AGENDA

Meeting Type:	S
Date:	03-21-1990
SUBJECT	Special Joint Meeting City County NFL Stadium & Convention Center Briefing

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office

Special Meeting - Stadium & Convention Center

City Council/County Commission 3/21/90

5:15 P.M.

Sue Myrick	DuPuy
Stan Campbell	Blackmon ✓
Dan Clodfelter	Autry
Ann Hammond ✓	Lockwood ✓
Pat McCrory ✓	Andrews ✓
Tom Mangum ✓	Walton
Hoyle Martin	Leeper ✓
Roy Matthews ✓	
Cyndee Patterson	
Ella Scarborough ✓	
Richard Vinroot ✓	
Lynn Wheeler	

STADIUM?

O. Wendell White

Mark Richardson — LAST NIGHT NFL MEETING 5 MEMBERS ON EXPANSION COMM TV CONTRACTS ALREADY MADE FOR 1991

RUSTY GOODE

RICHARDSON

BLACKMON

RICHARDSON

GUERRANT

WHITE

HAINES (DAVID) WSOC

RICHARDSON

HAINES

RICHARDSON

HAINES

ANDREWS

RICHARDSON

BLACKMON - SOCCER

RICHACDSON

MATHEWS

RICHACDSON

HARVEY BURGESS

RICHACDSON

WHITE

ISSUE #1 - FINANCING

#2 - BUDGET/FUNDING - NO FULL FIX ON PKG YET

#3 ROADS - STATE RUSTY GOODE-NCDOT

#4 PARKING - 1200 SPACES - ALREADY COVERED

2500 EXISTING PKG PLACES UPTOWN

#5 SPUR TRACK

#6 PRACTICE FIELDS CLOSE TO BEING SOLVED

#1 GRAINGER SITE - MAJOR IMPACT ON

SCHEDULE -

#8 - SELF EXPLANATORY

#9 - LEGAL DOCUMENTS - MAY HAVE TOMORROW

#10 - LAND ACQUISITION -

#11 -

#12 SCHEDULE

QUESTIONS -

ANDREWS

WHITE

BLACKMON

KEEBLER
WHITE

LOY MCKEITHAN

UNDERHILL

MCKEITHAN

HAMMOND

WHITE

HAMMOND

WHITE

RICHARD MARTIN, FINANCE DEPT

HAMMOND

MCKEITHAN

MCCRORY

WHITE

MCCRORY

MANGUM

UNDERHILL

MANGUM

BLACKMON

MANGUM

BLACKMON

UNDERHILL

ANDREWS

BUNCKMAN

ANDREWS

WHITE

ANDREWS

MCKEITHAN

ANDREWS

HAMMOND

WHITE CONVENTION CTR 6 00

#1 LEGIS FUNDING APPROVAL
PROJECT

#2 COSTS - UNKNOWN

#3 MARKETING COSTS + OPERATING DEFICIT
- REFERRING TO #2

MATHEWS

WHITE - 2 PHASES

MATHEWS

WHITE

MCCRORY

WHITE

# of Local Consensus

McCrory

White

McCrory
White
Andrews

White

McCrory

White

#5 Site Assemblage-

McCrory - Are other sites being considered?

White

McCrory

Mangum

White

McCrory

White

#6- Covered

#7- Covered

#8 - Architect

#9 - Staging & Parking -

#10 Old Conv. Ctr. -

#11 Lobbying

McCrory

White

SCARBOROUGH

MANGUM

ANDREWS

MANGUM

ANDREWS

WHITE - ADJOURNED. 6:28 P.M.

CONVENTION CENTER
BRIEFING OUTLINE
MARCH 21, 1990

BACKGROUND/MAJOR EVENTS TO DATE

1985

- **February 1985** - Coliseum-Convention Center-Auditorium Authority completes report on lost business and proposed expansion of the existing Convention Center.

- **May 1985** - Authority hires Hammer Siler George to conduct expansion study.

1986

- **January 1986** - Study submitted to Council which considered tearing down the Convention Center and building a larger facility elsewhere or on the current site.

