

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Special Meeting on Monday, October 31, 2016, at 12:13 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Jennifer Roberts presiding. Councilmembers present were Al Austin, John Autry, Ed Driggs, Julie Eiselt, Patsy Kinsey, Vi Lyles, LaWana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Greg Phipps, and Kenny Smith.

ABSENT: Councilmember Claire Fallon

* * * * *

REZONING PETITION 2016-056

Mayor Roberts said I want to let everybody know that this is a special meeting of the Charlotte City Council. It is a Special Meeting to receive more information about a rezoning, Petition 2016-056, and we will have an opportunity for Councilmembers to ask questions. This is not a public hearing, so there are no speakers that are available from the public, but we will be getting a lot of questions answered and we also will not be voting today. The vote for this will happen on November 21, 2016. I also want to recognize quickly, we do have our Zoning Commission Chairperson, Tony Lathrop is here.

Ron Kimble, Interim City Manager said this is probably one of the largest rezoning considerations that you have ever had in the City of Charlotte, this Council or the previous Councils. It is large. It is complex, at times confusing, but you have asked lots of questions. You have raised lots of issues, and it was felt by many of you, in conversations with me, that you felt that maybe a meeting like this would be helpful to you as you bring this forward to City Council consideration at the November 21, 2016 Zoning Meeting. We plan today on having staff make this presentation. Mr. McKinney is going to carry the bulk of it, since he is our Interim Planning Director. Towards the end, he is going to be assisted by Mr. Pat Mumford in our Neighborhood and Business Services office, because you have also asked some questions about conceptual framework and funding for roads, but most importantly, we want to convey to you answers to a lot of the questions and issues that you have raised. It is going to be in the areas of infrastructure, parks, open space, schools, workforce housing, issues about police stations, fire stations, questions that you had around the environment and questions that you had around transit and around roads and thoroughfares. Because you had a lot of questions, many of you said it would be helpful to have an informational meeting, and that is what this is. It is an informational meeting.

The Zoning Committee deferred action on this last week. It is my understanding that the Zoning Committee is scheduled to pick this up on November 7, 2016. On November 7, 2016, remember you have five hearings carried over, that you will hear at 4:00 p.m. They will sit for those hearings and then afterwards, they will adjourn to consider this issue in the form of whatever recommendations or thoughts they may have on this particular petition. So, they have deferred while they also got additional information from this meeting, because that is what it is; it is an informational meeting. No decisions will be made today, and it will be scheduled on your November 21, 2016 Zoning Meeting, but it is up to you to decide what you do at that meeting on November 21, 2016. This is complex. We believe, at staff level, when you have 1,377 acres, under option or scheduled ownership by two entities and they come to you and say, how about we discuss how we can master plan this area together, and obviously, one of the first actions is a rezoning action, but it results in a master planning of this area that you wouldn't get if individual land owners are going to come to you 10 and 20 acres at a time and say, I would like to rezone this property. It is very difficult at that point and time to come out with the holistic infrastructure type approach, and I think you and we have been afforded this opportunity.

It is still up to us; it is up to you how you want to proceed, how quickly you might want to take action or receive more information. Staff is trying to work with you best as we can, to answer those questions and get you as comfortable or not as we can, and you still have the final decision making authority and the timing for when you want to take action on this. We believe we can convey critical information to you today. We encourage a dialogue. We have a fairly lengthy presentation. It is up to you whether you want to let Mr. McKinney get through most of it and ask questions at the need or whether you want to ask questions as we go, because there is great information that I think we can share to you about what has transpired. We also have other staff members of the County and the schools here as well. We are trying to give you as much

information, as much data, as we possibly can. It is up to you how you want to have all of your questions and all the issues resolved today, if that is the path forward that you want to take.

Mayor Roberts said we have this room until 2:00 p.m., correct?

Mr. Kimble said I believe that is the case. We tried to schedule it so that you would be in and out of here in a couple of hours, and we respect your time and want to give you as much information as we can in the next hour and forty minutes. If you are so inclined, I would like to call on Mr. McKinney and get started with the presentation. You have a copy of it in front of you, and we wanted that to be able to assist you on the questions and follow up that you may want to have, and I am assuming that you are going to have more questions today that are going to go to the November 21, 2016 Zoning Meeting as well.

Mayor Roberts said I'm going to ask Council; if there is a question specifically related to a slide right at that moment and you are just burning to ask it we can do that, but try to hold questions to the end for the global presentation, but if there is something particularly you want clarity on as it is presented then let me know.

Ed McKinney, Interim Planning Director said as let me real quickly talk to you about the agendas, as Mr. Kimble already described, it is pretty ambitious. We have a lot of detail that we want to go through today. I will just very quickly go through an overview of the petition, so just some of the information you saw at the hearing and then the next two categories are really what we described as kind of an interpretation of the questions that came up in the hearing of two categories, the infrastructure questions and the funding questions. As Mr. Kimble said, I will walk through the infrastructure pieces of this and the details you see here in the outline, then I am going to turn it over to Mr. Mumford to talk to the funding strategy and then we will come back and talk a little bit about next steps in both for the zoning petition itself and some of these funding issues and then certainly I can imagine we will have questions and dialogs throughout.

Real quick again, overview, just to give you back to the context, I am sure you are familiar now with the location, the scale of this, the notion of you see that highlighted for the 13,000 acres essentially between the Catawba River and I-485 adjacent to the airport. A couple of key things again I will mention, just about the history of the planning that has gone on here for the last 20 plus years, really starting in many ways with the Strategic Airport Plan in 1996, which anticipated development in this portion of the County and ultimately the City on the west side of I-485, adjacent to the airport. Really, in part to the growth and the dynamic nature of the airport as an economic engine, all of the circles that you see in that area are that notion that we would anticipate that kind of development. That is, in context, how this petition sits within there. Following upon that, we have formalized some of that thinking in our area planning work, back in 2003, which anticipated and looked at how the Dixie-Berry Hill Strategic Plan, how development in this whole area essentially between the river and I-485 should develop. As you can see sort of the colored areas, and we talked about this again at the hearing, the notion that those areas were anticipated to be mixed use centers, the notion of higher intensity employment, again building upon the idea of how we are generating use and development related to the airport over the long-term.

The environment, on thing that I will mention here too, and you will see this as I walk through some of the infrastructure pieces and the commitments that the petitioner has made, is certainly the environment, the relationship to the river and many layers really was an part of this and a part of this petition's commitment. Now, we have zoomed in. This is sort of a close end. You see the black highlight and again the 13,000 acres, the context of West Boulevard, the interchange. This is a big portion; the big important part of this that we will talk about in the transportation piece, is the access, here is I-485, West Boulevard, Dixie River, Garrison, and then you see the river. Again, this just describes the scale of the entitlement that we talked about at the hearing, the notion that over the long term it is 8 million square feet of office, 500,000 square feet of retail, 1,000 hotel rooms and a little over 4,600 residential units.

We talked too about how, in this petition, we have broken down entitlement, both by district, and I will not go into that now, but more importantly by phase, and that phasing, as we described at the hearing, really related to a set of commitments that were made to the transportation improvements that would need to be in place to make these phases work. I will not go into detail, but as we talk, there is a lot of analysis at the regional scale, at sort of the site specific scale, to test these phasings and to insure then that we had transportation commitments that were

calibrated to those entitlements. It was really important, certainly from Charlotte Department of Transportation and our perspective, that we did that. We took this large scale entitlement and broke it down into phases that made sense, and was important for us that could be achievable phase by phase. This is again a diagram that Mike Davis showed at the hearing that talked about that phasing, so now you will see in that chart, the one, two, three phases. I will walk through, just so you can see diagrammatically. We will not go into extreme detail here, that first phase being, I will not go into the numbers, but you see that first million square feet of office as an example, then the notion of what would need to be in place, the idea of the extension of West Boulevard, the connection to I-485, the extension of both Garrison and Dixie River, widening in some cases, and new connections, that is essentially what allows you to build that first phase. The next phase, the \$3 million Phase II build additional connection, in particularly related and one of the big issues has been the capacity and access to get the development connected to I-485. So, this is a conceptual notion of how this might work, some connectivity that builds to that, that connects both to Garrison and Dixie River, the long term provides better access to the interchange and to I-485 and then ultimately, connections south from both Garrison and Dixie that kind of build that second phase of work, so that is the basic set of infrastructure. Lastly on that, we will talk a little bit about this in the funding, but the notion of the long term, particularly related to the realignment work that the airport will be looking at on West Boulevard between I-485 and Billy Graham, capacity improvements will be needed to make these phases achievable as well.

