November 30, 2012

TO: Mayor and Members of Council
FROM: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager

SUBJECT: Items for Your Information

Council Follow-Up Items

- Status of Waste Management & Recycling Task Force Recommendations
  As a follow-up from a request from Councilmember Bellamy-Small at the November 7, 2012 Work Session, attached is a memorandum from Field Operations Director Dale Wyrick, dated November 28, 2012, providing the list of recommendations identified by the Solid Waste & Recycling Task Force.

- Eva Foster Update
  As a follow-up to requests from Council at the November 20, 2012 City Council meeting, attached is a memorandum from Deputy City Manager Jim Westmoreland, dated November 30, 2012, providing an update on the concerns raised by members of the community regarding the Eva Foster case.

- Concrete Usage on Sidewalks and Driveways on City Projects
  As a follow-up to a request from Mayor Perkins at the November 20, 2012 City Council meeting, attached is a memorandum from City Engineer Ted Parrick, dated November 28, 2012 regarding the concerns expressed by a resident regarding the quality of the concrete construction on the two projects was not consistent.

- Glenwood Neighborhood Plan Update
  As a follow-up to a request from Councilmember Vaughan at the November 20, 2012 City Council meeting, attached is a memorandum from Planning and Community Development Director Sue Schwartz, providing a summary on the Greater Glenwood Neighborhood plan.

- Street Performers/Buskers Ordinance
  As a follow-up to a request by Councilmember Vaughan at the November 27, 2012 Work Session, attached is a memorandum from City Attorney Mujeeb Shah-Khan, dated November 30, 2012, providing a draft version of a proposed Street Performers/Buskers Ordinance.

- Downtown Appearance and Good Repair Code
  As a follow-up to a request by Councilmember Matheny at the November 27, 2012 Work Session, attached is a memorandum from City Attorney Mujeeb Shah-Khan, dated November 30, 2012, providing a draft version of the proposed Downtown Appearance and Good Repair Code.

ReCommunity Contract Negotiation Update

Attached is a memorandum from Field Operations Director Dale Wyrick, dated November 30, 2012 providing an update on the contract negotiation with ReCommunity for the processing and marketing of recovered recyclables.

Holiday Parade

Attached is a press release regarding the closing of several roads in the downtown area that will be closed on December 1 for the City’s Annual Holiday Parade. The street closures will begin at 7am and should be open no later than 3pm.
Boards and Commissions Workshop
Attached is a memorandum from Planning and Community Development Director Sue Schwartz, dated November 30, 2012, regarding the Boards and Commissions workshop that has been scheduled for December 13, 2012 at 10am to 3pm at the Cultural Arts Building.

Façade and Retail Grants
Attached is a list of all of the façade grants approved by Downtown Greensboro, Inc. (DGI), and a list of the retail grants approved by Downtown Greensboro Improvement Corporation (DGIC) over the life of the two programs.

Latino Community Outreach
Attached is a memorandum from Deputy Police Chief Dwight Crotts, dated November 27, 2012, providing an update on the efforts to improve the relationship between the Latino community and the Greensboro Police Department.

Water Bills Mailed Late
Attached is a memorandum from Water Resources Customer Service Manager Jeff Kimel, dated November 29, 2012, regarding water bills that had been mailed late due to an error from the vendor.

Greensboro Child Response Initiative
Attached is information on the Greensboro Child Response Initiative.

Contact Center Feedback
Attached are the weekly reports generated by our Contact Center for the weeks of November 12, 2012 through November 25, 2012.

Small Group Meetings
Attached is the Small Group Meeting report for the weeks of November 16, 2012 through November 29, 2012, between City Staff and [more than two but less than five] Councilmembers.

Zoning Commission Meeting
Attached is the November 19, 2012 Zoning Commission meeting results.

Grant Report
Attached is an updated list of grants for which the City intends to apply that do not require a match. Under the policy adopted by City Council, grants that do not require a match are not required to receive formal Council action.

DTR/mm
Attachments

cc: Office of the City Manager
Global Media
November 27, 2012

TO: Jim Westmoreland, P.E., Deputy City Manager

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

SUBJECT: Waste Management & Recycling Task Force Recommendations Status Report

At the November 7, 2012 City Council meeting, the request was made by Council for staff to provide ideas for a Solid Waste Advisory Committee to research the City’s long-term goals based on the list of recommendations by the Solid Waste & Recycling Task Force.

Attached you will find the list of recommendations identified by the Task Force, categorized into short, mid, and long-term completion dates, along with the progress to date of each of those items.

If further is information is required, please advise.

DDW
Attachment
STATUS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT & RECYCLING TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

November 26, 2012

Listed below are the recommendations of the Waste Management & Recycling Task Force as presented in their October 31, 2012, Final Report, along with the City’s current status of implementing those recommendations. Short-term strategies are expected to be completed within one year or less; mid-term strategies are expected to be completed within two years; long-term strategies are expected to take more than two years to complete and may be ongoing.

**MSW Disposal Strategies**

**Strategy 1:** Begin study of, and eventually plan for a MSW facility owned and operated by the City of Greensboro that will process MSW for volume reduction and other benefits (renewable fuels waste-to-energy feedstocks, etc.), preferably one that may attract neighboring communities to utilize it with consideration for disposal of residue at their MSW landfill.

*Long Term Strategy: (Status-Additional Analysis Required)* No significant action taken to date, staff to explore level of interest and feasibility with regional solutions discussions.

**Strategy 2:** Monitor advancements and/or alternative strategies and technologies in MSW disposal being utilized by other governments in NC.

*Long Term Strategy: (Status-Additional Analysis Required)* No significant action taken to date, staff currently keeps up with emerging trends in MSW disposal through involvement in professional associations.

**Strategy 3:** Explore the feasibility of regional collaboration in solid waste disposal considering, among other things, potential mandated environmental and health regulations, advanced technology, required infrastructure, and fiscal parameters. Consider public regional landfilling options, preferably as an equity partner (e.g., Randolph County, Rockingham County).

*Mid-Term Strategy: (Status-In Progress)* Staff is initiating discussions with other regional local governments to explore opportunities for regional collaboration.

**Strategy 4:** Explore the benefits of a regional administrative structure in the form of a waste management authority to serve as the managing body for future disposal of solid waste.

*Mid-Term Strategy: (Status-In Progress)*: Staff to explore the benefits, level of interest, and feasibility of a regional structure and report progress to Council around June 2013.

**Strategy 5:** Explore the feasibility of waste transport by rail as an alternative to trucking, assuming that the current MSW transfer strategy endures for the next 20+ years (rail transport is not believed to be feasible in the 10-year planning period due to a lack of industry infrastructure in NC).

*Long Term Strategy: (Status-Additional Analysis Required)*: No significant action taken to date, staff to explore feasibility of rail transport in coordination with regional solutions discussions.
MSW Recycling & Reduction Strategies

**Strategy 1:** Ensure that multi-family units are incorporated into the city's curbside recycling routes where possible and that public housing units are included in curbside recycling.

*Short Term Strategy: (Status-In Progress):* In fiscal year 2011-12, the City of Greensboro provided recycling collection services to 2,200 Greensboro Housing Authority units at 19 different locations, with federal stimulus funds. Since 2008-09, the City has added 68 different multi-family locations to its recycling collection service. Staff plans to add recycling collection services to an additional 300 multi-family locations before the end of this fiscal year.

**Strategy 2:** Implement a pilot program using routing and Radio Frequency Identification Technology (RFID) to optimize route efficiency, measure program performance and track program participation.

