

**FAYETTEVILLE CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
JANUARY 28, 2013
7:00 P.M.**

Present: Mayor Anthony G. Chavonne
Council Members Keith Bates, Sr. (District 1); Kady-Ann Davy (District 2); Robert A. Massey, Jr. (District 3); Darrell J. Haire (District 4); Bobby Hurst (District 5); William J. L. Crisp (District 6); Valencia A. Applewhite (District 7); Wade Fowler (District 8) (via telephone); James W. Arp, Jr. (District 9)

Others Present:

Ted Voorhees, City Manager
Kristoff Bauer, Assistant City Manager
Karen McDonald, City Attorney
Brian Meyer, Assistant City Attorney
Dana Clemons, Assistant City Attorney
Lisa Smith, Chief Financial Officer
Rusty Thompson, Engineering and Infrastructure Director
Randy Hume, Transit Director
Victor Sharpe, Community Development Director
Karen Hilton, Planning and Zoning Division Manager
Craig Harmon, Planner II
Patricia Bradley, Police Attorney
Rebecca Rogers-Carter, Management Services Manager
Steven Blanchard, PWC CEO/General Manager
Pamela Megill, City Clerk
Members of the Press

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Chavonne called the meeting to order.

2.0 INVOCATION

The invocation was offered by Council Member Fowler.

3.0 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was led by the Mayor and City Council.

4.0 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tem Arp moved to approve the agenda.

SECOND: Council Member Fowler

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

5.0 CONSENT

MOTION: Council Member Haire moved to approve the consent agenda with the exception of Items 5.2 and 5.3.

SECOND: Council Member Fowler

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

5.1 Addition of certain streets to the City of Fayetteville system of streets.

Council officially accepted the dedication of streets for maintenance and addition to the City of Fayetteville system of streets. The list included 18 residential paved streets adding up to a total of 2.15 miles.

5.2 Pulled for discussion by Council Member Haire.

5.3 Pulled for discussion by Council Member Haire.

5.4 Capital Project Ordinance Amendment 2013-24 (Fire Station #19 located on Walsh Parkway).

The amendment reduced the amount of budgeted loan proceeds by \$15,057.00, appropriated a \$1,042.00 transfer from the General Fund to cover ancillary project costs that were not eligible for reimbursement from the loan proceeds, and appropriated \$1,100.00 in estimated investment

and miscellaneous income for the project. The adjustments decreased the total project budget by \$12,915.00, resulting in a final budget of \$2,679,085.00.

5.5 Capital Project Ordinance Amendments 2013-25 and 2013-26 (FY 2012 and FY 2013 street resurfacing projects).

The amendments moved the funds remaining in the completed FY 2012 street resurfacing project to the FY 2013 street resurfacing project budget.

5.6 Community Development - Revisions to the HOME Investment Partnership Recapture-Resale Provisions.

5.7 Approve meeting minutes:

November 5, 2012 – Work Session

November 13, 2012 - Discussion of Agenda Items

5.8 Special Revenue Fund Project Ordinance Closeout 2013-7 and Capital Project Fund Ordinance Closeouts and Partial Closeouts 2013-9 through 2013-17.

Annually the City closes out several projects that are completed in previous fiscal years and no longer active. Various projects including public improvements, property acquisition, and economic development activities were completed in a previous fiscal year and the revenues and expenditures related to the projects were audited.

5.9 Tax refunds greater than \$100.00.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Basis</u>	<u>City Refund</u>
GKB Developers, Inc., Kidd, Harold J.	2011	Corrected Assessment	\$3,302.59
McCoy, Wiggins, Cleveland & O'Connor PLLC	2010	Corrected Assessment	<u>3,302.59</u>
Total			<u>\$6,605.18</u>

5.2 Community Development - Authorization of the City Manager to execute documents pertaining to the acquisition of property in Catalyst Site 1 of the Murchison Road Redevelopment Plan Area.

This item was pulled for discussion by Council Member Haire. Mr. Haire requested the Community Development Director provide an overview of the item.

Mr. Victor Sharpe, Community Development Director, explained the purpose of the request was to allow the City Manager or his designee the authority to negotiate and acquire properties in the Murchison Road Corridor Redevelopment Plan Area. He stated on September 20, 2012, staff briefed City Council and Fayetteville State University Board of Trustees on the status of the Murchison Road Corridor Redevelopment Plan and Catalyst Site 1 was recommended by staff as the area to concentrate its efforts in property acquisition and demolition. He further stated the City would continue to pursue the acquisition of available property in the area and Council would receive a quarterly update on the status of the property acquired.

