CHAPTER THREE

IMPLEMENTATION

With a preferred alignment for the Cross Charlotte Trail (XCLT) chosen, the City will next need to identify how the project is to be phased, funded and governed - key strategic considerations that will be crucial to the future success of the Trail. As depicted in Figure 3.1, the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County will each fund pre-determined segments of the Trail. This chapter provides an implementation framework for the City of Charlotte. It begins by describing potential funding strategies for capital and ongoing operational costs, then discusses possible governance structures to steward the Trail, and concludes by discussing the phasing of the Trail.
"GREAT FOR ALL. HURRY UP AND FINISH IT - WE'RE OLD AND OUR BIKING DAYS ARE NUMBERED!"
- PUBLIC MEETING PARTICIPANT, JULY 15, 2015, PUBLIC MEETING
Section 3.1 Funding Strategies

Viable plans for both capital and operating funding are necessary to ensure the Trail reaches its full potential as a community asset. The capital investment will fund the construction of the Trail itself, neighborhood connections such as paths and pedestrian bridges, and a variety of permanent amenities incorporated along the Trail. Operating funding is needed to support maintenance and programming of the Trail, including the governing entity tasked with the management and deployment of these funds. Both components of the funding equation are equally important in creating a world class Trail, and will require targeted and creative applications of resources from public and private partners.
Figure 3.2 illustrates the spectrum of capital and operating funding opportunities that exist for the XCLT. These opportunities are discussed in greater detail in this chapter.
CROSS CHARLOTTE TRAIL

Section 3.1 - Funding Strategies

The capital funding strategy should address both major infrastructure moves and small-scale interventions. The capital funding options outlined in the following chapter identify potential resources which can cover the capital costs incurred by the City for building the Trail.

The City of Charlotte has already committed $5 million from a 2014 bond referendum to construct the Brandywine Road to Tyvola Road segment of the Cross Charlotte Trail and to fund planning of the Cross Charlotte Trail. The City intends to issue a public improvement bond to help fund design and implementation of future segments of the trail. It is anticipated that resources in addition to the bond proceeds will be required to construct and maintain the trail.

CAPITAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

As both a city-wide transportation network and an open space amenity, there are several potential funding sources for the capital costs of the XCLT. Generally, it is believed public funding will be necessary for the major infrastructure investments and primary lengths of the Trail, with public-private models leveraged to facilitate connections and specific amenities.
PUBLIC SOURCES

**PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT BONDS**

Bonds issued by the City of Charlotte will pay for much of the Trail's capital costs, serving as the foundational funding source for the creation of the Trail. The City of Charlotte has already committed $5 million from a 2014 bond referendum to finance planning efforts and plans to commit to a $30 million bond allocation in 2016, subject to a public referendum. The $30 million bond will be issued as a general obligation bond backed by the full faith and credit of the City of Charlotte. Details regarding conditions or restrictions on uses of funds are still forthcoming. It is anticipated that these proceeds will not be sufficient to fund the total capital costs of the northern, middle and southern segments of the Trail. Successful implementation of the first phases of the Trail using these funds could help build public momentum for future bond issuances as the major funding source to complete the Trail. We recommend that future bond allocations be considered as the primary funding opportunity to pay for large remaining gaps in costs.

**FEDERAL AND STATE TRANSPORTATION GRANTS**

Charlotte should consider seeking federal and state transportation grants as gap funding sources to supplement public improvement bonds. The XCLT is a recreational amenity, economic development project and transportation alternative. State grant funding could provide a substantial amount of support for the Trail. For instance, last year the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) provided a $3 million grant to help Mecklenburg County fund the extension of the LSCG south of Uptown, which will become part of the southern portion of the XCLT.

There are two primary sources of federal funding that the City should consider exploring. The first is allocations under the federal transportation bill, which has funded trail projects across the country. In 2015, the State of North Carolina received $1.6 million for trails projects. In Minnesota, the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority utilized federal grants to fund the Midtown Greenway, in addition to its own funds and State and County allocations.