*Long Term Strategy: (Status-In Research):* Research for this pilot program is underway. City collection trucks currently have counters/readers on them that track recycling set out and participation rates. The addition of RFID to rollout carts is expected to enhance route efficiency, operator accountability, and program participation. However, costs for implementation need to be compared to benefits to the City.

**Strategy 3:** Encourage the reduction of waste requiring disposal by:

a) Expanding the types of materials that can be accepted and processed at the recycling facility.

*Short Term Strategy: (Status-In Progress):* The City’s new contract with ReCommunity, scheduled to go into effect before January 2013, expands the types of materials that can be accepted at their facility. The attached City of Greensboro Recyclable Products list provides more details.

b) Promoting the practice of backyard composting.

*Mid-Term Strategy; Status-In Research:* Staff has not begun significant promotion of backyard composting at this time.

c) Encouraging large commercial generators of food waste to divert organic materials from the waste stream.

*Mid-Term Strategy; (Status-In Research):* Staff has not begun encouraging commercial generators to divert organics from the waste stream.

d) Supporting outside proposals/programs that offer services for recycling special wastes.

*Short Term Strategy: (Status-In Progress):* On December 3, 2012, the City will begin a one-year pilot program with Mattress GO Round, a local company that recycles old mattresses and box springs (bulk collection items) by repairing, sanitizing and rebuilding them for resale, thereby keeping them out of the City’s landfill.
Landfill Gas-to-Energy Strategies

Strategy 1: Issue a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to outside vendors to explore and propose ways in which the White Street Landfill's excess methane could safely become a source of positive net revenue for the City, without adversely impacting the surrounding neighborhood. Short Term Strategy: (Status-In Progress): Project selection committee is finalizing an RFQ (Request for Statements of Qualifications) for project ideas for the utilization of the White Street Landfill’s methane gas. Anticipated issuance is mid-December 2012.

City of Greensboro Recyclable Products
(Effective with new ReCommunity contract commencement)

1. Newsprint: also referred to as old newspaper (ONP), which shall include newspaper and advertising supplements and other paper grades generated in the City

2. Mixed Paper: includes magazines, junk mail, chipboard, and telephone directories

3. Office/School and Computer Papers: includes high grade paper from offices such as computer paper, sorted white ledger, copier paper and office stationary

4. Corrugated Containers (OCC): includes boxes with unbleached and non-waxed paper with ruffled liners, it also includes used pizza boxes

5. Bottle Glass: includes household glass containers, bottles and jars, including amber, flint, green and mixed

6. Tin, Steel and Bi-Metal Containers: includes food, beverage, nonfood and aerosol cans made of mixed metal, such as tin and steel

7. Aluminum Cans: consists of household beverage cans made of aluminum and other aluminum, non-food contaminated containers

8. Plastics: includes plastic bottles, containers and packages made from various resins including PETE, HDPE, LDPE, PP, PS and other plastics, resin codes #1 through #7

9. Bulky Rigid Plastics: defined as large polyethylene and polypropylene items (buckets, crates, toys, trays, furniture, bins, barrels, etc.)

10. Polycoated Containers and Aseptic Packages: paper milk and fruit juice container, gable and flat tops

11. Pots and Pans

DW
November 30, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager

FROM: Jim Westmoreland, Deputy City Manager

SUBJECT: Eva Foster Update

The City is continuing to review and investigate concerns raised by members of the community, Reverend Alphonso E. McGlen, and Reverend Nelson Johnson regarding the Eva Foster case. Provided below is an update on a few important items regarding our actions.

I. Meeting arranged with Mrs. Foster, her attorney, Reverend McGlen to discuss the case with the City on December 12

I have scheduled a meeting between Mrs. Foster, her attorney, and Pastor McGlen and our staff for December 12th. The purpose of the meeting will be to review City’s case details and position.

II. November 20, 2012 Council Meeting Follow-up Items

- Clarification of status of any investigation GPD conducted into the officers involved in the case (Response provided by City Attorney Shah-Khan).

The City has reviewed records to clarify the status of any investigation into the officers involved in the case. The City Attorney’s Office has determined that Ms. Foster contacted the Greensboro Police Department’s Professional Standards Division and was interviewed as part of an initial inquiry. Following her interview, Professional Standards staff reviewed the case and the Commander of Professional Standards determined that a formal investigation into any of the officers involved in the September 21, 2009, raid was not necessary.

Professional Standards determined that no violation of any Greensboro police departmental directive had occurred. During her interaction with the Professional Standards Division, Ms. Foster indicated that she was seeking compensation for an injury. As such, Professional Standards then referred the matter to the Insurance Advisory Committee and as per GPD policy.

- Staff to provide a written response to questions raised by Reverend Nelson Johnson. Reverend Johnson’s questions included: Would there be a speedy settlement of the Eva Foster case; if Pastor McGlen’s complaint would be investigated and when the results would be communicated to him; and will there be a process to look into the investigative mechanism of the Greensboro Police Department?

I spoke with Reverend Johnson this week to update him on our status; to advise him of the planned meeting with Mrs. Foster, her attorney, and Reverend McGlen on December 12; and to let him know that staff would provide more formal follow-up to his questions after the meeting.
November 28, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager
Andy Scott, Assistant City Manager

FROM: Ted Partrick, PE, City Engineer, Engineering & Inspections

SUBJECT: Concrete Usage on Sidewalks and Driveways on City Projects
Citizen Concern

At the November 20 City Council meeting, Mr. Wiley McRae, the owner of the properties at 721 and 723 Franklin Boulevard, requested information about the construction of the sidewalks and driveways on the Franklin Boulevard and Friendly Avenue widening projects. The primary concern he expressed was that the quality of the concrete construction on the two projects was not consistent, with a specific concern that the fire stations on Friendly and Franklin did not have the same construction in the driveway aprons. This memorandum was prepared following my visual observations at the job sites and my review of the contracts and specifications.

The two construction contracts were roughly contemporaneous. The Franklin Boulevard Contract 2005-50 with Sharpe Brothers began on January 20, 2006. The Friendly Avenue Contract 2005-21 with Triangle Grading and Paving began on August 24, 2005. The concrete specified in the two contracts was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Franklin Boulevard</th>
<th>W. Friendly Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Concrete:</td>
<td>4 inch, NCDOT Class B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway/Apron Concrete:</td>
<td>6 inch, NCDOT Class B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerant for Aprons:</td>
<td>Sika Rapid -1 with 24-hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000 psi cure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sika Rapid -1 with 24-hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000 psi cure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concrete specified in the two contracts was identical. It is the NCDOT standard specification for sidewalks and driveways, with the exception of the accelerant. For the aprons of driveways, especially for sensitive drives that must be restored as soon as possible, the accelerant is used to produce early strength. On the Franklin Boulevard project, all driveways required the accelerant. On the Friendly Avenue project, select driveways required accelerant at the direction of the engineer. Engineering records do not show any deviation from these specifications on either project. They reflect the customary construction materials and techniques that all roadway contractors are accustomed to.
A request was made for warranty information on the sidewalks and driveways. The City does not warranty the condition of the sidewalks, aprons or roadway it builds. It does maintain them in safe and usable conditions for the public.

Another request was made for better information for homeowners about the materials used on the sidewalks and driveways built along their properties. The information requested typically focuses on the impact, location and sizes of the improvements. The specifications on the concrete have not been considered to be helpful to property owners and, therefore, were never publicized. They are always available upon request.

A concrete test was made on the concrete in the driveway at 721 Franklin Boulevard on September 10, 2007, by Atlantic Coast Engineering & Testing at Mr. McRae’s request. The results show an in-place concrete strength of 5,305 psi (pounds per square inch) – a high strength concrete. By way of comparison, the NCDOT standard for driveways and aprons is 2,500 psi – a much lower strength concrete. This result indicates that the concrete in the driveway met the specifications for an accelerated mix with 2,000 psi strength within 24 hours.

