



August 24, 2012

TO: Mayor and Members of Council
FROM: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager *DTR*
SUBJECT: Items for Your Information

IFYI HIGHLIGHTS

- Piedmont Triad Water Quality Partnership Information
- Homeless Funding
- Curb and Gutter
- GBB Evaluation Update
- Outside Agency Funding
- Disparity Study Update
- Towing Ordinance Amendment

Council Follow-Up Items

• **Piedmont Triad Water Quality Partnership Information**

As a follow-up to a request from Councilmember Wade, attached is a memorandum from Water Resources Director Steven Drew, dated August 23, 2012, regarding public education materials and outreach efforts conducted by the Piedmont Triad Water Quality Partnership.

• **Homelessness Funding**

As a follow-up to a request from Councilmember Wade at the August 21, 2012 Council meeting, attached is a memorandum from Planning and Community Development's Grants Administrator Gwen Torain, dated August 24, 2012, providing a breakdown of the funds provided for homelessness prevention.

Curb and Gutter

Attached is a memorandum from Transportation Director Adam Fischer, dated August 16, 2012, regarding Hilltop Road, Stanley Road and Franklin Boulevard projects that are scheduled for a public hearing and request for approval of curb and gutter assessments at the September 4, 2012 City Council meeting.

GBB Evaluation Update

Attached is a memorandum from Field Operations Director Dale Wyrick, dated August 22, 2012, with an update on the evaluation of proposals by Gershman, Brickner, and Bratton, Inc. in response to RFP #08-12 for MSW Management Services.

Outside Agency Funding

Attached is a memorandum from Interim Assistant to the City Manager Mary Vigue, dated August 23, 2012, regarding the process that the City has for funding of outside agency.

Disparity Study Update

Attached is a memorandum from Planning and Community Development Disparity Study Phase 2 Project Manager, dated August 24, 2012, providing an update on the next phase of the disparity study.

Towing Ordinance Amendment

Attached is a memorandum from Police Attorney Jim Clark, dated August 24, 2012, regarding an amendment in the Greensboro Code of Ordinances section 16-39, which would include adopting a Request for Quotation process.

Contact Center Feedback

Attached is the weekly report generated by our Contact Center for the week of August 13, 2012, through August 19, 2012.

Small Group Meetings

For the week of August 17, 2012 through August 23, 2012, there were no small group meetings between City Staff and [more than two but less than five] Councilmembers.

DTR/mm
Attachments

cc: Office of the City Manager
Global Media



August 23, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager

FROM: Steven D. Drew, Director Water Resources



SUBJECT: Piedmont Triad Water Quality Partnership Information

Water Resources staff was requested by Councilwoman Dr. Trudy Wade to provide specific examples of public education materials produced and outreach efforts conducted by the Piedmont Triad Water Quality Partnership.

Background:

In 2000, jurisdictions within the Randleman Lake Watershed met to determine the stormwater management requirements for the Randleman Rules. In early 2002, it was determined that the same initiatives could be used to meet NPDES Phase II requirements as well. Jurisdictions outside of the Randleman watershed joined efforts eventually and by 2003, the partnership was formed through an interlocal agreement. Currently the partnership consists of 18 members working together on a campaign to educate and reach out to citizens at every level in the region concerning the following targeted pollutants and issues.

- Pet Waste, Litter
- Fertilizer & Pesticides
- Used Motor Oil and other Illicit Discharges
- Erosion, Silt Fencing
- Minimizing Stormwater Runoff
- Municipal Employee Education
- Cleaning Techniques
- Construction Phasing and entrances
- Storm Drain Inlet Protection
- Business Pollution Prevention
- Proper Landscaping Technique
- Stream Buffers

The Public Education Fact Sheet attached details educational materials and specific efforts of the Piedmont Triad Water Quality Partnership since its inception.

Piedmont Triad Water Quality Partnership Education Components Summary last updated 8/22/2012

Campaign	Topics Covered	Media Type	Target Audience	Campaign Effectiveness
Litter Prevention, Fertilizer & Pesticides	Litter prevention and proper fertilizer and pesticide application	Television	General public, homeowners	1,667 ads placed on local TV stations
Watershed Signs	Watershed Identification and Awareness	Signage	General public	146 signs installed within participating jurisdictions
General Pollution Prevention	Chemicals, pet waste, litter, septic tanks, car washing, landscaping	Brochure	Hispanics, general public	Brochure distribution: 178,790 English; 3,500 Spanish
Website www.piedmontwaterquality.org	All campaign topics are covered here	Website	General public	Average 800-3000 hits per month
Illicit Discharge, Pet Waste	Illicit discharge, pet waste	Television, Website	General public, homeowners, pet	758 ads placed on local TV stations
Construction Site BMPs	BMP techniques for construction sites	Flyer	Businesses, developers, contractors	17,000 flyers for distribution with building permits
Carolina Yards and Neighborhoods Program	Partnership with NC Cooperative Extension Services to promote home landscaping techniques to protect water quality, reduce stormwater runoff and conserve	Television, Newspaper, Workshops, Garden Demonstration Site Signage, Surveys, Tabletop Displays, Partnership Kits, Promotional Giveaways, Website	General public, homeowners	1,609 TV ads, Newspaper ads in 4 newspapers, Demonstration Garden signs viewed at 3 Coop. Ext. locations (3) 15-minute videos explaining the nine principles of CYN program.
Drain Markers	Protecting water quality by preventing pollution	Plaques	General public	5,500 applied to storm drains
Business Pollution Prevention	Pollution prevention at the workplace	Flyer/Poster	Commercial and Industrial	3,301 distributed to local business owners
Lenny the Lifeguard	Pollution prevention and importance of protecting water quality for younger children.	Television, Curriculum Guide & Student Kit, Science Teachers Conference attendance, Promotional Giveaways, Website	Elementary school children and their parents	995 TV ads, 512 5 th grade curriculum guides distributed to teachers with 12,219 student giveaway items. 50,000 Lenny stickers and coloring pages distributed at 21 Chick-fil-a locations.
Municipal Housekeeping Training	Good housekeeping and pollution prevention	Video	Municipal Employees	Videos available for member checkout
Used Motor Oil Carolina Yards and Neighborhood Program Lenny the Lifeguard	Proper disposal of used motor oil for do-it-yourself mechanics. Landscaping techniques to protect water quality, reduce stormwater runoff, and conserve.	Television, Radio, Movie Theater, Point of Purchase Displays, Promotional Giveaways, Website	General public, male do-it-yourself mechanics, Hispanic males	757 Television ads, 136 Radio ads on La Preciosa. 3 month movie theater ads shown on 106 screens. Market area results indicated 11,765 people reached. 2,000 oil funnels purchased for distribution. (2) 30 second CYN commercials aired at least 7674 times on local stations and Time Warner Cable. Pre and Post survey administered to 402 residents in Alamance, Forsyth, Guilford, and Randolph County. CYN PowerPoint presented at 175 workshops and community presentations. 995 total Lenny the Lifeguard television ads purchased.
General Pollution Prevention Lenny the Lifeguard Carolina Yards and Neighborhoods Program	General Pollution Prevention topics covered. Pollution prevention and importance of protecting water quality for younger children	Television, Radio, Tabletop Displays, Promotional Giveaways, and Newspaper, Website	General public, Hispanics Elementary school children and their parents and Homeowners	596 General pollution prevention television ads, 364 radio ads, 1188 Lenny the Lifeguard television ads, 14,000 Lenny the Lifeguard activity books ordered for distribution. Newspaper ad placed in 2 local newspapers.
Bacteria Waste Lenny the Lifeguard Carolina Yards and Neighborhood Program	Bacteria waste pollution prevention. Pollution prevention and importance of protecting water quality for younger children	Television, Promotional Giveaways, Printed material, Website updates	General public, pet owners. Elementary school children and their parents.	501 Television ads purchased, 445 Hispanic Radio ads purchased. 2,625 frog key chains purchased for distribution. 10,000 Scoop the Poop postcards and stickers ordered for distribution. 30 rolls of oxo-biodegradable pet waste bags ordered for distribution. 12 CYN workshops provided to residents in 2 counties.
Spills and Skills Non-Emergency HazMat Spill Response	Good housekeeping and pollution prevention	Video	Municipal Employees	Videos available for member checkout
Stream Buffers Lenny the Lifeguard Backyard Buffer Program Carolina Yard and Neighborhood Program	Stream buffer benefits. Pollution prevention and importance of protecting water quality for younger children. Residential stream buffer giveaway program.	Television, Radio, Website Updates, Printed material, Presentation binders	General public, pet owners. Elementary school children and their parents.	487 Buffer television ad, 529 Hispanic radio buffer ads, 1376 Lenny the Lifeguard television ads. 4,000 stream buffer plants distributed and 133 interested homeowners in attendance at the scheduled workshops. 1250 postcards distributed to homeowners in participating communities. 12 CYN workshops held in two counties. 203 <i>Follow the Water from Brook to Ocean</i> books by Arthur Dorros placed in elementary and public libraries within participating communities.
Club Stormdrain-General Pollution New Lenny the Lifeguard Commercial Backyard Buffer Residential Program Clean Streams Commercial Landscape Program Carolina Yards and Neighborhood	Pollution prevention for homeowners, professional landscapers. Pollution prevention and importance of protecting water quality for younger children	Television, Radio, Web banners, Website updates, New Lenny Facebook page created in February 2012, Promotional Giveaways	General public, Homeowners, landscape professionals, Elementary school children and their parents.	1454 Lenny the Lifeguard television Ads 208 General Pollution Prevention radio ads 100 Lenny the Lifeguard Face book Likes 54 Backyard Buffer Workshop attendees 34 Clean Streams workshop attendees 9 CYN workshops held in two counties. 16,000 CYN Workbooks reprinted 6,200 Lenny key chains purchased for distribution



