

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Budget Workshop on Wednesday, February 3, 2021 at 1:35 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Matt Newton, Greg Phipps, and Braxton Winston II.

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmember Watlington

Mayor Lyles said members of our community, we are conducting an electronic meeting in accordance with all of the laws of the State of North Carolina. We hope that the community will watch this meeting either on the City's YouTube Page, the Government Channel or on Facebook. This is the first of the beginning of our follow-up to our Strategic Planning around the positions and strategies the City Council has adopted and would like to move forward including them in the budget process.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 1: WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said it's that time of year again, where many consider this to be the most important policy document that the Council will vote on, which culminates in June, but we start today with our first Budget Workshop. If you will go back to the Annual Strategy Meeting, we talked about utilizing the first Monday of the month and then the Budget Workshop, which is the first Wednesday of the month to tackle some big issues and concepts.

Today, we will start off with a robust discussion about the CIP, the Capital Improvement Plan. Unlike years before, we are at a place where we are going to populate a CIP or better yet, some bond cycles beginning not this year, but next year and every two years thereafter. One of the things that's important for us today is to set a level, if you will, about where we are and where we can go. But we need that input from the Council and the community. So, we are going to roll out a series of what I would call all-stars today to get us going. We have Ryan Bergmann, who's in the room, as well as Kelly Flannery, the Budget Director, and the CFO that play a tremendous role in getting this document together. I can see Ryan has his budget book by his foot. It's about how many pages, Ryan when it's all said and done? There are hundreds of pages, okay. But what's important is as we can start to deal with some of the items today, so we will talk about where we are off the General Fund, our Revenue Update, and periodically, that is what we do at these Budget Workshops. From time to time, the Mayor will turn to me and ask, is the revenue picture any better? Because as the revenue picture gets better, it helps us to address some of the concerns on the expenditure side.

Also, we'll have a discussion on our Five-Year Capital Plan, as I discussed earlier, Advanced Planning Program, which was a new development that we did a couple of years

ago to help us to have better estimates for our projects before we would put them in a CIP and eventually go before the voters for a vote.

We also have in the CIP discussion, we have Phil Reiger, Jennifer Smith, and Liz Babson, who will help us through a series of projects that are in this Advanced Planning Fund and where we are now. We'll have a summary of the bond programs. Mr. Driggs, I think you've asked for this over the course of the last year or so to have an opportunity to, if you will, plug and play with various projects and how they impact our capacity and the timing of certain projects. So, with that said Mayor, what I'd like to do right now is turn it over to Ryan. Ryan will give us an update. Before I turn it over to you Ryan, I forgot to mention that Tiffany Blackwell will also give us an overview of community engagement. As you know, putting a budget together without getting community input is a recipe for disaster that we try to avoid at all costs and Hannah Bromberger will talk a bit about where we are with some of our current CIP programs.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: GENERAL FUND REVENUE UPDATE

Ryan Bergman, Budget Director said you grilled me earlier on the exact number of pages in the Budget Book, and I'm 0 for one today, I looked at it, it's 457 pages. So, I know that's important. I talked about the General Fund Revenue update at our Annual Strategy Session a few weeks ago. What I said at the time was we would actually be getting quite a bit of information from the County in January. Fortunately, the information that we have gotten from them, has been mostly positive news. So, let me walk you through about 4 or 5 slides on the information we've gotten since that Strategy Session and how it is fairly helpful to us as we plan this budget.

The first thing which is already up on the screen is the property tax evaluation information that we've gotten from the County Assessor's office. So, every year when we build a budget, we are just making a forecast for the following year. What you'll see on that first column, the FY2021 budget, that's what we expected. That's what we built the current budget around; \$125 billion in value and real property and \$146 billion total. Fortunately, we've received some good news from discoveries and things that the County Assessor's office has been working on, that we did end up about a percent higher in this current budget than we had anticipated. So, that adds about \$3.5 million to the current year's budget, which helps account for some revenue dips in other areas due to COVID, but that's also important as we're very forward-facing with these Budget Workshops. This means that the starting point of our forecasts for next year is a little bit better. So, I also showed a slide last time that showed we dipped a little bit in property tax collection rate last year, and we were very concerned about the property tax collection rate this year. We received some more good news here that where we are right now are through January 31, compared to last year is a very minor difference. So, that means that if we're going to see some kind of a property tax collection dip, it's not going to be catastrophic, we're already at 96.38%. The Tax Collector's office did express some concerns on if we'll get

up to 98.9% or 99% based on some business bankruptcies and things like that. So, we may still end up half a percent or a percent lower than we did last year, but that's something that we can manage through. The base starting point where we are right now, this is certainly positive news.

Then not a lot of changed here, this is sales tax. We've got one more month of data, which I did circle there for you with about 4% less than last year. And so, as you can see from those four months, it's very clear that we're reasonably steady with a little bit of a dip, but we're pretty close to prior-year levels. Where this will be really interesting is when we get to January, because as you can see with the red line, we had built this year's budget with the anticipation that we would be back to normal in January and then really starting growth again in the final quarter of this year.

So, this doesn't really update our forecast from what we had a month ago, but it's another month of reasonably positive data as we build this budget. So, then the final slide, this is just an update on what that means. A couple of things have changed. We got the property tax information, which I mentioned, but we also got a lot deeper with some of these smaller revenue sources from departments, and we're still working through some of those. A couple of those were a little bit less than anticipated. But overall, what you're seeing is about \$2 million better in revenue than we would have projected a month ago. So, what that means is without a salary increase, we're actually net positive right now. So, you can say that we are not locked into anything with a deficit at this point. If we build to a salary increase, we still have an \$11 million challenge, which, as I mentioned last month, is fairly normal and consistent with many years in Charlotte's history, the last decade. So, I have a team of very impressive and intelligent Budget Analysts that are working with directors on options to try to close that gap in the most reasonable way possible. So, with that, that is the update a little bit more positive than last month, which is good news. We still have a decent challenge and we'll be working on it through the remainder of the budget process.

Councilmember Ajmera said Ryan if you could go to slide number 3, you'd mentioned about half a percentage that we could see in an impact compared to last year, what does that translate into in terms of dollars?

Mr. Bergman said every percent is about \$4 million. I can tell you that right now we're holding in our forecast 98.5% collection rate. The last few years it's been 99% that we've held in the budget. So, we're already planning on a slight dip due to the pandemic. But if we have to go below that, it's \$2 million every half percent. Ideally, things continue to look good and we are able to increase it back up to our normal levels.

Ms. Ajmera said the last slide that you presented, so this is being accounted for in that formula that you have on the last slide?

Mr. Bergman said correctly. So, our forecast, which I should mention is primarily done by Dr. Tazifor, who's our City Economist, who does a fantastic job. He is holding in his

forecast a slight dip to 98.5% because it is the conservative thing to do at this point. Ideally, it will increase a little bit, but it is possible that will be normal for this upcoming year.

Councilmember Driggs said Mr. Bergman, I just wanted to clarify, when you talk about these collection rates, I mean, the way it works is you have delinquencies and then you have the final collection. So, do these numbers reflect the ultimate un-collectability that we anticipate or how do we adjust for just late payments and the collection process?

Mr. Bergman said I believe in the collection process, they have maybe another month or so before they start to publish delinquencies in the Observer. But all this is collecting right now is what's actually been paid. Everything beyond that will be payments that are made up until June 30th. So, if you look at last year, some of those payments may have occurred on June 30th, May, and so on to get to the ultimate 98.9%. The other point I'd make, Mr. Driggs is just because we don't get the money by each fiscal year, we actually are able to get it in future years. So, I'm kind of in the weeds, but for every budget, we are anticipating about \$5 million of revenue from old budgets.

Mr. Driggs said that was kind of my point. So, the assumptions that we're making could be slightly pessimistic, given the possibility of the subsequent collection of unpaid taxes. Correct?

Mr. Bergman said correctly.

Councilmember Phipps said on slide one, the slide that talks about the slightly anticipated growth in the evaluation and you basically said that was resulting from some County discoveries. Do you anticipate any downward surprises from the County as we move in the Budget Cycle?

Mr. Bergman said there's two pieces here. This is what we projected in the budget last April versus what actually happened. I think most of the numbers on there, other than maybe vehicles are fairly firm from the County. But then the County also gives us a projection on their end that we use in the upcoming budget year. I know in the past we've brought in Mr. Joyner to a Budget Committee to talk about some of these details. We could do something like that again, but they do give us a forecast. Our economist works off of that forecast. I can tell you that the forecast that our Economist was using for next year ended up being within .001% of what the County is projecting. So, I was pretty proud of Dr. Tazifor for there. But when we're working on next year's budget, it's really a forecast with the educated information we have.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I would before we go into the next section, and thanks, Ryan. A couple of things I'd like to reiterate that we discussed a bit at the Annual Strategy Meeting is that one, and it's just kudos to the team, both the Financial Management Team, but also the operations folks. We since last March have basically been providing core

services for the City without missing a beat. I'm very proud of everybody that's out there from first responders to individuals and Solid Waste, C-DOT (Charlotte Department of Transportation), or General Services of Water. What I will say is that we ended FY20 with a surplus, given all that was going on. As we continue to work through FY-2021, as Ryan said earlier, in terms of the salary increase and us being in the positive territory without it, and somewhat of a negative territory without counting the salary increase, it doesn't mean that we aren't trying to achieve a salary increase for our employees for FY-2022. So, that is what we're working on as we continue to have updates and address the revenue situation as well as the expenditure situation.

The other thing I'd like to just comment because I'll do this next section and then hand it back off to the team. There'll be a number of questions that absolutely we can answer today. There will be many questions that we may not be able to. We have a team that's taking these questions down so that as we have subsequent Workshops, we can have these answered. For the individuals who have been through multiple budget cycles versus a single budget cycle, typically what we do is take the questions. We have an answer and we will give those back to you prior to the next Workshop. With that said, I would like to go into the Capital Investment Plan and do a bit of an introduction with that.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: INTRODUCTION TO FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN

Marcus Jones, City Manager said as we think about our budget, we have Enterprise Funds, we have the General Fund, but we also have this Capital Investment Plan. We're at a very different place going into FY22 than we have been in the past few years. I'll just begin to do a little bit of a backdrop. As we talk about the Capital Investment Plan, what has been typical in the City is that you have a series of bond cycles that start off with a tax increase. I'll give you a spoiler alert is that we are not suggesting or recommending any tax increase to do what we're planning to do for the next series of bond cycles. What goes into a Capital Investment Plan? Typically, we have a great deal of time talking about Affordable Housing Bonds, Neighborhood Bonds, the Transportation Bonds. There's also a piece of the Capital Investment Plan that does not go to voters for approval, and that is our Certificates of Participation. Typically, that allows us to build Fire Stations or Police Stations or even our building needs. There are things that we're doing with the SEAP (Strategic Energy Action Plan) that's related to sustainability that we do with these Certificates of Participation. Then outside of that, we do have what would be the Capital Investment Plan that actually goes to the voters every couple of years. And we have affordable housing, which last year was \$50 million. We have Neighborhood Bonds, last year was \$44.5 million, which was made up of C-NIP (Comprehensive Neighborhood Improvement Program) and about \$14.5 million for Corridors of Opportunity.

Then lastly, and normally, what is the biggest pot are our Transportation Bonds, we had almost \$103 million at this last bond cycle for just Transportation Bonds. That would be anything from sidewalks to road projects such as Bryant Farms Road. But what's unique

now is that we've closed out the Big Ideas. Even though we've been talking about these past four bond cycles and many of you have had input in the last two, they didn't start two years ago or four years ago. They started way before then. So, I'd like to do the last series of bond cycles. If we start off with what occurred in 2006, we basically had a bond cycle which covered four years. You only have three up there because in 2012 there was no bond, but at 2.67 cent property tax increase was approved to support this bond series. And so, the original plan was about \$390 million over those three bond cycles, which averaged about \$130 million per bond cycle.

Councilmember Watlington arrived at 1:58 p.m.

What actually occurred was different than that, and over those three bond cycles, it was closer to \$550 million dollars, because as you go through a bond cycle, much like the last two where we had planned \$15 million originally for affordable housing and we're able to go up to \$50 million, that's why you see the actual bond being different than the original. That's not the case for this series, but that's an example of how a bond can increase. If we go to what we call the big the Big Ideas. So, in the Big Ideas, there was an additional 3.17 cent property tax increase in order to support four bond cycles, 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020 with 2020, the most recent one that's been approved.