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO NEGOTIATE AND ACQUIRE REAL PROPERTY IN THE MURCHISON ROAD REDEVELOPMENT CORRIDOR AREA.

RESOLUTION NO. R2013-008.

MOTION: Council Member Haire moved to adopt the resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute documents pertaining to the acquisition of property in Catalyst Site 1 of the Murchison Road Redevelopment Plan area.

SECOND: Council Member Massey

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

5.3 Community Development - Approve acquisition of two houses in Catalyst Site 1 of the Murchison Road Corridor Redevelopment Plan.

This item was pulled for discussion by Council Member Haire.

MOTION: Council Member Haire moved to authorize the City Manager to execute all documents necessary to acquire the property located at 532 and 536 Durham Street in the amount of \$48,290.00.

SECOND: Council Member Davy

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

6.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS

6.1 Case No. P12-55F. Request for Special Use Permit to construct a Child Daycare Facility in an SF-10 district on property located on the northwest side of Lakewood Drive across from Meadowmont Lane. Containing a portion of a 48.6 acre tract and being the property of Hairr Family LLC.

Mr. Craig Harmon, Planner II, presented this item. Mr. Harmon showed vicinity maps and gave overviews of the current land uses, current zonings, surrounding land uses and zonings, and 2010 Land Use Plan. He stated the case had been tabled at the Council's December 10, 2012, meeting as concern was raised that the site plan had not indicated whether a fence would be installed around the detention pond. He further stated the concern was that no fence could be a hazard to children attending the daycare. He explained that since this was a Special Use Permit, the Council could condition that the project have a fence around the pond, which could affect other standards. He further explained the project would be required to meet state child care design standards which would address issues like fencing of outdoor play areas, design of drop-off areas, and other safety concerns. He provided information on the site plan not being a requirement for a Special Use Permit and the options available to treat the storm water runoff on the property. In summary, he stated staff was confident that child safety would be covered by both City and State site design requirements and if Council felt uncomfortable with the particular situation, the following language could be considered: In the event that a detention pond was used by the project developer to meet stormwater management requirements, it shall be fully surrounded by a four-foot tall fence placed in a location to allow pond maintenance, and any gates on said fence shall be secured at all times during which the pond was not being actively maintained or monitored. He advised the Zoning Commission and staff recommended approval based on (1) the property being a proper size and in a proper location for a day care center, (2) Lakewood Drive being a minor thoroughfare, (3) the property being located across the street from a new commercial center, and (4) meeting the City's use specific requirement for a child care center. He further advised that the Zoning Commission and staff recommended approval as presented by staff and based on the request being able to meet the following findings:

- 1.The special use will comply with all applicable standards in Section 30-4.C, Use-Specific Standards;
- 2.The special use is compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zoning district(s) of surrounding lands;
- 3.The special use avoids significant adverse impact on surrounding lands regarding service delivery, parking, loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration;
- 4.The special use is configured to minimize adverse effects, including visual impacts of the proposed use on adjacent lands;
- 5.The special use avoids significant deterioration of water and air resources, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and other natural resources;
- 6.The special use maintains safe ingress and egress onto the site and safe road conditions around the site;
- 7.The special use allows for the protection of property values and the ability of neighboring lands to develop the uses permitted in the zoning district; and
- 8.The special use complies with all other relevant City, State, and Federal laws and regulations.

This is the advertised public hearing set for this date and time. The public hearing was opened. Mr. Brian Ketchem, Engineer for the project, 4072 Barrett Drive, Raleigh, NC 27609, appeared in favor and requested Council approve the request for the Special Use Permit.

There being no one further to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Council Member Applewhite stated she conducted research of other cities around the nation and found many municipalities were not allowing retention ponds that were in close proximity to children, such as schools and day care centers.

Council Member Fowler expressed concern that Council was providing an additional burden and expense to the builder with requiring installation of a fence.

Mayor Pro Tem Arp stated Veterans Park had the Cross Creek running adjacent to it, and if they applied the same standard would they need to install a six-foot privacy fence along the river bank and also along the Cape Fear River Trail.

Council Member Crisp expressed concerns for the safety of children.

