AGENDA

Meeting Type:	W
Date:	10-05-1992

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP AGENDA
October 5, 1992

5:00 pm	Animal Shelter
5:45 pm	Dinner
6:00 pm	Law Enforcement Center
7:00 pm	Medians at Intersections
7:30 pm	Citizens Hearings
8:00 pm	Adjourn

CHARLOTTE POLICE DEPARTMENT

Sept 8, 1992 Workshop

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS THROUGH 2012*
10/5/92

2002 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS

2002 NEEDS CURRENT COST	FUTURE COST	TOTAL
50,190,763	**6,704,600**	**56,895,363**
154,500 SQ FT (HDQR)	29 500 SQ FT (HDQR)	184,000 SQ FT (HDQR)
1332 SPACES (HDQR)	300 SPACES (HDQR)	1632 SPACES TOTAL

2002 DECENTRALIZED

2002 NEEDS CURRENT COST	FUTURE COST	TOTAL
46,988,751	**8,093,600**	**55,082,351**
125,500 SQ FT (HDQR)	39 000 SQ FT (BUREAU)	125,500 SQ FT (HDQR)
945 SPACES (HDQR)	406 SPACES (BUREAU)	58 500 SQ FT (BUREAU)
19 500 SQ FT (BUREAU)		184,000 SQ FT TOTAL
281 SPACES (BUREAU)		1632 SPACES TOTAL

1992 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS

1992 NEEDS CURRENT COST	FUTURE COST	TOTAL
43,514,554	**11,107,800**	**54,622,354**
105,000 SQ FT (HDQR)	20,500 SQ FT (HDQR)	125,500 SQ FT (HDQR)
945 SPACES (HDQR)	39,000 SQ.FT (BUREAU)	58,500 SQ.FT (BUREAU)
19,500 SQ FT (BUREAU)	406 SPACES (BUREAU)	184,000 SQ.FT TOTAL
281 SPACES (BUREAU)		1632 SPACES TOTAL

* ALL ESTIMATES IN 1994 DOLLARS

CHARLOTTE POLICE DEPARTMENT

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION THROUGH 2012*
10/5/92

2002 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS

CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTERS FOR GROWTH TO 2002 WITH ALL PARKING ON-SITE
ADD TO HEADQUARTERS AND ON-SITE PARKING IN 2002
ADD TO ON-SITE PARKING IN 2007

CURRENT COST	FUTURE COST	TOTAL
50,190,763	**5,026,000**	**56,895,363**
154,500 SQ FT (HDQR)	29,500 SQ FT (HDQR)	184 000 SQ FT (HDQR)
1332 SPACES (HDQR)	300 SPACES (HDQR)	1632 SPACES TOTAL

2002 DECENTRALIZED

CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTERS TO MEET 2002 NEEDS
CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTER PARKING ON SITE
CONSTRUCT ONE BUREAU STATION CONCURRENT WITH HEADQUARTERS
CONSTRUCT SURFACE PARKING WITH BUREAU STATION
ADD TWO BUREAU STATIONS IN FUTURE ONE IN 2002 AND ONE IN 2007
ADD SURFACE PARKING FOR BOTH BUREAU STATIONS

CURRENT COST	FUTURE COST	TOTAL
46,988,751	**8,093,600**	**55,082,351**
125 500 SQ FT (HDQR)	39 000 SQ.FT (BUREAU)	125,500 SQ.FT (HDQR)
945 SPACES (HDQR)	406 SPACES (BUREAU)	58,500 SQ.FT (BUREAU)
19,500 SQ.FT (BUREAU)		184,000 SQ.FT TOTAL
281 SPACES (BUREAU)		1632 SPACES TOTAL

1992 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS

CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTERS TO MEET 1992 NEEDS
CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTER PARKING ON SITE
CONSTRUCT ONE BUREAU STATION CONCURRENT WITH HEADQUARTERS
CONSTRUCT SURFACE PARKING FOR ONE BUREAU STATION
ADD TO HEADQUARTERS IN 1997
ADD ONE BUREAU STATION IN 1997, WITH SURFACE PARKING
ADD ONE BUREAU STATION IN 2002, WITH SURFACE PARKING

CURRENT COST	FUTURE COST	TOTAL
43,514,554	**11,107,800**	**54,622,354**
105,000 SQ FT (HDQR)	20,500 SQ.FT (HDQR)	125,500 SQ.FT (HDQR)
945 SPACES (HDQR)	39,000 SQ.FT (BUREAU)	58,500 SQ.FT (BUREAU)
19,500 SQ FT (BUREAU)	406 SPACES (BUREAU)	184,000 SQ.FT TOTAL
281 SPACES (BUREAU)		1632 SPACES TOTAL

* ALL ESTIMATES IN 1994 DOLLARS

CHARLOTTE POLICE DEPARTMENT

OPTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION THROUGH 2012
10/5/92

2002 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS

CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTERS TO MEET 2002 NEEDS
154,500 SQ FT
CONTINUE USE OF SATELLITE STATIONS
ON-SITE PARKING TO MEET COMPLETE NEEDS*
1332 SPACES IN DECK OR BELOW GRADE

BUILDING COST	16 223,000
PARKING COST	9 592,000
STREET IMPROVEMENT ALLOWANCES	300 000
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2 000,000
DEMOLITION OF EXISITNG CONDITIONS	250,000
TOTAL	28 365,000
3% CONSTRUCTION ESCALATION	1 03
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST	**29,215,950**
SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT CONTINGENCY	4 382 393
TOTAL	**33,598,343**
5% BIDDING CONTINGENCY	1 05
FIXED LIMIT OF CONSTRUCTION	**35,278,260**
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT	2,034,900
PROJECT DESIGN MANAGEMENT	3 716 138
TOTAL	**41,029,298**
5% CITY PROJECT CONTINGENCY	1 05
TOTAL	**43,080,763**
SITE ACQUISTION	7,110,000
TOTAL	**50,190,763**

2002 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS-FUTURE

ADD TO HEADQUARTERS IN 2002 TO MEET NEEDS THROUGH 2012
29,500 SQ FT
ADD TO PARKING GARAGE IN 2002
82 SPACES ADDED TO DECK
ADD TO PARKING GARAGE IN 2007
218 SPACES