Initially, the original plan was for those four bond cycles to be \$627 million, or an average of about \$156 million per bond. What was actual was closer to \$784 million, or an average of about \$196 million per bond. So again, what changed. We look at the asterisks in 2018. How did we jump from the \$164 million planned to \$223 million? Well, one of the key drivers there was taking the Affordable Housing Bond from \$15 million to \$50 million, and that actually ripples out into 2020 also.

I do want to bring back to that everybody's memory that there was a quarter-cent increase in the property tax and that quarter penny increase helped support affordable housing, but it also helped us with Public Safety and what we were doing with pay. We had a situation where we're losing a number of officers and we were able to address that somewhat through the change in the public safety pay plan. If we go to where we are today, so the Big Ideas are behind us and now I don't know what this Council will deem the next four cycles or the next two bone cycles, but there's this opportunity to populate these cycles from scratch. Again, the key is no additional property tax increase in order to have bonds that are averaging about \$198 million per bond cycle. When you start to look at the Big Ideas, the average bond being \$196 million, we are right in line with this capacity over the next four bond cycles. I know it sounds like a lot, but before we leave today, we will show you that when you start to talk about road projects and what we like to do in the corridors as well as affordable housing, we can eat that up pretty quickly. But again, the good news for me is that we're starting off with a series of bonds that we do not have to have a property tax increase to begin conversations around them. But, also the Council on the front end is providing input on what we should be focusing on in terms of priorities. One of the things that is important that you'll see is that there are road projects and those road projects are significantly more than some of the road projects that we

have had in the past. Before I turn it back over to Ryan, I'll just summarize it on the last slide. Today's Workshop, we will have presentations dealing with the Advance Planning Fund, the capital program summary, and the Five-Year CIP scenarios. I will tell you that as we begin this process, things will change. I think what's different when I say things will change is that there will be priorities that change over the years with different Councils. But what's good for us today is that we have this opportunity to begin a discussion about what is a priority, as opposed to a City Manager dropping something in your lap on the first week of May and saying this is what we have. So, we really appreciate the opportunity to have this dialogue.

Councilmember Johnson left at 2:00 p.m.

Councilmember Driggs said first, I'd like to note that I heard the Manager saying no tax increase. On that basis, I'd like to move to approve the Manager's budget for this year. But I do have a question. If you go back to slide four, you've got \$627 million for the Big Ideas Plan. In fact, the nominal value of that plan was over \$800 million. So, is this only the publicly approved bond portion and did the \$800 million include COPS (Certificates of Participation) and PAYGO (Pay-As-You-Go), and other capital sources?

Mr. Jones said Mr. Driggs yes, this is the publicly approved portion of it and Ryan will go north of \$784 million, do you know what that includes?

Ryan Bergman, Budget Director said the average Big Ideas when you included COPS, which as a reminder included the police station was \$56 million every two years. So, that would add a little above about \$225 million in COPS to this with what actually happened.

Mr. Driggs said right so that's how you get to over \$800 million, which was the nominal amount of the original Big Ideas Plan. So, on that basis, when you talk about \$198 million of capacity, are you including there the COPS or any PAYGO, or does that refer only to the publicly approved bonds?

Mr. Jones said it refers only to publicly approved bonds and what we have in the plan right now is \$14 million every bond cycle for COPS.

Mr. Bergman said \$14 million every year, \$28 million every bond cycle.

Mr. Driggs said as we go to populate the CIP and we will see as we have in the past, a clear sort of publicly approved general obligation bonds and COPS, right?

Mr. Jones said yes.

Mr. Driggs said just so everybody's clear COPS is basically secured debt that we are able to issue because it's collateralized without going to the public. So, that's a separate funding mechanism and we need to keep sight of the fact that there are general obligation

bonds that are approved by the public and the COPS that we can authorize ourselves and then also track the total of those.

Mayor Lyles said I would add Mr. Driggs, that is a Council adopted a policy in our budget because it does have to be secured. It does have ramifications on the types of other things that we have to do and so just to make sure everybody knows there's a policy foundation for why COPS and why debt.

Councilmember Eiselt said Mr. Manager, I have a question on your final slide. Well, if you go back to slide four again or stay there, each one of those bond cycles did for whatever reason, Affordable Housing Bond or whatnot, exceed the original plan by in the end, on average 25%. So, with the final plan of \$198 million for the next four bond cycles, are you comfortable that in fact there's a good chance that could go over even less than a total of 25%? But how much cushion do you feel you have available if that were to happen?

Mr. Jones said I don't know if I would call it cushion Ms. Eiselt. This is just a new way of thinking. So again, when I got here in 2016, I guess that was right before the 2018 bond, there were concerns as it related to some projects, not necessarily the estimates being correct. Some of the projects had to go back in and we had to refine the estimates. What's different for these next bond cycles and why I'm comfortable with the \$198 million is that we have this Planning Fund which we're starting off by trying to get to 30% design before we populate any project in the CIP. As we go forward, and if there's more capacity because we are able to because the resources that populate the revenue side of the CIP, if they get better, then you would be able to have more capacity. If something changes that we're not able to have those resources, the capacity would potentially go down. But this is just a Steady State saying where we are now with the inputs that we have, we feel comfortable that you're able to have \$198 million every bond cycle for the categories related to Housing, Transportation in Neighborhoods.

Ms. Eiselt said so in a Steady State then, if what you're saying is in your 2022, there actually ends up being another \$20/\$30 million increase to something which we all agree we really want to have happened like we did with the Affordable Housing Bond, then you are rolling in that change, you're essentially going to defer other projects in this four-year cycle, is that right?

Mr. Jones said correct. There are a couple of ways of doing it. One is we could figure out how do we finance this differently, right or if some of the bonds, maybe a little bit higher, maybe some a little bit lower. But you're correct. Ultimately, this is what we would call par that if we're to populate a bond with \$198 million worth of projects every two years, we feel comfortable that is within the financial constraints that we have.

Ms. Eiselt said okay. I guess the reason why I mention that is because if we tell people we're going to build a new pedestrian bridge for you, whatever, everybody is excited about that, but then we find we have to roll projects out, then I guess what you're saying is to

make sure that people understand that this is fluid and that not every project is really that scheduled in for the four-year cycle.

Mr. Jones said well, maybe if I could try just a little differently, is that they going to be choices and if the Council decides that something is a higher priority than another item and for whatever reason, that gets you above the one \$198 million Steady State, the question becomes what becomes delayed or what do you not do or do you raise taxes in order to make this Steady State even higher? So, there are options on the table.

Councilmember Watlington said the question I have Mr. Manager was, and I may be getting ahead of us, but when we talk about the scale of transportation projects that will be included in the CIP, I know it's much smaller than when we talk about some of the bigger things in the Mobility Plan, but just so that I'm clear, how much of the Mobility Plan assumes that they are projects included there that are also covered here, or is have we assumed any overlap?

Mr. Jones said you are getting me into Monday, February the 8th. But what we will do today is Liz Babson will talk about some of the projects that are in the Planning Fund and how they could be populated in the CIP. What I will say is that right now, if we try to put everything in the CIP over the course of the next four bond cycles, there's not enough capacity to do that. So, as we talk about the Mobility Plan, that is transit and transportation, and the transportation piece being roads and sidewalks and greenways and bike facilities, that would be over and above what would be a normal CIP. All we're doing today is talking about a normal CIP that is constrained, is financially constrained, and because it is financially constrained, there are only so many projects that we can do and stay within these limitations.

Mr. Watlington said let me ask my question differently. Are we to assume that some component of those transportation projects from the Mobility Plan will show up here or given that we already know that not all fit, we're not planning to necessarily include them?

Mr. Jones said right. The Mobility Plan includes some transportation projects, those projects will in their entirety not show up in the CIP because of the lack of capacity. So, to some extent, that's why there has been a discussion about the Mobility Plan because the Mobility Plan would allow us to accelerate some projects that would allow this region to have more connectivity. But that isn't contemplated in the CIP because of the constraints that we have.

Councilmember Phipps said just to piggyback off of comments that Councilmember Eiselt mentioned, about changes to the plan, I know to populate the CIP, we get considerable input from the public. So, in as much as subsequent Council should come in and have other priorities, do we still have a transparent process to which we would inform the public of changes that are contemplated to the plan, you know, like reconciliation or just a general change process. Do we still have that kind of a process in place when it comes to the public?

Mr. Jones said yes, Mr. Phipps, we do. I'll give you two examples. So, in the last two bond cycles of the Big Ideas, it was not contemplated to have the Affordable Housing bond go from \$15 million to \$50 million. So, that's part of the change. It was not contemplated to have the Corridors of Opportunity, which was about \$14.5 million, as well as congestion mitigation projects, both in University City, Steele Creek and South Charlotte. All of those projects resulted in the actual bond being more than the original and only if we took a project out, I think, for instance, there was a project related to the River District, if we're to make a project out, we would take a project out because maybe it's no longer relevant or we don't have the private sector leverage or investments to go along with it. So, it is always a transparent process that is before the public because when you vote on this budget, you will see the changes in the plan.

Councilmember Ajmera said I wanted to follow up on Councilmember Eiselt's question earlier about the 2020 actual versus the original plan. So, I know in 2018, with affordable housing and infrastructure and CIP, we had approved a higher amount for an actual bond. I know that CIP and neighborhood improvement we continue to have a bigger list of improvement projects as our need continues to increase for affordable housing. So, what would 2022, 2024 look like if we're to have a higher bond amount in 2020? So, as you put together multiple scenarios in front of Council, I'd be interested in seeing if you were to increase the upcoming bond amounts to meet the growing needs, what would the capacity look like in later years?

Mr. Jones said that's a great question, Ms. Ajmera, and those are one of those things that we'll put on the list and we can give you some examples of how that could change. Yes.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I'm also considerate of the point that my colleague, Mr. Driggs had made of our tax increase. We had to be careful, especially with this pandemic, about additional tax increases. I'm trying to figure out what is the capacity that we have to meet the growing needs without putting the additional tax burden on our residents, at least for the upcoming bond referendum, for affordable housing, for CIP, and for neighborhood development? Obviously, that's a separate conversation from Charlotte Moves, and I recognize that.

Mr. Jones said \$198 million every two years going out is the capacity. As we start today, that is where we are. That takes into account everything that's happened in the past, including moving from the original bonds to the actual bonds, taking into consideration raising additional bonds for affordable housing, Corridors of Opportunity as Ryan and maybe Hannah go through this interactive model with you, I think that will answer a lot of the questions that you have. If they don't, then I would address them again. But a lot of this is going to show as you start to plug and play some of the projects, how does that impact that one \$198 million, not only in 2022 but beyond?

Mr. Bergman said if I could add one thing, Ms. Ajmera. Some of the questions we've been receiving are about the original plan for Big Ideas versus the actual. Part of that was Affordable Housing. Another part of that is where they were in FY-14 in their debt model

versus what actually happened. So, an example is just this past month, our Steady State actually increased some because of that same property tax information that we got from the County. So, our CFO handles the debt model. If in a year we exceed the projection and anything, we may get a little bit more capacity that builds into our model, which can work going forward. Of course, that does work the other way. But in the example of the Big Ideas that did add some capacity as we along.

Ms. Ajmera said I understand. The other question I have is, I know because of the cost structuring model we had in the past where the costing was not done up front for many projects, and as a result, we had budget shortfalls for many capital projects. How many of those projects we still have, I know House Charlotte Trail was one of them. Are there any additional projects that were part of our bond referendum that is part of our budget shortfall?

Mr. Jones said I'm not sure that I would call it a budget shortfall. But if the question is, have we identified all of the Big Ideas Projects that have some level of uncertainty with whether or not they can be funded at the approved rate, that's the document that Phil puts together. I think during the budget process where we have the red and yellow lines with projects that have some level of concern. So, I know that we will get that to you. There are still a couple of projects that have a concern, but it is light years better than where we started a couple of years ago with those projects.

Ms. Ajmera said so, yes, I'll be interested in seeing that list as you're looking at our capital funding for the next five years. Let me ask you a question a little bit differently. So, if there was an amount that was approved by residents for one project and it did not get completed within that amount or within that budget that was approved, what happens in terms of the time frame, does that get rolled into the next capital budget cycle?

Mr. Jones said well, I guess there's a bunch of ways to answer that question. If there's a project that's in the CIP, that the estimate was, let's say X, but once you go through the full design, it's X plus three, how do you make up the plus three? Over the years, there have been projects that needed additional funding and we would have come back to Council, showed you the list of the projects that need the additional funding, and either change that in the CIP or we would use any type of savings from refinancing or any types of savings from closing out projects to make up that gap. So, it's not as if we would not do a project because of funding. We would try to find a way to get the project done.