- **February 1986 to November 1987** - Convention Center put on hold because of Coliseum and Performing Arts Center projects.

1987

- **December 9, 1987** - CUDC initiates the "Ben Craig Study" for new Convention Center.

- **December, 1987** - CUDC holds joint meeting with City Council to consider expanding the existing Convention Center.

1988

- **January, 1988** - CUDC Expansion Study completed.

1989

- **January 11, 1989** - Council is presented a planning staff proposed process for conducting a feasibility study, a site evaluation analysis and a process for determining cost estimates for a new convention center. Council authorizes Planning and Public Works Committee to take the lead on this project.

- February 3, 1989 - Process for Convention Center Study presented to Planning and Public Works Committee. A March 1989 deadline is proposed for site evaluation and an April deadline for a financing study by the "Hugh McColl Committee."

- February 23, 1989- CUDC hires Laventhol and Horwath to conduct an "Economic Impact and Market Evaluation Study for an Expanded Convention Center."

- April 25, 1989 - Planning staff briefs the Planning and Public Works Committee on the current process and reviews a revised process which concentrates on an individual site (Schottenstein proposal).

- April, 1989 - McColl Committee submits report to Council.

- May 23, 1989 - Council meets in executive session and advises the Manager to evaluate the Schottenstein proposal and negotiate with Schottenstein over cost to be incurred by the City and the developer.

- May 23, 1989 - City Manager appoints a Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) to work with Schottenstein in evaluating his proposal and presenting alternatives to Council.

- June 26, 1989 - The negotiated Schottenstein proposal is presented in executive session to Council as follows: the developer would assemble land; build a Convention Center; pay the City a minimum fair market value for the old Convention Center; construct an adjacent 750 room Convention Hotel with parking; and complete the facility one-and-a-half to two years faster than the City could do otherwise. Council instructs the manager to refine the proposal with the intent of minimizing the $1.8 million Council would be required to pay prior to the legislature's approval of our financing plan.

- July 1989 - City staff begins negotiating a development agreement with Schottenstein; a Citizens Advisory Committee is appointed (Dagenhart Committee); and members of the Citizens Advisory Committee and the TCC visit the Schottenstein headquarters in Columbus, Ohio. City staff visits Schottenstein's architect in Atlanta and reviews in detail their construction schedule and cost estimates.

- August 1, 1989 - A press conference is held with Schottenstein publicly outlining the Schottenstein/City proposal.

- August 7, 1989 - A Council Workshop concentrates on major points of contention in the development agreement, including: public risk vs. benefits of private construction; unknown city costs; potential conflicts of interest in constructing a hotel in conjunction with the Convention Center; developer's experience; etc.

- September 11, 1989- Council votes to request a recommendation regarding how to proceed from the Citizens Advisory Committee

- October 17, 1989 - County Commission approves the concept of paying for the new Convention Center with an increase in the hotel/motel tax and a 1% restaurant tax.

- October 20, 1989 - Citizens Advisory Committee recommends modified fast-track approach without the private developer. Schottenstein is to merely assemble land and hold the options until the legislature approves the financing program. The Citizens Committee advises Council to spend $825,000 in preliminary design and cost estimating in order to advance the schedule of completion.

- October 25, 1989 - Council approves the Citizens Advisory Committee recommendation and asks the Coliseum Authority to advance the $825,000. The Authority declines, but appropriates $200,000 to begin the program development phase for the "Ideal Convention Center."

- October 27, 1989 - Schottenstein's realtor notifies the City that Schottenstein would not continue to carry the options on the proposed site.

- November 14, 1989- Council appropriates $255,000 to address essential elements in the process--a financing plan, additional site evaluations, and a public information campaign. Design and construction documents estimated to cost $570,000 are postponed.

- November 21, 1989- Convention Center Workshop is conducted for the hospitality industry at the Convention Center.

- December 18, 1989- The Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem meet with the small towns regarding the proposed hotel and restaurant taxes. The small towns suggest that they receive 60 percent of the existing 3 percent hotel occupancy tax.

1990

- January 8, 1990 - A briefing paper outlining the Convention Center process is sent to City Council.

