## AGENDA

| Meeting Type: | Workshop |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | $06-02-1993$ |

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office

A Budget Workshop was held on June 2, 1993 at 505 p m in Room 267 of the CharlotteMecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Richard Vinroot presiding Councilmembers present were Stan Campbell, Dan Clodfelter, Ann Hammond, Pat McCrory, Nasif Majeed, Tom Mangum, Hoyle Martin, Cyndee Patterson, Don Reid, Ella Scarborough, and Lynn Wheeler

ABSENT: None<br>$\mathrm{Y}_{1}$ Alexander. Budget Director said the Public Services Committee had asked Steve Camp to do a formal presentation

Wendell White City Manager said there had been some discussions about how to market the new Convention Center, so they would address that in this conversation

Councllmember Pat McCiory said he wanted to make Councl aware that Shawn Lemmond was working on a bill to make it easier to sell certan types of wines in grocery stores which is just the opposite of what Council has requested Mr McCrory is going to speak against it it is up for Committee vote tomorrow and he would appreciate any feedback anyone may have

Mayor Ruchard Vinroot said he had been in Raleigh and met with the committee that Fountann Odom presented the anti-annexation legislation They did not get to that topic, but had a good discussion and he feels progress is being made toward avoiding the threat to our very sound annexation policy Mike Boyd, Henry Underhill and Boyd Cauble were with him in Raleigh

Mr McCrory sadd he had asked Mr Cauble to give an update on the bill regarding the proposal to review police activities

## AUDITORIUM/COLISEUM/CONVENTION CENTER AUTHORITY PRESENTATION

Steve Camp. Director of the Charlotte Coliseum. sard he appreciates the opportunity to respond to questions about the Authonty He passed out some handouts to parallel his presentation on the annual operating and capital budgets of the Coliseum and long range financial projections as well as the reserves and how they are used, and then discussed the marketing agreement between the Authonty and the Convention and Visitors Bureau Mr Camp said there is a surplus of just over $\$ 19$ mulhon from 38 years of operation During that tume, they have put back in for capital improvements $\$ 14,205,000$ There have been about $\$ 2$ million in grants from the City and other grants totaling $\$ 118,000$ If you take the total surpluses and subtract the transfers from the City in the form of capital improvements, there is a total on hand of $\$ 7,170,000$ As of June 30, 1993, we expect an annual operating surplus in the neighborhood of $\$ 35$ million It has been a good year, one of our best Next year we are projecting $\$ 18$ mullion in profits for the Authonty, and we would subtract from that the capital improvements which is a little over $\$ 4$ million so we will have a projected proprietary interest of $\$ 5,300,000$ as of June $30,1994 \mathrm{Mr}$ Camp then talked about the plans to cover some of the needs anticipated

Wendell White. City Manager sard he agreed that this is the tume to be cautious in both long term and short term Also, while he knows that the Authonty is conscientious about keeping the properties up, there is an area where he would vote to have a maintenance program, the results of which are shared with Council each year so that you know the facilities are mantaned and up to date As a general manager, I'm always concerned that that is an area which could slide and cost in the long run

Mayor Vinroot said he would be delighted to hear from members of the Authonty any comments they may have

Mr Camp said he wanted to remund everyone when the new Convention Center opens, they will be managing nearly a quarter of a billion dollars in assets for the City That will require very close attention from a maintenance standpoint and they are willing to work toward that annual maintenance contract with Council Mr Camp then spoke of the marketung plan for the new Convention Center
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Del Borgsdorf. Assistant City Manager said the National League of Cities is looking at the new Convention Center as a potential site for their conference They said they had met with two representatives, one from the Authonty and the other from the Bureau, so they are working together to promote the center to major organizations Mr Borgsdorf went over the financial impact of the marketing study and the one budget adjustment it involves

Councilmember Nasuf Majeed asked if the renovatuons for Independence Arena were $\$ 2$ milion?
Mr Camp sard it was split up for two years, part to be spent last year and part this year
Mr Majeed asked is there a possibility of recouping some of this through advertisers, etc ?
Mr Camp sard it is in there under projected excess revenues, in what he hopes is a conservative figure There is every chance to believe that the building will do exactly what we've said all along - yes, we will spend $\$ 4$ million on it, but over a ten year period, it will not only pay us back that $\$ 4$ million, it will also cover all the operaung costs incurred during that ten years

Councilmember Don Reid asked why the Coliseum was shown with Independence Arena, why couldn't they be separated so Council could see what each of the buldings is doing?

Mr Camp replied they were making every effort but it is very hard to know since the management and maintenance staffs will be shared, but they're going to do the best they can to separate them

Mr Reid said since we're banking on repaying the $\$ 2$ mulinon, we will never know unless they are able to do that

Mr Camp sard they would try to do it, and make it known How accurate it would be would be a little shaky, because that complex was designed to be operated together

Mr Reid asked what is the capital improvement cost of half a million for the NCAA?
Mr Camp said a big part is refurbishing They are topping the parking lot and restriping, the rest is painting, and some of it is at Independence Arena

Mr Reid asked what happened to the money the Auditonum Authonty asked Councll for the NCAA?

Mr Camp sard that request is stll on there Last year they also made a request, and Council passed that on to them

Ms Alexander said it is shown as unfunded in your budget
Councilmember Hoyle Mantin said Mr Camp made reference to the newspaper artucle Does that mean you were not kept informed of some of the costs, and more importantly, have you had a chance to venfy whether that story was accurate?

Mr Camp sard he that he was surprised because the newspaper did not realize they would not open untul December We had never antucipated having the building open before then

Mr Martin asked if the $\$ 4$ million overrun would be offset by different designs in the building
Mr Camp sad there had been some cosmetic changes made that would not affect the operation of the building in any way

Mr White sald we are withun our budget and we are into our contungencies The reason we have contungencies is to take care of situations such as this
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Mr Martin said his concern was that we had $\$ 6$ million in that contingency and we have cut through $\$ 4$ milhon with over a year to go on the project If what Steve says is true about offsetting it by cosmetic changes, then I guess we're okay

Mr White sad he was sorry the status was reported to Council through the Observer but he doesn't control that part of it He has another strategy that he will share as time goes on to get things back into a sharper perspective He is as concerned as anybody because he does not want to fanl We are on top of it, but it is not nght to say this is easy It is very difficult

Mr Martin said he did not mean he thought it was easy
Counclimember Dan Clodfelter sard the excess revenue over expenditures and transfers is avalable for operating deficit, and asked what is the fifty percent line

Mr Borgsdorf said the difference is, in the official statement for financing, although all that money is avaulable should you choose to use $1 t$, none of it was specifically earmarked for deficit reduction and the marketing budget is fixed at a million and half

Mr Clodfelter asked why is it necessary to limit yourself to that $50 \%$ figure, don't we want the flexibility to use all of the excess revenues for operating deficits?

Mr Borgsdorf said the reason you might want to limit it is that makes it clear what the Council's direction is to the Authonty in terms of managing the bottom line of the building so they keep 50 cents on the dollar, their eyes are on the bottom line in terms of deficits, and they know they are not "insured" by this surplus This simply indicates to what extent you are willing to do that

Mr White sard one other piece is that we antucipate you will want to buld more, so he wants to see us develop the capacity to add to the building as the business warrants Under the strategy that you have, you will be able to do that in probably ten years This should be about the tume we would have taken the market from some of the other minor players

## EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE REPORT

Bill Wilder_ Director of Human Resources presented the employee health insurance report
Mr White sald he was concerned that under the new policy, employees may pick the option which costs less because of budgetary concems, and then not have sufficient coverage

Mr Wilder sard that they had had a number of calls, and due to the complexity of the program, they anticıpate some employees may simply drop out of the plan

Mr Clodfelter asked how would the phasing in of the separation be handled?
Mr Wider sad one option is to implement on the individual contribution, we could begin next year with $5 \%$, and go to $10 \%$ the following year A spinoff from that would be to go directly to $10 \%$ For employees with dependent coverage, an option is to begin shiftung costs immediately on an accelerated basis

Mr Clodfelter said he really was wondering how the phasing in of returees would be handled
Mr Wilder sard one option is to get the point of service plan in place, begin cost shiftung to actuve and reurees this next year, then look at our expenence under the plan and be committed to begin phasing in the separation process within a three year period

Mr White sand there is a little bit of concem that if we move quickly, we will have a number of employees that you would rather not see reture, retire to avoid the increase which will come later
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Councilmember Majeed sard he realized they had labored over this, but he is really troubled
He thinks the slower route, five year plan, should be taken because the working people will have a definte shrinking paycheck This will not be good for the morale of the troops, and we should take it very slowly

Councilmember Wheeler asked how many employees have a spouse who works and could get the coverage that way?

Mr Wilder said information on employment of spouses is not avalable except when they file a clamm

Councilmember Lynn Wheeler asked how many returees opt for farmly coverage
Anna Ellis. Human Resources Departmentsald there are 350 under 65 who have family coverage, and 142 over 65

Counculmember Ella Scarborough sard she wanted to be sure she understands The proposal you have on the table is related directly to the vote that Council took to begin cost shifting immediately, is that correct?