Ms. Ajmera said yes because that's the commitment we had made to our residents. OK, thank you, Mr. Manager.

Mayor Lyles said I just wanted to say that on the presentation when we talk about the Advance Planning Fund, I think that is really something that is essential. I think referring to both Councilmember Eiselt and Ms. Ajmera's statements and several others of you have made the statement that if we commit to something, it needs to have a plan. It needs to have beyond reasonable, some financial backing that says this is the dollar amount.

We all know that life changes things and we all know that there might be volatility and cost, and especially now. But I think that one of the things that I'm looking forward to is learning more about how do we do Advance Planning to ensure that the projects are viable as well as within a certain range of certainty for their financing ability. I think that's been something the Council may want to look into a little bit more and I like the Budget Committee to actually review in close depth. I mean, because I think that's where we talk about a project in our project out or project going forward. It's just really an important thing that we begin to hit the mark because that's a part of our commitment to the public.

Mr. Jones said I'd like to add that I thought we had gotten past this. So, in the 2014 Big Ideas, nobody in this room was a part of that. They had no rigor in it, it didn't have the analysis that we're doing with this Advanced Planning Fund. So, yes, they were going to projects that are part of the 2014, 2016, 2018, 2020 bond cycle that didn't have the level of review before they went into the CIP. So, we have two new things. We have this Advanced Planning Fund and we have a Steady State model that says this is what we can afford. As we move forward, that scrutiny is built into the process, but I can't go back in time and put a scrutinizer process that began in 2013.

Councilmember Bokhari said I just want to pile on to that because hopefully the public and everyone who is watching this has picked up on the fact that this Steady State model that we see enables us to ensure we know what we're signing up for is actually inside of our bank account. What we can pay for over time. The Advance Planning Fund is it's a miracle one that we're doing it. Two, that it wasn't done before and we're all still alive. I think this Advanced Planning Fund is the difference between what used to be called a Big Idea and what now we can refer to as a good idea. So, that is, in my opinion, and what I've seen over these last almost four years and then what I watched from just my community seat. The years before that is nothing short of revolutionary in how you're running this. I just say, you know, we all still have a lot of things to figure out, but thanks to you and your team's work, we're standing on a firm foundation now as we do that.

Mayor Lyles said agreed.

Mr. Driggs said, first of all, I was going to point out a couple of things that have been said. The Big Ideas Plan was 3.17 cents in additional taxes. It was billed as something that would fund basically over \$800 million of capital investments over four bond cycles and basically, the revenue assumptions and the cost assumptions veered way off the original concept. So, in fact, there was more debt capacity than the original plan programed. And as we know, the cost of the projects, the timing of the projects veered far away. We had situations where we had to reauthorize old bonds because 7 years had gone by and we hadn't even started work on the project. So, suffice to say, it is good news that we have improved our capital scheduling and planning and that we have this bond capacity analysis.

I will mention that when we do these bond authorizations, they are marketed with a description of the capital projects. But if you look at the actual referendum, it doesn't

itemize. So, the actual referendum kind of identifies certain amounts of money that are available for housing and so on. One of the things that have happened historically is that because of contingency that was built into the budgeting process, it would sometimes be unused bond capacity left over and Council treated that as available for investment in similar projects. I just want to make clear that our commitment to any particular CIP project as a result of the bond or authorization is not an actual promise with reference to that project, to the public that is binding. The only thing that is binding is that we use the money in accordance with the language of the referendum, which doesn't name the CIP projects. I also wanted to comment the actual Steady State analysis is based on assumptions, and I think in response to Councilmember Eiselt's question, we could say, all right, we are assumptions conservative or aggressive. Do you think that those amounts that you built-in will be exceeded or could be exceeded? Because certainly over the course of the Big Ideas thing, the assumptions were exceeded. It may be, therefore, that we actually have more capacity as time goes by. We also have issues like past capital projects that we may decide not to pursue at all, which could free up some capacity for the conversation you were going to have now. I guess Manager, my question to you that is in that context, when you look at the notion of whether you're a Steady State analysis is conservative or aggressive, is it your expectation that we will in all likelihood match or even exceed the assumptions and in fact, we will end up updating that analysis as we must on an ongoing basis with the result that we could have more capacity in the future?

Mr. Jones said absolutely. As Ryan mentioned earlier, it's been updated even since the Annual Strategy Meeting. As the data comes in and if the data is rosier than what we have now, absolutely that gives us an opportunity to update. But what I believe you want from us is to give you something that is not too conservative and not too aggressive, but something that we can hang our hat on, given the data that we have right now. And that is what you have.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: ADVANCED PLANNING PROGRAM

Ryan Bergman, Budget Director said in this session we'll talk about the Advanced Planning Program. We had started this in FY20, and we put some projects into it. I'm going to turn it over to Phil Rieger, our General Services Director, who was actually the Budget Director when we did this, who will talk a little bit about the program. Then we actually have Liz Babson our Transportation Director and Jennifer Smith, our City Engineer, that will talk about some of those actual roads and intersection projects and what we've learned about them over the last year and a half.

Phil Reiger, General Services Director said as Ryan said I'm the Director of the Department of General Services, to my right is Liz Babson, Director of Charlotte Department of Transportation (C-DOT) and Jennifer Smith, Charlotte City Engineer. The three of us are going to give you an update on the progress made with the FY-2020 projects approved for Advanced Planning and Design. I'll spend just a few minutes

reviewing the purpose of the Advance Planning and Design Program and how it works. Ms. Babson will take a look at and talk about project prioritization and selection, which ultimately leads to City Council's action to move projects into the Advance Planning Program. Ms. Smith will give an overview of each project that's currently in the program and what we've learned about them so far. So, just to give just a little history about the program, the program was derived from the lessons that we've learned from the CIP Big Ideas. As Manager Jones explained the previous four bond cycles. The Big Ideas CIP was developed with an emphasis on bold new ideas and robust community engagement. While that program was well-intended and yielded good projects, in many cases it lacked the planning and design discipline and as a result created downstream challenges, including challenges managing project scopes and budgets. So, in FY-2020 City Council approved and funded the Advanced Planning and Design Program to restore the planning discipline. The FY-2022 budget also included advanced projects for Advanced Planning and Ms. Babson and Ms. Smith will talk about those in just a moment.

Let's talk just a little bit about how the program works. The program is intended to allow staff to take approved projects through a planning and design process. We like to get projects to 30% design so that project scopes are well developed, and cost estimates are well informed. This process takes about 18 to 24 months. The information that we get from the process can be used then to make budget decisions about future bond programs, which is what we're talking about today. Once a project is budgeted in the CIP, the dollars that are appropriated for the planning and design of that project are then used to refund the advance planning of the design program so that we can use that money for future projects. In addition to better cost estimates, this program advances projects such that when bonds are approved, the project is much closer to going to construction. This means the community sees the project breaking ground much sooner after the bond referendums, and they experience the benefits of the projects sooner as well. This program really becomes the pipeline for priority projects. So, at this time, let me turn it over to Liz Babson and Jennifer Smith to talk specifically about the project.

Liz Babson, Transportation Director said before we go into reviewing the projects that are moving through the advance planning fund, I'd like to take a moment and talk about what you see on the slide and how we really have some good foundational policy work to develop that list and identify those potential projects. So, as a starting point, we've done substantial work in developing transportation mobility policies that build complete streets and advance our goals in building a connected mobility network for all users. These policies are focused on safety with our vision zero policies, prioritizing investment on our most dangerous corridors, which are also often some of the most congested corridors in our City. These policies are also focused on building a connected network, especially for pedestrians and cyclists, because that's an area where we have under-invested in the latter part of the last century. We want to make sure that we're supporting access to transit because that's one of our strongest tools in managing congestion on our streets as our City continues to grow. So, it's all of this important policy work that lays the foundation for prioritizing these projects that move into our current capital program. So, you'll see on the slide before you that prioritization criteria. In selecting those projects that move into

advanced planning, we evaluate our entire transportation system and rank the areas in greatest need based on things like safety and congestion across the entire City. It's those projects that are then evaluated so we can see if the investment creates that greater connection in our network and if we can leverage other investments made by the City, NC-DOT, or the private development sector.

Before we jump into the list of projects and give you an update on those today, I just want to do this as a reminder and let everyone know what makes a complete street and why is that so important? It's really making sure that we provide for all components necessary for all users of the system in a connected way. It includes things like center space, which is important for turn lanes to deal with congestion, landscaping, creating a tree canopy that we prioritize here in the City, and pedestrian refuge. It obviously provides travel lanes for motor vehicles, but also pedestrian and bicycle facilities and then an amenity zone that can include things like additional street trees and landscaping and lighting. Why are those complete streets really important in building our City? Well, it's about connecting our residents to the places and the services that they need and ultimately offering them choices in how they get there. So, our complete streets that include things like safety components. It addresses equity and responds to economic growth and it, again, is an important tool in helping us manage congestion that comes with the growth of a great City.

Real quickly, I'll show you visually what that looks like with a project that's on the ground with a real example. Here's a photo of Rea Road prior to completing a CIP project from Colony to NC. 51. And then here's that same section after. You'll see from the before and after photos that these are components of the complete street with pedestrian and bicycle facilities, street trees, and street lighting, as well as pedestrian scale lighting.

Now Jennifer and I will review the FY20 Advance Planning Fund Projects. Then we'll turn it back over to Phil to give you an update on segments 10 and 11 of the Cross Charlotte Trail. Here's a map of the Advanced Planning Transportation Projects that were added in FY20. You'll see at the top we have two road projects and then two intersection projects. Shown on the map, you can see where they are geographical across the City. I would like to point out real quickly, based on the discussion that occurred earlier, as Mr. Jones mentioned, there are only four that we moved into FY20 Advanced Planning because we understood and were aware of the existing financial capacity that we have in our capital program. Councilmember Watlington, I'd also like to add and as Mr. Jones described in responding to you, that the basis behind the Transformational Mobility Network, which is what you hear us talk about a lot today, is really about taking some of these same types of projects and doing more of them and accelerating the pace at which we do them.

Now, we'll start with Bryant Farms Road two, which is one of our two highest priorities for road projects in the City. You will see on this map there are five North-South corridors shown in gray and there are only two East-West corridors shown in yellow. When there aren't sufficient East-West routes, as in this example in this area of the City, many of those trips have to travel on some portion of those North-South routes to get to their

destination. What does this do to traffic? Well, it means that more traffic is added to those already congested corridors and intersections on those East-West routes, and it increases the frequency of crashes that we see in our network. So, the value of a new street like Bryant Farms Road alignment can be seen in the relief that it provides to the other quarters surrounding it. And this wide connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists doesn't exist today. So, just as a reminder, you'll see shown in green phase one, which was funded for construction in the 2020 bond, and then shown in blue is phase two, which is the section that we're talking about today. It's a little over 1.2 miles long and when completed will provide that East-West connection from Community House to Ardrey Kell.

I'd also add there's extremely strong community support for this phase two because when we went out and did public engagement during phase one, the residents absolutely see the value in this complete connection in that area of Charlotte. Then just real quickly, if you can see on this map, I'm not sure how well you could differentiate with the colors, but each intersection that's indicated with a yellow or red, or orange dot shows that the level of congestion that we have in this area. And again, it supports the point that East-West connection can really help relieve congestion and improve safety at many intersections and corridors throughout the area.

Additionally, in the last two years alone, for example, we had two fatalities on Rea road as a result of some of that intense congestion that we see in that area. Now I'll turn it over to Jennifer to update you on where we are with the project.

Jennifer Smith, City Engineer and General Services said we are currently building a two-lane road with a multi-use path between Rea Road and Audrey Kell Road. We're planning that intersection improvement at Rea Road, Audrey Kell Road, and Tom Short Road. At Tom Short Road, we're considering both a roundabout and a signalized intersection. We are coordinating with the school that's there on the Southern corner to make sure we meet their needs with either the roundabout or the signal intersection. We're completing 30% design in September of this year, and the current costs that we're seeing are in the range of between \$65 million and \$75 million.

