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City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office
Request for Council Action

City Council adopt recommendations of the Council Planning Committee concerning storm water rates and fee credits.

Responsible Department: Engineering Department

Explanation of Request

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.
   - $2.80 per month
   - $1.90 per month

B. Single family homes with 2,000 or more square feet of impervious area
   - $3.05 per month
   - $2.40 per month

Commercial, industrial, and other non-single family rates that correspond to the above
   - $43.32 per month
   - $35.42 per month
   - for one impervious acre

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:
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- 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.

**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, which make up the largest category of land parcels. 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 "typical" 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. This perception can be addressed 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.

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.

**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 should also be eligible. A credit is granted only
when on-site storm water controls are constructed and maintained to City
of Charlotte standards.
NOTE: This is an effort to compile the items from my May 27 memo, the June 8 memo concerning modifications, and some items from Don Reid's June 8 proposal. I found it useful for my own purposes to try to put everything together in one place, and I hope it can be useful for others. As before, all additions are are beyond any additions proposed in Manager's budget. Deletions and cost reductions are in addition to any proposed in Manager's budget. Programs affect Operating Budget only, except where shown.

All items have been previously voted on in workshop on May 28 EXCEPT the items indicated in the margin by "****".

1. COMMUNITY SAFETY/CRIMINAL JUSTICE

OBJECTIVES: (1) expand implementation of Community Policing, (2) fund support for criminal justice system based on recommendations of Criminal Justice Commission, and (3) support community based prevention and deterrence programs.

Proposed Additions

a. 50 officers - community policing $1,293,933
   (25 to be funded and 25 to be made available through rightsizing. Total increase of 100 should be added as police training classes can graduate them.)

   Note: includes allocation for non-departmental costs

b. Support for CJC non-equipment requests - clerical positions from rightsizing assigned to Police Dept. and loaned to judges, clerk and D.A. 150,000

c. Support for CJC equipment requests through use of city print shop, city purchasing discounts, surplus equipment and fax. Items requested by CJC at price of $156,040, can be provided by city at a city cost of approximately 30,000

d. Restore Safe Neighborhood Awareness Program in public housing 5,042

e. Contribution to Stop the Killing 10,000

Subtotal Community Safety/Criminal Justice $1,488,975
2. CITY WITHIN A CITY

OBJECTIVES: (1) Provide resources for family support, (2) increase resources directed at helping families avoid displacement from housing, (3) increasing pool of eligible buyers and tenants for Innovative Housing, Housing Partnership and Habitat programs, and (4) support and strengthen neighborhood based non-profit organizations interested in housing and community economic development.

Proposed Additions/Changes

a. Crisis Assistance $63,000
b. YWCA Scattered Sites 12,595
c. Fund CMHP/LSSP Credit counselling and neighborhood legal support 48,000
d. Expand mediation, credit counselling and family assistance, landlord/tenant disputes, establish tenant loan fund for minor rehab repairs 150,000
e. Additional support for community-based programs such as Success by Six, United Way, and others 50,000
f. Support for Children's Services Network (see memo from Ann Hammond and Pat McCrory) 50,000
g. Expand downpayment assistance targetted to help tenants purchase existing units (CDBG) 100,000
h. Expand Belmont model to 2 more neighborhoods, and expand Belmont effort into Villa Heights and Optimist Park 400,000
i. Neighborhood Matching Grants Program $650,000 (as described in attachment)

Subtotal City within a City $1,523,595
3. EMPLOYEE COSTS

OBJECTIVE: Help offset effect of insurance increases and benefit reductions for employees who would not otherwise receive pay adjustment due to normal step increases or longevity payment. This adjustment would do nothing more than help keep employees from suffering a pay cut until the outcome of the pending pay and benefits study is completed.

Proposed Additions

- 2.5% lump sum pay adjustment 7/1/92 for employees who do not receive longevity or step increases (approx. 10% of the workforce) $340,000
- Equalization lump sum for employees whose longevity pay is less than 2.5% 275,000

Total Pay Adjustment $615,000

Note: General fund #s only shown. Other funds not shown.

4. OTHER MISCELLANEOUS

OBJECTIVES: (1) To deal with certain funding decisions which were discussed during the year but deferred to budget time; (2) to address the Cultural Action Plan issues; and (3) to deal with certain other miscellaneous items discussed during budget workshops.

Proposed Additions

a. Restore verbatim minutes $22,341
b. Restore Sister Cities contribution 12,000
c. HDC staff conversion from part-time position to full-time to deal with district expansions 17,000
d. Fund update to disparity study for MWBE program in light of Richmond case 150,000

****

Note: This is a one-time expenditure which would be funded by one-time revenue from the General Fund Fund Balance

e. Contribution toward Option 3 of Cultural Action Plan 196,000

Note: If Option 3 is funded, then no separate funding is required for the Nature Museum. Also, commitment to Option
for FY93 does not mean commitment for PAC funding beyond the terms of the special two-year contract.

f. Lease purchase of Animal Control radios
(This is matched by a funding entry and is a change for purposes of generating funds) 35,000

g. Lease purchase of recycling trucks
(This is matched by a funding entry and is a change for purposes of generating funds) 143,000

Subtotal Miscellaneous $575,341

TOTAL PROPOSED ADDITIONS $4,202,911
5. FUNDING OPTIONS FOR ADDITIONS/CHANGES

FUND BALANCES / REPROGRAMMING FUNDS

Note: The City within a City items listed above are all to be funded from reprogramming either CDBG or General Fund monies already in the proposed budget or from unexpended fund balances drawn from Community Development or Housing programs. The use of fund balances from Innovative Housing and Neighborhood Reinvestment are one-time revenues from prior years' appropriations, but the same appropriations can be made in succeeding years for any amounts appropriated to these two funds in FY93 but remaining unspent at the end of FY93.

General Fund

Existing City within a City line item 138,518
From Neighborhood Reinvestment Fund unused fund balance 500,000
Unappropriated revenues from city rental units, in excess of reserve for maintenance and repair 379,000
Unexpended FY92 Innovative Housing Fund balance 310,000

CDBG or Home Funds

Unexpended balance of existing down payment assistance program 21,000
Other CDBG or Home Grant funds for balance of downpayment assistance item 89,000
From HOME Grant, for eligible items in Neighborhood Matching Grants program 86,077

Subtotal 1,523,595

OTHER SOURCES

Delete Federal Program representative 15,000
Convert from one-time purchase of new Animal Control radio system to lease purchase, at FY93 savings, net of first year's lease purchase contribution of 114,000
Convert from one-time purchase of recycling trucks to lease purchase, at FY93 savings, net of first year’s lease purchase contribution of 505,000

***** Eliminate non-cash incentive awards program 222,747
(Decision on employee incentives and compensation to be made after compensation study)

***** Eliminate Performance Management Unit
Employees in this unit have either been reassigned, are scheduled to be reassigned to other funded positions, or have left city employment. 250,000

***** Reduce travel budgets as set out in Don Reid’s proposal. 67,414

***** Yes Increase rightsizing savings (now budgeted at $4,250,000) to $5,000,000. 750,000

***** .3 cent property tax. 750,000

***** Net General Fund revenue from stormwater utility decision (see below) 250,000

***** Use of FY92 General Fund fund balance for one-time expenditure for MWBE study 150,000

Total Other Sources $3,074,161

Note: This funds all additions in the categories of Crime/Public Safety, Employee Cost, and Other Miscellaneous and leaves a surplus of $394,845. The surplus can be used to do any of several things: (a) fund some of the unfunded items in the list in the following section; (b) offset decision not to adopt some of the cost reductions or cuts listed above; (c) reduce the level of the .3 cent increase; or (d) expand funding of City within a City items.
6. **UNFUNDED ITEMS**

* * * * * 1. Request for contract increase from Family Housing Services $10,000

* * * * * 2. Restoration of reductions in staffing in response to neighborhood street light petitions, neighborhood sidewalk petitions, neighborhood traffic control petitions, etc.

7. **STORMWATER UTILITY CHARGE**

* * * * * Contribution to stormwater utility from General Fund to consist of two components:

1. $2,500,000 (approx.) based on assessment for city-owned impervious acreage.