ADD BUILDING COST	3,098,000
ADD PARKING COST	1,691,000
TOTAL	4,789,000
PROJECT ADMIN , CONT , ESCALATION ETC	1 40
TOTAL	**6,704,600**

CURRENT & FUTURE TOTAL **56,895,363**

*MAY REQUIRE ZONING VARIANCE TO ACCOMMODATE ALL PARKING ON-SITE

2002 DECENTRALIZED

CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTERS TO MEET 2002 NEEDS
125,500 SQ FT
CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTER PARKING ON- SITE
945 SPACES IN DECK OR BELOW GRADE
CONSTRUCT ONE BUREAU STATION CONCURRENT W/ HEADQUARTERS
19,500 SQ FT
CONSTRUCT SURFACE PARKING FOR BUREAU STATION
281 SPACES SURFACE PARKING

BUILDING COST	14,836,000
PARKING COST	7,692,000
STREET IMPROVEMENT ALLOWANCES	300,000
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2,000,000
DEMOLITION OF EXISITNG CONDITIONS	250,000
TOTAL	25,078,000
3% CONSTRUCTION ESCALATION	1 03
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST	25,830,340
SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT CONTINGENCY	3,874,551
TOTAL	29,704,891
5% BIDDING CONTINGENCY	1 05
FIXED LIMIT OF CONSTRUCTION	31,190,136
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT	2 034 900
PROJECT DESIGN MANAGEMENT	3,516 632
TOTAL	36,741,668
5% CITY PROJECT CONTINGENCY	1 05
TOTAL	38,578,751
SITE ACQUISTION	7,110,000
LAND ACQUISTION FOR BUREAU	1,300,000
TOTAL	**46,988,751**

2002 DECENTRALIZED-FUTURE

ADD ONE BUREAU STATION IN 2002 AND ONE IN 2007
19,500 SQ FT EACH
ADD SURFACE PARKING FOR EACH BUREAU STATION AS THEY ARE BUILT
203 SPACES EACH

ADD TWO BUREAU STATIONS	3,315,000
ADD 406 SURFACE PARKING SPACES	609,000
TOTAL	3,924,000
PROJECT ADMIN CONT. ESCALATION ETC	1 40
TOTAL	5,493,600
LAND ACQUISTION COST	2,600,000
TOTAL	**8,093,600**

CURRENT & FUTURE TOTAL **55,082,351**

1992 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS

CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTERS TO MEET CURRENT (1992) NEEDS

105,000 SQ FT

CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTER PARKING ON SITE

945 SPACES IN DECK OR BELOW GRADE

CONSTRUCT ONE BUREAU STATION CONCURRENT W/HEADQUARTERS

19,500 SQ FT

CONSTRUCT SURFACE PARKING FOR BUREAU STATION

281 SPACES

BUILDING COST	12,683,000
PARKING COST	7 392,000
STREET IMPROVEMENT ALLOWANCES	300,000
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2,000,000
DEMOLITION OF EXISITNG CONDITIONS	250,000
TOTAL	22,625,000
3% CONSTRUCTION ESCALATION	1 03
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST	23 303,750
SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT CONTINGENCY	3 495,563
TOTAL	26,799,313
5% BIDDING CONTINGENCY	1 05
FIXED LIMIT OF CONSTRUCTION	28,139,278
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT	2 034,900
PROJECT DESIGN MANAGEMENT	3,258,730
TOTAL	33,432,908
5% CITY PROJECT CONTINGENCY	1 05
TOTAL	35,104,554
SITE ACQUISTION FOR HEADQUARTERS	7 110,000
SITE ACQUISTION FOR BUREAU STATION	1 300,000
TOTAL	**43,514,554**

1992 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS-FUTURE

ADD TO HEADQUARTERS IN 1997

20,500 SQ.FT

ADD ONE BUREAU IN 1997

19,500 SQ FT

ADD SURFACE PARKING FOR ONE BUREAU IN 1997

203 SPACES

ADD ONE BUREAU IN 2002

19, 500 SQ FT

ADD SURFACE PARKING FOR ONE BUREAU IN 2002

203 SPACES

ADD BUILDING COST	5,468,000
ADD PARKING COST	609,000
TOTAL	6 077,000
PROJECT ADMIN CONT , ESCALATION ETC	1 40
TOTAL	8,507,800
LAND ACQUISTION	2,600,000
TOTAL	**11,107,800**
CURRENT & FUTURE TOTAL	**54,622,354**

CHARLOTTE POLICE DEPARTMENT

OPTIONS FOR PARKING CONSTRUCTION THROUGH 2012

2002 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS

CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTERS TO MEET 2002 NEEDS
154,500 SQ FT
CONTINUE USE OF SATELLITE STATIONS
ON-SITE PARKING TO MEET PARTIAL NEEDS
442 SPACES IN DECK OR BELOW GRADE
890 SPACES OFF-SITE ($5,340,000 CONSTRUCTION BY OTHERS)

BUILDING COST	16,223,000
PARKING COST	2,817,000
STREET IMPROVEMENT ALLOWANCES	300,000
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2 000,000
DEMOLITION OF EXISITNG CONDITIONS	250,000
TOTAL	21 590 000
3% CONSTRUCTION ESCALATION	1 03
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST	**22,237,700**
SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT CONTINGENCY	3,335,655
TOTAL	**25,573,355**
5% BIDDING CONTINGENCY	1 05
FIXED LIMIT OF CONSTRUCTION	**26,852,023**
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT	2,034,900
PROJECT DESIGN MANAGEMENT	3,038,725
TOTAL	**31,925,647**
5% CITY PROJECT CONTINGENCY	1 05
TOTAL	**33,521,930**
SITE ACQUISTION	7 110,000
TOTAL	**40,631,930**

2002 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS- FUTURE

ADD TO HEADQUARTERS IN 2002 TO MEET NEEDS THROUGH 2012
29,500 SQ FT
ADD 300 SPACES TO OFF-SITE PARKING
($1,691,000 CONSTRUCTION BY OTHERS)