There has been some misinformation concerning the standard concrete specification used in the City’s construction. I misquoted the specification in my responses at the Council meeting. It is commonly believed that 3,000 psi concrete is the standard strength specified, but NCDOT Class B is only 2,500 psi and is used for almost all flatwork (sidewalks, driveways, curb and gutter, median islands, paved ditches, etc.). Class A concrete at 3,000 psi is not the standard NCDOT specification on any roadway work.

Discussion of payments to the contractor raised a question whether the City pays the extra cost if a contractor uses a higher strength or other more expensive concrete. A common scenario is a contractor that wants a concrete to reach its design strength early, which allows the contractor to remove his forms or construction barriers earlier. The City only pays the additional costs if the City’s engineering staff directs or requires the special concrete, not if it is just for the convenience or benefit of the contractor.

Summary

The concrete used on Franklin Boulevard was installed and inspected using the same specifications as the concrete on Friendly Avenue and other City roadway projects. While there is a performance issue with apron cracking at fire stations on both Franklin and Friendly, the construction has otherwise provided good results.

There are no records of concrete test results to substantiate Mr. McRae’s claims that there was a difference in the materials used on the Franklin Boulevard or Friendly Avenue projects.

TP

cc: Mary Vigue, Assistant to the City Manager
    Walter Simmons, Director, Engineering & Inspections
    Dale Clark, Construction Superintendent, Engineering & Inspections

One Governmental Plaza, PO Box 3136, Greensboro, NC 27402-3136 (336) 373-CITY (2489)
November 30, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager
FROM: Sue Schwartz FAICP Director

SUBJECT: Glenwood Neighborhood Plan Update

At the last City Council meeting, Council requested a copy of the Greater Glenwood Neighborhood and an update of the plan’s implementation activities. Attached is a summary report from Jeff Sovich, AICP. Jeff was the lead planner for the development of the plan, and has regularly attended the Greater Glenwood Neighborhood Association meetings since the plan’s adoption and has communicated with GGNA members through their list serve on various issues of concern over the years.

Hard copies of the plan were delivered to Council and the CMO earlier in the week. A link to the electronic version of the plan is included in the summary. Please let me know if there are any questions. Jeff can be contacted directly at 433-7264 or jeffrey.sovich@greensboro-nc.gov.

SS
Attachment
Glenwood Neighborhood Plan  
Implementation Summary 2008 to 2012

**Background:**

In response to requests from the Greater Glenwood Neighborhood Association, the City Council directed city staff to develop a neighborhood plan for the Glenwood neighborhood to provide a general framework to direct growth and reinvestment in the area.

This planning effort, headed by the Planning and Community Development Department, included collaboration with other City departments including, Transportation, Police, Fire, Engineering and Inspections, Libraries, Parks and Recreation, Field Operations, and Public Affairs, as well as the Greater Glenwood Neighborhood Association. Public involvement in this process included a series of 11 public meetings held between November 2006 and January 2008. These meetings attracted a broad spectrum of interest from property owners, residents, business operators, landlords, clergy, UNCG administrators, and adjacent neighborhoods. The Greensboro City Council adopted the Glenwood Neighborhood Plan in February 2008. The plan is available in electronic form on the City’s website at: [http://www.greensboro-nc.gov/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=9826](http://www.greensboro-nc.gov/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=9826)

**Summary of Implementation Activity:**

The Glenwood Neighborhood Plan establishes six broad goals for addressing the issues and concerns identified by Glenwood stakeholders:

- Increase Home Ownership & Maintenance
- Improve Walkability & Bikeability
- Promote Desirable Infill Development
- Reduce Crime & Perceptions of Danger
- Promote Vibrant Accessible Retail & Services
- Strengthen Community Fabric

The Plan includes an extensive implementation component containing over 200 recommended Action Steps to advance the stated goals. Each Action Step identifies the specific City departments and/or other entities responsible for implementation, and includes a general timeline for completion, within an overall plan horizon of approximately 10 years. Roughly, 25% of the Action Steps relate to Housing issues, while another 15% relate to Zoning and Land Use issues. Since the Plan’s adoption, implementation work has been carried out on over 60 of the Action Steps. The PCD staff member who was the lead planner in producing the Glenwood Neighborhood Plan continues to attend meetings of the Greater Glenwood Neighborhood Association, and actively follows discussions on the neighborhood’s electronic forum and social media page.

The Plan also includes Future Land Use recommendations at a more specific level than is shown for most other areas of the City’s Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLUM). The Glenwood portion of the GFLUM has been amended twice: first, in 2009 to coordinate with the Future Land Use recommendations of the High Point Road / West Lee Street Corridor Plan, and again
in 2011 to accommodate the rezoning requested by UNCG for its Spartan Village campus expansion project.

**Key Implementation Successes:**
The PCD staff member who was the lead planner in producing the Glenwood Neighborhood Plan continues to attend meetings of the Greater Glenwood Neighborhood Association, and actively follows discussions on the neighborhood’s electronic forum and social media page. Specific implementation efforts have included:

- Multiple SCORE Team operations in Glenwood.
- Preservation Greensboro, Housing Greensboro and other entities have coordinated with PCD to preserve, relocate, or renovate several historic homes for resale to owner-occupants.
- The Servant Center’s Phase II of disabled veteran housing was successfully designed to harmonize with the existing single-family residential character of its surroundings.
- PCD, UNCG and the neighborhood successfully collaborated to design a cooperative agreement for developing the campus expansion in harmony with the intent of the Glenwood Neighborhood Plan.
- Grace Community Church has established Hope Academy, a college and life preparatory school for grades 5-9 students, especially those living in Glenwood.
- Multiple new businesses have opened in the Grove Street corridor, including Glenwood Coffee & Books, ZenCat Gluten-Free Bakery, and Legitimate Business.
- Three community gardens have been established, the largest of which is in Steelman Park.
- A major renovation of Steelman Park is in the planning phase.
- Glenwood has hosted multiple community events, including The Peoples’ Market, GlenFest, Halloween Carnival & Costume Swap, National Night Out, and Glenwood Holiday Bazaar.
- Upgrades to water and sewer lines along multiple Glenwood streets were recently completed.
- Glenwood has applied for and received multiple grants for neighborhood improvement projects.

**Delays, Barriers, and Obstacles to Implementation Efforts:**
(Beginning at the macro-level and proceeding down to the block-level)

- The nation-wide economic recession and housing market meltdown has affected Glenwood no less than other parts of Greensboro. High rates of vacant homes in the neighborhood, along with low rates of owner-occupancy have been a major obstacle to many of Glenwood’s intended revitalization efforts and plan implementation steps.
- The UNCG Campus Expansion project, which is currently underway, has consumed a significant amount of time and attention from both Glenwood neighborhood leaders and City
staff, which might otherwise have been focused on implementing the Glenwood Neighborhood Plan, resulting in a delay of roughly 12 to 18 months.

• Generally, the ongoing reductions in available budgets for most City departments have caused implementation of many Glenwood Neighborhood Plan Action Steps to proceed more slowly.

• The Glenwood neighborhood has struggled to keep its Community Watch committee active.