Councilmember Phipps said with regards to these three phasings, is it much too early, at this point, to try to correlate the phasing of the projects with the number of years that it might take, when would you invasion a Phase I or a Phase II? Would that have to come in after the infrastructure it there, then these would come, or would it be a concurrent type of proposal?

Mr. McKinney said Mike Davis can correct me if I state this wrong, but it essentially what we have done and part of the languages and commitment has these big phases, but to your point, allows us to work with the petitioner to kind of sub phase those things. So, there are pieces of this in each phase, depending upon how they break down their development in phases. We have the ability to make sure that they can. We can kind of calibrate what they might actually do in their first project, but ultimately the point is, you cannot build, for example that first phase, that first million square feet. By the time you get to those million square feet, those improvements have to be in place. There is no debate about that. We do have some ability to respond to how the market will treat this and the way they will get into more detailed development phases, but there is a hard stop in the notion that each phase has a very clear set of expectations but with some flexibility to how we get there.

Councilmember Driggs said I just wanted to follow up on that. What is the end date? We have been talking; is it 2030 or is there some sort of –

Mr. McKinney said I will answer that from our perspective, and maybe later, if needed, we can have this discussion with the petitioner. From our perspective, the end date is less important than these infrastructure commitments. The scale of this investment obviously, and the amount of entitlement that is in play here is certainly 10, 20 years plus. From our perspective, in the entitlement, we haven't put any provision on the dates. Really for us, the important part was making sure we had clarity on the infrastructure needed.

Mr. Driggs said is there a critical path that defines the timeline, like certain events that have to happen first or what are the constraints that dictate when which thing happens?

Mr. McKinney said again, I will answer it from our perspective. It certainly would come differently from a developer's perspective. As we talk, you will see this when we get into the funding discussion later. There is certain clarity that is more understandable now about Phase I as an example, and the West Boulevard extension is really to a critical path as you get in that project and is really critical to this first phase. We have some anticipation on how our capital community investment funding will play to that, and getting that in place first is obviously going to be critical to getting Phase I in play. As we get farther out though, that kind of time frame and the specifics of that I think are less, we are unable to define in any more detail.

Mr. Driggs said thank you.

Mr. McKinney said you see in the green talks about Phase III. Bigger projects and I did not mention this yet but the notion that part of this east west connectivity, both the extension of West Boulevard and what you see here in portions of green and the purple are both notions of east west connectivity, one of which and certainly both are designed to then allow for that connection across the river, so it is anticipated that the southern one would be the one that would kind of provide you the direct connection ultimately to the regional connection to Gaston County.

Ultimately, again, we believe that some addition interchange capacity will be required and some new thinking about how that connection might actually connect to the interchange. I think Mike had mentioned this before, but as you can see, very diagrammatically, that is a different looking kind of interchange. Conceptually, it is similar to some of the things that we did up at Prosperity Village, so the notion that we can design the community around the interchange in a way, both to kind of enhance capacity to the interchange itself but also influence how development would occur around it. That is a lot about phasing. Let me quickly finalize one question that kind of related to the transportation network that I think came up at the hearing, which was what are the changes related to the thoroughfare network? That was one of the key questions. I want to make sure it is clear, because I think that the point was that there has been a lot of thinking, a lot of work, in the community, about what the long-range thoroughfare should look like, and does this change that? So, this first line, that first dash line sort of conceptually shows what is currently on our thoroughfare network about that east-west connection, and that connection would extend obviously, and at one point was the Garden Parkway that would extend from I-485 to the river and across.

What we are showing now in this plan is just sort of a different alignment to that, the same purpose. It is the same east-west connection, but now with some greater sense of the topography and kind of the nature of that site. That alignment has been refined, and you can kind of see essentially doing the same thing but in a slightly different way. That is essentially the difference between what is for the West Boulevard realignment, what the difference is for the thoroughfare network. The other two important ones are the Dixie River Road and then that essentially remains unchanged, so it connects up through the River District project and ultimately is anticipated to extend farther north, getting you ultimately up to Wilkinson so we have a stronger north-south connection. Parallel to that has always been the notion of Garrison Road, which would run parallel down from Berewick then reconnect back up to Dixie River. The only change here is back to that notion of what we just talked about in terms of how this might interface with a new interchange connection. That connection is still made. Garrison would still be connected but then it would ultimately potentially get you more directly to that interchange then connect you back up over to Dixie River. Different alignment but essentially both of these changes are essentially doing the same thing, providing the east-west connectivity and the north-south connectivity.

The last thing, just to mention too, is this this new piece. So, we have gained this added thoroughfare, which enhances our east-west connectivity and then also insures that we get that connection ultimately regionally to Gaston County and across the river and connecting more work to be done but connecting south of the airport to a future realigned West Boulevard. That is a good place to stop. That is sort of my basic summary of the petition.

Mr. Driggs said we have about \$43 million or something in the CIP right now for the area, right? So, which of those things are paid for by that money?

Mr. Kimble said I am going to show you that towards the end of the presentation.

Councilmember Lyles said I have a couple of things if this is the right point. When we are doing this, can you give me from page five that we have, where you are talking about the proposed entitlement, do we have comparable to other comparative strategic centers that we have in the City, and what would they look like? That is going to be one of the things. I am a learner that has to have what does it mean as oppose to what have we done. So, can we, for example on page six, tell me what we have done in comparable? What would be the same? What would be different? This may be a qualitative question. What have we learned since the last comparable that we want to have happened, that is different in our vision? In this section, it would help me if I could have what else is like this district, because I have heard people compare it to whatever employment center we have, whatever large residential center. I am not sure what the

comparable is, what date it was, how is it different, and how do we want it to be different in our vision since the last plan was approved.

Mr. McKinney said I can answer this briefly. There is actually a slide that I took out that you may recall we showed at the hearing. I had a slide that showed essentially at the same scale, a comparison of this 1300 acres to Ballantyne and to South Park. To remind you about that comparable, Ballantyne is plus or minus 6 million square feet of office, not all fully developed yet, but essentially the entitlement for that. South Park, as it sits today as it evolves, it sits to day plus or minus 5 million square feet of office; obviously, a significantly larger amount of retail with the mall. Both of those scale-wise give you a sense of basic comparable to this. To sort of give you a little bit of an answer as to how we view those comparables to the things that we are doing in this plan, what I would say is for us it has been a really good opportunity to insure that we get a comprehensive planning for all of this acreage. Think about all of the entitlement at once and think about all of the things that I am going to talk about in a minute, which is schools and parks, even affordable housing, fire, police; all of the infrastructure that needs to go into that. Not to say that those things weren't thought of in Ballantyne, but certainly we have an opportunity now to think differently. We have new standards about our road design. We have new standards about our road connectivity. We actually do have a significant opportunity to do and really build into all of the policies and principals we have in place to make this, in our minds, a stronger version of those.

Ms. Lyles said I agree with that, but I am looking at this as saying, what is the city that we think in 20 years we should have and be like? What is the same, what does this give us and what is different or remaining? So, I just want to kind of get an idea. This is how I look at it. The people that live in South Park and Ballantyne, what kind of areas have they called us and said this should have been different. We would have liked this, so that we would have some idea of where trends are, not just with this but locally. Then, what is the trend naturally? I think it is better again for me to see it written down. If I could get that information, that would be helpful.

Mr. McKinney said okay.

Councilmember Mayfield said question regarding slide 7, with looking at the Gaston County connector, I do not remember, but I want to preface this, that this conversation started in 2014 with staff, as was mentioned by Mr. Kimble and under the previous Mayor, a lot of conversations working with Staff, CDOT, and the community meetings probably started late 2015 or earlier this year. There has been a lot of conversations that have been happening, but I am trying to understand for the Gaston County connector, what is Gaston County contributing to this?