## Mr Wilder answered yes

Ms Scarborough said so if she were to agree with what is on the table, that would mean you are going to phase in this partucular cost shiftung startung with the '94 budget Her concern is that we don't start immediate cost shifting Mr Majeed sand it very well in reference to our employees and some of the things we've done in our nightsizing, continuing to say what an excellent job they're doing, etc She has said it before, and it is worth repeating, if it is like my household, we can't stand an extra penny coming out of our salanes and I really beheve that we stull are on the wrong track even with this phase in method As we talk around this table about what business and industry are doing, the business community did not put this on their employees all at one tume They did it in phases The employees absolutely should not take the burden of immediate cost shifting

Mr Clodfelter says he realizes we just offer employee and employee dependent, but looking beyond that, is there any data that would let us get a picture of our current retiree population and how many of them are carrying that for employee and spouse, and how many for employee only? There are some fairly different impacts based on which of the categones in the new plan someone might fall into He has a hunch that retrees would be more likely to have employee and employee/spouse coverage and less likely to have employee/child coverage He needs this information before he can make a decision

Mayor Vinroot said he wanted to make a quick observation He went through all the numbers rather quickly, and under our present system, an employee's annual cost for sungle coverage is zero but for the whole family, is about $\$ 1300$ per year Under the new system, depending on the low or high option, the cost is ether zero or it's up as high as $\$ 204$ per year If 1 t's the whole family, it's up to $\$ 2500$ per year on the low end, $\$ 2900$ on the high It's about a $\$ 1200$ per year increase for whole family coverage That is a farrer way of looking at it The truth is, those are not unreasonable figures in today's climate, whether you are a secretary in some other company outside this city or whether you are a laborer outside or inside the city Maybe you are nght, we should phase it in, but the fact is those adjustments in total cost for someone who wants to cover his whole family are competitive

Mr Wilder stated even the task force recommended on family coverage that it be phased in It is definitely a tremendous burden to lay it out at once

Councilmember Reid sard it seems the real problem is the returees There is hardly any increase for employees, if you separate the rates, so the question is, how much of the burden of retirees health care benefits are you going to ask the employees to carry? It's going to be a shock to returees no matter when it happens, and he doesn't know when it ought to happen
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That's the real question If I'm an employee and I say go ahead and do it now, without regard to employees, it doesn't cost me much, I only pay $\$ 12$ a year under one plan and $\$ 3$ under another, which is nothing The real cost is retirees because we, not this Council but someone, gave that very generous benefit to returees several years ago We had a task force work on it and he would like to hear what they have to say before he makes any decision on that
[ Motion by Councilmember McCrory, seconded by Councilmember Wheeler, to have the ] [ the task force come back with a recommendation on employee health care insurance

Mr Clodfelter asked if he could piggy-back on that The task force brought a mullon one savings, Towers Perrin brought three point seven He would also like to hear what Towers Pernn has to say

## Mr McCrory was in agreement

Mr Reid said he wanted to respond to that The task force brought an additional one point seven in addition to the three point something that Towers Perrin brought

Mr Clodfelter said they didn't a point of service plan initally, that was Towers Pernn
Mayor Vinroot sald both groups needed to hear it and tell Council what they think
Councilmember Cyndee Patterson. sard she finds it frustrating that in year one you see the increase for employee and family, but in year two and three we can't see how differently they would look She is also concerned about whether she really belneves year two and three She understands it is based on what is thought will happen in the insurance industry, but you're telling her because of the industry they're going to absorb a lot of

Mr Wilder said what is it saying is, based on our movement into the point of service plan, we beheve if we have a sufficient number of participants at a certam level of deductions, we are going to save a lot of money

Ms Patterson asked for further explanation of the chart indicating costs to employees
Mr Wilder said the cost shaning does two thungs It shufts from the current level of payment which is $30 \%$ and takes into account the projected inflationary increase of $14 \%$ for this type of plan

Mr Majeed said in three years that is over a $125 \%$ increase We talk about a $25 \%$ increase, are we going to be competitive with the pnvate sector?

Mayor Vinroot satd Council is way out of line nght now We have the best deal in the world This is a dramatic increase, but again, it's a matter of looking at things He doubts if there is anybody in the whole city that is doing what we're doing and has the deal we have He really believes that

Councilmember Ann Hammond asked Mr Wilder to prepare a sheet similar to the one they have for returees under the separated plan She has heard a lot about the extravagant returement benefits, but she is not sure she knows how extravagant they are for a retured Sanitation Crew Chief I or Office Assistant III

Ms Scartorough asked if there were any projections on how many employees are not carrying health care now

Mr Wilder said everyone has individual coverage, because there is no charge The number carrying dependent coverage is between 500 and 600

The vote was taken on the motion and camed as follows
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AYES: Campbell, Clodfelter, Hammond, McCrory, Majeed, Mangum, Martin, Patterson, Reid and Wheeler

## NOES: Scarborough

Mr White said the only thing he has nght now to share with the employees is where Councll is He asked for some guidance

Mayor Vinroot replied that they would have the recommendation after they hear from the committees

Mr White sard that is not the question Do you have any gurdance as to what you want us to say to the workforce, if anything

Mayor Vinroot sald if you want to say we have asked these committees for their reaction, that's what we have done

Mr White sard you have decided, and we're busy moving toward implementation
Ms Patterson sadd you came to us today, and asked us because of the way the numbers really were, to consider a slower option, five years, don't separate nght away We're saying, we hear you, we're willing to look at that, but we need some input from the folks that made the onginal recommendation

Mayor Vinroot said he didn't think they wanted to agree without hearing from the committees
Ms Patterson sard you have raised an adequate question in some of their minds that they want to look at the go slow option and hear what the task force says, so I don't think you give them much nght now

Mr White sard that's all I wanted I think the question is sufficient then, that you have not made a final decision

Mayor Vinroot sad no, clearly not
Mr Clodfelter sand there is some additional information he did not think they would get from Towers Perrin or the task force, because it's not what they have been generatung It is these kind of flow sheets They will react in concept and pnnciple It's sort of what we adopted the first round, now we're testung it against legality That's fine, and we shouldn't get womed about that You take a policy direction and put it on the ground and see how it looks, smells, kick the tures, see what you think of it To do that and think about what you have suggested we consider today, I would like to see some runs on how a phase in of the ratings might look I think that is real important, and would like to see the numbers Also, how a phase in of the cost shifung might look If I'm going to evaluate the issue you brought to us, I need that

Mr Wilder asked in order to avoid the big hit on the bottom line, to look at phasing it in after we get the point of service plan in place?

Mr Clodfelter said no, that's a policy question I don't hear the Council today backing off the first page, the policy outhne page Now we're tunkering with the actual implementation refinement, and I didn't hear any discussion about backing off that, that we start it now We're suggesting that the full implementation gets phased over a more extended period of tome I just need to see how that might work from your standpoint, especially on the ratungs split Don is nght, that's where the real issue is

Ms Scarborough sand the vote that the Council took last week in reference to the health and benefits did not change and the only thing that is changing is that we're looking at phasing it in So, the employees who have been calling and wniting relating to whether or not Council would reconsider, we're not reconsidening We're talking about phasing in what we already voted on

Mayor Vinroot said in light of the implementation results of our decision, we are considering the implicit suggestion of the Manager that we consider phasing it in, and we are asking the people who have advised the Manager, Towers Pernn, and how have advised us generally, the task force, what their reaction would be to the phased in alternative That's basically what we have done today

Mr Clodfelter added, and we have asked staff to run some alternatuve numbers to look it
Mayor Vinroot said within 30 days, we're going to make a final decision, if not before, about either phasing in or staying where we are, or whatever we decide to do That's clear

Ms Patterson said one of the phasing options takes single employee only coverage straght to the ten percent now I suspect those people have coverage somewhere else, maybe through a spouse Since they get free, they have it here anyway

## SERVICES ASSESSMENT PROCESS

## Pam.Syfert. Deputy City Manager discussed the services assessment process

Counclimember Martun sard he had one observation In the budget information, Council got a list indicating how they ranked the services and cautioned us to try to heed to that as we begin to deliberate the budget decisions In that context, he would like to make one other suggestion On solid waste collection, he would like to know if it is going to be more costly to do a plot project on the roll out He would like to see them take a whole year and see how it goes It would save tume and probably money

Ms Syfert sand maybe it would be appropriate to hear the report from the Public Services committee next

Mayor Vinroot said since you have rased the subject, he sent out a memo that deals with that His understanding is that there is a $\$ 17$ million savings in this coming year if we go to this system, skip the test and go straight to it That gets up to, in year ten, \$6 milion a year That's a lot of things we could do that we can't do without raisıng taxes He thinks that perhaps Council is on the right track, that is real rightsizing He thinks the community would accept the fact that we can make a decision on that and get on with it and not try to prove what he thinks is obvious