The second federal source that the XCLT may be a strong candidate for is the TIGER Grant Program. While the program is extremely competitive and its future beyond the Obama Presidency is uncertain, across the country there is excellent precedent for TIGER grants contributing to funding the capital construction of recreational trail projects. Examples include a $17.3 million grant to Philadelphia's Schuylkill River Trail, including pedestrian bridges; an $18 million grant for Atlanta's BeltLine Corridor Trail; a $4.6 million grant to Missoula County, Montana for the Missoula to Lolo Trail; and $10.5 million to the Lee County, Florida Metropolitan Transportation Organization for a Complete Streets Initiative, which included trail projects. The Cultural Trail in Indianapolis utilized federal transportation grant funding to cover more than half of capital costs, about $35.5 million, including a $20.5 million TIGER Grant.

In considering state and federal funding sources, it is important to be mindful that federal and state funding would likely impose additional fees, requirements and layers of review on the project that would ultimately serve to extend the project timeline and increase cost, eroding some of the benefit.

**APPLIED INNOVATION DISTRICT**

The City should consider targeting Applied Innovation Corridor (AIC) funds to concurrently support the creation of the XCLT, as the Trail will bolster the mission of the AIC. Both the geographies and economic development goals of the Applied Innovation Corridor and the XCLT overlap. The Corridor has a dedicated funding source in the form of Public Improvement Bonds: $12.5 million in bonds passed in 2014; future funding referendums include $7.7 million on the ballot in 2016 and $8.7 million on the ballot in 2018. There may be potential to utilize some of these funds to construct connective trail infrastructure that supports the mission of the AIC.

---

5 "Mecklenburg County moves to finish LSCG", The Charlotte Observer, 2015.


7 City of Charlotte, Applied Innovation Corridor (AIC) Program Overview, 2015.
SYNTHETIC TAX INCREMENT FINANCING (TIF) GRANT

Synthetic Tax Increment Financing (TIF) may be useful in filling gaps in financing for crucial infrastructure pieces along the Trail that will enable private development. Under synthetic TIF, the City would implement an installment finance agreement based on incremental tax revenues expected, and pledge the infrastructure improvements themselves as security. Cities in North Carolina, including Charlotte, tend to use Synthetic TIF instead of traditional forms of tax increment financing to bypass the complex public process for establishing a TIF district. The XCLT qualifies as one of the three principal uses for tax increment grants in Charlotte – a new public infrastructure investment that stimulates development that would not have otherwise occurred. This method of financing is likely to be most useful to the XCLT for specific infrastructure required along the Trail, for example; a pedestrian bridge connecting to a major redevelopment site. One challenge to using this synthetic TIF is that the value of property permitted to participate in the program is capped at 3 percent of the City’s total property tax levy in any given year.

CONTRIBUTION "MENU" IN EXCHANGE FOR PRIVATE INVESTMENT

It is recommended the City consider establishing a consistent approach to engaging developers of adjacent property in the development of both trail connections to private property and amenities. These improvements would follow the design principles identified for the Trail, including improving connectivity between neighborhoods and the Trail, increasing the overall coherence of the design through wayfinding and visual improvements, and prioritizing trail users by creating safer transitions between the Trail and surrounding street grid.

Rather than negotiating a series of custom, one-off public-private deals with developers in order to build out connections to private development or fund other amenities, a standardized contribution “menu” could be developed to streamline and coordinate the process. Creating a system for partnerships with developers would not only potentially produce capital funds for the Trail, but could also offset future programming and maintenance costs. Local developers HR&A spoke with, including those considering investments along the XCLT, felt the ‘menu’ idea was an intriguing approach, and were interested in exploring the idea further.

There are national precedents for incentive programs under which developers opt to provide funding to support infrastructure or amenities desired by the community from a “menu” of options. These programs are most successful in strong real estate markets, like Charlotte, where developers are incentivized to obtain regulatory permissions, such as density bonuses, in exchange for contributions for infrastructure and amenities. Two precedent programs are seen in New York and Seattle:

- New York, NY: The City’s publically operated private space program has provided over eighty acres of open space in more than 250 plazas since 1961. Under this program, incentives in the zoning code encourage developers, particularly those of office buildings in Manhattan, to create plaza areas accessible to the public in exchange for the ability to develop more densely. On a case by case basis, projects can receive height and setback waivers in exchange for open space.
- Seattle, WA: Since 1966, the City of Seattle, WA has been encouraging the creation of public spaces by providing developers with a set of regulatory incentives. In exchange for additional development rights, or increased height, developers are required to construct and maintain a public space. There are a range of options of space types, including plazas, pocket parks, or rooftop spaces. Downtown Seattle currently has 27 different privately owned public spaces, including Benaroya Hall and the Bank of America Tower.

