with owners, I had not contacted owners yet.
D. Comments
Demolish house and sell vacant lot to New Zion Baptist Church or broker with winner to sell to church before demolition.

Please advise.

Name ________________
Date Completed ________

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  

Director's Comment/Concerns:

Insert to order to carry out the demolition order
- Property Address: 3400 Boyd Street
  Apt. 1 and 2
  (AKA 130 Oregon Street)

- Owner: Michael Kirkley & W/Wanda

- Census Tract: #45.00

- Council District: #2

- Date of Inspection: 7/3/91

- Owner Notified of Hearing: 7/11/91

- Hearing Held: 7/25/91

- Owner Ordered to Demolish Dwelling By: 9/5/91

- Letter received on 8/12/91 from owner stating plans to repair the dwelling.

- Supplemental Order to Repair Issued: 9/10/91

- Two Extension of Time Requests were approved extending the compliance date to 12/23/91.

- Title search received in April 1992 revealed parties in interest to the property.

- Parties in interest Ordered to Demolish the Dwelling by: 5/21/92

- Structure Occupied: No

- Repairs include major structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing.

- Feasibility to Save or Demolish Structure:

As part of the Acquisition/Disposition Program (ADP), an analysis has been performed by CD staff. It has been determined it is not feasible to rehabilitate the structure at 3400 Boyd Street, Apt. 1 and 2 (aka 130 Oregon Street)(See Exhibit A). In this case, demolition is being recommended because: (1) the estimated In Rem Repair cost is $39,910, which is 710% of the value of the structure and (2) the estimated cost of $88,050 to acquire and rehabilitate the structure makes it not economically feasible to do.
I. CODE ENFORCEMENT COST REVIEW (to be completed by HRS II)

Code Order:

In Rem Repair

Demolition

Effective Year

Structure Built

1940

Style

Tudor

Bedrooms


Sq. Ft. (House)

1740

Civil Penalty

Amount

1070

Date

2-20-92

A. Current Tax Value of Structure $ 5420
B. Land Value $ 2500

SUB-TOTAL TAX VALUE $ 8120

C. Estimated Cost to In Rem Repair to Code Standards $ 39,910

TOTAL $ 48,030

D. % of C divided by A

110

< 65% of Value Yes No

E. Once HRS II completes above, forward to NDS.

Name

Miller

Date Completed 3-30-92

II. Estimate of Cost to Acquire & Rehabilitate Property

Information received from HRS II Date 5-20-92

1. Negotiated Acquisition (Tax Value) $ 8120

2. Rehabilitation (Substantial) $ 41,980

(based on average cost of CD rehabilitation x sq.ft. in house)

1740 sq.ft. x $27.00 per sq.ft.)

3. Delinquent Taxes (if any) $ 0

4. Outstanding Loans/Liens (if any) $ 32,950

TOTAL $ 88,050

Is Total > $50,000 Yes No
III. Amount of Civil Penalties

$1070

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>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
Date Completed 5-24-92

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

4. Explain Proposed External Sale of House

Property sale discussed with Jeanne Robertson, Director of Lakeview CDC in March, 1992. Nonprofit only interested in vacant lot not repairing prior damage structure. Lakeview CDC in attempt to get funding from CMHP to acquire a rehabilitated property in Lakeview. 
D. Comments

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

Name ________________________
Date Completed ________________

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 _____

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:

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________