2. Contribute 1 cent from General Fund (approx. $2,500,000) on an annual basis as a supplement. This number will grow as value of 1 cent grows and will fix the formula for the General Fund contribution.

3. As a result of combination of #1 and #2, approximately $250,000 would be available as a cost savings/reduction for the General Fund.

*Resulting stormwater rates would be less than those advertised at public hearing.*
Mr. Richard Vinroot and Members of the City Council  
City of Charlotte  
CMGC  
600 East Fourth Street  
Charlotte, NC 28202  

Dear Mayor and Members of City Council.

Re: FY 93 Operating Budget

Ref: Mayor Vinroot’s request that we each bring forth proposals for budget changes.

As you all know, I have tried to avoid micro managing the City Manager by recommending specific plans to cut costs. I believe it is the job of the manager to present cost-cutting programs that meet the goals set by the council. However, the City Manager has not brought us a list of potential cost cutting ideas and since some council members believe that finding ways to cut costs is the responsibility of each council member, I have made a list of ideas for your consideration.

These are exceptional times and call for exceptional actions....old habits must be challenged. If all these suggestions are adopted, we would have $8 million; enough to fund Dan Clodfelter’s shortfall, provide additional support to City Within a City, meet the Police Chief’s requests for 126 additional officers, address an employee pay increase and cut the property tax rate by 1.25 cents.

ITEMS OTHER THAN ORGANIZATION OR PERSONNEL:

1. The Office Supply Budget is $576,414. Reduce this budget by at least 9% to reflect the 9% headcount reduction. For example, stop writing internal memos on stationery that has an embossed gold crown logo. Go to a simple printed crown logo. Stop writing internal memos on the highest quality paper. Ditto for envelopes. Use the current expensive and high quality stationery and envelopes only in the Mayor’s office and the City Manager’s office for external communications. The total reduction of 9% would be $51,877.

2. Reduce the travel budget of the Mayor and City Council and the City Manager by 50% Reduce the travel budget of all remaining departments by 25% This will reduce the budget by $67,414.

3. Reduce the Training and Conference budget by 50% from $247,876 to $123,938. This will save $123,938.
4. Reduce Dues and Subscriptions by 50% from $234,301 to $117,150. This will save at least $117,150.

5. Shut off the fountains at CMGC. This saves $28,080 in electricity and $21,008 in maintenance.

6. What are "non-cash" recognition awards for outstanding work by City employees? Who determines and what criteria are used to determine "outstanding"? Reduce this item by 50% which will save $111,373.

7. Chapter V, Subchapter B, Section 5.22 of the City of Charlotte Charter refers to Officers and Funds of the Auditorium-Coliseum-Convention Center Authority. It states:

"....The net proceeds from the operation of the Authority shall be used to pay the interest and retirement on the bonded debt of the City of Charlotte incurred in connection with such auditorium-coliseum-convention center and shall not be used for any other purpose until said bonds, principal and interest have been paid, except as may be otherwise approved by the City Council for other uses of the Authority. Quarterly operating statements of the Authority and an annual audited statement shall be presented to the City Council----" (Two quarters have ended since I have been on City Council and I have not received any "Quarterly operating statements of the Authority, nor do I have the Annual audited statement from FY91.)

The proposed FY93 operating budget for the City's General Fund includes a $7.3 million contribution to the Debt Service Fund. Among the outstanding general obligation bonds serviced by the fund are $37,750,000 for the new coliseum. There are probably some bonds outstanding for other Authority facilities

According to the FY91 Annual Financial Report of the City of Charlotte, there are $5,300,000 of unreserved and undesignated funds in the Authority's fund balance on June 30, 1991. The latest quarterly operating statement can be used to determine the present fund balance.

A significant portion of the Authority's fund balance can be transferred to the Debt Service Fund which will result in reducing the General Fund contribution otherwise necessary, to make the payment on the bonds for the new coliseum and whatever other bonds are still outstanding for Authority facilities. This transfer could be somewhere between $3,000,000 and $5,000,000. This would give us another $3,000,000 to $5,000,000.
ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL CHANGES:

There is room to improve the organization structure of our city. The city has too many levels of bureaucracy and too many supervisors. This is not the way modern organizations run and does not develop the full potential of city employees. The organization structure is the responsibility of the City Council. I suggest we move to a leaner and more effective and more affordable organization.

Let me make quite clear that I am talking about positions and an organizational chart and not about personalities or the effectiveness of individuals.

The City Charter gives the City Council the following right and a responsibility.

From the City Charter, page 85 under CHAPTER 4 ADMINISTRATION

SUBCHAPTER A IN GENERAL
Sec. 4.01. Organization

"The City Council may by ordinance create, combine, consolidate, and abolish such offices, positions, and departments as it may from time to time deem best for the operation of the city government, except as may be otherwise provided by this charter and by the applicable general laws of the State. All offices, positions and departments, as the same may exist from time to time, shall be under the general supervision and direction of the City Manager."

I interpret this to mean that the organizational structure of our government is the council's responsibility. We can create it and we can abolish it. Further I interpret this to mean that whatever organization we create and the people within the organization are under the general supervision and direction of the City Manager except the City Clerk and City attorney who report directly to the City Council.

I am proposing the following changes to the organization to be put into effect immediately:

1. Eliminate the positions of Deputy City Manager and three Assistant City Managers and all of their administrative assistants and secretaries. Create the position of Director, Economic and Social Development, and Director, General Services Administration, each with one administrative assistant and one secretary. (See Organization Chart attached) This will reduce the Budget by over $600,000. (See note #1, page 6)

2. Over and above the proposed position bank, eliminate at least an additional 30 supervisors, managers or directors. If the current supervisory ratio is 1 supervisor to every 7 employees eliminate 30 supervisory positions to go along with the 223
workers in the Position Bank. This would maintain the 1 to 7 ratio. This reduction would result in a $700,000 reduction in FY 93 if accomplished by October, 1992.

3 The Internal Consulting Unit is supposed to generate cost reduction actions. I fully support an effective effort of this sort. However, activities like this are expected to save five to ten times their cost. The budget lists savings from this group at $200,000 whereas this unit's cost is $266,000 (with fringes). Either we should increase the savings goal of this unit to at least five times its cost of $266,000, ($1,330,000) or eliminate this unit for a savings of $66,000.

4 It is my understanding that performance measurement has been the responsibility of Budget and Evaluation for years. Elimination of the Performance Management Unit will save $200,000.

5 The necessity for an Economic Development Department is questionable. It certainly is not essential and rates a very low priority compared to Police, Fire, and Solid Waste. Since this Department duplicates efforts of the Chamber of Commerce, and many other corporate activities, eliminate the Department and save $225,000.

6. The Non-Departmental budget includes $100,000 for "city-wide employee training". There also are $188,322 in Human Resource budget for a similar purpose. Elimination of this Non-Departmental item will save $100,000.

I personally believe that all of these cuts can be made without reducing services to our citizens by one iota.

CHANGE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN DAN CLODFELTER'S PROPOSED BUDGET.

1. The Mayor and some council members have heard from some CEO's in Charlotte that the pay and benefits for City employees are out of line on the high side for our city. The Mayor has appointed a task force to study the levels of pay and benefits to city employees. If Ms. Poteat from the Parks and Rec. department, who made a very persuasive presentation to us at the council meeting on May 26, 1992, is correct, the benefits being paid to city employees may be out of line, on the high side, compared to the benefits being paid to county employees. I propose that we make no provision in this budget for any wage or salary increases to city employees in FY 93. This will reduce the budget proposed by Dan Clodfelter by $615,000.

2. Increase the number of new police officer positions by a net of 126, (requested by the Police Chief), which is 26 more than Dan Clodfelter's proposed budget. Approve the idea of letting Mecklenburg County police officers transfer to the Charlotte Police Department on a lateral basis. If 40 officers would transfer it would save the city $72,000 in training costs and whatever it costs to do background checks on the 200 or so applicants that it is necessary to go through to find 40 who survive that process. Here is how I think this will change Dan Clodfelter's budget proposal:
Reduced cost of training 40 officers who will transfer from county  
= $ 72,000.*
Added cost of 26 officers for 1/2 year  
= $ 535,691
Net change to Dan Clodfelter's proposed budget on Police  
= $ 463,691

*This is for training materials only and does not reflect a share of the 
$800,000 personnel budget for the Police Training Academy.