If implemented along the XCLT, the City would craft an overarching partnership strategy with private developers or institutions by devising a “menu of options” in which developers would fund set portions of connections to the Trail and/or amenities along the Trail in exchange for public contributions to cover the residual costs of connections to their developments, or regulatory incentives such as density bonuses or other permissions. In instances where the public sector is providing funding to support such a connection, a minimum leverage ratio of private investment could be set. In addition to funding immediately adjacent infrastructure and amenities, the private funding contributions received by the City could be used to subsidize the cost of Trail amenities in segments of the Trail with less potential to access private funding, like segment 3.

This strategy could specifically be used to support the City’s planned public art program. In this scenario, the developer would have the option to contribute funding to add distinctive artistic elements to the Trail as identified by the City’s future Public Art Master Plan. The developer could in turn receive public support for connections to their projects or regulatory permissions.

---

*Recent Synthetic TIF project issuances for infrastructure in Charlotte include: the Wesley Village Business Corridor and the Charlotte Premium Outlets.*
**OPERATING FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES**

In addition to capital funding, the Trail must have an operational funding strategy. Mecklenburg County will assume responsibility for funding ongoing operations and maintenance. Operating costs may include trail maintenance and repairs, lighting, landscaping, painting, mowing, trash removal, security and programming. As the level of programming on the Trail increases, so do the costs. For example, public art, exercise equipment or seasonal events all increase maintenance and staffing costs, as well marketing efforts.

To operate a world-class trail that includes intensive seasonal programming, a trail may be supported by a “friends group.” The 3.5-mile Katy Trail in Dallas, Texas has an annual operating budget of approximately $880,000, which supports staffing that manages high quality programming activities, marketing and annual fundraising to cover operational costs and build capital towards future projects. These functions are the heart of a successful, world-class urban trail.

Mecklenburg County estimates that the baseline maintenance cost for the XCLT is $18,000 per mile annually. For the 26-mile XCLT, this amounts to $486,000 in minimal annual funding to maintain the Trail in a state-of-good-repair condition. This ignores the cost of programming and enhanced operations. By comparison, the world-class, highly programmed Katy Trail costs $250,000 per mile to maintain, operate, and program.

We assume that a highly successful XCLT will aspire to the Katy Trail’s level of service, but will cost less to maintain on a per-mile basis because (1) it is unlikely that a trail of regional size would be as intensely programmed for the full length of the Trail and (2) economies of scale in management and operations would be achieved. For the 26-mile XCLT, we assume that a per-mile cost of $62,500 annually, one-fourth of the Katy Trail’s $250,000 per mile cost, may be feasible depending upon the level of programming. This would bring total operational costs to around $1.6 million annually, about $1.1 million above the baseline maintenance cost.

Success of the Trail depends on its being well-maintained with well-designed and executed programming. It is imperative that any financing plan for the Trail carefully consider ongoing operating funding. When seeking private contributions and philanthropy, the City should target these funds for operating rather than capital expenses because operating funds are generally more difficult to source than capital funding.

**PUBLIC FUNDING SOURCES**

**COUNTY MAINTENANCE FUNDS**

Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation will provide annual funding for the Trail’s maintenance and operations. There is recent precedent of the department increasing its operating budget to provide for new and expanded facilities: it increased its operating budget by $875,000 to cover increased maintenance for Romare Bearden Park, the Regional Sportsplex, Flat Branch Nature Preserve, Evergreen Nature Preserve, Ballantyne Park, Barton Creek Greenway and Wesley Heights Greenway. Given the level of programming envisioned, we do not anticipate public funding will be adequate to also fund the Trail’s programming. As such, a variety of private funding sources should be explored.
PRIVATE FUNDING SOURCES

ANNUAL PHILANTHROPIC OR CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS
We believe that private contributions and philanthropy should be targeted for operating rather than capital expenses because operating funds are generally more difficult to source than capital funding. Philanthropic donations from foundations and individuals can fill critical funding gaps. Charlotte is home to multiple corporations including Bank of America, Duke Energy, Nucor, and Wells Fargo’s East Coast operations. All of these companies have been engaged in civic philanthropy. Corporate sponsorship of events along portions of the Trail and at key nodes could serve as an anchor source of operating funds. Corporate sponsorship generally takes the form of an in-kind or cash contribution from an organization to a park/trail or non-profit partner on behalf of a park/trail, typically in exchange for some form of recognition for the donating organization such as naming rights to a trail facility.