Ms. Babson said so, now we'll move on to Robinson Church Road, which is one of our second high-priority road projects across the City. Robinson Church Road was actually one that we looked at prior to the Big Ideas CIP in the last decade. We identified it as a need that many years ago. We started the initial planning at that time but did not have continued funding in this Big Idea CIP to complete this road project. Since that time, as many of you know, and if you're familiar with this area, we have continued to see high residential growth along the corridor and traffic has increased significantly. While each development has made their required improvements adjacent to their development, there's still significant gaps along the corridor that really don't allow us to see those improvements being fully utilized because they're not connected. So, there is congestion along the corridor and particularly at the intersections, with travel along the corridor being about 25% higher during peak times. As I mentioned, with congestion comes also crashes. So, this street is one of our classic examples of what we call a farm-to-market

road, which means that it was built with the bare minimum standards and basic requirements for car travel. So, there's really no turn lanes or no pedestrian facilities, bicycle facilities nor street lighting. You'll see here, this is what we call a hotspot map that shows the crashes along the corridor. Speeding is the biggest contributing factor in those crashes. The patterns of crashes are really concentrated in the curves and at the intersections. Along this corridor, we've had three fatalities in the last 5 years. I'll turn it over to Jennifer for an update on where we are with the project.

Ms. Smith said on Robinson Church Road we're looking at widening this roadway to a three-lane section that would allow for turn lanes. The widening would also include and allow for landscape medians, curb and gutter, multi-use paths for bicycles and pedestrians, planting strips, and where needed, pedestrian refuge islands. We're also evaluating a roundabout at Plott Road intersection. The 30% design will be completed in September, and our current cost projections for this project are between \$55 and million \$65 million.

Ms. Babson said all right, now we'll move on to Ashley Road, Tuckaseegee Road and Freedom Drive intersection improvement project. This is one of our top two priorities for intersection projects in the City. This intersection has been on our high injury network for more than a decade. We've seen fatal and serious crashes for all modes, meaning drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists. There are no bicycle facilities through this intersection. The pedestrian facilities are fairly substandard, with the minimum back of the curb sidewalk. Significant congestion during the peak periods because if you're familiar with this area and off to the left of the screen is the interchange with I-85. So, it's fairly congested and definitely congested during the peaks such that we see travel times about 30% higher during the peaks. Additionally, its close proximity to I-85 just makes it very difficult for pedestrians and cyclists in this current design to navigate through that intersection safely, which is concerning because the intersection is actually adjacent to the County's Valerie Woodard Center, which results in a lot of pedestrian activity and high transit ridership on CATS facilities. So, it's important to CATS, as well because several of their high ridership bus routes go through this area.

I'd also like to bring to your attention, here's an example where connectivity is really important. Currently, we have 3 miles of continuous bike facilities that have been built through previous CIP investment and it goes from this intersection into uptown connecting neighborhoods like Enderly Park and Wesley Heights. But when a cyclist reaches this intersection, it is a barrier and it's not safe for them to cross. There's really no comfortable way for them to access the businesses and services along Freedom Drive. So, improving this intersection to provide those safe facilities is important.

Ms. Smith said so this concept plan for Ashley Road, Tuckaseegee Road, Freedom Drive intersection chose improvements that extend turn lanes and adds pedestrian refuge islands and wider sidewalks that make the intersection safer for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross. It also adds planting areas. We can add additional trees in this area that is somewhat of a concrete desert out here. The 30% design will be completed by December,

and we're currently looking at costs in the range of \$13 million to \$17 million for this intersection improvement.

Ms. Babson said moving on to our second intersection is at Eastway Drive and Shamrock Drive, which again is one of our top two priorities for intersection improvements across the City. This location has had a significant crash history and has existed for at least the last two decades. I'm personally familiar with this because more than 23 years ago, when I was hired by the City of Charlotte, I was the Safety Engineer, and this was an intersection I looked at as one of my first projects. There have been several fatal and serious crashes, again for all modes, motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists. Since we have seen that crash history for the last two decades, I don't want you to think that we didn't try to respond to some of those conditions, we have. We've been making minor adjustments over the last 20 years to try to improve conditions by making signal operational changes. We've added signage. We've done additional pavement markings in an effort to all make this intersection safer and mitigate for some of those crashes. But really, nothing has resolved the many issues that occur at this intersection. As you can see from the aerial, it is very skewed and that's the biggest challenge is because it creates some significant site distance issues for motorists trying to make turning movements, but particularly for the pedestrians and cyclists if they choose to navigate this intersection.

It's fairly congested like the others in the peak periods, with travel time being about 30% higher during that time. As I mentioned, another level of complexity is you'll notice there is a 5th approach at this intersection, and that is Frontenac Avenue. It is not signalized, but there is a fire station on Frontenac and that does have a signal but is only activated for fire access when they need to exit and respond to calls. So, what happens when they respond to calls is, they preempt the signal so they can get out into the intersection safely. They do that many times a day, as you might imagine. And it creates a lot of confusion for all of the other motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists trying to navigate through here. Pedestrian facilities are pretty substandard. The skew of the intersection results in some really long and misaligned crosswalks. So, it puts the pedestrian in areas sometimes where it's difficult for the motorists to even see them. One approach even doesn't have a marked crosswalk because it's just too unsafe for us to operate it in a way that we feel comfortable. No bike facilities at this intersection. And again, it's a critical intersection for CATS because they've got a couple of high ridership transit routes that travel through this intersection that connect to the Blue Line as well as across town route that provides access to Randolph/Billingsley medical area. This intersection was also identified as a high priority improvement when we did public engagement for a CNET project that I'll mention in just a moment.

Additionally, it is a high priority for NC-DOT since Eastway Drive is a state route and at this point, NC-DOT has committed \$8 million to the project. Real quickly, here's another example of where creating a connected network is important and helps us manage growth and congestion as we are a growing City. The City has made a lot of investments in this area. The map you see shows all of those projects that are either underway or have recently been completed. The intersection is shown to the right of the map with the yellow

star. The red line shows active projects that include bike facilities like Matheson Avenue streetscape, The Plaza Street conversion, and Shamrock Drive complete street improvement project, which was the CNET project that I mentioned just a moment ago. It also helps connect neighborhoods like Villa Heights, Plaza Hills, and Plaza-Shamrock, key destinations like the LYNX Blue Line shown in blue and Cross Charlotte Trail shown in yellow to the left of the screen, and the Brier Creek Greenway shown in green on the right of the screen.

Ms. Smith said what we've looked at is modifying this intersection at Shamrock Drive and Eastway Drive by constructing new connector streets, and with that it allows us to remove the left turn lanes from the intersection, making that intersection more efficient through traffic going through. We're also adding a multiuse path along Eastway Drive and adding buffered bike lanes, sidewalks, and planting strip on Shamrock Drive that will tie into the Shamrock Drive street project that has been completed through the CNET Program. Thirty percent design is completed on this project and our current estimate is a total of \$39 million with the \$8 million coming from the state. That leaves \$31 million for the City's contribution.

Ms. Babson said before I turn it back over to Phil, I would like to make mention of one project that's moving through the Advanced Planning Fund and was added FY21. I want to provide a real quick update on that. We received notice from NC-DOT last year that the CRTPO would receive \$24.8 million in bonus allocation for the I-485 managed lanes projects. This is fairly new legislation and it was passed in 2013 by the state. But the cool thing is, it provides incentives for local funding that goes toward additional projects in a community when they support a highway tolling project. So, we recently received similar funding for projects in conjunction with I-77 Managed Lanes Projects. So, in order to get prepared to compete and receive those bonus allocation dollars that we found out about last year, we rolled 3 projects into the FY21 Advanced Planning Fund, and those were Rea Road, Audrey Kell Road, and South Boulevard I-485 interchange.

These projects were selected because the criteria for VA funding requires that the project be along the corridor and we knew we needed to do some preliminary design work necessary to compete for that funding. So, I'm happy to report that the Rea Road project competed successfully for those funds. The CRTPO approved \$6.67 million in funding for this project at their January 2021 meeting. General Services will continue to move that project through the process, and we'll have 30% design and cost estimates later this year. The scope of the project is to widen Rea Road from I-485 to Williams Pond Lane and really mitigate the traffic congestion in that area.

Then real quick, that's not the only good news. So, in addition to the Rea Road project, the City actually was successful in receiving funding for two more projects, but those will be constructed by NC-DOT. So, we're receiving VA funds for three of four projects that were awarded. The fourth one is in Pineville. The two additional projects in Charlotte are also in District Seven are US-521 widening from Providence West to Ballantyne

Commons Parkway and Weddington Road and McKee Road intersection improvement. With that, I will turn it over to Phil.

Mr. Reiger said I'm going to transition to talk about the Cross Charlotte Trail and I want to do a little bit of level setting before we do that before we talk about segment 10 and segment 11 of the trail, which are in the Advanced Planning and Design Program. Many on Council will remember in FY-2020 that Council advanced the Cross Charlotte Trail by appropriating an additional \$54 million to fund nine segments of the trail that had been through a planning process and thus had legitimate cost estimates. As of today, two segments are complete. Two segments are under construction and five segments are in the final design and right away acquisition phases and will be transitioned into construction soon. By 2025 segments one through nine of the trail are scheduled to be complete and those segments are represented by the green line here on the map. Also, the County will complete its two segments by that time as well. So, by that time, people will be able to move 22.5 miles from North to South along the trail. Now, recognizing that the two most Northern sections of the trail at that time had not been through a planning process City Council approved placing segments 10 and 11 of the trail in the Advanced Planning and Design process. So, with the following slides, I'm going to talk about staff's findings from that planning effort on those two sections.

So, starting with Segment 10, Segment 10 is a 1.44-mile section of trail, that parallels North Tryon Street. It intersects with Mallard Creek and connects the trail to the PNC Pavilion up here at the top of the screen. This section of the trail has gone through and we have completed 30% design and the estimated cost is \$9.5 million.

Now moving on to Segment 11, Segment 11, the final section of the trail, was originally conceptualized to connect PNC Pavilion to the Carolina Thread Trail at the Cabarrus County line. The alignment followed Mallard Creek adjacent to residential neighborhoods around the Mallard Creek Wastewater Treatment Facility before it dead-ended at the County line at what we anticipate to be the future connection with the Carolina Thread Trail. After studying the alignment, it became apparent that it would require multiple bridges and boardwalks to navigate stream crossings and wetlands in the area. In addition, the topography in this area is very challenging. We found that navigating around the Wastewater Treatment outfall there at the Southern part of the Wastewater Treatment Plant was particularly challenging.

All that said, the project would cost tens of millions of dollars to build on this original alignment. So, as a result, the team went back to the drawing board to see if there was a more affordable alternative to achieve the benefits comparable to the original alignment and also preserve our ability to connect with the Carolina Thread Trail in the future. This represents the alternative that we looked at and the alternative is represented on the map by the yellow or orange line. This alternative alignment follows the beginning of the original alignment and connects the trail to Kempsford Drive here on the northside of the neighborhood. There's also a spur to the north that connects a multifamily development located off of North Tryon Street. This alternative connects 605 dwellings and gives them

access to the Trail. This alternative connects only five fewer dwellings than the original alignment. The original alignment connected 610 dwelling units. This alignment connects 605 to the Trail. Because this alignment uses the original alignment, none of the City's investment is lost when it's time to connect to the Carolina Thread Trail. In conversations with the Carolina Thread, folks, the current timeline for the Carolina Thread Trail up in this area is still unknown and has not been published. So, this alternative is still in the planning process, 30% design could be achieved by September of 2021. Based on what we know today, the alternative is estimated to cost \$8 million to \$11 million. This alternative optimizes access to residents of Charlotte. It does so with an eye towards connecting to the Carolina Thread Trail when the time comes, but it does so at a significantly less cost. So, as a result, this alternative is the staff's recommended and preferred alignment that we're presenting to City Council today for consideration. So, with that, that completes our presentation and we're welcome to take any questions that the Council may have.

Mayor Lyles said well this is a lot of information. I think overarching what I heard is that this Advance Planning process is serving us well now for the decision-making that we have today and I know that we've got several Councilmembers that want to speak, so I'm just going to dive right in.

Councilmember Watlington said I've got a few, some of them can be answered now, some of them may take a little longer, so I'm just going to put them out there and we can go from there. I know we got a lot of people in the queue. So, the first question that I have was on Advanced Planning, if you could back up to the first slide. I just would like a little bit more context around the prioritization piece. So, you talked about what the criteria is. I just like to know, is there a level of risk assessment done when it comes to obviously you won't get to 30% until you're out of the exploratory phase but or on the front end is there any conceptualization of this could swing \$50 million so we know is too big to start this process? You can answer that offline. But I would like to understand how we get projects even to consideration from a cost standpoint to go in here before we allocate resources.