MOTION: Council Member Crisp moved to approve the request for a Special Use Permit for a Child Care Center, as presented by staff, based on the eight findings and the Use Standards listed under “issues”, and to require the retention pond have a six-foot locked privacy fence surrounding it; provided that requirement was not inconsistent with any State or County regulations.

SECOND: Council Member Bates

VOTE: FAILED by a vote of 4 in favor to 6 in opposition (Council Members Chavonne, Arp, Hurst, Fowler, Haire, and Applewhite)

MOTION: Council Member Fowler moved to approve the request for a Special Use Permit for a Child Care Center, as presented by staff, based on the eight findings and the Use Standards.

SECOND: Council Member Massey

VOTE: PASSED by a vote of 7 in favor to 3 in opposition (Council Members Crisp, Applewhite, and Haire)

6.2 Case No. P12-57F. Request for a Special Use Permit to construct monitored electrified fencing on property zoned CC - Community Commercial and located at 432 Rankin Street. Containing 1.26 acres more or less and being the property of ASC Equipment Co.

Mr. Craig Harmon, Planner II, presented this item. Mr. Harmon showed vicinity maps and gave overviews of the current land uses, current zonings, surrounding land uses and zonings, and 2010 Land Use Plan. He provided background on the development code amendment to allow electrified fencing. He explained the property was an existing building and business with a standard six-foot chain link fence already in place. He further explained the application was not meeting the new standards for monitored electrified fencing. He stated the applicant asserted that this type of security fencing was needed at the location to protect the large equipment that was stored outside. He noted there had been 65 calls for police service within a 500 foot radius in 2012--29 calls were on Rankin Street and 2 from the address of the applicant. He advised the Zoning Commission and staff recommended approval based on (1) the property being surrounded by heavy commercial zoning and the uses bordering on light industrial, (2) the criminal activity in the area and monitored electric fencing being appropriate to protect the property, and (3) the design of the fencing following the regulations established in the City's design code. He further advised that the Zoning Commission and staff recommended approval as presented by staff and based on the request being able to meet the following findings:

- 1.The special use will comply with all applicable standards in Section 30-4.C, Use-Specific Standards (specifically, Sec. 30-4.C.5.b.2 (Heavy Equipment Sales, Rental or Storage);
- 2.The special use is compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zoning district(s) of surrounding lands;
- 3.The special use avoids significant adverse impact on surrounding lands regarding service delivery, parking, loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration;
- 4.The special use is configured to minimize adverse effects, including visual impacts of the proposed use on adjacent lands;
- 5.The special use avoids significant deterioration of water and air resources, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and other natural resources;
- 6.The special use maintains safe ingress and egress onto the site and safe road conditions around the site;
- 7.The special use allows for the protection of property values and the ability of neighboring lands to develop the uses permitted in the zoning district; and

8. The special use complies with all other relevant City, State, and Federal laws and regulations. This is the advertised public hearing set for this date and time. The public hearing was opened. Ms. Cindy Gsell, 201 Wintermist Drive, Cary, NC 27513, representing the applicant, appeared in favor and requested Council approve the request for the Special Use Permit.

There being no one further to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Council Member Applewhite inquired as to the size of the warning signs and at what length of intervals they would be placed. Mr. Harmon responded the signs would be placed at least every 60 feet and would be bright yellow in color. He further responded the warning message was in both English and Spanish and the size of the sign was approximately 8.5 inches by 11 inches. Council Member Davy requested an example of other fences that had been installed. Ms. Gsell responded the company had installed approximately 3,500 fences across the country and they were the largest installer of electric fences and the system was patented 1991. She stated in North Carolina the company had fences in the cities of Durham, Greensboro, and Charlotte. Council Member Crisp inquired of Mr. Harmon if there were any electric fences already in the City. Mr. Harmon replied he was aware of one.

Mayor Pro Tem Arp inquired as to how this type of electric fencing compared to cattle type fencing. Ms. Gsell responded it was very similar.

Council Member Bates inquired if the only way someone would get a jolt would be if they had first scaled the perimeter fence and then made contact with the interior electric fencing and at that time they would be trespassing. Ms. Gsell replied that statement was correct.

MOTION: Council Member Davy moved to approve the request for a Special Use Permit as presented by staff, subject to the conditions described by staff and based on the findings of fact, and to include all barbed wire be removed as required by the ordinance.

SECOND: Mayor Pro Tem Arp

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

6.3 Case No. P12-59F. Request for a Special Use Permit for warehousing on property zoned Community Commercial and located at 430 Chicago Drive. Containing 0.98 acres more or less and being the property of Lacast Commercial LLC.