- January 19, 1990 - The second meeting with the small towns is held at which time the Mayor, the Mayor Pro Tem, and County representatives agree to give the towns what they had originally requested.

- January - March - Chamber of Commerce takes lead in lobbying effort for funding. John Harris and Mac Everett coordinate with the Dagenhart Citizens Advisory Committee.

CURRENT ISSUES

- Issue #1: Legislative Funding Approval

Summary. The "McColl Finance Committee" recommended a user fee finance strategy involving hotels; restaurants; other primary beneficiaries of the convention business; and a sizable donation from the State due to the large amount of State sales tax to be generated. Because of tight State budget constraints, the City Council and Mecklenburg County Board of Commissioners have approved funding the facility with local revenue from the two primary beneficiaries of the facility--hotels and restaurants. The proposed financing includes a doubling of the current 3 percent hotel/motel tax to 6 percent and a 1 percent restaurant tax.

Status. During last year's session of the General Assembly, the Senate approved a doubling of the hotel tax in order to allow Mecklenburg County to present an amended bill in the short session of 1990. We need unanimous local delegation approval so the bill will be considered "noncontroversial." At the request of the small towns, the City and County have proposed to redistribute the original first 3 percent hotel/motel occupancy tax in order to "guarantee" those towns with

hotels within their jurisdiction at least 60 percent of the first 3 percent tax. The towns are now demanding 40 percent of the entire 6 percent occupancy tax and restaurant tax. Furthermore, the towns do not want the funds restricted for travel and tourism. The tax bill will be presented to the local delegation on March 27, 1990.

- Issue #2: Project Costs

Summary. One of the most difficult tasks is to provide a project estimate for the facility. Prior estimates have been based upon square footage costs of facilities in other cities. These costs, in most cases, did not include soft costs, such as architectural fees, construction manager fees, and general administration. Furthermore, the estimates did not include land costs and costs associated with specific site constraints; e.g., maintaining the railroad spur, replacing a bridge, excavating large amounts of rock, building on a tight site, etc.

Status. The FWA Group will provide us with a most recent project cost estimate in April. Ultimately, we will build the best facility we can afford with the revenues to be generated by the proposed taxes. The City's Finance Director has hired a financial advisor to evaluate the maximum project costs that could be funded with the identified sources of revenue: three percent occupancy tax and one percent restaurant tax. The financing is to be addressed in conjunction with the facility program being prepared by the Coliseum Authority.

- Issue #3: Marketing Costs and Operating Deficit

Summary. Preliminary costs associated with operating the proposed facility in the early years are being reevaluated and fine tuned by the Convention Center staff. The Charlotte Convention and Visitors Bureau (CCVB) has prepared a marketing plan for the facility and has shared the plan with City staff. The operating deficit could be as large as $500,000/year, and the marketing budget prepared by the CCVB totals $2.5 million/year.

Status. The City's finance study will recommend approximately approximately $1.5 million annually for marketing in addition to retiring a debt of approximately $150 million. We are discussing with the Coliseum Authority the possibility of the Authority's assuming the operating deficit as part of the Authority's overall budget. This issue will be discussed at a Council briefing in April.

- **Issue #4:** Local Consensus

  Summary. The City Manager appointed a Citizens Advisory Committee with representatives from the hotels, the restaurants, and various other businesses in order to build consensus. The tax package for funding the facility resulted from this groups dialogue and work.

  Status. We are continuing to address the desires of local interest groups without negating the impact of the tax benefits for the proposed Convention Center.

- **Issue #5:** Site Assemblage

  Summary. In early 1989, the Planning Commission staff evaluated numerous potential sites for the Convention Center and recommended three sites as top-priority sites to receive detailed evaluation. Shortly thereafter, Council voted to concentrate on the Schottenstein site as the Number 1 priority. After Council decided to build the Convention Center through the public process, the City began negotiations with Schottenstein, Charles Young, and the Norfolk Southern Railroad (the three individual land owners for the Schottenstein site). Negotiations were slow because of a post business dispute between two of the participants.

  Status. The City is negotiating with all three property owners and is optimistic that options will be executed for all three sites by mid-April. There have been no appropriations by Council to purchase. We are negotiating for free options and feel we are close.