August 24, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager
FROM: Gwen Torain, Grants Administration
SUBJECT: Homelessness Funding

The following is in response to Council’s request at August 21, 2012 meeting, for the recipient agencies, the award amounts, and the use of funds for activities funded through the City’s FY 12-13 allocation for homelessness prevention.

Under the contracting arrangement with Partners Ending Homelessness that Council approved on August 21st the City will provide \$433,081 to the agencies listed below. Including the administrative fee for Partners, the total contract amount is \$462,285. The funding will help supplement the cost of providing emergency shelter and services and permanent housing opportunities for persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Agency	Amount Awarded	Use of Funds
Family Service of Piedmont - Clara House	17,404	Program expenses
Housing Coalition Hotline	55,841	Information/Referral
Housing Coalition Operations	10,440	General operating/maintenance, Program expenses
Greensboro Urban Ministry - Weaver House	25,833	General operating/maintenance
Jericho House	7,000	General operating/maintenance
Mary's House	34,915	General operating/maintenance, administrative, program expenses
Room at the Inn of the Piedmont	32,058	General operating/maintenance, administrative, program expenses
Servant Center	34,915	General operating/maintenance, administrative, program expenses
Salvation Army - Center of Hope	26,319	General operating/maintenance, administrative, program expenses
Youth Focus - Act Together	20,261	Program expenses
Youth Focus- My Sister Susan's House	34,497	Program expenses
Emergency Solutions Grant Funding	133,598	To be directed for Rapid Re-housing and Prevention activities
	433,081	

GT



August 16, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager

FROM: Adam Fischer, Director

SUBJECT: Curb and Gutter Assessments for Hilltop Road, Stanley Road, and Franklin Boulevard

Hilltop Road, Stanley Road and Franklin Boulevard projects are scheduled for a public hearing and request for approval of curb and gutter assessments at the September 4 City Council meeting. The Legal Department sent a letter of "Notice of preliminary assessment roll for local improvements" on July 31 to property owners informing them of the upcoming Public Hearing. The City Clerk's office will advertise the public hearing on August 23, which includes the actual assessment charges to the property owners. After the mailing of the letters, City staff received several inquiries from the property owners about the amount of the assessments and the payment options, as well as inquiries about the length of time between the completion of the project and the assessments.

On January 5, 1999, City Council adopted a resolution by public necessity ordering the widening on Hilltop Road from Adams Farm Parkway to approximately 1300 feet east of Stanley Road with the installation of curb and gutter. Construction on Hilltop Road started in the fall of 2003 and the contract was finalized in the fall of 2007.

On December 17, 2002, City Council adopted a resolution, by public necessity, ordering the widening on Stanley Road from Hilltop Road to a point 320 feet north of Hilltop Road with the installation of curb and gutter in conjunction with the Hilltop Road improvements. Construction on Stanley Road Boulevard started in the fall of 2003 and the contract was finalized in the fall of 2007.

On December 17, 2002, City Council adopted a resolution, by public necessity, ordering the widening on Franklin Boulevard from Bessemer Avenue to McConnell Road with the installation of curb and gutter. Construction on Franklin Boulevard started in the spring of 2006 and the contract was finalized in the fall of 2007.

Final assessments are calculated after the closing of a contract. Before assessment rolls were prepared and sent to City Council for these three projects, City Council asked staff at the July 16, 2008 City Council Meeting to investigate the curb and gutter assessment process.

- Staff sent a memo (attached) about Curb and Gutter Assessments to the Mayor and City Council on August 15, 2008.
- Curb and Gutter Assessment options were reviewed briefly at a City Council Work Session on February 24, 2009.
- Staff sent an IFYI memo to the City Manager on November 4, 2010 with three assessment options. (see attached)
- City Council took final action on the Curb and Gutter Assessment issue on February 1, 2011 and decided to continue to assess for roadway improvement projects where new curb and gutter is installed except in cases where curb and gutter is being installed for the primary purpose of constructing sidewalks. (see attached City Council resolution)

Since the primary purpose of installing curb and gutter on Hilltop Road, Stanley Road, and Franklin Boulevard is to improve roadway, assessments for curb and gutter still apply. Upon confirmation of the assessment roll the property owners will have 90 days to pay the charge in full without interest or in installments of 10 annual payments with 6% interest. The property owners are billed by collections in September of every year.