Councilmember Hammond sard the Public Services Committee did look at the solid waste collection system and initally recommended by a vote of three to two that we proceed and make the change to once a week curbside collection in roll out containers We were concerned that if we did not have a strong contention of Council in favor of that decision that it would not hold and we would perhaps make a change and go back and have to change again Therefore, we suggested to you that you might want to try a pilot project She was struck when Wendell (White) made the budget presentation last week that the City staff, top to bottom, has made all sorts of adjustments to save a tremendous amount of money That was the rightsizing part of the challenge The Council's part of the challenge was the services assessment At this point, the only large savings that she can point to that services assessment has come up with is, at some considerable cost to the employees She doesn't see that City Councll has taken any real intiative to try to deal with changes in service levels to adjust to current situations She asked to put back on the table, as others have suggested, the initual recommendation of the committee and the strong feelings of some on Council, that we ought to move ahead now and convert to once a week curbside collection She feels that are some unanswered questions that had they been on the table could have been easily answered This is such a potential for savings and an opportunity to make investments in things that are probably much more important to this community nght now that we need to add this to the budget discussion at this time
[ Motion by Councilmember Hammond to put back on table for discussion at the

Counclimember Patterson sadd she was very much in favor of the program, but rather than run away with the motion tonight, there were a lot of people who were not on the commuttee, and the committee had excellent data that would help those who have questions feel more comfortable She would rather that they all have ownership so there is no backing up and retreatung when a decision is made

Council was in verbal agreement to proceed with the onginal motion by Councilmember Hammond

Committee Charpersons Patterson, Campbell, Clodfelter and Wheeler reported for the CD and Housing, Transportation, Planning and Regionalism Committees respectively

## Ms Alexander made a list of items Council wanted to discuss at future budget workshops

Councilmember McCrory asked whether or not there is increased funding for bicycle patrol units, minutes of the discussion on fare increases, relocation of displaced persons from housing because of government action, and information on neighborhood cnme prevention

Counculmember Reid asked for 100 more police officers, and elimination of the City Page to be added to the list

Councilmember Wheeler asked for an explanation of the increase in water and sewer rates, and a status report on CityFar

Councilmember Clodfelter asked about the street interdiction unit Is there any merit in folding that into community policing Also, he would like to see a history of noise ordinance complaints in the last three years

Councilmember Campbell also has questions about the drug interdiction unit, and questioned why the budget went up when PS\&I merged with the Print Shop How is the increase for the Cable Oversight Committee justufied?

Counclimember Patterson asked why the updating of 911 was not included in the budget and the ability to generate workorders in departments

Councilmember Mangum asked about the three positions for CDOT, and the 12 year averaging on the street mantenance

Counclmember Scarborough wanted to know what it would cost to exempt churches from the stormwater fee

Councilmember Reid asked what we get out of the Centralina Council of Government, the Carolinas Partnership, and the Carolinas Transportation Compact

Councilmember Clodfelter asked what it would cost to pay out the bonds on the CityFair parking deck, how many employees this year will get step increases under the old plan, what would be the cost of $25 \%$ general pay adjustment for employees

Councilmember Mangum wondered why CDOT has as many engineers as the Engineening Department, 94 engineers

Councilmember Patterson asked why the Children's Services Network hired an Executuve Director She asked for an update
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Councilmember Scarborough said it would help to know what the Children's Services Network, Success by Six and Teen Health Connections are providing, because there are some overlaps

Councilmember Clodfelter asked for information on the $\$ 573,000$ for the radio tower on North Tryon, and why can't this be accumulated in a pay as you-go fund instead of a general fund contribution?

Councilmember Mangum wanted to know why the City is buying land for the tower
Councilmember Clodfelter asked whether a change in the lightung standards could lower costs
[ Motion by Councilmember Scarborough, seconded by Councılember Mangum, to
[ adjourn at 805 p m

# Budget Workshop June 2, 1993 

## Agenda

500 Auditorium/ ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ Coliseum/Civic Center Authority Budget Presentation Steve Camp
6:00 Dinner
6:15 Employee Health Insurance Report Bill Wilder
6.45 Services Assessment Process Pam Syfert
7.30 Council Listing of Items to be Voted Up/Down

# City of Charlotte Auditorium-Coliseum-Convention Center Authority <br> Post Office Box 669247 <br> Charlotte, North Carolina 28266-9247 <br> (704) 357-4700 

## General Information

Members Mr John W Harrıs, Chauman<br>Mr Edward H Hardison, Vice Chaırman<br>Mr William H Ashendorf, Budget Officer<br>Mrs Virginia W Bush, Secretary<br>Mr Wilham B Dukes<br>Mr John C Fennebresque<br>Ms Geraldune Sumter

Managing Durector Mr Steve Camp

Goals and Objectives of Organization See Chapter V, Subchapter B, of the Code of the City of Charlotte (enclosed)

Use of Requested Funds For Fiscal 1994, the Authority will not request any capital or operating funds from the City of Charlotte Please see the enclosed budget summary for the proposed use of funds currently under Authority control

# AUTHORITIES, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS 

Subch A In General, 8501<br>Subch B Auditorium Coliseum-Convention Center Authorits, 88521 5.23<br>Subch C Reserved<br>Subch D Reserved

## SUBCHAPTER A IN GENERAL

## Sec 5.01. Powers of city council.

(a) In addition to any authorities boards or commissions now or hereafter created and estab lished by or pursuant to General Statutes of North Carolina Special Acts of the General Assembly, or this Charter the City Councll is hereby vested with power to create and establish, by ordinance or resolution, such other authorities, boards and commissions as it mas deem necessary or appro priate to the administration, regulation, and op eration of services, activities, and functions which the city is authorized by law to perform regulate, and carry on It is desirable that in appointing persons to boards, commissions and authorities the appointing authority should attempt to secure reasonable representation on each such body of all sexes races, geographic sections of the city and political parties Provided however, that such representation shall not be required, and the va lidity of any appointment may not be challenged on grounds that such representation has not been achieved
(b) Any authority board commission, or other agency to which the Mayor or City Council ap points members or appropriates money is hereby required to furnish to the Mayor and City Coun cil upon request, such information as the Mayor and City Council may deem relevant to the af fairs of any such authority board, commission, or other agency The duty to provide such informa tion is mandatory and may be enforced by an action for mandamus in the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County
(c) [Reserved.]
(Sess Laws 1971, Ch 97, § 1, Sess Laws 1981 Ch 61, §1, Sess Laws 1981, Ch 363, §1)

## SUBCHAPTER B. AUDITORIUM-COLISEUMCONVENTION CENTER AUTHORITY

## Sec. 5.21. Continuation.

The control, management and operation of the property and improvements now or hereafter made or acquired by the City of Charlotte for auditorı um, coliseum, civic center and baseball stadium purposes shall continue to be vested in the Au thority to be known as the Auditorium Coliseum Convention Center Authority The Authority shall continue to be composed of seven (7) members, five (5) members to be appointed by the City Coun cll and two (2) members to be appointed by the Mayor Each member shall serve a term of three (3) years No member shall serve more than two (2) consecutive terms In case any vacancy shall be created on said Authority, the City Council or the Mayor, as the case may be, shall appoint a member to fill the unexpired term The members of the Authority shall recerve no compensation

Any member who fails to attend at least sev enty five (75) percent of the regular and special meet ings held by the Authority during any one year period shall be automatically removed from said Authority Vacancies resulting from a member's fallure to attend the required number of meetings shall be filled as provided herein
(Sess Laws 1971, Ch 92, § 2, Ord No $82 \mathrm{X}, \S 1$, 12874 , Ord No $134 \mathrm{X}, \S 1,4874$, Sess Laws 1977, Ch 140, § 1, Ord No 1011, § 1, 72781 (Sess Laws 1971, Ch 97, §1, Sess Laws 1981 Ch Laws 1987, Ch 191, §1)

## Sec 5.22 Officers and funds.

The members of the Authority shall elect an nually from their body a chaurman, vice-chaurman
and a secretary and otherwise provide for the efficient adminstration of its affairs provided however, the Treasurer of the City of Charlotte shall by virtue of his office be also the Treasurer of the Authority, and he shall serve as such Trea surer ${ }^{\text {without additional compensation All funds }}$ of the Authority shall be kept by its Treasurer in a separate bank account or accounts from other funds of the City of Charlotte and shall be pand out only in accordance with procedures estabhshed by such Authority The net proceeds from the operation of the Authonty shall be used to pay the interest and retirement on the bonded debt of the City of Charlotte incurred in connection with such auditonum-colseum-convention center baseball stadum and shall not be used for any other pur pose until sand bonds, principal and interest have been paid, except as may be otherwise approved by the City Council for other uses of the Authori ty Quarterly operating statements of the Author ity and an annual audited statement shall be presented to the City Councll The Authority shall be deemed a "special district," as defined in G S 1597 , for purposes of the Local Government Bud get and Fiscal Control Act and shall budget and adminster its fiscal affars according to the pro visions of that act applicable to special districts Sess Laws 1983, Ch 956, § 1, Sess Laws 1987, Ch 191, § 1)