"FRIENDS OF" GROUP
A “Friends of the XCLT” could solicit contributions in return for membership, typically coming from an individual or family, or from a corporation on behalf of its employees. Often these groups provide exclusive member benefits, such as special access to events or park facilities. The Friends group could also head up annual fundraising efforts to cover improvements to the Trail and its amenities, such as landscaping, furniture and play equipment. Examples of successful “Friends” programs include the Friends of the Katy Trail, Friends of City Park in New Orleans, and the membership program maintained by the Shelby Farms Park Conservancy in Memphis.

We believe that private contributions and philanthropy should be targeted for operating rather than capital expenses because operating funds are generally more difficult to source than capital funding. Philanthropic donations from foundations and individuals can fill critical funding gaps. Charlotte is home to multiple corporations including Bank of America, Duke Energy, Nucor, and Wells Fargo’s East Coast operations. All of these companies have been engaged in civic philanthropy. Corporate sponsorship of events along portions of the Trail and at key nodes could serve as an anchor source of operating funds. Corporate sponsorship generally takes the form of an in-kind or cash contribution from an organization to a park/trail or non-profit partner on behalf of a park/trail, typically in exchange for some form of recognition for the donating organization such as naming rights to a trail facility.

EARNED INCOME
The City should investigate how earned income sources could be integrated into the funding structure for trail infrastructure and annual programming. Earned income can take the form of food and beverage vending, perhaps at key destinations along the Trail. Holding events or promotions can also serve as an annual source of income; given the length of the Trail, it is possible to hold various sporting events, including races, walkathons and bicycling events. The Trail’s planned length of 26 miles may lend itself well to holding a marathon, which could serve as a signature annual fundraising and awareness event. There is also potential to use rents or leases on land surrounding the Trail to generate revenue. For instance, amenitized locations along the Trail could support events that build social cohesion and build a sense of community ownership, such as weddings and parties.

The Katy Trail in Dallas, Texas, successfully utilizes several private funding mechanisms to fund its annual operations, totaling nearly $900,000 in 2014. These contributions are broken down in Figure 3.3. Notably, a single major event and annual membership dues fund over 60% of the Trail’s annual operating budget.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCE</th>
<th>FUNDING AMOUNT</th>
<th>FUNDING PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHELOB ULTRA 5K</td>
<td>$354,325</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERSHIP DUES</td>
<td>$192,683</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL SUPPORT CAMPAIGN</td>
<td>$180,036</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL DONATIONS</td>
<td>$106,433</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER EVENTS</td>
<td>$34,036</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS</td>
<td>$11,461</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALUE CAPTURE FUNDING SOURCES

SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICT

A special assessment district could be considered to enable the County to capture a small incremental assessment on top of existing City-County taxes to fund adjacent programming. As discussed in more detail in Chapter 1, the implementation of the Trail will both increase the value of existing adjacent and nearby properties and generate additional development activity in certain neighborhoods. The logic of a special assessment district is that a small incremental assessment on only nearby properties concentrates the funding responsibility on parties benefitting from property value increases catalyzed by the Trail. The amount of the special assessment should be set such that the additional taxes due are less than the anticipated increases in property value.

Successful special assessment districts include the Bryant Park Corporation in New York, which was founded to restore the park using private dollars and private management. The restoration of the park resulted in a 63% increase in rent for office space immediately adjacent to the park. A 2015 study commissioned by the Bryant Park BID found that buildings on the perimeter of the park commanded rents 12.5% higher than similar buildings a few blocks away, translating into 20% to 25% higher property values, on average. Justified by these value increases, an extra property tax assessment levied on properties immediately adjacent to the park helps fund operations and maintenance, in addition to fees from concessions and event revenues.

The special assessment would be an incremental addition to the annual property tax total paid on the assessed value of a property. For example, a property assessed at $200,000 currently pays approximately $2,600 in City and County property taxes annually. Given the value premium of 5% expected to accrue to nearby properties owing to the Trail, a special assessment levied at between 1-2% of the property tax payable would yield approximately $27-$54 in funds from that property annually.

