AGENDA

Meeting Type.	WORKSHOP
Date:	04/05/1988

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP AGENDA
April 5, 1988

5:00 - 6:00 p.m.	Presentation by Charles Siemon on Impact Fees
6:00 - 6:20 p.m.	Dinner
6:20 - 6:45 p.m.	Plaza Park Update
6:45 - 7:20 p.m.	Airport Taxicab Discussion
7:20 - 7:50 p.m.	Stormwater Status Report
7:50 - 8:30 p.m.	Council Retreat Follow-up

SUBJECT: INDEPENDENCE PLAZA PARK

BACKGROUND:

In 1979, the City of Charlotte undertook a major replanning effort for its uptown, or "central area". A contract was awarded to RTKL Associates, Inc., of Baltimore, to provide a comprehensive plan and an implementation strategy for the city's core. This plan addressed three residential areas, the governmental complex, and the office/retail core.

Completed in November 1980, the plan stressed capitalizing on the healthy economic condition of Charlotte's central business district by continuing the district's logical development and by adding 24-hour-a-day vitality through the enhancement of cultural, residential, entertainment, and recreational facilities. The plan also proposed the construction of the transit mall and an urban park at the southwestern corner of Tryon and Trade Streets to reinforce the identity and sense of place at Trade and Tryon, the crossroads of the uptown area.

On April 28, 1981, the voters of Charlotte approved a bond package that provided 8.6 million dollars for the construction of the Transit Mall and Plaza Park projects. The same vote resulted in approval of the reconstruction of Trade Street into a tree-lined boulevard with a landscaped median. In addition, approval was also given for construction of Church and College Street connectors required to divert auto traffic away from Tryon Street.

Subsequently, the City of Charlotte sponsored a design competition to select a designer for the Transit Mall. The firm of Skidmore, Owens, and Merrill was chosen. Construction of the mall was completed for a formal opening on Thanksgiving Day, 1984. Design and development of the urban park, however, was not included in the Transit Mall contract due to a lack of consensus on a design and land acquisition problems.

DESIGN:

The next design step did not occur until late 1985, when City Council approved a Design Program involving setting up a Citizen's Design Committee, defining a designer selection process and laying out the design procedure.

In May 1986, a design charrette was held for the purpose of defining a direction for a future park at the corner of Trade and Tryon Streets. The results of the charrette yielded design philosophy and policy program for the development of the park. The guidelines called for a duel phased approach for designing the Square. The first was to develop the specific Plaza Park site. The second, called for establishing urban context guidelines for the entire contextual "Square" setting. Adopted by City Council in July 1986, the program has directed the park process to date.

In October 1986, the design firm of Danadjieva and Koenig Associates was hired by the City to design Plaza Park. As a public input mechanism, two workshops were conducted to investigate various scenarios for the buildings. In addition, the February 24, 1987 edition of "Ask The Mayor" show was devoted to discussing park issues.

In April 1987, Danadjieva and Koenig Associates presented three design programs for Plaza Park including a budget pricing analysis. This analysis indicated a probable project cost of $2.75 million for all three programs. This information was presented to City Council together with a reiteration that the public construction dollars were set at $1 million. Council concurred that the designers should proceed with a design program leading to the selection of one of the options or a variation thereof. This assumed any cost above $1 million would be provided for privately. It also assumed a phased construction program may be required with the City using its funds to construct the water feature.

On June 25, 1987, Danadjieve and Koening Associates conducted a workshop with City Council to review their proposal for the future development of the Plaza Park site. The meeting enable D&KA to fully explain their intentions for the Square, while allowing Council members a change to provide input on the direction they should follow.

As a result of City Council's positive reaction to the D&KA proposals, the design process proceeded into further design development, centering on a single concept known as B-2. The concept is highlighted by a major water feature and space for historic expression together with two small fountain areas.

On September 28, 1987, staff presented a concept modification to Council that addressed budget concerns. This involved dividing the project into several phases with the first phase estimated to cost from $1.35 million to $1.8 million. Council reached a consensus to proceed with design work as follows:

a) Complete a schematic design including updated cost estimates for a fee of not to exceed $28,000. Included was a wind study.

b) Assume a phase 1 construction budget of $1.45 million (includes the major water feature).

c) Reduce the water feature to approximately 24 feet in height and reduce its area by 25%. The water feature will be granite faced.