Ms. Babson said we do what we call feasibility work and we do that before we put a project into the Advanced Planning Fund. So, we are looking at exactly what you just described. We're trying to make sure before we spend those kinds of planning and design dollars that we believe we have a feasible project

Ms. Watlington said fantastic. Thank you for that, that what I was looking for. The next question is, and this is really maybe a question for the Council. So, Madam Mayor, we can maybe add this to the discussion. But this one is a philosophical question. Are we wanting to look at the big rocks first or are we thinking about we want to get as many small impact improvements done as possible? Then the other piece of that is as we think about value add scope, when I think about complete streets, right. Having a new street is better than a complete street in some ways. In other ways you would say, well, no, I'd rather go ahead and invest incomplete streets on an existing street for safety reasons, for instance. So, I'd just like to hear a little bit from the other Councilmembers about how

they're planning to approach that. The next question was in regards to the prioritized road improvements. I just want to know; I know that we added prioritization criteria for the Advance Planning piece. I'd like to understand how we're trying economic development into these transportation investments. The reason I ask that is because as you look at, for instance, the intersection with Ashley Road, Tuckaseegee Road and Freedom Drive, one thing that you'll see there is where the parking lot, where the Boost Mobile, Coin Laundry, and Planet Fitness is, you see at that intersection there's a lot of parking lot space. Right. Which one could probably assume that there's a desire to increase density there at some point? I'm just wondering how we're targeting private investment in places so that we know that this is going to spark something here. We can make sure all the front end we have connected those dots. Does that make sense?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I just confirmed with Ryan we do have a whole team that's taking questions. So, if there's something that we don't have a response for right now, we'll do that through the normal process. Yes.

Mayor Lyles said we will get the question addressed and out and I think we can have a discussion about how to do this. Maybe we should plan a section of the next Workshop to say we've got the questions, what discussion do we need that that might help facilitate action because we will have the answers by then.

Ms. Watlington, you had this as a Council discussion about whether to choose the big ones or the small ones. I just want to remind Council that in this 2020 bond you did have congestion mitigation funds to address what we would call the small one Steele Creek, University City, and South Charlotte. So, I would say Liz Babson is excited because there are opportunities to do some of the things that we can do now and some of the bigger projects that are down the road.

Ms. Watlington said then the last question that I had was just to make sure I'm interpreting what I'm seeing here. I'm seeing almost \$200 million worth of projects with these. Is the idea that these are the ones that are ready in the hopper and that this would take up the balance of the first bond cycle?

Mr. Jones said so I'll take the first crack at this. It will be ultimately the Council's decision. I will tell you why we started off with these. They were the highest-ranking projects and I did make a decision to draw a line somewhere. I think if we did all of them, let's see if we did 20, I don't know that is the right thing to go down and do number 19 because you have more funds versus dealing with the projects that would release the most capacity as we try to deal with moving people around. So, we selected the highest-ranking intersections and road projects. And as you'll see a little bit later, for 2021 the Advance Planning Fund does have additional road projects and intersections, but it's up to the Council how you address these, whether it's over eight bond cycles, 12 bond cycles, three bond cycles. That's the beginning of the discussion.

Ryan Bergman, Budget Director said Councilmember Watlington if I could add, later on, we have a bond scenario presentation, which is only five or six slides. The reason we have that is to have a touchpoint with Council to have those types of discussions where you can understand if we put all four of these big projects into our five-year CIP, what does that mean for other types of projects like housing or corridors? If we only do one, what does that mean? If we do zero, what does that mean? So, that should be a solid starting point for that type of discussion.

Mayor Lyles said I'm really interested in the Council discussion of like, you can get two roads in a housing bond and \$8 million for everything else. So, maybe you do two intersections, one road. This is going to be really a great discussion. I think it's one that really adds value because it's just a growing City like ours. Mr. Jones, you said project 19? If we're not going to address it some other way I'm going to just say personally, I think property taxes are more regressive than any other tax in a City like ours, especially when we talk about the areas that of opportunity that we have and displacement and gentrification. I just really feel like we ought to be making our property tax essential services, safety, you know, the ability to keep our City clean. We're struggling with some of that. But I just think that it's going to be a great discussion and look forward to those comments.

Councilmember Newton said I'm going to follow my previous question up at another time. But I want to thank both Liz and Phil for their presentations. I think complete streets, the pictures are in our materials are beautiful. So, those pictures of Rea Road, and I'm excited about the possibilities here. I figured that there are some areas, so, in some of these projects, there might be some other projects that are currently underway. I can speak to the Robinson Church Corridor, particularly the intersection at Robinson Church Road and Highland Avenue. There is a traffic signal that is planned to be installed there. It's my understanding that that should be installed around April of this year. So, my first question is, should we approve these projects or even start to talk about the approval of these projects and give them an indication that we're going to follow through? What impact, if any, would that have on some of the existing projects that are currently underway on these corridors? I think that's really more directed towards Liz. The C-DOT question pertaining to the complete streets.

Ms. Babson said the traffic signal that you mentioned, I believe, is being funded by the developer and was part of their development requirement. As we move a project through planning and design, we will absolutely continuously update the information on existing conditions and make that part of the final project.

Mr. Newton said just so I'm clear. So, we're incorporating those into our grander plans for the complete streets so that they complement one another? Is that what I'm hearing?

Ms. Babson said Yes, sir. That signal would be installed before we even complete the design work. So, that wouldn't be an issue.

Mr. Newton said okay, and my hope is, that with other improvements, infrastructure, and transportation-related improvements in these areas where the complete streets are being proposed, that would likewise be the case, the complementing of the currently existing projects, even ones that maybe have yet to be completed beyond our potential approval of these projects in this year's budget. Those being included in complementing the larger scale on complete street projects. I noticed that with the prioritization criteria they seem to be and have the propensity to be somewhat fluid. I think one of the criteria was crash data. I know that's not always fixed, particularly if you have an area that is due to growth is experiencing heightened traffic. There could be the possibility of that heightened traffic leading to increase crashes in the future, thereby for that one criterion, thereby maybe creating a different priority in the future. I'm kind of wondering, but are we continuing to review other areas, look at their priorities, and assuming that we move forward, adopt these projects, what room do we have to also consider additional projects that seem to or appear to take on more of a priority themselves, maybe even competing with the ones in front of us here today?

Ms. Babson said let me try to answer that from a couple of different perspectives. So, we are constantly taking traffic counts across the City all the time. We have a really good handle on where we see growth and increased traffic and congestion. Similarly, we are constantly working hand in hand with the CMPD and we received their crash reports on a daily basis. As a pattern of crashes starts to develop and increase, for example, we are aware of that information as well. All of this feeds into the feasibility work that we do to select projects as well as once we move it into advanced planning and begin doing the planning and design, will incorporate that most current up-to-date information to make sure that we're responding to the conditions as they're changing.

Mr. Newton said that's fantastic. It sounds like this is a coordinated effort with Planning, maybe even the Zoning Department. Having said that, are we able, knowing that there are certain corridors where the growth is going to occur rapidly, Harrisburg Road, Plaza Road Extension, for example, 15-16 projects yet to be developed, many of which have yet to have shovel in the ground. But we know they're going to happen, are there ways that we can start to create some projections here to help us in this process so we can be even further ahead of the curve?

Ms. Babson said I'd like to follow up with you with a response on that and go back and work with the folks from our Planning Department to get you a more comprehensive answer.

Mr. Newton said that would be great. In following up on Councilmember Watlington's question as well. What I'm hearing is, that there are other ways to kind of take bites of this apple and so certainly within these projects here we are looking at these areas more extensively, but that doesn't prevent us from infrastructure traffic improvements elsewhere through other routes or other avenues of our budget, correct?

Ms. Babson said yes, sir and you'll see, I believe, as Ryan moves into the next part of the presentation and you'll hear from Hanna as well, we have programs within our current Capital Budget that allow for those types of incremental infrastructure improvements. So, congestion mitigation, for example, is one that the Manager just recommended, and Council approved this last year. Additionally, we have a sidewalk program. We have a bicycle program and so we are able to do those smaller-scale projects across the City.

Mr. Newton said you read my mind with all of that. Thanks, so much Liz, I appreciate it.

Councilmember Ajmera said first, thank you, City manager, for this Advance Planning process. Great work here. Like Councilmember Watlington had mentioned, I'm looking forward to seeing how we can incorporate all the Advanced Planning projects that were presented into our budget and what budget implications we will have. So, I'm looking forward to that presentation. Liz some of my questions were already addressed when you were responding to Councilmember Newton's question about Robinson Church Road planning. There are a couple of more questions that I have just overall in terms of are there any other projects that are in the pipeline for the state bonus plan that you had mentioned very briefly? So, how many projects did we submit and how many got approved by the state?

Ms. Babson said I would have to follow up and let you know that total list of projects because they didn't simply come from the City of Charlotte. For example, Pineville was successfully awarded one of the four projects that were funded with these bonus allocation dollars. In conversations before we submitted, we knew that NC-DOT was submitting the two projects that you see listed here because they will lead the construction for those projects. Those were two of the highest priorities from a staff perspective when we looked at the data. And so, we submitted Rea Road after we did further work through the Advanced Planning Fund.

Ms. Ajmera said from the City of Charlotte lead two projects, the Rea Road and the 521 widenings?

Ms. Babson said, and Weddington Road and McKee Road is also within the City limits. It is at the border of Mathews Town limits as well.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, so this was the one that awarded the bonus allocation but were there additional projects that came to the City of Charlotte? If you could just send us that list? The other question I have here is, if we can go to the Cross Charlotte Trail, I know the City Manager does expect me to ask questions on this one. Can we go to Segment 11 here? So first let me thank you Marcus, for putting together the design funding and at least having a better estimate than we have had in the past. Certainly, this helps us with the additional capital planning in the future. With this Segment 11 that the proposed plan, how would that look compared to what was originally put in front of the residents? I'm trying to understand how are these two different.

Mr. Reiger said what's in front of you today called original plan is the original line that was drawn on the map. Recognized that when the Cross Charlotte Trail was conceived there was no planning done at that time. It was just a line on the map. It was a concept that got put in the CIP of Big Ideas and this generally represents the line that would have been drawn on the map. When you look at the alternative, you'll notice that the alternative we're proposing really is the beginning of that line on the map. But when we looked at the benefit to our residents, we recognized that we didn't need to go all the way to here to pick up almost that 610 dwellings that's connecting to this street right here and building this spur connected all of these residents to the trail. Then the dotted line just represents that this alternative sets the Trail up such that when the anticipated Thread Trail comes to being, we can connect to it. One of the other considerations that I failed to mention earlier was we were really concerned about leaving a dead-end at the County line, which would have just been a wooded area. It didn't connect to anything. We were a little concerned about doing that and so this alternative again, connects to a neighborhood and offers almost the same benefit to the residents as it relates to access and connectivity as the original alignment.

Ms. Ajmera said I understand that this was a concept, a Big Idea, there was no planning or design done ahead of time before it was put forward for bond approval. I'm trying to understand the alternative that you are all proposing versus the original dotted line. What neighborhoods it would have connected under our original plan and what neighborhoods now, would it connect if the Carolina Thread Trail were to be built in the future? So, I'm trying to understand have the neighborhoods changed? I understand there are 610 homes for the original plan and now it's 605. The variance is only five homes. I'm trying to understand what neighborhoods or are we are changing? Is this a completely different path than originally approved by the residents of Charlotte?

Mr. Reiger said no, ma'am, it's not. I apologize, I was using the cursor and I don't think anybody could see the cursor that I was trying to use to illustrate my points. But the neighborhood that you see to the South of the Trail is the neighborhood that the originally conceived alignment would have connected. We are essentially connecting that neighborhood, again 610 homes versus 605.

Ms. Ajmera said so essentially, you are you saying it's the same route?

Mr. Reiger said it's effectively the same route. It just doesn't go to the County line because there's nothing at the County line to connect to at this point.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, so how far along does it go? I'm trying to understand here I guess what is the difference.

Mr. Reiger said the yellow line on the map represents including the spur represents a mile. The grey dashed line on the map, it goes to the County line is 1.3 miles.

Ms. Ajmera said so that's last 1.3 Mile is not something that is being proposed in the alternative, is that correct?

Mr. Reiger said that's correct because that 1.3 mile does not connect to anything at this point in time. However, when a timeline for the Carolina Thread Trail is received, when we know the timing around that project, it makes sense to us then to tie a connection to the Carolina Thread Trail. But we don't have a timeline for that. And in discussions with the Carolina Thread folks, we're not sure when we'll get that timeline.

Ms. Ajmera said right so that last 1.3 miles, does that only consist of five homes? Is that where the difference of where the five homes come from?

Mr. Reiger said well no, the actual homes that we connect aren't exactly the same homes. So, there's a bit of a difference, but again, the number is 610 versus 605. We will be able to connect up another neighborhood that sort of in the lower right-hand corner of that map. But those homes in the meantime would have to use Harris Houston Road to gain access to the Trail. So, it's not that they don't have access to the Trail. It's that there's not a direct spur that connects those neighborhoods in this alternative.