The boundaries of the special assessment district should carefully consider the segmented nature of the Trail – there are significantly more value capture opportunities in Segments 1 and 2, where the development pipeline is saturated with projects, than Segments 3 and 4, where the preferred alignment passes through neighborhoods less likely to be redeveloped and/or contribute a significant tax increment to the Trail’s development. Establishing a special assessment district requires agreement that there will be enough existing value and anticipated new development to generate a meaningful contribution to funding, and that the assessment can be levied fairly, taking into account the number of low income areas along the corridor. The assessed area may need to adhere to custom boundaries in order to ensure that neighborhoods of lower socio-economic standing do not experience an increased tax burden.

Figure 3.5 demonstrates that a special assessment levied at one or two percent of the City-County tax bill on existing property and future development located within a quarter mile of the preferred alignment could raise roughly $277,000 to $554,000 annually to fund operations.

---

2 Bryant Park Corporation, Bryant Park Blog, 2015.
3 Bryant Park Corporation, 2015 BID Membership Registration, 2015.
Depending on the opinion of legal counsel, future real estate value could be leveraged to create an operating reserve for the Trail. While the Trail will require a certain baseline amount of land acquisition for the right-of-way, an opportunity exists for the City of Charlotte to purchase more than this baseline amount in neighborhoods that have current or near-term development potential and in which the City would like to influence neighborhood outcomes. The City could then devise a disposition strategy for either selling or ground leasing the land in either individual development deals or to one developer as part of a master development strategy. Proceeds from future sales could then be used in part to capitalize a reserve fund to offset the County’s cost for the operations of the Trail. At Brooklyn Bridge Park in New York, 95% of the park’s annual operations are funded through ground lease fees and property taxes.
"IT IS GOING TO BE OUTSTANDING! THE BIKEWAY WILL OFFER MORE THAN RECREATIONAL RIDING, IT WILL HELP MAKE CONNECTIONS THROUGHOUT OUR CITY (AND) WILL BE A GREAT TOOL TO GET FROM PLACE TO PLACE."

- JANE CACCHIONE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE CHARLOTTE AREA BICYCLE ALLIANCE
Implementing the XCLT will require a range of capacities over time, from construction and design, to routine maintenance and management of fundraising and programming. A sound governance structure is necessary to ensure that these capacities are in place as the Trail is implemented.

The sheer length of the Trail and funding gaps will necessitate a phased approach to Trail implementation. Demonstration of early success is critical to eventually achieving the full scale of the vision and keeping momentum behind the project. Successful implementation of the first phase will help to catalyze both community support and demonstrate positive impacts on surrounding land values to the local real estate community, garnering enthusiasm and support for subsequent phases, and associated public funding asks. The City will need to strategically focus on implementing priority segments of the alignment to build this momentum.
The Trail’s funding structure will inform the type of governance needed to guide the Trail from initial implementation to stabilized operations. Effective governance models reflect funders’ interest, capacities and relative level of support. A significant portion of the capital funding for the XCLT will be provided by the public sector, and ongoing maintenance and operations will be managed by the Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation Department.

The table on the following page summarizes the relationship between public capital funding and the eventual governance structure for relevant precedent projects. The Midtown Greenway in Minneapolis, Minnesota is likely the most apt comparison. The Greenway was constructed with public funds and is owned by the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority, with the City of Minneapolis serving as the principal operator. The Trail’s primary partner - the Midtown Greenway Coalition, is a member-based citizen group which advocates for trail improvements and runs a volunteer-based nighttime patrol. The other three precedents, by comparison, are owned by their respective cities but are primarily operated by a sophisticated non-profit entity.
Informed by the funding strategies used for the Trail, the consulting team recommends that a 501(c)(3) “Friends Of” group complement Mecklenburg County’s operational leadership by taking charge of annual fundraising activities, programming and associated marketing. However, it is essential that this non-profit have strong, committed local leadership in order to build momentum for implementation and establish a network of local partners to support the Trail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>KATY TRAIL</th>
<th>HIGH LINE</th>
<th>BELTLINE</th>
<th>MIDTOWN GREENWAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>CITY OF DALLAS</td>
<td>CITY OF NEW YORK</td>
<td>CITY OF ATLANTA</td>
<td>HENNEPIN COUNTY REGIONAL RAILROAD AUTHORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Operator</td>
<td>501c3 - FRIENDS OF THE KATY TRAIL</td>
<td>501c3 - FRIENDS OF THE HIGH LINE</td>
<td>501c3 - ATLANTA BELTLINE, INC.</td>
<td>CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Key Partners</td>
<td>INVEST ATLANTA ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>501c3 - MIDTOWN GREENWAY COALITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Private Funding for Capital Costs</td>
<td>26% *</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

~ Sources: Friends of the Katy Trail; Friends of the High Line; Midtown Community Works; Atlanta Beltline Inc.
PHASING

The middle section of the Trail corridor has been divided into four segments, each with different real estate characteristics. Early introduction of the Trail in segments with strong development potential will enhance funding streams directly tied to real estate values and/or private participation, such as tax increment grants, developer contributions to privately-owned public spaces and special assessment districts.