Mr. McKinney said a lot of work yet to be done on that. So, what has happened since the notion of the Garden Parkway, which is now from a project standpoint, gone away, but the need for that regional connection hasn't. So, what we have been doing with the County, both regionally and with the petitioner, is make sure that we have a plan that insures that we get that connection and the things that we are doing and the things that we control as a City. Work regionally then to work with the state ultimately to revision what that project should be, and work with the state and the region to think through how we might fund that. What we are doing today with this petition though is making sure that we haven't precluded that, and in fact, we actually in our minds insured that we have a clear path on our side for sure to get there.

Ms. Mayfield said so, let me clarify, Ron, you want to jump in on this?

Mr. Kimble said I think what I would be inclined to say is that the state is certainly going to be the major participant in getting a bridge built across the Catawba River. What we have to do, in Mecklenburg County and Charlotte, on outside of the Catawba River, is make sure that we are providing for the kind of development and the kind of connectivity to that river crossing, the same as what Gaston County, Gastonia, and the towns in the Gaston County area are going to have to figure out how they partner in order to get the roads build west of the river. We are going through the exercise with development here and trying to explain how the road network, that is necessary for the entire development over whatever 30 years to occur, but making sure that we preserve the river crossing so that the two sides of the Catawba River are developing in conjunction in one another, that they do dovetail, connect, and make sense.

Ms. Mayfield said I am going to dig a little deeper in that. Are we looking at what the total build out numbers would be if the state does not come to the table, since we have had other major project discussions where there was a verbal commitment on the front end for the state and then a decision was made that they were not going to financially contribute one, and two, still with this being a regional project, we have other regional projects that we thought the other parts of the region that were going to benefit would come to the table and recognize the value, that did not happen. I am trying to get a clearer understanding of what the financial expectation is and/or worst case scenario, what the financial implication on Charlotte is going to be for this.

Mr. Kimble said there would need to be a partnership between Gaston, Mecklenburg, the two MPO's to make sure that we are together partnering to talk to the state of North Carolina, to move a bridge project to a priority position, so that we could get a bridge build across the Catawba. We are figuring out the partnership opportunities for the road network still in Mecklenburg County. Gaston County and Gaston will have to figure out how to do it on their side but there is a partnership opportunity with developers, private sector, public sector entities, counties, and MPO's in order to make sure that we are advocating and prioritizing the bridge across the Catawba. That would be my answer. I will ask Mr. McKinney or Mr. Davis or Ms. Pleasant to chime in as well.

Mr. McKinney said again, it is not funded today, and as Mr. Kimble described, it is going to take a lot of discussion regionally and both with us and the Gaston County partners. What was important for us from a transportation stand point, from a thoroughfare stand point, from a regional stand point, was that we insured that we have that ability to have that corridor, and in fact, we have, in our minds, a scenario here were we, on our side in partnership with this petitioner, actually built portions of that, sooner rather than later with the notion that yes, the big hurdle there is ultimately the bridge across. We actually think that we put in place here a scenario that we actually get that connection sooner rather than later in partnership with the petitioner at the table.

Ms. Mayfield said so, the last piece that I am going to add to that is for future Councils, especially since we are looking at a 20 year potential build out. We need to have a very clear understanding of the financial impact of the what-ifs. I like the idea of the regional partnerships, but we also have to be cognizant of the realities. We have attempted at regional partnerships on major developments over the years. Those have not necessarily turned out the way that we anticipated, and it is the tax payers and the citizens of Charlotte that end up absorbing the bulk of those costs. I just want us to make sure that we are as transparent as possible when we are having those conversations and making sure that our regional partners recognize the true value of them being at this table and not just in name only.

Mr. Kimble said you may be one of the few that hasn't looked ahead in the presentation, but towards the end, we do talk about the partnership that would get the roads built on the Mecklenburg County side. Again, you are correct. The missing piece and the missing link is the bridge across the Catawba, and we have to work together with our partners across the river to elevate that discussion with the state of North Carolina.

Ms. Lyles said why don't we ask CARPO to give us the outline of the decision making on the bridge, because we had a bridge alignment that was taken off of the plan by Gastonia, of the Gaston MPO. So, we need to actually take this and refer it to CARPO as something of how do we do it? That would be my suggestion on this to start.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you, because without actually identifying that, I wanted to highlight that in conversation, it looks great, but when it is time for implementation and the funding, we need to be very cognizant of what expectations we have and what does a MOU entail that is going to strengthen. We want to benefit the region, but not on the backs of the tax payers of Charlotte only.

Councilmember Eiselt said Ed, and this may be for the City Manager, with the \$43 million that we have dedicated right now, this is not land that, for the most part, is in the City of Charlotte.

Mr. Kimble said that is correct.

Ms. Eiselt said so, we are making that commitment on capital to land that is not in Charlotte right now. So, I would like to hear a little about how this infrastructure is going to benefit this part of town that is in Charlotte right now, if we are going to make that commitment of capital.

Mr. Kimble said back in 2012, when you formulated your \$816 million eight-year bond package, we conceptually put \$43 million worth of roads that would help create connectivity west of I-485 and we clearly said, these are conceptual and one big thing that is going to drive how these roads get built, where they get built, and when they get built, is annexation. If we are on record, back in 2012, you cannot participate as easily in road building outside of the city limits of Charlotte as you can when you are partnering inside the city limits of Charlotte. You can build roads outside of Charlotte, but you cannot maintain them, according to North Carolina Department of Transportation regulations, so we have always had this dilemma, how are the roads going to be built in unincorporated areas of the City of Charlotte? Through the petitioner coming forward with 1,380 acres, we have the opportunity, utilizing the opportunities that they present through petitions for voluntary annexation and thereby getting into a partnership with the \$43 million that you had in your bond campaign, together with roads that they will build privately, together with funds that the State of North Carolina might come forward with and together with the County participating in parts of the road building here, because this tax base and this development is going to be very crucial to the future growth and development of the west side of Charlotte, Mecklenburg County. In fact, I would even say as Ms. Mayfield has pointed out, regionally. This is very important regionally, with another regional partner across the river. We have now found ways, through leveraging private investment, which was another one of the criteria that you came forward with in 2012, with your bond package, of doing it in a master plan format that can allow us to do this in the holistic fashion and get the roads built and get them in the city limits of Charlotte, such that you are advantaging and leveraging everything that we had envisioned back in 2012. Annexation is a critical piece of how all of this comes together, gets built in the form of police stations, fire stations, transit, roads, parks, open space, schools, workforce housing, all of that, and having it come into the city limits is very powerful, because then you get a lot of say so in how this builds out according to the notes on the rezoning plan and according to a future memorandum of understanding that we would have with the developers that are at the table with us. This fits very nicely with the goal that you have in the 2012 bond referendum in the \$43 million in roads that we had mentioned.

Ms. Eiselt said to follow up on that then, I look at that as an investment that we have chosen to make with that \$43 million, which would have some kind of a return. Do we have a financial analysis, by phase on what that capital investment that could be used in other parts of town, are going to do in a return standpoint from us?

Mr. Kimble said we have estimates, and we are going to drill down further in that in the Memorandum of Understanding that will come to you in late winter/spring of the year, because it is going to actually get down to more of the numbers over time. We have conceptual framework. We are going to show that to you today, at the end of the presentation on potential conceptual costs of this road network and all of the other things that will happen in this area, and we will drill down even further in the memorandum of understanding that comes forward. The County will also be a partner in that memorandum of understanding and the schools likely too, because [inaudible].

Councilmember Smith said I can't get my I-Legislate to open and this answer may be in there. How many individual land owners are in this 1400 acres?

Ms. Mayfield said two.

Mr. McKinney said I would have to get the exact number, because it is more than two because it is with some holdings that Lincoln Harris and Crescent had, but then they've also partnered and have a number of other properties under contract. I do not have the exact number.

Mr. Kimble said in the end, they have under option, the properties. So, if you consider the options that they have, is their more than two?

Mr. McKinney said yeah, definitely more than two.

Mr. Smith said I am curious to how many individual land owners make up that 14,000 acres.

Tracy Dodson, 4725 Piedmont Row Drive said within just our parts, the Lincoln Harris half, we have 17 different property owners that we have been working with in trying to coordinate, of which, some have multiple family owners or multiple investment partners.

Mr. Smith said are we losing some I-1 land in this, and did any of our planning take into account sort of a shrinking industrial land and how we may compensate for that?