**SUMMARY OF MY PROPOSALS:**

**ITEMS OTHER THAN ORGANIZATION OR PERSONNEL:**
1. Lower cost of Office Supplies  
= $ 51,877
2. Travel  
= $ 67,414
3. Training and Conferences  
= $ 123,938
4. Dues and Subscriptions  
= $ 117,150
5. Shut off the Fountain at the CMGC  
= $ 49,088
6. Eliminate *Non-Cash* recognition awards  
= $ 111,373
7. Transfer $3,500,000 from Aud, Col, & Conv. Ctnty. Authority  
= $ 3,500,000
   Sub Total, Items other than organization or personnel  
= $ 4,020,840

**ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL CHANGES:**
1. City Manager's Department  
= $ 600,000
2. Supervisory Ratio  
= $ 700,000
3. Eliminate the Internal Consulting Unit  
= $ 56,000
4. Eliminate the Performance Management Unit  
= $ 200,000
5. Eliminate Economic Development Department  
= $ 225,000
6. Eliminate Non-Dept. Employee Training  
= $ 100,000
   Sub Total, Organization and personnel changes:  
= $ 1,891,000

**CHANGE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN DAN CLODFELTER'S PROPOSED BUDGET:**
1. Drop proposed Wage and Salary increases for City employees  
= $ 615,000
2. Add 26 police officers and allow 40 transfers from county  
= $ 463,691
   Sub Total Changes to Dan Clodfelter's proposed budget  
= $ 151,309

**GRAND TOTAL OF DON REID'S PROPOSED SAVINGS**  
= $6,063,149

As you all know I believe that increasing the number of police officers and supporting 
City within a City are two of the most important programs we are considering. 
Therefore I propose that we set aside from the above savings another $300,000 as a 
reserve to do more in City within a city.

I believe that we should set aside as a reserve $615,000 to be used for employee pay 
Increases if, and only if, the Mayor's Committee finds that our employees are underpaid.
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Further, I believe that we should reduce the property tax by 1.25 cents instead of increasing it by .75 cents. The recap of my proposal for allocating the savings follows:

**Final Summary of this proposal:**

1. Net Savings from above  
   -$6,063,149
2. Cash needed to meet Dan Clodfelter's shortfall  
   +$1,850,000
3. Reserve for City within a City  
   +$ 300,000
4. Reserve for possible employee pay increase  
   +$ 615,000
5. Proposed 1.25 cent property tax decrease (Approximate)  
   +$3,125,000
6. Reserve for emergencies  
   +$ 173,149

If the council approves all of these changes there will be no adverse effect on any service to any citizen, each department head will have more responsibility and authority; we will add the 126 police officers the Chief has requested. City within a City will have a reserve, there will be a reserve in the event the Mayor's Committee on Compensation and benefits finds that our employees are underpaid and the taxpayers will benefit by a property tax reduction.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Don Reid

Enc  Proposed Organization Chart

CC Wendell White  
   Black Political Caucus  
   Business Leaders  
   Citizens For Effective Government  
   Vision  
   Media

Note #1. This would eliminate two levels of management within the city's management structure. In any public or private organization we could all agree that there has to be two levels, the chief executive officer and the workers. All other levels that are added in between are optional. Mr. Ken Iverson, internationally recognized for his exceptional management ability and the organization structure of his company, manages NUCOR's 5,600 employees with just three levels of management between him and the operatives. There are departments within the city that have at least seven levels where Mr. Iverson has three levels. If the city is to reduce its levels of management it has to start at the top. Having the operating department heads, such as the Chief of Police, Fire Chief etc. reporting directly to the city manager instead of through two levels of management gives each operating department head considerably more responsibility and authority. Mr. Peter Drucker says, "If you have as
many as nine levels of management you have an unmanageable company!"

If you adopt this scenario I will recommend that each department head that reports to the city manager attend all City Council meetings. The City manager can not be expected to know the answers to all our questions but the department heads should know the answers to just about anything we ask.

If you are serious about reducing the cost of our government then this is the least painful place to begin. This would send a signal to all employees that we are serious.
Charlotte
Organization Chart

City Council
  - A.C. & CC Authority
  - City Clerk
  - City Attorney

City Manager
  - CIS
  - PSI
  - CFO
  - Exec. Assistant

General Services Administration
  - Human Resources
  - Parks and Rec.
  - Animal Control

Purchasing

Chief of Police

Engineering
  - Community Relations
  - Emp. & Training

Economic and Civic Development
  - Community Develop
  - City within a City
  - Neighborhood Crtrns

Transit Fund

CMUD

Fire Chief

Solid Waste Services

Airport

Transp.
June 1, 1992

Mr. Joe C. Stowe, Jr.
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department
5100 Brookshire Boulevard
Charlotte, North Carolina 28216

RE: BACK FLOW PREVENTION DEVICES ON FIRE LINES

Dear Mr. Stowe,

It has come to our attention that the Plumbing Inspection Division of the Building Standards Department has the responsibility of inspecting back flow prevention devices on fire lines. We strongly urge this practice to cease. The rules and regulations governing the devices on fire lines are established by CMUD and the Fire Department and therefore, should be inspected by either CMUD or the Fire Department.

At the present time, two devices with three check values are required on fire lines. The first device is a detector check. The second device is a double check back flow preventor. We would like to propose that a double detector check valve be used in place of the two separate devices presently used. The double detector check valve will provide the same protection for the public water supply and is less expensive to install and maintain. It will also provide a meter to enable CMUD to charge for the flow of water through the double detector check valve.

Please notify us by our meeting June 8, 1992, as to when this will become effective.

Thank you.

Wilhe L. Rea, Chairman
Plumbing Advisory Board

Vincent James, Chairman
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Building Standards Advisory Board
cc. Gerald G. Fox, County Manager
O Wendell White, City Manager
John W. Knowles, County Fire Marshal
Dave Carelock, City Fire Marshal
Charlotte City Council
Board of County Commissioners
CMUD Advisory Board
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Mr Joe C Stowe, Jr.
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department
5100 Brookshire Boulevard
Charlotte, North Carolina 28216

RE: BACK FLOW PREVENTION DEVICES ON FIRE LINES

Dear Mr Stowe

It has come to our attention that the Plumbing Inspection Division of the Building Standards Department has the responsibility of inspecting back flow prevention devices on fire lines. We strongly urge this practice to cease. The rules and regulations governing the devices on fire lines are established by CMUD and the Fire Department and therefore, should be inspected by either CMUD or the Fire Department.

At the present time, two devices with three check values are required on fire lines. The first device is a detector check. The second device is a double check back flow preventor. We would like to propose that a double detector check valve be used in place of the two separate devices presently used. The double detector check valve will provide the same protection for the public water supply and is less expensive to install and maintain. It will also provide a meter to enable CMUD to charge for the flow of water through the double detector check valve.

Please notify us by our meeting June 8, 1992, as to when this will become effective.

Thank you

Willie L. Rea, Chairman
Plumbing Advisory Board

Vincent James, Chairman
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Building Standards Advisory Board

700 North Tryon Street • PO Box 31097 • Charlotte, North Carolina 28231-1097 • (704) 336 2831
cc: Gerald G Fox, County Manager
    O. Wendell White, City Manager
    John W Knowles, County Fire Marshal
    Dave Carelock, City Fire Marshal
    Charlotte City Council
    Board of County Commissioners
    CMUD Advisory Board
ADDITIONAL
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

1. Replace the Q&A title page with the new page

2. Replace page 17/18 with the new page 17/18

3. Add pages 19-21

4. Replace the ATTACHMENTS title page with the new ATTACHMENTS title page

5. Add Attachments O - T
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
FY93 BUDGET DELIBERATIONS

Attached are Staff's responses to questions asked by City Council during the FY93 Budget deliberations.
57. Q. WHAT SERVICES DOES THE CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG HOUSING PARTNERSHIP (CHMP) PROVIDE IN UNION COUNTY?

A. o None. The CHMP serves only Mecklenburg.

58. Q. EXPLAIN DEPARTMENTAL CHARGEBACKS AND FUNDING FOR THE INTERNAL CONSULTING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT DIVISIONS.