• Interdepartmental coordination. Although there is a great deal of coordination through the SCORE process, it is acknowledged departments need to go further. PCD will establish regular meetings with City departments to review implementation efforts for Glenwood and other adopted neighborhood, corridor and area plans to better monitor and communicate these efforts.
November 30, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager

FROM: S. Mujeeb Shah-Khan, City Attorney
James A. Clark, Police Attorney

SUBJECT: Draft Street Performers/Buskers Ordinance

Attached is a draft version of a proposed Street Performers/Buskers Ordinance. I would note that until the final version is presented to the City Council, it is a draft subject to further revision.

If you have any questions, please contact me at your convenience.

SMS
STREET PERFORMERS/BUSKERS ORDINANCE
November 30, 2012 DRAFT

Sec. 13-120. – Street performers.

(a) Definitions.

As used in this section, “perform” or “performance” means audible or visual entertainment such as, but not limited to reciting or singing, acting, dancing, miming, pantomiming, playing a musical instrument or performing a theatrical or literary work. “Street performer” means an individual who performs on public property within the city of Greensboro.

(b) Intent and purpose.

The Greensboro City Council finds and determines the following:

(1) Permitting regulated performances by street performers would enhance the character and culture of the city of Greensboro. Street performers are engaged in commerce as professional entertainers whose livelihood comes, wholly or in part, from gratuities received in exchange for the artistic value of the performance.

(2) Street performers have a right to perform on public property, but unregulated street performances are also likely to cause adverse impacts to the community such as: gathering crowds attracted to the entertainment offered in public locations not appropriate for street performances because of insufficient room for crowds; blocked sidewalks; blocked ingress and egress of buildings; the risk of disrupting nearby motor vehicle traffic; interference with the operation of commercial activities; and disturbance of the quiet enjoyment of residents. Street performances are distinguished from panhandling activities by the commercial nature of the performer’s actions which provide the benefit of a live performance of artistic value in exchange for gratuities from citizens in appreciation of the performance. Therefore, the nature and character of a street performance differs from solicitation of a charitable contribution.

(3) For these reasons, it is the intent of the Greensboro City Council to permit street performances in limited locations within Greensboro subject to careful regulation in order to reduce or eliminate adverse impacts associated with unregulated or poorly regulated street performances. The purpose of this licensing ordinance is to create a means of licensing and regulation which ensures the ability of street performers to perform in public spaces and to promote
harmony among street performers, local businesses, permitted event sponsors, residents and visitors of Greensboro by balancing the interests of performing artists with Greensboro citizens through the careful licensing and regulation of street performances.

(c) Permit required.

Every person engaged in conducting a street performance shall first complete an application for a privilege license permitting such activity and pay an annual tax of fifty dollars ($50.00). Upon payment of said tax, the person shall be issued a privilege license to conduct street performances as otherwise permitted herein. Every street performer shall keep on their person the privilege license issued hereunder during any street performance, and shall produce same upon request of any City official.

(d) Locations where street performers are allowed.

(1) Street performers may only perform at specified areas of public property within Greensboro which the City Manager or her designee determines to be reasonably suitable to conduct street performances without adverse impacts to the community as described in sub-section (b)(2) above.

(2) The Clerk shall keep a list of such areas of public property where street performers are permitted to conduct performances.

(3) The City Manager or her designee may solicit opinions from any party concerning the suitability of allowing street performances at any area of public property in Greensboro. In the event the City Manager refuses to allow street performances of any area, any party may petition the City Council for including the area in the list of areas where street performances are permitted.

(e) Cooperative performances; limit on number of street performers.

Any street performance may be performed cooperatively by no more than five (5) total performers, provided that the group of cooperating street performers stay at least 150’ away from all other street performances. Each cooperative street performer within a single group is required to meet all of the licensing requirements of this ordinance. The provisions of this sub-section shall not relieve any performer in a cooperating street performance from complying with sub-section (f)(1) herein.

(f) Regulations.
Street performers shall comply with the following regulations:

(1) Street performers shall not block, or cause the blocking of any sidewalk, passageway, street, or any ingress or egress to any building, structure, driveway or other passage.

(2) Street performers may accept contributions of money or property at their performance in exchange for their artistic performance as allowed in this section, and may sell audio or video recordings of their own artistic works. Street performers shall not sell any other goods, wares, works of art or conduct any other service on public property.

(3) Street performers shall not perform on private property without written permission of the property owner. Street performers are required to keep the writing granting such permission on their person during any performance on private property.

(4) Street performers shall not infringe or detract from the purpose of special events, temporary gatherings or vendor activities for which a city permit has been issued to another party. Street performers shall not perform at such permitted events, gatherings or activities without the written permission of the permit holder. Street performers are required to keep the writing granting such permission on their person during any performance at permitted events, gatherings or activities.

(5) No street performer shall make any use in any way of fire, sharp instruments or objects, spray paint, aerosols, firearms (real or simulated), dangerous weapons or any form of harmful chemicals during a street performance.

(6) Street performers shall stay at least one hundred fifty feet (150') away from other street performers.

(7) Street performers shall not commit any violation of Chapter 18, Article IV, Offenses of Unreasonable or Disturbing Sound.

(8) While conducting a street performance, street performers shall not use language or gesture, or display any matter which:

   (a) is obscene as prohibited by G.S. § 14-190.1;
   (b) is profane or indecent as prohibited by G.S. §14-197;
   (c) incites or urges riot as prohibited by G.S. §14-288.2; or
(d) is defamatory, insulting or constitutes a communication which tends to inflict injury or incite an immediate breach of the peace.

(9) When directed by any City official, street performers shall promptly comply with the directions to cease or relocate street performances when the City official determines that such action is necessary in response to a complaint by a patron or business operator that the street performance interferes with any private business. Upon request, the City official directing a street performer to cease or relocate the street performance is required to immediately inform the person requesting the information the name(s) of the person(s) making the complaint, the nature of the interference described by the complaining party and the location(s) of the business(es) where the interference is alleged to occur.

(10) Street performers shall not remain at one location for a total duration of more than four (4) hours during any one-day period. When a street performer leaves a location, the street performer shall not return to that location for at least one (1) hour.

(11) No street performer shall claim a greater right to perform at any location over a street performer who arrives first at the same location.

(12) Street performances are not permitted at any location not presently identified on the list kept by the City Clerk.

(13) Street performances are not permitted before 11:00 a.m., nor after 11:00 p.m.

(14) Street performers may display one (1) sign no larger than 18 inches by 18 inches advertising the sale of their own artistic work and asking for gratuities in exchange for their live performance. Said sign may be placed on a prop or sandwich-board type stand in a location no closer than three (3) feet from any curb and not in any location which impedes any foot traffic, parking or persons entering or exiting any motor vehicle. Street performers shall remove such signs from any location at the conclusion of their performance. No sign, handbill, flyer or other advertisement shall be left at any location after the conclusion of a performance.

(15) Street performers shall not conduct any street performances on property used for any residential purpose.
(g) Enforcement.

(1) Any person who fails or refuses to comply with the regulations contained in this section, or to produce a license issued herein upon request of a City official, shall be guilty of a Class 3 misdemeanor. Except as otherwise provided herein, a police officer shall issue a citation for a violation of this section.

(2) A police officer may arrest a street performer or performers for a violation of sub-sections (1) (1), (3), (4), (5), (7), (8), (9), (13) or (15) herein, interference with the enforcement activities of the officer, or any other act which causes an imminent danger to the public health or safety.

(h) Non-transferability.

A license issued hereunder shall not be transferable to any other person or group for the purpose of conducting a street performance as defined herein.
November 30, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager
FROM: S. Mujeeb Shah-Khan, City Attorney

SUBJECT: Draft Downtown Appearance and Good Repair Code

Attached is a memorandum from Associate General Counsel Tom Carruthers concerning a draft version of a proposed Downtown Appearance and Good Repair Code. The memorandum briefly explains the proposed code and attaches the proposed code for review. I would note that until the final version is presented to the City Council, it is a draft subject to further revision.