- **Issue #6:** Public Information Program

  Summary. On November 14, 1989, Council authorized the Public Information Group to begin a public information program designed to build local consensus and inform the State and local interest groups of the potential benefits from the convention business.

  Status. The public information group has produced an information pamphlet and a monthly newsletter which is mailed to over 1,000 local restaurants, hotels, and interested individuals. The public information group is supporting the Citizens Advisory Committee in their lobbying efforts to get the financing program approved by the legislature. In addition to providing documentation, the Public Information Group is researching comparable data regarding convention centers in other cities and is helping disseminate recent developments to all interested parties.

- **Issue #7:** **Program Development**

  Summary. In order to save approximately five months' time, the Coliseum Authority has funded a $200,000 program development phase which will provide the eventual design architect with a document specifying the general requirements for the new facility. The program development phase includes: visiting eight convention centers nationwide; bringing in meeting planners and facility managers to suggest ways to design the "perfect facility"; and evaluating the existing site in light of program requirements.

  Status. The program development phase is on schedule, and the finished product is due in early April. In addition to providing the program documents, the Authority's consultant (the FWA Group) will also provide the Authority and City with a preliminary project budget. This will be the first budget based upon the Charlotte project and specific local conditions. Council will be briefed on the facility program in April, 1990.

- **Issue #8:** **Architect Selection**

  Summary. In order to be prepared to begin the project design upon favorable legislature approvals, we have begun the architect and construction manager selection process.

  Status. Request for Qualifications (RFQs) have been mailed to numerous firms locally and nationally. We have currently "short listed" eight architectural firms and fifteen construction manager groups. The selection committee consists of Larry Dagenhart, Johnny Harris, Virginia Bush, Steve Camp, Richard Martin, Martin Cramton, and Ken Gillis. The selection committee is evaluating the qualifications of all firms with the assistance of a facilitator, Mr. Allen Waters, formerly in charge of professional service contracts for the North Carolina University System. The final selection of an architect and construction manager will occur prior to legislative approval of our funding sources.

- **Issue #9:** **Staging Area and Parking**

  Summary. Parking for the new Convention Center will be limited to the Young Ford Used Car lot adjacent to the County ABC warehouse. The Program Development Phase will identify the essential number of parking spaces necessary to support the Convention Center. We are

also including the parking analysis for the Convention Center in the NFL Parking Study, which is currently underway. A staging area for holding large trucks has been identified as doubling for potential surface parking for the NFL Stadium project. The entire parking issue associated with the Convention Center is being jointly examined with the NFL project.

Status. The parking and staging issues will be fully examined in late April after the NFL Parking Study and the Program Development Phase of the Convention Center Analysis has been completed.

- Issue #10: Old Convention Center

Summary. The Schottenstein proposal provided for Schottenstein to guarantee the City a fair market purchase price for the old Convention Center. The old Convention Center sale would help offset the cost for the new Center. Unfortunately, Schottenstein's buy-out offer would have required the City pay the cost of a letter of credit ($200,000/year ±) until such time as he exercised his option to purchase. Additionally, the Central Area Plan suggests that the old Convention Center and/or the vacant lot across the railroad track from the Center be used for a future transit facility.

Status. We have not resolved the question of what to do with the old Convention Center once the new facility is built. This issue will require a Council policy decision during the Capital Budget process.

Issue #11: Lobbying Efforts

Summary. The 1990 Short Session requires that issues considered be non-controversial in nature. A local bill requesting any new source of revenue not previously granted will be very difficult to achieve. The primary benefit to the State for authorizing our funding request is the anticipated local economic benefits from the project's direct state revenues--an estimated $14 million in new sales tax.

Status: Information describing and supporting the project has been assembled and we are presenting the merits of the project to our local delegation whose unanimous endorsement is almost essential. The Chamber of Commerce is coordinating our Raleigh lobbying efforts. Councilmembers, Commissioners, local business people and others will be called upon to personally contact members of the legislature at the most appropriate time.