ADD BUILDING COST	3,098,000
ADD PARKING COST	0
TOTAL	3,098,000
PROJECT ADMIN CONT ETC	1 40
TOTAL	**4,337,200**
CURRENT & FUTURE TOTAL	**44,969,130**

2002 DECENTRALIZED

CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTERS TO MEET 2012 NEEDS
125,500 SQ FT
CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTER PARKING ON- SITE
246 SPACES IN DECK OR BELOW GRADE
699 SPACES OFF-SITE ($4,194,000 CONSTRUCTION BY OTHERS)
CONSTRUCT ONE BUREAU STATION CONCURRENT W/ HEADQUARTERS
19,500 SQ FT
CONSTRUCT SURFACE PARKING FOR BUREAU STATION
281 SPACES SURFACE PARKING

BUILDING COST	14,836,000
PARKING COST	1,561,000
STREET IMPROVEMENT ALLOWANCES	300,000
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2,000,000
DEMOLITION OF EXISITNG CONDITIONS	250,000
TOTAL	18 947,000
3% CONSTRUCTION ESCALATION	1 03
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST	19 515 410
SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT CONTINGENCY	2 927 312
TOTAL	22,442,722
5% BIDDING CONTINGENCY	1 05
FIXED LIMIT OF CONSTRUCTION	23,564,858
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT	2,034,900
PROJECT DESIGN MANAGEMENT	2,872 035
TOTAL	28,471,793
5% CITY PROJECT CONTINGENCY	1 05
TOTAL	29,895,383
SITE ACQUISTION	7,110,000
LAND ACQUISTION FOR BUREAU	1 300 000
TOTAL	**38,305,383**

2002 DECENTRALIZED-FUTURE

ADD ONE BUREAU STATION IN 2002 AND ONE IN 2007
19,500 SQ FT EACH
ADD SURFACE PARKING FOR EACH BUREAU STATION AS THEY ARE BUILT
203 SPACES EACH

ADD TWO BUREAU STATIONS	3,315,000
ADD 406 SURFACE PARKING SPACES	609 000
TOTAL	3,924,000
PROJECT ADMIN & CONT	1 40
TOTAL	5,493,600
LAND ACQUISTION COST	2,600,000
TOTAL	**8,093,600**

CURRENT & FUTURE TOTAL **46,398,983**

1992 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS

CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTERS TO MEET CURRENT (1992) NEEDS
105,000 SQ FT
CONSTRUCT HEADQUARTER PARKING ON SITE
246 SPACES IN DECK OR BELOW GRADE, 699 SPACES OFF SITE
($4,194 000 CONSTRUCTION FOR OFF SITE BY OTHERS)
CONSTRUCT ONE BUREAU STATION CONCURRENT W/HEADQUARTERS
19,500 SQ FT
CONSTRUCT SURFACE PARKING FOR BUREAU STATION
281 SPACES

BUILDING COST	12,683,000
PARKING COST	1,561,000
STREET IMPROVEMENT ALLOWANCES	300,000
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2,000,000
DEMOLITION OF EXISITNG CONDITIONS	250,000
TOTAL	16,794,000
3% CONSTRUCTION ESCALATION	1 03
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST	17,297,820
SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT CONTINGENCY	2 594 673
TOTAL	19,892,493
5% BIDDING CONTINGENCY	1 05
FIXED LIMIT OF CONSTRUCTION	20,887,118
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT	2 034 900
PROJECT DESIGN MANAGEMENT	2,645 675
TOTAL	25,567,693
5% CITY PROJECT CONTINGENCY	1 05
TOTAL	26,846,077
SITE ACQUISTION FOR HEADQUARTERS	7,110,000
SITE ACQUISTION FOR BUREAU STATION	1,300,000
TOTAL	**35,256,077**

1992 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS- FUTURE

ADD TO HEADQUARTERS IN 1997
20,500 SQ.FT
ADD ONE BUREAU IN 1997
19,500 SQ FT
ADD SURFACE PARKING FOR ONE BUREAU IN 1997
203 SPACES
ADD ONE BUREAU IN 2002
19, 500 SQ FT
ADD SURFACE PARKING FOR ONE BUREAU IN 2002
203 SPACES

ADD BUILDING COST	5,468 000
ADD PARKING COST	609,000
TOTAL	6,077,000
PROJECT ADMIN & CONT	1 40
TOTAL	8,507,800
LAND ACQUISTION	2,600,000
TOTAL	**11,107,800**
CURRENT & FUTURE TOTAL	**46,363,877**

CHARLOTTE POLICE DEPARTMENT

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS WITH PARKING ADJUSTMENTS THROUGH 2012*
10/5/92

2002 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS

	CURRENT COST	FUTURE COST	TOTAL
2002 CENTRAL HDQR	50,190,763	5,026,000	56,895,363
PARTIAL OFF SITE PARKING	40,631,930	4,337,200	44,969,130
SAVINGS	9,558,833	688,800	10,247,633
COST OF REVISED OPTION 1	**40,631,930**	**4,337,200**	**44,969,130**
CURENT AVAILABLE FUNDS	33,250,000		
DEFICIT	**-7,381,930**		

2002 DECENTRALIZED

	CURRENT COST	FUTURE COST	TOTAL
2002 DECENTRALIZED	46,988,751	8,093,600	55,082,351
PARTIAL OFF-SITE PARKING	38,305,383	8,093,600	
SAVINGS	8,683,368	0	8,683,368
COST OF REVISED OPTION 2	**38,305,383**	**8,093,600**	**46,398,983**
CURRENT AVAILABLE FUNDS	33,250,000		
DEFICIT	**-5,055,383**		

1992 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS

	CURRENT COST	FUTURE COST	TOTAL
1992 CENTRAL HDQR	43,514,554	11,107,800	55,038,748
PARTIAL OFF-SITE PARKING	35,256,077	11,107,800	
SAVINGS	8,258,477	0	8,258,477
COST OF REVISED OPTION 3	**35,256,077**	**11,107,800**	**46,363,877**
CURRENT AVAILABLE FUNDS	33,250,000		
DEFICIT	**-2,006,077**		