A. o Internal Consulting Budget (Cost) $210,501
   Revenue (savings) from Other Funds (10,000)
   Savings from General Fund Departments (200,501)
   Net Cost $0

   o Performance Management does not chargeback.

59. Q. HOW IS GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS) MAPPING COORDINATED BETWEEN THE CITY AND THE COUNTY?

A. o Informally between the City and County data processing departments.
   o There have been recent discussions about developing a formal coordination agreement.

60. Q. WHAT IS THE MONEY GOING TO BE USED FOR FOR THE FINAL FOUR?

A. o Breakdown of a rough budget for the 1993 NCAA Southeast Regional and the 1994 Final Four is provided in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Facility Decorations</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Accommodations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality &amp; Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NCAA required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration – office</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rent, management fee,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>office equipment, supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting space &amp; exhibit</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required funding for NCAA</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events &amp; additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Expense</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Network</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$1,065,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
61. Q. WHY DON'T WE USE THE CITYFAIR PARKING DECK FOR DISCOVERY PLACE RATHER THAN BUILDING A NEW PARKING DECK?
   A. o This question would require further analysis.
      o The Discovery Place deck is budgeted in FY94.

62. Q. WHAT ARE THE SERVICES CURRENTLY FUNDED BY GENERAL FUND DOLLARS THAT CAN BE CHARGED TO STORM WATER FEES?
   A. o FY93 EXPENDITURES FOR STORM WATER ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>CLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Stream Pollution Abatement</td>
<td>$178,369</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drainage Improvement Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Maintenance</td>
<td>$3,074,694</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>$471,394</td>
<td>$139,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditch Mowing</td>
<td>$259,270</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Allocation Plan</td>
<td>$900,160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,883,887</td>
<td>$639,396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total = $5,523,283

*note 1* annual payment to Mecklenburg County for a share of the stream pollution abatement program
*note 2* annual program to replace and upgrade culverts in street rights of way
*note 3* annual cost of Street Maintenance crews involved in storm drainage work
*note 4* annual cost of staff involved with existing storm water programs and development of the new program
*note 5* a portion of right of way mowing is drainage ditches along streets which do not have curb and gutter; this figure is one-half of the total mowing cost
*note 6* allocation of service department costs to line departments
63. Q. WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE SIDEWALK PROGRAM?
A. Current Program Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graham Street (I-85 to Dalton)</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuckaseegee and Thrift</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Street</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover Street</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$910,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Contracts to be let in FY93.
- In 1991, the sidewalk funding criteria was changed to include thoroughfares because:
  1. High priority residential requests had been constructed.
  2. Many thoroughfare locations did not have sidewalks and this was a safety concern.
- Residential sidewalk requests included in Attachment J have not been ranked or cost estimated.

64. Q. WHAT IS THE BREAKDOWN OF THE OPTION 4 PLUS UTILITIES AND INSURANCE WITHOUT THE NATURE MUSEUM IN THE CULTURAL FACILITIES PLAN?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Mint Museum</th>
<th>PAC</th>
<th>AACC</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Maintenance &amp; Operations</td>
<td>360,682</td>
<td>56,890</td>
<td>213,994</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>5,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior/Structural Facility Maint</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Areas, Driveways, etc.</td>
<td>8,467</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>4,202</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping-grounds maintenance</td>
<td>25,883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing, HVAC, Electrical Systems</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Floors, Ceilings, Walls Maint</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors, Windows Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Janitorial Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window/Carpet Cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,253</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, Sewer, Water Services</td>
<td>384,661</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Improvements</td>
<td>24,465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53,245</td>
<td>24,499</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator Maintenance</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$771,696</td>
<td>$295,132</td>
<td>$243,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The total cost would be $1,367,845.
- The difference between this total and the budgeted amount ($1,307,103) is $60,742.
65. Q. WHAT HAS BEEN SPENT THIS FISCAL YEAR OUT OF THE
NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT ACCOUNT? WHAT ARE THE
PROJECTED USES IN THE FIVE-YEAR CIP FOR NEIGHBORHOOD
REINVESTMENT?

A. o FY92 funds have been spent as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Drive</td>
<td>$59,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>269,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druid Hills</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seversville/Smallwood</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockwood</td>
<td>13,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Oaks</td>
<td>17,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid Park</td>
<td>2,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Community</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$367,341</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The above information does not include $1,762,421 in Neighborhood Investment contracts scheduled for Council approval on May 26.

o Attachment O is a listing of projected uses for the funds in the five-year CIP.

66. Q. WHY SHOULD THE CITY PARTICIPATE IN THE CONSTRUCTION
OF STATE ROADS?

A. o The City participates in State road projects for three purposes, as follows:

1. To fund sidewalk construction on State roadway projects within the City limits to conform with City standards.

2. Landscaping: NCDOT does not commit as much funding to landscaping on their roadway projects as we do on City roadway projects.

3. State Transportation Board members have indicated that City participation (which works out to about 10% of overall project costs) is a real benefit in their efforts to obtain funding for projects in our area.
67. Q. WHAT IS THE COST OF ADDING AN ADDITIONAL BUILDING INSPECTOR WITHIN THE COUNTY BUILDING STANDARDS DEPARTMENT FOR ZONING ENFORCEMENT?

A. The cost of each Inspector is $54,000, which includes salary and fringes, an automobile and supplies.

68. Q. WHY IS THE SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM NOT A PART OF THE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING BUDGET?

A. Funding is located in Non-Departmental since the Program provides temporary workers for nine City departments. Expenditures which cross departmental lines, such as insurance and other fringe benefits, are budgeted this way.

69. Q. WHAT IS THE COST OF GENERAL FUND STEP INCREASES? IF STEP INCREASES WERE FROZEN AND LONGEVITY WAS STOPPED, WOULD THE SAVINGS FUND THE 2 1/2% PAY ADJUSTMENT?

A. Step Increases $1,450,000
Longevity 1,043,000
Total 2,493,000
Cost of 2 1/2% Adjustment (3,000,000)
Gap $507,000
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Neighborhood Reinvestment

**Definition**

Neighborhood Reinvestment Guidelines

- City Within a City neighborhoods
- Inner-City problems
- Neighborhood Leadership
- New or reconstructed infrastructure
- Leverage other program funds
- Small Area Plan projects combined in recommended FY93 CIP

**Process**

- Work closely with neighborhoods to identify needs
- Conduct technical analysis of infrastructure
- Prioritize needs with neighborhood; construct highest priorities.

**Attachment Notes**

1. Following projects should be under construction by end of FY92:
   - Capitol Drive
   - Lockwood
   - Belmont Phase 2

2. The following projects will include storm water funding:
   - Belmont Phase 3
   - Seversville/Smallwood
   - Druid Hills

3. Revised estimated project balance at June 30, 1992 is $4,060,000. (Original estimate of $4,850,000 has been lowered due to projects being bid ahead of schedule)

4. Extensive neighborhood contact has occurred on most projects.
# NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT
## STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT AREA</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Belmont Phase 3</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Genesis Park</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Chantilly/Commonwealth</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Beatties Ford Road</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lockwood Phase 2</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL DESIGN PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Seversville Phase 1</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Reid Park</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>2,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cherry</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Seversville/Smallwood</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ABC</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hemphill Heights</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Rockwell Park</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Druid Hills</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL PLANNING PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NOTES

1. Estimated project balance at June 30, 1992 is $4,060,000 (Revised)
2. Recommended annual project allocation is $2 million
3. Neighborhood Reinvestment leverages funding from other projects, e.g., Storm Water Repairs, Sidewalk Program, etc.
I have discussed the proposed sale of City-owned acreage tracts, i.e., Beam Road adjacent to the Police/Fire Training Academy, Monroe Road adjacent to McAlpine Greenway and Beaumont Avenue property in the Elizabeth neighborhood with two of our knowledgeable brokers in the Charlotte Real Estate market.

At the present time, property values have not rebounded to their level of three years ago. Specifically, the Beam Road property is worth approximately $25,000 per acre today where it may have brought as much as $45,000 per acre three years ago. The Monroe Road property has a present value of $35,000 to $40,000 per acre where it was worth $55,000 three years ago. What you find in the market place today is investors taking advantage of distressed property needing to be liquidated. There are many opportunities today to purchase property for 60% of its value three years ago. Speculative development is not being done in our area because of the overall economy. These brokers believe that our properties could only be sold to investors at the low value and they, in turn, would subdivide the property and sell small tracts to specific users over the next four to six years.