## Sec. 5.23. Powers and duties.

The Authority shall operate the auditorium coliseum-convention center baseball stadium in a proper, efficient, economical, and business like man ner, to the end that such properties and facilities may effectively serve the public needs for which they were established at the least cost and ex pense to the City of Charlote The Authorits shall appoint a manager of such auditorıum coliseum-convention center baseball stadum prop erties, whose salary shall be fixed by the Author ity Such manager shall, in addition to other du thes amposed upon him by the Authority, be re sponsible for the collection of rents or fees for the use of the properties and facilities of the Authori ty The Authority shall select such other person nel as it deems advisable to properly operate such properties The Authority shall have full and com plete control of such auditonum-coliseum-convention Supp No 19
center baseball stadium properties and facilities shall have full and complete control over grant ing and denying the use of, and estabhshing and collecting rents and fees for the use of the prop erties and facilities, shall make all reasonable rules and regulations as it deems necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of such properties and facilities, may expend funds of the Authority for the advertising and promotion of the use of the properties and facilities, and may sponsor and promote shows, events, games and activities involving the use of the properties and facilities and make reasonable charges therefor

The Authority may, in its discretion, lease or rent auditorum-colseum-convention center baseball stadium properties and facihties for such terms and upon such conditions as the Authority may determine but not for longer than ten (10) years Leases and rentals for terms of more than one (1) year may be executed only after ten (10) days' public notice by publication describing the prop erty to be leased or rented, stating the annual lease or rental payments and announcing the $A u$ thority's intent to authorize the lease or rental at its next meeting No public notice or resolution of the Authority is required with respect to leases and rentals for terms of one (1) year or less (Sess Laws 1971, Ch 92, § 3, Sess Laws 1987, Ch 191, § 3(1)-(4))

## SUBCHAPTER C RESERVED*

## SUBCHAPTER D RESERVED $\dagger$

[^0](The next page is 145)
City of Charlotte
Auditorium-Coliseum-Convention Center Authority
Calculation and Use of Proprietary Interest (Cash Reserves)
June 2, 1993
Proprietary Interest, June 30, 1992
Cumulative Surplus (Deficit) ..... 19,004,607
Cumulative Capital Improvement Transfers ..... (14,205,237)
Grants of Funds From City of Charlotte ..... 2 251,940
118,939
Grants of Funds From Other SourcesTotal Proprietary Interest
Projected Operating Surplus (Deficit), June 30, 1993
Ovens Auditorium96,550
Charlote Coliseum ..... 3,961,300
Charlotte Convention Center ..... $(518,459)$
New Charlotte Convention Center ..... $(13,552)$
Authority Operating Surplus (Deficit)
Projected Capital Improvement Transfers, June 30, 1993
Ovens Auditorium$(65,000)$
Independence Arena Renovation ..... (2,000 000)
Charlotte Coliseum$(801,565)$
Charlotte Convention Center ..... $(246,417)$
New Charlotte Convention Center ..... (92 000)
Authority Capital Improvement Transfers
Projected Proprietary Interest, June 30, 1993
Budgeted Operating Surplus (Defict), June 30, 1994Ovens Auditorium/Independence Arena460,247
Charlotte Coliseum ..... 2,056,913
Charlotte Convention Center$(540,184)$
New Charlotte Convention Center ..... $(143,502)$
Authority Operating Surplus (Deficit) $1,833,474$
Budgeted Capital Improvement Transfers, June 30, 1994Ovens Auditorium/Independence Arena$(397,000)$
Independence Arena Renovation ..... (2,000 000)
Charlotte Coliseum ..... $(706,940)$
Charlote Coliseum, NCAA ..... $(540,600)$
Charlotte Convention Center ..... $(320,350)$
New Charlotte Convention Center ..... (40 000)Authority Capital Improvement TransfersBudgeted Proprietary Interest, June 30, 1994
(3,204,982)7.491,106
3,525,839 ..... 3,525,839
7,170,249(4,004,890)5,319 690
Budgeted Reserves for Propretary InterestNew Convention Center Operating Deficit(1500,000)
New Convention Center Capital Improvements ..... (1000,000)
Ovens Auditorium A D A Renovation ..... (2,000 000)5,319 690
Total Budgeted Reserves$(4500,000)$
Batance of Propnetary Interest819690

For subsequent years capital improvements, operating deficits and reserves

Cty of Chalote
udtorum Cof stum Convent on Crmer Auther iy
ouccar of Cast Reserves
r-cal 1986 Fiscal 2000

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ovens Aud torium |  | $10711^{\circ}$ | 99335 | 12127 | a 550 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Gferama Suplos (D) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3040000 | 3049000 | 3040000 |
| Charletye Col sam <br> Operal ng Surpls (Oetet) | 3631981 | 3044500 | 3238265 | 3294251 | 3051300 | 2056413 | 3040000 | 3040000 | 3040000 | 304000 | 304900 |  |
| Cha lotle Convent on Cente |  |  |  | (230 075) | (518 459) | (510 184) | (175000) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Operat na Surplua (Vatiat) | (227 526) | (16148) | (443 538) | (230075) | (510 4S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Haw Cratitta Convention Center ner aing Surplas (Defi il) | n/a | n/a | 0 | 10959 | (i3 552) | $(143 \mathrm{ch2})$ | (712 And) | ( 1450200$)$ | (1 195400 ) | (1) 135 200) | $(1523$ 100) | (947360) |
| Independence Arera |  |  |  |  | N/a | 460247 | $4 \times 354$ | 485276 | 502924 | 518012 | 533552 | 540.550 |
| Operatina Surplus (0eficit) | n/a | n/a | no | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3525839 | 1833474 | 2635254 | 2087076 | 2356524 | 2410012 | 2559452 | 2751299 |
| Annyal Operse ng Euplus (Defct) | 3447564 | 3801171 | 2895062 | 3087172 | 3525 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (1413029) | (156s 44) | (3518 719) | (1 188 403) | (3204992) | ( 6004890 ) | ( 4500000 ) | $(2000000)$ | (2000 D00) | (20f0 000) | (2000 0000 |  |
| Cap talimp ovemeni* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Aduanre of Sco eboard Funds | (257 465) | 785000 | 0 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| dedependence Arena Oebt Saty er | m/a | $n / a$ | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ralr jat on of Cash Regerves |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comulave Operer ng Suplus (Ditct | 9132202 | 13022373 | 15917435 | 19004607 | 22530446 | 24363920 | 26999174 | 29085250 | 3142775 | 33553507 | 36413039 | 15429 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (23 415 109) | (25 915 109) | (27915 109) | (29 915 109) | (31915 103$)$ | (33 915 109) | (35915 109 |
| Cap almproverment transkia | (7623 572) | (9409 115) | (13016834) | (14205237) | (174102) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 2251040 | 2851940 | 2251940 | 2251940 | 2251940 | 2251940 | 2251940 | 2251040 | 2251940 |
| Cant of Funds From Clly | 2251940 | 2251910 | 2231940 | 2 S 19 O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 110930 |
|  | 118939 | 119030 | 118939 | 118939 | 118039 | 110930 | 114099 | $11893{ }^{\circ}$ | Ho 93 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Advance al Storebosid Funds | (705 000) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 149105 | 3319590 | 345494 | 3542020 | 3898545 | 4309357 | 4969809 | 5820 gen |

Tetal Cash Reserves

| 3087409 | 5805137 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Asumplion -

