COMMITTEE AGENDA TOPICS

I. Subject: Out of School Time
Action: This item was referred to the Committee on May 12, 2014. Staff will provide an overview of the 2014 Out of School Time review process, respond to Committee questions and determine next steps.

COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Present: Michael Barnes, Al Austin, Vi Lyles and LaWana Mayfield
Absent: Claire Fallon
Others: Ed Driggs
Time: 12:00p.m. – 1:06p.m.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Out of School Time Funding Recommendations (two handouts)

DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

Chairman Barnes opened the meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves. The topic on today's agenda is the Out of School Time item that we were discussing yesterday in the Budget Meeting and the Council asked us to revisit the item today to determine whether we could make a recommendation regarding the funding methodology from the partners and any other process adjustments that we might recommend to the full Council. I will turn it over to the Deputy City Manager or the City Manager, however you have agreed to work it out and let you get started.

I. <u>Out of School Time</u>

Kimble: I'll start and the City Manager can jump in at anytime. Thank you all; it has been a long time since we've seen each other, 18 hours; to talk about the topic that had a lot of your time yesterday and we thank you for the conversation that happened and it gave us some additional thoughts over the last 18 hours. You only have one item on your agenda today. We sent out a couple different agendas but we felt like this was approximately what you would be able to handle today so we asked others to wait for another time, so Out of School Time is the only item we have on your agenda today. The most immediate item to address will be what was referred yesterday; how do we make a recommendation from this Committee back to the full Council in time for the May 28th Straw Votes and so we want to make sure that you have enough time to discuss the issue and talk about it and come out of today's meeting with a recommendation on the nearest term issue which is the funding and the allocation for Out of School Time this next year.

Secondarily what was referred to was the process for this Committee to kind of look at the process, make some observations about how you might want to tweak or change that or how we might move

forward. You can have some of that conversation today if there is time and it would require then a couple other meetings in the future to look at those kinds of issues. That is not as immediate today as the issue of trying to move forward with a recommendation on Out of School Time. We have had conversation with the City Manager this morning; he is here and we felt it best after hearing the conversation yesterday during the meeting and some of the conversations that occurred in the room afterwards that in order to really give you some things to talk about and discuss and chew on today that maybe we could come back with a recommendation. We are going to talk today about the money side of it first. I'm going to turn to Pat Mumford and let him discuss why what you are seeing today in the form of a Manager's revised recommendation coming forward in the amount of $1,200,000 to $1,375,000 and change. How asking about why that is a valid number or a good number and then after Pat discusses the funding amounts and the funding sources, we thought we would turn to Tom Warshauer, who has been the staff person on point to walk you through the revised recommendations and why and how we came to those. The City Manager is here also to weigh in and also respond to questions and comments the Council has and walk out of here today with a recommendation that the Committee is comfortable making to the full Council. If that suits you and the process we are following we would like to turn to Pat and move forward.

Mumford: As you all know the Out of School Time funding total of $1.2 million is made up or essentially split down the middle between your Pay-As-You-Go-Fund money, General Fund money and Community Development Block Grant money. The numbers are actually $610,000 of that $1.2 million comes from the Community Development Block Grant. In late April we heard from the Federal Government that our allocation of those CDBG funds had increased so we have more capacity and the $175,261 proposed increase to this illustrative total pie is representative of what is called a public service portion of the CDBG funds. The Federal Government allows us to use 15% of the total allocation for public service and this would represent 100% of that going toward Out of School Time Funding. That is kind of confusing but those are the parts. We still have the $590,000 of the General Fund money in here so the total amount that we feel is appropriate for allocation amongst the providers is the new amount of $1,375,261. As you remember from yesterday's conversation that amount won't fully fund everybody at their requested amount, so we came up with a strategy of how we want to talk about and Tom will discuss that; how we propose splitting that $1,375,261.

Lyles: I was wondering, and we got the notice, I can't remember how you were saying that the notice of the increase, 100% of that would go towards this particular program that has been the context of what is eligible. What else is it eligible for?

Mumford: It is eligible for regular CDBG activities such as housing. We have work that we've used the CDBG funds and in the past it was almost a little bit of a timing issue between money that we knew the full allocation and when we put this out on the street. The $610,000 was traditionally put in there and we just never knew, there was a point in time when the money was actually reducing and now we know that is going to increase from the $610,000 and fully allocate that public service.

