



Agenda

Greenville City Council

January 14, 2016
6:00 PM
City Council Chambers
200 West Fifth Street

Assistive listening devices are available upon request for meetings held in the Council Chambers. If an interpreter is needed for deaf or hearing impaired citizens, please call 252-329-4422 (voice) or 252-329-4060 (TDD) no later than two business days prior to the meeting.

I. Call Meeting To Order

II. Invocation - Council Member P.J. Connelly

III. Pledge of Allegiance

IV. Roll Call

V. Approval of Agenda

- **Public Comment Period**

The Public Comment Period is a period reserved for comments by the public. Items that were or are scheduled to be the subject of public hearings conducted at the same meeting or another meeting during the same week shall not be discussed. A total of 30 minutes is allocated with each individual being allowed no more than 3 minutes. Individuals who registered with the City Clerk to speak will speak in the order registered until the allocated 30 minutes expires. If time remains after all persons who registered have spoken, individuals who did not register will have an opportunity to speak until the allocated 30 minutes expires.

VI. Special Recognitions

- Police Department Reaccreditation
- Ethelene Hardy Stover - Convention Services Manager of the Year Award

VII. Appointments

1. Appointments to Boards and Commissions

VIII. New Business

Public Hearings

2. Ordinance to amend the Zoning Ordinance by adding a Domestic Violence Center as a permitted land use within the MS (Medical Support) zoning district, subject to specific criteria
3. First public hearing for the 2016-17 Annual Action Plan for the CDBG and HOME Investment Partnership Funds

Other Items of Business

4. Resolution approving a lease agreement with the Coalition for Healthier Eating
5. Police Department Update
6. Financial Benchmark Comparison Report: North Carolina's 15 Largest Cities
7. Update on ADA Compliant Crosswalks
8. Update on Railroad Crossings
9. Presentation on the landscape enhancements on Memorial Drive in the vicinity of the Pitt-Greenville Airport

IX. Comments from Mayor and City Council

X. City Manager's Report

XI. Adjournment



City of Greenville, North Carolina

Meeting Date: 1/14/2016
Time: 6:00 PM

Title of Item: Appointments to Boards and Commissions

Explanation: **Abstract:** The City Council fills vacancies and makes reappointments to the City's boards and commissions. Appointments are scheduled to be made to nine of the boards and commissions.

Explanation: City Council appointments need to be made to the Community Appearance Commission, Firefighters' Relief Fund Committee, Greenville Bicycle & Pedestrian Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, Human Relations Council, Police Community Relations Committee, Public Transportation & Parking Commission, Recreation & Parks Commission, and Youth Council.

Fiscal Note: No direct fiscal impact.

Recommendation: Make appointments to the Community Appearance Commission, Firefighters' Relief Fund Committee, Greenville Bicycle & Pedestrian Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, Human Relations Council, Police Community Relations Committee, Public Transportation & Parking Commission, Recreation & Parks Commission, and Youth Council.

Viewing Attachments Requires Adobe Acrobat. [Click here](#) to download.

Attachments / click to download

[Muni_Report_2015_Appointments_to_Boards_and_Commissions_998631](#)

Appointments to Boards and Commissions

January 2016

Community Appearance Commission

Council Liaison: Council Member McLean Godley

Name	District #	Current Term	Reappointment Status	Expiration Date
Tyler Richardson	5	First term	Resigned	July 2017
Joanne Robertson	4	First term	Not seeking an additional term	April 2015
Fred Wright	4	First term	Resigned	April 2016

Firefighters' Relief Fund Committee

Council Liaison: N/A

Name	District #	Current Term	Reappointment Status	Expiration Date
Peter Geiger	4	Filling unexpired term	Eligible	January 2016

Greenville Bicycle Pedestrian Commission

Council Liaison: Council Member Calvin Mercer

Name	District #	Current Term	Reappointment Status	Expiration Date
Ashley Breedlove	2	First term	Did not meet attendance requirement.	January 2018
Corina Jury		Filling unexpired term	Eligible	January 2016
John Kenney	3	Second term	Ineligible	January 2016
Paul Linden	4	Filling unexpired term	Eligible	January 2016

Historic Preservation Commission

Council Liaison: Mayor Pro Tem Kandie Smith

Name	District #	Current Term	Reappointment Status	Expiration Date
Alice Arnold	3	Unexpired term	Eligible	January 2016
McLean Godley	3	Filling unexpired term	Resigned	January 2017
Roger Kammerer	3	Second term	Ineligible	January 2016
Ryan Webb	5	Second term	Ineligible	January 2016

Human Relations Council

Council Liaison: Council Member Rose Glover

Name	District #	Current Term	Reappointment Status	Expiration Date
Marvin Arrington	5	Second term	Ineligible	Sept. 2015
Rodney Coles	1	Second term	Ineligible	Sept. 2015
Inez Dudley	2	First term	Resigned	Sept. 2017
Robert Hudak	4	Second term	Ineligible	Sept. 2014
Maurice Whitehurst <i>(Pitt Community College)</i>	2	Second term	Did not meet attendance requirement	Oct. 2015

Police Community Relations Committee

Council Liaison: Council Member Rose Glover

Name	District #	Current Term	Reappointment Status	Expiration Date
Shawan Sutton <i>(Council Member Kandie Smith)</i>	1	First term	Eligible	October 2015

Public Transportation & Parking Commission

Council Liaison: Council Member Rick Smiley

Current	Reappointment	Expiration
----------------	----------------------	-------------------

Name	District #	Term	Status	Date
W. Scott Alford	4	Filling unexpired term	Resigned	January 2016
Jessica Faison	3	Filling unexpired term	Eligible	January 2016

Recreation & Parks Commission

Council Liaison: Council Member McLean Godley

Name	District #	Current Term	Reappointment Status	Expiration Date
Deb Jordan <i>(Council Member Rick Smiley)</i>	5	First term	Resigned	June 2018

Youth Council

Council Liaison: Mayor Pro-Tem Calvin Mercer

Name	District #	Current Term	Reappointment Status	Expiration Date
-------------	-------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------

11 Available Spots

Applicants for Community Appearance Commission

Orrin Allen Beasley
925 Spring Forest Road #7
Greenville, NC 27858

Application Date: 2/3/2014

District #: 1

Home Phone: (252) 216-6099
Business Phone: (252) 216-6099
Email: oab0119@gmail.com

Matthew Mellis
529 Spring Forest Road Apt. H
Greenville, NC

Application Date: 3/6/2014

District #: 1

Home Phone: (252) 702-3429
Business Phone: (252) 752-5938
Email: mellism@pitt.k12.nc.us

Applicants for Firefighters' Relief Fund Committee

Crystal M. Kuegel
1200 B. Glen Arthur Ave.
Greenville, NC 28540

Application Date: 2/23/2015

Home Phone: (252) 885-9245

Business Phone:

Email: crystal.kuegel@gmail.com

District #: 4

Applicants for Greenville Bicycle & Pedestrian Commission

Ann Eleanor
102 Lindenwood Drive
Greenville, NC 27834

Application Date: 11/23/2015

Home Phone: (252) 227-4240

Business Phone:

Email: aeleanor@suddenlink.net

District #: 5

Applicants for Historic Preservation Commission

Jamitress Bowden
111 Brownlea Drive Apt. O
Greenville, NC 27858

Application Date: 8/8/2014

District #: 3

Home Phone:
Business Phone:
Email: jamitressbowden@gmail.com

Jake Postma
108 S. Harding Street
Greenville, NC 27858

Application Date: 7/23/2015

District #: 3

Home Phone: (252) 439-2303
Business Phone:
Email: videoman9@yahoo.com

Tyrone O. Walston
2706 Webb Street
Greenville, NC 27834

Application Date: 6/6/2014

District #: 2

Home Phone: (252) 412-7351
Business Phone: (252) 355-8736
Email: walston.tyrone@gmail.com

Elizabeth Wooten
3504 Wallingford Road
Greenville, NC 27858

Application Date: 6/9/2015

District #: 5

Home Phone: (919) 999-2600
Business Phone: (252) 752-7101
Email: edarden@gmail.com

Monday, November 23, 2015

Applicants for Human Relations Council

Crystal M Kuegel
1200 B Glen Arthur Avenue
Greenville, NC 28540

District #: 4

Application Date: 2/23/2015

Home Phone: (252) 885-9245
Business Phone: (252) 885-9245
Email: crystal.kuegel@gmail.com

Joyce M. Mitchell
311 St. Andrews Drive
Greenville, NC 27834

District #: 2

Application Date: 11/17/2015

Home Phone: (252) 321-0920
Business Phone:
Email: jmitch2008@aol.com

Deborah J. Monroe
1308 Old Village Road
Greenville, NC 27834

District #: 1

Application Date: 1/15/2015

Home Phone: (252) 714-0969
Business Phone:
Email: debj.monroe@gmail.com

Bridget Moore
4128A Bridge Court
Winterville, NC 28590

District #: 5

Application Date: 8/28/2014

Home Phone: (252) 355-7377
Business Phone: (252) 355-0000
Email: bmoore2004@netzero.com

Travis Williams
3408 Evans Street Apt. E
Greenville, NC 27834

District #: 5

Application Date:

Home Phone: (252) 412-4584
Business Phone:
Email:

Applicants for Police Community Relations Committee

Gregory Barrett
308 Brighton Park Dr. Apt. 12
Greenville, NC 27834

Application Date: 12/16/2015

Home Phone: (252) 689-2688

Business Phone: (252) 258-1056

Email: gregorybarrett91@gmail.com

District #: 1

Applicants for Public Transportation and Parking Commission

Richard Malloy Barnes
206 South Elm Street, Apt. N
Greenville, NC 27858

Application Date: 12/10/2014

District #: 3

Home Phone: (252) 752-5278

Business Phone:

Email: kiltedmile@aol.com

Ann Eleanor
102 Lindenwood Drive
Greenville, NC 27834

Application Date: 11/23/2015

District #: 5

Home Phone: (252) 227-4240

Business Phone:

Email: aeleonor@suddenlink.net

Applicants for Recreation and Parks Commission

Marion Blackburn
802 River Hill Drive
Greenville, NC 27858

District #: 3

Application Date: 12/20/2015

Home Phone: (252) 931-0728

Business Phone:

Email: marion@marionblackburn.net

Ann Eleanor
102 Lindenwood Drive
Greenville, NC 27834

District #: 5

Application Date: 11/23/2015

Home Phone: (252) 227-4240

Business Phone:

Email: aeleonor@suddenlink.net

Henry Harvey
2043 A Quail Ridge Road
Greenville, NC 27858

District #: 4

Application Date: 5/12/2014

Home Phone: (252) 321-1080

Business Phone:

Email: hankandk@suddenlink.net

Bridget Moore
4128A Bridge Court
Winterville, NC 28590

District #: 5

Application Date: 8/28/2014

Home Phone: (252) 355-7377

Business Phone: (252) 355-0000

Email: bmoore2004@netzero.com

Elizabeth Wooten
3504 Wallingford Road
Greenville, NC 27858

District #: 5

Application Date: 6/9/2015

Home Phone: (919) 999-2600

Business Phone: (252) 752-7101

Email: edarden@gmail.com

Applicants for Youth Council

None.



City of Greenville, North Carolina

Meeting Date: 1/14/2016
Time: 6:00 PM

Title of Item: Ordinance to amend the Zoning Ordinance by adding a Domestic Violence Center as a permitted land use within the MS (Medical Support) zoning district, subject to specific criteria

Explanation: **Abstract:** The City of Greenville received an application from Mr. Jeff Sarvey, WPJS Properties, LLC, for a text amendment that proposes the addition of regulations to allow Domestic Violence Centers in the MS (Medical Support) zoning district as a permitted use, subject to specific criteria.

Explanation: Greenville's Zoning Ordinance does not list a Domestic Violence Center land use among its list of land uses and, as such, does not address where such a land use is allowed.

The attached staff report provides additional details regarding this text amendment. The applicant's full application submittal is attached to the staff report in Appendix B.

Fiscal Note: No cost to the City.

Recommendation: In staff's opinion, the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment is in compliance with Horizons: Greenville's Community Plan.

The Planning and Zoning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the request at its December 15, 2015 meeting.

If the City Council determines to approve the text amendment, a motion to adopt the attached text amendment ordinance will accomplish this. The ordinance includes the statutorily required statement describing whether the action taken is consistent with the comprehensive plan and explaining why Council considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest.

If the City Council determines to deny the text amendment, in order to comply with statutory requirements, it is recommended that the motion be as follows:

"Motion to deny the requested text amendment, to make a finding and determination that the requested text amendment is inconsistent with the comprehensive plan or other applicable plans, including but not limited to the following; Horizons: Greenville's Community Plan 2004, Housing Element Objective H2 to provide transitional housing."

Viewing Attachments Requires Adobe Acrobat. [Click here](#) to download.

Attachments / click to download

- [Staff Report](#)
 - [Domestic_Violence_Center_Ordinance__Text_Amendment_1016733](#)
-

ORDINANCE NO. 16-
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE
OF THE CITY OF GREENVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Greenville, North Carolina, in accordance with Article 19, Chapter 160A, of the General Statutes of North Carolina, caused a public notice to be given and published once a week for two successive weeks in The Daily Reflector setting forth that the City Council would, on January 14, 2016, at 6:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers of City Hall in the City of Greenville, NC, conduct a public hearing on the adoption of an ordinance amending the City Code; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the provisions of North Carolina General Statute 160A-383, the City Council of the City of Greenville does hereby find and determine that the adoption of the ordinance involving the text amendment is consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan and other officially adopted plans that are applicable and that the adoption of the ordinance involving the text amendment is reasonable and in the public interest due to its consistency with the comprehensive plan and other officially adopted plans that are applicable and, as a result, its furtherance of the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan and other officially adopted plans that are applicable;

WHEREAS, as a further description as to why the action taken is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other officially adopted plans that are applicable in compliance with the provisions of North Carolina General Statute 160A-383, the City Council of the City of Greenville does hereby find and determine that the adoption of this ordinance is consistent with provisions of the comprehensive plan including, but not limited to, Horizons: Greenville's Community Plan, 2004, Plan Elements, Housing, Objective H2 to provide transitional housing;

WHEREAS, as a further explanation as to why the action taken is reasonable and in the public interest in compliance with the provisions of North Carolina General Statute 160A-383, the City Council of the City of Greenville does hereby find and determine that the adoption of this ordinance will help promote the safety and the general welfare of citizens in the community in need of transitional housing.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GREENVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, DOES HEREBY ORDAIN:

Section 1: That Title 9, Chapter 4, Article B, Section 9-4-22 of the City Code is hereby amended by adding the following definition for "Domestic Violence Center":

Domestic Violence Center. A home for women and children seeking relief and refuge from family violence and abuse.