In December 1987, due to private litigation regarding the Interstate Tower project, D&KA was instructed to stop on design work except for completion of the wind study.

In January 1988, a wind study was completed by Applied Research Engineering, Inc. (Raleigh, N.C.). Costs incurred amounted to $2,650.00. Additional wind measurement at the site is being completed. The information will be used to verify and calibrate the wind study model. This final work will be completed as part of the $28,000 study when it resumes.

<u>ACTION:</u> April 5, 1988 Council Workshop

I. There is currently approximately $1 million available for design and construction. Private funding that might be available from Interstate Tower project is uncertain due to private litigation. Even though the zoning issues have been addressed by Council, it is still not certain when the project may proceed.

We need approximately $1.5 million as an assumed project budget in order to finalize a phase 1 design.

Options:

A) Additional $500,000 public funding. The Citizen Review Committee recommends Council consider this during its C.I.P. Budget process.

B) Private fund raising: This expectation could be met if Interstate Tower project litigation is resolved.

C) Redesign entire park as a more passive area assuming there will only be a $1 million design and construction budget.

II. If we continue to delay design and construction, there may be merit in designing and constructing an interim improvement to expand usability of this area. The Citizen Review Committee recommends this if we are likely to experience an additional 1-2 year delay.

Staff has completed an interim design that would cost approximately $45,000 to $50,000 and significantly enlarge the usable space and improve its appearance. This design assumes use of City landscape material and labor to the extent possible.

It is still anticipated that subsequent construction phases for completion of the $2.75 million park project will be raised privately.

RECOMMENDATION:

Council set a construction budget for phase 1 at $1.5 million. This will require Council approval of an additional $500,000 for the project as part of this years C.I.P. At such time as the Interstate Tower project is undertaken, repayment of a part or all of the $500,000 is possible. Finally, Council concur with completion of the $28,000 contract with D&KA for schematic design and cost estimates. This will enable a final verification of construction costs prior to any further expenditures of the $1.5 project budget.

NOTES

ISSUE: Airport Advisory Committee Resolution Recommending an Exclusive Taxi Contract

BACKGROUND: Several members of the Airport Advisory Committee received complaints about taxi cab service at the Airport during the January snowstorm. A subcommittee was formed to review the quality of service at the Airport and to study the revenue aspects of the ground transportation operation. Members of the subcommittee were Don Bryant, Peggy Culbertson, and Ed High. The subcommittee recommended that a resolution be prepared recommending that City Council consider an exclusive contract arrangement with a single taxi company. A copy of that resolution is attached (Attachment 1).

The most recent study addressing Airport taxi service was the 1985 Thompson/Crenshaw Ground transportation study. Thompson/Crenshaw recommended regulation of taxicabs through an exclusive contractual arrangement with a single taxi company or a modified open curb with strict enforcement of the City-wide taxi regulations. City Council chose the modified open curb option and approved a full-time taxi inspector assigned to the Airport.

In 1987, the Airport completed implementation of Thompson/Crenshaw's recommendation for taxi holding area improvements including the addition of restrooms, lounge, vending machines and taxi dispatching room.

For several years, the Airport has had a ground transportation hostess. This hostess sat in a booth on the lower level curb near the baggage claim area. The hostess called the taxi dispatcher at the taxi holding area whenever a traveller requested a taxi. The Thompson/Crenshaw study recommended that the ground transportation hostess be replaced with curb side, self-service, direct telephone lines to the taxi dispatcher. Recently, the Airport implemented this change and installed curb side taxi telephones. During this transition period, the Airport is using temporary personnel to direct travellers to the taxi telephones. Attachment 2 outlines Highlights of Airport Taxi Service (1958-1988).

DEFINITIONS: An open curb system means that taxis park on or cruise the terminal building curb waiting for a customer. There is no dispatching system. Any taxi may compete for Airport curb business.