If you have any questions, please contact me at your convenience.

SMS
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Greensboro  

November 30, 2012  

TO: S. Mujeeb Shah-Khan, City Attorney  
FROM: Tom Carruthers, Associate General Counsel  

SUBJECT: Downtown Appearance and Good Repair Code  

In accordance with recent discussions, I have drafted a proposed Downtown Appearance and Good Repair Code (“Code”). The new Code provisions will be part of the Land Development Ordinance and will apply to the buildings in the Central Business District. The new Code will mandate the repair of windows and doors and prevent the boarding up doors and windows for more than 60 days. Barred or caged windows and doors will be prohibited, except for movable devices used after the business is closed. The Code will mandate the preservation of marble, stone, and masonry features and prohibit decayed facades. It will require painted surfaces to be maintained.  

North Carolina case law permits reasonable regulations based on aesthetic considerations as a valid exercise of the police power. “Aesthetic regulation may provide corollary benefits to the general community such as protection of property values, promotion of tourism, indirect protection of health and safety, preservation of the character and integrity of the community, and promotion of the comfort, happiness, and emotional stability of area residents... Such corollary community benefits would be factors to be considered in balancing the public interests in regulation against the individual property owner's interest in the use of his property free from regulation. The test focuses on the reasonableness of the regulation by determining whether the aesthetic purpose to which the regulation is reasonably related outweighs the burdens imposed on the private property owner by the regulation.” State v. Jones, 305 N.C. 520, 530-31, 290 S.E.2d 675, 681 (1982)  

Enforcement procedures would initially involve a zoning official issuing a notice of violation. The owner will have the option of complying or appealing the notice to the Board of Adjustment. Failure to comply would result in civil penalties in the amount of $50.00 for the first violation, $100.00 for the second, $250.00 for the third and $500.00 for the fourth and all succeeding violations. Each day of noncompliance could be considered a new violation. If necessary, the City could file suit in Superior Court to abate the noncompliance or compel the repair. If the City ultimately bears the cost of the repair, this cost and related penalties would become a lien on the property. However, this lien would fall behind the existing deeds of trust or mortgages and tax liens. Attached is the initial draft of this proposed ordinance.  

TDC  
Enclosure  

One Governmental Plaza, PO Box 3136, Greensboro, NC 27402-3136  336-373-CITY (2489)
30-7-5.2 (E) CB, Central Business

3) Appearance and Good Repair Regulations.
   (a) Intent.

   The Greensboro City Council finds and determines the following:

   Appearance and good repair regulations for the Central Business District will preserve
   the character and integrity of the downtown community. It will provide corollary
   benefits such as protection of property values, promotion of tourism, preservation of the
   character and integrity of the downtown, and contribute to the comfort, happiness, and
   emotional stability of downtown residents and the greater Greensboro Community. It is
   the further purpose of this Code to minimize discordant, unsightly and offensive
   surroundings while preserving beauty as well as the usefulness of the environment.

   (b) Scope and applicability.

   The provisions of these Appearance and Good Repair Regulations shall apply to the
   exterior of all premises, structures, and buildings as defined by the Greensboro Land
   Development Ordinance (LDO) located within the CB, Central Business District which
   are adjacent to a public street or parking area. Exterior walls adjacent to alleys are exempt
   from these regulations. These regulations establish minimum standards, and do not
   replace or modify standards otherwise established for the construction, repair, alteration,
   or use of the building, equipment or facilities contained therein, except as provided
   herein.

   (c) Conflicting Provisions.

   In any case where the provisions of this Code impose a standard other than that set forth
   in any other ordinance of the City or under the laws of the State of North Carolina, then
   the more restrictive standard shall prevail.

   (d) Building Regulations.

   1. A structure shall not have awnings with more than 20 percent of the surface area,
      torn, tattered, or missing for a period of more than 60 consecutive days.
   2. A structure shall not have windows or doors with glass that is broken, missing or
      covered. A structure shall not have window frames with more than 50 percent of the
surface area covered with disfigured, cracked, or peeling surface materials. No such defects shall remain for a period of more than 60 consecutive days.

3. All openings originally designed as windows shall be maintained as windows, complete with sills, lintels, frame, and glass, unless the Code Enforcement Officer approves enclosure of the window in a manner that appropriately fills the space.

4. A structure shall not have windows or doors that are permanently barred or chained. Movable devices over windows or doors that are put in place after business hours are permitted.

5. A structure shall not have exterior surfaces holes, excessive cracks or decayed surfaces for a period of more than 60 consecutive days.

6. Design details of the façade of the structure, including but not limited to the marble, stone, or masonry features shall be preserved.

7. A structure shall be maintained free of cracked or broken glass, loose shingles, loose wood, crumbling stone or brick, loose or broken plastic, vinyl, or similar conditions.

8. A structure shall not have exterior painted surfaces with more than 20 percent of the surface area covered with disfigured, cracked, or peeling surface materials for a period of more than 60 consecutive days.

(e) **Amortization.**

All structures within the Central Business District not in conformity with this section shall comply within 6 months of the enactment of this ordinance.

(f) **Enforcement.**

Violations of this ordinance are subject to the remedies and penalties as provided in Article 5 and applicable state law.
November 30, 2012

TO: Jim Westmoreland, P.E., Deputy City Manager
FROM: Dale Wyrick, P.E., Director of Field Operations

SUBJECT: ReCommunity Contract Negotiations Update

The following is an update on contract negotiations with ReCommunity for RFP #11-12 Processing and Marketing of Recovered Recyclables. Throughout the month of November, staff has been working with ReCommunity to finalize the contract for these services. Negotiations are expected to be completed no later than December 14, 2012, and a new contract should be in place January 1, 2013.

During December, staff will also work with ReCommunity to develop a communications program to promote and emphasize the new line of recyclable items as well as the benefits of recycling for the community. The communications campaign will begin around the middle of December.

As a reminder, the following items will be accepted in the “new and improved” City of Greensboro Recycling program (items in bold red italics are new to the Greensboro program):

1. **Newsprint**: also referred to as old newspaper (ONP), which shall include newspaper and advertising supplements and other paper grades generated in the City

2. **Mixed Paper**: includes magazines, junk mail, chipboard, and telephone directories

3. **Office/School and Computer Papers**: includes high grade paper from offices such as computer paper, sorted white ledger, copier paper and office stationary

4. **Corrugated Containers (OCC)**: includes boxes with unbleached and non-waxed paper with ruffled liners; also includes *used pizza boxes*

5. **Bottle Glass**: includes household glass containers, bottles and jars, including amber, flint, green and mixed

6. **Tin, Steel and Bi-Metal Containers**: includes food, beverage, nonfood and aerosol cans made of mixed metal, such as tin and steel

7. **Aluminum Cans**: consists of household beverage cans made of aluminum and other aluminum, non-food contaminated containers
8. **Plastics**: includes plastic bottles, containers and packages made from various resins including PETE, HDPE, LDPE, PP, PS and other plastics, **resin codes #1, #2, #3 through #7**

9. **Bulky Rigid Plastics**: defined as large polyethylene and polypropylene items (buckets, crates, toys, trays, furniture, bins, barrels, etc.)

10. **Polycoated Containers and Aseptic Packages**: paper milk and fruit juice container, gable and flat tops

11. **Pots and Pans**

If further information is needed, please advise.

DW
Holiday Parade Affects Downtown Traffic

GREENSBORO, NC (November 28, 2012) — Several roads in downtown Greensboro will be closed on December 1st to provide a safe and enjoyable route for The City’s Annual Holiday Parade.