AF

Attachments:

- January 5, 1999 City Council Minutes- Resolution Authorizing Widening, Curb and Gutter on Hilltop Road
- December 17, 2002 City Council Minutes- Resolution Authorizing Widening, Curb and Gutter on Stanley Road
- February 1, 2011 City Council Minutes- Ordinance Amending Chapter 26 of the Greensboro Code of Ordinance with Respect to Streets and Sidewalks
- August 15, 2008 Memorandum- Curb and Gutter Assessments
- November 4, 2010 Memorandum- Curb and Gutter Special Assessments

cc: Butch Simmons, Engineering & Inspections Director
Ute Munro, Engineering & Inspections Business Manager

Mr. Martin stated staff supported the transfer of the Bunch Road lot because a portion of that property was already in the Town of Summerfield. He stated that while the Fleming Road property was in Guilford County, staff did not support the moving of that property because Greensboro planned a future annexation of property in this area. In response to Council inquiries, Mr. Martin explained the circumstances which had caused a slow response from Greensboro to Summerfield's request with respect to these properties. Mr. Martin also detailed the extensive negotiations and subsequent agreement between Greensboro and Summerfield which Council was now being asked to amend.

Rebecca Brogdon, owner of the lot on Fleming Road, spoke to her petition to request that this property be annexed by Summerfield. She stated that her original desire to receive Greensboro water and sewer was cost prohibitive and that she had since that time provided a well and septic system for her property. Ms. Brogdon also spoke to her plans for the property and advised Summerfield abutted this lot on three sides.

The Manager stated that at the time of negotiated annexation agreements with Summerfield and other recently-incorporated municipalities, all parties had accepted the agreed-upon boundary lines. He expressed concern that if Council approved this request to amend the annexation agreement with Summerfield, the action would set a precedent for future requests to amend boundary lines in existing annexation agreements with other municipalities. The Manager stated it was the responsibility of Council members to determine whether each individual request for an amendment to annexation boundary line agreements would be considered by Council. He asked if Council would consider approving these changes and emphasizing to Summerfield representatives that no additional amendments would be considered.

Council discussed with staff various opinions and concerns: i.e., the unique circumstances with respect to the Bunch Road lot which would support its annexation into Summerfield, the provision of police and fire services to these properties, the precedent this action would set for future requests, the timeframe for potential annexation into Greensboro of the Fleming Road property, the unusual boundary line between these two municipalities, the overall purpose of the annexation agreements to enable the growth of Greensboro, the legal agreement in place between Greensboro and Summerfield, etc.

After lengthy discussion, Councilmember Vaughan moved that this matter be tabled to enable additional discussion between the City Manager and Summerfield representatives. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Johnson and adopted unanimously by voice vote of Council.

.....

The Mayor stated that this was the time and place set for a public hearing to consider a Resolution authorizing on basis of public necessity widening, curb and gutter improvements on Hilltop Road from Adams Farm Parkway to approximately 1,300 feet east of Stanley Road. Mayor Allen asked if anyone wished to be heard.

After brief comments by Councilmember Carmany and there being no one present desiring to speak to this matter, Councilmember Carmany moved adoption of the resolution. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Burroughs-White; the resolution was adopted on the following roll call vote: Ayes: Allen, Burroughs-White, Carmany, Holliday, Johnson, Jones, Mincello, Perkins and Vaughan. Noes: None.

RESOLUTION ORDERING THE MAKING OF CERTAIN LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS

H-216

HILLTOP ROAD FROM ADAMS FARM PARKWAY TO APPROXIMATELY 1300 FEET EAST OF STANLEY ROAD

WHEREAS, due notice has been given that on the 5th day of January, 1999 at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber in the Municipal Office Building a public hearing would be held on the improvements hereinafter described and that all objections to the legality of the making of the improvements are required by law to be made in writing, signed in person or by attorney, and filed with the City Clerk at or before the time of the public hearing;

WHEREAS, the public hearing has now been held and no objections have been made to the making of the improvements;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GREENSBORO:

A. That the street or streets hereinabove set out is/are without curbs and gutters, that public necessity and interest require that said street or streets within the limits set out be widened, with curbs and gutters, and that abutting property will be benefited to the extent of the part of the cost thereof to be assessed against such abutting property.

B. That the local improvements to be made on the street or streets set out above are as follows:

Roadway Improvements. That the street or streets hereinabove named within the limits defined be widened on both sides with stone base asphaltic concrete surface, the widening to include grading, construction of storm sewers and necessary laterals, laying of concrete curbs and gutters, and all other work incidental to the improvements.

C. That the proportion of the cost of the improvements to be assessed against the abutting property and the terms of payment will be as provided in the Notice of Public Hearing which was served on the owners of the property to be assessed.

D. That this resolution be published one time in a newspaper published in the City of Greensboro as notice of the matters herein set out.

(Signed) Sandy Carmany

.....

Mayor Allen stated this was the time and place set for a public hearing to confirm assessment roll for water main improvements on Farrell Street from end of pavement to end of Farrell Street where none now exists. The Mayor asked if anyone wished to be heard.

After brief discussion and there being no one present desiring to speak to this matter, Councilmember Jones moved adoption of the resolution. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Carmany; the resolution was adopted on the following roll call vote: Ayes: Allen, Burroughs-White, Carmany, Holliday, Johnson, Jones, Mincello, Perkins and Vaughan. Noes: None.

F-179

F-179 RESOLUTION CONFIRMING ASSESSMENT ROLL FOR LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS

FARRELL STREET FROM END OF PAVEMENT TO END OF FARRELL STREET WHERE NONE NOW EXISTS

WHEREAS, on the 19th day of December, 1994, the City Council of the City of Greensboro adopted a resolution ordering the making on the street or streets hereinabove set out of the following improvements:

Water Main Improvements. That a water main be laid on the street or streets hereinabove named within the limits defined, and that necessary laterals (including sewer laterals where none exist and sewer main has been installed) be laid for the proper connection of abutting property.

AND, WHEREAS, the improvements have now been completed, and the City Council has ascertained the total cost thereof and the amount that should be assessed against each lot abutting on the improvements on account of the improvements and has caused to be prepared a general plan map of the improvements, on which map is shown the frontage and location of each lot on the street or streets improved, together with the owners thereof, as far as the same can be ascertained, the plan map being marked:

FARRELL STREET

End of Existing Pavement to the end of Farrell Street

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GREENSBORO:

1. That the total cost of the improvements is hereby designated to be the amount shown thereof on said general plan map.
2. That the City Council finds as a fact that each lot abutting on the improvements has been specially benefited by the improvements in the amount assessed against such lot as shown by the preliminary assessment roll.
3. That the general plan map is hereby confirmed at 4:00 p.m., on the 5th day of January, 1999, and is hereby made the final assessment roll for the improvements.