Mr. McKinney said we are. Again, I did not include that level of detail, but we did talk about the hearing. There is a portion of what they are rezoning. Most of it is single-family residential, but there is a portion of it that is zoned for industrial I-1. I would have to get back to you with the exact number of acreage in that, but back to, the strategic plan for Dixie Barry Hill. There was the notion that you saw that kind of mixed use color, was the notion that a mix of high-tech, airport related manufacturing employment would be a part of that, and that I think is still essentially the vision for what is allowed and certainly will occur, both here and around the airport.

Mr. Smith said the reason I wanted to try to get to the bottom of how many land owners there are, is clearly 1,400 acres is a complex transaction from the zoning aspect, but it is an equally complex transaction from the real estate portion, and this may be a unique opportunity for us where we have 1,400 acres under control that may not replicate itself in the future. I just think that is a point worth noting.

Councilmember Autry said I would really appreciate this discussion about a bridge across the Catawba River. I wonder if we are considering that bridge to only be for pedestrians and bicycles.

Ms. Mayfield said what? Excuse me?

Mr. Autry said there is humor in that? We certainly saw on the example, a couple of years ago, in Minneapolis of where they have a bridge across the Mississippi River that was a great conduit and very beneficial to everyone involved. So, if we are designing an environment for people, why do we keep talking about designing our environment and infrastructure for cars? That seems like lost opportunity.

Mr. Kimble said my suspicion is that we would design it for all forms of mobility.

Mr. Autry said I understand that. I also think that this is an opportunity for a more encompassing project about the future of what it means to move people around this city and parts that are not even in the city yet. Has there been any economic impact study done at all?

Mr. McKinney said there has. The petitioner has; we as staff nobody has reviewed any of that work yet, and certainly that kind of information can and should be part of the kind of work and discussion that would happen as to how the city might participate with funding and what the benefits with it, what we get out of that, from an economic development stand point.

Mr. Autry said I think that would be an important piece of the puzzle to understand where that investment goes and what the benefits of that investment are, as the Mayor Pro Tem was trying to align. Also, I see that there has been talk about 40% of the land that was going to be left to set aside for open space and parks and greenway and so forth. I see in the Parks and Rec's comments outstanding issues.

Mayor Roberts said are we going to talk about schools and parks?

Ms. Mayfield said we have not gotten to that.

Mr. Autry said fine, but I just wanted to know what portion of the land is considered undevelopable, if at all. How much more conversation has been going on about the potential for rail transit to the area? We have talked about extending the Gold Line out to the airport. Where are the opportunities to connect this development with rail transit? There again, speaking about the future of 1.4 million people in this City, it looks like eventually a lot of them will live in this area. How do they get in and out of the city without having to always be reliant on an automobile? As we are talking, I thank the City Manager for reminding us that the multi-modal should also include public transit. When you are considering bicycling infrastructure, are we really considering protected bicycle lanes in this? It seems like the opportunity with a clean slate

to get this done right and in the direction that we hope the whole city is going to be moving towards in the future. As you develop this property, what opportunities will there be for the public to have access to the river? Is there a river front that the public can get to? That is it. I will wait for the rest of this stuff to come.

Mr. McKinney said you have given me an outline of my next topics. I think we have hit most of those. I will try to hit on most of those as we talk through.

Mr. Driggs said one of the pieces for this, from the petitioner, is that there will be property tax generation and in fact, if you just do some mental arithmetic, if you get to \$3 billion of total investment and you figure out over a certain span of time, you probably end up with total tax receipts for the City in the \$220 to \$250 range and for the County at a larger amount. So, without getting into the details, is the proposition that there would be a surplus of tax receipts over the public spending that needs to occur in this area, does that test out? Have you looked at it enough to be able to say that this thing ultimately pays for itself and then some?

Mr. Kimble said conceptually, absolutely. Now, we need to get into the details to find out the magnitude of that.

Mr. Driggs said right, but then you do sort of have a concept at least of where we need to borrow, where we need to invest, and how it unfolds, and what commitments we made. Madam Mayor, with some trepidation, I have a question for the petitioner. I do not know whether my colleagues object.

Mayor Roberts said our attorney has already said that even though this is a staff briefing Council, if there is someone on the room who knows the answer and staff does not know the answer, we are allowed to ask them to come to the podium to answer.

Mr. Driggs said these are fairly targeted, specific questions.

Mayor Roberts said is it a whole number of them?

Mr. Driggs said I wanted to put the question; the plan as it stands has some TIGS incorporated in it. The whole concept of the thing includes some TIG financing. The question is what if that doesn't happen?

Mayor Roberts said well, financing is another part of the presentation too. We are going to get into that, so if you can hold that question until we talk about financing that would be great.

Councilmember Mitchell said this is on transportation. A couple of questions were presented to me this morning. I told them I would try to raise them today. One is referencing Councilmember Mayfield and Mayor Pro Tem. About the bridge, is the bridge in our plan?

Ms. Lyles said no, it is not, and we are doing the 30 year plan now. It is not there.

Mr. Mitchell said so we are waiting from the representative from Gaston, Lincolnton to give us feedback to include it in the plan?

Ms. Lyles said that is what I was saying. Let's talk about that with CARPO and get a report, because otherwise, I think we are just wandering in the wilderness.

Mr. Mitchell said then they made a reference to the Catawba Crossing Project. Is that the same as the bridge or is that a different? Is that the bridge?

Mr. Kimble said that is the bridge, the Catawba Crossing.

Ms. Lyles said that is the important thing. The other towns are growing as fast as Charlotte, so when you choose this bridge, it is going to be really important. You wouldn't want them coming to Charlotte and building the bridge wherever they want it, and we can't go over there and say here it is wherever we want it. It is a big deal.

Mr. McKinney said these are the questions that were raised, many of which you have already raised here today that were raised at the hearing, and we want to put those back in context. Community infrastructure related and the funding related, so that is really outlines the structure of what we are going to do next.

Ms. Lyles said I read the list, and it says provide a business plan for providing light rail to the airport, this project into Gaston County. I actually said, I thought I wanted to see a transit plan that was inclusive of whatever methodology we are going to go with, and if rail is the choice, if in buses are the choice, I want to see as you have for roads, a plan that talks about transit. I think that, I just want to make sure that point on the last was not the business plan, that it was actually the transit plan.

Mr. McKinney said we will touch a little bit about that today. Let me dive in there. So, what I am going to do next, as you have already seen is your slides is kind of in the weeds, so if you need me to move faster, I will. It is important to kind of walk through these in more detail, just to kind of understand and touch upon all of the infrastructure things that have been done here in this petition. All of the things that I am going to describe here in these categories are sort of above and beyond. What you are not going to see here is all of the things that you have to do just by nature of the development standards that we have. These are the things that we have been working through with all of the different departments and agencies to insure that we get above and beyond for this petition. I am going to start first with environment. A couple of highlights here, as you know, we have a goal here for the tree canopy, sort of our 20/50 goal for 50%. Obviously, we have the water shed and the river here as an important sensitive area that we are protecting both with existing overlay standards and the things that we can do above and beyond. In that proposed commitment, a number of things that I just want to highlight. Both things that are during construction, which is pretty important given the scale of this and as you can imagine, the length of construction that is going to occur here and essentially what you will get at the end of the day. They have committed to some important base line and post development surveys, so there are some things that even our agencies do not know, in terms of what is out there in terms of the codes and the nature of the biology of these creeks that are committed to setting that base line. It is valuable information for us moving forward. They will have this notion of real time monitoring, so that all of the four coves the coves that are really affected by development here, will have monitors that are essentially wired to provide actual real time monitoring. So, as construction is occurring, if there is an issue or a change in the nature of the water or the nature of dirt that is happening during construction, they will know that immediately and be able to respond. In addition, they will have a staff person committed to responding to that, so coordinating through all of that development there would be immediate respond to kind of deal with and adjust to those issues. Longer term then, the other things that they have committed to is the basin sizes themselves would be larger and would help us in terms of the water quality. They have enhanced kind of the treatment of those basins and also, along all of the streams and there are some more detailed maps and things that we can show, but in the stream buffers themselves, they have committed to some larger enhanced buffers than what are required, again by right through the overlay standards that we have. So, all of these things again are things that are designed to insure that there is an extra layer of protection to the water quality of the area.