The Hunter Dairy property which is adjacent to our property on Beam Road was being offered for $45,000 per acre three years ago and the Hunters have indicated a willingness to take an offer in the low to mid $20,000 range. These brokers believe that it will be at least two years before the market has rebounded to its former position and that the advantage that the City has for holding onto the property is its low base in the property to start with and the fact that we will not be paying any taxes on our property. Our recommendation is to continue holding the property until the market conditions substantially change.

The Beaumont Avenue property will have a change in use when the zoning is changed from its present zoning to a residential or multi-family zoning and, thereby, decrease the value of that property. It is thought that a public/private house venture on this property may be the most advantageous in the event the City wishes to pursue a use for this property.

Should you have any questions or need any clarification, please let me know.

cc: Phil Cowherd
MEMORANDUM

May 20, 1992

TO:  Vl Alexander
     Budget and Evaluation Director

FROM: Henry W Underhill, Jr
      City Attorney

SUBJECT: NFL Football Stadium Funding

The proposed 1992-93 Capital Improvements Project budget includes $2,000,000 for the City's portion of the cost in the development of a proposed NFL Football Stadium. A council member has asked whether or not the City is legally obligated to provide this funding.

On July 23, 1990, the City Council approved a development agreement between the City and Richardson Sports Limited Partnership (RS) that obligates the City to provide funding for the acquisition of land for a football stadium, practice fields, and parking areas. The development agreement further requires the City to participate in certain identified environmental clean-up costs with respect to the stadium and the practice field areas.

On August 27, 1990, the City Council approved a lease between the City of Charlotte and RS that further confirmed the financial obligations of the City with regard to the NFL Football Stadium Project. The above-referenced development agreement and lease create legally binding obligations upon the City to provide the $2,000,000 of funding included in the proposed CIP budget.

I trust this is responsive to your request. If you need anything further on this matter, please let me know.

HWUjr/ef
## ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT WORKLOAD

### NUMBER OF ACTIVE PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PROJECTS/PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK PROJECTS</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING PROJECTS</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD PROJECTS(1)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDEWALKS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORM DRAINAGE/STORM WATER(2)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL ESTATE SERVICES(3)</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY PLANNING</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION - LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>407</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes Small Area Plan, Neighborhood Reinvestment, Business Corridor Revitalization
(2) Includes Storm Drainage Improvement Projects, Storm Drainage Repair Program studies, and Stormwater Inventory Activities
(3) CMUD and CD projects which we provide real estate services (water and sewer acquisition and disposition of CD property).
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

NAME OF PROGRAM:       COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION AND ENRICHMENT PROGRAM
PERIOD COVERED:         JULY 1, 1990 - March 30, 1991
DATE PREPARED:          MAY 21, 1991
CONTRACTOR:             BETHLEHEM CENTER

SUMMARY

* Contract was approved by City Council for $123,825 for the period
* During this 9-month period, program expenditures totaled $85,482,
  69% of the amount budgeted. (Nine months represents 75% of the
  contract year).
* The Program served a total of 209 persons, including
  * 85 Youth in the Summer Day Camp,
  * 39 Junior High Youth in the School-Year Program
    (See Exhibit A - Daily Schedule),
  * 30 Preschoolers in the School-Year Program (See Exhibit B -
    Daily Schedule) and
  * 55 Elementary Youth in the Tutorial School-Year Program
    (See Exhibit B - Daily Schedule).

(See Table 1 for Summary of Objectives Achievement By Program Component).

MAJOR FINDINGS:

1. Of the 10 objectives stated in the contract:
   * the program met or surpassed 9 objectives, and
   * the daily attendance objective for preschool and school
     age youth was 16% short and for junior high 8% short
     of the goal of 80%, however, the daily attendance for
     junior and senior high youth surpassed its objective by 26%.

(See Table 2 for Summary of Objectives Achievement By reporting period.)
2. The program met 116% of its client goal.

3. The program's retention rate was: Summer - 100% and School Year - 85%.

4. The average daily attendance rate was: Preschool/School Age Youth - 64%, elementary age youth - 86% and Junior/Senior High Youth - 52%.

5. Staff met with each family twice during the year to encourage parental involvement.

6. During the 6-month period between pre-and post-testing, the elementary students gained an average of 1.5 months in reading, 5.3 months in language and 5.9 months in math. (See Table 3)

The preschool youth averaged gains of 5.1 months in Gross Motor Skills, 3.3 months in Fine Motor Skills, 1.2 months in Concepts and 6.3 months in Communication. (See Table 4)

The junior and senior high youth increased: 1.1 years in Reading, 9.6 years in Language and 7.3 months in Math. (See Table 3)

7. During this contract period, the Contractor received additional funding in the amount of $48,036 from: The USDA Food Program $10,800, Child Care Resources, Inc. $35,484 and Presbyterian Hunger Relief Fund $1,452 in addition to the on-going support from the United Methodist Church.
TABLE 1

Enrollment, Dropout, and Retention Rate *
by Program Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Component</th>
<th>Enrollment Objective</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Obj.</th>
<th>No. of Dropouts</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2, 1990-Aug 21, 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>123%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31 days) 3 hrs/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (32 days)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 hrs/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year Program (Thru Mar.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning - Preschool</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>125%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3½ hrs/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School - Elementary</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hrs/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening - Jr. High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>130%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/hr/wk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program (Thru Mar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5, 1990-March 30, 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Components</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>117%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 2**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES ACHIEVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>% of Obj. Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improve basic skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a. 50 Elementary School age youth enrolled  
  (Summer) | 53 | 106% |
| b. 26 Jr/Sr High enrolled  
  (Summer) | 32 | 123% |
| c. 30 Jr/Sr High enrolled  
  (School Year Evenings) | 39 | 130% |
| d. 50 Elementary age youth  
  (After School Program) | 55 | 110% |
| e. 24 Pre Schoolers  
  (School Year Program) | 30 | 125% |
| 2. Enrolled low/mod students from Southside NSA | 209 | 116% |
| a. Enrollment based on need | | 100% |
| b. Need determined by objective and subjective assessment | | 100% |
| 3. Assess needs w/i 6 weeks (Fall) | | 100% |
| a. Obtain last report card and test scores  
  (Summer) | Met | 100% |
| b. CTBS Test Scores  
  (After School) | Met | 100% |
| c. DIAL or other test scores, interview, observation  
  (Preschool) | Met | 100% |
| 4. Encourage parental involvement | | |
| a. Meet w/each family twice | | 100% |
| 5. Report student progress by April 9, 1991  
  (See Table 3) | | 100% |
| 6. 1 Cultural/Event twice month; each student participates | | 100% |
| 7. Avg. daily attendance of: | | |
| a. Preschool/School Age  
  (80%) | 64% | 80% |
| b. Elementary Age Youth  
  (60%) | 86% | 108% |
c. Junior High School Age (60%)

8. Involve parents

   a. 1 Meeting before August 1, 1990

      Met 100%
      7/26/91

   b. 1 Meeting per quarter

   c. Review program operation

      Met 100%

9. Teacher/Staff workdays

   July 1-4, 1990 for Summer Session
   Met 100%
   August 20-21, 1990 for School Year
   Met 100%
   June 24-28, 1991 for final reports/closeout
   X X

10. Identify and secure other funding

      Met 100%

Met = Required by contract and provided by contractor.
X = Not required during the reporting period.
**TABLE 3**

**TESTING RESULTS**

**MATHEMATICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-TEST</th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCHOLASTIC MONTHS INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior/Senior High</strong></td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**READING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-TEST</th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCHOLASTIC MONTHS INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior/Senior High</strong></td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANGUAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-TEST</th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCHOLASTIC MONTHS INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior/Senior High</strong></td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4

**CHRONOLOGICAL AGE TESTING RESULTS**

**PRESCHOOLERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>GAINS/LOSS MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Motor Skills</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Motor Skills</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Elementary**