A modified open curb implies that there are some restrictions on taxi operations. The restrictions may be a dispatching system with a taxi holding area away from the curb. Or the restriction may be a limited number of permits issued allowing taxis to operate from the Airport curb.

DEFINITIONS CONTINUED

An exclusive contract allows only one taxi company to operate taxis from the Airport curb.

A non-exclusive contract (or arrangement) allows more than one taxi company to operate taxis from the Airport curb.

CURRENT SYSTEM:

The current system is a non-exclusive arrangement and modified open curb where Taxi's check-in with the taxi dispatcher at the Taxi Holding Area. Taxi's are dispatched in the order in which they arrive. Drivers pay dispatcher a 75¢ gate fee for each fare. This fee is not included in the total ride fare. The gate fee is charged to defray the cost of the dispatcher contract. The FY87 gate fee collection was $48,611. Taxi customers call the taxi-dispatcher via the free taxi courtesy phones located at the lower level curb.

OTHER AIRPORTS:

The Airport Operators Council International (AOCI) conducts an annual survey on airport ground transportation. In 1987 thirteen large U.S. airports responded and three of the 13 have exclusive taxi contracts (Detroit, Honolulu, and St. Louis). The remaining 10 have non-exclusive contracts or arrangements with taxi companies. Among the 10 Airports with non-exclusive arrangements are: Atlanta, Charlotte, Houston, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, Orlando, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Pittsburgh and Tampa.

- Atlanta (42.4 million passengers) has a modified open curb system very similar to Charlotte's (12.9 million passengers).

- Raleigh-Durham Airport (2.7 million passengers) recently completed non-exclusive agreements with 25 taxi companies serving the cities of Raleigh and Durham. This agreement limits the number of taxis authorized to operate from the Airport and establishes a quarterly taxi permit fee of $250. The dispatching service is provided by taxi operators.

- Tampa (10.6 million passengers) has a non-exclusive contract with two taxicab companies. Tampa has two terminal buildings. Each terminal building has a taxi curb. Two contracts are awarded to the highest and second highest bidder. The most recent highest bid was $125,000 annually and the second highest bid was $100,000 annually. Each company is assigned to one of the terminal buildings exclusively. Other taxi operators may only come to the Airport on a pre-arranged customer request basis.

More comparative information can be collected on other Airport's taxi systems if Council wishes.

DECISION: Does City Council wish to act on the Airport Advisory Committee's resolution?

ALTERNATIVES:

- o Make no change in current system.
- o Study further the advantages and disadvantages of other taxi arrangements.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS: State legislation and City Charter allows exclusive franchises and contracts for taxi service.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Personnel expenses associated with the modified open curb include a contract Taxi Dispatcher and Taxi Inspector (Police Department inter-departmental charge). Personnel expenses related to modified open curb operation are approximately $71,000. Additional costs associated with Taxi operation are debt service for the taxi holding facility and proportional share of Airport roadway system maintenance, and total approximately $70,000. Combined personnel and facility related costs is estimated at $141,000.

ATTACHMENT I

RESOLUTION FROM THE AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, the Airport Advisory Committee is assigned the continuing responsibility of reviewing and studying all revenue aspects of the Airport and recommending appropriate action to City Council on Airport policy matters:

AND, WHEREAS, the Airport Advisory Committee finds that the ability to monitor and control the quality and level of service for ground transportation at the Airport, especially taxi cabs, should be improved;

AND, WHEREAS the Airport Advisory Committee finds that all commercial transportation services at the Airport including limousines, courtesy vehicles, parking shuttles and delivery vans should be regulated and charged reasonable fees for use of Airport property and premises for business purposes and profit;

AND WHEREAS, the Airport Advisory Committee finds that certain ground transportation services at the Airport should be contracted, through concessions agreements, in order to eliminate the cost of providing necessary personnel to adequately administer the open curb policy and to generate additional revenues to enhance the financial posture of the Airport;

NOW, THEREFORE, upon consideration of all of the foregoing, it is hereby resolved and ordained by the Airport Advisory Committee,

1. It is recommended that City Council proceed with implementation of regulations and reasonable charges for a commercial transportation services at the Airport as informally approved by Council through acceptance of the 1985 Airport Ground Transportation Report on September 23, 1985.