On the tree save area, there are two things here. Essentially the tree save is broken down into the mix use portion and the residential portion, the 15% that is allowed where essentially the office and employment will be, has been designed to be put into one location and they have actually strategically worked without departments to figure out what the right location is to protect the existing tree canopy that is out there, so there is sort of a single location. Residential would happen as projects occur. The remaining issue there, as you see in highlight, is there is still a desire from our side to essentially set the bar for the whole development at 15%. Today, they are allowed to do 10% of the residential. The issue here that we are trying to do is get to 15%. So, a real high level of additional water quality standards on top of what is allowed by right, and then some specific and unique things that we can do to protect the existing tree canopy using the tree save requirements that we have today.

Mr. Phipps said I can appreciate the different policies that we have in place now, with regards to the environment. I remember, as a Planning Commissioner, any construction or development that went on in this water shed, even if it was for an acre, it was like walking on egg shells to get anything approved and it had to be carefully vetted. So, how do we know what we have now, if it is really sufficient for development on this scale? Is there a mechanism by which we could overlay what we propose to do and have someone else look at it to see if it is adequate for what we want to do? Is that possible or not?

Mr. McKinney said potentially, staff could answer that today or we could follow up on that. I would be hesitant to give you an answer to that. One comparable I would give you is that many

of the standards that are in this commitment are very similar to what is committed on the Tanger Outlet development, just south in Berewick, with the same issue in its relation to Brown's Cove. I think that the experience there, both with the folks in that cove and with our development staff has been that it has been successful and those standards did do a good job of insuring those things that we wanted to ensure both during and post construction.

Mr. Phipps said how many acres was that?

Mr. McKinney said I could not tell you off of the top of my head, probably 30 to 40.

Mr. Phipps said it wasn't 1400 right?

Mr. McKinney said correct.

Mr. Phipps said I am just saying, that would give me greater comfort to see if something like that was feasible.

Mr. McKinney said again, there are existing overlay standards for the protected area for the water sheds that have been in place. Those were designed and are still in affect here, that sort of restrict the amount of development and the amount of impervious surface that you can have. So, those standards have been in place for some time, are guiding development of this area and will continue, even though this petition, none of that has changed. Those are standards that were looked at regionally, that were intended to do the things that they were intended to do here and the mater of the scale of the development.

Ms. Mayfield said actually, I realized that if we keep going, when we get to the transportation and roads, I have a question.

Ms. Lyles said I am asking Mr. Phipps if the question is, have we hired a consultant that is a specialist in these kinds of sizes and types of land development, to review the environmental impact of what has been submitted. Is that what you are asking?

Mr. Driggs said I would hesitate to say for us to hire a consultant but something on that level to give me greater comfort that the amount of development that we are proposing with this many acres is really going to have the kind of sensitivity we need to have for the water shed, regardless of what our current practices are. Some of those, I do not know how long they have been in effect. Are they really adequate for what we are trying to do here? Someone that would look at it and say, hey based on what I see, my professional opinion is this looks like you are well within the confines of an environmentally sensitive water shed, and that your policies and proposed construction practices would be sufficient to safeguard the water way, almost like a traffic impact study to see, okay given this, this is what it looks like. Right now, we are just basically saying that this is what we have and we think it is sufficient, but I would like to see some sort of a second opinion on that to see if we are doing all that we can to make sure that we are operating within the spirit of it.

Ms. Lyles said okay, I just wanted to be clear with what you were- I heard you.

Mr. McKinney said Park and Rec, what is outlined there in sort of the infrastructure police issues, are really the goals that both we through the area plan and Park and Rec have had for how we would treat open space in this area, their request right now is for 40 acres of active open space. So, the ability for neighborhood, community parks, this would potentially be a location long-term in this area of Charlotte for a regional recreation center. Certainly the notion of connections and a greenway network with overland trails and protecting the creeks and systems that we have there with a system that would provide public access, and to the point that was raised earlier, the notion of insuring that we have public access to the Catawba River, that is obviously important and it has been part of the counties plan to have a blue way and a public connection along the river and this provides public access to those. So, as you see in the commitment, essential the petitioner is committed to about half of what was asked for, the 20 acres of active recreational space. They are committing to the greenway system, so particularly along the main creek system, Beaver Dam Creek and then overland trails to the point of the design of the streets, how we make them multi-modal. Dixie River and both West Boulevard are examples of where we have worked with them to insure that we get, yet to fully be defined, but the notion of trail and/or bicycle facilities along those corridors that insure that they are part of the system of multi-modal access to the greenway system. They have also committed to

providing public access to the river and a greenway connection to that access that was really essentially part of the system. As you can see then, what is really on the table is sort of the notion between the additional 20 acres and we still need some technical clarity about how we are going to dedicate some of the greenway connections

Ms. Mayfield said on this part, if I am looking at this correctly, the question is that we know recently, the beach that the County opened and the fact that there has been a lot of traffic concerns and problems because of trying to backfill. So, we are having serious conversations now when we are looking at the dedication of Beaver Dam Greenway and overload trails along the road and the provision of public access. We are looking at parking as well as some of the concerns that we are running into as far as the residents having vehicles parked all inside the neighborhood and the impact of that to have access for public access to the river. We are taking all of that in consideration now with this partnership with a combination of both transportation and Parks and Rec.

Mr. McKinney said some details will be determined. They have committed through this notion of the Memorandum of Agreement to work with parks and rec on more of a master planning effort to dive into these things a little more deeply and answer to those kinds of questions. Those are things that are not easily answered now, but they are committed to working with Parks and Rec to do that.

Mayor Roberts said we have our Director of Parks and Rec here if you want more detail.

Ms. Mayfield said this is more of the design question than Parks and Rec, just making sure that we are looking at where we can improve on hind sight being 20/20.

Ms. Lyles said I want to follow up to Ms. Mayfield, the question that I have is give me the comparable to the other locations that we have and will there be a minimum standard to, what I heard you say, work with; if there is, what is that minimum standard to be negotiated from? We are not starting at zero, so I am following up. I want to see what is current, what is working and what is the minimum standard in the commitment?

Mayor Roberts said adding to that, we know that we are under parked in general. We do not have as much park space as other communities our size, in general, and to see it has already been half of what we would like, that is concerning. That will be great to have that comparison and sort of fit that into the whole thing.

Mr. McKinney said Schools; a lot of work has been going on with CMS and public schools through this process to determine what their needs are, both today and for the long term, particularly with the nature of what this development will produce. Needs, as you can see here, have really been focused from CMS's perspective on the Elementary and Middle school needs, yet to be fully defined. They already have plans in the works for this part of Charlotte for a High School, so their focus was really on those two schools. So you see that reflected in the commitment that the petitioner has made for two school sites, 15 to 25 acres that gives CMS some flexibility as they move forward with their planning to determine whether or not it is specifically Elementary or Middle, but it gives you those two sites, with some provisions embedded in this to insure that the location has done in a way that serves the residential that will be there, so access and making sure that they were part of the community was important, then some very specific commitments about how the land will be identified and reserved and the period of time for that reservation. The last mention and you will see this in some of the other commitments that I will show is not in the zoning but the Memorandum of Agreement there are some commitments that the petitioner is making to the sale of that property. In this case, you are seeing the notion of that sale to the CMS would be at 80% of fair market value.

Mr. Smith said Ed this is a question that you can get back to me on. I know that we are at a meeting with school board member Eric Davis, this past week. Capacity at a couple of schools in my district, South Meck and Myers Park, they are way over booked, two of the largest schools in the state. As a follow up, figure out who these new schools might provide relieve to would be helpful, so that is something that you could get back to me with that answer today. I am just curious as we are trying to work more hand and hand with CMS on some of these zoning decisions. That would be helpful for me to get understanding of what that relief might look at. I think that Providence [inaudible] probably busting at the gills too, but I know South and Myers Park are two of the largest schools in the state.

Mayors Roberts said I am going to add to that. I am very skeptical that it is only two schools. If you look at the total build out, 4,800 residential units, even if only half of them have children, you are still way past two schools. So, I agree. I think we need to drill down further, as we go through this, with CMS and really get a realistic picture, because we already have overcrowded schools, and they are going to need probably six schools, elementary and middle, when that gets totally built out. I hope that CMS is aware of all of the land that is available nearby and how that could fit, and that is before you even get to high school. That is just elementary and middle. I just think that the needs are greater.