**Daily Schedule**

**Summer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Schedule Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30am - 8:30am</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>Table Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30am - 9:00am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>Clean Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00am - 11:00am</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>Recreation &amp; Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workbook Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15am - 1:00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>Rest Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00pm - 3:30pm</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>Recreation &amp; Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workbook Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30pm - 4:15pm</td>
<td>Snack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15pm - 5:30pm</td>
<td>Table Games, Music Games, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## JR./ SR. HIGH

### Daily Schedule

#### Summer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Schedule Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:30pm - 6:00pm</td>
<td>Arrival, Table Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00pm - 8:00pm</td>
<td>Teacher's Choice, Discussion Groups/Rap Sessions, Workshops, Arts, Crafts, Field Trips, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 8:30</td>
<td>Clean Up, Dismissal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DAILY SCHEDULE**

**Fall**

**Preschool**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAYS</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday-Friday</td>
<td>8:30 - 9:15</td>
<td>Pick up and Free Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday-Friday</td>
<td>9:15 - 9:30</td>
<td>Clean up, restroom, break, assist with breakfast preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday-Friday</td>
<td>9:30 - 10:00</td>
<td>Breakfast &amp; rest period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday</td>
<td>10:00 - 11:30</td>
<td>A combination of whole group and small group activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd. Wed. of the month</td>
<td>10:00 - 11:00</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>Field Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday-Friday</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Take Home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The schedule for the three and four year olds consists of a combination of small and whole group activities. The activities are designed to improve the fine motor, gross motor, concept and communication skills of the preschooler. Activities include but are not limited to music, storytelling, drama and arts and crafts.
### DAILY SCHEDULE

**ELEMENTARY**

**Fall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAYS</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon.-Thurs.</td>
<td>2:00-3:00</td>
<td>Arrival and Homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon.-Thurs.</td>
<td>3:00-4:00</td>
<td>Snack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. &amp; Tues.</td>
<td>4:00-5:00</td>
<td>Tutoring (1st-2nd, 5th-6th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed. &amp; Thurs.</td>
<td>4:00-5:00</td>
<td>Tutoring (3rd-4th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon.-Thurs.</td>
<td>4:00-5:00</td>
<td>Field Trips, Arts and Crafts, Group Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fridays</td>
<td>4:00-5:00</td>
<td>Fun Fridays: Special Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon.-Fri.</td>
<td>5:00-5:30</td>
<td>Dismissal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Daily Attendance

**Jr./Sr. High**

**Fall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAYS</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday-Thursday</td>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>Arrival and Recreation in game room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday-Thursday</td>
<td>5:30-6:30</td>
<td>Group Instruction Homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday &amp; Thursday</td>
<td>5:30-8:00</td>
<td>Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>6:30-8:30</td>
<td>Seminars, Workshops, Recreational games, Arts and Crafts, Discussion groups, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>6:00-8:30</td>
<td>Field Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday-Thursday</td>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Dismissal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

NAME OF PROGRAM: GETHSEMANE ENRICHMENT PROGRAM
PERIOD COVERED: JULY 1, 1990 - March 31, 1991
DATE PREPARED: MAY 22, 1991
CONTRACTOR: GETHSEMANE AME ZION CHURCH

A. SUMMARY

- Contract was approved by City Council for $371,475 covering a
  12-month period (July 1, 1990 - June 30, 1991).

- During the first nine months, the program served 404 youth in the
  summer program and 454 youth in the after-school program.

- Program costs were $288,101.47 through March 31, 1991 which is 78% of
  the amount budgeted for the program year. (9 months represents 75% of
  the contract year.)

B. MAJOR FINDINGS:

1. The program has met or surpassed all of its objectives.
   (See Table 1.)

2. The program met 101% of its summer enrollment goals and 114% of
   school year enrollment goals.

3. The average daily attendance was:
   a. 352 Summer Program (total enrollment = 404). (See Exhibit A for
      Summer Schedule.)
   b. 393 School Year Program (total enrollment = 454). (See Exhibit B
      for School Year Schedule.)
       For the average daily attendance and enrollment for each
       reporting period, see Table 2.

4. The dropout rate was: Summer Program: 0%, School Year Program: 14%.

5. Over a period of 6 months, the average increases in academic achieve-
   ment level were 8.1 months in Reading and 5.3 months in Math.
   (See Tables 3 and 4)
6. The program was conducted in several locations:
   a. **Summer Program**
      - Billingsville Elementary School
      - Lincoln Heights Elementary School
      - Barringer Elementary School
      - Antioch Baptist Church
   b. **Fall Program**
      After School  - Amary James Elementary School
                     - Antioch Baptist Church
                     - Billingsville Elementary School
                     - Gethsemane AME Zion Church
                     - Lincoln Heights Elementary School

7. The program also provides in-school tutoring or counseling for students in the program, when requested by any of the 32 schools where the students are enrolled.

8. Efforts to secure other funding resulted in securing a total of $122,784; from Mecklenburg County ($111,584), Bissell Company ($5,500), Allstate ($500) and Committee To Restore and Preserve Third Ward ($200). These funds were used to purchase a bus and employ additional staff for the enrichment program.

9. During the program year, 3 parenting educational sessions were held in the areas of math and reading. Two workshops were held on nutrition and Child and Family Development. Monthly newsletters are sent to parents informing them of the activities and opportunities that the Gethsemane Enrichment Program provides. Tutorial assistance training sessions were set up for 10 parents to work as assistants in the Gethsemane Enrichment Program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviated Objectives</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. After-School Teacher/Student Ratio</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>1:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enrollment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop Individualized Instruction</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for each student within 6 weeks after enrollment</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 1/2 month Educational Achievement</td>
<td>3 Mos.</td>
<td>8.1 Mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Increase for each Month of Instruction for at least 80% of Students.</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Pretest given</td>
<td>by 10/22/90</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Post test given</td>
<td>by 4/9/91</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recreational &amp; Cultural Activities</td>
<td>1/week</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 activity per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each youth 2 activities per month</td>
<td>2/month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Program Retention Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Advisory Committee Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Meetings Per Quarter)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Identify other Funding Sources</td>
<td>N.Q.</td>
<td>$122,784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Enrollment and Average Daily Attendance for Each Reporting Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Component</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Average Daily Attendance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 1990 - July 31, 1990</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Program (After School):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 12, 1990 - November 30, 1990</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3, 1990 - March 31, 1991</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>School-Year Average</em></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3
**Testing Results**

**Reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Average Grade Level</th>
<th>Average Scholastic Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>K.O</td>
<td>K.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>K.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE INCREASE**

8.1 Months
Table 4
Testing Results

Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Average Grade Level October</th>
<th>Average Grade Level April</th>
<th>Average Scholastic Month Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>K.0</td>
<td>K.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>K.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Increase** 5.3 Months
EXHIBIT A

GETHSEMANE ENRICHMENT PROGRAM
SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

CLUSTER A

SUMMER

8:00-8:20 Readiness Experience
8:20-8:40 Breakfast
8:40-9:10 Poetry
9:10-9:30 Color Songs, Nursery Rhymes, Circle Games
9:30-10:00 Recreational Activities
10:00-10:10 Whole Class Restroom Break
10:15-11:15 Small Group Activities
  Language/Math/Art (approx. 20 min. each)
11:20 Clean Up
11:30 Lunch 11:30-11:45
11:50 Storytime (Whole Group)
12:10 Safety Units
12:40 Daily Evaluation (Whole Group)
  Prepare for Dismissal

CLUSTER B

8:00 Readiness Experience
8:15 Breakfast/Clean-up
8:30-9:30 Art "Sailing into Summer"
9:30-10:00 Outside Recreation
10:00-10:30 Math Experience
10:30-11:00 Music/Aerobics
11:00-11:30 Reading Experiences
11:30-11:45 Lunchtime
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:45-12:15</td>
<td>Storytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-12:45</td>
<td>Oral and Written Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-1:00</td>
<td>Prepare for Dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:15</td>
<td>Setting Tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>Breakfast/Clean-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:30</td>
<td>Small Group Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language/Math/Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:00</td>
<td>Cultural Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music/Art/Poetry/P.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>Small Group Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language/Math/Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>Oral and Written Expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:00</td>
<td>Enrichment through Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:30</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-12:45</td>
<td>Prepare for Dismissal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULES

SPAUGH

Music  July 23 - July 27
P.E.    July 9    - July 13

BILLINGSVILLE

Music  July 16 - July 20
P.E.    July 16 - July 20

LINCOLN HEIGHTS

Music  July 9    - July 13
P.E.    July 23 - July 27

MUSIC 30 MINUTES

(A)  9:35-10:05

(B)  9:00-9:30

(C)  10:45-11:15

(D)  10:10-10:45

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

(A)  9:00 - 9:30

(B)  9:35 - 10:05

(C)  10:10 - 10:40

(D)  10:45 - 11:15

CHOIR (5th GRADERS AND 6TH GRADERS) - MONDAY  12:30 - 1:00

TUESDAY 12:30 - 1:00

P.E. (SMALL GROUPS)  11:45 - 12:45
EXHIBIT B
GETHSEMANE ENRICHMENT PROGRAM
SCHEDULE
FALL

CLUSTERS A AND B

3:45-4:00  Roll Call/Snacks
4:00-4:30  Small Group Activity - Language Arts/Math/Construction
4:30-5:00  Recreation Activity
5:00-5:30  Small Group Activity - Language Arts/Math
5:30-5:50  Story Hour/Poetry Time
5:50-6:00  Evaluation/Preparation for Dismissal

CLUSTERS C AND D

3:45-4:30  Homework
4:30-4:45  Snacks
4:45-5:15  Small group activities - Language Arts/Math/Others
5:15-5:45  Small group activities - Language Arts/Math/Others
5:45-6:15  Recreational Activity
6:15-6:30  Evaluation - Preparation for Dismissal
EXHIBIT B

GETHSEMANE ENRICHMENT PROGRAM
SCHEDULE
FALL

SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES
FOR
ALL SITES

4:00-4:15  Setting the Tone
Preparation and Expectations

4:15-5:45  Group Activities
1. Language Reinforcement Skills
2. Math Reinforcement Skills
3. Homework - Clusters B, C and D
Creativeness - Clusters A and B

5:50  Daily Round-up

6:00  Dismissal

6:00-6:45  Tutor Workshop (if needed)
Planning

*CLUSTER A  PRE-SCHOOL - KINDERGARTEN
CLUSTER B  FIRST & SECOND GRADES
CLUSTER C  THIRD & FOURTH GRADES
CLUSTER D  FIFTH & SIXTH GRADE
ADDITIONAL
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

1. Replace page 21 with the new page 21/22
3. Add pages 23-27
4. Replace the ATTACHMENTS title page with the new ATTACHMENTS title page
5. Add Attachment U

RECEIVED
MAY 29, 1992

Office of City Clerk

May 28, 1992
67. Q. WHAT IS THE COST OF ADDING AN ADDITIONAL BUILDING INSPECTOR WITHIN THE COUNTY BUILDING STANDARDS DEPARTMENT FOR ZONING ENFORCEMENT?

A. o The cost of each Inspector is $54,000, which includes salary and fringes, an automobile and supplies.

68. Q. WHY IS THE SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM NOT A PART OF THE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING BUDGET?

A. o Funding is located in Non-Departmentals since the Program provides temporary workers for nine City departments. Expenditures which cross departmental lines, such as insurance and other fringe benefits, are budgeted this way.

69. Q. WHAT IS THE COST OF GENERAL FUND STEP INCREASES? IF STEP INCREASES WERE FROZEN AND LONGEVITY WAS STOPPED, WOULD THE SAVINGS FUND THE 2 1/2% PAY ADJUSTMENT?

A. o Step Increases $1,450,000
Longevity 1,043,000
Total 2,493,000
Cost of 2 1/2% Adjustment (3,000,000)
Gap $ 507,000

70. Q. CAN THE "STOP THE KILLING" PROGRAM BE FUNDED FROM ASSETS FORFEITURE FUNDS?

A. o Eligibility is determined by submitting a proposal to the Department of Justice prior to the payment.

o Eligibility depends on the specific item being funded. Federal guidelines mandate items be for a direct law enforcement purpose.

o Examples. A cash contribution to the Stop the Killing Program would not be eligible; a specific item, such as a radio, may be eligible, depending on how the item conforms to the Federal guidelines.
71. Q. IF POLICE CONSOLIDATION OCCURRED, WOULD THE EXISTING MECKLENBURG COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT OFFICERS MAKE UP FOR THE CITY'S DEFICIT SINCE THEY COVER THE SAME TERRITORY?

A. To answer this with accuracy requires a study that has not been done.

72. Q. WHAT PROJECTS CURRENTLY FUNDED WITH PAY-AS-YOU-GO FUNDS ARE BONDABLE? WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF TRANSFERRING A CENT OR ONE-HALF CENT FROM PAY-AS-YOU-GO TO THE GENERAL FUND AND BONDING THESE PROJECTS?

A. All Pay-As-You-Go projects included in the CIP can be bond financed.

- Pay-As-You-Go is financed with three cents of the property tax. (In FY94, one cent is scheduled to be transferred to debt service for football). Shifts in the property tax to debt service would result in the following debt capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Debt Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cent</td>
<td>$24 million or $4.8 million per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 Cent</td>
<td>$18 million or $3.6 million per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 Cent</td>
<td>$12 million or $2.4 million per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each of these alternatives would maintain interest income and State reimbursements in the Pay-As-You-Go Tax Fund.

- The five-year Pay-As-You-Go revenues total $30.3 million.

- Example: If $12 million in Pay-As-You-Go projects were displaced with bonds, one-half cent could be transferred to the Operating Budget.

- Disadvantages to this approach:

  1. The bonds would be sufficient to displace Pay-As-You-Go projects for only a five-year period.

  2. Payment on the bonds would be over 20 years.

  3. Further reliance on bond financing would reduce the diversification of revenue sources dedicated to the CIP. Diversification of revenues is a sound financial practice and a Council CIP Policy (see page 7 of the CIP).
73. Q. EXPLAIN THE CFEG CHALLENGE TO "RIGHTSIZING OFFSET".
A. o Taking the beginning pay step for each currently vacant position, omitting uniformed police and fire positions, the total salary is $4,250.
   o Since the position bank is constantly changing, the total six to ten weeks ago was slightly different, thus the $40,000 difference from the budget to the current estimate.
   o Since fringe benefits are budgeted in lump sum non-departmentals, those accounts were already adjusted by an estimated amount for the final vacancies.
   o This was reviewed with CFEG.

74. Q. WHAT COST SAVINGS AND/OR OTHER BENEFITS HAVE RESULTED FROM INTERNAL CONSULTING PROJECTS?
A. o Attachment U is Internal Consulting's "Report Card" for May 1991 to May 1992. A summary of the estimated pay-off of Internal Consulting is described below

   Charges to CMUD for Services $ 2,900
   Immediate Cost Savings/Increased Revenue (implemented or to be implemented in FY92-FY93) $334,160
   Cost Avoidance $154,929

   o The figures do not reflect any long-term savings which result in service improvements, such as the consolidation of City and County Parks and Recreation and Police Departments and working with the County and the towns on police tax equity.

   o Internal Consulting's workplan includes a post-project review one year after the completion of a project to assess if and how departments have implemented recommendations and to determine actual savings realized.
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75. Q. WHAT WOULD BE THE IMPACT OF DELAYING CERTAIN CAPITAL PROJECTS (LISTED BELOW)?

A. o This question will be addressed in the referral to the Council Public Service Committee.

76. Q. WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF NOT REPAYING THE DEBT SERVICE FUND THE $2 MILLION FOR FOOTBALL AND USING THE PAY-AS-YOU-GO FUNDING FOR OTHER PURPOSES?

A. o The chart below illustrates the impact on the debt model. This chart should be compared with the chart on page 10 of the CIP.

CITY OF CHARLOTTE
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>$2 Million Football Loan Not Repaid</th>
<th>Recommended FY93-97 CIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>Percent of Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$31.5</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
77. Q. WHAT WOULD BE THE EFFECT OF SPREADING THE PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONTRIBUTION TO LIGHT RAIL RIGHT-OF-WAY FUND'S PURCHASE OF THE CSX CEDAR STREET YARD OVER THE FULL FIVE YEAR TERM RATHER THAN WHAT APPEARS TO BE A THREE YEAR TERM?