Where Do We Go From Here

1. Introduce an amended funding bill to the 1990 Legislature (May 20, 1990).

   - Address Small Towns' concerns (March, 1990)
   - Get Local Delegation endorsement (March, 1990)
   - Work with Chamber, Local Delegation, Citizens Advisory Committee and others to present case for Convention Center to the Legislature.

2. Obtain "free" options for the Trade Mart/Young Ford/Norfolk Southern Site (April, 1990)

3. Continue to keep all local groups informed about the process by using monthly newsletters.

4. Conclude development of the program for the new building and present an updated project budget and cost estimate (early April)

5. Select an Architect and Construction Manager (May 1, 1990)

6. Complete project budget with annual operation/maintenance and marketing amounts (April, 1990)

7. Identify parking needs and proposed solutions (April, 1990)

8. Set policy for "Old Convention Center" (May, 1990)

NFL STADIUM
BRIEFING SUMMARY
MARCH 21, 1990

BACKGROUND/MAJOR EVENTS TO DATE

1987

- Dec. 15, 1987 - Public announcement by Richardson Sports (RS) that they intend to seek an NFL expansion franchise.

1988

- Fall, 1988 - Carolina's NFL Expansion Committee appointed with Henry Faison as chair.

1989

- Jan. 17, 1989 - CUDC letter to City Manager proposing an uptown location.
- March, 1989 - Meeting of NFL owners in Palm Desert, California; Carolina's NFL Expansion Committee chaired by Henry Faison attends to lobby the owners; uptown Charlotte is not among the potential sites under consideration.
- March, 1989 - CUDC appoints John Boatwright to chair Committee to pursue appropriateness of an uptown site; Laventhol & Horwath hired by "Boatwright Committee" to assess appropriateness of uptown site; Planning staff begins analysis of uptown sites.
- May 16, 1989 - Planning Commission staff submits uptown site analysis.
- May 24, 1989 - Laventhol & Horwath "Developmental Issues" report to the CUDC indicating that uptown is a viable location.
- Jul. 20, 1989 - Memo from Richard Vinroot to Council advising of other counties' efforts.
- Sep. 11, 1989 - KPC Research submits "Uptown Stadium Study" to CUDC.
- Sep. 11, 1989 - CUDC stadium committee submits recommendations for an uptown site.
- Sep. 12, 1989 - Council votes unanimously to begin negotiations with RS with regard to an NFL stadium in Uptown Charlotte.
- Sep. 15, 1989 - City Manager memorandum to Council indicating staff is reviewing the CUDC proposal requested from RS.
- Oct. 23, 1989 - Council authorizes staff to continue negotiations with RS and to identify extent of soil contamination on several parcels.
- Oct. 30, 1989 - RS memorandum requesting Council to adopt stadium proposal; RS opens the competition for site selection.
- Oct. 30, 1989 - Council approves purchase of six parcels; appropriates $79,000.

- Oct. 30, 1989 - County approves concept of joining City and RS in pursuit of Uptown site; County commits to relocating Magnolias Rest Home and other facilities as appropriate.
- Dec. 13, 1989 - City letter to Max Muhleman outlining "10 point" City commitment to project.
- Dec. 15, 1989 - Uptown site selection decision made by RS.
- Dec. 18, 1989 - Council appropriates $500,000.

1990

- January 1990 - County and Hospital Authority negotiate agreement regarding Magnolias Rest Home and warehouse and laundry facilities.
- Jan. 8, 1990 - City Manager memo to Council re: organizing for the project:
  - Project Manager: City Manager
  - Project Liaison: Loy McKeithen
  - Citizens Advisory Group: C. Patterson, R. Vinroot, P. Keber, R. Walton, C. Duncan, J. Boatwright, R. Whisnant, R. Goode, S. Dickson
  - Technical Advisory Group: Finance Director, Budget Director, Planning Director, CDOT Director, City Attorney, City Engineer, Assistant County Manager
- Jan. 8, 1990 - Council appropriates $6,626,000.
- Jan. 11, 1990 - RS letter addressing need to resolve concerns re: 1200 car parking commitment.
- Jan. 12, 1990 - City Manager letter to RS providing City points of contact.
- Jan. 22, 1990 - Council appropriates $1,300,000.
- February, 1990 - County applies for Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish Magnolias Rest Home; County agrees to buy AT&T facility.
- Feb. 1, 1990 - HOK (RS' architects) submits stadium footprint to City enabling the finalization of land acquisition and road realignment plans.
- Feb. 5, 1990 - Council appropriates $2,448,000.
- Feb. 19, 1990 - RS letter to City Manager providing time chart for site preparation.
- Feb. 26, 1990 - Loy McKeithen letter to Elliott Schwartz outlining the City's final position regarding the acquisition of his property; summary of this letter is sent to Council by Henry Underhill on 3/8/90.