BEGINNING at a point in the intersection of the southern right-of-way line of Bothwell Street and the western right-of-way line of Willow Road, said point being the northeast corner of Lot 8 of Bothwell Street Subdivision as recorded in Plat Book 29, Page 83 in the Office of the Guilford County Register of Deeds; thence along the western right-of-way line of Willow Road the following three (3) courses and distances: S01°57'E 379.25 feet to a point, thence S01°57'E 20.75 feet to a point, thence S03°34'E 173.89 feet to a point at the southeast corner of said Lot 8; thence along the southern property line of Lots 1 through 9 and the southern property line of Power House of Deliverance of the Apostolic Faith as recorded in Deed Book 4558, Page 189 S87°49'47"W 1,165.76 feet to a point, said point being the southwest corner of Power House of Deliverance of the Apostolic Faith; thence along the western line of said Power House of Deliverance N13°38'19"W 134.86 feet to a point in the southern property line of Lot 8 of Ambassador Estates as recorded in Plat Book 72, Page 129; thence along the southern property line of Lots 8 through 13 of the above mentioned Ambassador Estates N77°29'45"E 336.88 feet to a point in the southern property line of said Lot 13, said point also being the southwest corner of Power House of Deliverance as recorded in Deed Book 3418, Page 675; thence along the western property line of Power House of Deliverance N13°33'37"W 197.69 feet to a point in the southern right-of-way line of Bothwell Street; thence along the southern right-of-way line of Bothwell Street N76°02'03"E 916.91 feet to the point and place of BEGINNING, containing 10.82 acres more or less.

Section 2. That the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit in accordance with the above-mentioned change in zoning classification is hereby authorized subject to the following use limitations and conditions:

- 1) Uses: Church addition, church-related school, day care center, rehabilitation and counseling services, community recreation center, administration offices, independent living housing, townhomes, café and related accessory uses.
- 2) Construct and maintain an opaque privacy fence along lines adjoining residentially zoned property. Install and maintain landscaping on exterior of fence.
- 3) Preserve any existing perimeter trees to extent possible adjoining residentially zoned property.
- 4) Trash containers shall be screened.
- 5) Exterior lighting shall be directed away from adjoining properties.
- 6) Maximum number of townhomes shall be no more than 15.
- 7) Maximum number of group homes shall be no more than 4.

Section 3. This property will be perpetually bound to the uses authorized and subject to such conditions as imposed, unless subsequently changed or amended as provided for in Chapter 30 of the Greensboro Code of Ordinances. Final plans for any development to be made pursuant to any Conditional Use Permit shall be submitted to the Technical Review Committee for approval.

Section 4. Any violations or failure to accept any conditions and use limitations imposed herein shall be subject to the remedies provided in Chapter 30 of the Greensboro Code of Ordinances.

.....

The Mayor declared a recess at 8:08 p.m.

The Council reconvened at 8:24 with all members present.

.....

Mayor Holliday stated that this was the time and place set for a public hearing to consider a resolution authorizing on the basis of public necessity widening, curb and gutter (where none now exists) on Stanley Road from Hilltop Road to a point 320 feet north of Hilltop Road.

The Mayor asked if anyone present wished to be heard. There being no one present who wished to speak to this matter, Councilmember Vaughan moved adoption of the resolution. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Carmany, the resolution was adopted on the following roll call vote: Ayes: Burroughs-White, Carmany, Gatten, Holliday, Jessup, Johnson, Perkins, Phillips and Vaughan. Noes: None.

12.17.2002

S-226 RESOLUTION ORDERING THE MAKING OF CERTAIN LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS

WIDENING WITH CURB AND GUTTER (WHERE NONE NOW EXISTS) OF STANLEY ROAD FROM HILLTOP ROAD TO A POINT 320 FEET NORTH OF HILLTOP ROAD

WHEREAS, due notice has been given that on the 17th day of December, 2002 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber in the Municipal Office Building a public hearing would be held on the improvements hereinafter described and that all objections to the legality of the making of the improvements are required by law to be made in writing, signed in person or by attorney, and filed with the City Clerk at or before the time of the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the public hearing has now been held and no objections have been made to the making of the improvements;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GREENSBORO:

A. That the street or streets hereinabove set out is/are

STANLEY ROAD FROM HILLTOP ROAD TO A POINT 320 FEET NORTH OF HILLTOP ROAD

B. That the local improvements to be made on the street or streets set out above are as follows:

- (a) Roadway Paving Improvements. That the street or streets hereinabove named within the limits defined be widened on both sides with stone base asphaltic concrete surface, the widening to include grading, construction of storm sewers and necessary laterals, laying of concrete curbs and gutters, and all other work incidental to the improvements.

C. That the proportion of the cost of the improvements to be assessed against the abutting property and the terms of payment will be as provided in the Notice of Public Hearing which was served on the owners of the property to be assessed.

D. That this resolution be published one time in a newspaper published in the City of Greensboro as notice of the matters herein set out.

(Signed) Donald R. Vaughan

.....

The Mayor stated that this was the time and place set for a public hearing to consider a resolution confirming assessment roll for sanitary sewer improvements on Maybrook Drive from existing sewer at O'Ferrell Street to 150 feet west of O'Ferrell Street.

Mayor Holliday asked if anyone wished to speak to this matter. There being no one present who wished to be heard, Councilmember Vaughan moved adoption of the resolution. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Burroughs-White, the resolution was adopted on the following roll call vote: Ayes: Burroughs-White, Carmany, Gatten, Holliday, Jessup, Johnson, Perkins, Phillips and Vaughan. Noes: None.

M-241 RESOLUTION CONFIRMING ASSESSMENT ROLL FOR LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS

MAYBROOK DRIVE FROM EXISTING SEWER AT O'FERRELL STREET TO 150' WEST OF O'FERRELL STREET

WHEREAS, on the 3rd day of February, 1998, the City Council of the City of Greensboro adopted a resolution ordering the making on the street or streets hereinabove set out of the following improvements:

2/1/11 40 minutes

11-20 ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE CORPORATE LIMITS (LOCATED AT 3123 CEDAR PARK ROAD – 20.17 ACRES)

Section 1. Pursuant to G.S. 160A-58.1, the hereinafter described territory is hereby annexed to City of Greensboro:

BEGINNING at a point, said point being the northwest corner of Schwarz Property, LLC as recorded in Plat Book 170, Page 81 in the Guilford County Register of Deeds; thence proceeding along northern, eastern and southern line of said Schwarz lot the following seven courses: (1) N 60° 46' 08" E a distance of 560.32 feet to a point; thence (2) S 59° 42' 44" E a distance of 575.37 feet to a point; thence (3) S 59° 31' 47" E a distance of 117.96 feet to a point; thence (4) S 04° 08' 57" W a distance of 669.23 feet to a point; thence (5) S 78° 23' 51" W a distance of 208.97 feet to a point; thence (6) S 78° 11' 23" W a distance of 149.81 feet to a point; thence (7) S 11° 49' 01" E a distance of 290.66 feet to a point, said point being within the northern right-of-way line for Cedar Park Road (60-foot width); thence proceeding along the northern right-of-way for Cedar Park Road S 78° 07' 49" W a distance of 319.37 feet to a point; thence proceeding along the eastern line of said Schwarz lot N 62° 31' 56" W a distance of 85.44 feet to a point; thence proceeding N 44° 53' 59" W a distance of 103.00 feet to a point; thence proceeding N 21° 03' 43" W a distance of 20.65 feet to a point, said point being the southeast corner of Lot 1 of the Guilford Commons Subdivision as recorded in Plat Book 165 on Page 52 of the Guilford County Register of Deeds; thence proceeding along and adjoining the boundary of the adjacent property, same being known as Guilford Commons, which boundary is shown as N 03° 21' 00" E a distance of 926.30 feet on the plat recorded in Plat Book 170 on Page 81 of the Guilford County Register of Deeds, said boundary to be construed as completely adjoining the Guilford Commons property without regard to discrepancies in the description of this boundary in recorded plats or deeds; thence proceeding along and adjoining the boundary of the adjacent property, same being known as Guilford Commons, which boundary is shown as N 71° 39' 24" W a distance of 350.71 feet on the plat recorded in Plat Book 170 on Page 81 of the Guilford County Register of Deeds, said boundary to be construed as completely adjoining the Guilford Commons property without regard to discrepancies in the description of this boundary in recorded plats or deeds; to the point and place of beginning, containing 20.17 acres, more or less.

Section 2. The owner agrees to pay to the City of Greensboro an acreage fee of five hundred eighty dollars (\$580.00) per acre for water service and five hundred eighty dollars (\$580.00) per acre for sewer service immediately prior to the time of annexation. Any utility line assessments which may have been levied by the County shall be collected either by voluntary payment or through foreclosure of same by the City. Following annexation, the property annexed shall receive the same status regarding charges and rates as any other property located inside the corporate limits of the City of Greensboro.

Section 3. The owner shall be fully responsible for extending water and sewer service to the property at said owner's expense.

Section 4. From and after the effective date of annexation, the above described territory and its citizens and property shall be subject to all debts, laws, ordinances and regulations in force within the City and shall be entitled to the same privileges and benefits thereof, subject to the provisions in Sections 2 and 3 above.

Section 5. From and after February 1, 2011, the liability for municipal taxes for the 2010-2011 fiscal year shall be prorated on the basis of 5/12 of the total amount of taxes that would be due for the entire fiscal year. The due date for prorated municipal taxes shall be September 1, 2011. Municipal ad valorem taxes for the 2011-2012 fiscal year and thereafter shall be due annually on the same basis as any other property within the city limits.

Section 6. That this ordinance shall become effective upon adoption.

(Signed) T. Dianne Bellamy-Small

.....

Mayor Knight introduced an ordinance amending Chapter 26 of the Greensboro Code of Ordinances with respect to Streets and Sidewalks – Exempting Curb and Gutter assessments.

Transportation Director Adam Fischer stated this had been presented to Council at a Work Session in November; outlined the options presented at a Work Session; stated that the ordinance presented was at Council's

2/1/11 CC minutes

direction; and that the City would continue to assess for curb and gutter except where the main purpose for installation was for the construction of sidewalks.

Councilmember Bellamy-Small moved adoption of the ordinance. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Thompson; the ordinance was adopted on the following roll call vote: Ayes: Bellamy-Small; Kee, Knight, Matheny, Perkins, Rakestraw, Thompson, Vaughan, and Wade. Noes: None.

11-21 ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 26 OF THE GREENSBORO CODE OF ORDINANCES WITH RESPECT TO STREETS AND SIDEWALKS – EXEMPTING CURB AND GUTTER ASSESSMENTS

Section 1. Chapter 26, Section 2, Subsection (c) of the City of Greensboro Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to read as follows:

(c) The assessment formula for streets shall be set at a rate that recovers fifty (50%) of the construction cost; except that curb and gutter improvements shall be exempt from any assessment if the primary purpose for the curb & gutter installation is the construction of an adjacent sidewalk or sidewalks.

Section 2. Chapter 26, Section 65, Subsection (b) of the City of Greensboro Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to read as follows:

(b) The council shall determine what streets or portions of streets and which side of streets shall be provided with sidewalks, and shall likewise determine the amount of costs incident to such sidewalk construction which shall be borne by the city and the amount of such costs which shall be borne by the abutting property owners; however, curb and gutter improvements shall be exempt from any assessment if the primary purpose of the curb and gutter installation is the construction of an adjacent sidewalk or sidewalks.

Section 3. That all ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

Section 4. That this ordinance shall become effective upon adoption.

(Signed) T. Dianne Bellamy-Small

.....

Mayor Knight introduced a resolution approving 2011 Legislative Agenda and requesting support thereof by the Guilford County Delegation to the General Assembly and stated Council would vote on each item separately.

Assistant City Manager Denise Turner made a PowerPoint presentation; stated that these items were reviewed at the January 25th Work Session; and that she would introduce each item for Council to vote on.

Assistant City Manager Turner stated that the first item was to seek local legislation to amend Sec. 4.21 of the City Charter to provide the Greensboro City Attorney be appointed by and report to the City Council. Councilmember Wade moved adoption of the Appointment of the City Attorney. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Rakestraw; the item was adopted on the following roll call vote: Ayes: Kee, Knight, Matheny, Rakestraw, Thompson, Vaughan, and Wade. Noes: Bellamy-Small, and Perkins.

Assistant City Manager Turner stated that the second item was to seek legislation to limit the City Manager's authority to enter into service contracts. Councilmember Wade moved adoption of the Limitation of Authority for City Manager to authorize Service Contracts. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Matheny; the item was adopted on the following roll call vote: Ayes: Kee, Knight, Matheny, Perkins, Rakestraw, Thompson, Vaughan, and Wade. Noes: Bellamy-Small.

Assistant City Manager Turner stated that the third item was to seek legislation to amend the City Charter to repeal the City's authority to place utility liens against residential rental property when a tenant failed to pay and when the water bill was in the name of the tenant. Councilmember Wade moved adoption of amendment to the City Charter with regard to Utility Liens. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Rakestraw; the item was adopted on the

Date: August 15, 2008
To: Mayor and City Council
From: City Engineering and Inspections, Legal and Transportation Departments
Re: **Curb and Gutter Special Assessments**

Legal Findings

City staff has been requested to apprise you of various considerations, specifically with respect to curb and gutter assessments on City roadway improvement projects. The first consideration is regarding the general authority to make special assessments. Pursuant to Section 6.131 of the Charter of the City of Greensboro and N.C.G.S. §160A-216, the City of Greensboro has the authority to make local improvements and to assess the cost against the benefited property. Though the City has the ability to make special assessments, is not required to do so.