Section 2: That Title 9, Chapter 4, Article F, Section 9-4-78 (Appendix A), of the City Code is hereby amended by adding the following new land use:

(2)(m)1. "Domestic Violence Center (see also section 9-4-103(DD)); by allowing as a permitted land use, by right, in the Medical Support (MS) zoning district; and by assigning

a LUC 3 to the land use.

Section 3: That Title 9, Chapter 4, Article D, Section 9-4-103 (DD), of the City Code is hereby amended by adding the following new subsection

(DD). Domestic Violence Center (see also section 9-4-22).

(1) The minimum lot size shall be 15,000 square feet.

(2) Maximum occupancy shall be in accordance with the North Carolina State Building Code or not more than one person per each 500 square feet of lot area, whichever is less.

(3) On-site supervision shall be maintained during all hours of operation.

(4) Single-building development shall be in accordance with single-family standards.

(5) Multiple-building development shall be in accordance with multi-family development standards.

(6) Parking shall be required at a ratio of one space per every two supervisors and one space per each 500 square feet of habitable floor area.

Section 4. That any part or provision of this ordinance found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States or North Carolina is hereby deemed severable and shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of the ordinance.

Section 5. That this ordinance shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

Adopted this 14th day of January, 2016.

Allen M. Thomas, Mayor

ATTEST:

Carol L. Barwick, City Clerk

Staff Report to City Council Domestic Violence Center – Text Amendment

Applicant: Jeff Sarvey, General Manager, WPJS Properties, LLC

Contents

Background 1
Zone Where Domestic Violence Centers are Proposed Under This Text Amendment. 1
Proposed Text Amendment 3
Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan 5
Recommendation 5

Maps

Map 1: Medical Support Zoning District 6
Map 2: Zoning Districts 7

Exhibits

Exhibit A: Excerpt of the Table of Uses Showing Proposed Amendments 8
Exhibit B: Application Submittal Documents 9
Exhibit C: DRAFT, Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes, 12/15/2015.. 11



**City of Greenville
Community Development Department - Planning Division
December 16, 2015**

Background

Greenville's Zoning Ordinance does not list a Domestic Violence Center land use among its list of land uses and as such, does not address where such a land use is allowed. The City of Greenville received an application for a text amendment from Mr. Jeff Sarvey that proposes the addition of Domestic Violence Centers in the Medical Support (MS) zoning district as a permitted use, by right. (Exhibit B: Application Submittal Documents).

Zone Where Domestic Violence Centers are Proposed Under This Text Amendment

The text amendment proposes Domestic Violence Centers in the MS (Medical Support) zoning district as a permitted land use, by right, and proposes review criteria and operational requirements for such centers. Maps 1 and 2 illustrate locations of the MS zoning district throughout the City where Domestic Violence Centers would be allowed under the proposed text amendment.

The Medical Support zoning district is defined in the Zoning Ordinance, Sec. 9-4-56 as follows:

The MS Medical Support District is primarily designed to create areas in which hospitals, rehabilitation centers, medical offices and clinics may be compatibly mixed, in order that these related uses can be near each other for doctor and patient convenience. The district shall also allow a wider variety of medical support services. In addition, through its permitted uses, the district shall encourage a healthful environment in abutting residential areas, as well as within the health care delivery community.

Land uses currently allowed, by right, in the MS district are listed below:

- (1) *General*
 - a. *Accessory use or building*
 - b. *Internal service facilities*
 - c. *On-premises signs per Article N*
 - f. *Retail sales; incidental*

- (2) *Residential*
 - l. *Group Care Facility*
 - n. *Retirement Center or Home*
 - o. *Nursing, convalescent or maternity home, major care facility*

- (4) *Governmental*
 - b. *City of Greenville Municipal Government building or use*
 - c. *County or State building or use, not otherwise listed, excluding outside storage and minor or major repair*
 - d. *Federal government building or use*
- (5) *Agricultural/mining*
 - a. *Farming, agriculture, horticulture, forestry*
- (6) *Recreational/entertainment*
 - f. *Public park or recreational facility*
- (7) *Office, Financial, Medical*
 - e. *Medical, dental, ophthalmology or similar clinic, not otherwise listed*
- (8) *Services*
 - Y(3). *Television and/or radio broadcast facilities, including receiving and transmission equipment and towers or cellular telephone and wireless telecommunication towers not exceeding 80 feet in height*
 - ee. *Hospital*
 - ff. *Mental health, emotional or physical rehabilitation facility*
 - ff(1) *Mental health, emotional, or physical rehabilitation day program facility*
- (10) *Retail Trade*
 - d. *Pharmacy*
 - w. *Florist*
- (12) *Construction*
 - c. *Construction office; temporary including modular office*
- (13) *Transportation*
 - h. *Parking lot or structure; principal use*

Land uses currently allowed in the MS district, with approval of a special use permit, are listed below:

- (2) *Residential*
 - l. *Land use intensity dormitory (LUI) development rating 67 per Article K*
 - i. *Residential quarters for resident manager, supervisor or caretaker; excluding mobile home.*
- (4) *Governmental*
 - a. *Public utility building or use*
- (6) *Recreational/entertainment*
 - m(1). *Dining and entertainment establishment*
- (7) *Office, Financial, Medical*
 - a. *Office, professional and business, not otherwise listed*
 - d. *Bank, savings and loan or other savings or investment institutions*

- (8) *Services*
 - a. *Child day care facilities*
 - b. *Adult day care facilities*
 - j. *College and other institutions of higher learning*
 - l. *Convention center; private*
 - s. *Hotel, motel, bed and breakfast inn; limited stay lodging (see also residential quarters for resident manager, supervisor or caretaker and Sec. 9-4-103)*
 - gg. *Vocational rehabilitation center*
 - jj. *Health services not otherwise listed*

- (10) *Retail Trade*
 - h. *Restaurant*
 - j. *Restaurant and/or dining and entertainment establishment; regulated outdoor activities*
 - k. *Medical supply sales and rental of medically related products including uniforms and related accessories*

- (14) *Manufacturing/warehousing*
 - t. *Manufacture of nonhazardous medical supplies or medical products, including distribution*

Title 9, Chapter 4, Article U, Administration, Enforcement, Penalties, Appendix A: Table of Uses, (A)(15) Other Activities (not otherwise listed – all categories) provides limited flexibility for other activities, not otherwise listed, in the Table of Uses for certain zoning districts through approval of by rights. This catch-all flexibility tool is allowed in nine of the twenty seven zoning districts. However, the MS (Medical Support) zoning district is not one of the zoning districts where this allowance is available for a Domestic Violence Center.

Proposed Text Amendment

In order to amend the Zoning Ordinance to add a Domestic Violence Center land use and allow them to operate in the MS zoning district, text amendments must be adopted. This text amendment application requires a public hearing before City Council.

The application submittal documents are attached (Exhibit B). The application includes Mr. Sarvey's proposed language and an attachment that provides additional justification for his proposed text amendment. In the application attachment, Mr. Sarvey explains how the Domestic Violence Center has a strong dependence on medical facilities and medical staff.

Maps 1 and 2 illustrate all of the properties within the City that are zoned MS. If this amendment is adopted, it would only apply to properties zoned MS.

Proposed text amendments to add Domestic Violence Center are illustrated below using underlined text to denote regulations to be added in three areas of the Zoning Ordinance.

1. This text amendment application proposes to amend Title 9, Chapter 4, Article B, Section 9-4-22, by adding the following definition for “Domestic Violence Center”:

Domestic Violence Center. A home for women and children seeking relief and refuge from family violence and abuse.

2. This text amendment application proposes to amend Title 9, Chapter 4, Article F, Section 9-4-78 (Appendix A, Table of Uses), by adding the following new land use, by right, in the Medical Support (MS) zoning district and by assigning a LUC 3 to the land use. Exhibit A presents how the proposed land use would appear in the Table of Uses if this amendment is adopted through the addition of the following language:

(2)(m)1. “Domestic Violence Center (see also section 9-4-103(DD))”;

3. This text amendment application proposes to amend Title 9, Chapter 4, Article D, Section 9-4-103 (DD), by adding the following new subsection. This list of review criteria is the same list applicable to homeless and abuse shelters that already appears in the Zoning Ordinance. In conversations between city staff and the applicant, the applicant believes the location he has selected for a Domestic Violence Center and the operation of the facility will comply with this criteria so staff added this language to the application.

(DD). Domestic Violence Center (see also section 9-4-22).

(1) The minimum lot size shall be 15,000 square feet.

(2) Maximum occupancy shall be in accordance with the North Carolina State Building Code or not more than one person per each 500 square feet of lot area, whichever is less.

(3) On-site supervision shall be maintained during all hours of operation.

(4) Single-building development shall be in accordance with single-family standards.

(5) Multiple-building development shall be in accordance with multi-family development standards.

(6) Parking shall be required at a ratio of one space per every two supervisors and one space per each 500 square feet of habitable floor area.

Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan

Consideration of any modification to the city zoning ordinance should include a review of the community's comprehensive plan and other officially adopted plans that are applicable.

Greenville's comprehensive plan, Horizons: Greenville's Community Plan, 2004, and the 2009/2010 update contains adopted goals, policy statements and objectives that should be reviewed and considered to ensure that the proposed text amendments are in compliance with the Plan, and effectively with the community's values.

Staff reviewed the Plan and provides the following findings regarding consistency between the proposed text amendment and the Plan. In staff's opinion, the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment is in compliance with Horizons: Greenville's Community Plan.

Following is a relevant excerpt from Horizons: Greenville's Community Plan, 2004.


Plan Elements, Housing: *Objective H2: To provide transitional housing.*

Staff believes allowing Domestic Violence Centers to be permitted in the MS (Medical Support) zoning district will allow residents of the center and health care providers to be located in close proximity. As the provision of convenient health care access to domestic violence center residents is essential to treat and counsel patients, staff believes the Domestic Violence Center land use is compatible with other land uses allowed in the Medical Support District and meets the intent of the definition of the Medical Support Zoning District.


Recommendation

The Planning and Zoning Commission unanimously approved a motion to recommend approval of the proposed text amendment. An excerpt from the draft Planning and Zoning Commission's December 15, 2015 meeting minutes is attached (Exhibit C).

Map 1- Medical Support Zoning District



Map 2 - Zoning Districts



- Legend**
- Greenville ETJ
 - Tar River
 - PGV Airport
 - CD
 - CDF
 - CG
 - CH
 - CN
 - MCH
 - MCG
 - I
 - IU
 - PIU
 - MI
 - MO
 - MS
 - O
 - OR
 - R6
 - R6A
 - R6A-CA
 - R6A-RU
 - R6MH
 - R6N
 - R6S
 - R9
 - R9S
 - R9S-CA
 - R15S
 - PUD
 - MR
 - MRS
 - RA20

Item # 2 1 2 4 Miles

EXHIBIT A: EXCERPT OF THE TABLE OF USES SHOWING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Excerpt of Title 9, Chapter 4, Article D, Section 9-4-78 (Appendix A: Table of Uses) 2, Residential - Showing proposed text amendments to add Domestic Violence Center as an allowed use within the MS (Medical Support) Zoning District as a permitted use.

(2) Residential.

USE	LUC #	RA 20	R 15 S	R 9 S	R 6 S	R 6 N	R 9	R 6	R 6 A	R 6 M H	M I	M S	M O	M C G	M R	M C H	M R S	O R	O	C D	C D F	C G	C N	C H	I U	I	P I U	P I
a. Single-family dwelling	1	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P					P		P				P							
b. Two-family attached dwelling (duplex)	1	S				P	P	P	P	P					P			P			P							
b(1). Master Plan Community per Article J		P			P		P	P	P																			
c. Multi-family development per Article I	2					P		P	P	P					P			P		P	P							
d. Land use intensity multi-family (LUI) development rating 50 per Article K	2							S	S						S			S			S							
e. Land use intensity dormitory (LUI) development rating 67 per Article K	2							S	S			S						S			S							
e(1). Dormitory development	2																			S								
f. Residential cluster development per Article M	1	P		P	P		P	P	P						P		P											
g. Mobile home (see also § 9-4-103)	1	S								P																		
h. Mobile home park	2									P																		
i. Residential quarters for resident manager, supervisor or caretaker; excluding mobile home	*										S	S	S	S		S		S	S	P	S	S		S	S	S	S	S
j. Residential quarters for resident manager, supervisor or caretaker; including mobile homes	*																							S	S	S	S	S
k. Family care home (see also § 9-4-103)	1	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P					P		P	P			P							
l. Group care facility	3							S	S		P	P	P		S													
m. Shelter for homeless or abused (see also § 9-4-103)	3																	S			S							
m(1). Domestic violence center (see also § 9-4-103)	3											P																
n. Retirement center or home	3	S						S	S		P	P	P		S			P		P	S							

EXHIBIT B: Application Submittal Documents



Date Received 11/12/2015

CITY OF GREENVILLE
ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT APPLICATION

Applicant Name(s) WPJS Properties, LLC Jeff Sarvey-General Manager

Mailing Address PO Box 88 Winterville, NC 28590

Contact Phone Number (252-714-1959) _____

Contact Fax Number (252-355-2002) _____

Zoning Ordinance Section Proposed to be Amended: For a "Domestic violence Center" and we ask that the use be allowed "by right" under the MS Zoning ordinance.

Reason for Request: This area is an ideal location for the Family Violence Support Network Community Home . As a behavioral health organization_ we want to be close to the hospital.

Proposed Language of Text Amendment (attach additional pages if needed): see attached

Text Amendment Language

Text Amendment for "Domestic Violence Center"

Sec. MS Zoning

Group Care Facility

Words and Terms defined as a home for women and children seeking relief and refuge from family violence and abuse. Specifically this location of 1707 W. Sixth Street will be the domicile for the Center for Family Violence Prevention. The building will be residence for those needing relief and support for several days or several weeks until a safe location can be provided. This property will be fenced containing the side and rear yards and security measures will be in place. Hours of operation will be 24/7 with domestic type provisions. We are a behavioral health program serving Pitt, Martin and Washington counties. Nearly 20% of our residents come to us directly from the hospital on their own or with an officer. As per Sec. 9-4-56 we are a rehabilitation center for women and their children. We are requesting a group care facility use as a shelter for the abused to get mental health counseling, health care and information about prevention for themselves and children, over 80% of our clients have mental health issues. We provide workshops on health issues, and mental health training. This site will allow us to provide this in a private appropriate manner. We are a nonprofit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy by abused women and children. We are certified by the N.C. Council for Women Domestic Violence Commission and are funded by them. Individuals contribute to our mission as well as grants from the Kate B. Reynolds Foundation and Vidant Health. We hope this location will allow us to have a Registered Nurse there at regular scheduled times.