Conumion Center performance tevised to current tends
New Convention Center petiormance per Piat Marmichiepon
bervice raducedrozero
spec al Cop lad Improvement
FY 93804 Independenct Arena Renovation ( 40 M )
FY 9 Oums A diter um $A O A$ Renovat on (20M)
i 94 ' F nal Four' Rifurb shments ( 540 K )
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| Calcuation of Annust |  |  | E/30/91 | 6/70/92 | 5/30993 | 6/30/94 | $530 / 95$ | 6/30195 | 63097 | 5139199 | 53010 | 558000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ope 0 a Suples (Defel) | 6/30/89 | 6/30/80 | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ovens Aud lar um | 43109 | $10^{7} 1{ }^{10}$ | 99335 | 12127 | 05550 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| Charlote Col ium |  |  |  |  |  | 2056913 | 7040000 | 3040900 | 3040000 | 3044000 | 304000 | 3042000 |
| Opurstig Surplus (Dafic) | 3631981 | 3044500 | 1239265 | $32^{04251}$ | 3961 700 | 2056 di | 7 (0)0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Charlotte Corvention Center |  |  |  | (230075) | (515 459) | (540 184) | $(175000)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Operat na curplus (Dafict) | (227 526) | (161 448) | (443 538) | (230075) | (sio AS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Now Ltarlotte Convent en Certer |  | a | 0 | 10859 | (13552) | (143592) | (712 8 cm | (1450 200) | (1 19543n) | (1 155208$)$ | (1023 100) | 47 ${ }^{75} 9$ |
| Operi na siplsa (0afi) | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 518012 | $53355 \times$ | 543550 |
| indafurdence mera |  | $n / 2$ | n/a | $n / 2$ | n/a | 460247 | $4710^{54}$ | 489216 | 502924 | 518012 |  |  |
| Cperat ra sutplus (Def Cil) | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3087172 | 3525839 | 1833474 | 26352 c 4 | 2087076 | 2355524 | 2410812 | 2550452 | 2751259 |
| snnual Opt ating su plus (Dafict) | 3447564 | 3800171 | 2095062 | 3087172 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (3518719) | (1 188 403) | (3204982) | (6004890) | (2500000) | (2000 006) | (2000 000) | (2000 000) | (2000 000) | (coorros) |
| Cat al lmp ovamenta | $413029)$ | (1568 4, | (351879) | (1 18a 40s) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | $n$ |
| asuanme of Sco eboard funds | (257 485) | 795000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | n/a | $n / 2$ | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $n$ |  |
| Andependence a ena Dete Serves |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cat dat on ar Soth Rtatives |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9132202 | 13022373 | 15917435 | 19004607 | 22530416 | 24363920 | 26999174 | 20055250 | 31422775 | 3) ${ }^{\text {as3 }}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | 034) | (14005 237 | $(17410219)$ | (23415 109) | (25915 109) | $(27315109)$ | (29915 109) | (31915 109) | $(33015$ 109) | ( 95915 (not |
| UFinllmptovamentiansfag | (7629572) | (9498 4.5 | (30, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | (1420s 23 ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2251040 | 2751940 | 2251940 | 2251940 | 2251940 | 2251940 | 2251940 | 2251940 | 2251940 | $2<51040$ |
| Crant of Funds From Cily | 2251940 | 2251940 | 2251940 | 225190 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 110.039 | 118979 | 118930 | 11899 | 118970 | 118098 | 118930 | 119939 | 118070 | 11809 | 118 |
| $\bigcirc$ ants from Oher Sourct | H0. | f103 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Advance of Sesrebesrd funds | ( 550000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 494 | 3542020 | 3898545 | 4309357 | 4859,809 | ¢ 2008 g |
|  | 3087409 | 5895137 | 5274480 | 7170249 | 7491105 | 3319590 | 344914 |  |  |  |  |  |

Agsumpt ons
setial (guresusedio Fi $89 \mathbf{9 2}$ projectiona for FY 93 budgrtior FY 98
وre' forecosi of Col stum performance wi Parking ia sed to $\$ 400$ n FY 9500
Convent on Center petformance rivised to curtent lent
New Convent on Center pefformance per Peat Marw extipor
Andere arena debe survice reduced to zero
apectol Coprol Improviment
FY 93194 Independence Arena Renovation ( 40 M )
940ven $A$ dio um ADA Fenovat on ( 20 M )
F 94 " F nal Four" Refurb shmants ( 540 K )


## Impact on the Financial Plan

In order to provide a means of financing the new convention center in Charlotte, legislative authority was requested and granted to levy a $1 \%$ Prepared Food and Beverage Tax as well as an additional $3 \%$ Occupancy Tax These two revenues serve as the dedicated source of funding for obligations associated with the convention center financing plan The state statute authorizing these revenues prioritizes the permitted uses for these revenues as follows

To pay any debt when due with respect to any financing for the new convention center
To pay costs ( $\$ 1,500,000$ in each fiscal year) for marketing and promoting the new convention center

To pay other costs of acquiring, constructing, maintaining, operating, marketing, and promoting the new convention center

The financial plan for the New Charlotte Convention Center (NCC) includes projections of these revenues and the application of the revenues to cover debt service requirements and $\$ 15 \mathrm{~m}$ marketing costs associated with the new facilty After satisfying these obligations, any excess revenues were shown to accumulate in a fund balance These excess revenues can be used for any of the purposes outlined in the third priority, including operatıng and marketıng costs

The proposed marketing agreement between Charlotte Convention and Visitors Bureau (CCVB) and the Auditorium-Coliseum-Convention Center Authority regarding current and future marketing of the NCC suggests three dedicated uses for excess revenues available under the third prionty as described above

- First, in order to increase the amount of marketing dollars avalable, additional revenues would be allocated for this purpose equal to $15 \%$ of convention center revenues (compared with the $\$ 15 \mathrm{~m}$ currently dedicated) This allocation would be more comparable to sumilar facilties in other cittes
- Second, change the treatment of operating deficits of the new facilty whereby $50 \%$ of any deficit would be covered by these excess revenues This will allow greater flexibility in developing compettive bid packages for the new center. The financial plan assumed that any deficits would be covered entirely from Authority funds.
- Third, use excess revenues to provide an incentive plan to both the Authority and CCVB relating to occupancy tax revenues. This incentive would allocate $30 \%$ of occupancy tax revenue in excess of projections to the Authority and CCVB ( $15 \%$ each) These funds would be used to further enhance bid packages

These proposals will strengthen the competitive marketing activities of both the Authority and CCVB in their efforts to make the New Charlotte Convention Center a success. It is also the intent that these proposals will enhance the financial potential of the new facility, the revenues supporting the new faculity and the overall economic "plus" for the community These ideas were included in the report by Cumings McNulty consultants as suggestions for improving the overall marketing effort for the facility Furthermore, these proposals are consistent with the permitted uses of occupancy tax and food/beverage tax revenues dedicated to the new convention center as defined in the statute outlined above The Finance Director has analyzed the impact of these changes and has determined that these proposals would not have a detrimental effect on the convention center fund balance The projected fund balance in fiscal year 2000 under the original financial plan was $\$ 344 \mathrm{~m}$ If these proposals are implemented, the fund balance in fiscal year 2000 would fall to $\$ 30 \mathrm{~m}$ (see comparative schedules attached)

CITY OF CHARLOTTE
NEW CONVENTION CENTER FUND
FORECASTED 8TATEMENT OF REVENUES EXPENDITURES AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE

|  | FY 91 | FY 82 | FY 93 | FY 94 | FY 85 | FY 98 | FY 97 | FY 88 | FY 99 | FY 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REVENUES OCCUPANCY TAX FOOD \& BEVERAGE TAX COUNTY ADMINISTRATION FEE | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 3085834 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 3,921,582 \\ 3,176,794 \\ (95,304) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 4161295 \\ 8595345 \\ (197.860) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 4349261 \\ 7057020 \\ (211.711) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 4,624,795 \\ 7,551,011 \\ (226,550) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 5020,955 \\ 8079,882 \\ (242,387) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 6,388,740 \\ 8645,162 \\ (269,365) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 85743227 \\ 9,250,313 \\ (277,609) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86,052,758 \\ 9,897,835 \\ (298,935) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 68,588,266 \\ 10,590,683 \\ (317,721) \end{array}$ |
| NET TAX REVENUES INTEREST INCOME | 3085894 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,005072 \\ 218598 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10558780 \\ 505090 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11194570 \\ 752,568 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11,049,276 \\ 1,069,479 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12,850149 \\ 1,272,246 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13,774,688 \\ 1,452,688 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14,718,081 \\ 1,885,292 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15,655,659 \\ 1,677,854 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16,680,220 \\ 1,838,606 \end{array}$ |
| TOTAL REVENUES | \$3085 834 | \$7,221 670 | \$11,063 870 | \$11947136 | \$13,017,788 | \$14,130,396 | 818,227,178 | 818,301,263 | 817,381,812 | 818,497,734 |
| EXPENOTTURES PROMOTIONS | \$0 | \$1,500 000 | \$1 500,000 | \$1 500,000 | \$1,500 000 | \$1,800,000 | 81,800,000 | \$1,600,000 | \$1800,000 | \$1,600,000 |
| REVENUES OVER EXPENDITURES | \$3 085884 | \$5,721,670 | \$9563 870 | \$10447.135 | \$11,617,766 | \$12,630,398 | \$13,727,175 | \$14804,265 | \$15,831,612 | 816,997,794 |
| OPERATING TRANSFER TO THE CTTY OF CMARLOTTE GENERAL FUND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13820,100 | 13810100 | 13808.400 |
| SCHEDULED INSTALLMENT PAYMENT RESERVE FUND EARNINGS | 0 0 | $\begin{gathered} 9,995,600 \\ (923,400) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,400100 \\ & (1008,900) \end{aligned}$ $(5730000)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10400100 \\ & (1008,900) \\ & (2913700) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10,400,100 \\ (1,008900) \\ (271,500) \end{array}$ | $(1,008800)$ | $(1,008,900)$ | $(1008,800)$ | $(1,008,900)$ | $(1,008,800)$ |
| TOTAL OPERATING TRANSFER | \$0 | \$0 | \$3661 200 | \$6477,500 | $\$ 9119700$ | \$9,394 200 | \$12,822,800 | \$12,811.200 | \$12,801,200 | \$12,797,500 |
| EXCESS (DEFICIENCY) OF REVENUES OVER EXPENOITURES \& TRANSFERS | \$3085 894 | \$5721 670 | \$5902 870 | \$3 969 635 | \$2 388 055 | \$3,239 185 | \$904,375 | \$1980,063 | \$5,050 312 | \$4200234 |
| BEGINNING FUND BALANCE | \$0 | \$3085 834 | \$8807504 | \$14710 174 | \$18,678,810 | \$21077865 | \$24,317,060 | \$25 221,438 | \$27211498 | \$30241811 |
| ENDING FUND BALANCE | \$3 085834 | \$8,807 504 | \$14710 174 | \$18679810 | \$21077865 | \$24317060 | \$25 221,435 | \$27211498 | O | \$34 442,045 |