Street closures begin at 7 am along the parade formation area which includes the northbound lanes of Murrow Boulevard from Lindsay Street to Fisher Avenue, and sections of Greene Street, Lindsay Street and Battleground Avenue. (See map.)

At approximately 11 am, Greensboro police officers will begin closing roads along the parade route. The parade processional starts on Greene Street at Lindsay Street and proceeds south on Greene Street. The route includes Market Street, Church Street and Lindsay Street, ending in front of the Children’s Museum. (See map.)

Parking is prohibited on portions of Greene Street, Market Street, and Church Street. Vehicles parked along the route will be towed.

All roads should be open no later than 3:30 pm.

---MORE---
The City works with the community to improve the quality of life for residents through inclusion, diversity, and trust. As the seventh largest employer in Greensboro, the City has a professional staff of 2,800 employees who maintain the values of honesty, integrity, stewardship, and respect. The City is governed by a council-manager form of government with a mayor and eight council members. For more information on the City, visit [www.greensboro-nc.gov](http://www.greensboro-nc.gov) or call 336-373-CITY (2489).
November 30, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager

FROM: Sue Schwartz, FAICP, Director

SUBJECT: Up coming Board and Commission Workshop

There have been a significant number of recent appointments to Boards and Commissions that hear decisions on quasi-judicial requests. Appointees do receive an orientation prior to their first meet however given number it was thought a more focused workshop would be helpful for not just new members but an excellent refresher for other board and commission members as well. The workshop is designed to ensure these Boards and Commissions have more clarity on the unique proceedings that are required by quasi-judicial bodies. These Boards include Board of Adjustment, Historic Preservation Commission, Minimum Housing Standards Commission and Zoning Commission.

The instructor is Rich Ducker, Professor of Public Law and Government from the School of Government at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The workshop will be held:

DATE: December 13th
TIME: 10 a.m. until 3:00 p.m.
(The workshop hours are designed to allow attendees to attend a morning or afternoon portion only, if they cannot attend the entire workshop).

LOCATION: Cultural Arts Building - 200 N. Davie Street, Board Room 112

Attached is the workshop announcement sent to all board and commission members. Please let me know if there are any questions.

SS
Attachment
QUASI-JUDICIAL TRAINING WORKSHOP

Rich Ducker
Professor from the School of Government
at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

December 13th
10:00AM – 3:00PM
200 N. Davie Street
Cultural Arts Building
Board Room 112
Greensboro, NC

Workshop Topics:
- Understanding your role and consequences
- Ex Parte Communications
- Conflict of Interest
- Relationship to other Boards
- Zoning investigation procedures and what can be considered evidence
- Reasonable Use for Property

Individual box lunches will be catered at 12:00

Staff Contacts:
Loray Averett 336-373-4764
Fred Boateng 336-433-7258
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Total Project</th>
<th>Address/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Street Gallery</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$11,670</td>
<td>320 S. Elm St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburger Square LLC</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>345 S. Elm St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Greene Exchg.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>330 S. Greene St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric H. Roberts</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$22,781</td>
<td>120-C West Lewis St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Broach</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$8,912</td>
<td>520 S. Elm St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphica</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$10,000+</td>
<td>306 E. Market St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teague Freyaldenhoven</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>317 S. Elm St. (estimated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindermusik</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$29,226</td>
<td>203 S. Church St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston Properties</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>327 Battleground Ave. (estimated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPL Properties</td>
<td>$5,950</td>
<td>$22,360</td>
<td>352 &amp; 354 S. Elm St., 109-115 McGee St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triad Stage</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$30,427</td>
<td>232 S. Elm St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamison Family Trust</td>
<td>$2,052</td>
<td>$8,211</td>
<td>316-318 S. Greene St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Theater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riva's Trattatoria</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$16,050</td>
<td>257 N. Greene St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Atlantic Properties</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>356 South Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Davis</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$13,106</td>
<td>343 South Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zen Sushi</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$11,828</td>
<td>214 South Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sweet Shop</td>
<td>$633</td>
<td>$2,530</td>
<td>631A South Elm Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutsell</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$14,637</td>
<td>500 South Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Street Holdings</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$12,575</td>
<td>312 N. Eugene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS International</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$20,170</td>
<td>117-119 S. Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greener Alternatives</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$45,875</td>
<td>526 S. Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt Partners</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$29,488</td>
<td>304 E. Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011 (and 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Land Co</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mack &amp; Mack</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momentum Development</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$37,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blvd Interior Marketplace</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$6,053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012-2013

Funding approved, but not awarded pending project completion
# Retail Grants Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Beauty</td>
<td>$13,420</td>
<td>$53,800</td>
<td>519 S. Elm St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 1 match - mixed use; no funds given to applicant until they open and expenses and jobs verified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit for Life</td>
<td>$3,685</td>
<td>$14,741</td>
<td>524 S. Elm St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 to 1 match - mixed use; paid $2,600; opened less than a week and closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House/Taylor</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>348 N. Elm St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 to 1 match (max amount)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 12-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$109,910</td>
<td>226 S. Elm St.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 to 1 match (max amount)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$67,105</td>
<td>$308,451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 27, 2012

TO: Ken Miller, Chief of Police
FROM: D. K. Crotts, Deputy Chief of Police

SUBJECT: Latino Community Outreach

In January 2012, while serving as the Patrol Bureau Commander, I had the opportunity to speak with Reverend David Fracaro, the Executive Director of FaithAction International House regarding the relationship between the Latino community and the Greensboro Police Department, specifically as it related to issues of trust between this community and the Department. We decided that we should meet and discuss the topic in more depth and determine what steps could be taken to improve this relationship and address perception issues. We developed a plan to move forward that would include clergy leadership from the Latino community and representatives from each of the patrol divisions and our Criminal Investigations Division (CID).

Our first group meeting was held on March 29th and included several clergy members serving Latino congregations in Greensboro along with one representative from each Patrol division and CID, including two Spanish speaking officers. This first meeting was designed for introductions and to get a general idea about perceptions and issues as seen by the Latino community and by officers that affect the level of trust from this community. The meeting was very productive and some additional small group meetings were held. It was decided by the group that a series of community forums would be the best method to reach the larger Latino community to address specific issues that could help build trust between the Latino community in Greensboro and the Greensboro Police Department. It was also decided that for a feeling of safety for the members of the Latino community that the forums be hosted by one of the churches involved in the meetings.

Three forums were held on the following dates: June 24th at St. Mary’s Catholic Church; October 26th at Friendly Avenue Church of Christ; and November 18th at Christ Wesleyan Church. Reverend Fracaro served as the facilitator and translators were provided at each forum.

Some specific topics of discussion from the community became thematic through all of the forums. These include:

- the Greensboro Police Department’s role in immigration enforcement activities
- valid identification and their inability to obtain a drivers license
- how to learn about criminal activity taking place in their neighborhoods
- how residents can help make their communities safer
• how to communicate concerns to the Police Department
• what the Department is doing in regard to recruitment of Latino officers and/or having enough translators
• racial profiling
• the use of Driver/License Checkpoints
• what are good driving behaviors

After each forum, the smaller group met to discuss the information generated from the participants to determine any steps moving forward to address the concerns raised. One of those topics was the inability to obtain official government identification and how that impacted the Latino population’s ability to live and function in the City, specifically as it related to encounters with police officers. We decided as a group to explore what other cities have done regarding alternative forms of identification.