Mr. Craig Harmon, Planner II, presented this item. Mr. Harmon showed vicinity maps and gave overviews of the current land uses, current zonings, surrounding land uses and zonings, and 2010 Land Use Plan. He explained the request was for a Special Use Permit for the use of warehousing in the CC - Community Commercial district. He further explained that Chicago Drive was a heavy commercial, almost industrial area. He stated staff considered the property a proper location for low-intensity warehousing because the property was surrounded by heavy commercial and industrial zoning and uses. He further stated the building was approved prior to the adoption of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), and the owner was upgrading the proposed landscaping to more closely match that required by the UDO. He advised the Zoning Commission and staff recommended approval based on (1) the property being currently surrounded by heavy commercial and industrial zoning, (2) the City's Land Use Plan calling for heavy commercial on the property, and (3) the Land Use Plan calling for heavy commercial and industrial to surround the property. He further advised the Zoning Commission and staff recommended approval as presented by staff and based on the request being able to meet the following findings:

1. The special use will comply with all applicable standards in Section 30-4.C, Use-Specific Standards (specifically, Sec. 30-4.C.5.d.2);
2. The special use is compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zoning district(s) of surrounding lands;
3. The special use avoids significant adverse impact on surrounding lands regarding service delivery, parking, loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration;
4. The special use is configured to minimize adverse effects, including visual impacts of the proposed use on adjacent lands;
5. The special use avoids significant deterioration of water and air resources, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and other natural resources;

6. The special use maintains safe ingress and egress onto the site and safe road conditions around the site;
 7. The special use allows for the protection of property values and the ability of neighboring lands to develop the uses permitted in the zoning district; and
 8. The special use complies with all other relevant City, State, and Federal laws and Regulations.
- This is the advertised public hearing set for this date and time. The public hearing was opened. Mr. Greg Whitley, 130 Thorncliffe Drive, Fayetteville, NC 28303, representing the applicant, appeared in favor and requested Council approve the request for the Special Use Permit. There being no one further to speak, the public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Council Member Davy moved to approve the Special Use Permit for warehousing for distribution, as presented by staff, based on the eight findings.

SECOND: Mayor Pro Tem Arp

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

6.4 PWC - Phase 5 Annexation Areas 14 and 15 Public Hearing

Mr. Steven Blanchard, PWC CEO/General Manager, presented this item with the aid of a power point presentation. He provided background and stated the cost to property owners for a typical single-family residential lot would be \$5,000.00 and for all other non-residential properties a per front foot rate of \$55.56 with a 90-foot minimum plus the average lateral charge. He further stated no payment would be due until construction was complete and the assessment roll was adopted. He advised financial assistance would be available for those that qualify. He concluded by stating after the public hearing, the next step in the process would be to approve the resolution directing the project be undertaken which would be scheduled for February 11, 2013.

This is the advertised public hearing set for this date and time. The public hearing was opened. Ms. Nancy Tart, 6305 Melody Lane, Fayetteville, NC, appeared in opposition and stated there were a lot of citizens on disability and fixed incomes that would not be able to pay the assessment fees. Mayor Chavonne responded that staff would contact Ms. Tart to make sure she was aware of the City funding programs.

There being no one further to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Council Member Haire inquired how well the assistance programs were used for those citizens that were unable to pay assessment fees. Mr. Victor Sharpe, Community Development Director, responded the City had a program for citizens that were eligible and the City usually budgeted approximately \$60,000.00 per year. He further responded the information was provided to the residents with the packets that PWC sends out to residents affected.

Council Member Applewhite inquired of Mr. Sharpe as to what point in time were residents applying for funding assistance. Mr. Sharpe responded as soon as the tax roll was confirmed was when they received the majority of applications, especially for the \$900.00 hook-up fee. Mayor Chavonne thanked Mr. Blanchard for his presentation and stated no action was required for this item.

6.5 Public hearing regarding proposed Transit fare increases.

Mr. Randall Hume, Transit Director, presented this item with the aid of a power point presentation. He stated since FY 2008 significant improvements had been made to the FAST fixed route and paratransit system during which time ridership had increased by 80 percent while almost 27 percent more service hours had been added. He further stated at the November 5, 2012, City Council meeting, staff presented a Transit Fare Policy and reviewed a Fayetteville Advisory Committee on Transit (FACT) recommendation to increase passenger fare rates, along with other adjustments to passes and transfers, in order to ensure the City could continue to make transit service improvements. He explained the recommended rates were projected to generate an additional \$190,000.00 in annual passenger revenues in FY 2014 and \$214,000.00 in FY 2017 based on current service levels. He concluded by stating after considering all comments received, staff was planning to present its final recommendation for Council's approval on February 11, 2013.