[^1]- INCLUDES UPDATED REVENUES AS OF 2/93

|  | FY 81 | FY 92 | FY 93 | FY04 | FY 95 | FY 98 | FY 97 | FY 88 | FY 99 | FY 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REVENUES OCCUPANCY TAX FOOD \& BEVERAGE TAX COUNTY ADMINISTRATION FEE | $\$ 3085834$ 0 0 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 3,921,582 \\ 3,176,794 \\ (85,304) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 4.161295 \\ 6598345 \\ (197860) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 4,349261 \\ 7057020 \\ (211,711) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 84824785 \\ 7,551011 \\ (228.550) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 5020955 \\ 8079582 \\ (242,387) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 65,388,740 \\ 8648,162 \\ (259,356) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 55748227 \\ 9,250,313 \\ (277,500) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50,052759 \\ 0,897,838 \\ (206,986) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58,988,280 \\ 10,690,689 \\ (317,721) \end{array}$ |
| net tax revenues interest income | 3085834 | $\begin{array}{r} 7.003,072 \\ 218,598 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10,558,780 \\ 505,090 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11194570 \\ 752,566 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11,949,276 \\ 1062,746 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12858149 \\ 1251238 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \text { 774,538 } \\ 1407,698 \end{array}$ | 14716,081 1506,345 | $\begin{array}{r} 15653,859 \\ 1554250 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16,659,229 \\ 1658,648 \end{array}$ |
| TOTAL REVENUES | \$3085 834 | \$7221.670 | \$11063870 | \$11947135 | \$13,012 021 | \$14109 387 | \$15,182,236 | \$16,222,376 | \$17207900 | \$18,317.877 |
| EXPENDTTURES PROMOTIONS OPERATNG DEFICIT (50\%) | \$0 | \$1500000 | \$1,500 000 | \$1679 185 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1.782391 \\ 356400 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1928,722 \\ 725,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 2,068,181 \\ 597,700 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 2207,405 \\ 578,100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 2348.049 \\ 511550 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 2498884 \\ 423,650 \end{array}$ |
|  | so | \$1,500,000 | \$1500000 | \$1679 185 | \$2,148,791 | \$2,65s 822 | \$2 669,881 | \$2 785,505 | \$2,859,589 | \$2,922 534 |
| REVENUES OVER EXPENDITURES | \$3085834 | \$5 721.670 | \$956s 870 | \$10267850 | \$11,219,630 | \$12,180665 | \$43,116,056 | \$14,014,972 | \$14,859,880 | \$15,818 892 |
| OPERATING TRANSFER TO THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE GENERAL FUND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SCHEOULED INSTALLMENT PAMMENT | 0 | 9895600 | 10400100 | 10400100 | 10 400,100 | 10400100 | 49,891,700 | 19,820,100 | 13,810,100 | 13808400 |
| RESERVE FUND EARNINGS | 0 | (923 400) | (1 008 900) | (1008900) | (1 008,800) | (1008,800) | (1008,800) | (1 008,800) | (1 008.800) | $(1,008,800)$ |
| CAPITALIZED INTEREST | 0 | (9072 200) | ( 5730000 ) | (2913700) | $(271,500)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL OPERATING TRANSFER | \$0 | \$0 | \$3 661200 | \$6477500 | \$9.118700 | \$9 381200 | \$12,822,800 | \$12,811,200 | \$12,801 200 | \$12,797,500 |
| EXCESS (DEFICIENCY OF REVENUES OVER EXPENDTTURES \& TRANSFERS | \$3 085834 | \$5721 670 | \$5 902670 | \$3790450 | \$2099 930 | \$2789 465 | \$293255 | \$1.203 772 | \$2058660 | \$3 021492 |
| beginning fund balance | \$0 | \$3085 834 | \$8807504 | \$14710 174 | 818500824 | \$20 600,554 | \$23,390 019 | \$23,689 274 | \$24,887 046 | \$26945,708 |
| ENDING FUND BALANCE | \$3085834 | \$8807504 | \$14710 174 | \$18,500 624 | \$20600 554 | \$23390 019 | \$23,68s,274 | \$24887,048 | \$26945 706 | \$29967 198 |

INCLUDES ASSUMPTIONS BASED ON RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE CUMINGS MCNULTY DRAFT REPORT DATED 1/21/93

- REVENUE ALLOCATED TO PROMOTION BASED ON $15 \%$ OF NET TAX REVENUES VERSUS $\$ 1$ SM EACH YEAR
- NEW CONVENTION CENTER FUND TO ABSORB 50\% OF FACILTY OPERATNG OEFICTT (SHARED WTH AUTHORITM
- INCLUDES UPDATED REVENUES AS OF $2 / 93$
- MAINTAINS REVENUE GROWTH RATE ASSUMPTIONS AS PRESENTED IN THE OFFICIAL STATEMENT

Summary Of Council Actions Approved May 10, 1993

- Implement Point of Service Plan
- Tiers of coverage:

> individual
> employee + spouse employee + child(ren) employee + spouse +child(ren)

- $\mathbf{8 0 \%}$ reimbursement level for hospital charges for employees/retirees in the network;
$\mathbf{6 0 \%}$ reimbursement level for those not in the network.
- Two choices in benefits:

High Option: has $\$ 200$ deductible and requires employee contribution for individual coverage;

Low Option: has $\$ 400$ deductible and no cost sharing.

- Phase-in cost shifting for dependent coverage:

Employees will pay $50 \%$ of the individual + dependent coverage.

- Employees begin paying $\$ \mathbf{2}$ /month for Dental coverage.
- Implement long-term disability for employees with less than 5 years of service.
- Develop and phase in separate rate structure for retirees.
- Establish "defined contribution" plan for employees who retire after 1/1/94.
- $50 \%$ of hard dollar cost savings resulting from changes in employee and retiree health insurance will be used to fund employee incentive programs.

| COVERAGE | POINT OF SERVICE EFFECTIVE SEPTEMB <br> PLAN I |  | PLAN 1, 1993 | $\square P \mathrm{P}$ N II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | IN-NETWORK | OUT-OF-NETWORK |
| Office Visits (PCP/Specialists) | \$15 co-pay | 60\% after annual deductible | \$20 co-pay | 60\% after annual deductible |
| Other Services (Hospital, Surgery, etc.) | 80\% after annual deductible | 60\% after annual deductble Additional \$200 hospital confinement deductible | 80\% after annual deductible | 60\% after annual deductible Addrtional $\$ 400$ hospital confinement deductible |
| Calendar Year Deductible | \$200 | \$200 | \$400 | \$400 |
| Out-Of-Pocket | $\$ 1500$ <br> (Excludes \$200 deductible and co-pays) | $\$ 3000$ <br> (Excludes \$200 deductibles) | \$2400 <br> (Excludes \$400 deductible and co-pays) | $\$ 4800$ <br> (Excludes \$400 deductibles) |
| Prescription Drugs | \$5 Co-pay (Generic) <br> \$10 Co-pay (Brand) | 60\% after annual deductible | \$10 Co-Pay (Generic) <br> $\$ 15$ Co-pay (Brand) | 60\% after annual deductible |

## EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE KEY FINANCIAL INFORMATION

- TARGET SAVINGS: $\$ 5,000,000$
- KNOWN SOURCES: \$3,900,000
$>$ Medical Redesign $=\$ 3,700,000^{*}$
> \$2/Month Employee Dental Contribution $=\quad 100,000$
> Experıence Gain in Dental Plan $=\quad 100,000$
- NET TO BE COLLECTED
\$1,100,000
THROUGH INCREASED
EMPLOYEE AND RETIREE
MEDICAL PLAN
* Orıgınal medıcal redesign reflected in the City Manager's recommendations would have resulted in savings of $\$ 3.3$ million.