* ALL ESTIMATES IN 1994 DOLLARS

CHARLOTTE POLICE DEPARTMENT

COST OF OFF-SITE PARKING
10/5/92

	CURRENT	FUTURE	TOTAL
2002 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS			
COST OF CONSTRUCTION	5,340,000	1,691,000	
SOFT COSTS	1 40	1 40	
TOTAL	7,476,000	2,367,400	
LAND AQUISITION	8,860,000	0	
TOTAL	**16,336,000**	**2,367,400**	**18,703,400**
2002 DECENTRALIZED			
COST OF CONSTRUCTION	4,194,000	0	
SOFT COSTS	1 40	1 40	
TOTAL	5,871,600	0	
LAND AQUISITION	8,860,000	0	
TOTAL	**14,731,600**	**0**	**14,731,600**
1992 CENTRALIZED HEADQUARTERS			
COST OF CONSTRUCTION	4,194,000	0	
SOFT COSTS	1 40	1 40	
TOTAL	5,871,600	0	
LAND AQUISITION	8,860,000	0	
TOTAL	**14,731,600**	**0**	**14,731,600**

CHARLOTTE POLICE DEPARTMENT

◆PROGRAM ALTERNATIVES◆

1992 CENTRAL HEADQUARTERS
105,000 Sq. Ft. Headquarters & 19,500 Sq. Ft. Bureau #2

2002 CENTRAL HEADQUARTERS PKG 1400 CARS
154,500 Sq. Ft.

2002 DECENTRALIZED
125,500 Sq. Ft. Headquarters & 19,500 Sf. Ft. Bureau #2

10/5/92

CHARLOTTE POLICE DEPARTMENT

◆PROJECT FUNDING◆

COUNTY OFFERING	$13,850,000
LAND & FEES	7,400,00
CITY C.O.P.S. FINANCING	12,000,000
TOTAL AVAILABLE	$33,250,000

10/5/92

CHARLOTTE POLICE DEPARTMENT

◆ESTIMATED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES◆

Program without Staff Parking	Building Costs	Cost for On-Site Staff Parking	Cost Including Land for Off-Site Staff Parking	Future Costs to Meet Needs for 2012
1992 CENTRAL HEADQUARTERS 105,000 Sq. Ft. Headquarters 19,500 Sq. Ft. Bureau #2	**$35,256,077** 369	**$8,258,477** (Tot $45,514,554) 945 spaces	**$14,731,600** (Tot $49,987,677)	**$11,107,800** (Tot $54,622,354) ($61,095,477) 1632
2002 CENTRAL HEADQUARTERS 154,500 Sq. Ft.	**$40,631,930** 369	**$9,558,833** (Tot $50,190,763) 1332 spaces	**$16,336,000** (Tot $56,967,930)	**$6,704,600** (Tot $56,895,363) ($63,672,530) 1632
2002 DECENTRALIZED 125,500 Sq. Ft. Headquarters 19,500 Sf. Ft. Bureau #2	**$38,305,383** 369	**$8,683,368** (Tot $46,988,751) 945 spaces	**$14,731,600** (Tot $53,036,983)	**$8,093,600** (Tot. $55,082,351) ($61,130,583) 1632

10/5/92

COUNCIL WORKSHOP
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TOPIC:

Recommendations from Public Service Committee on the Animal Shelter

KEY POINTS (Issues, Cost, Change in Policy):

-Whether to leave proposed Animal Shelter at current airport location
-Location of Spay/Neuter Clinic
-Costs involved in relocating Spay/Neuter Clinic and Animal Shelter

OPTIONS:

1 Proceed with construction of new Animal Shelter at current airport site
2 Relocate new Animal Shelter to different site
3 Redesign Spay/Neuter Clinic to have a separate entrance at the new Animal Shelter
4 Humane Society continue to operate Spay/Neuter Clinic at Toomey Avenue

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:

Approve recommendations of Public Service Committee that 1) The new Animal Shelter be built at the current airport site with full noise attenuation for the building and the indoor and outdoor kennels, and, 2) Staff work with the Humane Society on housing the Spay/Neuter Clinic at Toomey Avenue and bring this information back to City Council

ATTACHMENTS:

1 Memo to the Public Services Committee from Pam Syfert

Public Services Committee
September 28, 1992; 5:00 pm
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room 270-271

Committee members:

Ann Hammond, Chairman
Dan Clodfelter, Vice-Chairman
Hoyle Martin
Cyndee Patterson
Don Reid

A G E N D A

I. Overview of Animal Shelter Project - Julie Burch

A. Role of Facilities Committee

B. Decisions by City staff on location and design

C. Brief description of proposed animal shelter - East Coast Design

D. *Questions/committee discussion*

II. Alternatives for Moving Forward

A. Overview - Pam Syfert

B. Cost Estimates - East Coast Design

C. Questions/committee discussion

III. Committee Recommendation

Attachment

C: Mayor and City Council
Wendell White
Pam Syfert
Julie Burch
Don Steger
Clark Readling
Animal Control Team
Vi Alexander
Bill Guerrant

M E M O R A N D U M

September 23, 1992

TO: City Council Public Services Committee
Ann Hammond, Chairman
Dan Clodfelter, Vice-Chairman
Hoyle Martin
Cyndee Patterson
Don Reid

FROM: Pam Syfert
Deputy City Manager

Attached is information for the Committee meeting on Monday, September 28, at 5:00 p.m. The information is in outline form and covers the decision process on the animal shelter facility, and alternatives for moving forward.

Not all of the issues raised by the Humane Society are covered in this outline, but the appropriate staff people will be present to answer questions on financing, airport siting, etc. Because questions have been raised concerning cost estimates, we will have East Coast Design, the project architect, present to address those questions. We also are trying to arrange for the General Contractor to be there to address delay and cost issues.

Mrs. Lewis has asked for time on the agenda to present information she has on our cost figures. The usual Committee procedure is to limit committee meetings to staff presentations and Council discussion. However, if the Committee wishes to hear the presentation, it can be added to the agenda at the meeting.

Information from Mrs. Lewis will be sent out in Friday's Council-Manager memo.