(076.1)

CURRENT ISSUES

- **ISSUE #1:** Ability to Finance the Project

  Summary: The City is exploring every possible means to finance its share of the project costs to include land acquisition, demolition and parking.

  Status: Extensive discussions are being held with bond counsel to identify legal means by which the project can be financed. Bond counsel's decision will for the most part hinge on the ability of the City to pledge the property as security for potential lease purchase financers. We anticipate resolving this key issue by March 30th.

- **ISSUE #2:** Budget/Funding

  Summary: Current budget projections total approximately $43 million. However, recent developments favorable to the City related to the Schwartz parcel and to the potential use of on grade versus deck parking might reduce the total budget number to approximately $35 million.

  Status: Potential sources of funding for the $35 million budget include:

• $2 million/year in pay-as-you-go funds used in a lease-purchase mechanism	20.0 million
• Sale of a portion of Coliseum Center's Tract IV	4.0 million
Subtotal	$24.0 million
• Current GAP 3/4 TO 1¢ ADDED TO TAX RATE	$11.0 million

  We anticipate being able to finalize our budget estimates and develop alternative approaches for dealing with the current estimated gap by April 30th. Notes: (1) to date Council has authorized the expenditure of $10.9 million of which $6.3 million has been spent; (2) to date the County has spent approximately $10 million.

- **ISSUE #3:** Roads

  Summary: The State is currently responsible for road construction and funding. Morehead, Graham, Mint and Second Streets plus ramp(s) to 277 will be impacted by the project. The timeframe for road construction is extremely tight and there is concern with coordination between a road contractor working in proximity to the stadium contractor. Timing of State funding may not meet construction needs.

  Status: The State is discussing with Richardson Sports (RS) the possibility of transferring road construction to RS thru the City/RS agreement. State representatives have broached the idea of the City "fronting" the money to accomplish road construction within the schedule in return for the State funding a comparable City project at a later date. We anticipate resolving these issues by April 30th.

- **ISSUE #4: Parking Commitment**

  Summary: The City is responsible for providing 1,200 spaces. Staff is exploring various locations and deck vs. on grade options. Capital cost and revenue projections vary greatly between deck and on grade alternatives.

  Status: Capital costs are being determined. Barton Aschman, a traffic consultant, is in the process of developing revenue projections. The final decision will consider capital costs, revenue projections, land use and RS considerations. We expect to have all information (except environmental) by March 30th and anticipate having a final resolution of this matter by April 30th.

- **ISSUE# 5: Spur Track Relocation**

  Summary: The relocation of the spur track leading to The Charlotte Observer's facilities has both direct cost and "opportunity" considerations as well as road realignment ramifications.

  Status: An alternative which minimizes relocation of the spur and is lowest in cost has significant negative land use impacts on property traversed by the spur. It also may be unacceptable to The Charlotte Observer due to their long range plans for building expansion. A second alternative is being explored which is better from the perspective of land use and pedestrian access to the stadium but is higher in cost. The City is conducting discussions with RS, The Charlotte Observer and other property owners involved.

- **ISSUE #6: Practice Fields**

  Summary: The City is committed to provide a practice field site. The Schwartz site (former scrap yard site in the Third Ward) has been negotiated. A portion near Fourth Street (+4.7 acres) is contaminated. An adjoining (+8.7 acres) site appears to have only minor contamination.