2. It is recommended that City council consider an exclusive contractual arrangement with a single taxi company, which will include all personnel necessary to provide an acceptable quality and level of taxi service as well as provide additional revenues for the City;

ATTACHMENT 2

HIGHLIGHTS OF AIRPORT TAXI SERVICE (1958-1988)

1958 - 1971	Open curb taxi service
1972	Arnold Thompson Associates (ATA) study ground transportation. ATA's overall evaluation preferred exclusive taxi service for guaranteed revenue and consistent service levels during peak and non-peak demand.
1972 - 1978	Exclusive taxi contracts.
1978-1980	Council elects not to award an exclusive taxi contract. Alternatives are studies. Airport implements open curb taxi service with self-dispatching system.
1981	Wackenhut Security contract approved to operate taxicab dispatching system with coin-activated gate to maintain open curb access.
1982	New terminal opens. Charlotte Sky Cap Service contract approved to provide personnel curbside for taxi dispatching. Taxi queuing area constructed adjacent to passenger terminal.
1985	Thompson/Crenshaw Ground Transportation study recommends regulation of taxicabs through an exclusive contractual arrangement with a single taxi company or a modified open curb with strict enforcement of the City-wide taxi regulations.
1986	Full-time Taxi Inspector (Police Department inter-departmental charge) assigned to Airport.
1987	Taxi holding area improvements are made including restrooms, lounge, vending machines and taxi dispatching room.
1988	Curbside contract ground transportation hostess is replaced with curbside taxi telephone stations. Temporary agency hostesses are used for transition period.

NOTES

Stormwater Management

Over the last two decades, Charlotte has adopted many policies and regulations concerning the management of stormwater runoff. As the City has become more urban, drainage issues have become more pressing and complex. The storm drainage system does not function well overall because no one is responsible for the total system. For example, the City maintains drainage facilities only in street rights-of-way and on City property. Elsewhere, they are the responsibility of the individual property owners. As a result, little maintenance is performed on private property. New development is required to install adequate facilities on-site, but limited resources are allocated to maintaining or upgrading existing facilities.

Our recent work in this area has been directed at reviewing all drainage policies and regulations and working to shape those individual parts into a coordinated stormwater management program. In 1985, the North Carolina Water Resources Research Institute collaborated with the City to evaluate Charlotte's existing stormwater policies. The principal researcher was Dr. H. R. Malcom, a civil engineering professor at North Carolina State University. Dr. Malcom made several recommendations, some of which have been implemented. (A copy of Dr. Malcom's report is available in the Council library.) Below is an update on the three primary issues.

Drainage Improvements on Private Property

In 1978, City Council adopted a program to assist private property owners with correcting erosion and flooding problems on private property, funded through a $1.5 million bond referendum approved that year. Requests were handled on a first come, first served basis with the involved property owners required to share one-third of the cost. Participation was low due to the relatively high cost to individual property owners, and in 1983, the citizens' share was reduced to one-fifth. At that level of cost participation, demand stabilized at approximately $500,000 per year. A bond referendum was approved in 1986 intended to finance the program for 5 years.

It was recognized that there was a much greater need for funds for drainage projects, and increasing the City's share of the cost would increase property owner participation. In response to recommendations by Dr. Malcom, Council adopted revisions to the policy in September, 1987 designed to prioritize drainage problems and direct the limited funds available to the most severe problems. As a result, problems are now ranked in one of three categories. High priority problems (approximately 20% of requests) receive first priority for Engineering resources and 80% funding of improvements. Moderate priority problems (approximately 70% of requests) receive second priority for Engineering resources and 50% City funding. Low priority problems receive only technical assistance on how the property owner can address the problem on their own. Since September, 1987, the Engineering Department has been preparing estimates and petitions for the high priority requests on file. When that work is complete, studies will begin on moderate priority requests.

The Engineering Department has recently received two major neighborhood petitions for storm drainage improvements in accordance with the Storm Drainage Repair Policy. These projects are in the high priority category and represent a total expenditure of $890,000. This would commit nearly two years worth of available funds at the $500,000 per year funding level. Consequently, the proposed FY89 allocation has been increased from $500,000 to $1,000,000. A public hearing on the two petitions is scheduled for April 25.