Mr. McKinney said I will provide some more details, but rest assured though that there has been a lot of discussion and a lot of analysis. One note that I would say here is that the existing entitlement for single-family residential, compared to what this new entitlement is, more or less net the same. So, the amount of residential that is allowed here and the number of students that would generate hasn't dramatically changed. What this allows us to do is more comprehensively plan for it than what we would have through incremental residential development.

Mayor Roberts said I just know that they are behind already. They are behind \$800 million. We hear about this all of the time; we don't talk to the schools enough, because you are just developing hand over fist.

Mr. McKinney said we will follow up with CMS.

Mr. Kimble said I will tell you, CMS and the County have been involved in all of these discussions with the development team and the City of Charlotte, as we go through the rezoning.

Mr. Mitchell said but no one is here right now.

Mr. Kimble said no.

Mr. Phipps said is it realistic for us to assume that these schools will serve as a relief school for other areas? It seems to me that the capacity, just the sheer volume of this development and construction, these schools would be dedicated to what we are building on the ground instead of relief for other schools in the area. I'm just trying to be realistic about it.

Mr. McKinney said we will follow up in more detail; it is a little bit of both and there is some need, the Berryhill Elementary School for example, as part of this analysis that was done so there is some both relief what is there but then in anticipation for growth has been part of the thinking that CMS has been doing.

Ms. Lyles said just the specific on the period of 10-years for the mutual agreement of site locations; that to me seems problematic and I don't understand the 10, why isn't it 20 with the rights that are being asked for the overall development. Is this just Phase I, is the 10-years related to Phase I? You don't have to answer it you can just back to me.

Mr. Phipps said to follow up on that question what happens if they don't commit within the 10 years, does it revert to some other land use after that?

Mr. McKinney said it is the notion trying to find the right balance between the kinds of assurance that we need but also some predictability the petitioner needs. They have worked with CMS and others to kind of think through what that time period is. We will follow up based on any discussions CMS to ensure it makes sense for them.

Mr. Kimble said these are sites of land for the building of future facilities, but it is making the land and the site available.

Ms. Eiselt said it almost seems to me that when you are looking at Phase I, II, III and IV that if Phase I gets built out and we don't have the school capacity we need we should be thinking twice about starting the next phase. There should be a commitment from CMS or from our other partners as to the services and the facilities that we need out there. I don't know why we would continue to keep building on a phase basis. This is a huge project and if we don't even know for sure that they are going to put schools out there it seems a little bit irresponsible to keep building and building if we don't have commitments to be able to put schools out there.

Mr. McKinney said I don't want to speak for CMS's perspective there; they have committed and they have been part of this discussion since the beginning of the petition and the notion of

planning and the work they have done to identify these sites and commit to working with the developer to make sure we get those sites has definitely been part of the discussion with CMS.

Mayor Roberts said we will look forward to more information.

Ms. Mayfield said what I'm thinking about is I want to make sure that as we are having this conversation we don't get too far off track. We have been seeing now for a while that CMS needs to be more vocal, but I'm concerned if we are saying that the expectation is on the developers to push for something that CMS isn't calling for. CMS needs to step up to the table and identify okay what is your expectation. We don't know yet if we are talking about middle school or high school; are we still talking about K-8; by 2020 or 2030 when this is going to be built out we might realize that we need to go back to what it used to be elementary, middle and high school. Without CMS being in the room I'm going to encourage and trust staff to do their due diligence but I want to make sure that we are not taking this conversation in a direction where we are saying okay, developer in this build out we set 15 to 25 acres reserve without knowing if the full acreage of 1,300, almost 1,400 square feet, what available possible land after the build out of the project will there still be opposed to saying we actually need you to identify five sites that are going to be 15 to 25 acres. What would that do to the project; does that mean that we are going to lose some housing if we move that direction? Does that mean we are going to lose potential office space or job opportunities if we move in that direction? I think for me it would be much more helpful to know what is CMS looking at and are they doing their due diligence to think about the growth of the area. I agree with Mr. Phipps to say I don't see this being people from outside coming in. Whatever is going to be built in nine or ten chances is going to absorb the community that is coming into the area since we have multi-levels from multifamily to single family and we are working on that workforce and creating a diverse community that is going to have young families and older families in there. I just want to make sure that we are not going too far into trying to designate to say okay we believe that you need five sites; CMS needs to come to the table and tell us what is your plan, what money they have allocated, what do you have planned in your bonds that is going to build schools and where are you looking to build those schools in the immediate area.

Mayor Roberts said I'm going to do a little time check here. We've got quite a few things to get through and we've got financing to talk about so I'm going to ask for the next sections for Council write down your questions and e-mail them. We are not going to have time to get them all answered if we are going to try to finish by 2:00 p.m. As we go through the rest of them if you have a question instead of having those come in the middle, write them down and e-mail them to the Manager and we will try to get through the rest of the presentation and if there is time at the end we will have questions.

Mr. Kimble said I would ask that you e-mail your questions to Mr. McKinney because this is a rezoning at the planning and I want to try and capture all of that so we can answer all of your questions.

Mr. McKinney said let me keep moving and I will walk you through the next few as quickly as I can. The next one we wanted to talk about is Workforce Housing. Again the notion we have a very clear kind of policy goal and expectation. The petitioner has been working with our Neighborhood and Business Services staff to think through how that would work on this petition. We talked a little bit about this at the hearing; for example, in Phase I they have committed to 85 units, essentially 10% of the first 850 units developed. Since the hearing we've had some additional discussions with them about the future phases and there is some additional commitment now they have made to an 8% goal on essentially the rest of residential development as the full build out of their entitlement at 8%. Couple of other things to mention here; all of those commitments are subject to the availability of the kind of things that we use to finance and fund those affordable housing projects, particularly including tax credit housing grants and the other sources that we have and then some definitional things here; the workforce housing is defined and I think we talked about this at the hearing as 80% of AMI and that time period they've committed to is a 30-year time period. The last is just a quick outstanding issue. A little bit more clarity we are working on is the connection between those percentage commitments and the development of the units. What are those triggers and making sure that we got some clarity about those kinds of commitments.

The next think I will walk through is two public safety issues, Fire and Police. The first one fire and again some are the schools here so we have been doing a lot of work to think through the development of this in the long-term and what would be the needs from fire and police. We've done some planning to think through about what kind of criteria that Fire has about how they would serve the community out here. I won't go into the detail of that, but essentially that comes down to the notion that they anticipate the need to have a new engine and ladder companies strategically located within this development. The petitioner again since the hearing has been working with us to strengthen that commitment that includes the reservation of a site for that future engine/ladder company, work with us on the location criteria so that we get that sited in such a way that it serves the community in the best way. The two things we've already talked about, for example, on reservation for schools, similar here. This notion once we identify the site giving us a 10-year window to purchase the land and then ultimately, not in the zoning, but in the agreement that we would have that 80% of fair market value on the price. Police is more or less the same thing, slightly different kind of location criteria but the same issue, the notion that over time it is anticipated that a Division Station here would be needed. It sits between two Divisions now and certainly the growth of this project in particular would provide for that need; similar scale and site, a 3.5 acre site, some similar locational criteria and then essentially the same 10-year and 80% of value commitment.

Water and Sewer – a big piece of infrastructure here and a lot of work has gone on on our side to anticipate and plan for the kind of the needs they would have. You can see the numbers in terms of the water and the wastewater capacity needs that would be there. Charlotte Water has anticipated that the current treatment plants they have now and the plans they have for improvement would allow them to serve that. They also, as you see outlined here and I won't go into details, they have already been planning their own capital investment on some key projects that the petitioner has included in their infrastructure planning. Essentially the way this would work very similar, not to dissimilar another development but at a larger scale is that the basic infrastructure that would have to connect into this is certainly on the developer's dime that would be connected into the system. It is anticipated obviously that the revenues that Charlotte Water gets from this over time is part of their funding model that allows this to occur over the period of development.