EXHIBIT C: DRAFT, Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes (12-15-15)

ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING ORDINANCE BY ADDING A DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CENTER AS A PERMITTED LAND USE WITHIN THE MS (MEDICAL SUPPORT) ZONING DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO SPECIFIC CRITERIA.- APPROVED

Mr. Thomas Weitnauer, Chief Planner, delineated the property. Mr. Weitnauer stated that the applicant is Jeff Sarvey with WPJS Properties, LLC. Mr. Connally Branch was present to represent the application.

Mr. Weitnauer read the existing definition of the Medical Support District. The MS Medical Support District is primarily designed to create areas in which hospitals, rehabilitation centers, medical offices and clinics may be compatibly mixed, in order that these related uses can be near each other for doctor and patient convenience. The district shall also allow a wider variety of medical support services. In addition, through its permitted uses, the district shall encourage a healthful environment in abutting residential areas, as well as within the health care delivery community.

Mr. Weitnauer stated the text amendment application proposes to amend Title 9, Chapter 4, Article B, Section 9-4-22, by adding the following definition for “Domestic Violence Center” as follows. A home for women and children seeking relief and refuge from family violence and abuse. The text amendment proposes to amend Title 9, Chapter 4, Article F, Section 9-4-78 (Appendix A, Table of Uses), by adding the following new land use, Domestic Violence Center, by right, in the Medical Support (MS) zoning district and by assigning a LUC 3 to the land use. The Following land use will be added to the Table of uses along with a cross reference to read, (2)(m)1. “Domestic Violence Center (see also section 9-4-103(DD)). Mr. Weitnauer presented maps to show locations of the Medical Support Zoning District in relation to other surrounding zoning districts.

The text amendment proposes to amend Title 9, Chapter 4, Article D, Section 9-4-103 (DD), by adding the list of review criteria that is applicable to homeless and abuse shelters to be applicable for domestic violence centers:

- (DD). Domestic Violence Center (see also section 9-4-22).
- (1) The minimum lot size shall be 15,000 square feet.
 - (2) Maximum occupancy shall be in accordance with the North Carolina State Building Code or not more than one person per each 500 square feet of lot area, whichever is less.
 - (3) On-site supervision shall be maintained during all hours of operation.
 - (4) Single-building development shall be in accordance with single-family standards.
 - (5) Multiple-building development shall be in accordance with multi-family development standards.
 - (6) Parking shall be required at a ratio of one space per every two supervisors and one space per each 500 square feet of habitable floor area.

Mr. Weitnauer stated the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment is in compliance with Horizons: Greenville's Community Plan 2004 Plan Elements, Housing Objective H2 - To provide transitional housing.

Chairman Parker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Connally Branch, representing the applicant, spoke in favor of the request. He distributed maps of the proposed location for the center. The applicant plans to lease the property to the Family Support Network Community Home. Parking is not an issue. The sides and rear of the property will be fenced. The lot is idea for the use and the hospital is nearby which 20% of the inhabitants come directly from the hospital.

Ms. Ann Bellis asked if there were any other occupants in the building.

Mr. Branch stated no and that the building was a vacant medical office.

Ms Bellis asked if the text amendment addresses security.

Mr. Branch stated that security will be on the premises at times; however, the building will be equipped with security cameras and alarms. The location is well lit with lights. Staff will be on the premises 24/7

Ms Bellis asked if the existing location had any safety issues.

Mr. Branch stated no.

No one spoke in opposition of the request.

Chairman Parker closed the public hearing.

Ms Bellis asked if the text amendment's goal was to "attract new businesses" as stated in the ordinance.

Attorney Dave Holec stated at the "attract new businesses" should be stricken from the ordinance.

Mr. Dustin Mills asked how the use was determined by right versus special use.

Mr. Weitnauer stated that the applicant asked specifically to be a permitted use. A special use permit would require notifications to property owners and they did not want to bring awareness to the location. The applicant wanted to intentionally be in the medical campus versus a residential neighborhood for security reasons.

Mr. Mills asked if most of the designated areas around the MS zoning district commercial in nature.

Mr. Weitnauer stated yes.

Mr. Mills asked if it would be fair to say that the city does not have a lot of MS zoning areas.

Mr. Weitnauer stated that that was correct.

Motion made by Mr. Schrade, seconded by Mr. Mills, to recommend approval of the proposed amendment, to advise that it is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other applicable plans, and to adopt the staff report which addresses plan consistency and other matters. Motion passed unanimously.



City of Greenville, North Carolina

Meeting Date: 1/14/2016
Time: 6:00 PM

Title of Item: First public hearing for the 2016-17 Annual Action Plan for the CDBG and HOME Investment Partnership Funds

Explanation: **Abstract:** As a requirement of receiving Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funds, the City of Greenville must prepare an Annual Action Plan every year and hold two public hearings. This agenda item is for the first required public hearing to provide input for potential activities for the 2016-17 plan year.

Explanation: As a requirement of receiving Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funds, the City of Greenville must prepare an Annual Action Plan every year and hold two public hearings. This agenda item is for the first required public hearing to provide input into activities for the 2016-17 plan year.

The City of Greenville is an entitlement community and receives an annual allocation of CDBG and HOME funds by formula allocation from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). At this time, the exact allocation of CDBG and HOME funds to the City of Greenville has not been released. In keeping with past practice, entitlement communities utilize the previous allocation as the basis for planning for activities until such time that a budget is established by HUD and the grant formula allocation is determined. Based upon 2015-2016 Annual Plan allocations, it is anticipated that the City of Greenville will receive approximately \$380,000 in HOME funds and \$840,000 in CDBG funds. As mentioned previously, the actual funding amount is unknown at this time and the actual grant amounts will be established once a budget is established by Congress and appropriations are made to HUD.

The City of Greenville is still working under the adopted 5-year Consolidated Plan which outlines activities and programs that the City will carry out under the 2013-2018 plan. The following activities are being considered for the 2016-17 Annual Action Plan:

*Planning and Administration

- *Owner-Occupied Substandard Housing Rehabilitation
- *First-time Homebuyer Down Payment Assistance
- *New Construction of Affordable Housing
- *Improvements to Public Facilities serving Special Needs Populations
- *Property Acquisition
- *Demolition and Clearance
- *CHDO Set-aside/New Construction

A possible budget with proposed activities might be in the following amounts:

Proposed 2016-17 CDBG and HOME Budget

Proposed Activities	HOME	CDBG
Administration	\$38,000	\$168,000
Housing Rehabilitation	\$200,000	\$500,000
CHDO/New Construction	\$57,000	0
Down Payment Assistance	\$30,000	
Acquisition	0	\$30,000
Public Facility	0	\$100,000
Multi-Family New Construction	\$55,000	
Demolition/Clearance		\$42,000
Total	\$380,000	\$840,000

During the development of the Annual Plan, a detailed and specific plan of activities will be developed. Staff will develop this plan with additional public input during the months of February-April 2016. The Affordable Housing Loan Committee will review the plan and make a recommendation to City Council. The plan will be submitted to City Council in June of 2016 for adoption. Programs and activities would begin in the 2016-17 fiscal year of the City.

Fiscal Note:

Anticipated resources to be available during the 2016-17 Annual Plan year are \$380,000 in HOME funds and \$840,000 in CDBG funds, for a total of \$1,220,000 for housing and community development activities.

Recommendation:

Hold the first public hearing and provide input.

Viewing Attachments Requires Adobe Acrobat. [Click here](#) to download.

Attachments / click to download



City of Greenville, North Carolina

Meeting Date: 1/14/2016
Time: 6:00 PM

Title of Item: Resolution approving a lease agreement with the Coalition for Healthier Eating

Explanation: **Abstract:** The Coalition for Healthier Eating has submitted a proposal for leasing a number of Floyd Flood lots that are owned by the City of Greenville resulting from the buyout of flooded properties. The organization plans to use the properties for community-based gardens.

Explanation: Through the Flood Land Reuse Plan, the City possesses 315 lots available for lease to the public. These lots are located in areas flooded during Hurricane Floyd. These areas experienced catastrophic damage resulting from the hurricane in 1999. Following the storm, the City was approved by the State and Federal Emergency Management Agency for assistance to lessen the effects of future flooding by removing man-made improvements from the flood zone.

The Flood Buyout Leasing Program allows for up to five-year, renewable leases for use in accordance with FEMA and City-mandated specifications. Currently, there are 234 lots available for lease, totaling 88% of all program acreage. The City is responsible for maintaining all unleased property in compliance with City Code.

The Coalition for Healthier Eating, an Eastern North Carolina non-profit, has expressed interest in leasing buyout property for a community agricultural project. Staff has discussed a proposal to lease property to this organization for three years, with option for one-year renewals, to create and manage community gardens and orchards. With the produce from the leased property, the organization plans to provide a portion to the community.

In total, the Coalition seeks to lease 118 flood lots, for a combined 32.12 acres, and will be responsible for regular maintenance of the lots.




Fiscal Note: Revenues of \$118.00 annually will be realized during the terms of the lease. In

addition, the City will recognize a reduction in lot maintenance cost of \$11,563.20 annually for the next 3 years.

Recommendation: Approve the resolution authorizing the leasing of Floyd Flood lots to the Coalition for Healthier Eating and authorize the City Manager to execute lease agreements.

Viewing Attachments Requires Adobe Acrobat. [Click here](#) to download.

Attachments / click to download

-  [CHE Flood Lot Lease Map](#)
 -  [Resolution Approving Lease with Coaliton for Healthier Eating 1016890](#)
 -  [CHE Lease 1016535](#)
-

RESOLUTION NO. -16
RESOLUTION APPROVING LEASE AGREEMENT WITH THE
COALITION FOR HEALTHIER EATING

WHEREAS, North Carolina General Statute 160A-272 authorizes the City Council of the City of Greenville to approve a lease of property for a term of less than ten (10) years for any property owned by the City for such terms and upon such conditions as City Council may determine; and

WHEREAS, City Council does hereby determine that the property herein described will not be needed by the City for the first year of the lease and, at this time, it appears that it will not be needed by the City for the potential five (5) year term of the lease.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Greenville that it does hereby approve the Lease Agreement with the Coalition for Healthier Eating for 118 lots located in the area east of North Greene Street, south of Pactolus Highway, and north of E. Moore Street, extended, said lots being lots acquired by the City pursuant to the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (flood buyout lots) and in the aggregate consisting of 32.12 acres, with the lease being for the purpose of having community-based gardens, for a three-year period with an option to renew for two additional one-year periods, and for the annual rental sum of one dollar.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Greenville that the City Manager is hereby authorized to execute the Lease Agreement for and on behalf of the City of Greenville.

This the 14th day of January, 2016.

Allen M. Thomas, Mayor

ATTEST:

Carol L. Barwick, City Clerk

NORTH CAROLINA
PITT COUNTY

HMGP LOTS LEASE AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

THIS LEASE AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT, is made and entered into this the _____ day of _____, 2016, by and between the CITY OF GREENVILLE, an incorporated municipality of the State of North Carolina, hereinafter referred to as "LESSOR," and _____ hereinafter referred to as "LESSEE;"

WITNESSETH:

That the LESSOR hereby leases to the LESSEE the premises commonly known as City-owned HMGP property parcel # _____ consisting of approximately _____ acre(s), in Pitt County, North Carolina, all as shown on the diagram or survey for the "City of Greenville" and marked by legal description as Exhibit "A" which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This LEASE and MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT is executed upon the following terms and conditions:

1. TERM. For Three (3) years, which shall begin on the _____th day of _____, 2016 and shall exist and continue until the _____th day of _____, 2019, unless sooner terminated as hereinafter set forth.
2. EXTENSION OF TIME. It is further understood and agreed by and between the parties hereto that either party can exercise the option to renew the lease for an additional One (1) year period as needed by giving notice to the other party in writing and not less than ninety (90) days prior to the expiration of the lease, and with the consent of the other party.
3. RENT. The LESSEE agrees to pay as rent to LESSOR the sum of _____ Dollars (\$xx.00) per year for each year of the term of the lease and any extension periods for the leased premises, and additional consideration in the form of the required maintenance of the property according to the terms of this Agreement.
4. ASSIGNMENT SUBLETTING. This lease shall not be assigned, or the leased property sublet, without the written consent of the LESSOR. Such consent not to be unreasonably withheld.
5. TERMINATION. Either party shall have the right to terminate this Lease and Maintenance Agreement upon ninety (90) days written notice to the other party. The LESSOR shall not exercise the option to terminate the lease as long as the LESSEE agrees to the terms of the lease and complies with its conditions, or unless the LESSOR identifies an alternate future use of the property to serve a public purpose.
6. MAINTENANCE. During the term of this lease, LESSEE shall maintain the real property in good condition including but not limited to cutting grass (grass shall be cut and maintained at a reasonable lawn length) or other vegetation, trimming of shrubs and plants as necessary, and insuring that no trash or other debris accumulates upon the property. The LESSEE agrees that the LESSEE shall be responsible for any violations of

the City of Greenville Code of Ordinances, Title 12, Chapter 3, Article A if the LESSEE permits nuisance activity as described in Title 12 and will be subject to citations for violations of the ordinance. LESSEE further understands that if the LESSOR is required to abate such nuisances during the period of the lease or upon the end of lease, the LESSEE shall be responsible for all abatement costs and any liens until paid in full including initiating of any litigation and reasonable attorneys fees and costs.

7. **REMOVAL OF TREES AND/OR SHRUBS.** LESSEE shall not remove or cause to be removed any trees or shrubs without prior written approval of the City of Greenville.
8. **PERMISSIBLE USES OF PROPERTY:** The real property, the subject of this Agreement is restricted to certain uses, as follows:

THE FOLLOWING USES OF THE PROPERTY ARE NOT ALLOWED:

- No hunting shall be allowed; and
- No new structures may be placed or constructed upon the property.

ONLY ALLOWED USES OF THE PROPERTY:

Urban gardening

NO OTHER USES ARE PERMITTED ON THIS PROPERTY.