Accordingly, the City has the ability to discontinue curb and gutter assessments for projects that have not already been assessed. If the City were to institute such a policy change, the policy would apply to all future properties to be benefited by local improvements. **The City also has the ability to apply such a policy to properties already impacted by a resolution ordering improvements, where the assessment rolls have not yet been confirmed; i.e. the properties have not yet been assessed.** In that situation, Council would rescind the portion of the resolution ordering improvements which sets forth the designation of the proportion of the cost of improvements to be assessed against abutting property. It is important to note that the discontinuance of curb and gutter assessments must be instituted in a uniform manner to meet constitutional requirements.

On the other hand, it is not recommended that the City retroactively discontinue assessments with respect to properties as to which assessment rolls have already been confirmed. If property owners are granted relief from past assessments, there will be some property owners who have paid their assessments in full and others who have outstanding payments remaining. It could be argued that property owners are not being treated uniformly, thus exposing the City to certain constitutional challenges. Equal protection arguments could be raised as well as arguments that those who have yet to pay their assessments in full are receiving an exclusive emolument or privilege not afforded others, contrary to the North Carolina Constitution.

Policy Impacts

Public Concerns

The curb and gutter assessment requirement has the effect of reducing public support for and increasing opposition to public necessity roadway and sidewalk improvements. One factor has been the property owners' ability to pay. Another is a perception of unfairness since the City assesses projects where ribbon pavement is upgraded to curb and gutter and not the wider range of City street and sidewalk improvements. This relates also to the perception that property owners are being charged twice for the improvements: in the form of the assessment and again through the property tax.

City Staff Time and Cost Impacts

It is roughly estimated that the City spends approximately 1,650 staff hours per year on curb and gutter assessments. This work is spread across Engineering and Inspections, Legal, Finance, Collections, and Transportation, and is estimated to equate to approximately \$33,000 worth of staff time. If assessments were eliminated, this time would be diverted to other City service functions.

Projects Involving Assessments and Related Impacts

The first set of projects in the table indicates projects for which assessments have been made and for which payments are still active. The second set indicates projects for which construction is complete and are ready for assessment, but for which assessment roll is not yet finalized. The third set of projects is in development and would involve assessment at a later point in time. The table indicates that overall the assessment fees capture a relatively small portion of the overall project costs. It also indicates, in the second and third parts, potential revenue losses to the City and corresponding cost savings to affected property owners if assessments were eliminated.

1) Previously assessed, with payments still in progress			
	Assessment	Full Cost	Recovery
Horse Pen Creek	\$15,911	\$308,171	5%
Murraylane	\$52,121	\$253,384	21%
New Garden	\$158,657	\$2,948,339	5%
Aloe	\$45,570	\$433,458	11%
Henry	\$6,220	\$46,788	13%
S. Elm – Eugene	\$118,007	\$2,685,558	4%
Total	\$396,486	\$6,675,698	6%

2) Authorized, assessment roll not finalized, ready to assess			
	Assessment	Full Cost	Recovery
Hilltop	\$254,453	\$1,387,024	18%
Franklin	\$296,336	\$2,614,240	11%
McKnight	\$3,477	\$18,122	19%
Stanley	\$16,814	\$71,813	23%
Total	\$571,080	\$4,091,199	14%

3) Future projects, assessment roll not finalized, not ready to assess			
	<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Full Cost</u>	<u>Recovery</u>
New Garden	\$140,000	\$2,650,000	5%
Rehobeth Church	\$6,783	\$75,000	9%
Creek Ridge	\$192,118	\$5,100,000	4%
Lake Jeanette	\$168,735	\$4,400,000	4%
Jolson	\$15,135	\$35,000	43%
Mackay	\$106,027	\$2,800,000	4%
Hornaday	\$86,705	\$1,800,000	5%
Total	\$715,503	\$16,860,000	4%

The City's policies indicate that the street assessment fee should recover 50% of the curb and gutter costs. The assessment fees are reevaluated every three years. New rates are designed to achieve a 50% recovery rate based on typical unit costs for upgrading a standard ribbon pavement residential street to add curb and gutter. A request for an increase of assessment fees is included in the User Fee Schedule that Council adopts during the budget process. Over the past twenty years the street assessment rate has only been raised twice, on July 1, 1988 and July 1, 1999. In practice, only a small portion of overall project costs are typically covered by project assessments. These revenues typically fall short of the 50% goal of just the curb and gutter related costs as well.

Additional Concerns

Impacts related to Public Necessity & Petition Projects

Roadway projects adding new curb and gutter in the City are currently identified in one of two ways. Public necessity projects are identified by the City to meet a public health, safety, and welfare need such as a street widening and/or sidewalk installation, drainage solution or related purpose. Petition projects are proposed by property owners, and require 51% or more of affected property owners' approval. Petition projects are made on the basis of public request instead of a finding of public necessity by the City.

Because assessment increases opposition to projects, if curb and gutter assessments were eliminated, then the number of petition requests might increase. Such projects would require a funding source in order to move forward. Changing the petition process to feed directly into the CIP process, where public support and funding availability are key considerations, would be one way to manage this issue.

If the assessment procedure is maintained, then the City will still need to evaluate how to fund curb and gutter petition projects because there is no currently identified funding source (former funding sources Powell Bill and/or Street & Sidewalk Fund are no longer available).

cc: City Manager
Deputy City Manager
Acting Assistant City Manager



November 4, 2010

TO: Rashad Young, City Manager

FROM: Adam Fischer, Director of Transportation

SUBJECT: Curb and Gutter Special Assessments

Background:

Pursuant to Section 6.131 of the Charter of the City of Greensboro and NCGS § 160A-216, the City of Greensboro has the authority to make local improvements and to assess the cost against the benefited property. Though the City has the ability to make special assessments, it is not required to do so. Currently the City of Greensboro assesses for water, sewer, and roadway improvements which include the installation of curb and gutter. The City of Greensboro does not assess for sidewalk improvements.

The City's current policies indicate that the street assessment fee for roadway improvements should recover 50% of the roadway improvement costs. Assessment rates for roadway improvements have been increased twice over the past twenty five (25) years, July 1, 1988 and July 1, 1999. In practice only about 6% of the overall roadway construction costs are typically recovered through curb and gutter assessments. The current assessment rate for roadway improvement projects with curb and gutter is \$23/linear foot.

Accordingly, the City has the ability to discontinue curb and gutter assessments for roadway improvement projects that have not already been assessed. If the City were to institute such a policy change, the policy would apply to all future properties to be benefited by local roadway improvements. The City also has the ability to discontinue curb and gutter assessments for roadway improvements to properties already impacted by a resolution ordering improvements, where the final assessment rolls have not yet been confirmed. It is important to note that the discontinuance of curb and gutter assessments must be instituted in a uniform manner to meet constitutional requirements. It is not recommended that the City retroactively discontinue assessments where City Council has already authorized assessments and payments are in progress. If property owners are granted relief from past assessments, there will be some property owners who have paid their assessments in full and others who have outstanding payments remaining. It could be argued that that property owners are not being treated uniformly, thus exposing the City to certain constitutional challenges.