[^2]note
(1) High Option $=\$ 200$ Deductible
(2) Low Option $=\$ 400$ Deductible

## EXAMPLES OF THE IMPACT OF INSURANCE RATE INCREASE

Gross Monthly Salary With 4.5\% Salary Increase
Current Net Monthly Salary
After Taxes and Insurance
Laborer I
Asst III

Sanitation Crew Chief I

Police Officer

Civil Current Gross
Monthly Salary
Job Titie

U Laborer 1

## Office

Asst III Engineer I
$\$ 948$


Net Monthly Salary After Taxes and Insurance Rate Increase Of $43.81 / \mathrm{mo}$.

| $\$ 1,393$ | $\$ 959$ | $+\$ 11(1 \%)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 1,567$ | $\$ 1,080$ | $+\$ 18(17 \%)$ |
| $\$ 1,742$ | $\$ 1,193$ | $+\$ 12(1 \%)$ |
| $\$ 2,177$ | $\$ 1,493$ | $+\$ 29(2 \%)$ |
| $\$ 2,612$ | $\$ 1,785$ |  |

Difference In Net
\$49 (2 8\%)

ASSUMPTIONS: Examples are based on an employee with farnily coverage claiming marned status with 1 exemption

# IMPACT OF SEPARATE RATING PLAN FOR RETIREES AND EMPLOYEES (MONETARY COST) 

(IF IMPLEMENTED WITHOUT PHASE-IN)

| Option and Coverage | Current Employee | Combined Rates |  | Separate Rates |  | Increase |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | And Retiree Cost | Employee | Retree | Employee | Returee | Employee | Retree |
| High Option |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employee Only | -0- | \$1368 | \$ 1368 | \$ 1094 | \$ 2189 | \$ 1094 | \$ 21.89 |
| Employee \& Child | \$106 71 | \$13156 | \$13156 | \$105 25 | \$210 50 | $(146)$ | \$10379 |
| Employee \& Spouse | \$106 71 | \$139 13 | \$139 13 | \$11130 | \$222 61 | \$ 4.59 | \$11590 |
| Employee \& Family | \$106 71 | \$14852 | \$14852 | \$11882 | (\$23763 | \$12.11 | (\$13092) |
| Low Option |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employee Only | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- |
| Employee \& Child | \$106 71 | \$12104 | \$12104 | \$ 9683 | \$19366 | (988) | \$ 8695 |
| Employee \& Spouse | \$106 71 | \$12800 | \$12800 | \$10240 | \$20480 | $(431)$ | \$ 9809 |
| Employee \& Family | \$106 71 | \$136 64 | \$136 64 | \$109 31 | \$21862 | \$260 | \$11191 |

NOTE Rates for retırees over age 65 are being calculated

# Status Report <br> Council Committees' Service Assessment Assignments 

June 2, 1993

## Introduction

In October 1992 City Council began the Services Assessment Process which was facihtated by Organizational Consultants, Inc The City Council's central role was twofold
(1) determine which services City Government should provide ( $\mathbf{e}$, define our businesses), and
(2) determine whether those services should be expanded, cutback, or otherwise altered ( 1 e , define level of funding)

At the retreat Council identified the services which they wished to study or discuss further The process chosen to accomplish this task was to assign services to Council Committees Since March 1993 more than 30 services have been discussed in Committees This report's purpose is to highlight accomplishments and to give the status of the services assigned to Committees

## Services Recommended for Change

To date these topics have been reviewed by a Committee and forwarded to Council for action

## 1) Employee Health Insurance

Committee Action Implement point of service plan and phase-in cost shaning in FY95
Council Action. Implement point of service plan and cost shaning in FY94
Impact: Cost savings from managed care are $\$ 37$ million, additional cost savings from employee and retiree contributions are still being calculated
2) Animal Control Fees for Receiving Unwanted Animals Committee Action Recommend new fees Council Action Approved new fees Impact New revenue of $\$ 75,000$ to $\$ 100,000$ annually
3) Solid Waste Collection Options

Committee Action Recommend once a week curbside collection with a rollout container and no backyard collection
Council Action Approved pilot test program
Impact Not known
4) CBD Garbage Collection Service

Committee Action Provide the same level of refuse collection service to businesses in the CBD as elsewhere Council Action Approved Committee Recommendation Impact. Reduction of one position, approximately $\$ 23,000$
5) Capital Improvement Program

Committee Action Approved the CIP with the exception of the Environmental and Housing Programs which will be considered by Councal
Council Action Approved Committee Recommendation
6) Transit Authority

Committee Action Defer action on approval of legislation creating a Regional Public Transportation Authonty
Council Action Approved Committee Recommendation
7) Community Relations Mission and Staffing

Committee Action. Approved mission and reduced 15 positions Council Action None required Impact. Savings of $\$ 63,000$ in HUD Fair Housing Grant

## Services with No Changes Recommended

City staff presented reports on the following topics including changes made duning nightsizing. Committee recommended no further action or change.

1) Liability Insurance

Action. Reviewed progress in reducing costs
2) Job Training Initiatives

Action: Reviewed link to CPCC
3) Franchise Agreements with Utility Companies

Action. Reviewed encroachment agreements and amounts paid
4) Coordination of Activities in Street Right-of-Way Action. Reviewed work coordination process and sidewalk assessment project
5) Development Services Coordination Action. OK with current staff effort, Planning Commission to follow-up with options to improve City and County coordination
6) CWAC Status and Strategies

Action. OK with status and strategies
7) Staffing of Cable Franchise Administration

Action. OK with current staffing after nghtsizing
8) Staffing and Mission of PS\&I

Action. OK with current staffing after nghtsizing
9) Allocation of Engineering Staff for CIP Projects

Action. OK with current staffing after nghtsizing
10) Allocation of Real Estate Staff and Asset Management Philosophy Action. OK with staff allocation after rightsizing, plan to move to asset management philosophy
11) Review of CUDC Mission and Budget Action. OK with mission and budget

## Reviewed in Committee and to be Considered by Council

These topics have yet to be considered by Council

1) Housing Policies

Status. Workshop recommended for July
2) Off-Duty Police Officers Worker's Compensation Status: Staff will develop recommendations for Council consideration
3) Employee Compensation

Status: To be discussed in Budget Workshops
4) City-County consolidation of EMS and MEDIC

Status. To be on June 14 meeting agenda
5) City-County consolidation of Fire Marshals

Status. To be on June 14 meeting agenda
6) Combining City Arson Investigation and City Police Investigation Status. To be on June 14 meeting agenda
7) Penalty for False Security Alarms

Status. Pending report from Staff
8) Staffing and Work Backlog in CDOT Public Service

Status. Potential Budget Workshop discussion (Recommended 3 new positions)
9) Street Resurfacing Program

Status. Potential Budget Workshop discussion (recommended returning to 12 year average resurfacing cycle instead of 18 years)
10) Funding for Cultural Facilities and Agencies

Status, Potentral Budget Workshop discussion
11) Funding for Community Agencies

Status. Potential Budget Workshop discussion

## Items Not Considered By Committee Yet

These topics have not yet been considered by a Committee

1) Tree Purchase Program Options
2) Community Development Loan\Lien Collection Practices and Procedures
3) Computerized Traffic Control
4) Users Fees for Construction Related Traffic Control and Private Sector Traffic Control with Off-Duty Police Officers

## Attachments

These are attached for your information

1) Summary of Committee Assignments and Actions
2) Overall Rankings from Services Assessment

COMMITTEE
ASSIGNMENT

Review Job Trainıng Inıtiatives \& Options To Link To Community Colleges And Schools

## Review Housing Policies And Programs

## Review And Update Mission Of Community

 RelationsReview CD Loan/ien Collection Practuces And Procedures

Employee Benefits

CD \& Housing

CD \& Housing

CD \& Housing

Personnel \& Finance
CD \& Housing

COMMITTEE ACTIONS

## COUNCI

ACTIONS

Presentat
President

No official action taken Due to the need fo further time to review Council's goals, policies \& programs related to housing Committee asked that the Public Services Committee defer this item from their agenda until the CO \& Housing Committee review is complete Will further discuss at May 18 committee meeting At May 18 meeting. committee decided to bring selected policy recommendations to Council at a Budget Workshop, recommend to Council the extension of all current agency contracts until September 30, and directed staff to prepare a Councll Workshop on housing policies
Motion was approved 41 to accept the report on the CRC's mission and proposed staffing level to the CRC's mission and

Committee meeting not scheduled, however, staff presentation will be made to committee by CD on presentation wili be made to comfnittee by CD assignments

At April 14 meeting, the committee voted to recommend to Council the changes presented by recommend to Counci the changes presented by staff Motion passed Unanimously This issue was discussed again at May 5 meeting, committee voted
to recommend to the full Council that the Point of to recommend to the full Council that the Service concept recommended by staff be
implemented effective September 1, 1993 and that the cost shifting recommendation of the
Compensation Task Force be incorporated into a second phase for implementation Staff will bring back to the appropriate Council Committee next

Council act
Committee recommendation will be sent to full council in June with a full policy discussion scheduled for a July workshop

Committee approved CRC's mission and proposed affing level, Council action not required staffing level, Council action not required

Committee has not met on this assignment $C D$ staff will make a presentation to committee at an upcoming committee meeting No Council action will be required

On April 26 Council voted to defer this item and send back to committee On May 10. Council approved the Compensation Task Force proposal including implementing cost shifting in FY 94

COMMITTEE ACTIONS

COUNCIL

## spring the recommendations for how and when to implement that second phase Motton passed 32

Options and a presentation by Police Dept concerning off duty police officers/workers compensation will be scheduled for the committee's consideration at an upcoming meeting

No formal action taken Presentation made at May 10 meeting by Frank Johnson, compensation consultant, no action taken

Motion unanimously approved to direct City Mgr to notify County Mgr that Council is considering discontinuing present funding agreement for the Veterans' Service Office because of tax equity issue