Furthermore, any use of the property shall be in conformity with all existing zoning regulations, deed restrictions and covenants of record in the office of the Register of Deeds in Pitt County, North Carolina.

9. LESSOR shall periodically visit and examine the property to assure that all provisions of this Lease Maintenance Agreement are being followed.
10. LESSEE shall make no unlawful or offensive use of the premises, nor allow any others to do so.
11. **DEFAULT.** Failure of LESSEE to comply with the terms and conditions of this Agreement shall constitute a breach of the Agreement. In the event of such a breach, the LESSEE shall be in default, and if such default shall not have been cured within 30 days of receipt by LESSEE of a written notice of such default, the LESSOR, without any other notice or demand, may terminate this Agreement and require LESSEE to immediately surrender the premises.
12. **INSURANCE.** LESSEE, shall during the entire term of this Agreement, keep in full force and effect a policy of public liability insurance with respect to the premises. LESSEE further agrees to hold harmless, defend and indemnify LESSOR, its mayor, council, managers, directors, employees and agents from any and all claims of liability or loss resulting in damage or loss to property, body or life alleged to have occurred during the term of this Agreement or any extensions thereto.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement hereto, in duplicate originals, as of the date first above written.

City of Greenville:

LESSOR:

By: _____
Barbara Lipscomb, City Manager

LESSEE:

(Printed) Signature

Address

City State Zip

NORTH CAROLINA
_____ COUNTY

I, _____, a Notary Public of the aforesaid County and State, certify that
_____ personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged
the due execution of the foregoing agreement for the purposes as herein set forth.

WITNESS my hand and Notarial Seal this the _____ day of _____, 20_____.

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires:


NORTH CAROLINA
_____ COUNTY

I, _____, a Notary Public of the aforesaid County and State, certify that
_____ personally appeared before me and acknowledged that he/she is
_____ of the City of Greenville, North Carolina and pursuant to authority duly
given, and as an act of the City, executed this Agreement for the purpose herein expressed.

WITNESS my hand and Notarial Seal this the _____ day of _____, 20_____.

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires:



Map Legend

- CHE Lots
- Leased Flood Lots
- FEMA Buyout Lots

Item # 4



City of Greenville, North Carolina

Meeting Date: 1/14/2016
Time: 6:00 PM

Title of Item: Police Department Update

Explanation: Mayor Allen Thomas requested an item be added to the City Council agenda for Police Chief Mark Holtzman to present 2016 expectations, needs, plans, and goals in law enforcement.

Fiscal Note: No direct cost to hear the update

Recommendation: Hear the presentation from Police Chief Mark Holtzman

Viewing Attachments Requires Adobe Acrobat. [Click here](#) to download.

Attachments / click to download



City of Greenville, North Carolina

Meeting Date: 1/14/2016
Time: 6:00 PM

Title of Item: Financial Benchmark Comparison Report: North Carolina's 15 Largest Cities

Explanation: **Abstract:** Staff will review the Financial Benchmark report which compares the City of Greenville across a number of financial indicators to the State of North Carolina's largest cities based on population. The review will consist of an understanding of the financial comparisons made within the report and how such benchmarks should be interpreted so as to better understand Greenville's fiscal environment relative to that of the largest cities within the state.

Explanation: Select financial and demographic data for North Carolina's 15 largest cities, based on population, has been compiled into a Financial Benchmark report for the purpose of providing valuable comparisons between Greenville and its peers. The foundation of the benchmark comparisons made within the report is the information compiled from a host of publically available sources including:

- United States Census Bureau
- North Carolina Department of Commerce
- North Carolina State Treasurer
- Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of Each City

The information compiled from such sources has been used to compare the City of Greenville across a wide spectrum of financial categories. The following are the areas of comparison as included within the benchmark report:

- Select demographic and economic comparisons
- Property tax rate and revenue comparison
- General Fund revenue comparison
- General Fund expense comparison
- Fund Balance analysis and comparison
- State Treasurer Benchmarking Tools

The benchmark report provides the basis for a better understanding of the

similarities between Greenville and the larger urban areas of the state as well as the economic and demographic variations that differentiate Greenville from other such municipalities.

Fiscal Note: No direct cost to hear the report.

Recommendation: Hear the presentation on the Financial Benchmark Comparison Report from the City Manager's Office staff.

Viewing Attachments Requires Adobe Acrobat. [Click here](#) to download.

Attachments / click to download

 [Benchmark_Report_1018285](#)

*Financial Benchmark Comparison:
North Carolina's 15 Largest Cities*

**Report Developed by
City of Greenville- City Manager's Office
January, 2016**



FINANCIAL BENCHMARK COMPARISON NORTH CAROLINA'S 15 LARGEST CITIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page #
Chapter One: Property Tax Rate and Revenue Comparison	1.
Section 1. Introduction	3.
Section 2. Cities Included in Comparison	4.
Section 3. Select Demographic Comparison	5. - 7.
Section 4. Greenville Property Tax Rate and Revenue	8. - 9.
Section 5. FY2016 Tax Rate Comparison	10.
Section 6. Change in Property Tax Rate	11. - 12.
Section 7. Revenue Generated by \$.01 on the Tax Rate	13.
Section 8. Per Capita Revenue Generated by \$.01	14. -15.
Section 9. Annual City Property Taxes on \$150,000 Property	16. - 17.
Section 10. Observations and Conclusions	18.- 19.
 Chapter Two: General Fund Revenue Comparison	 21.
Section 1. Greenville General Fund Revenues	23. - 25.
Section 2. Total General Fund Revenue per Capita	26. - 28.
Section 3. General Fund Ad Valorem Revenue per Capita	29. -30.
Section 4. General Fund Other Tax Revenue per Capita	31. - 32.
Section 5. General Fund Intergovernmental Rev per Capita	33.
Section 6. Licenses, Permits, and Fees Revenue per Capita	34.
Section 7. Observations and Conclusions	35.- 36.
 Chapter Three: General Fund Expense Comparison	 37.
Section 1. Greenville General Fund Expense	39. - 40.
Section 2. Total General Fund Expense per Capita	41. - 43.
Section 3. General Fund Public Safety Expense per Capita	44. - 45.
Section 4. General Government Expense per Capita	46. - 47.
Section 5. Public Works Expense per Capita	48. - 50.
Section 6. Cultural and Recreational Expense per Capita	51.
Section 7. Observations and Conclusions	52. - 53.

FINANCIAL BENCHMARK COMPARISON NORTH CAROLINA'S 15 LARGEST CITIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page #
Chapter Four: General Fund- Fund Balance Comparison	55.
Section 1. Greenville General Fund- Fund Balance	57. - 58.
Section 2. General Fund- Comparison	59. - 61.
Section 3. Observations and Conclusions	62. - 63.

*Financial Benchmark Comparison:
North Carolina's 15 Largest Cities*

**CHAPTER ONE:
PROPERTY TAX RATE AND REVENUE
COMPARISON**




Chapter One: Property Tax Rate and Revenue Comparison

Section 1. Introduction

Any discussion related to funding municipal operations and services in North Carolina will inevitably include some conversation about ad valorem or property taxes. This is because property taxes are the single largest revenue source for a vast majority of North Carolina municipalities. Consequently, municipal property tax rates are often compared among cities, and while such comparisons can provide valuable information, they can also result in overly broad and uninformed conclusions.

The reality is that each city is unique and other variables related to the revenue generated by property taxes should be considered along with the rate. To this end, the purpose of this report is to examine multiple dimensions of municipal property tax rates that will allow for a more comprehensive comparison to our peers.



Section 2. Cities Included in Comparison

It is often challenging to determine which communities to include in various types of comparisons because each community is in some way unique and defining one’s peers often depends on the specific nature and context of the comparison. In some instances, it may be useful to use a set of communities that are of a similar size, while other situations may dictate using communities based upon their location or other factors.

For the purposes of this comparison, the 15 largest (i.e. most populous) North Carolina cities have been utilized. This peer group includes the State’s seven largest cities, each with a population of at least 135,000 (Charlotte, Raleigh, Greensboro, Winston-Salem, Durham, Fayetteville, and Cary); various communities with a similar population to Greenville (High Point, Asheville, Concord, and Gastonia); and cities located in the Eastern portion of the State (Wilmington, Jacksonville, and Rocky Mount).

City	Population	Population Rank
Charlotte	809,958	1
Raleigh	439,896	2
Greensboro	282,586	3
Durham	251,893	4
Winston-Salem	239,269	5
Fayetteville	203,948	6
Cary	155,227	7
Wilmington	113,657	8
High Point	108,629	9
Greenville	89,852	10
Asheville	87,882	11
Concord	85,560	12
Gastonia	73,698	13
Jacksonville	69,047	14
Rocky Mount	56,325	15

Note 1: US Census Bureau 2014 Estimated Population

Of the 15 cities listed above, the following cities have been Council approved as the City of Greenville’s benchmark communities: High Point, Asheville, Concord, Gastonia, Wilmington, Jacksonville.

Section 3. Select Demographic Comparison

Demographic data can be crucial to understanding a specific region relative to others. Although demographic information can seem to be nothing more than numbers, such data can provide valuable information about a community’s population, their background, economic situation, and their family lives relative to that of other communities.


This section of the report provides select demographic information related to the 15 largest cities within North Carolina as published by the US Census Bureau and the North Carolina Department of Commerce. This information should be considered in conjunction with property tax rate and revenues for each of the top 15 cities to better understand the economic characteristics of each community that impact the level of tax rates that are levied.

The following is a summary of the per capita income and unemployment rates for each of the top 15 cities:

City	Per Capita Income		Unemployment Rate	
	Income	Rank	Rate	Rank
Charlotte	\$ 31,556	2	5.80%	7
Raleigh	30,470	3	5.20%	13
Greensboro	25,861	8	6.30%	4
Durham	28,565	5	5.40%	12
Winston-Salem	24,858	9	5.80%	7
Fayetteville	23,409	10	8.00%	2
Cary	41,554	1	5.20%	13
Wilmington	29,017	4	5.80%	7
High Point	22,940	11	6.30%	4
Greenville	22,836	12	6.80%	3
Asheville	26,912	6	4.80%	15
Concord	25,897	7	5.80%	7
Gastonia	21,531	13	5.80%	7
Jacksonville	21,210	14	6.20%	6
Rocky Mount	20,185	15	8.80%	1

Greenville’s per capita income of approximately \$22,836 ranks 12th highest of the 15 largest North Carolina cities while Greenville’s August 2015 unemployment rate of 6.80% ranked 3rd highest of the 15 largest cities.

The economic makeup of Greenville’s citizenry, in comparison to that of North Carolina’s largest municipalities, is also reflected in the percentage of persons living in poverty as shown in the following graph:



Data from the US Census Bureau (2009-13) shows that approximately 30% of the persons living in Greenville are at or below the poverty level which is considerably higher than the average of 19.28% for the 15 largest cities in North Carolina combined. It must be noted that the percentage of persons living in poverty within Greenville relative to the other cities is significantly impacted by the disproportionate number of college students that comprise Greenville’s population.

The following is the home ownership rate for the top 15 North Carolina cities:


City	Home Ownership %	Rank
Charlotte	56.3%	5
Raleigh	53.6%	8
Greensboro	53.1%	9
Durham	50.5%	11
Winston-Salem	56.7%	4
Fayetteville	49.9%	12
Cary	69.1%	1
Wilmington	46.7%	13
High Point	56.8%	3
Greenville	37.8%	15
Asheville	51.5%	10
Concord	68.1%	2
Gastonia	55.5%	6
Jacksonville	38.1%	14
Rocky Mount	54.3%	7

The home ownership rate for the city of Greenville is approximately 37.8% as compared to an average for the top 15 North Carolina cities of 53.2%. Greenville's home ownership percentage ranks lowest of the 15 cities with the next lowest city being Jacksonville at 38.1%. The low home ownership percentage for Greenville is a reflection of the disproportionate number of college students that comprise Greenville's population that reside in rental housing such as apartments and townhomes. Jacksonville's low percentage is a reflection of the large, transient military population that comprises the area.


The two cities with the highest home ownership percentages are Cary at 69.1% and Concord at 68.1%. Cary and Concord serve as suburban residential communities to the larger metropolitan areas of Raleigh and Charlotte, respectively, which would tend to result in a higher home ownership percentage.

Section 4. City of Greenville Property Tax Rate and Revenue

This section of the report provides information related to the City of Greenville’s property tax rates and associated property tax revenue per capita. Property taxes comprise the city’s largest source of General Fund revenue as represented in the following graph:



The following provides a history of the change in property tax rates over the last six years for the City of Greenville:



On average, the City’s property tax rate has increased less than .50% each year for the last five fiscal years.

The following chart provides a comparison of the property tax revenue generated by \$.01 on the tax rate as well as the per capita revenue generated by \$.01 on the tax rate:

City	Current Tax Rate	Net Tax Levy (in Millions)	Revenue Generated by \$.01 on Tax Rate	Per Capita Rev Generated by \$.01 on Tax Rate
Charlotte	\$ 0.4787	\$ 410.56	\$ 8,759,611.69	\$ 10.81
Raleigh	0.4210	203.14	5,309,384.11	12.07
Greensboro	0.6325	163.81	2,589,826.31	9.16
Durham	0.5912	132.83	2,340,566.54	9.29
Winston-Salem	0.5650	108.11	2,039,811.15	8.53
Fayetteville	0.4860	64.48	1,413,970.79	6.93
Cary	0.3700	78.75	2,249,904.83	14.49
Wilmington	0.4850	59.35	1,318,789.00	11.60
High Point	0.6500	61.50	911,127.23	8.39
Greenville	0.5300	31.66	608,799.38	6.78
Asheville	0.4750	49.87	1,084,056.48	12.34
Concord	0.4800	46.55	969,754.48	11.33
Gastonia	0.5300	27.24	513,962.09	6.97
Jacksonville	0.6420	20.60	382,917.42	5.55
Rocky Mount	0.5500	23.25	400,777.33	7.12
Average	0.5258	98.78	2,059,550.59	9.42



The source for the Net Tax Levy and the Revenue Generated by \$.01 on the Tax Rate for each city is their respective FY2014 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). As of the generation of this benchmark comparison report, the FY2014 CAFR is the latest annual financial report available for all 15 cities. For this reason, the FY2014 CAFR report will be used for comparison purposes throughout the benchmark analysis.