The following tables show 1.) Roadway Improvements that are complete and final assessments have been authorized; 2.) Roadway Improvements that are complete but final assessments have not been authorized; 3.) Roadway Improvements under construction, City Council has authorized with intent to assess.

Table 1				
Construction is Complete				
City Council has Authorized Final Assessments/Payments are in progress				
	Assessment	ROW Payments	Construction Cost	Recovery
New Garden Road Ph 1	\$158,657	\$214,663	\$2,948,339	5.4%
S. Elm – Eugene Street	\$118,008	\$478,630	\$2,685,558	4.4%
Total	\$276,665	\$693,293	\$5,633,897	4.9%

Table 2				
Construction is Complete				
Projects Authorized with Intent to Assess				
City Council Has Not Authorized Final Assessment				
	Estimated Assessment	ROW Payments	Construction Cost	Recovery
Hilltop Road	\$254,453	\$562,522	\$4,213,937	6.0%
Franklin Boulevard	\$296,336	\$320,057	\$2,614,240	11.3%
Total	\$550,789	\$885,579	\$6,828,177	8.1%

Table 3				
Under Construction				
City Council Has Authorized Project with Intent to Assess				
	Estimated Assessment	ROW Payments	Construction Cost	Recovery
New Garden Rd. Ph II	\$140,000	\$1,118,213	\$4,668,000	3%
Lake Jeanette Road	\$168,735	\$696,794	\$3,064,242	5.5%
Hornaday Road	\$86,705	\$167,779	\$1,800,000	4.8%
Total	\$395,440	\$1,982,786	\$9,532,242	4.1%

Issues:

The curb and gutter assessment requirement can reduce public support for roadway improvement projects. Adjacent property owners who will benefit from the project because of increased property values, often times do not realize the benefit of the improvements. Payments to property owners for right-of-way are made several years in advance of the curb and gutter assessment and the property owner does not realize the "trade-off" between the right-of-way payment and the assessment, especially where property changes hands in the mean time.

The City does not assess for sidewalk installation; however, some sidewalk installation requires the placement of curb and gutter because of grade and drainage issues. Current City policy requires the City to assess property owners when roadway improvements with curb and gutter are made, even if the curb and gutter is installed for the primarily purpose to construct the sidewalk. This has been an issue with recent sidewalk projects where the addition of curb and gutter is necessary for the installation of sidewalk, including the Heath Community Organization (sidewalks on Lowdermilk Street and Holt's Chapel Road), and from residents in the vicinity of Guilford Middle School who have requested sidewalks along Lindley Road leading to the School. These residents want/need the sidewalk in their neighborhood, but do not want to pay the curb and gutter assessments.

Options:

The following are options for City Council to consider with regards to assessments for street improvements with curb and gutter:

1. Continue the current policy to assess adjacent property owners for all street improvements where new curb and gutter is installed. *(This option would not address any of the issues raised above.)*
2. Discontinue the policy to assess for street improvements initiated by the City for public necessity which involve the installation of curb and gutter. The improvement projects in Table 1 (New Garden Road Phase I and South Elm-Eugene Street) would continue with assessments since City Council has already approved the final assessment rolls for these roadway improvement projects and payments are being made. The improvement projects in Table 2 and Table 3 would not be assessed for curb and gutter as City Council has not approved the final assessment rolls for these roadway improvement projects. *(This option would address all of the issues raised above, but would eliminate a source of revenue which is used to off-set about 6% of the construction cost for roadway improvement projects. This option however would still assess those projects where the City received petitions.)*
3. Continue to assess for roadway improvement projects where new curb and gutter is installed except in cases where curb and gutter is being installed for the main purpose of constructing sidewalks. All the projects listed in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3 above as well as future roadway improvement projects (Creek Ridge Road, Horse Pen Creek Road, and Alamance Church Road) would still be assessed for curb and gutter. Sidewalk installation projects like Holts Chapel Road, Lowdermilk Street, and Lindley Road would be exempt from the curb and gutter street improvement assessment. *(This option would address the issue of curb and gutter assessments for sidewalk projects while still retaining assessment revenue for roadway improvements)*

AF

cc: Andy Scott, Assistant City Manager
Bob Morgan, Deputy City Manager

Field Operations Department
City of Greensboro



August 22, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager

FROM: Dale Wyrick, P.E., Field Operations Director

SUBJECT: RFP# 08-12 for MSW Management Services: GBB Evaluation Update

The following is an update on the evaluation of proposals by Gershman, Brickner, and Bratton, Inc. (GBB) in response to RFP #08-12 for MSW Management Services. On Monday, August 20, 2012, GBB and staff conducted interviews with Hilco Transport, Republic Services, and Waste Connections to seek additional clarification on their proposals.

After the completion of those interviews, John Carlton of GBB advised that we could expect to see their additional report, including their recommendation, by the end of next week, August 31, 2012.

If further is required, please advise.

DDW



August 23, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager
FROM: Mary Vigue, Interim Assistant to the City Manager
SUBJECT: Outside Agency Funding

The City of Greensboro currently provides funding to outside agencies which is included in the adopted budget. For FY 12-13 these agencies include:

- Piedmont Triad Regional Council
- Triad Stage
- Greensboro Sports Commission
- Greensboro Children's Museum
- East Market Development Corporation
- Preservation Greensboro
- Piedmont Triad Partnership
- Greensboro Jaycees (Holiday Parade)
- Grassroots (Fun Fourth, Festival of Lights)
- Community Theater of Greensboro

This list does not include Planning & Community Development's outside agencies or any of the economic development funding.

Currently, staff is working on the appropriate contracts for FY 12-13 and has implemented the following process:

- A letter was sent to all agencies informing them of the financial information requirement and the internal audit process.
- Entities were asked to submit prior year financials.
- Upon verification that the City has an entity's financials, Budget and Evaluation will begin routing the contract for FY 12-13.
- All entities must submit an external audit within 90 days of the end of their fiscal year.
- The Internal Audit Division will contact the outside agency to schedule a review of the entity's records that details how the agency is utilizing the City's funds prior to any funding decisions being made for FY 13-14.

Staff has researched our current internal auditing practices as they relate to outside agencies which receive funding and has developed an ongoing monitoring process.

All outside agencies who receive funding will be required to submit the following items each year to Internal Audit:

- An external audit from a CPA firm must be submitted within 90 days of the fiscal year-end of the entity
- The financial statements should be prepared under the accrual basis which is the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)
- Any Management Letters issued with the financial statements shall be submitted to the City within 90 days of the entity's year-end
- If no Management Letters are issued a letter from the CPA firm shall be submitted to the City on its letterhead stating that no management letters were issued

Upon receiving the external audits and financials, Internal Audit will schedule a review of the entity's records that details how the City funds were utilized and this will occur prior to following year budget cycle in order for the entity to be eligible for funding. The City is currently drafting the contracts for outside agencies and these will now be a standardized contracts that includes these provisions.