The economic development analysis in Chapter 1 found:

- Segments 1 and 2 have the highest potential for future development (discussed in more detail in Chapter 1).
- Segments 3 and 4 are less likely to experience new development in the intermediate term.

Focusing implementation efforts on segments 1 and 2 provides an opportunity to demonstrate proof-of-concept that gives developers greater confidence to undertake similar developments in later phases of the Trail, even in less tested markets. A similar process played out in Charlotte on the LYNX Blue Line, where the light rail’s promotion of transit-oriented development in South End prompted many developers to consider similar projects along the Blue Line Extension (BLE).

There will be tremendous value in establishing an early connection of the XCLT into Uptown Charlotte. Uptown is the City’s central business district, and an increasingly vibrant residential zone. Facilitating trail connections into Uptown will enhance the value of the Trail to a multitude of users. These connections can be created by implementation of the Uptown Loop in at least two ways, both of which should be prioritized in early phases. The first connection parallels North Brevard Street along a 10’-wide sidewalk adjacent to the Blue Line with an eventual connection to a proposed cycle track along 12th Street and into Center City. A second connection to Uptown is planned to follow Trinity Passage - beneath I-277 - that will complete the east side of the Uptown Loop as shown in Chapter 2. The Uptown Loop will link North Charlotte to the activity in Uptown as well as recent mixed-use developments along the Greenway, such as the Metropolitan.

Of course, the potential to capture real estate value is only one consideration in the Trail’s phasing; community engagement and pride of ownership are essential. Public-private opportunities for near-term build out are generally concentrated in more wealthy areas of the Trail. An approach that prioritizes only the segments closest to Uptown (Segments 1 and 2) will likely be at odds with an equitable approach to trail development that favors building out trail segments serving more socioeconomically challenged areas. To take affirmative steps in encouraging equitable trail development, we recommend that the implementation of segment 3 also be prioritized in early phases. As discussed in the funding opportunities section, this could be accomplished by using a portion of funding raised through value-capture or private sources to construct Trail enhancements in lower-income areas.

Early completion of the South section, Brandywine to Tyvola portion, is also of great symbolic and functional significance. One of the central goals of the Trail is to create a recreational and transportation resource that will span the City and connect to South Carolina. Completing this connection quickly, combined with the existing greenway and the County’s investments, will create a length of Trail stretching from South Carolina to the Matheson Bridge. The functionality of this completed segment will incite further public support for the completion of the Trail to Cabarrus County.

Establishing coordination with the North Tryon Applied Innovation Corridor (AIC) also offers an opportunity to build on existing momentum and stated City goals.

There are several significant reasons for the Corridor to coordinate with the Trail:

- The geographies of the Corridor and Trail overlap. The AIC extends from Uptown to the University of North Carolina at Charlotte campus - right along the XCLT’s future corridor. Building on the development momentum that exists in Uptown, the Corridor is modeled on an “innovation district” concept in which Charlotte would link academic and research capital with its business assets, emerging industries, and governmental support. Appropriate links to the XCLT could facilitate access to the Corridor and enhance its vibrancy.

- Funding sources should be evaluated to determine ability to advance shared goals. As discussed above, the AIC has secured dedicated funding in the form of Public Improvement Bonds. Voters approved $12.5 million in 2014; future funding referendums include $7.7 million on the ballot in 2016 and $8.7 million on the ballot in 2018.

---

14 Urban Land Institute, Charlotte’s North End: Applied Innovation Corridor, 2014
SEGMENT 1  
7th Street to Matheson

SEGMENT 2  
Matheson to Sugar Creek

SEGMENT 3  
Sugar Creek Road to Old Concord Road

SEGMENT 4  
Old Concord Road to Toby Creek Greenway

— Cross Charlotte Illustrative Master Plan (Middle Section)