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions.

cgm

Attachments

Date: September 23, 1992

To: Pam Syfert
Deputy City Manager

From: C. D. Readling
City Engineer

Subject: Animal Control and Police K-9 Facility

Attached is an outline of the process that was used in site selection and design of the Animal Control Facility and a listing of alternatives and options that are available for continuing this project.

A. Location

1. Decision Process

- December 28, 1988 -WKWW, Inc. (Architects) hired to perform a space needs study on the existing Toomey Avenue site.

- February 4, 1989 - WKWW report states that the Toomey Avenue site (because of its limited size, zoning and setback requirements, and the I-77 future right-of-way projections) could not accommodate the current space and parking needs of the City facility, much less the projected 10 year needs of a Charlotte-Mecklenburg Animal Control facility.

- May 17, 1989 - City Manager's Capital Advisory Group recommends moving Animal Shelter. To keep costs down, Budget Office suggests investigating City-owned land. Site criteria was: 7.5 to 10 acres; B-2, I-1, or I-2 zoning; 300 feet from residentially zoned property; and easy access to the interstate system.

- Sept. 18, 1989 - Engineering (Real Estate Division) identifies 2 possible City-owned locations; Airport and Irwin Creek Treatment plant land.

- April 19, 1990 - Engineering receives information from Planning Commission, CMUD, and Aviation and recommends to Budget & Evaluation and Animal Control Department that new facility be located at the Airport.

- July 23, 1990 - Council asked to either approve relocating on Airport property or direct staff to pursue other options. Council directs staff to pursue Airport property.

- Between Sept 1990 and Nov. 1990 - Aviation Director selects site. Animal Control Director views site, investigates other animal shelters in close proximity to airports and finds no concerns with their locations and approves site.

2. Benefits of Utilizing Airport Property:

   a. Comparable land elsewhere would cost $375K to $525K; however, a prime location would cost upwards of $750K. Money is not available for purchase of land elsewhere.

   b. Aviation able to fund project if building built on Aviation property. Money is not in the CIP to fund the project if the project is not built on their land.

   c. Rezoning of the Aviation property could be handled fairly easily.

   d. Animal Shelter affects no neighborhoods.

   Issues:

   a. Concerns over noise.

      - When Airport land was recommended by Planning Commission, Engineering contacted the National Humane Society to determine if any studies were available concerning adverse problems with animals in close priority to Airports. No studies available. They recommended contacting San Francisco Animal Shelter which offered the following:

        - Have operated the shelter for the last two years.
        - Their shelter is approximately 1 mile from the end of the runway.
        - There are air traffic patterns that shake the building. Noise comes across water.
        - When Coast Guard is called upon in emergency situations, planes fly over at roof top level.
        - Have not noticed any animals having a problem with noise.

      - Before approval of specific site, Animal Control Director contacted Gainsville and West Palm Beach, Florida, and Washington, D.C. animal shelters (which are near airports). Following is a matrix of information we have received from other animal shelters:

Shelters	Ldn Levels	Acoustical Attenuation	Type of Kennel
Memphis	65	None	Indoor
ASPCA	65	None	Indoor/Outdoor
Palm Beach	60	None	Indoor/Outdoor
Peninsula	60	None	Indoor/Outdoor

- Public and staff portions of the facility have been designed to reduce airplane noise.

- Animal Control Director stated acoustical treatments were needed to protect kennel workers from barking dogs. These baffles also serve to assist in reducing airplane noise.

- Originally we had $91,000 in acoustical attenuation including specially designed windows, light weight concrete on roof, entry vestibules, and acoustical blankets and ceiling tile in the staff portions and concrete roof decking and acoustical baffles in the kennel area. To assist in bringing the project within budget, the acoustical blankets and baffles were eliminated for a savings of $31,000. Also, the kennel building was changed from a concrete deck, built up roof to a metal building with acoustical baffles for a savings of $59,700. If funding is made available, we can add the acoustical baffles and blankets back into the building at any time.

- Animal shelter operators that have been contacted have not noticed any detrimental affects on animals from airplane noise. Mr. George M. Strain, Ph.D., Professor of Neuroscience at Louisiana State University who is "the leading authority on deafness in dogs" states that muscles within the dogs ear "allow the ear to adjust by reflex to loud sounds by reducing the force transmitted to the inner ear and it is by this means that dogs do not deafen themselves with their own barking."

- We employed the Airport's acoustical consultant to design sound attenuation measures in this facility.

- There are numerous residential neighborhoods that exist in the same Ldn contour (70-75) as the proposed animal shelter site on Byrum Drive and are not proposed for purchase. They are Steeleberry Acres, Garrison Road Area, E. Todd Road, Tuckaseegee Road Area, Westerwood, Sheets Circle, Area, Wandawood, Westerly Hills, Beechwood Acres, and Glenwood. Ridgeview Baptist Church is also located in this contour.

b. Accessibility:

- A preliminary signage plan to help direct the public to the shelter has been developed by CDOT and will be supplemented with more signs if necessary.

- CDOT will assist the Animal Control Center in developing a directional map to use as a insert in mailing or customer handouts.

- CDOT states that access to the Byrum Drive site is much better than the existing shelter on Toomey Avenue.

B. Design:

1. Design process

- First project to be scrutinized by the Facilities Review Committee (FRC),(Manger's Office Budget & Evaluation, General Services, Engineering and Planning Commission).

- In an effort to minimize costs (both short and long term), this group very conscientiously reviewed the building to ensure that it was utilitarian, efficient and that it would have low operation and maintenance costs.

2. Decisions made by Facilities Review Committee

- Architect was directed to design office sizes based on performed task and not job classification. This reduced office space in the building by 30%.

- Architect directed to develop an operation cost comparison between indoor and outdoor kennels. Indoor/outdoor kennels are more expensive in initial capital outlay but will result in $27,000/year savings.

- A mechanical system has been designed for the facility to reduce ongoing maintenance and operational cost.

- To minimize long term maintenance costs experienced at the current shelter, the finishes in the animal housing areas (floors, kennel walls, etc.) have been designed with materials that will withstand abuse by the animals and constant contact with animal wastes.

- Group made decision to look at renegotiation of the contract with the Humane Society for Spaying and Neutering since we are providing them with a much better facility.