The City also has a Zero-Tolerance Policy that was adopted by Council through a resolution on February 17, 2004. This requires that all public service agencies be reviewed to ensure that city funds are expended for a public purpose. Also included is the provision that the City Manager is to receive a copy of the entity's audit of its financial records as well as a status report of all program activities. Staff has reviewed the City's current practices and has realigned and created safeguards to ensure that this Policy is followed moving forward.

Staff is continuing to review the audit process for Planning & Community Development outside agency grants and also Economic Development funding to entities. Once this review has been completed, staff will submit their findings and make a recommendation to the City Manager.

Please let me know if you need additional information.

MV
Attachment

cc: Larry Davis, Director, Budget & Evaluation Department
Len Lucas, Internal Audit Director



August 24, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager
FROM: Gwen Torain, Disparity Study Phase 2 Project Manager
SUBJECT: Disparity Study Public Meetings Process

The City is moving forward with the second phase of the Disparity Study review process and several public focus groups have been scheduled. To aid the City in providing outreach and support, a Community Relations Steering Committee (see list of committee members below) has been created and Gerry McCants, President of McCants Communications Group Inc., has agreed to serve as chair.

The Community Relations Steering Committee will assist the City in facilitating five public focus group meetings in September (see schedule below). During these meetings, participants will offer their input into the 2012 Disparity Study and suggestions for improving the City's Minority and Women Business Enterprise Program.

Using the community's feedback, the City will evaluate potential changes to its Minority and Women Business Enterprise program. The goal is to ensure equal opportunity in all City contracting and purchasing programs, including construction, professional and other services, and purchased goods and materials.

This process will culminate in a set of recommended changes that will be presented to City Council for consideration in November.

First Meeting of Community Relations Steering Committee

- Monday, August 27, 12 noon to 1 pm,
Melvin Municipal Office Building – Plaza Level Conference Room

Focus Group Meeting Schedule

- September 13, 3-5 pm and 6-8 pm
- September 18, 8-10 am and 6-8 pm
- September 20, 10 am to 12 noon

All focus group meetings will take place at the Simkins Indoor Sports Pavilion at Barber Park, 1500 Dans Rd.

Disparity Study Community Relations Steering Committee Members

- Gerry McCants, Committee Chair, McCants Communications Group, Inc.
- Shermin Ata, Shermin Ata Architect PLLC
- Steve Branch, Greensboro Merchants Association
- Cynthia Clemons, Bennett College for Women
- Kathy Elliott, Greensboro Chamber of Commerce
- Jamal Mention, Mention Group, LLC
- Arthur Samet, Samet Corporation
- Mac Sims, East Market Street Development Corporation
- Evon Smith, Sustainable Community Resources

GT/dt

cc: Sandy Neerman, Assistant City Manager
Chris Payne, Deputy Finance Director
Susan Crotts, Central Contracting Division Manager
Kathleen Hoskins Smith, M/WBE Coordinator
Donnie Turlington, Communications Division Manager

Office of the City Attorney
City of Greensboro



August 24, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager
FROM: Jim Clark, Police Attorney
SUBJECT: Amendment of towing and impoundment ordinance

In response to a recent concern expressed by a member of the towing service community, City Staff reviewed Greensboro Code of Ordinances section 16-39 to determine whether additional service contractors may be added to the towing rotation. During this review, Staff determined that the current ordinance does not provide an equitable opportunity for competition to contract with the City for towing services, and improvements may be made to the terms of service in order to gain greater cost efficiency for the City.

After researching the various ways to amend section 16-39 to improve towing services, competition and cost efficiencies, City Staff determined that the most suitable arrangement would involve adopting a Request for Quotations (RFQ) process. The RFQ process allows the City to set specific terms including costs incurred by the City or affected citizens, and it allows for the City to determine appropriate qualifications and letting of contracts for a defined period before re-soliciting services. The contract period proposed by City Staff is three years, with two 1-year extensions permitted.

City Staff recently prepared a text amendment for section 16-39, which re-adopts language inadvertently removed from a previous version of the ordinance. The text amendment also specifically named the City officials responsible for serving as hearing officers in appeals of towing decisions. However, these changes may easily be incorporated into a broader text amendment which City Staff will offer for consideration at the September 4, 2012 City Council meeting.

City Staff is completing the required changes to section 16-39 and the Standards for Wrecker Service originally adopted by the City Council on September 16, 2003. Staff anticipates that the necessary revisions will be complete and forwarded to City Council review on Tuesday, August 28, 2012.

JAC/mm

cc: S. Mujeeb Shah-Khan, City Attorney
Michael Speedling, Assistant City Manager
Kenneth C. Miller, Chief of Police

**Public Affairs
Contact Center Weekly Report
Week of 8/13/12 – 8/19/12**

Contact Center

4751 calls answered this week

Top 5 calls by area

Water Resources

Balance Inquiry – 917
New Sign up – 237
General Info – 214
Cutoff Requests – 106
High usage calls - 105

Field Operations

Bulk Guidelines – 114
HHW/Landfill/Transfer – 93
Repair Can/Garbage – 65
E-Waste – 51
No Service/Garbage - 41

All others

Police/Watch Operations – 417
Courts/Sheriff – 62
Overgrown Lots - 55
GTA - 44
Parking Enforcement - 35

Comments

We received a total of 4 comments this week:

Field Operations – 1 comment:

- Called to commend the men that were handling the construction/widening of Creek Ridge, they were just wonderful. They were very aware of the residents. They were courteous and were careful to make sure the residents were taken care of and could get into their driveways when necessary. They were wonderful to have around, and they did a great job that residents are very pleased with. Caller wanted to make sure that this message reached the City Manager's office.

Public Affairs – 1 comment:

- Caller really appreciates the services we offer at 373-CITY, very convenient,

Water Resources – 2 comments:

- Wanted to thank the city for leaving the high usage notice on her door. Luckily she was already in process of repairs but she wanted to thank us for being proactive and for doing such a good job of alerting residents of possible areas where there could be a problem.
- Would like to thank the storm water crew that fixed the issue with the apartments storm water running off into her yard. They created a ditch to prevent the water from flooding her yard. With the recent hard rain she was able to see their work deflect water from her house. She has never seen it rain this hard. Had they not fixed the problem it would have probably flooded her house. She has never seen a crew work so hard and clean up and not leave a mess behind. Cleaned up her yard and did not leave anything laying around and place fence back when done. The entire crew worked so hard and she wanted to thank all of them.

Overall

Call volume was a bit reduced from our high volumes in July and early August. New students arriving for school were calling about bus schedules, and the recent rain brought overgrown lawns back into the mix of calls. Parking enforcement calls were also on the increase.