Maintenance of Drainage Facilities on Private Property

Dr. Malcom identified that maintenance of existing drainage channels and culverts--the majority of which are on private property-- is a significant link in the management of stormwater runoff. He suggested that it is a "level of service" issue for a municipality--that is, the more resources invested, the better the drainage system can be expected to perform.

Last summer, staff explored options ranging from the present policy of the City performing no maintenance of drainage facilities on private property to one of accepting full responsibility. City Council reviewed and discussed that information in October, 1987. Since a source of funds for this type activity was not readily available, no decision to accept any more responsibility was made at that time. This issue will be addressed again during an upcoming study of drainage regulations and funding options (described below).

Land Development Regulations

Present regulations establish standards for drainage facilities installed by developers. These standards insure adequate facilities on the properties being developed. To help protect downstream properties, a detention requirement in effect since 1978 requires developers of commercial, institutional, and multi-family property to limit the rate of stormwater runoff to that which existed prior to development.

The Engineering Department has been working closely with the Mecklenburg County Engineering Department to develop a County-wide stormwater management ordinance and technical specifications to regulate private land development. City and County staffs have developed a consultant contract which will (1) create an ordinance which requires developers to contribute to stormwater runoff management commensurate with the increased runoff caused by development, and (2) identify associated funding sources and how revenue generated can be used to address related stormwater issues such as maintenance and upgrading of existing facilities. Maintenance on private property requires a minimum expense of approximately $500,000 per year; capital improvement needs are in the tens of millions of dollars.

The City and County staffs have jointly selected a consultant to perform this work; the recommendation for Council award of the contract will be presented

to Council sometime in April. Key tasks in the study and anticipated dates are outlined below.

September, 1988 - Determine possible elements of the City and County's future drainage programs, including:

- Administration, Financial Management and Program Development
- Planning, Design and Engineering
- Maintenance and Operations
- Regulations and Enforcement
- Capital Improvements

December, 1988 - Identify and evaluate financing options, including but not limited to:

- Construction Fees in lieu of On-site Detention
- Storm Drainage Service Charges
- Impact Fees
- Revenue and General Obligation Bonding
- Federal and State Funding

January, 1989 - Develop for City Council/County Commission review outlines of ordinance options, including the basis of any fees, estimates of revenue to be generated and administration requirements. City Council and County Commission will select the desired option at this time eliminating any further work on other options.

April, 1989 - Draft the selected Stormwater Management Ordinance and any necessary enabling legislation for adoption.

June, 1989 - Prepare a manual of technical standards and specifications as a comprehensive resource.

Based on our discussions with County staff, the cost of the consultant's work is to be shared equally between the City and County. The total contract costs are outlined below:

Development of Ordinance and Manual	$166,220
Reimbursables	$ 28,780
Additional Services Allowance	$ 20,000
TOTAL CONTRACT AMOUNT	$215,000

A citizens advisory committee has been appointed, consisting of representatives of the land development industry, design professionals, and the general public. The committee will meet with the consultant quarterly during the project to provide input, and comment on the consultant's findings and recommendations.

NOTES

PROCEEDINGS REPORT

Mayor and City Council Retreat
January 8-9, 1988

Introduction

The Mayor and City Council retreat focussed on selected City Council policies in the following specific areas: Transportation, Economic Development, 2005 Plan, Finance, Capital Improvement Program, Balanced Growth and Housing.

The retreat format involved both small group discussion and discussion by City Council as a whole. The purpose of these discussions was to review each policy and, if needed, clarify the policy, revise the policy, or identify the policy for major review at a later date. The Councilmembers were also asked to review the impacts of these policies and identify impacts of any proposed changes to the policies.

The retreat agenda is included on the following page, followed by a summary of the policy changes receiving consensus at the retreat, and the policy changes that were identified for review.