Ms. Ajmera said got it. So, then the path of the routes is different than what was originally approved if there are different homes?

Mr. Jones said Councilmember Ajmera I'll try to give it a shot. Thanks, Phil, great job. This is very complicated, very complex. One of the things I propose that we do is provide for you what was the public outreach back in 2012 or 2013 whenever this thing started? Because I'm not sure that there was a robust public outreach that said you're going to get this Trail going by your home. I think the beauty of this Planning Fund is that we maintain flexibility, we learn new information and we're able to, I guess, pivot. So, if we went with the original plan, which again was a line on a map that should have considered its wetlands and you'd have to build bridges, that it would be complicated and costly. So, if anything, I own that I told everybody pause because we're not going to spend tens of millions of dollars to connect to nothing. So, how can we then try our best to do what I believe the Cross Charlotte Trail was designed to do. To create this connectivity from the far eastern northern part of the City all the way down to the south. I believe this recommendation gets us there. We can figure out what type of public outreach was given, what was promised. I hate to use that word. If no one really promised that something would go past someone's neighborhood. I think the key is what Phil said earlier from this point and what's not proposed to be constructed today, which doesn't mean it couldn't be constructed later, would connect 605 homes to this Trail. The additional mile or so that would be built actually just goes through the woods goes past the Wastewater Treatment site and connects to nothing. I think that's a future discussion with the Carolina Thread Trail folks because if we go out and end this at a particular spot and that's not where they like to connect, I think that causes a problem. So, what Phil mentioned earlier is that this investment does nothing to counter what was discussed years ago. And if you wanted to continue with the remaining piece of this alignment, you could. It just seems that this

proposal today gives you the connectivity to a boatload of homes and gets us to further advance across Charlotte Trail.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I'm interested in seeing what was promised and what was being delivered and also the neighborhoods that were originally even though it was just the line. Right. I'm trying to understand what were the neighborhoods that were in the original plan versus what is in the proposed plan to really get a complete understanding of what is different? Because at this point, I'm not clear what is different in this plan. I understand from the cost perspective there are huge savings and that is great. But as we are putting out more capital projects for bond referendum approval, I want to make sure that we deliver on those commitments that we have made. I think this is a matter of public trust and this is a matter of following through on those promises. So, I look forward to having more conversations about this and trying to figure it out before I can say I'm comfortable because at this point, I have a lot more questions.

Mr. Jones said I mentioned when we asked you to approve the additional \$54 million for the other segments, it's never been my intention to ever put this Council in a position where they would have to go back to the voters to ask to put the remaining piece of this in the bond. What I said to the Council then, and I will say it again today, is that we will find opportunities, whether it's through refunding, closing out projects, or pivoting from projects to finish what's related to the Cross Charlotte Trail.

Councilmember Winston said I'd just like to point out, as I've heard the previous conversation, and kind of take it into a bit of a different route from a community, what is our role in ensuring community safety? From what I hear the staff telling us that it would be not a smart plan to build a public maintained facility in the middle of the woods that connects to nowhere that dead-end into a sparsely populated part of our City. I think that doing so, you know, you would basically have to spend millions of dollars to do things like patrol that area and get it by creating a dead-end road in the middle of the woods. That would not be something that would ensure a safe community. What I also heard is that originally, we are connecting to the community that we had already agreed to through this spur. That 1.3-mile path, as there are often places on Cross Charlotte Trail, those communities would have to be connected by privately paid connection. So, even if we built that, there's no guarantee that, again, those communities would buy in to create those connections and therefore, again, creating honestly a very potentially dangerous stretch of the publicly maintained thoroughfare and increase the cost of, for instance, CMPD patrol in that district.

So, I, for one, am not for increasing police budgets unnecessarily. I think the staff for making this wise fiscal decision and strategic decision to be and use our tax dollars to the best and highest use. I would like to ask a question to Ms. Babson, about slides it was 23 and 22. We keep hearing from experts that road widening actually does not relieve congestion. It is actually one of the things that we're talking about with our large Mobility Plan. It is also something specifically that we talk about, for instance, when we are doing these bus lane pilots on Central Avenue and 4th Street. I'd like just to kind of hear from

you as we think about policy as it relates to this budget that is going to come out, what is the benefit of widening these roads in particular? Because just now you said it would relieve congestion, but we are under the assumption that it doesn't relieve congestion. In general, how should we be thinking about road widening as we move forward?

Ms. Babson said thank you for the question, Councilmember Winston. I would say it's complicated as you well stated in your question and there is this balance that we have to strike with trying to build the facility that is appropriately sized for the need and the demand that exists. For example, we don't want to add too much capacity because then we have issues with people driving too fast for conditions. Similarly, we're very thoughtful about the width of the lanes that we build when we widen facilities and we keep them appropriately spaced. So, think about the difference in how you travel on an interstate, how wide it is, and the safe zone that exists on either side of you that makes you feel really comfortable driving at high rates of speeds, and compare that to one of our surface streets in the City and the scale at which we build those streets. So, that's a high-level way of describing the balance that we're constantly striving for. Again, there is a beauty to how the users of that street system all come together. There is some level of congestion that we would accept because we do believe that congestion helps slow those speeds down.

Mr. Winston said thanks. I definitely think I would love to have a further discussion at a different point in time around how we should think about kind of what you said as we write policy around our roads and our transportation networks and systems.

Councilmember Phipps said yes, with respect to the final two sections of the Cross Charlotte Trail, I think my colleagues can remember public consternation and frustration that these two segments had not been planned out as much as the other segments have that preceded it. We've just heard that these are the only two sections that remain and other parts of this Trail will be opening, I think someone said 2025. I'm pleased that we got the requisite planning done and we have an alignment that I think makes sense that I would hope that we would proceed with getting a complete Charlotte Trail done. Inasmuch as the Thread Trail is still hanging out there with not a definitive timeline, I hope that would not preclude us from finishing up this project. There is considerable multifamily development going on in that corridor right now, and even a portion of it is in the ETJ (Extraterritorial Jurisdiction). I like where we are compared to where. I look forward to its timely completion.

Councilmember Eiselt said Liz thanks for all of this detail. It's kind of it's a lot to absorb in one sitting, but I think at a more 10,000-foot level and this information and it's kind of going back to my initial question about, shifting the bond amounts if projects change or what not if something comes up. I just want to make sure that even with Advanced Planning and Design, that there is room to have major shifts. For instance, if you have a major tract of land that a company headquarters comes in and wants to purchase, like a Centene, and they say, well we need to have access on and off of I-485 or a state road. We know the state of NC-DOT right now. We know how hard it is to move anything in the

[inaudible]. I'm a little bit curious about what would happen if that were to take place and DOT says you can have the road as long as you're willing to put all that infrastructure in and that really puts everything on its head, but it's a major ED (Economic Development) project for example. How do those priorities integrate and what flexibility do we have in this Steady State Plan to be able to pivot to something like that? Would the Council have to vote on that, or how would that work?

Mr. Jones said I'll take the first crack at it. So, as Ryan discusses this interactive model that I know everybody is patiently waiting to play around with a little bit, there is a section on that we've gone back in time, looked at what I would call public-private partnerships for economic development. There is a placeholder in there for each bond cycle because you are correct, we don't know what an opportunity may be today, but two months from now, Centene could come or there could be an opportunity. So, there is a placeholder in each year of the bond cycle potentially for any type of public-private partnership that has an economic development focus on it.

Ms. Eiselt said okay, that's what I was getting at initially that makes me feel a lot better, and I appreciate that. I appreciate this new modeling, and I'll just say on the Cross Charlotte Trail, I appreciate your creativity with that. My far sight is terrible, but my near site is pretty good, and it looks like that spur gives access to that neighborhood road. If you follow that neighborhood road through and maybe this answers Ms. Ajmera's questions, it looks like those roads connect with almost all of those neighborhoods. It looks like a great way to have all of those neighborhoods have access to the Trail. I agree. I think let's I do agree with Mr. Winston that some of our trails in Charlotte, we've had some major concerns from the public, from high school runners, people that are out there running on the road from a security standpoint. I think this is a really good alternative for right now, saves a lot of money and doesn't seem to really cut anybody off that I can see. And until Cabarrus County comes up and the Thread Trail comes up with an answer for what they're going to do on that segment, I think this is a great alternative.

Mayor Lyles said all right, I just want to follow up on the Thread Trail. I think that if we are going in this direction and instead of spending money on boardwalks and outfalls, it'd be better to help get the Trail completed. If we could determine how much that is or help support the private sector donations, I think that's important. I think there are two things that gave me concern about the existing plan is that security is important for the Wastewater Treatment Plant in these very perilous times that we live. Then I've walked many trails in my neighborhoods and I think bridges and boardwalks, unfortunately, in our community, people love to litter. Just the thought of doing anything in a wetland with a bridge or a trail and people tossing whatever debris they have on a trail is just one of those things that it's something to be thoughtful about as we're doing this. It's great news to be able to have this. I think Mr. Jones, that you are suggesting that we actually go to the next area.

The meeting was recessed at 3:48 p.m. and reconvened at 3:57 p.m.

Mr. Bergman said Mr. Newton asked earlier, there's a lot of typical smaller things that we do in each bond that can add up to as much as a third of the annual capacity or the biannual capacity. So, Hannah Bromberger, who is kind of the behind the scenes capital leader for us, who's been kind of connecting all the departments over the last couple of years, will walk us through a quick version of it, of some of our normal capital programs, which you really need to have a solid understanding of when we get into talking about some of the scenarios in the next section. Let me do the first couple of slides. I had shown this at the annual Strategy Session. These are some of the programs that Hannah is going to go into today. What we're really trying to do is collect questions and feedback on some of these capital programs so that we can better build this upcoming five-year CIP. So, that I'll turn it over to Hannah.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: SUMMARY OF BOND PROGRAMS

Hannah Bromberger, Strategy & Budget said It's just about information sharing so that you have this as background as we look to what's next and begin to think about programming future bonds. The first program that we'll talk about is the sidewalk and pedestrian safety program. This program aims to improve walkability and provide a pedestrian experience that is safe, useful, and inviting. Program funding is used to construct new sidewalks, especially along and across high volume and high-speed thoroughfares. This program is really focused on those busy thoroughfare streets. In addition, this program also connects existing sidewalks by filling gaps wherever there is no imminent private development on the horizon. Funding also provides safe crossings at intersections, at midblock locations, and in school zones. Right now, there are 713 miles of thoroughfare sidewalks and there's a gap of 367 miles of thoroughfares without sidewalks. These projects in this program are prioritized by the Council adopted Charlotte Walks Plan from 2017, which is one of those foundational documents that Liz referenced earlier during the Advance Planning and Design Program power point.

Next is the Transportation Safety Program. You may not recognize the name of this program, we tend to refer to it sometimes as the Vision Zero Program, but it's really important to note that every single piece of work that C-DOT does is rooted in that vision zero philosophy, that the loss of life on our roadways is acceptable. So, this funding is specific to those locations with fatal and serious injury crashes. We know from data that about 10% of our streets fall into the high injury network. So, this funding is targeted in those locations. Projects tend to be a relatively low dollar, but they're intended to enhance safety for all modes of transportation. The funding is used in a couple of different areas. It's used for traffic calming, which includes the installation of speed humps. It's used to upgrade street lighting on thoroughfares to LED lights, and it's for spot safety projects, including pedestrian beacons. These projects are data-driven, and they're prioritized by the High Injury Network and the Vision Zero Action Plan. It's important to note that this program and the work around Vision Zero is built on really strong partnerships.

We have a Vision Zero Task Force that includes over 50 people from 25 different agencies, and they're all working to implement this Vision Zero goal. So, the Bike Program aims to make bicycling safe, comfortable, and convenient for people of all age's abilities and from all neighborhoods. The program funding is used to stitch together a more connected bicycle network by utilizing existing facilities and connecting the gaps in between those facilities. There are currently 201 miles of bikeways, and that includes several different things, that includes bike lanes on streets, it includes separated or buffered bike lanes, and it also includes shared use paths, which includes Greenway's. Improvements in this program are prioritized by the Council adopted Charlotte Bikes plan from 2017 and with the guidance and input from the Bicycle Advisory Committee.