  Status: We are performing environmental testing of the 8.7 acre Schwartz site. We have obtained an estimate of $500,000 to develop a detailed investigation of the entire 13.4 acre Schwartz site and develop a clean-up (remediation) plan to satisfy State requirements. We have identified an alternate potential practice field site and are assessing advantages and disadvantages compared to the Schwartz site.

- **ISSUE #7: Grainger Site**

  Summary: The projected timing of the Grainger relocation (i.e., no earlier than November 1st) misses by at least one full month the "no later than" start-to-grade date mandated by the 21-month stadium construction schedule.

  Status: On 3/21/90, we were advised by Grainger that they have come to terms with the owner of the building into which they are slated to move. However, the vacate date has now been slipped to 11/15/90 - two weeks later than planned. We will continue to work closely with Grainger but this site continues to pose major timing problems.

- **ISSUE #8:** Sites Requiring Remediation

  Summary: In addition to the contaminated portion of the Schwartz site (see issue #6), two sites ("Uptown Parking" and "Younce") will require some degree of remediation.

  Status: The "Uptown Parking" site lies in the direct footprint of the stadium itself. Given that a significant amount of earthwork will have to be done to prepare the field, a coordinated effort to address the remediation may be possible. The "Younce" site is not located directly in the footprint but will still have to be remediated. We anticipate having a better feel for the extent of the remediation that will be required by April 30th.

- **ISSUE #9:** Legal Documents

  Summary: The principal legal documents defining this project will be a development agreement and ground lease.

  Status: Staff is working with RS to finalize the Development Agreement which will be the umbrella document linking the City and RS. The ground lease is the companion document which will contain all of the specific lease provisions. We anticipate being able to finalize both documents in time for Council's June 11th meeting.

- **ISSUE #10:** Land Acquisition-General

  Summary: The process of purchasing or optioning all of the land involved has taken a significant coordinated effort on the part of a number of parties including the City and County.

  Status: Mecklenburg County has taken all of the actions necessary to relocate the satelite jail and has executed a contract with the Hospital Authority to relocate the warehouse and laundry. For our part, the remaining purchases/options to accommodate the stadium itself and the practice fields will be on Council's March 26, 1990 agenda. We are continuing to pursue the acquisition of additional sites for parking and other purposes.

- **ISSUE #11:** Relocation of Utilities

  Summary: The relocation of the various utility lines which are in the path of construction will call for the cooperation and coordination of the various parties involved.

  Status: Discussions are currently underway with Duke Power (who will be the most impacted of all of the utilities) and with Southern Bell to develop an agreement regarding who will pay for the relocation of these utilities.

ISSUE #12: Tightness of Schedule

Summary: The entire project schedule has no slack built in. All of the various events will have to be accomplished on or ahead of schedule for the stadium to be completed by August 1, 1992. This issue is in effect an element - in varying degrees - in all of the foregoing issues.

Status: We have developed preliminary PERT (Project Evaluation and Review Technique) charts to identify early-on those facets of the project which are in the "critical path." Three major events have surfaced as critical:

1. The relocation of Southern Bell's fiber optics line by 9/1/90 (Bell currently projects 10/1/90);
2. The relocation of Grainger by 10/1/90 (Grainger currently projects no earlier than 11/15/90); and
3. The stadium schedule itself which allows only 21 months for construction (items 1 and 2 above exacerbate this already tight schedule).

Every effort will be made to make or improve the already-tight deadlines.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE

1. By March 30th we will:
   a. Resolve the financing issue (issue #1)
   b. Resolve the practice fields issue (issue #6)
   c. Complete the land acquisition issue (issue #10)

2. By April 30th we will:
   a. Finalize our budget plan (issue #2)
   b. Resolve the roads issue (issue #3)
   c. Resolve the structured vs surface parking issue (issue #4)
   d. Resolve the relocation of the spur track issue (issue #5)
   e. Develop the remediation action plan for the contaminated sites (issue #8)
   f. Develop the utility relocation plan (issue #11)
   g. Develop schedule of key events (issue #12)

3. By June 11th we will:
   a. Finalize and place on your agenda the Development Agreement and Ground Lease (issue #9)

(076)