We are currently only in the beginning discussions of this issue and there are many significant concerns that will have to be addressed before making any recommendations to move forward. Some of those concerns include:
• what documentation would be required to obtain the identification card
• what agency (private entity – not the City or any City department) would produce the card
• what security measures would be in place to address counterfeit cards being produced
• what legal issues are being encountered by other communities already using this type of identification
• what requirements would have to be met by the agency personnel producing the identification cards and what, if any, action should occur if those requirements are not followed

It is important to note that these are not government issued identification cards and are not accepted on their face as valid identification. As discussed at the forums, what the identification cards can provide is additional information to the officer during an encounter and can be a factor in determining whether a citation could be issued in lieu of a custodial arrest due to no identification.

We believe that if all of the concerns about alternative forms of identification can be satisfactorily addressed, we can go a long way in continuing to build trust between our Latino community and the Greensboro Police Department.

DKC
November 29th, 2012

TO: Denise Turner Roth, City Manager

FROM: Jeff Kimel, Customer Service Manager

SUBJECT: Mail delay with our new bill print vendor

We recently changed bill print vendors through a competitive bid process (this should save us over $30,000 a year in print costs). Cash Cycle Solutions (CCS) is a North Carolina Company with mail distribution points in Charlotte and San Diego.

They began mailing our bills the week of November 6, 2012, and bills went out normally. During the week of November 12th, a programming change was performed by CCS that resulted in over 7000 bills not being mailed that week. Water Resources generated two bill files and approved samples for mailing. Indications to us from CCS were that the bills from the two files were mailed. However, Mary Jutle’s staff in the Contact Center alerted us that they were receiving a large volume of calls from customers stating they were not getting their bills in billing cycles 21-24. The red delinquent notices in cycles 21-24 went out, but not the green bills (normal bills with no past due amount owed).

Upon contacting CCS, they acknowledged their mistake in not mailing the green notices from those two bill files and they were very apologetic for their error (please see attachment). They were very helpful in working through the issue. To correct the problem, they regenerated those files with the green bills that were not mailed with an updated due date. The due date was extended and accounts with a bank draft will have the draft extended a few days. None of these customers were past due, so there is not a risk of penalty or cut off for nonpayment on these bills by the extended due date. The revised bills were created and mailed Tuesday, November 27th. The City of Greensboro will be credited $500.00 which basically covers the cost of printing the missed bills.

jsk
Attachment: CCS letter
November 28, 2012

Mr. Jeff Kimel
City of Greensboro
One Government Plaza
Greensboro, NC 27402

Dear Mr. Kimel,

I wanted to apologize for the error that occurred with the billing files received by CCS on November 13th and November 14th that resulted in over 7000 of the City of Greensboro’s bills being mailed late. CCS received the files without error. Samples were provided to the city and approved by the city without delay. During our backend processing there were bills that the application marked as not to be generated. These were for the regular bills (green) that had no past due amount owed. The rest of the bills for these files were printed and mailed and delivered to the USPS. The job totals in MailManager reflected what CCS actually mailed.

On Monday CCS received a call from you alerting us that there may be a problem. The Customer Service department had received a large number of calls indicating they had not received their bills. After receiving your call we conducted an in depth investigation and determined that indeed CCS had failed to mail bills from both the files received on November 13th and November 14th. The total of the bills not mailed on time was approximately 7000 bills. We immediately went about the process of generating those bills and getting them in the mail. We added a special message and extended the due date as directed on the affected bills. The cause of this error was a programming change that was made to better automate the application. The change that was put into place also caused this error. We have since corrected the application and have confirmed that the application is generating all of the bills.

As per our contract CCS will be imposing a $250 penalty per file ($500 total) which will be credited to the City of Greensboro on the November 2012 invoice. This error was the entire fault of CCS. The City of Greensboro did nothing to cause the issue. CCS has corrected the problem and we do not expect another occurrence.

CCS is committed to the City of Greensboro. We appreciate the business. If there is anything CCS can do to better assist you in this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Laura C. Roberts
Vice President, Client Services
CCS | Document Group East

3035-R Horseshoe Lane
Charlotte, NC 28208
Office: 205-216-3266
Mobile: 662-523-6138
Fax: 704-399-1122
forderis@totalccs.com
www.TotalCCS.com
Greensboro Child Response Initiative
Supporting Kids and Families Toward
Safety and Wellness

EVALUATION BRIEF, NOVEMBER 2012

What is the impact of G-CRI?

G-CRI Contacts

- G-CRI has served 3,056 children and families in Greensboro to date.
- Between August and October 2012, G-CRI served a total of 535 youth and families in Greensboro.
- Trends of monthly G-CRI contacts with children and families shows an increase in contacts in 2012 as compared to 2011.
- The Southern Division of GPD began referring youth and families in January 2012. Referrals have continued to increase.

![G-CRI Contacts by Month](chart)

Demographics of children and families served by G-CRI

- Since it's inception, the average age of a G-CRI client served was between 11- and 12-years old.
- Children and family members served by G-CRI have ranged in age from 0-83 years old. This included both formal and informal referrals.
- The majority of G-CRI contacts were female (48.7%)

Gender of G-CRI Contacts

- Male: 40.2%
- Female: 48.7%
- Unknown: 11.1%
Greensboro Child Response Initiative
Supporting Kids and Families Toward Safety and Wellness

Demographics of children and families served by G-CRI continued...

◊ The majority of G-CRI contacts (59.5%) were identified as African American/Black.
◊ The remaining G-CRI contacts were identified as Caucasian/White (11.5%), Hispanic (4.4%), Asian (1.5%), Other (0.5%), or race was not indicated (22.6%).

Race of G-CRI Contacts

G-CRI Referral Sources
Since its inception, G-CRI has received referrals from:
◊ Formal incident reports — 55.7% (258) (where formal police report made)
◊ Informal reports — 44.3% (205) (from officer without a formal report, community member, other agency, etc.)

Service & Resource Utilization
◊ 24.1% (737) of G-CRI referrals were involved with CPS
◊ 39.7% (1212) of G-CRI contacts were referred for therapeutic services
◊ 8.9% of contacts were referred for other community resources

Incident Types
The top five incident types of G-CRI referrals were:
1. Assault — Domestic Violence
2. Family Offenses (child abuse, neglect, and abandonment)
3. Sex Offenses
4. Aggravated Assault — Domestic Violence
5. Burglary

Funding provided by the North Carolina Governors Crime Commission and the Cone Health Foundation. The Cone Health Foundation has as its mission to invest in the development and support of activities, programs and organizations that measurably improve the health of people in the greater Greensboro area.
Services Available

- Trauma informed advocacy and support
- Safety planning
- Peer support
- Educational information about common reactions to trauma
- Connection with mental health and substance abuse assessment and treatment
- Connection to general community resources such as tutoring, mentoring, or housing
- Danger assessments
- Strengthening of police-community partnerships
- Healing Homes parent support group

Services provided within 24-48 hours.

We have served over 3,000 children and families from 2008 to 2012.

Our Team

Kelly Graves, PhD, HSP-P
Project Director and Clinical Supervisor

Mandy Curley, MA
Lead Advocate- Eastern Division

Lisa Taylor, LCSW-A
Advocate-Southern Division

Wendy Scott, LCSW
Parent Outreach Advocate

Anne Buford, MS, Ed.S., MPA
Advocate-Schools

Esther Mendez
Translator/Interpreter

Greensboro Child Response Initiative

Supporting Kids and Families Toward Safety and Wellness

Funding provided by the North Carolina Governors Crime Commission and the Cone Health Foundation. The Cone Health Foundation has as its mission to invest in the development and support of activities, programs and organizations that measurably improve the health of people in the greater Greensboro area.

Center for Behavioral Health and Wellness
336-285-2605
What is CRI?