- The Spay/Neuter Clinic was moved to the center of the building because:

  1) It allows more flexibility in choosing options for spay/neuter operations (i.e., space still functional if, for any reason, the Humane Society is not contracted with in the future).

2) Relocation would consolidate the primary entrance for all public access to services, resulting in more efficient control, better customer service, and less confusion about public entry for the building.

3) This move resulted in a cost savings by eliminating unnecessary dual public entry, service desks, etc.

Issues:

a. Humane Society left out of decision process.

b. Humane Society concerned about their location (in building interior).

- On August 12, we met with Patti Lewis and her veterinarian to determine changes they desired.

  1) They wanted to have a better view from the surgery and prep rooms to the recovery room requiring the rotation of three rooms within the spay/neuter area.

  2) In doing this rotation the grooming room, toilets, and cat cages would have to be relocated within the space.

  3) Requested the pharmacy be moved away from the public entrance.

  4) Requested a wall be placed around the exam room which had been an open space.

- Humane Society has subsequently indicated this would not be satisfactory for their needs.

- Humane Society will have 24 hour access to the Clinic.

- City is restructuring their operational hours to ensure that there will be a receptionist on duty to assist clinic customers at all time.

C. Alternatives for moving forward to build a new Animal Shelter. See attachment for cost matrix options.

1. Continue with construction of Spay/Neuter area as planned. No additional costs or delays would be incurred beyond present delay costs.

2. Redesign Spay/Neuter Clinic as previously directed by Humane Society on August 12. Clinic remains in interior of building.

   a. Final approval from Humane Society necessary.
   b. Funding approval from Manager's office necessary.
   c. Architect estimates costs for changes to be around $15,200.

3. Redesign Spay/Neuter Clinic to an exterior wall (Resolves design issues).

   a. Direction from Council necessary.
   b. 6 month delay in construction.
   c. Architect estimates additional costs of around $525,000. Council would need to determine how to fund changes.
   d. If at some point the Humane Society decides not to renew their contract, the City would be left with a building that is not efficient for our needs.

4. Move shelter to a different location on Airport property (Resolves location and design issues).

   a. Direction from Council necessary.
   b. Aviation states that this is the piece of property best suited for this project.
   c. Time delays would be significant (a year or more).
   d. Our architect estimates it could cost between $850,000 and $1.25 million to move to another site.

5. Move shelter to a different site off of Airport property (Resolves location and design issues).

   a. Council would need to direct staff to pursue this option.
   b. Time delays would be maximum as project would have to go through the CIP process as Aviation is unable to fund project if it is not on this property.
   c. The architect estimates it could cost between $850,000 and $1.25 million to move to another site plus land costs.

EVEN THE OPTION TO PROCEED AS PLANNED WILL WIPE OUT OUR EXISTING CONTINGENCY DUE TO DELAY DAMAGES THAT WILL HAVE TO BE PAID TO THE CONTRACTORS. WE EXPECT THIS PROJECT TO REQUIRE ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO COMPLETE.

6. Selling/Leasing current site to Humane Society.

   o. It is preferred that the Toomey Avenue site be leased rather than sold to the Humane Society because:

      1. NCDOT has requested City to retain ownership due to future right of way needs.

      2. I-77 requires 350 feet of right of way (175 feet on either side of centerline). The future right of way line passes through several buildings comprising the CMACC.

      3. If the City were to sell the property, and NCDOT needed it for right of way, the state would have to pay for relocation of the tenant. This would increase the cost of the project to the public.

4. If the City retains ownership and leases the facility on the basis of a short term renewable lease, the lease could be terminated prior to NCDOT needing the property. Relocation cost would not have to be paid to the tenant.

D. Spay/Neuter Clinic operational options

1. Spay/Neuter Clinic operates out of new building as previously planned and designed.
   a. City pays for Spay/Neuter operations - cost of $51,464 last year.
   b. rent space to Humane Society at a rental rate as yet to be determined.
   c. net cost of $51,464 minus rent.
2. Spay/Neuter Clinic operates out of old shelter and Animal Control adoptive animals transported to old shelter for Spay/Neuter operations
   a. $30,000 to transport animals
   b. Spay/Neuter operation costs ($51,464)
   c. net cost of $81,000 minus rent from existing facility if leased to Humane Society
3. Animal Control staff veterinarian performs Spay/Neuter operations on Animal Control adoptive animals.
   a. cost of $38,000 for supplies and two permanent part-time veterinary technicians. Animal Control staff costs (already in operating budget) would be in addition to this.
   b. If Animal Control staff does not do operations, an additional $26,000 would need to be funded to hire a part-time veterinarian.
   c. this option cuts Humane Society Spay/Neuter operations by 30%.

E. Construction Options for Spay/Neuter Area in New Building:

1. Finish Spay/Neuter area out as planned; no savings or additional expenses (beyond delay costs already incurred) would be realized.

2. Leave Spay/Neuter Clinic unfinished (ie. no cabinetry, equiptment, etc.). The Architect estimates a savings of $19,000. Furnishings could be added later at a higher cost.

3. Leave Spay/Neuter area as raw space (ie. stone floor, no ceiling grid, etc.). The Architect estimates a savings of $100,000. Finishes could be added later at a higher cost.

dc

COSTS

OPTIONS	Architectural Design	Additional Construction	Expenses to Date Lost	Total
Leave S/N as is	$0	$0	$0	$0
Redesign S/N as requested by Humane Society (clinic remains on interior of building)	$6,200	$9,000	$0	$15,200
Redesign S/N to be on an exterior wall and remain on existing site	$100,000	$325,000	$100,000 (1/3 of expenses to date)	$525,000
Move shelter to a different site and move S/N to an exterior wall	$150,000	$500,000–$900,000 to terminate contracts	$200,000 (2/3 of expenses to date)	$850,000–$1 25M (Does not include land costs, if any)

COUNCIL WORKSHOP
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TOPIC:

Law Enforcement Center

KEY POINTS (Issues, Cost, Change in Policy):

Cost estimates for new construction of LEC based on program developed with Police Department and architectural team

OPTIONS:

1 Reduce target year for sizing the new LEC from 2002 to 1997
2 Shift some police functions to alternate locations
3 Develop alternative parking strategies

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:

Set general direction for management and architect regarding building and parking options

ATTACHMENTS:

Presentation will be made by Middleton-McMillan Architects

MEDIANS AT INTERSECTIONS

Council Workshop
October 5, 1992

A. Introduction

B. Objectives of intersection channelization

C. Items considered when installing medians

D. Examples of Innovative Solutions to Access Concerns

E. Case Studies

F. Summary

(over)

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF INTERSECTION CHANNELIZATION

- Ensure orderly traffic movement
- Increase capacity
- Improve safety
- Provide maximum convenience/efficiency

ITEMS CONSIDERED WHEN RECOMMENDING MEDIANS AT INTERSECTIONS

- Accident History
- Number of Turn lanes
- Required length of turn lane storage
- Proximity of nearby signalized intersections
- Number of conflict points
- Driveway volumes
- Alternative Access options
- Existing roadway cross-section to be met
- Impact of rerouted traffic on roadway system

COUNCIL WORKSHOP
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TOPIC:

Presentation on impacts and benefits of medians at intersections

KEY POINTS (Issues, Cost, Change in Policy):

-Objective of medians at intersections
-Items considered when installing medians at intersections
-Case studies of specific intersections

OPTIONS:

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:

No Council decision requested

ATTACHMENTS:

None

COUNCIL WORKSHOP
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TOPIC:

Changes to Citizen Hearing portion of City Council business meetings

KEY POINTS (Issues, Cost, Change in Policy):

-Council's desire to provide a forum for citizen concerns
-Length of time consumed by citizen hearings in their current format

OPTIONS:

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:

Discuss, approve or modify the recommendations from Councilmembers Hammond, Mangum and Martin.

ATTACHMENTS:

1 Memo to Councilmembers Hammond, Mangum and Martin from Pam Syfert

Recommentations for the Citizens Hearing Portion
of the City Council Meeting

Purpose: Time will be set aside at each City Council Business Meeting to hear comments, complaints and suggestions from citizens. That time will not be used to attempt to resolve problems or take action unless there are exceptional circumstances.

Guidelines for Citizens

1. Time limits: 3 minutes per individual; 9 minutes per subject.

2. A maximum of ten citizens will be heard at the citizens hearing portion of the City Council meeting. In addition, speakers on an agenda item will be heard when the agenda item is discussed.

   - The City Clerk will advise citizens when the speaker's list is full and offer to take their names for the next Council meeting.

   - The Mayor will announce at the beginning of the meeting how many people are signed up to speak and if additional speakers can be heard at the meeting.

   - Citizens will be encouraged to call the City Clerk prior to the meeting if they wish to speak.

3. Seats near the front of the Council Chamber will be reserved for citizens signed up to speak.

4. Citizens may submit written comments.

Guidelines for City Council

1. Decisions on items brought forward by citizens will not be made at that Council meeting, but placed on a future agenda.

2. Councilmembers may address questions to speakers, but will not debate an issue until placed on the agenda.

3. If circumstances require action that evening, Council will complete the citizens hearing then return to the issues requiring action that evening.

Changes

1. The Council meeting schedule would be revised as follows:

   5:00 p.m. - Dinner
   6:30 p.m. - Inovcation
   Announcements
   Awards/Recognitions
   Citizens Hearing
   7:15 p.m. - Business Meeting

2. Council will receive a list of citizens signed up to speak at their dinner meeting.

3. Customer Service staff will be present at each meeting to assist citizens with service requests and/or complaints.

   o Follow-up reports will be sent to Council each Wednesday.

4. A speaker's list will be posted at the entrance to the Council Chamber.

5. The changes will be effective December 1 (if approved at the workshop on October 5), and communicated extensively:

   o Brochure
   o City Page
   o Channel 32

BUDGET AND EVALUATION DEPARTMENT REPORT

September 18, 1992

Survey on Citizen Hearings

PURPOSE: To determine other methods for conducting citizen hearings

SURVEY CITIES: Ten cities were surveyed Greensboro, Raleigh, Asheville, Wilmington, Winston-Salem, Richmond, Columbia, Tampa, Jacksonville-Duval, and Nashville-Davidson

FINDINGS: Here is a summary of the survey findings

RALEIGH — Citizen Hearing is only held at one business meeting per month Business Meeting is 1 00 - 5 00 p m Citizen Hearing at 7 00 p m - until

WINSTON-SALEM — Citizen Hearing is held at end of regular business meeting - considered as "other business" (evening meeting) City Clerk and Mayor's Office direct citizens to appropriate Council Committee meeting to be heard when possible

RICHMOND — Citizen Hearings are held at beginning of each business meeting (7 00 p m) for only 30 minutes Citizens are required to call the City Clerk and make an appointment to speak The limit is 6 speaker appointments per meeting and 5 minutes per speaker Overflow appointments are made for next meeting

TAMPA — Citizen Hearings are held at beginning of each business meeting (daytime) Town meetings are held bi-monthly by district Council Members to receive citizen comments Hotline for citizen complaints has reduced number of citizens at citizen hearings

JACKSONVILLE DUVAL — Citizen Hearings are only conducted at Council Committee meetings (afternoon hours)

Survey on Citizen Hearings Continued

NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON	No citizen hearings held by Council City Clerk directs citizen to address appointed committees or to call Council Members directly Meetings begin at 7 30 p m
COLUMBIA	Citizen hearing held at end of regular business meeting (daytime) Quarterly evening meetings are held in the four different districts
OTHER	The other cities (Greensboro, Asheville and Wilmington) were similar to Charlotte in how they conducted citizen hearings

Council Workshop 10/5/92

Mayor ✓
Campbell
Cloffelter ✓
Hammond ✓
McCory ✓
Majeed ✓
Margason ✓
Martin ✓
Patterson ✓
Reid ✓
Scarborough ✓
Wheeler

5:10 p.m.

Hammond
#1 Animal Shelter

Scarborough / Cloffelter - Continue contract for current location for new animal shelter

Reid
Hammond
Reid

Syfert

Hammond

McCrory

Scarborough - Campbell will not be here.