Bridges, this program provides funding to complete the federally mandated inspection, repair, and replacement of bridges based on their structural load capacity. So, the number of bridges in the City changes annually as development occurs, new bridges come into our system and on occasion, sometimes bridges leave our system. NC-DOT may take over control of a bridge or in some instances, if it's over a creek with a culvert, Stormwater may also take over that bridge, but there are currently 218 bridges. There's an important note about what this funding is used for, and it depends on the length of the bridge. So, if a bridge is longer than 20 feet, the federal government splits funding with us for the inspection and replacement of those bridges on an 80/20 split. So, the City is only responsible for 20% of the cost for bridges longer than 20 feet, for bridges shorter than 20 feet, the City of Charlotte covers 100% of those costs, and that's from this program. So, again, this work is federally mandated and is prioritized through a biennial and every other year inspection program where the state produces a list of all bridges with a rating associated with them, and that rating typically dictates which bridges must be repaired or replaced.

So first, traffic control devices are a little bit of a technical term, and when a transportation engineer says a traffic control device, they mean three different things. They mean signs, pavement markings, and signals. When I say signals, I mean the signal itself, but I also mean the loops in the pavement, the signal boxes, the hardware in the boxes, all of those physical components. So recently, in addition to installing and maintaining those traffic control devices, we've also started installing leading pedestrian intervals and accessible pedestrian signal devices, which you may have heard there. Sometimes it's a chirping noise and other times it's a verbal command at key intersections that assist visually impaired residents. This work is also federally mandated by the Federal Highway Association, and essentially what we tell the government is if we're going to install it, then we're going to maintain it in perpetuity. And so, this work is prioritized based on the age of the equipment.

Councilmember Johnson returned at 3:21 p.m.

Councilmember Braxton left at 4:06 p.m.

Traffic Signal System Coordination, so this is a program that is standard on the bonds and we don't get an opportunity to talk about it very much. But this is actually a fascinating program. Lots of really interesting technology is maintained in this program. This is all about the communication network that enables that infrastructure that we just talked about with traffic control devices. This is the communication that allows those pieces to improve traffic flow and to talk to each other. This funding installs and maintains fiber optic cable and traffic management cameras, and together those two things send data back to one central control facility where signal timing can be adjusted accordingly. That means that during peak times, we can adjust signals to improve the flow of traffic. But it also means that sort of on-demand in real-time, we can adjust signal timing. If there is an unusual traffic backup caused by a wreck or caused by a lane blockage or a special event, we can address traffic signal timing in real-time.

All of our cameras are integrated with our public safety system and with the real-time crime center. So, police and fire have access to the exact same data that is coming in through this signal technology. There's one other piece of this program that I want to mention that's really interesting, it's a traffic signal priority. Both the Fire Department and our Transit System have access to this signal priority. What it means is because our systems are integrated, when fire receives a dispatch call, their pad system immediately speaks to our traffic signal coordination system and can adjust the signals along the route to the fire's destination, which allows Fire to get there seconds faster than they could otherwise.

Similarly, for transit, if a bus is behind schedule, they can have this traffic signal priority along their route and have a better shot at getting back on schedule. This fiber and signal software are truly state-of-the-art, and C-DOT deserves a lot of credit for it. It's also the technology that is going to allow our roads to be poised for a future that includes automated vehicles.

Economic Development initiatives, this is a little bit different than the programs we just talked about, we don't ever have something named this a bond, but what we do have is different kinds of projects on the bond that are all geared at promoting job creation, guiding redevelopment, and supporting new development opportunities. During Big Ideas, we had two different kinds of projects. The first kind of project to promote economic development is where the City actually constructs infrastructure ourselves. Usually, the goal is to facilitate a more pedestrian-friendly or mixed-use development corridor and the image on the top of the slide there is an example from the Monroe Road streetscape that's a proposed cross-section of that project where we're adding multi-use paths, adding planting strips, all to sort of facilitate development in that section of the corridor.

The second type of Economic Development Program that you would see on a bond is an infrastructure reimbursement agreement with a private developer, and this is like Eastland Mall. So, a developer is going to build something, and we might put funding on a bond to reimburse them for the public components of that infrastructure. So, the streets and the sidewalks, for example. Well, much of this funding is heavily market-driven, funding

decisions are made in concert with planning documents and, of course, with leverage opportunities. I put all three of these programs on one slide because these were new additions to the 2020 bond, and since the bond was just voted on in November, it has to go through a certification and a contest period after that. So, funding just became available for these three programs on January 22nd.

Congestion Mitigation is a program intended to improve traffic flow in targeted areas through small-scale quick infrastructure projects. And it might look like adding a turn lane or extending a turn lane. These are in targeted areas that are prioritized based on data about congestion and the 2020 bond dollars we're focused on in University City, Steele Creek, and South Charlotte. Street resurfacing is exactly what it sounds like. This is when we resurface City maintained streets according to our resurfacing cycle and just a reminder that we have funded street resurfacing for many, many years. This is just the first year that it was in the Capital Program. This used to be a General Fund supplement to our Power Bill funding from the state, but in this year, in FY 2021, we transitioned it out of the General Fund and into the CIP as one of our COVID-related balancing strategies. And it's really a better alignment anyways of sources and uses.

The last program is one that you're all familiar with, Corridors of Opportunity. This funding renews our commitment to six key corridors. Just a reminder that the \$14.5 million that's listed is specific to transportation infrastructure components. This includes connecting infrastructure gaps and creating mobility options. There was additional PAYGO funding for community engagement, business development initiatives placemaking, and another programming separate from these bond dollars. The work is prioritized by corridor-specific playbooks that were created in partnership with the community. I just want to bring all these pieces together. We just went through transportation programs, economic development initiatives, neighborhood development programs like Corridors of Opportunity, and of course, we have our affordable housing component. The piece that's really missing, if you look back at bonds from the Big Ideas, is that named project piece, the named roads, and the named intersections. That's what we get from the advanced Planning and Design Program. Those are the projects that Phil, Liz, and Jennifer just went through. With all the pieces in one place, we're prepared to start talking about programming future bonds.

Councilmember Ajmera said could you go back to the Corridors of Opportunity slides? The additional \$10 million in PAYGO, is that what the proposal is from the PAYGO fund?

Ryan Bergman, Budget Director said the \$10 million is what was built into the FY21 budget. That's the cash that we had available to support corridor initiatives over the last six months or so. The amount that would be in next year's budget would be part of this budget process. So, that's not a proposal, no.

Ms. Ajmera said so you said \$10 million was the allocated amount right from 2020?

Mr. Bergman said no, the \$14.5 million is the amount that was in the 2020 bond, and then the \$10 million is in PAYGO, which is separate and kind of can be used for different things. For example, is if we're doing a specific economic development initiative or placemaking that would be from PAYGO, the bond dollars would be intersection improvements, transportation focused type things.

Ms. Ajmera said got it. I know that we had talked about this, about increasing our Corridors of Opportunity. There are five or six Corridors of Opportunities. I'm trying to remember now the number; I look forward to increasing that. How much can we use in 2020 so far?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said we can give you an accounting of what we've used so far, and you may recall Councilmember Ajmera from the \$10 dollars million in PAYGO, we had two corridors that, let's say, are further along in their planning than the other four. So, we have had projects both on Beatties Ford Road as well as West Boulevard. What's up next that they're in the planning phase, if you will, are Central Avenue, Albemarle Road as well as we have I-85 and Sugarcreek. So, that's how the process really works. We'll get you an accounting. A lot of as Ryan has pointed out the PAYGO piece, which has \$5 million of the \$10 million set aside for economic development. We have a couple of projects that are in the \$14.5 million CIP piece. But we can give you an accounting. I will tell you that if we really start to look at the funding that is in these corridors, it exceeds the \$24.5 million because there are other projects that are going on over and above this.

Ms. Ajmera said so you said there are other projects that are ongoing above this. Are you talking about CIP?

Mr. Jones said right, if we go back in time in think about the Corridors of Opportunity, we had conversations around hot spots and hot spots turned into priority areas and those priority areas turned into Corridors of Opportunity. What we tried to do is make sure that, as Liz discussed earlier, if there is a list of projects and let's say that there's a project on Beatties Ford Road, don't take me literally, but this is the 50th project on a list, the funds that we set aside for the Corridor of Opportunity were specific for those corridors because we wanted to jump start so you could have a project that may have ranked very, very low, that we are getting done because their dollars set aside specifically for the corridors. But that doesn't mean that the existing CIP or existing PAYGO programs are not also being invested in the Corridors of Opportunity. You get both.

Ms. Ajmera said right, I understand, I think the purpose behind setting additional dollars for us to be innovative with addressing economic disparity issues. I know that were thanks to Tracy Dodson and her team, we were able to come up with innovative ideas and implement those for Beatties Ford Road and West Boulevard because of the funding that was available in our Corridors of Opportunity bucket. I just don't know from looking at those two corridors, what kind of request we are seeing for additional projects. I want us to be flexible because I know that we are trying to focus on our corridors and really tackle the issue of creating economic opportunities throughout the City and address some very high unemployment rates especially along the corridors. I want us to be flexible, but this

pool of funding where we are able to fund as many projects as we can along the corridors. If we have an idea of how much has been spent, what has been the ask in the pipeline, and depending on the trend we have seen along Beatties Ford Road and West Boulevard, I'm sure we can somehow we can forecast what that would look like for Central and Albemarle as well as I-85 and Sugarcreek to plan ahead for our next budget.

Councilmember Driggs said I wonder if we could look at slide four, please. The whole subject of sidewalks is I think a lot of, you know, is quite a sore point in my District. A lot of this District was developed from farmland and many of the roads that we have are old farm roads that have no shoulder on either side. So, no sidewalk and not even a comfortable way to walk along the side of the road. The result is there are places where children are walking to school within a couple of feet of cars roaring by 50 miles an hour. When I'm taking these subjects up, like on Elm Lane and Kuykendall Road, I'm told, wow, Elm Lane, \$5 million. Kuykendall Road would cost \$7.5 million. As they are currently prioritized the prospect that anything actually getting done at those locations is some 20 years away. What I'm wondering is, are we really investing enough in sidewalks? I think we have a backlog that extends out decades and we 367 miles of thoroughfares that don't have sidewalks. Shouldn't we be giving these more priority is our first question? The second one is what kind of acceleration could we expect from the Mobility Plan, which also or is contemplating walking on these various modes of transit or connectivity? So, if that plan moves forward, would we see a bigger infusion of capital into the creation of sidewalks?

Mr. Jones said Mr. Driggs, I'll take your questions inverse. So, yes, if the Mobility Plan passed, you would see a greater infusion into sidewalks because sidewalks, roads, greenways, and some of our bike facilities are a part of the non-transit piece or what I would call the mobility piece. Your first question, Mr. Driggs, I would just go to 2018 to use it as an example. So, the discussion earlier was how did some of these bonds get bigger? Some of the bonds got bigger because Council priorities put us in a position to expand some of these projects. This would be example, Big Ideas, \$15 million, \$15 million, \$15 million, \$15 million for sidewalks, we experimented in the 2018 bond and say what would happen if you doubled that? We doubled it to \$30 million and Liz and Jennifer and Phil have been able to appropriate all of those or allocate all of those dollars for sidewalks, so the test is absolute. Your question is absolutely we can spend more on sidewalks if there are more funds allocated and we can use the 2018 bond as an example.

Mr. Driggs said I would just put that out there as something that I think applies not only in my District, but there are situations with sidewalks. The other odd thing is because of the sidewalk policy we adopted, you can have situations where sidewalks are being required or being created where there really isn't the same priority. I would just love to see us, for one, allocate funds rigorously in accordance with priority and not have mechanisms through corridor and other plans where sidewalk money is being spent in some parts of town, as you suggested, out of line with the priority that has been assigned to the projects. And the other is, I really think as we go to make these allocation decisions if other Councilmembers agree with me that we ought to focus because I think I'm fair in saying,

Mr. Manager, that the pipeline of projects that we've identified in terms of when they're likely to get done, that stands out 20 or 30 years. Isn't that true?

Mr. Jones said that would be correct.

Councilmember Eiselt said Mr. Driggs touched on a subject that I'd have thought a lot about as well. But we also have to talk about fixing sidewalks. I absolutely believe that our money is well spent, and people would be happy if we fix some of our infrastructures. We've got sidewalks that, because of tree roots, are easily four inches from block to block of cement apart. So, they're just in lousy shape. When people walk across them, they trip bikes going across them. We've got as Liz knows, last year I brought up a section of sidewalk that has been fixed now because the developer had to do it. But we have utility poles in the middle of sidewalks and if you're in a wheelchair or on a bike, you're going to fall into the street because they're also right up against the curb. I really like a robust program on sidewalks that also address the sidewalks that need to be fixed. Can you speak to what fund is available to fix sidewalks?