The Greensboro Child Response Initiative (CRI) is a secondary prevention program that addresses the needs of children exposed to violence and trauma and their families.

CRI provides a coordinated community response to children (0-18 years of age) and their families who have experienced any type of trauma or violence.

Using a trauma informed framework focused on safety and empowerment, CRI advocates, police officers, and community providers work together to help and support your family after an experience of violence or trauma.

Greensboro Child Response Initiative

To Refer a Child or Family, Contact Our CRI Advocates:

Eastern Division Advocate  
Phone: 336-451-5146  
E-mail: g-cri-e@greensboro-nc.gov

Southern Division Advocate  
Phone: 336-430-6400  
E-mail: g-cri-s@greensboro-nc.gov

Anyone Can Refer a Child or Family in Need of Assistance After a Trauma

CRI Trauma Provider Network

Our Trauma Provider Network includes a vast range of mental health providers offering many different services, hours of operation, insurance types, and specialty areas. We also partner with over 30 community resource agencies to meet the diverse needs of children and families.

Our Network meets monthly and has signed a memorandum of agreement to jointly address the needs of children exposed to violence and their families.

If you would like to join the CRI network and our efforts to reduce child trauma, please contact us!
Public Affairs
Contact Center Weekly Report
Week of 11/12/12 – 11/18/12

Contact Center
4196 calls answered this week

Top 5 calls by area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Resources</th>
<th>Field Operations</th>
<th>All others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVR/Pay by Phone – 227</td>
<td>Holiday Schedule – 75</td>
<td>Privilege License – 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Info – 137</td>
<td>Bulk Guidelines – 66</td>
<td>Inspections – 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Sign up – 118</td>
<td>HHW/Landfill/Transfer – 66</td>
<td>Courts – 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutoff Requests – 96</td>
<td>Dead Animal Pick up – 50</td>
<td>Parking Enforcement – 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

We received a total of 11 comments this week:

Field Operations – 9 comments:

- Customer wanted to thank Field Operations employee for locating his phone and returning it. Very courteous.

- I bag all my leaves every year and have done so for the last 16 years, but the majority of the people leave their leaves in the street. I would like to see the city pick up these leaves a lot more often. I realize the city requires that the leaves be kept on the parkway, but this kills the grass and I know no one who does this. No one wants their grass dead because the city takes forever to come pick these up! By having all these leaves in the street they are creating a problem for vehicles to get through various neighborhoods. I will always bag my leaves, but when neighbors just leave all their leaves in a huge pile in the street, they simply blow over into my yard. It pisses me off, because I’m the one person who is doing things the right way!! If you are not going to make more frequent leaf pickups, then don’t complain when these leaves wind up in your storm sewer!!

- One cure for your leaf collection problem would be to require everyone to bag their leaves in clear plastic bags. My neighbors would kill me for saying this, but I’m almost 65 and I’ve always bagged my leaves and I will continue to bag them. I’m not guilty of putting any leaves in the sewer system, but I love this city!!! The City of Greensboro does a nice job of making the city look great!!!

- Concern about leaves on the street, wishes we would enforce this so people were fined and ticketed.

- Customer called to compliment the beautiful job the loose leaf crew did picking up her leaves. She appreciates their good work and how clean the street front looks.

- Customer called back to thank us for coming back to get her brown can. She is very grateful and wanted the supervisor to know.

- Veteran’s Day not on holiday schedule. Explained that this was approved by City Council after the Solid Waste cards were mailed earlier in the year.
• Customer is very upset about the trash pickup this week. He was going by the schedule we sent out which did not have the Veteran's Day on it. He said we should have sent out a corrected schedule. Also, he had to delay his plans because his trash was a day late.

• Caller suggests we work with the media to better publicize city service changes. For Veteran's Day, he did not see the information in the newspaper and asks if any announcements could be in a specific place in the newspaper. Customer also asks if the local television news could include Solid Waste schedule changes.

Transportation – 1 comment:

• Read about truck getting stuck under bridge. Thinks GDOT should install warning lights to tell trucks they are too tall for the bridge. She is concerned that a car behind the truck would not see the issue and not expect the sudden stop, run up under it, and get killed or hurt. This has happened too many times and she is sure there is technology to warn the driver to prevent this.

Water Resources – 1 comment:

• Customer did not get October statement. Offended by past due wording on next bill, very harsh.

Overall
Calls about the change in the Solid Waste Collection schedule due to Veteran’s Day impacted our call volume last week. Calls about loose leaf collection also increased.
Public Affairs  
Contact Center Weekly Report  
Week of 11/19/12 – 11/25/12

Contact Center  
4073 calls answered this week

Top 5 calls by area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Resources</th>
<th>Field Operations</th>
<th>All others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iVR/Pay by Phone – 152</td>
<td>HHW/Landfill/Transfer – 117</td>
<td>Courts/Sheriff – 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Sign up – 85</td>
<td>Holiday Schedule – 117</td>
<td>Guilford Metro – 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutoff Requests – 69</td>
<td>E-Waste Collection – 63</td>
<td>Privelege License – 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Info – 64</td>
<td>Bulk Guidelines – 53</td>
<td>Inspections – 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

We received a total of 3 comments this week:

Field Operations - 3 comments:

- Customer feels we need to have more flexibility in the loose-leaf pickup schedule. We need to pick up leaves more quickly and plan dates tentatively so when leaves come down early we can be more efficient.

- If weather patterns change, the pattern for collection of leaves should change. Leaves are going into storm drains and coming into home.

- Feedback on website: Providing pickup dates in the past is not nearly as valuable as providing estimated future pickup dates.

Overall

Calls about loose-leaf collection continued to increase last week. Customers also had questions about the Solid Waste collection schedule for the Thanksgiving holiday. Call volume remained steady for the week.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Councilmember</th>
<th>Department / Person Contacted</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Council Notification Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 20, 2012</td>
<td>Mayor Perkins, Councilmember Methany, Councilmember Vaughan</td>
<td>City Manager Roth</td>
<td>Performing Arts Funding</td>
<td>November 30, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Small Group Mtg is 2 or more Councilmembers w/ City Staff*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>REQUEST/LOCATION</th>
<th><strong>PROPOSED USE</strong></th>
<th>ACTION/VOTE</th>
<th>STAFF RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>SPEAKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z-12-11-001</td>
<td>C-M to CD-LI 3224 North O'Henry Boulevard</td>
<td>All uses allowed in the LI (Light Industrial) zoning district except, animal shelters, shooting ranges, outdoor advertising services, truck stops, microbrewery, heavy truck tractor &amp; semi rental, leasing &amp; service, trucking and freight terminals and cemeteries.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Final unless appealed</td>
<td>1 for; 0 opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne Troder for Paul and Jean Cockman</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 to 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-12-11-002</td>
<td>County HI to City HI 100 Ward Road and 100 R1 Ward Road</td>
<td>All uses allowed in the HI (Heavy Industrial) zoning district</td>
<td>Favorable Recommendation</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>December 4, 2012 City Council Meeting</td>
<td>1 for; 0 opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Terrell for Tom Bigham Holdings LLC, et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 to 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Please see staff report for full list of conditions and uses

If you have any questions about these results, please contact Frederick Boatseng or Mike Kirkman at 336-373-2144
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grants Projects / Description of Purpose</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Department Requesting Funding</th>
<th>Council Notification Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep America Beautiful Inc.</td>
<td>To increase awareness and promote a greater involvement in recycling at six area high schools. The program will clearly outline how the recyclables will be collected and properly packaged for collection.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Field Operations</td>
<td>30-Nov-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This list does not represent grants that require Council's approval.