A. On May 26, Council approved the Wind-Up Ordinance which included a $316,000 transfer from the Light Rail Study to the Light Rail Right-Of-Way capital account. The Light Rail Transitional Study is costing less due to federal participation. The transfer of funds was made to pay off the City's portion of the CSX Yard to avoid interest payments. To complete this pay-off, the FY93 Light Rail Right-Of-Way appropriation of $400,000 in Pay-As-You-Go funding is necessary.

78. Q. COULD THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD INSTALLATION AND POLICE AND FIRE TRAINING ACADEMY EXPANSION PROJECTS BE COMBINED?

A. The Academy expansion includes additional classrooms and storage. The Air National Guard fire training facility will include a simulated airplane fire pit.

- Due to the availability of the Air National Guard fire pit to the Charlotte Fire Department, the Academy fire pit will be reduced in size and number.

- Both the Air National Guard and Academy fire pits will use gas instead of liquids to ignite fires.

- Both fire pit sites are needed due to specialized training for airplane disaster and the frequency of training needed.

79. Q. IS IT LEGAL TO USE AIRPORT FUNDS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE ENTIRE ANNEXATION FIRE STATION AT THE AIRPORT?

A. The project is budgeted in FY94; further analysis is required regarding the uses of Airport funds for general government purposes. A report will be forwarded to Council.
80. Q. WHAT IS TAKING SO LONG ON THE MCALPINE CREEK WASTEWATER TREATMENT COMPLEX?

A What Has Happened:

o Several years ago, CMUD asked for and received statements of qualifications from vendors to submit proposals to design a composting system for McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. Review of the qualifications led CMUD to require specifications that addressed, among other things, two specific issues: odor control and worker safety.

o One vendor, American Biotech, objected to the specifications on the grounds that the City's requirements put them at a competitive disadvantage--they appealed to the City to amend its specifications.

o The City, pursuant to the Utility Director's recommendation and advice from private counsel, amended the specifications but American Biotech was still not satisfied and appealed directly to the EPA.

o After a delay of approximately 12 months, the EPA agreed with American Biotech, stating that the City had not justified its need for the specifications in question.

o After the unfavorable decision from the EPA, the City took time to evaluate the feasibility of composting and decided to continue to pursue the concept.

o During the last 8 to 12 months, CMUD has amended its specifications, reviewed several vendor qualifications and has received and is evaluating several statements of qualifications.

What Will Happen:

o On June 3, 1992, CMUD will decide on two or three vendors that it feels can design a facility to meet specifications.

o The State now recognizes an alternative method of sludge disposal called lime stabilization. This process takes much less time than composting. CMUD conducted a pilot project using lime stabilization at the Harrisburg Road Landfill. Preliminary results are favorable.

o By July 31, 1992, CMUD must choose which method of sludge implementation is most suitable, composting or lime stabilization.
By September 30, 1992, the State must submit all grant requests to the EPA. Therefore, in order to be eligible for more than $9 million in EPA grant funds, CMUD must choose a method of treating and reusing sludge before the end of September 1992.

NOTE: The possibility of a vendor protesting CMUD's decision always exists. If this happens, the process could be slowed down again.
LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

FOR

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
FY93 BUDGET DELIBERATIONS

Attachment A - PS & I Department Line-Item Budget
Attachment B - Planning Commission Line-Item Budget
Attachment C - Historic District Line-Item Budget
Attachment D - Art Commission Line-Item Budget
Attachment E - Community Relations Line-Item Budget
Attachment F - Dispute Settlement Line-Item Budget
Attachment G - Community Relations Staff Time %
Attachment H - Criminal Justice Commission Requests
Attachment I - $11 Million Road Savings Recommendation
Attachment J - Sidewalk Requests
Attachment K - Water & Sewer Rate Comparison
Attachment L - City Within A City Line-Item
Attachment M - Police Department’s Unfunded Priorities
Attachment N - Community Policing Service Level Description
Attachment O - Neighborhood Reinvestment Program Update
Attachment P - Status of City Land Sales
Attachment Q - Football Stadium $2mil Payment Obligation
Attachment R - Engineering’s Presentation - "OTHER" Category
Attachment S - Bethlehem Center Enrichment Program
Attachment T - Gethsemane AME Zion Church Enrichment Program
Attachment U - Internal Consulting Report Card
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Cost Savings/Cost Avoidance/Service Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Engineering Cost Analysis Follow-up organization review to Engineering Cost Analysis | A reorganization of the Design Division has been approved which meets the recommendations of the Cost Analysis | Cost Savings  
*Reduction of one Civil Engineer II  $45,400 |
| 2. Central Services Division Span of Leadership/Layers of Management Organization review of Central Services | An implementation plan has been approved  
(An intra-divisional reorganization was recommended) | Service Improvements  
*Reorganization recommended to improve service to CMGC, reorganization will eliminate one layer of management  
Cost Savings  
*Reduction of two positions  $72,942 |
| 3. Meter Reading and Billing Alternatives Analysis of changes to the frequency of reading water meters and billing customers | Findings and cost information under review by CMUD and Finance  
(Bimonthly reading/billing of residential customers results in highest savings)  
Decision to change pending outcome of stormwater billing method | Cost Savings  
*Bimonthly option (residential only) yields estimated cost savings of $321,949 |
| 4. Integrated Communications Plan City reorganization/realignment of technology (computers, radios, phones, ) resources | Department is working under new organization structure | Potential Long Term Savings  
*Consolidation of resources has made savings possible in cellular phone and pager equipment (procedures implemented reducing costs through economies of scale), reductions in long distance rates and eliminating redundant equipment  $19,750 |
| 5. Recreation Division Span of Leadership/Layers of Management Organizational review of Recreation Division | Implementation plan was put on hold pending City/County consolidation | Cost Savings  
*Four positions were identified for elimination  $108,000 |
| 6. Reorganization Task Force Review of building maintenance, grounds maintenance, security and law enforcement, and vehicle and equipment maintenance resources. Includes Police, Parks & Recreation and General Services | Project was put on hold pending City/County consolidation | |
| 7. Workers' Compensation System Review Internal Consulting support to City Review Committee | Recommendations have been approved and will be implemented July 1, 1992 | Potential Cost Savings  
*Elimination of supplemental pay  $157,000  
Cost Avoidance  
*Undetermined, expected reduction in lost workdays |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Cost Savings/Cost Avoidance/Service Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **8** DOT Administrative Review - Organizational review of DOT administrative functions | Recommendations have been approved, implementation is underway | Cost Savings  
*Reduction of one administrative position $39,229  
Cost Avoidance  
*Process/methods improvements $45,400 |
| **9** Biweekly Payroll - Cost/benefit analysis of changing employee pay from weekly to biweekly and changing workweek to end on Friday (currently ends on Tuesday) | Implementation plan is being developed by CIS and Finance Departments. | Cost Savings/Increased Revenue  
*Reduction in forms and paper usage and increased interest revenue $92,841  
Cost Avoidance  
*Reduction of City-wide payroll processing and recordkeeping $109,529 |
| **10** CD Administrative Staff Review | Recommendations have been presented to department. |  |
| **11** Parks & Recreation and Police Consolidation Internal Consulting facilitation of process between City and County and appointed citizens' Task Forces | Interlocal agreement for Parks & Recreation consolidation expected in June, 1992 for July 1, 1992 implementation | Property owners in Charlotte will receive a net tax reduction in the property tax rate resulting from Parks & Recreation consolidation |
| **12** Police Tax Equity Internal Consulting assistance in developing tax equity methodology for Mecklenburg County police services. | Interlocal agreement for Police Tax Equity expected in June 1992 for July 1, 1992 implementation | Property owners in Charlotte will receive a net tax reduction in the property tax rate (estimated at over $02 per $100 assessed value) resulting from police tax equity |
| **13** Real Estate Division Workload and Cost Analysis - Review of projected workload for Real Estate Division of Engineering Department and appropriate staffing levels. | Real Estate Division is implementing Internal Consulting recommendations. | Cost Savings  
*Reduction of 3 - 6 positions $83,748 - $194,141 |
| **14** Rightsizing Internal Consulting facilitation of process for the City | Process currently underway City-wide and departmental innovations and organizations teams have formed and are meeting Costs being developed for city services (Services Inventory) |  |
| **15** Medical Services Review - Analysis of delivery and cost of medical services for City workforce | Project underway |  |
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