The last two I will talk about is Transit and Transportation; we've talked a little bit about this already. We talked about this at the hearing and obviously there is the plan for transit in the west side of Charlotte, essentially the west corridor that would connect from uptown ultimately to the Airport. That current plan has it on Wilkinson Boulevard as was mentioned at the hearing. Later next year it is anticipate that CATS will be re-looking at this corridor the way they just did with the Silver Line as an example. That re-look will allow them to think through both the kind of technology whether that is light rail or other and the alignment itself so certainly how you might connect to the River District would be part of that thinking and certainly different alignments that would include that as part of their thinking, but that is long-range needed planning that would occur through that process. They are also underway with bus service analysis; so the thinking to how they would serve places like this from just a bus operational standpoint. The things that have pulled out of that for us from CATS on this is the notion that planning for an anticipating the need for a transit center in this place would be part of the first and foremost things, insuring whether or not we had some sort of rapid rail connection or ultimately just bus service, having a transit center ala Eastland as an example where they can coordinate routes in this area and have a centralized location for that planning. This is a key part of that so that is one of their requests and as you can see that is still an outstanding issue and we are working with the petition on clarifying the physical need of that and similar to these other commitments we talked about, just what is the timeframe and how would we insure that either through the rezoning or through the Memorandum of Agreement.

The last one we've already talked about in which I wanted to highlight in the same context the Transportation pieces; we've already mentioned that we've broken it down into phases and those entitlements are triggered to those improvements and we've been planning this as part of an activity center we had planned for, just making sure that we have the infrastructure in place to make it happen. We've talked a lot about transportation already and I would highlight there are a few little details that we are trying to finalize making sure we've got all the right language and the kind of key commitments that are tied to those phases in the right way. That is sort of the picture of the infrastructure pieces and the details and as you have already said if you have other

questions feed those to us and we will prepare a response based on the discussions we've already had and the questions that you will send us in more detail.

Mayor Robert said we still need to hear from Pat Mumford about the finance and funding so if everybody is okay to go ahead with that and then if there is time for questions for either one at the end we will do that otherwise we will e-mail our questions. Thank you Mr. McKinney; that was a lot of information and we appreciate what you going through and outlining a lot of those questions for us.

Pat Mumford, Director of Neighborhood and Business Services said I do want to set up this portion of the conversation to help people understand that this is going to be an order of magnitude discussion. We don't have defined numbers specific timeframes. What we've been doing is working with the developer and our other public partners to really wrestle with the complexity and the scope of all of this infrastructure work. I will show you a little bit of how we are breaking that down, who the partners might be; the proportionate share of potential costs in the future. I appreciate the need to know the details; we just aren't quite there yet, that will be the next step.

I did want to start with this slide; you have seen this before. These goals have been discussed already today but just the economic development opportunity here, the ability to support this infrastructure with development and the opportunity for the annexation with this large of a development is rather unique. We've been talking about \$43 million of CIP money; that actual number is \$44.7 million, just to clarify that so the only piece of certainty that we really have today is \$16.2 million is suggested to be used for this West Boulevard Extension and would be one of the first phase projects. I was struggling with how to present this and also the graphic of the phasing so what I might do is just ask you to refer back to your slide 7 so that I am not toggling between the slides. Slide 7 is the representation with the color of all the road network and I can reference that in this discussion. Back to order of magnitude this is proposed or conceptual funding source chart so what we've listed is the phases on the side. We've listed two phases and you've heard there will be three phases for full build out. The reason we didn't go into Phase III is that is so far out and it is too unknown today to really get our head around, but the first two phases we feel pretty comfortable about at least listing the roadwork on the left so you can see in Phase I the West Boulevard Extension. I mentioned \$16.2 million from the CIP and if you will cross this chart you will see four different opportunities for funding participation; the CIP, our Community Investment Plan, regional and others including potentially the state, the tax increment grant that would be City and County participation and then the private sector through development participation. The reason you don't see numbers where the check marks are we just don't have that quantified yet, however what we do have, back to the order of magnitude at the bottom is how we see the total aggregate amount of money to be represented by these projects and this is really important. These numbers are what it would cost today to build. I can guarantee you that in 10 or 15 years the full build out the total cost will not be these numbers; it will be more. There will be cost escalations associated with inflation for material and construction and there will also be some interest over that period of time. This is not to suggest that the total number for all of this infrastructure ten years from now will be \$131 million, but it is to suggest that of the \$131 million we are proposing that here is the breakdown of these four tranches of participation.

Phase I is on your graphic here from page 7 and Phase I is essentially those roads that are highlighted in yellow so it is the east/west West Boulevard Extension so that is the east/west corridor as well as some north/south improvements to Dixie Berryhill and north/south extension for Garrison and there will have to be some I-485 interchanges associated with that West Boulevard Extension. That is the roadwork that would support the Phase I development and you can see on the far right all of the activity that is included in Phase I proposed for that development. As Mr. McKinney mentioned those two have to work together; there must be the infrastructure before all of that development can occur. As well for Phase II which then takes from the yellow and includes all of the roads that are highlighted in that pink or purple color. These are roads both north/south and west so the I-485 expansion is what Mr. McKinney mentioned north of the current West Boulevard interchange so an additional opportunity for access from I-485, the Garrison and Dixie River Road, continuing the expansion, widening and improving of Dixie River north and south as well as extending the Garrison and improving it north and south and then the east/west thoroughfares as a continuation of West Boulevard beyond Dixie River as well as some notion of extending West Boulevard and you will see. This

is a suggestion to West Boulevard between I-485 and Billy Graham needs to be substantially improved to accommodate all this potential traffic. We will be working with the Airport on that; we just don't have the information today to fully understand the scope and scale of that but we do know that is a critical component in the Phase II portion of this work. That is generally how we are looking at this; this will all come forward in more detail through the Memorandum of Understanding and through any potential incremental reimbursement agreement that we might have with the developers.

Ms. Mayfield said Mr. Mumford we are looking between Phase I and Phase II three TIGs Are we looking to request those based on the phase so Phase I a request would go to Council for the TIG and explain what it would be helping to pay for and then for Phase II the other two would come in or you are looking to asks for it up front in the rezoning?

Mr. Mumford said I think this is probability the difficulty in presenting so much information on a simplified chart; the checkmarks don't represent separate agreements. The checkmarks are to represent that in a tax increment grant or infrastructure reimbursement agreement would include work for those three line items so two portions of Garrison and Dixie as well as the east/west thoroughfare so the idea is that all of that would come together in one agreement but it is that amount of work that would be included.

Mr. Mayfield said so a total of \$22 million is what we are looking at and just for the sake of clarity because you explained it to us to the point where I think I finally understand it but for others that may not can you just give the condensed version of what the tax increment grant (TIG) is because I think there is still confusion as far as there are triggers that need to be hit in order to qualify for the grant and different things that go along with it so that the community understands that this isn't we are just putting this money into it but there is a process and this will be the developer that is paying for this infrastructure.

Mr. Mumford said yes, so it is really an infrastructure reimbursement tool based on incremental taxes to pay for that. The developer would have to put the development in the ground, taxes would have to be paid and some portion of that could go back to reimburse for completed road infrastructure at an agreed upon timeframe and an agreed upon percentage. This is very similar to what the Council has seen before with recent deals structured the same way. That is the general overlay so I don't have anything else to provide with details today and will answer questions you may have.

Mr. Driggs said as I said before I have a question actually for the petitioner or the developer and it relates to the take financing and in essence what happens if for any reason the TIG doesn't materialize. In other words are we by making a step in this direction are we actually incurring an obligation or putting ourselves in a position where a failure to perform on our part would derail the whole thing? I wonder if there could be a firm answer.

Mr. Mumford said if I might be able to answer that from the City's perspective because I think we are talking about protection.

Mr. Driggs said I think what I'm getting at here and this is my other question; we are looking at all of this as a kind of cooperative venture with the private sector partners so I was just looking to hear from them have them tell us that this is what we are here for and this is how it works because a lot depends on that frankly. A lot depends on our deciding what part of this we want to play and they will have to come up with theirs. I would mention as an example, we talked about the schools before; it is pretty clear that the developer doesn't have any interest in building a huge development with no schools in it so we are really talking more about the kind of impact on other schools etc. They are going to be out partners, we are not going to get answers to all of our questions in this format and in fact we are running out of time right now but I just thought a statement from the developer about how they see this partnership unfolding and what agreements they have with other parties for example that are also necessary in order for this to be fulfilled so that we have a little bit of sense of context about what we are getting into. I don't know if that is too broad a question but I think for us to zoom ahead with this and not have further assurance from them would mean that we would all sort of agree amongst ourselves that we like it but we really don't know what we are getting from them.

Mr. Kimble said it is up to Council is you want to ask that question of the petitioner right now or have a response later.