AGENDA

Mayor and City Council Retreat
January 8-9, 1988

January 8

10:00 - 10:15	Retreat Planning Committee's Report
10:15 - 10:45	Brief Overview of Policy Book
10:45 - 12:00	Small Group Discussion: - Transportation
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch
1:00 - 2:00	Full Group Discussion: - Transportation
2:00 - 2:45	Small Group Discussion: - Economic Development - 2005 Plan - Finance - Housing - Balanced Growth
3:45 - 5:00	Full Group Discussion: - Economic Development - 2005 Plan - Finance

January 9

9:00 - 10:30	Overview of Capital Improvement Budget and Financing Policies
10:30 - 11:45	Small Group Discussion: - Capital Improvement Budget and Financing Policies
11:45 - 1:00	Full Group Discussion: - Capital Improvement Budget and Financing Policies

Summary of Policy Changes
and Policies Identified for Review

Policy Consensus

1. Review impact of a combined transportation project priority list for roads and intersections

2. Develop and review transportation options; i.e., reversible lanes

3. Approve list of 1987 Transportation Projects

4. Reorient the Citizen Participation process to up-front citizen education

5. Conduct a transportation symposium which would include a community discussion of regional transportation planning and transportation methods, including light rail.

6. Develop recommendations to reduce road construction time

7. Continue existing economic development policies

Policies Identified for Review and their Current Status

1. Review policy of dedicating auto tax revenues to the Transit Fund
   Status: To be discussed during the operating budget workshops

2. Review financing of Capital Program
   Status: To be discussed during the CIP workshop

3. Review road construction policy options; options were narrowed to·

   a. Construct all high priority City roads; all high priority (non-numbered, inner City) State roads; fund planning for high priority numbered State roads, and continue participation in State roads.

   b. Construct all high priority City and State roads, include roads outside City sphere of influence.

   Status: Referred to Transportation Committee

4. Review policy of funding upgraded sidewalk and landscaping in State roads within City limits
   Status: To be discussed during the CIP workshop

5. Establish a mission statement and goals for City economic development efforts within six months
   Status: To be discussed at a City Council workshop on economic development in May or June.

6. Review the use of proceeds from City's economic development program (i.e., Coliseum Center) for economic development efforts in depressed areas
   Status: To be discussed at a City Council workshop on economic development in May or June.

7. Review using the same criteria for both City economic development loan funds
   Status: To be discussed at a City Council workshop on economic development in May or June.

8. Review including retro-fitting as a priority in funding of capital projects
   Status: To be discussed during the CIP worhshops.

9. Review Convention Center Expansion by referring to Committee or hold on review until Light Rail Committee completes its work
   Status: Referred to the Planning and Public Works Committee.

10. Review use of conservation districts as an alternative to historic districts
    Status: To be discussed with City Council as part of the legislative package.

11. Review the funding for the HOV lane and northern right-of-way for Independence Boulevard
    Status: Council made a decision to include these projects in the CIP at the February workshop.

Results of Policy Discussions

Transportation

The City Council agreed to the following policy changes in the area of transportation:

- Combine the road and intersection lists
- Approved the list of road projects to be funded from the 1987 Transportation Bond

Council developed a consensus on the following transportation items:

- Transportation is their number one priority
- Citizen participation should be reoriented to up-front citizen education
- To conduct a transportation symposium that is a community discussion of transportation methods, particularly light rail
- The need for regional transportation planning
- Develop a list of additional transportation options to solve problems (i.e., reversible lanes, one-way streets)

The Council discussed the following transportation road policy changes, but reached no conclusion:

- Eliminate the dedication of auto tax revenues to the Transit Fund
- Change road funding policy to either Option III (Fund all high priority City roads; all high priority non-numbered State roads; planning for high priority numbered State roads and continue 25% ROW acquisition for State Roads) or Option IV (Fund all high priority City and State roads).
- Fund qualitative improvements (i.e., medians, buffers) to State road projects that the State cannot fund.

The Council had a conversation concerning the road building time span and requested that the Manager bring back to them methods to decrease that time span. The Council also discussed the need for a strategy for the outerbelt.

Economic Development

The Council made no changes to the City's economic development policies but did develop a consensus that the Development and Revitalization Loan Fund and the Community Development loans should include a criteria that would help coordinate these funds with the Business Corridor Revitalization Funds.