Council Member Applewhite inquired if there was any discussion regarding eliminating the \$5.00 vehicle license fee. Mr. Hume responded there had been no recent discussions on that issue.

Council Member Fowler inquired if routes were being continuously evaluated to ensure there was sufficient ridership. Mr. Hume responded in the affirmative.

Council Member Haire inquired how well the attendance was at the public meetings. Mr. Hume responded there were only six to seven citizens at each of the meetings in addition to staff.

Council Member Crisp inquired how much revenue was generated from the \$5.00 vehicle fee. Mr. Hume responded approximately \$680,000.00 per year.

Council Member Massey inquired why there was a projected price increase in 2017. Mr. Hume responded it was an exercise for anticipating revenues for the future and the level of analysis required for FTA.

Mayor Pro Tem Arp stated it was remarkable that they had some rates that had not increased since 2003 and others since 2007. He inquired if Sunday service was being considered. Mr. Hume responded in the affirmative and stated it was part of the master development plan.

Council Member Davy inquired if there had been thought to hold any of the informational meetings at the Transfer Center to get direct feedback. Mr. Hume responded space was an issue at the current transfer station, but once the Multi-Modal Transportation Center was operational, it would provide an ideal venue to hold such meetings in the future.

Council Member Bates inquired how many new buses had been purchased and at what cost since 2007. Mr. Hume responded 12 new buses had been purchased with an additional 3 currently on order at a cost of \$400,000.00 to \$560,000.00 per vehicle.

Council Member Bates stated in addition, improvements had included the installation of numerous bus shelters and benches.

This is the advertised public hearing set for this date and time. The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Jose Cardona, 233 Addison Street, Fayetteville, NC, appeared in opposition and stated the City should provide transit services on Sundays and did not approve of the comparisons that had been made between Fayetteville and much larger cities like Raleigh and Charlotte.

There being no one further to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Mayor Chavonne stated no action was required for this item.

7.0 OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS

7.1

A. Fayetteville Cumberland County Chamber of Commerce Economic Development 2nd Quarter Report.

Mr. Russell Rodgerson, Executive Vice President of Alliance, presented this item with the aid of a power point presentation and provided a copy of the Economic Development Quarterly Dashboard Report for the second quarter of 2012-2013. He stated Alliance was currently working with six active projects totaling more than \$400 million in potential community investment and estimated to create 1,700 new jobs.

Council Member Crisp expressed his displeasure of misleading information on the report regarding employment positions. He stated the report was stating Sykes created 150 jobs, but it could be months before they actually started work. Mr. Rodgerson explained this was an "industry standard" way to report, and stated future reports from Alliance would state jobs announced.

Mayor Pro Tem Arp expressed concerns with the reporting of community weakness as "an inadequate supply of skilled labor" from the existing industry synchronization report, and suggested if the survey was not providing sufficient or accurate data, they may want to look at how they tailor their surveys.

Council Member Applewhite made reference to a recent local newspaper article regarding Fayetteville's dependence on the military and their lack of diversity in the workplace, and requested a response to the article. Mr. Rodgerson responded all communities should diversify and this was their goal and what they were concentrating on by way of far more aggressive marketing.

Council Member Fowler suggested that they try to grow their own community and build on local and small businesses thereby fostering the entrepreneurial spirit. Mr. Rodgerson responded Alliance was working on putting together an "Angel Fund" which would be a fund to assist small businesses with start-up funding.

B. FY 2013 Strategic Plan 2nd Quarter Report

Ms. Rebecca Rogers-Carter, Management Services Manager, presented this item with the aid of a power point presentation. She stated the City was committed to the advancing policy and management agendas articulated in the City's Strategic Plan as developed by the City Council during their strategic plan retreat. In addition, she stated City staff prepared a report that detailed the progress made each quarter. She further stated this year, in an effort to promote greater accountability for results and transparency, the quarterly report focused on meeting objectives of the City's goals. She advised staff would work to incorporate performance measurement and benchmarking indicators in the future as resources allowed. She briefly reviewed the following five main areas of the City's Strategic Plan:

- 1.A vision statement describing the type of community the Council would like to facilitate through policy direction and staff's work efforts.
- 2.A mission statement describing the City's organizational purpose, "making Fayetteville a better place for all".
- 3.A list of core values describing the City's standards of performance which was expressed with the acronym statement to "Serve with RESPECT".
- 4.Multi-year goals providing an intermediate focus for the work of City Council and staff, and further outlining the activities Council believed were necessary to realize the vision.
- 5.A one-year action plan identifying issues that Council wished to address by providing policy direction and the necessary actions that the City management should complete during the upcoming fiscal year.