Hammond

Clodfelter

McCrory

Clod -

Vote - No Martin, Reid.

2ND Recommendation - Spay/Neuter w/ Scarborough/Clodfelter - 2ND RECOMMENDATION

Hammond - at Bonney Cove.

Clodfelter

Scarborough

Clodfelter

Hammond - What is preference of Humane Society?

Scarborough

Hammond

Syfert

Scarborough

Reid

Hammond

Reid

Hammond

Clodfelter

McCrory
Syfert
McCrory
Syfert
Patterson - Not very deep
Hammond
McCrory
Syfert
Clodfelter
McCrory
Syfert
Clodfelter
Martin
Marc Roberts 3 of the 4 have
Spay/Neuter Clinics
Martin - Gas problem separating the 2
Morgan
Morgan/Scarborough Proceed at
new site with Spay/Neuter in
it
Hammond - Ask staff to work
with Humane Society
Martin
Hammond

Martin
Hammond
Syfert
Martin - How long for report
Syfert
Martin
Scarborough
Hammond
Scarborough
Syfert
Scarborough - Withdraw second
to Jon's motion

Reid
Clodfelter
Martin
VOTE Reid, & Mangum - No -

Recess 5:40 - Dinner
Reconvene 5:50
Mayor
White
Asst. Chief Jack Bozer
Woody Middleton - Looked at current
needs + six increments of 5 years
1992, 1997 + 2002

Howard Beasley - Program Consultant
① Provide for long term needs
of Dept. - ② with effectiveness
& efficiency ③ Public Service
adjacent needs -

Police Dept.
Bozer - Very satisfied with
programming
Police Dept. has not yet
decided what a decentral-
ized Dept. will look
like - what can be
decentralized & what cannot.

Would not want to decentralize
Communications, Labs,
Investigations,

Middleton
- See handout -

Morgan
Middleton
Morgan
Bozer 73,800 sq. ft. Present facility

Hammond 945
281
White 1286
Hammond
Clodfelter
Geisler
Clodfelter
Geisler - 994
Clodfelter
Carol
Geisler
Clodfelter
Middleton
Majeed
Boger
Majeed
Geisler about 17,000
Majeed
Boger
Majeed
Boger 1 to 2 MILLION
Middleton
Patterson
Middleton
Majeed
Boger

Majeed

Middleton - Monitored both by Police + Engineering - growth to 2002 - checked other cities +

Majeed

Boger - Opted for needs + let go of rice -

Geisler - Security, Crime Lab - 24 hours operation - hard use -

McCrory

Geisler - Staff, Official vehicles, visitors - recognized vacation + sick + take home cars - visitor traffic

McCrory

Geisler - assumption that you are providing parking for all -

McCrory

Middleton - Parking a policy issue

Cloffelter

Geisler

Clodfelter

Geisler

McCrory - Off site + shuttles?

Middleton - Did discuss City Jail + existing deck

McCrory

White

McCrory

Patterson

McCrory

White

McCrory - Where are funding options?

White

Middleton 33,250 - 105,000 SQFT - 300 PKG

McCrory

Scarborough - ATLANTA -

① Police on foot in neighborhoods -

② Bureau stations in neighborhoods -

- Bogar - 3 TO 5% increase in police service costs each year

White

Scarborough

Boger

Geisler

Scarborough

Boger

Scarborough

Boger

White

Scarborough

Middleton

Geisler

McCrory

Middleton

Clodfelter

Geisler Marked - 170., unmarked, or asset forfeiture

Clodfelter - number of vehicles in this building + parking spaces provided?

Patterson

?

Patterson

Clodfelter

Patterson 185,000 what we need now?

Geisler Yes

Patterson

Middleton
Patterson
Middleton
Patterson
Middleton
Bill Hartman - Turner
Middleton
Patterson
Hammond $105.00 SQ FT.
Middleton
Hammond
Middleton
Hammond
Middleton
Carol Hoeffner
Hammond
Middleton
Mazyen
Hammond
Middleton
Patterson
Hammond
Middleton
Hammond
Middleton

Patterson

Hammond

Boger

Hammond

Boger

Hammond

Middleton

Hammond

Middleton

Vinroot

Martin

Reid - How will we pay for it?

Clodfelter

~~Pratt~~ Boger

Clodfelter

Middleton

White

Clodfelter

White

Vinroot

White

Mangum

White - Parking?

#3 - Medians at Intersections

Mayor

Bob Pressley

Reid

Pressley

Mayor

Pressley

Martin - Beattie Ford/I-85

Pressley

Martin

Pressley

Martin

Pressley

Majeed

Doug Gillis

Majeed

Pressley

Majeed

Gillis

Majeed

Scarborough

Pressley

Doug Gillis

Scarborough

Gillis
Searborough
Gillis
Pressley
Mangum
Pressley
Searborough
Pressley
John
Searborough
Mayor
Hammond
Searborough
Reid
Pressley
Majeed
Mangum
Pressley
Mangum
Mayor —

5 - TO 7 - per year

#4 Citizens Hearings
Mayor
Hammond
Martin
Mangum

Mayer

Scarborough

Clodfelter - use time for Citizens Hearings + not awards

Majeed

McCrory

Mangum

McCrory

Mayer

Patterson - Ellis + Pat had good ideas -

Go back to 7 district meetings per year -

Reid

Patterson

Reid

Patterson

Reid

Hammond

Majeed

Hammond

Vinroot

McCrory / Hammond - Refer to staff

Martin

Reid

McCrory

Mangum

McCrory

Hammond

Martin

Hammond

Freeze

Clodfelter - Do not respect speaker

Mangum

Freeze

O'Mangum

Winroot

Scarborough

Reid

Patterson

Reid

Winroot

Mangum

Patterson

Clodfelter - Stormwater

County - Stormwater 8:20
① Affirm resolution Tape 3
passed on 9/8 Side 1

② County would like to have appointments on Storm-water Advisory Committee

Martin
Clodfelter
Martin
Clodfelter
Vinroot
Reid
Vinroot
~~[illegible]~~ McCrory
Mangum
Vinroot
McCrory
Reid
McCrory
White
Vinroot
White

Adjourn 8:40