The tax rate detailed above is the most current tax rate as provided by each of the municipalities. The tax rates may include both a component used to fund operations and a component approved specifically designated to fund capital projects. The City of Greenville’s net tax levy for FY2014 stood at approximately \$31.7 million which equates to a tax levy per capita of approximately \$352.33. The average tax levy for the top 15 cities is approximately \$98.78 million which equates to a tax levy per capita of approximately \$483.03. The tax levy for the City of Greenville is approximately 27% lower than that of the average for the top 15 cities. In fact, Greenville’s tax levy per capita ranks 13th out of the 15 largest cities.

Section 5. FY 2016 Tax Rate Comparison

The City of Greenville’s fiscal year 2016 tax rate is \$.53 per \$100 valuation. Greenville has the 7th highest rate amount the 15 cities (top 50%). The average tax rate of the 15 cities is \$.5258 per \$100 valuation which is essentially equal to that of Greenville’s tax rate.

City	FY 2016 Tax Rate	Rank
High Point	\$ 0.6500	1
Jacksonville	0.6420	2
Greensboro	0.6325	3
Durham	0.5912	4
Winston-Salem	0.5650	5
Rocky Mount	0.5500	6
Greenville	0.5300	7 (t)
Gastonia	0.5300	7 (t)
Fayetteville	0.4860	9
Wilmington	0.4850	10
Concord	0.4800	11
Charlotte	0.4787	12
Asheville	0.4750	13
Raleigh	0.4210	14
Cary	0.3700	15




Section 6. Change in Property Tax Rates

The following chart provides a comparison of the property tax rates for the top 15 most populous cities in North Carolina for the past six fiscal years:

City	Property Tax Rate						CAGR
	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Wilmington	\$ 0.3700	\$ 0.3700	\$ 0.4500	\$ 0.4500	\$ 0.4600	\$ 0.4850	5.56%
Jacksonville	0.5380	0.5380	0.5380	0.5380	0.6420	0.6420	3.60%
Winston-Salem	0.4750	0.4750	0.4910	0.5300	0.5400	0.5650	3.53%
Concord	0.4200	0.4200	0.4800	0.4800	0.4800	0.4800	2.71%
Asheville	0.4200	0.4200	0.4200	0.4600	0.4600	0.4750	2.49%
Raleigh	0.3735	0.3735	0.3826	0.3826	0.4038	0.4210	2.42%
Cary	0.3300	0.3300	0.3300	0.3500	0.3500	0.3700	2.31%
Durham	0.5519	0.5575	0.5675	0.5675	0.5912	0.5912	1.39%
Fayetteville	0.4560	0.4560	0.4560	0.4560	0.4860	0.4860	1.28%
Charlotte	0.4586	0.4370	0.4370	0.4687	0.4687	0.4787	0.86%
High Point	0.6330	0.6620	0.6750	0.6750	0.6640	0.6500	0.53%
Greenville	0.5200	0.5200	0.5200	0.5200	0.5400	0.5300	0.38%
Rocky Mount	0.5500	0.5500	0.5800	0.5800	0.5500	0.5500	0.00%
Gastonia	0.5300	0.5200	0.5300	0.5300	0.5300	0.5300	0.00%
Greensboro	0.6325	0.6325	0.6325	0.6325	0.6325	0.6325	0.00%

Top 1/3 Highest Tax Rates
 Middle 1/3 Tax Rates
 Bottom 1/3 Lowest Tax Rates

The CAGR column above represents the Compounded Average Growth Rate which is the annual average growth in property taxes for each municipality over the last five fiscal years as ranked below:




The City of Greenville’s property tax increased from \$0.52 to \$0.54 from Fiscal Year 2014 to FY2015. The increases included \$0.01 for Facility Improvement Projects and \$0.01 for the loss of the privilege license fee per North Carolina legislation.

Collectively, the property tax rates for the top 15 cities in the state of North Carolina have increased approximately 1.80% each year for the prior five year period. The average annual increase in property tax rates over the past five years for the top 1/3rd highest cities was approximately 3.58% each year. The average annual increase over the past five years for the middle 1/3rd cities was approximately 1.65% each year. The bottom 1/3rd cities averaged an increase in property tax rates of approximately .18% each year for the past five years. Greenville’s property tax rate has increased less than .50% each year for the last five fiscal years.

The following is a comparison of the top 15 cities change in tax rates from fiscal year 2014-15 to fiscal year 2015-16:

City	FY 2015 Tax Rate	FY 2016 Tax Rate	Tax Rate Change	Rank
Wilmington	\$ 0.4600	\$ 0.4850	\$ 0.025	1 (t)
Winston-Salem	0.5400	0.5650	0.025	1 (t)
Cary	0.3500	0.3700	0.020	3
Raleigh	0.4038	0.4210	0.017	4
Asheville	0.4600	0.4750	0.015	5
Charlotte	0.4687	0.4787	0.010	6
Jacksonville	0.6420	0.6420	-	7 (t)
Concord	0.4800	0.4800	-	7 (t)
Durham	0.5912	0.5912	-	7 (t)
Fayetteville	0.4860	0.4860	-	7 (t)
Rocky Mount	0.5500	0.5500	-	11 (t)
Gastonia	0.5300	0.5300	-	11 (t)
Greensboro	0.6325	0.6325	-	11 (t)
Greenville	0.5400	0.5300	(0.010)	14
High Point	0.6640	0.6500	(0.014)	15




From fiscal year 2014-15 to fiscal year 2015-16, six of the 15 cities (40%) increased their property tax rates an average \$.019. A total of seven cities kept the property tax rate constant from fiscal year 2014-15 to fiscal year 2015-16 while two cities (Greenville and High Point) actually reduced the property tax rate. Greenville’s property tax rate was reduced by \$.01 from the prior fiscal year into fiscal year 2015-16.

Section 7. Revenue Generated by \$.01 on the Tax Rate

The amount of revenue generated by \$.01 on the tax rate varies greatly among the 15 cities. Charlotte, the State’s largest city by a wide margin, produces the most revenue per \$.01 on the tax rate (over \$8.7 million), while Jacksonville, the 14th largest city, generates the least (\$382,917). Greenville generates \$608,799 per \$.01 on the tax rate, the 12th most of the 15 cities (bottom 20%). It is recognized that the usefulness of this measure is limited as the value of \$.01 of taxation will, with limited exceptions, naturally increase with the size (i.e. population) of a city.


City	Population	Revenue Generated by \$.01 on Tax Rate	Per Capita Rev Generated by \$.01 on Tax Rate
Cary	155,227	\$ 2,249,904.83	\$ 14.49
Asheville	87,882	1,084,056.48	12.34
Raleigh	439,896	5,309,384.11	12.07
Wilmington	113,657	1,318,789.00	11.60
Concord	85,560	969,754.48	11.33
Charlotte	809,958	8,759,611.69	10.81
Durham	251,893	2,340,566.54	9.29
Greensboro	282,586	2,589,826.31	9.16
Winston-Salem	239,269	2,039,811.15	8.53
High Point	108,629	911,127.23	8.39
Rocky Mount	56,325	400,777.33	7.12
Gastonia	73,698	513,962.09	6.97
Fayetteville	203,948	1,413,970.79	6.93
Greenville	89,852	608,799.38	6.78
Jacksonville	69,047	382,917.42	5.55
Average	204,495	2,059,550.59	9.42



Section 8. Per Capita Revenue Generated by \$.01 on the Tax Rate

Per capita revenue generated by \$.01 on the tax rate normalizes for the size variance of cities and provides a more “apples to apples” comparison of taxation levels. By this measure, Greenville generates the 14th most revenue at \$6.78 per capita (bottom 20%). The average per capita generated by \$.01 on the tax rate is \$9.42, which means that Greenville produces approximately 28% less revenue than the average.

City	Population	Revenue Generated by \$.01 on Tax Rate	Per Capita Revenue Generated by \$.01 on Tax Rate
Cary	155,227	\$ 2,249,904.83	\$ 14.49
Asheville	87,882	1,084,056.48	12.34
Raleigh	439,896	5,309,384.11	12.07
Wilmington	113,657	1,318,789.00	11.60
Concord	85,560	969,754.48	11.33
Charlotte	809,958	8,759,611.69	10.81
Durham	251,893	2,340,566.54	9.29
Greensboro	282,586	2,589,826.31	9.16
Winston-Salem	239,269	2,039,811.15	8.53
High Point	108,629	911,127.23	8.39
Rocky Mount	56,325	400,777.33	7.12
Gastonia	73,698	513,962.09	6.97
Fayetteville	203,948	1,413,970.79	6.93
Greenville	89,852	608,799.38	6.78
Jacksonville	69,047	382,917.42	5.55
Average	204,495	2,059,550.59	9.42



It should be noted that there is a strong inverse correlation between this measure and tax rates. Cities with higher per capita revenue generated by \$.01 on the tax rate tend to have lower tax rates. This correlation is demonstrated by the fact that the six cities with the highest per capita revenue generated by \$.01 on the tax rates are the same six cities with the lowest tax rates.



City	FY2016 Tax Rate	Tax Rate Rank	Per Capita Rev Generated by \$.01 on Tax Rate	Per Capita Rank
Cary	0.3700	15	14.49	1
Asheville	0.4750	13	12.34	2
Raleigh	0.4210	14	12.07	3
Wilmington	0.4850	10	11.60	4
Concord	0.4800	11	11.33	5
Charlotte	0.4787	12	10.81	6
Durham	0.5912	4	9.29	7
Greensboro	0.6325	3	9.16	8
Winston-Salem	0.5650	5	8.53	9
High Point	0.6500	1	8.39	10
Rocky Mount	0.5500	6	7.12	11
Gastonia	0.5300	7	6.97	12
Fayetteville	0.4860	9	6.93	13
Greenville	0.5300	7	6.78	14
Jacksonville	0.6420	2	5.55	15
Average	0.5258		9.42	

In summary, Greenville’s property tax rate is less than 1% higher than the average for the 15 cities while property tax revenues per capita are approximately 28% less than the average for the top 15. This limitation requires that the city be proactive in growing the tax base and diversifying other revenues.

Section 9. Annual City Property Taxes on a \$150,000 Residence

The average annual city property tax due for a residential property valued at \$150,000 is approximately \$788.64. High Point has the highest property tax due at \$975.00, while Cary has the lowest at \$555.00. Greenville’s property tax due on a \$150,000 valued residence is \$795.00 which is \$6.36 more than the average.

City	FY2016 Tax Rate	Tax on \$150,000 Property Value	Rank
High Point	\$ 0.6500	\$ 975.00	1
Jacksonville	0.6420	963.00	2
Greensboro	0.6325	948.75	3
Durham	0.5912	886.80	4
Winston-Salem	0.5650	847.50	5
Rocky Mount	0.5500	825.00	6
Greenville	0.5300	795.00	7 (t)
Gastonia	0.5300	795.00	7 (t)
Fayetteville	0.4860	729.00	9
Wilmington	0.4850	727.50	10
Concord	0.4800	720.00	11
Charlotte	0.4787	718.05	12
Asheville	0.4750	712.50	13
Raleigh	0.4210	631.50	14
Cary	0.3700	555.00	15
Average	0.5258	788.64	



The average combined City / County property taxes for a residential property valued at \$150,000 is \$1,858.72. Gastonia, which is located in Gaston County, has the highest combined property taxes at \$2,134.50, while Cary, located in Wake County, has the lowest at \$1,476.75. Greenville’s combined annual property taxes (Greenville and Pitt County) are \$1,815, just slightly below the average.

City	FY2016 City Tax Rate	County	FY2016 County Tax Rate	Combined Tax Rate	Combined Annual City / County Property Tax on \$150,000 Residence
Charlotte	\$ 0.4787	Mecklenburg	\$ 0.8157	\$ 1.2944	\$ 1,941.60
Raleigh	0.4210	Wake	0.6145	1.0355	1,553.25
Greensboro	0.6325	Guilford	0.7700	1.4025	2,103.75
Durham	0.5912	Durham	0.7931	1.3843	2,076.45
Winston-Salem	0.5650	Forsyth	0.7310	1.2960	1,944.00
Fayetteville	0.4860	Cumberland	0.7400	1.2260	1,839.00
Cary	0.3700	Wake	0.6145	0.9845	1,476.75
Wilmington	0.4850	New Hanover	0.5740	1.0590	1,588.50
High Point	0.6500	Guilford (95%) Davidson (5%)	0.7585	1.4085	2,112.75
Greenville	0.5300	Pitt	0.6800	1.2100	1,815.00
Asheville	0.4750	Buncombe	0.6040	1.0790	1,618.50
Concord	0.4800	Cabarras	0.7000	1.1800	1,770.00
Gastonia	0.5300	Gaston	0.8930	1.4230	2,134.50
Jacksonville	0.6420	Onslow	0.6750	1.3170	1,975.50
Rocky Mount	0.5500	Nash (70%) Edgecombe (30%)	0.7375	1.2875	1,931.25
Average	0.5258		0.7134	1.2391	1,858.72

Section 10. Property Tax Rate and Revenue Staff Observations and Conclusions

1. An understanding of Greenville's property tax rates and its ability to generate ad valorem revenue relative to the remaining 14 largest cities in the state must be considered in conjunction with the demographic makeup of citizens of Greenville.
2. Greenville's per capita income stands at approximately \$22,836 which is 4th lowest of the 15 cities. Greenville's unemployment rate stands at approximately 6.80% which is 3rd highest of the 15 cities. Greenville's poverty rate stands at 30% which is by far the highest of the 15 cities. Rocky Mount has the second highest poverty rate of the 15 cities coming in at 24.50%.
3. Property tax rates vary greatly among the 15 cities with a high of \$.6500 (High Point) and a low of \$.3700 (Cary). Greenville's rate of \$.5300 is tied for 7th highest with Gastonia and is slightly lower than the average for the 15 cities of \$.5258.
4. Based on the current property tax rate, a Greenville resident who owns an average single family property valued at \$150,000 would pay an annual city property tax of \$795. This is approximately \$6.36 higher than the average of \$788.64 for the top 15 cities, or about \$.53 per month more than average.
5. The combined city / county property tax rates also vary greatly among the 15 cities with a high of \$1.4230 (Gastonia and Gaston County) and a low of \$.9845 (Cary and Wake County). Greenville / Pitt County's rate of \$1.2100 is the 6th lowest of the 15 cities and is slightly less than the overall average of \$1.2391.
6. Based on the current property tax rates, a Greenville resident who owns an average single-family property valued at \$150,000 would pay annual combined city / county property tax of \$1,815. This is \$43.72 less than the average of \$1,858.72.
7. It is important to recognize that cities and counties across the State have different relationships related to the types of services that are entirely provided by the county or jointly provided by the city and county. From a policy perspective, it is important to ensure that city residents, who pay county taxes, are not double taxed for certain services as this could potentially lead to city property tax rates being unnecessarily high and county taxes artificially low.