No action taken
Motion made and approved to continue the policy of designated smoking areas, but ask Managers of each City bldg (not predominately occupied by City employees) to consider ways to improve designated moking areas Will implement "No Smoking" in CMGC on May 3 Committee felt this should be Manager's call, however, item will go to Council for further action once reports from bldg managers are received

No action taken, committee requested a report on "who is charged for what" under encroachment agreements for discussion at April 22 meeting Further discussion at April 26 meeting, no formal

Council requested that staff develop recommendations for addressing workers compensation habily for off-duty officer Staff is to mitate Councl review once recommendations are complete

Committee still reviewing broadbanding and compensation philosophy

Council will review this assignment during Budget reviews

Councll will discuss during Budget reviews
Committee asked for additional information from Coliseum Authority Council action not required

## COUNCIL RETREAT COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

05/28/93

| COMMITTEE | ASSIGNMENT | COMMITTEE ACTIONS | COUNCIL ACTIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | action taken Report on current fees completed |  |
| Planning | Review Measures To Improve Planning And Coordination Of Street Maintenance Activities And Other Work In Street Row (e $g$ CMUD) | Reports made by CDOT, Planning, and Engineering Report on status of sidewalk assessments completed Council action not required | Council action not required |
| Planning | Review Consolidation Of Tree/Landscaping Development Requirements, Options For One-Stop Development Services | Councll OK with current staff effort no action required Planning Commisston assigned to follow-up development services coordination | Council action not required |
| Public Safety | Review User Fees For Animal Control In Order To Make Self-Supporting | Committee recommended charging fee for "anımals" citizens bring in to Animal Control, recommendation to full Council | Council approved committee's recommendation to charge fees for "anımals" that citizens bring in to Animal Control |
| Public Safety | Review City-County Consolidation Opportunities- EMS (medic) And County Fire Marshall | Committee recommended Council talk with County Commissioners about this consolidation Will go to Council in June | Will place on a Council agenda sometıme in June |
| Public Safety | Review Combining Arson Investigation (Fire) And Police Investigation | Committee recommended no change | Agenda item to Council in June |
| Public Safety | False Alarms | Committee recommended changing ordinance to establish penalty for false alarms after a designated number which will be reviewed after one year | Will place on Council agenda late June/early July |
| Public Services | Review Soltd Waste Collection Options | Committee voted 32 to recommend to Council once a week curbside collection with rollout container and no backyard collection At April 19 meeting, committee recommended to proceed with a pilot study To Council on April 26 | Council approved 90 day trial period to test both once a week and twice a week roll out service Staff to bring back criteria for evaluation for Council approval |
| Public Services | Review User Fees And Service Options For CBD Garbage Collection | Committee recommended that City provide CBD the same level of service as other businesses outside | Council approved providing the CBD the same level of service as provided to other businesses in the |

## COUNCIL

this area, CBD businesses can pay for any services required above the basic level of twice a week collection To Council on April 26

Public Services
Public Services

Public Services

Regionalism

Regionalısm

Regionalism

Regionalism

Regionalısm

## Review Tree Purchase Program And Options

Review CWAC Status \& Future Deployment Of "Neighborhood Service Delivery"

Budget Review Fy94-98 Capital Improvement Program

Review Staffing Of Cable Franchise Administration

Review Staffing And Mission Of PS\&l

Review Allocation Of Engineering Staff For CIP Projects

Review Allocation Of Real Estate Staff \& Plans To Move To Asset Management Philosophy

Review Options For Moving CUDC To CMGC

## This meeting has not been scheduled to date

Received report from CWAC team, committee OK with staff direction and strategies, no action

Committee reviewed and discussed at March 29 and April 29 meeting Motion approved to recommend to Council with exception of housing and environmental components

Cable staff made presentation to committee, no action

PS\&il staff made presentation to committee, no action taken

Engineering staff made presentation, no action taken

Engıneerıng/Real Estate staff made presentation, no action taken

Committee will recommend to Council that CUDC
board members be permitted to send designees to board members be permitted to send designees to meetings

## City

## Committee has not met on this item

Council action not required

Council approved committee recommendation to approve the proposed FY 9498 CIP with the exception of environmental protection and housing programs

Committee reviewed staff report Council action not required

Committee reviewed staff report Council action not required

Committee reviewed staff report Council action not required

Committee reviewed staff report Council action not required

Council approved committee's recommendations for
CUDC board members be permitted to send designee CUDC board members be permitted to send designees o meetıngs

|  |  | COMMITTEE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| COMMITTEE | ASSIGNMENT | ACTIONS |

Transportation

Transportation

Transportation

Review Computerized Traffic Control System Current Geography And Expansion Plans)

Review User Fees For Traffic Control During Construction And Private Sector Traffic Control With Off-duty Police Officers

Evaluate Staffing And Backlog Of Work In CDOT Public Service

Transit Management Contract Options
Review Street Resurfacing Program

ACTIONS

June meeting to be scheduled

June meeting to be scheduled

Committee recommended adding three positions to mprove response time to citizen requests,
acreasing street lighting funding
current and anticipated requests in FY 9495 , and make no changes to the multi way stop program

Placed on March 22 Councıl agenda, did not go to committee
Committee approved returning cycle to average of 12 years

Committee took telephone poll on this item and will recommend that Council defer action on the CTC proposal for an RTA pending the implementation nd outcome of a long range transportation/transit strategic process Will go to Council sometıme in April

Council may wish to review during Budget workshop

Item did not go to committee Councll voted to renew contract for one year
Committee approved returning cycle to average of 12 years Council may wish to review during Budget reviews No Council action required

Council approved commuttee recommendation to defe action on the CTC proposal for an RTA pending the implementation and outcome of a long range transportation/transit strategic process

## Overall Rankings - Relative Importance of Service

| RANK SERVICE | SERVICE <br> NUMBER | SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANX 1 Police Patrol | 20 | 65.31 |
| 2 Fire Fightong and Rescue | 11 | 63.80 |
| 3 Criminal Investigations | 22 | 6101 |
| 4 Police Street Drug Interdiction | 24 | 60.79 |
| 5 Pick - up Household Waste and Recyclables | 29 | 5762 |
| 6 Crime Lab | 26 | 5734 |
| 7 Crime Prevention | 21 | 56.85 |
| 8 Transit System | 34 | 56.02 |
| 9 Youth Services (Police) | 25 | 54.35 |
| 10 Move Traffic | 35 | 54.27 |
| 11 Maintain Streets and ROWs | 38 | 53.42 |
| 12 Fire Investigations | 12 | 5315 |
| 13 City Within A City | 41 | 52.86 |
| 14 Stormwater Services | 4 | 52.40 |
| 15 Neighborhood Development | 7 | 52.27 |
| 16 Transportation Planning | 37 | 52.11 |
| 17 Land Development \& Regulation | 5 | 5200 |
| 18 Fire Prevention | 13 | 51.97 |
| 19 Job Training, Development and Placemeat | 17 | 51.15 |
| 20 Community Improvement | 31 | 51.07 |
| 21 Long Range Community / Land Use Planning | 19 | 50.56 |
| 22 Engineering Capital Projects | 3 | 50.40 |
| 23 Street Lights | 36 | 49.82 |
| 24 Neighborhood-based Client Assistance | 18 | 49.79 |
| 25 Housing Preservation | 6 | 49.54 |
| 26 Economic Development | 10 | 49.52 |
| 27 Street Cleaning | 32 | 47.21 |
| 28 Maintain Central Business District | 33 | 46.74 |
| 29 Animal Control | 1 | 45.85 |
| 30 Collection of Miscellaneous Items | 30 | 45.75 |
| 31 Emergency Management | 14 | 4533 |
| 32 Landscape Maintenance | 15 | 44.72 |
| 33 Funding to Community Agencies | 40 | 44.56 |
| 34 Community Relations | 8 | 4452 |
| 35 Urban Forestry | 16 | 42.14 |
| 36 Funding to Cultural Facilities \& Agencies | 39 | 41.52 |
| 37 Customer Service Center | 9 | 39.73 |
| 38 Noise Control (Police) | 23 | 39.04 |
| 39 Taxicab Ordinance (Police) | 27 | 39.00 |
| 40 Public Information | 28 | 38.99 |
| 41 Cable Franchise | 2 | 3555 |


[^0]:    - Editor s note-Former Subch C $\mathbb{\leqslant}$ (541-549 which per tained to the Charlote Park and Recreation Commission was repealed br Sess Lawa 1955 Ch 370 हi
    tEditors note-Former Subch D $£ \S 561-564$ whach per tained to the boxing and wresting commission was repealed b) Sess Laws 1985 Ch 370 \& 8 The deleted prosisionc derved from Sess Laws $1967 \mathrm{Ch} 730 \& 1$ and Ord No $136 \lambda \& 1$ enacted April 81974

[^1]:    ASSLMPTIONS AS PRESENTED IN THE OFFICIAL STATEMEN

[^2]:    *Apples only to Retrees age 65 or older, Retrees under 65 are covered by employee rates