Mayor Roberts said we have a little disagreement on Council as to whether or not this is the appropriate question and the appropriate time.

Mr. Driggs said I will try and narrow the question a bit and just say can you tell us who the other parties are to agreements. I assume there are banks, there are tenants; is that an inappropriate question now otherwise we can get a written response.

Mayor Roberts said we only have six Councilmembers here and it is an important question and even though it will be televised and all of that we would prefer a written response.

Mr. Driggs said alright; I will just put to you again the issue is this is a multi-lateral agreement; there are other parties as well. It would be interesting for us to know a little more about who the other parties are and what we are counting on from them in order for all of this to work as intended and we will get a response later.

Mayor Roberts said if you can put all that in writing then we can share it with everyone and we will all be on the same page. We also appreciate this is not technically a public hearing; this is really staff presenting information to the Council.

Mr. Mitchell said it would be helpful if you can work the petition. I think part of the issues some Councilmembers are having that they think this has been a fast track process and I think it would be very helpful to educate us kind of a timeline. How long have you all really been working developer and staff on this process? There could be some business commitments why November 21, 2016 was so important so Jeff if you and staff could work together to provide a timeline to Council I think that would be very helpful.

Ms. Eiselt said not to beat a dead horse but with the Memorandum of Agreement I do want to see in addition to the chart that shows the capital commitments and who is paying what, I want to see what the returns are in each phase and I do want it to incorporate, and I'm not saying it is the developer's job to build schools or make sure they are included, it is our job. It's our job to make sure that those commitments are there, to know what CMS is even thinking so at that point, you know we have more control over fire and police. We know that not only do we have to build fire stations and police stations we have to staff them so we can include those numbers but all the numbers that aren't in our control I would like to see it in one presentation by phase including the tax revenues that we think it is going to kick off, what portion of those revenues would go to pay back TIGs, what that leaves and what we would do that.

Mr. Kimble said we will be glad to dive into those details and provide as much as we can and if it is not enough we will go back and do it again, but we will dive into those details and we will make sure that we are doing the analysis and there will be some build in assumptions and we will describe what those assumptions are too because they do have underlying assumptions but we will make those projections and we will give you the tables and the schedules.

Ms. Lyles said I am looking at the ED Committee review starting in December and January, particularly I assume around the TIGs and the Memorandum of Agreement and all of that. We as a Council said to the community that we would look at where public dollars were going to be done whether or not we were meeting the opportunity issues as well as the affording housing issues so I know that some of that is in place for coming forward. Where I get sideways is that sometimes we are considering things that we are talking about changes in policy but we haven't done them so we have no roadmap and we are kind of like negotiating without policy direction so the question that I have is before we get to the funding and the Memorandum of Agreement will the ED Committee and the Council have looked at what we have referred to Council for our commitment around the issues of economic inclusion and housing. I feel often very uncomfortable negotiating when we have a thought but not a written policy because I was hoping that we would actually have that fast tracked through ED so we would have this project fall within whatever our agreements were. I just wondered where we are.

Mr. Kimble said we can look at that to see how the timing lines up so that we can accomplish what you are saying. I will also say that the developer has made statements in their outline for the Memorandum of Understanding that they want to partner with you on some of the things that you are thinking about already on economic inclusion. So they are watching the conversation, they are partnering and they are willing to have the discussion about how we can achieve some of the mutual goals. I believe they are goals of theirs as well.

Ms. Lyles said I agree with that, but as I say reliable predictable are very important in the development community, but even more important in our relationship of what we want to do. I would encourage us to get to that point more quickly than not.

Mr. Driggs said just briefly to that point; I assume that if the developer includes a voluntary portion of affordable housing in their proposal and if we then sign agreements that contain those provisions those are legally enforceable and would not be construed to be mandatory inclusion, as long as the original proposal was a voluntary inclusion.

Mr. Kimble said yes I believe that is correct and we will triple, quadruple check that but yes the attorneys have been involved in the process as well.

Mr. Autry said I will beat a dead horse. The opportunity for having this master plan should be reflective of all of our aspirations that this Council has put forth about pedestrian safety, about multimodal and transportation options for everybody, for ways to get in and out of that area without having to rely on single occupancy vehicles and I think that making sure that the bicycle infrastructure is protected from everyday traffic, from automotive traffic is an important component of that. I also appreciate the measures that are being considered during the construction phase to address the environment area and the stormwater runoff and the potential for damaging that river. I am also curious as to how sustainable after construction, after this is built out; what is the impact on the river 10-years from now, 20-years from now, 30-years from now, down the road whenever all this is built out, what are we looking at to protect that. Where are those elements coming from?

Ms. Mayfield said piggybacking a little bit on Mr. Autry and Mr. McKinney I'm going to look towards you and Mr. Kimble but I'm directing it behind me. I'm thinking about as Mr. Autry just mentioned many years down the line at some point there may be a conversation regarding deed restrictions for development because what we saw years ago when we were having the discussion about the Charlotte Premium Outlet and the fact that we created some very – we were very intentional on reducing the impact on the water out by the cove, but what we also learned during those conversations is that it was homeowners that had done a number of building over the years with expanding and different things that caused sediment and concerns that were environmentally related. We have a blueprint in place because actually from our project the water was actually cleaner and it helped the area. So in thinking about the possibility going forward, and actually I think Teri it is directed to you; can we even ask that some language be put in place to try to mitigate if a homeowner gets in and then over the years decides to expand or whatever, to make sure that they maintain the environmental controls that are being put in place on the forefront of this development?

Terrie Hagler Gray, Senior Assistant City Attorney said you mentioned deed restrictions and we can't do that per the rezoning but I think we can talk to the developer about some conditions that might address your concerns.

Ms. Mayfield said I think that would be helpful and Mr. McKinney, I think it would also be helpful when you are bringing back because we have not too much time before this comes to a decision, but when you bring back information responding to the questions today I think it would also be helpful when we are looking at the public right-of-way, looking at designated bike lanes and multiple forms of transportation; help us to know what is state maintained roads, what is road and what is the impact of crossing the two. Worst case scenario we already have West Boulevard is four lane highway is state maintained so there are some things that we can't put in place over there without the state stepping in. I think it would be very helpful for us to get a full picture of once it is built out, since we are working in an unincorporated area, but once it is incorporated for now it will be within District 3, so it will be just expanding that area but where are the cross sections between state maintained and local maintained roads for the bike connectivity and with the greenway and cross trail and everything that we are doing that may cause challenges. I think that might be helpful for all of us to see that as well.

Mr. McKinney said I got it.

Mr. Phipps said at the public hearing we had a person who I guess spoke in opposition to this but I think they very eloquently put in writing what their concerns of the project were and I know we all got copies of it so I would appreciate the Planning staff to maybe address some of the concerns that were raised. They talked about creating a whole new activity center almost like an

edge city, compared it to Tyson's Corner and what happened there in terms of how they corrected it with expanding their metro rail system but we don't have such a system. We talked about an integrated transportation plan that won't produce such car centric transportation options so I don't know do you still because I can give you my copy, but I would like you to address how does this change our philosophy in terms of what we have been doing in terms of our growth corridors, connectivity and transportation since this is such a far flung project it seems to me he brings up some points that I wouldn't mind getting clarity from a staff standpoint on regarding what our philosophy is.

Mr. McKinney said I do have a copy and we can prepare that response. Real quick though I would use this opportunity to remind you that the adopted policy that has been in place since 2003 has anticipated this and the intensity and the kind of mix and the notion that we wanted to see this kind of development, particularly again with the investment we've made in the Airport and the development around it. The challenge obviously that we are grappling with is how do we insure that that vision is in line with our ability from an infrastructure standpoint to support it. That would be the gist of our response to that, but we will go into that in more detail.

Mr. Driggs said if there are any assumptions about future light rail investment that are underlying this could we see what they are; just a question for future response.

Ms. Lyles said adding onto Mr. Driggs can we do a comparison of the road costs and if there are projections on the transit plan that would include rail, streetcar or bus system I think would be very helpful.

Mr. Kimble said we have our work cut out for us between now and November 21st, but we are up to the challenge to bring back to you as much information as we can.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting.
--

The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m.



Emily Kunze, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 1 Hours, 45 Minutes
Minutes Completed: November 4, 2016