8. Collectively, the property tax rates for the 15 cities have increased approximately 1.80% each year for the prior five year period. Greenville's property tax rate has increased less than .50% on average each year for the last five years. Only 2 of the 15 cities have not increased property tax rates over the past five years (Gastonia and Greensboro). Six of the 15 cities increased property tax rates from fiscal year 2014-15 to fiscal year 2015-16. The average increase was \$.019.
9. Based on commentary found in the budget messages of these municipalities, the primary factors necessitating the need for property tax increases are:
 - a. Negative revaluations,
 - b. Changes in State authority that negatively impacted revenue growth (i.e. annexation),
 - c. Removal of privilege license per State law,
 - d. A recognized need to invest in infrastructure and other capital expenditures, and
 - e. Demands for additional services and/or increased service levels from citizens.
10. Recognizing that the value of \$.01 on the property tax rate is closely correlated to the size of a city (i.e. the bigger the city, the more revenue is generally generated by \$.01), a better and more equitable measure of revenue generation is per capita revenue generated by \$.01 on the property tax rate. By this measure, a \$.01 increase in the tax rate in Cary will generate \$14.49 per resident, slightly less than three times what is generated by Jacksonville (\$5.55).
11. Consequently, cities that generate more revenue per capita can fund their public services with lower tax rates than other cities. This correlation is demonstrated by the fact that the six cities with the highest per capita revenue generated by \$.01 on the tax rate are the same six cities with the lowest tax rates (i.e. Cary, Asheville, Raleigh, Wilmington, Concord, and Charlotte).
12. Greenville generates \$6.78 per capita for each \$.01 on the property tax rate, the second least amount of the 15 cities, and approximately 28% less revenue than the average of \$9.42. This limitation requires that the city be proactive in two areas:
 - a. Growing the tax base
 - b. Diversifying revenues

*Financial Benchmark Comparison:
North Carolina's 15 Largest Cities*


**CHAPTER TWO:
GENERAL FUND REVENUE COMPARISON**




Chapter Two: General Fund Revenue Comparison

Section 1. City of Greenville General Fund Revenues

The General Fund is the most commonly discussed fund in a city’s budget. It is usually at the forefront of budget discussions because it is the city’s main operating fund funded through the city’s general tax revenues. Fiscal impacts to the General Fund play a large part in a city’s ability to pay for and maintain core community services such as police and fire safety, public works, parks and recreation, and debt service which collectively use most of a city’s tax revenue. The General Fund comprises almost 2/3rds of the City of Greenville’s overall budget accounting for approximately 62.31% of the total budget as follows:




The following is a summary of the change in actual General Fund revenues for the prior six year period:



There are many factors that impact the actual level of General Fund revenues in any given year. Such factors include the position of the State and Local economy, changes in ad valorem property tax rates, positive / negative property revaluation, expansion / reduction of property tax base, change in State authority that directly impacts revenue, and growth in local economic development.

For fiscal year 2014, the City of Greenville’s General Fund revenues totaled approximately \$66,471,943 broken down as follows:



As discussed in Chapter One, the largest component of revenue is in the form of ad valorem taxes accounting for approximately 48% of actual General Fund revenues in FY2014. However, approximately 52% of the General Fund revenue is in the form of non-ad valorem taxes.

The following is the General Fund revenue for the City of Greenville on a per capita basis:

Revenue Type	Revenue	Per Capita
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$ 32,255,697	\$ 358.99
Other Taxes	15,827,568	176.15
Intergovernmental Revenue	9,076,830	101.02
Licenses, Permits, and Fees	2,288,539	25.47
Sales and Service Revenue	5,180,449	57.66
Investment Earnings	457,877	5.10
Other Revenue	1,384,983	15.41
Total	66,471,943	739.79


Greenville's per capita General Fund revenue is approximately \$739.79 with ad valorem taxes comprising the largest component at \$358.99 (48.5%). The next largest per capita revenue component is other taxes coming in at \$176.15 (23.8%). Other taxes consist primarily of sales tax revenues dedicated by North Carolina State statute to the City of Greenville as well as other taxes such as the cable T.V. franchise tax, vehicle license tax, Medicaid hold harmless payments, and rental vehicle tax. Together ad valorem taxes and other taxes account for approximately \$535.14 per capita (72.3%).

As with property tax revenue, the per capita revenue from the General Fund can become the basis for providing valuable comparisons between Greenville and the remaining 14 largest cities in the State of North Carolina. The following sections provide a comparison of General Fund revenue per capita for the top 15 cities as included in each city's 2014 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (most recent available for all 15 cities).

While the North Carolina Local Government Commission, through the guidance of Governmental Auditing Standards, has established a uniform financial statement reporting format across municipalities within the State, there is still significant flexibility in how municipalities may classify and summarize revenues within their financial statements relative to each other. Efforts have been made to group the line item revenues of the top 15 cities into like categories. However, due to the flexibility that municipalities have in classifying and summarizing line item revenues, there cannot be complete assurance that all classification differences have been eliminated in this analysis.

Section 2. Total General Fund Revenue per Capita

The following graph shows the percentage of General Fund revenues by revenue category for the City of Greenville compared to that of the overall top 15 cities:





Approximately 48.53% of the City of Greenville’s General Fund revenues for the 2014 fiscal year came in the form of ad valorem taxes as compared to approximately 55.83% for the overall 15 cities. The other tax revenues comprise a larger percentage of the City of Greenville’s General Fund revenues relative to that of the overall 15 cities. Other taxes, which consist primarily of sales tax, stood at approximately 23.81% of Greenville’s General Fund revenues as compared to 18.68% for the overall 15 cities. When added together, Greenville’s percentage of revenues coming from ad valorem and other taxes is slightly below that of the overall top 15 cities:

Revenue Category	Greenville	Top 15 Cities
Ad valorem tax	48.53%	55.83%
Other Tax	23.81%	18.68%
Total	72.34%	74.51%

Although the percentage of General Fund revenues for combined ad valorem and other tax is comparable to that of the overall 15 cities, it is clear that Greenville’s reliance on other tax revenues, such as sales tax, to fund the operations of the General Fund is significantly greater than that of the average for the top 15 cities.

The following is the overall General Fund revenue per capita as included in the FY2014 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report:

City	Revenue	Per Capita	Rank
Asheville	\$ 97,424,374	\$ 1,108.58	1
High Point	101,599,057	935.28	2
Rocky Mount	51,984,211	922.93	3
Cary	139,819,989	900.75	4
Greensboro	248,960,290	881.01	5
Raleigh	379,134,808	861.87	6
Concord	73,654,693	860.85	7
Wilmington	91,099,283	801.53	8
Gastonia	56,999,226	773.42	9
Greenville	66,471,943	739.79	10
Charlotte	563,994,000	696.32	11
Durham	171,418,278	680.52	12
Winston-Salem	159,463,192	666.46	13
Fayetteville	134,434,076	659.16	14
Jacksonville	39,399,688	570.62	15
Average	158,390,474	803.94	





Greenville’s overall General Fund revenue per capita for FY 2014 was approximately \$739.79 which was approximately \$64.15 (8.0%) less per capita than the average of \$803.94 for the 15 cities. The difference of \$64.15 per capita represents approximately \$5.7 million less in revenue based on Greenville’s population:

Greenville GF Revenue per Capita	\$ 739.79
Top 15 Cities Avg GF Revenue per Capita	<u>\$ 803.94</u>
Difference per Capita	\$ (64.15)
Greenville Population	<u>89,852</u>
Difference in Revenue	<u><u>\$ (5,763,693)</u></u>

Section 3. General Fund Ad Valorem Revenue per Capita

Ad valorem taxes from the General Fund include property tax collections from the current year as well as collections from prior year levies with the addition of all applicable interest and penalties. The following is an ad valorem comparison for the top 15 cities:

City	Revenue	Per Capita	Rank
Asheville	\$ 52,052,585	\$ 592.30	1
High Point	58,578,331	539.25	2
Concord	46,005,171	537.69	3
Greensboro	150,581,063	532.87	4
Cary	78,687,433	506.92	5
Raleigh	204,622,666	465.16	6
Wilmington	52,847,570	464.97	7
Rocky Mount	23,755,532	421.76	8
Charlotte	327,803,000	404.72	9
Gastonia	29,475,863	399.95	10
Winston-Salem	91,611,521	382.88	11
Durham	92,319,117	366.50	12
Greenville	32,255,697	358.99	13
Fayetteville	65,328,949	320.32	14
Jacksonville	20,627,279	298.74	15
Average	88,436,785	425.74	



Greenville’s ad valorem revenues per capita rank 13th out of 15 coming in at \$358.99 per capita as compared to the average of \$425.74. This is approximately \$66.75 less per capita than average.

The cities with the lowest ad valorem revenues per capita are Fayetteville at \$320.32 (2nd lowest) and Jacksonville at \$298.74 (lowest). This tends to support the ranking for property tax revenue generated by \$.01 on the tax rate presented in Chapter One where Greenville, Fayetteville, and Jacksonville held the lowest rankings of the 15 cities as follows:

City	Ad Valorem Revenue per Capita	Ranking	Per Capita Rev Generated by \$.01 Rate	Ranking
Greenville	\$ 358.99	13	\$ 6.78	14
Fayetteville	320.32	14	6.93	13
Jacksonville	298.74	15	5.55	15



The similarities in the transient composition of the populations of these three cities must be noted. Whereas a disproportionate number of college students comprise Greenville’s population, the populations of both Jacksonville and Fayetteville are comprised of a large number of military families.

Section 4. General Fund Other Tax Revenue per Capita

Other tax revenues are generally the second largest source of municipal revenues. Such taxes include the likes of local option sales tax, cable T.V. franchise tax, vehicle license tax, Medicaid hold harmless payments, and rental vehicle tax.

The following is the FY2014 General Fund other tax revenues for the 15 cities:

City	Revenue	Per Capita	Rank
Asheville	\$ 18,139,616	\$ 206.41	1
Gastonia	13,631,374	184.96	2
Fayetteville	37,704,717	184.87	3
Wilmington	20,789,893	182.92	4
Rocky Mount	10,025,051	177.99	5
Greenville	15,827,568	176.15	6
Cary	26,920,367	173.43	7
Raleigh	76,003,995	172.78	8
Concord	14,042,681	164.13	9
High Point	17,731,984	163.23	10
Durham	39,062,279	155.07	11
Jacksonville	10,319,682	149.46	12
Greensboro	40,380,347	142.90	13
Charlotte	82,828,000	102.26	14
Winston-Salem	20,487,173	85.62	15
Average	29,592,982	144.71	



Greenville’s other tax revenues per capita rank 6th out of 15 coming in at \$176.15 per capita as compared to the average of \$144.71. This is approximately \$31.44 more per capita than average and is representative of Greenville being the hub of Eastern North Carolina drawing citizens from all regions surrounding the City for employment, shopping, and entertainment. This difference represents approximately \$2.8 million more revenue than that of the average per capita based on Greenville’s population:

Greenville Other Tax Rev per Capita	\$ 176.15
Top 15 Cities Avg Other Tax Rev per Capita	<u>\$ 144.71</u>
Difference per Capita	\$ 31.44
Greenville Population	<u>89,852</u>
Difference in Revenue	<u><u>\$ 2,824,869</u></u>

Again this is an illustration that represents the importance of other tax revenues to the services funded by the City through the General Fund and the overall importance of the City of Greenville to the economy of Eastern North Carolina.



Section 5. General Fund Intergovernmental Revenue per Capita

Intergovernmental revenues represent amounts received from other governments in the form of shared revenues, reimbursements for performance of general government functions, or grants from an agency of those governments. Intergovernmental revenue is classified as General revenue and may be restricted or unrestricted based on the funding source and the intent from which the revenues are derived. The following are examples of Intergov revenues:

- Utilities Franchise Tax
- Beer and Wine Tax
- DOT Traffic Control Lights
- Housing Authority Grant
- ABC Board Revenues
- Other State Grants

The following is the FY2014 General Fund Intergovernmental revenue for the 15 cities:

City	Revenue	Per Capita	Rank
Rocky Mount	\$ 7,439,209	\$ 132.08	1
High Point	13,971,673	128.62	2
Asheville	11,068,144	125.94	3
Gastonia	8,291,245	112.50	4
Fayetteville	21,113,949	103.53	5
Greenville	9,076,830	101.02	6
Wilmington	11,028,855	97.04	7
Greensboro	27,047,705	95.71	8
Raleigh	40,997,509	93.20	9
Charlotte	74,870,000	92.44	10
Durham	22,981,267	91.23	11
Jacksonville	5,668,222	82.09	12
Concord	6,870,818	80.30	13
Winston-Salem	17,816,682	74.46	14
Cary	9,751,442	62.82	15
Average	19,199,570	93.89	




Section 6. General Fund Licenses, Permits, and Fees Revenue per Capita

License and permit fees are routinely charged to the public as authorization or consent to perform certain services and activities within the city and to cover the city’s cost to administer and oversee such services. The following are examples:

- Inspection fees
- Planning dept fees
- Construction permits
- State fire protection fees
- Sign permits
- Other permits & fees
- Police dept fees
- Fire / rescue fees

The following is the FY2014 General Fund Permit and Fees revenue per capita for the 15 cities:

City	Revenue	Per Capita	Rank
Raleigh	\$ 36,634,667	\$ 83.28	1
Asheville	5,418,682.00	61.66	2
Charlotte	43,446,000	53.64	3
Cary	6,738,719.00	43.41	4
High Point	3,728,062	34.32	5
Durham	8,423,618	33.44	6
Wilmington	3,346,447	29.44	7
Concord	2,210,200	25.83	8
Winston-Salem	6,107,076	25.52	9
Greenville	2,288,539	25.47	10
Greensboro	6,652,734	23.54	11
Jacksonville	1,549,458	22.44	12
Fayetteville	3,469,094	17.01	13
Gastonia	1,188,405	16.13	14
Rocky Mount	845,949	15.02	15
Average	8,803,177	43.05	



Section 7. General Fund Revenue Staff Observations and Conclusions

1. The General Fund is the primary source of revenues used to fund a city's core services. For the City of Greenville, the General Fund comprises approximately 2/3rds of the City's overall budget.
2. As with property tax revenue, the per capita revenue from the General Fund can become the basis for providing valuable comparisons between Greenville and the remaining 14 largest cities in the State of North Carolina.
3. Greenville's per capita General Fund revenue stood at approximately \$739.79 per the 2014 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, which ranks 10th highest out of the top 15 cities.
4. The average General Fund revenue per capita for the 15 cities was approximately \$803.94 which was \$64.15 greater than that of the City of Greenville. The difference of \$64.15 per capita represents approximately \$5.7 million less in revenue based on Greenville's population.
5. Ad valorem property tax revenue comprises approximately 48.53% of the City of Greenville's General Fund revenues as compared to approximately 55.83% for the overall 15 cities which is a difference of 7.3%. Greenville's ad valorem tax revenues per capita ranks 3rd lowest out of the top 15 cities coming in at \$358.99 as compared to the average of \$425.74. This tends to support the significantly less revenue per capita generated for each \$.01 on the property tax rate discussed in Chapter One.
6. It is important to note that the ad valorem property tax revenues for the City of Greenville are significantly impacted by the large Governmental / Non-Profit organizations located within the City that do not pay property taxes based on their legal tax status. Approximately 25% of property within Greenville is off the taxable property listing.
7. Other tax revenues, consisting primarily of local sales tax, comprise approximately 23.81% of the City of Greenville's General Fund revenues as compared to 18.68% for the overall 15 cities which is a difference of 5.1%. Greenville's other tax revenue per capita ranks 6th highest out of the 15 cities coming in at \$176.15 as compared to the average of \$144.71. This difference represents approximately \$2.8 million more revenue than that

of the average per capita based on Greenville's population and is a strong illustration of the importance of the City of Greenville to the economy of Eastern North Carolina.