Ms. Rogers-Carter provided a copy of the FY 2012-2013 Strategic Plan Second Quarter Report.

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tem Arp moved to accept the report.

SECOND: Council Member Hurst

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

7.2 Community Development - Hope VI Business Park Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Victor Sharpe, Community Development Director, presented this item with the aid of a power point presentation and stated the purpose of the item was to consider the Redevelopment Plan for the HOPE VI Business Park. He stated the City had worked with the Fayetteville Cumberland County Chamber of Commerce to complete a plan for developing a business park for the Hope VI Revitalization Project. He further stated the Chamber hired MKSK to complete the plan and MKSK presented an update on the status of the redevelopment plan at the City Council's October 1, 2012, and January 7, 2013, meetings. He explained the 12 main recommendations, the Conceptual Plan Details (Preferred Option), and an aerial rendering had been prepared for City Council's consideration.

A brief discussion period ensued.

MOTION: Council Member Davy moved to approve the Redevelopment Plan for the Hope VI Business Park.

SECOND: Council Member Bates

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (10-0)

8.0 ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

8.1 Monthly statement of taxes for December 2012.

2012 Taxes.....	\$12,931,722.65
2012 Vehicle.....	431,246.92
2012 Taxes Revit.....	42,539.70
2012 Vehicle Revit.....	323.26
2012 FVT.....	47,184.08
2012 Transit.....	47,184.09
2012 Storm Water.....	452,615.94

2012 Fay Storm Water.....	905,232.09
2012 Fay Recycle Fee.....	312,380.50
2012 Annex.....	0.00
2011 Taxes.....	10,610.39
2011 Vehicle.....	45,578.42
2011 Taxes Revit.....	80.94
2011 Vehicle Revit.....	4.28
2011 FVT.....	6,721.30
2011 Transit.....	6,721.25
2011 Storm Water.....	353.79
2011 Fay Storm Water.....	707.62
2011 Fay Recycle Fee.....	753.07
2011 Annex.....	0.00
2010 Taxes.....	2,447.96
2010 Vehicle.....	1,794.32
2010 Taxes Revit.....	18.66
2010 Vehicle Revit.....	0.00
2010 FVT.....	444.73
2010 Transit.....	444.75
2010 Storm Water.....	28.80
2010 Fay Storm Water.....	57.60
2010 Fay Recycle Fee.....	91.21
2010 Annex.....	0.00
2009 Taxes.....	276.77
2009 Vehicle.....	814.26
2009 Taxes Revit.....	0.00
2009 Vehicle Revit.....	0.00
2009 FVT.....	205.68
2009 Transit.....	205.71
2009 Storm Water.....	12.00
2009 Fay Storm Water.....	24.00
2009 Fay Recycle.....	38.00
2009 Annex.....	0.00
2008 and Prior Taxes.....	281.72
2008 and Prior Vehicle.....	1,646.65
2008 and Prior Taxes Revit.....	0.00
2008 and Prior Vehicle Revit.....	0.28
2008 and Prior FVT.....	310.33
2008 and Prior Transit.....	88.76
2008 and Prior Storm Water.....	27.60
2008 and Prior Fay Storm Water.....	24.00
2008 and Prior Fay Recycle Fee.....	42.00
2008 and Prior Annex.....	214.97
Interest.....	10,843.92
Revit Interest.....	9.85
Storm Water Interest.....	52.54
Fay Storm Water Interest.....	92.04
Annex Interest.....	214.28
Fay Recycle Interest.....	108.14
Fay Transit Interest.....	1,109.94
Total Tax and Interest.....	\$15,263,931.76

8.2 Tax refunds of less than \$100.00.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Basis</u>	<u>City Refund</u>
Fayetteville Miyabi, Inc.	2007-11	Corrected Assessment	<u>73.57</u>
			<u>\$73.57</u>

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.