The Council's discussion focussed on the following policy changes but no decisions were made.

- Both the Development and Revitalization Fund and the Community Development loan fund should have the same criteria.

- The proceeds of the City's economic development programs, such as the Coliseum Center, should be used for economic development in depressed areas.

Council discussed the need to establish goals for their economic development efforts. Council requested that staff review the existing policies, develop new recommendations, and report back to Council with a mission statement in six months.

2005 Plan

The City Council made no changes to the 2005 Plan policies, however some members of Council expressed an interest in the possibility of using conservation districts as an alternative to historic districts. Council discussed delaying staff work on forming new historic districts until conservation districts are reviewed, but no consensus developed on this issue.

Finance

The City Council gave direction to the City Manager to develop a Capital Improvement Program budget based on issuing debt in the first five years and continue to use pay-as-you-go capital, or, issuing more debt in the first five years by eliminating pay-as-you-go capital. Council also decided to revisit the dedication of the auto license fee to transit.

One group of Councilmembers suggested that the policy of avoiding tax increases should be restated to emphasize, "Every effort should be made to avoid a tax increase. However, property tax increases may be necessary to replace federal and state revenue losses and high priority capital needs."

Housing

The Council reaffirmed the 1987 Housing Policy Plan and its role in Community Development, emphasizing the need to effectively utilize local and federal resources. Discussion centered on emphasizing code enforcement efforts without causing problems in relocation and displacement. Council discussed strengthening the housing code and enforcement activities.

Balanced Growth

The Council reaffirmed the existing policies to stimulate growth in the northwest, northeast and southwest, and to use water and sewer lines to direct growth to the northeast and northwest. Council requested staff coordinate these policies with the economic development programs.

Capital Program

Council discussion of the Capital Program resulted in the following:

- Transportation: Suggested additional funding for the Independence Boulevard project to purchase the northern right of way and fund the HOV lane.

- Housing: Decided to focus on increased code enforcement by strengthening the Housing Code and increased targeted code enforcement

- Economic Development: Council affirmed the stated policy and agreed not to include the Convention Center Expansion in the Capital Improvement Program. However, no consensus was reached during the retreat on a process for considering this project. Since the retreat, the Convention Center Expansion project has been referred to the Planning and Public Works Committee.

- Cultural Facilities: Council affirmed its $15 million commitment to the Performing Arts Center and approved the 50/50 financing policy assumption for cultural facilities. Some Council Members stated a desired future goal is to establish an endowment for maintaining cultural facilities.

Some members of Council also expressed an interest in adding a criteria for retrofitting of older neighborhoods to the Capital Projects criteria, but no consensus was reached on this item.

Information Requests

During the course of the retreat, the Council asked for follow-up on various pieces of information. A list of these requests follows:

- Review federal rules that make it difficult to acquire right-of-way early
- Arrange a visit with the U.S. Secretary of Transportation during the League of Cities meeting to discuss the federal grant for the Independence HOV lane
- Update Council on City Fair
- Provide a status report on the Arrowood jobs program
- Provide a report on the Back Creek lift station
- Investigate the issue of private housing groups being turned down by the Community Development Department
- Include housing code enforcement legislation in the next legislative package
- Provide report on funds available from the Housing Trust Fund
- Report on the status of the Housing Policy Plan
- Investigate the reasons for Raleigh's low per capita debt
- Report on enforcement activities relative to citizens who put their leaves in the street
- Review the possibility of using Airport and funds for economic development venture capital
- Investigate the fund balances of other AAA cities
- Provide a status report on storm water drainage
- Explain the four priorities used in ranking capital projects
- Bring the impact fee issue back to the Council
- Develop a plan for a cleaner City and a report on the activities of the Clean City Committee.
- Develop policy information for distribution to the community
- Review the use of mini-parks

(Note: Staff is preparing a report providing the answers to these requests or a status report on the work.)

During the retreat, the City Council also suggested workshops on the following topics:

- Transportation Policy Statement, Symposium and regional planning.
- Housing Code Enforcement
- Area Planning
- Independence Boulevard: Acquisition of land for the concentric alignment; and Funding of HOV lane

NOTES