8. Ad valorem tax and other tax revenue combined account for approximately 72.34% of Greenville's General Fund revenue. This is slightly less than the average for the 15 cities for which ad valorem tax and other tax revenues combined account for approximately 74.51% of total General Fund revenue.
9. Although the percentage of General fund revenue for combined ad valorem and other tax is comparable to that of the overall 15 cities, it is clear that Greenville's reliance on other tax revenues, such as sales tax, to fund the operations of the General Fund is significantly greater than that of the average for the top 15 cities.
10. Intergovernmental revenues are revenues received from other government entities such as Federal, State, and other Local governments, or grants from an agency of those governments. Intergovernmental revenues comprised approximately 13.66% of Greenville's General Fund revenues in 2014 as compared to 12.12% for the overall 15 cities. Greenville's Intergovernmental revenues per capita ranked 6th highest out of the 15 cities coming in at \$101.02 as compared to an average of \$93.89 for the top 15.
11. Significant pressure is put on ad valorem tax and other taxes (primarily sales tax) to fund the services within the General Fund for the City of Greenville. Both revenue sources are significantly impacted by numerous economic factors. Greenville must continue to seek a higher level of economic development as the hub of Eastern North Carolina and pursue options to diversify its revenues through State and Federal grants and private partnerships so as to better serve and grow the City.

*Financial Benchmark Comparison:
North Carolina's 15 Largest Cities*

**CHAPTER THREE:
GENERAL FUND EXPENSE COMPARISON**




Chapter Three: General Fund Expense Comparison

Section 1. City of Greenville General Fund Expense

As discussed in Chapter Two, the General Fund is the most commonly discussed fund in a city's budget and is usually a city's main operating fund funded through the city's general tax revenues. The General Fund is the primary source used to fund the city's core services such as police and fire safety, public works, parks and recreation, and debt service.

For fiscal year 2014 the City of Greenville's General Fund expenses were used to fund the following services of the city:



Note that the General Fund expense does not include Other Financing Sources such as Transfers From/To the General Fund. An example of an Other Financing Source is Transfers From the General Fund to the Debt Service Fund to cover principal and interest expense on the City's existing debt service. Other Financing Sources are specifically segregated from Expenses within the Financial Statements of municipalities and for this reason are not included with expenses within this analysis.

Approximately 54% of the total General Fund expense was appropriated in the area of Public Safety which includes both Police and Fire/Rescue services. The Public Safety percentage of actual was significantly higher than the second highest area, General Government, which comprised approximately 14% of actual.

The following is the General Fund expense for the City of Greenville on a per capita basis:

Expense Type	Expense	Per Capita
General Gov	\$ 9,405,258	\$ 104.67
Public Safety	35,642,132	396.68
Public Works	8,129,886	90.48
Economic & Phy Dev	2,234,844	24.87
Cultural and Rec	7,429,094	82.68
Other Expense	2,829,474	31.49
Total	65,670,688	730.88


Greenville’s per capita General Fund expense was approximately \$730.88 for the 2013-14 fiscal year with the largest component being comprised of Public Safety coming in at \$396.68 per capita.

As with property tax revenue and General Fund revenue, the per capita expense from the General Fund can become the basis for providing valuable comparisons between Greenville and the remaining 14 largest cities in the State of North Carolina. The following sections provide a comparison of General Fund expense per capita for the top 15 cities as included in each city’s 2014 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (most recent available for all 15 cities).

While the North Carolina Local Government Commission through the guidance of Governmental Auditing Standards has established a uniform financial statement reporting format across municipalities within the State, there is still significant flexibility in how municipalities may classify and summarize expenses within their financial statements relative to each other. Efforts have been made to group the line item expenses of the top 15 cities into like categories. However, due to the flexibility municipalities have in classifying and summarizing line item expenses, there cannot be complete assurance that all classification differences have been eliminated in this analysis.

Section 2. Total General Fund Expense per Capita

The following graph shows the percentage of General Fund expense by expense category for the City of Greenville compared to that of the overall top 15 cities per the FY2014 CAFR report:



The following chart ranks the percentage of General Fund expense by category for the City of Greenville and the top 15 cities:

Expense Category	City of Greenville		Top 15 Cities	
	%	Rank	%	Rank
Public Safety	54.27%	1	51.65%	1
General Gov	14.32%	2	13.29%	3
Public Works	12.38%	3	16.62%	2
Cultural and Rec	11.31%	4	8.55%	4
Other Expense	4.31%	5	4.68%	6
Economic & Phy Dev	3.41%	6	5.21%	5
Total	100.00%		100.00%	

Public Safety comprises the largest component of General Fund expense for both the City of Greenville (54.27%) and the top 15 cities (51.65%). In fact, the top three areas are the same for the City of Greenville and the top 15 cities: Public Safety, General Government, and Public Works. Combined, the three areas comprised approximately 80.97% of total General Fund expense for the City of Greenville in FY2014 and approximately 81.56% of the total for the overall top 15 cities. Although the top three areas are the same, the ranking of these areas and the percentage differences are different as presented below:

Expense Category	City of Greenville	Top 15 Cities	Difference
Public Safety	54.27%	51.65%	2.62%
General Gov	14.32%	13.29%	1.03%
Public Works	12.38%	16.62%	-4.24%
Cultural and Rec	11.31%	8.55%	2.76%
Other Expense	4.31%	4.68%	-0.37%
Economic & Phy Dev	3.40%	5.22%	-1.82%
Total	100.00%	100.00%	

There are numerous reasons to explain the differences in the percentage allocation of expenses to the various categories for the City of Greenville compared to that of the overall top cities. Such reasons include, but are not limited to, the following:


1. Differences in financial and operating reporting structures between Cities.
2. Varying use of funds outside the General Fund to operate various programs and services that could differentiate among cities.
3. Use of fund balance appropriated to cover prior year encumbrances of various reporting areas.
4. Varying priorities amongst the Councils of the top cities.
5. One time capital / operational projects appropriated within various reporting areas.

It must also be noted that such statistics presented above are a mere snapshot in time of the 2014 fiscal year. A true indication of variations between cities and the percentage allocation of General Fund expenses across various categories should be monitored and studied over a series of time.

The following is the overall General Fund expense per capita as included in the FY2014 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report:

City	Expense	Per Capita	Rank
Asheville	\$ 86,461,567	\$ 983.84	1
Rocky Mount	53,876,338	956.53	2
High Point	100,942,222	929.24	3
Cary	124,815,402	804.08	4
Greensboro	223,459,707	790.77	5
Raleigh	323,316,576	734.98	6
Greenville	65,670,688	730.88	7
Winston-Salem	167,313,810	699.27	8
Concord	59,587,637	696.44	9
Gastonia	50,641,426	687.15	10
Charlotte	528,832,000	652.91	11
Wilmington	73,030,883	642.56	12
Durham	153,583,666	609.72	13
Fayetteville	123,940,426	607.71	14
Jacksonville	37,825,879	547.83	15
Average	144,886,548	708.51	

Top 1/3 Highest
 Middle 1/3
 Bottom 1/3 Lowest



The City of Greenville's total General Fund expense per capita stood at approximately \$730.88 which was approximately \$22.37 (3.16%) per capita higher than the average of \$708.51 for the top 15 cities.

Section 3. General Fund Public Safety Expense per Capita

Public Safety expense paid from the General Fund includes the operating expenses related to police, fire, and rescue services. The following are the service areas funded within Public Safety for the City of Greenville:


Police	Fire / Rescue
Administration	Administration
Investigations	Fire
Field Operations	EMS
Chief's Staff	
Code Enforcement	
Grants	

As discussed in the previous chapter, the financial and operating structures of cities can vary greatly. For example, Code Enforcement may be located in the Police Department in one city and fall under Community Development in another. Such differences can make comparison of expense per capita challenging with the limitation of specific financial data found within each city's CAFR report.

The following is a comparison of the Public Safety expense per capita for the top 15 cities:

City	Expense	Per Capita	Rank
Asheville	\$ 45,087,375	\$ 513.04	1
Rocky Mount	25,361,714	450.27	2
Charlotte	326,364,000	402.94	3
Greensboro	113,651,763	402.18	4
Greenville	35,642,132	396.68	5
High Point	43,060,217	396.40	6
Concord	32,950,943	385.12	7
Wilmington	41,055,658	361.22	8
Winston-Salem	85,050,958	355.46	9
Gastonia	25,585,942	347.17	10
Fayetteville	68,823,955	337.46	11
Durham	83,213,781	330.35	12
Raleigh	135,774,272	308.65	13
Jacksonville	19,172,474	277.67	14
Cary	41,680,461	268.51	15
Average	74,831,710	365.93	

	Top 1/3 Highest
	Middle 1/3
	Bottom 1/3 Lowest



Greenville’s Public Safety expense per capita from the General Fund ranks 5th out of 15 coming in at \$396.68 per capita as compared to the average of \$365.93. This is approximately \$30.74 higher per capita than average.

Asheville holds the highest per capita Public Safety expense at \$513.04 with the second highest being Rocky Mount at \$450.27. The cities of Jacksonville and Cary hold the lowest per capita expense at \$277.67 and \$268.51, respectively.

Section 4. General Government Expense per Capita


General Government expense includes the services needed to operate the day to day administrative services of the city. General Government expense includes the like of the following service area departments:

- City Council
- City Attorney
- Information Technology
- City Manager Dept
- Finance Dept
- Public Information Office
- City Clerk
- Human Resources
- Risk Mgmt

The following is the FY2014 General Government expense per capita for the 15 cities:

City	Expense	Per Capita	Rank
Asheville	\$ 13,051,223	\$ 148.51	1
High Point	15,632,281	143.91	2
Winston-Salem	28,310,282	118.32	3
Raleigh	49,625,548	112.81	4
Fayetteville	22,720,483	111.40	5
Greenville	9,405,258	104.67	6
Cary	15,810,298	101.85	7
Wilmington	10,988,733	96.68	8
Gastonia	6,427,010	87.21	9
Charlotte	66,094,000	81.60	10
Durham	20,030,554	79.52	11
Greensboro	18,879,716	66.81	12
Rocky Mount	3,618,438	64.24	13
Concord	4,802,271	56.13	14
Jacksonville	3,364,246	48.72	15
Average	\$ 19,250,689	94.14	

Top 1/3 Highest
 Middle 1/3
 Bottom 1/3 Lowest



Greenville's General Government expense per capita from the General Fund ranks 6th out of 15 coming in at \$104.67 per capita as compared to the average of \$94.14. This is approximately \$10.54 higher per capita than average.


Asheville holds the highest per capita General Government expense at \$148.51 with the second highest being High Point at \$143.91. The cities of Jacksonville and Concord hold the lowest per capita expense at \$56.13 and \$48.72, respectively.

Section 5. General Fund Public Works Expense per Capita

Public Works expenses for the City of Greenville include the like of the following service areas:

- Engineering
- Street Maintenance
- Traffic Services
- Administration
- Building and Grounds

The following is the FY2014 Public Works expense paid from the General Fund by division for the City of Greenville:




The following is the per capita expense for FY2014 by division for Greenville’s Public Works department as funded by the General Fund:

Division	Expense	per Capita
Street Maintenance	1,130,478	12.58
Engineering	2,089,759	23.26
Building and Grounds	2,642,236	29.41
Traffic Services	1,049,251	11.68
Administration	759,378	8.45
Other Expense	458,784	5.11
Total	8,129,886	90.48

The following is the FY2014 Public Works expense per capita for the 15 cities:

City	Expense	Per Capita	Rank
Cary	\$ 31,265,770	\$ 201.42	1
Greensboro	55,444,374	196.20	2
Rocky Mount	10,390,558	184.48	3
High Point	16,547,248	152.33	4
Asheville	12,701,049	144.52	5
Concord	11,854,052	138.55	6
Charlotte	103,365,000	127.62	7
Winston-Salem	28,356,894	118.51	8
Wilmington	12,984,874	114.25	9
Durham	25,329,960	100.56	10
Greenville	8,129,886	90.48	11
Gastonia	5,244,937	71.17	12
Jacksonville	4,777,784	69.20	13
Raleigh	25,408,628	57.76	14
Fayetteville	9,442,534	46.30	15
Average	24,082,903	117.77	



Greenville's Public Works expense per capita from the General Fund ranks 11th out of 15 coming in at \$90.48 per capita as compared to the average of \$117.77. This is approximately \$27.29 lower per capita than average.

Cary holds the highest per capita Public Works expense at \$201.42 with the second highest being Greensboro at \$196.20. The cities of Raleigh and Fayetteville hold the lowest per capita expense at \$57.76 and \$46.30, respectively.

As discussed in a previous section, there are numerous reasons why the expense per capita could vary from one city to the next. This particularly holds true with concerns to Public Works. Differences in financial and operating reporting structures can vary greatly between cities. For example, Sanitation services and Facilities Improvements may flow through the General Fund for one particular city but be accounted for in separate Enterprise and Internal Service fund in another. Such differences can make comparisons of expense per capita challenging with the limitation of specific financial data found within each city's CAFR report.