Liz Babson, Transportation Director said as it exists today the sidewalk and pedestrian safety program that you see on the screen is primarily targeting building new sidewalks. Any maintenance that we handle, we do that through our operating accounts.

Ms. Eiselt said Liz what is what kind of a backlog do you feel like you have? You've always been super responsive. So, this isn't a criticism. I know you can't help, you know, the backlog problem, but what kind of a backlog do we have for repairing sidewalks where there's a danger to pedestrians or cyclers?

Ms. Babson said yes, ma'am. If I may, I'd like to follow up on that and get you some actual data that reflects where we are currently with those needs. I will tell you anecdotally, at this point in time, we respond to those conditions that are called in. But as Council will be presented, I believe, in the next month, you'll get an update on the City's ADA effort. And a part of that includes the work that we've been doing in C-DOT to do an exhaustive inventory of our sidewalks throughout the City, which is now going to give us an inventory of where those problem areas exist. We'll have a much better handle on how to prioritize responding to those conditions, as well as have a better understanding of how much work is out there to be done to do that maintenance effort.

Ms. Eiselt said That's great to hear, thank you very much.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 6: FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN SCENARIOS

Ryan Bergman, Budget Director said this is really the presentation where we had hoped to get the most feedback from Council. Our final presentation is on Engagement Strategy. I wanted to get Tiffany Blackwell in front of you guys to talk about it. However, if we want

to focus on this next presentation, we can certainly take your feedback on an individual basis on how you'd like us to accelerate or adjust that Engagement Strategy. But I'll leave that for your consideration.

What I wanted to talk about is when we talk about what makes up a Steady State, we've spent most of our time focusing on General Obligation Bonds. As Mr. Driggs mentioned earlier, with some of the other debt that we have, we build things like Police Facilities, Fire Stations, and we also take care of some other building obligations that we have. I want to I wanted to spend one or two slides talking about that and what we have in the pipeline there.

These are the COPS that we put into the FY22 and FY23 plan in last year's budget. We left the bonds blank for this discussion. We did have a few facilities that we needed to take care of. We have an ongoing government HVAC project that is to the tune of almost \$20 million spread over multiple years. We've been doing some improvements in renovations. I also wanted to call attention to we put \$3 million in sustainability initiatives in COPS this past budget year. I talked to Sarah Hazel today and two of those \$3 million have been identified as funds to be used for rooftop solar. My understanding is they recently released an RFP to do some of that work that will likely be in front of the Council in the future.

The other facilities that we put into our COPS schedule for the upcoming year included the Hidden Valley Fire Station, which has been number one on the fire priority list for several years. Then there is a little bit of stress on COPS that will talk about a little bit more at the next Budget Workshop. For the last two years, we've had the external consultant come in and review our buildings for public access, employee access as it relates to ADA. And there will likely be an impact there that we'll talk about as its own presentation at the next Budget Workshop. If we flip to the next slide, while we have some pressures, we also have some opportunities on projects that could impact the Steady State and available resources. So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to the CFO to talk a little bit about that.

Kelly Flannery, Chief Financial Officer said I think you'll remember last month's Strategy Session, I briefed you all on affordability analysis. I'm pretty sure it was the highlight of the entire Retreat. As part of that, I talked about the inputs in the models and opportunities for efficiencies. At that time, I mentioned that there were a couple of projects that we could revisit that live in the Steady State model currently. But there might be opportunities to move forward on, and these are those two projects.

The first one is the Innovation and Technology Consolidation. This was a project that was to provide funding for the purchase and renovation of a location and Central Avenue. It's directly across from the Eastland Mall site, and it was to consolidate the IMT staff into one facility. Due to the pandemic, you don't usually get to say something good came out of it. But I think what we've learned here is that we have the ability to thrive in remote work conditions and that come into the office every day isn't something we need to do. That

realization, coupled with the funding that came from the CARES Act and the ability to remodel the ninth floor, maybe, I think where IMT is going to live in the CMGC has just changed what we need to do for the Central Avenue location. I think we have an opportunity in the model to reduce the appropriation that's remaining.

Councilmember Braxton returned at 4:30 p.m.

Additionally, we have the Joint Communication Center (JCC). I think you'll remember the City began developing the JCC project back in 2010 to address the need for space for CMPD and the Fire Department. There was an attempt to increase operational collaboration at the time and included multiple government agencies. That projects been through several iterations since its inception almost 11 years ago. At the time, the project was bid the budget was \$86.3 million and the original project was put on hold due to budget constraints. The bids had come in significantly over budget. Over the last several months, the team has explored options that have included creating separate standalone call centers, co-located call centers and even building a call center on top of a Fire Station. But when we look at the increase in capital needs of the City that the Budget Director just went over, and we look at the Council established policies for Capital Improvement Projects, I just can't in discomfort tell you that's a project we should proceed with at this point. It doesn't level to the priority level to fund right now.

The good news and all of that if we remove these two projects from the model, there's an opportunity to increase the Steady State, \$15 million for each bond cycle. Not only that, the increased capacity of the Steady State but could be used to fund other projects. Some of them we just saw, like Segment 11 of the Cross Charlotte Trail. We have assets I mean, the good thing about these two properties is we own them and they're in really desirable locations and there's real economic development opportunity there. So, impact the Steady State, which is what we're going to talk about now. But I think just remember, there's an economic development opportunity in both those locations.

Mr. Bergman said I'm going to show here, I wouldn't quite call it interactive, but it's really designed to level set the funding level we have when you compare it to some of these Advanced Planning Projects and some of our normal programs on a year to year basis to help understand, is there money left if you do that, is there a deficit? What would you need to do? We're hoping this goes into a discussion about prioritization, as you guys have been itching to have throughout each of our other presentations today. The three scenarios themselves are fairly simple. It's scenario A, the starting point. We don't do any road or intersection projects from that Advanced Planning Program. Scenario B, as we do one road and one intersection project over the five years. Scenario C is doing two of each over the next five years.

This maybe takes a second to figure out what you're looking at, but the way it's designed is there are six projects that are more or less locked at the top. When I say that they're locked, that doesn't mean that they might not change a million dollars or something by the time we appropriate a budget. But traffic devices, traffic coordination bridge program,

those are things that we really have to do at some level. So, if they're not in the capital plan, they're going to have to be in the operating plan in some way, shape, or form. NEESE was the only project from the Big Ideas that was going to turn into this bond cycle. That's not anything to do with cost overruns. There aren't any there. It was just scheduling of when the construction would be done on those projects that allowed us to put it into the next cycle, which allowed us to do a few more things in the last cycle, such as corridors.

Ballantyne Reimagined I won't spend much time on because that has been signed off on in an RCA by City Council which will be built into the next bonds. Street resurfacing was mentioned and then the next three, they're half locked I guess I would call because while we would presumably need to maintain some level of funding, there is a prioritization decision that would allow you to do less new sidewalks, quite a bit more new sidewalks. It really works the same way for bike programs and Vision Zero.

So, those programs will not change in any of these scenarios coming up. That's \$58.75 million, and then if you don't do any road or intersection projects, what you're left with is things you could do in that bottom bucket where I have affordable housing, corridors, congestion, and then public-private partnerships, ED. I do not want anyone to read into the numbers on those. All that is at this point is just the same level of funding as 2020 for a starting discussion point. You can see that from those scenarios if you don't do any road or intersection projects, you could take care of our existing programs at current levels. You could do roughly the same amount of bond dollars for housing, corridors, congestion, public-private partnership, and there would be a little more than \$50 million in this upcoming bond that could be spent in other targeted areas or added to any of those programs.

If we go to the next scenario, so, everything on here is exactly the same, except for the middle part where it talks about one road project and one intersection project. I intentionally did not get into which road or which intersection project because I don't think those discussions should necessarily occur until we're fully at 30% design. Either way, we could have a placeholder in our Capital Plan for a road and for an intersection project. What you'll see here is that if you did one road and one intersection project, you can essentially do it within the Steady State capacity, have a little bit of money left over without really adjusting any of our normal programs, staying with what you would have had previously in affordable housing, corridors, congestion and still holding a placeholder for ED.

Then if you go to the last scenario, which is scenario C, and I apologize, that's a little hard to read for you to read there. But it is a deficit. If we tried to build both roads, both intersection projects into the five-year CIP at this \$198 million level, we would not be able to do it and maintain all of our other programs at the same level. If Council wanted to go in that direction, then it would take a prioritization discussion of which other areas the funds should come from. I want to be clear that with these roads and these intersection projects, this is a starting point for a scenario as we get to 30% design, and we actually

were in FY23 about to propose a bond to the voters. The split may not be 50/50, it might be 30%, 70 %. But this is really just an example of giving you guys an understanding of what it would mean to do everything from Advanced Planning and what it would mean to do nothing and then really allow you guys a chance to discuss it now or at a future meeting as well, some of your capital priorities.

Mayor Lyles said thank you Mr. Bergman, I'm going to make a suggestion because I've gotten some text saying that most people had the schedule from 1:30-4:00 and we're now at 4:40. I like to first suggest that we've got our March 3, 2021 Budget Workshop schedule that we all put on our calendar from 1:30 to 5:00, because I think that we've got rich discussion to take place and that we should be doing that. I'd also like to suggest that we not begin a discussion like this, which really requires some thoughtfulness for people to be able to put out why are they thinking what they are thinking and what they'd like to see. We should start off with this in a way that's fresh and thinking and absorbing the materials that we've gotten. I would just like to suggest that we end our session now and if that would be possible, that we begin our session with scenarios and the staff has put three on the table. There might be others that need to go to the table.

I would like to say that why don't we by the middle of February, let's say February 15th sent to the Budget Director any other scenarios that you have that you like to have a full Council discussion on. That might give them some time to put it together, pros and cons, and things that they would like to comment on so that we're actually working with things that could accomplish our own short-term advance planning effort. I just wondered if that feedback was appropriate?

Motion was made by Councilmember Winston, seconded by Councilmember Bokhari, and carried unanimously to end the meeting and bring it back February 15, 2021.

Councilmember Bokhari said just wondering in addition to that, because every budget cycle and all the workshops, it's incredibly in-depth, a lot of work, a lot of ground to cover. It seems like we spent the vast majority of our time going through the presentation, the basics, and then we have a round of kind of fundamental questions and like learning a deeper level. I'm wondering if there's an earlier offline individual round that could occur somehow with Councilmembers and the staff where that first round of questions can get answered. The answers can be incorporated into the presentation, and then we can spend our time strategically discussing if that route is good or not. Because, I mean, I might argue that today 95 % of our time was focused on presentations and fundamental questions. I think if we had a little more prep time, we could increase that and really get our bang for our buck on the strategic conversation.

Mayor Lyles said I think that's a great idea. I think that if we could do some small group meetings as the staff, again, do it within a timely manner so that people have time to think about what are the decision-making principles that we're going to have for this budget would be very helpful. So, Mr. Jones, could we before the 15th or the 20th of February

have a round of small group meetings with the Councilmembers and then we could go and be prepared in the next several days, give them at least 10 working days to prepare for the strategic questions and we start off with the strategic questions versus the presentation. I think that's Mr. Bokhari's point. Is that OK?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I would say that it's a great recommendation. We've done that after my budget presentation. We've actually had one on ones with Councilmembers to Mr. Bokhari point to deal with some of those fundamental questions. We would welcome having a series of discussions prior to going into this interactive process.

Mayor Lyles said we have a motion to do the following: Ask the City Manager to do small meetings that would talk about the information and provide the presentations that are needed for our strategy discussion about what our guiding principles and policies will be for the upcoming budget and that we would do that by the 20th of February, but we would also ask that if you have scenarios that you have begun to think about to get those done by February 15th so the staff can have the ability to do the research and comment on those.

Councilmember Ajmera said yes, I'm going to go over some of the scenarios with Ryan, so I'll have a separate meeting with him so that we don't have to go over that right now.

Councilmember Phipps said yes, I was wondering if it was in a way possible that we could get our budget books any sooner than we do.

Mayor Lyles said I don't know the answer to that question. Do you mean the workshop agendas and the materials for the workshops?

Mr. Phipps said correct.

Mr. Jones said I was editing at 12:00 today.

Mayor Lyles said I think that it's really hard, I think, for them to get it produced in time. But we'll set that as an aspirational goal, Mr. Phillips.

Councilmember Driggs said I am fine with the small meeting format. Why don't we vote?

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as unanimously.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Winston, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m.



Stephanie Bello, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 3 Hours, 13 Minutes
Minutes Completed: March 31, 2021