Section 6. General Fund Cultural and Recreational Expense per Capita


Cultural and Recreational expense for the City of Greenville includes the like of the following service areas:

- Parks
- Recreation
- Aquatics & Fitness Center
- Bradford Creek

The following is the FY2014 Cultural and Recreational expense per capita for the 15 cities:

City	Expense	Per Capita	Rank
High Point	\$ 18,163,763	\$ 167.21	1
Rocky Mount	7,868,253	139.69	2
Raleigh	47,645,407	108.31	3
Asheville	8,710,768	99.12	4
Greensboro	26,751,224	94.67	5
Cary	13,795,424	88.87	6
Greenville	7,429,094	82.68	7
Gastonia	4,971,730	67.46	8
Jacksonville	4,421,759	64.04	9
Fayetteville	12,330,192	60.46	10
Wilmington	6,598,293	58.05	11
Concord	4,310,686	50.38	12
Durham	9,920,724	39.38	13
Winston-Salem	8,985,353	37.55	14
Charlotte	3,876,000	4.79	15
Average	12,385,245	60.56	

Top 1/3 Highest
 Middle 1/3
 Bottom 1/3 Lowest



The shared services between the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County in addition to private and non-profit funding tends to reflect a reduced per capita expense for Charlotte.

Section 7. General Fund Expense Staff Observations and Conclusions

1. General Fund expense does not include Other Financing Sources such as Transfers From/To the General Fund. Other Financing Sources are specifically segregated from Expenses within the Financial Statements of municipalities and for this reason are not included with expenses within this analysis.
2. Greenville's per capita General Fund expense was approximately \$730.88 for the 2013-14 fiscal year. This was approximately \$22.37 (3.16%) per capita higher than the average of \$708.51 for the top 15 cities.
3. The top three areas of expense per capita are the same for the City of Greenville and the top 15 cities: Public Safety, General Government, and Public Works. Combined, the three areas comprised approximately 80.97% of total General Fund expense for the City of Greenville in FY2014 and approximately 81.56% of the total for the overall top 15 cities.
4. The largest component of expense per capita was comprised of Public Safety coming in at \$396.68 per capita. Public Safety comprises the largest component of General Fund expense for both the City of Greenville (54.27%) and the top 15 cities (51.65%).
5. Greenville's General Government expense per capita from the General Fund ranks 6th out of 15 coming in at \$104.67 per capita as compared to the average of \$94.14. This is approximately \$10.54 higher per capita than average.
6. There are numerous reasons to explain the differences in the percentage allocation of expenses such as:
 - Differences in financial and operating reporting structures between Cities.
 - Varying use of funds outside the General Fund to operate various programs and services that could differentiate among cities.
 - Use of fund balance appropriated to cover prior year encumbrances of various reporting areas.
 - Varying priorities amongst the Councils of the top cities.
 - One time capital / operational projects appropriated within various reporting areas.

7. The following are examples that would create differences in expenses per capita between municipalities:
 - EMS service may be a County operated program or that of a local municipality.
 - Sanitation and Fleet services may flow through the General Fund for one particular city but be accounted for in separate Enterprise and Internal Service funds in another.

8. Such differences can make comparisons of expense per capita challenging with the limitation of specific financial data found within each city's CAFR report.

*Financial Benchmark Comparison:
North Carolina's 15 Largest Cities*


**CHAPTER FOUR:
GENERAL FUND- FUND BALANCE
COMPARISON**



Chapter Four: General Fund- Fund Balance Comparison


Section 1. City of Greenville General Fund- Fund Balance

In the General Fund financial statements, fund balance is composed of five classifications designed to disclose the hierarchy of constraints placed on how fund balance can be spent. The governmental fund types classify fund balance as follows:




Fund balance that is not considered Nonspendable or Restricted will be included as Unassigned unless formal action of the City Council is taken to classify fund balance as Committed or Assigned. Unassigned Fund Balance is considered to be available for appropriation by the City Council.

The following is the General Fund fund balance by category at June 30, 2014:



The General Fund Fund Balance, for the City of Greenville presented above for fiscal year 2014, is the latest fund balance information available for all of the top 15 cities. At the end of fiscal year 2014, Unassigned Fund Balance stood at 51% of total fund balance coming in at approximately \$16,108,088. The following is the change in Unassigned Fund Balance for the City of Greenville over the prior five fiscal years:

Year	Unassigned Fund Balance	Change
2010	\$ 13,364,965	-
2011	13,380,913	15,948
2012	14,683,133	1,302,220
2013	11,400,992	(3,282,141)
2014	16,108,088	4,707,096





When analyzing the City’s Unassigned Fund Balance it is important to remember that Unassigned Fund Balance is at a specific point in time (June 30). Fund Balance can fluctuate from month to month based on actual revenue, expense, accounts receivable, and accounts payable. This is best represented by the City’s change in Fund Balance from FY2012 to FY2013 and from FY2013 to FY2014. The swing was primarily the result of receivables due to the City from various other funds for projects being leveraged temporarily from the General Fund. The timing of the reimbursements of these revenues to the General Fund can have a significant impact on Unassigned Fund Balance reported at year end.

Over the past five fiscal years, Unassigned Fund Balance has averaged approximately \$13.80 million at year end with a high of \$16.10 million for fiscal year 2014 and a low of \$11.4 million for fiscal year 2013.

Section 2. General Fund- Fund Balance Comparison

The following is the Unassigned Fund Balance from the General Fund for the top 15 cities at the end of fiscal year 2014 (most recent information available for all cities):



City	Unassigned Fund Balance	Rank
Charlotte	\$ 95,298,000	1
Raleigh	73,079,992	2
Cary	63,977,908	3
Concord	37,663,790	4
Wilmington	31,383,688	5
Durham	28,181,588	6
Winston-Salem	26,906,450	7
Greensboro	23,349,690	8
Fayetteville	19,368,407	9
Gastonia	16,255,458	10
Greenville	16,108,088	11
Asheville	15,040,899	12
High Point	13,314,164	13
Rocky Mount	12,321,582	14
Jacksonville	8,202,431	15
Average	32,030,142	



The City of Greenville’s Unassigned Fund Balance in the General Fund ranked 11th out of 15 coming in at \$16,108,088 as compared to an average of \$32,030,142 for the top 15. The Unassigned Fund Balance for the top cities far exceeds the average for the remaining 12 cities. The average Unassigned Fund Balance for Charlotte, Raleigh, and Cary stood at approximately \$77.5 million while the average for the remaining 12 cities stood at \$20.7 million.

The following is the Unassigned Fund Balance per capita for the top 15 cities for FY2014:


City	Unassigned Fund Balance	Per Capita
Concord	\$ 37,663,790	\$ 440.20
Cary	63,977,908	412.16
Wilmington	31,383,688	276.13
Gastonia	16,255,458	220.57
Rocky Mount	12,321,582	218.76
Greenville	16,108,088	179.27
Asheville	15,040,899	171.15
Raleigh	73,079,992	166.13
High Point	13,314,164	122.57
Jacksonville	8,202,431	118.79
Charlotte	95,298,000	117.66
Winston-Salem	26,906,450	112.45
Durham	28,181,588	111.88
Fayetteville	19,368,407	94.97
Greensboro	23,349,690	82.63
Average	32,030,142	156.63





The Unassigned Fund Balance per capita for the City of Greenville stood at approximately \$179.27 at the end of FY2014 compared to the average of \$156.63 for the top 15 cities. This is approximately \$22.64 per capita higher than the average. The cities of Concord and Cary far exceeded the average coming in at a per capita fund balance of \$440.20 and \$412.16, respectively.

When analyzing Unassigned Fund Balance, it is important to find value in comparing Unassigned Fund Balance in relation to the General Fund revenues being used to operate the City. The following is a comparison of Unassigned Fund Balance as a percentage of total General Fund revenue for the top 15 cities:

City	Unassigned Fund Balance	Per Capita	% of General Revenue	Operating Months
Concord	\$ 37,663,790	\$ 440.20	51.14%	6.14
Cary	63,977,908	412.16	45.76%	5.49
Wilmington	31,383,688	276.13	34.45%	4.13
Gastonia	16,255,458	220.57	28.52%	3.42
Rocky Mount	12,321,582	218.76	23.70%	2.84
Greenville	16,108,088	179.27	24.23%	2.91
Asheville	15,040,899	171.15	15.44%	1.85
Raleigh	73,079,992	166.13	19.28%	2.31
High Point	13,314,164	122.57	12.28%	1.47
Jacksonville	8,202,431	118.79	20.82%	2.50
Charlotte	95,298,000	117.66	16.90%	2.03
Winston-Salem	26,906,450	112.45	16.87%	2.02
Durham	28,181,588	111.88	16.44%	1.97
Fayetteville	19,368,407	94.97	14.41%	1.73
Greensboro	23,349,690	82.63	9.38%	1.13
Average	32,030,142	156.63	20.16%	2.42

 **Top 1/3 Highest**

 **Middle 1/3**

 **Bottom 1/3 Lowest**

At the end of FY2014 the City of Greenville’s General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance stood at approximately 24.23% of the City’s FY2014 General Fund revenues. The average for the overall top 15 cities stood at approximately 20.16%. The cities of Concord, Cary, and Wilmington were considerably higher than average as a percentage of revenue coming in at 51.14%, 45.76%, and 34.45%, respectively.

The average Unassigned Fund Balance of \$32.0 million for the top 15 cities represent approximately 2.42 months of General Fund operating revenue in reserve and available for appropriation. The City of Greenville’s Unassigned Fund Balance of \$16.1 million at the end of FY2014 represented approximately 2.91 months of General Fund revenue in reserve which is approximately 20% higher than average.

Section 3. General Fund- Fund Balance Observations and Conclusions

1. Fund Balance within the General Fund is composed of five classifications with Nonspendable being most restrictive and Unassigned being least restrictive.
2. Unassigned Fund Balance is considered to be available for appropriations by the City Council.
3. For fiscal year 2014, total Fund Balance within the General Fund totaled \$31.4 million with \$16.1 million being classified as Unassigned.
4. The average Unassigned Fund Balance for the top 15 cities averaged approximately \$32.0 million for FY2014 which was significantly greater than that of the City of Greenville. However, there were three Cities (Charlotte, Raleigh, and Cary) that combined had an average Unassigned Fund Balance of \$77.5 million. The remaining 12 cities had an average Unassigned Fund Balance of \$20.7 million.
5. The following is a summary comparison of the City of Greenville’s FY2014 Unassigned Fund Balance to that of the overall top 15 cities:

City	Unassigned Fund Balance	Unassigned Fund Balance per Capita	% of General Revenue	Operating Months
City of Greenville	\$ 16,108,088	\$ 179.27	24.23%	2.91
Top 15 Cities	32,030,142	156.63	20.16%	2.42
Greenville's Rank	11th Highest	6th Highest	5th Highest	5th Highest

6. When analyzing the City’s Unassigned Fund Balance at the end of FY2014, in relation to other Cities, it is important to remember:
 - a. Unassigned Fund Balance as reported in the Financial Statements is at a specific point in time (June 30). Fund Balance can fluctuate from month to month based on actual revenue, expense, accounts receivable, and accounts payable.
 - b. Unassigned Fund Balance can be significantly impacted by one time projects and prior year encumbrances included in Appropriated Fund Balance. One time projects and prior year encumbrances can vary greatly from one year to the next thereby impacting Appropriated Fund Balance and Unassigned Fund Balance.

- c. Unassigned Fund Balance is most appropriately analyzed over a series of years in relation to revenue and not at any specific moment in time. For example, Unassigned Fund Balance for the City of Greenville has averaged approximately \$13.8 million which is significantly less than the \$16.1 million at the end of FY2014. However, the change in fund balance ranged from a \$4.7 million increase from FY2013 to FY2014 to a \$3.2 million decrease from FY2012 to FY2013.
7. The City of Greenville's Financial Policy Guidelines state that the City will strive to maintain an Unassigned General Fund balance at the close of each fiscal year of at least 14.0% of the total annual operating budget. The Unassigned General Fund balance as of the close of FY2014 was \$16,108,088, or \$5,537,579 above the 14% policy amount of \$10,570,509 which was calculated as follows:

Total Original FY2015 General Fund Budget Less Powell Bill x 14%

\$75,503,636 x 14% = \$10,570,509

It should be recognized that of the \$5,537,579 above the 14% policy, over half (\$2,810,221) had been allocated by budget amendments approved by the City Council through October of FY2015. This left approximately \$2,727,358 available above the 14% policy threshold for allocation.



City of Greenville, North Carolina

Meeting Date: 1/14/2016
Time: 6:00 PM

Title of Item: Update on ADA Compliant Crosswalks

Explanation: Staff will provide an update of ongoing study investigating pedestrian-related issues on and around the Medical Campus. The study area is defined by West 5th Street (to the north), Stantonsburg Road (to the south), Moye Boulevard (to the east), and Arlington Boulevard (to the west).

Fiscal Note: There are no financial impacts related with this presentation.

Recommendation: Receive presentation as information.

Viewing Attachments Requires Adobe Acrobat. [Click here](#) to download.

Attachments / [click to download](#)



City of Greenville, North Carolina

Meeting Date: 1/14/2016
Time: 6:00 PM

Title of Item: Update on Railroad Crossings

Explanation: This item is an update on repair of railroad crossings. There have been a number of concerns with several railroad crossings within the City limits having rough crossings - poor road conditions. Several of these locations are part of a larger improvement project. This is an update of our investigation to address these crossings.

Fiscal Note: No financial impacts are associated with this update.

Recommendation: Receive presentation as information.

Viewing Attachments Requires Adobe Acrobat. [Click here](#) to download.

Attachments / click to download



City of Greenville, North Carolina

Meeting Date: 1/14/2016
Time: 6:00 PM

Title of Item: Presentation on the landscape enhancements on Memorial Drive in the vicinity of the Pitt-Greenville Airport

Explanation: Public Works staff has been working with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) on the beautification of Memorial Drive in the vicinity of the Pitt-Greenville Airport. Staff will provide an update on the current status of the project, expected implementation schedule (pending approval of NCDOT funding), and future operation and maintenance costs to the City of Greenville.

Fiscal Note: There are no fiscal impacts associated with this presentation.

Recommendation: Receive presentation as information.

Viewing Attachments Requires Adobe Acrobat. [Click here](#) to download.

Attachments / click to download