Kimble: Since this is on a sheet that says revised City Manager recommendation, we've had robust conversations last night and this morning to see if we could come back to you with something that we would recommend and is now in the form of a Manager recommendation for you to discuss, debate and decide if this is indeed what you want to go forward with or increase it. With that, I will turn it

over to Mr. Warshauer and have you walk through the discussions we had this morning with the staff with Mr. Carlee's advice in the discussion.

Warshauer: I think the City is very fortunate to have quite a few that is recommended in the Out of School Time today. I had a chance to talk with all of them morning about the proposed list and one of the things I thought about on our Out of School Time sector is that we have so many great programs and everyone does the very best job they can to serve as many kids as possible. As I talked to people about budgets being reduced they really understood the need for us to preserve as many opportunities as we could for all the kids in our community. I think the sector really rallied around the notion of some mutual sacrifice in order to get the best results we can in their contracts of $1.4 million that is being allocated.

With Citizen Schools, we took a look at a reduction on going close to the $300,000 mark. They are a new funder and they do some essentially work. Next year they are going to be at the maximum of $300,000 anyway, so going in at $306,000 is getting close to the $300,000 mark is something that they are able to live with. It may impact some of the numbers of the kids that are served and they don't know exactly what that will be but I think that will be true for all of the programs that will impact the number served, but they are comfortable that they can move forward.

Police Activities League – Last night I was able to speak to Jeff Hood and we have taken a look at going back to their FY14 funding level of $287,000. It is still a significant contribution on both of these programs and believe strongly that they are some fantastic programs in our community.

Greater Enrichment Program – Support has been declining over time and so they were informed last year that this year we were proposing to revisit the list. Youth Development Initiatives, this is their first. They are underneath the 25% of budget cap so we are proposing to leave them at $162,000. That creates some additional savings so we can put on top of the $175,000 going Above and Beyond, able to increase their funding to what they had received in FY14 of $110,000. That leaves their funding flat which is actually the same case we would have for Police Athletic for the Police Activities League is flat funding. With the YWCA, we roll that back to the FY13 level. We are able to fully fund them at the FY13 level of $158,000 which is considerable more than being left off entirely, although it is considerably less than what they were looking for. FY13 and FY12 they were able to operate significant programs that would have benefited our community. They run a fantastic program and we are proud to deal with them as one of our funding partners.

Mayfield: Mr. Warshauer, have you had a discussion to find out what the impact may be because I understand even though we may love to fund completely, then it goes into another conversation but we are looking at the two that we are adding on, not being able to do the full amount requested for Above and Beyond and not being able to do the full amount requested for the YWCA. Are we looking at how many really are going to be impacted and are we having any conversations about whether or not they are going to transition to one of the other programs what does that look like?

Warshauer: The YWCA it looks like they would have to close one of their sites as opposed to three of their sites.

Mayfield: But did we have a conversation?

Warshauer: Yes. This is all this morning so they are examining what is the full impact is going to be. There could certainly be some impact across the board on the ones that are funded and maybe on the community and they may find additional funds elsewhere; that is also possible there are other kinds of savings that they could identify and other ways that they might meet the gap.

Austin: The organizations that are listed in gray here, do they just not apply or do they not meet the standards? Give me a sense of those as well. I know we are only talking about the others, but I just wanted to get a sense of these others.

Warshauer: CMS, Bethlehem and BELL were at the bottom and they haven't come back looking for additional funds from us. We are not recommending support on those.

Austin: Did they apply?

Warshauer: They did apply but we are not recommending funding for them.

Barnes: One of the challenging aspects of this experience for me over the last several years is that we seem to have this come up every year where people don't get included want to be included and went through this process last year in the Budget Committee and the ED Committee, made what we thought were some recommendations regarding caps on percentage of budget and overall dollar amount and here we are in 2014 dealing with it again. Would you talk to us about perhaps considering a two-year cycle on funding?

Warshauer: One of the things we looked at last year was moving to a two-year cycle beginning on the next cycle. We think that is better so if everyone is engaged, better perhaps politically, so we wouldn't have to hear it every year, but it could be better for a lot of the organizations for them to be able to make longer terms plans, be able to staff and be able to make the commitment to the program, the locations, the students, the camps and the programs that they are running. There are a lot of non-profits that are moving to the two-year cycle. There are a lot of funding in the two-year cycles, but there is a lot of work both for their staff on making award allocations but also there is a lot of empty space on the funded side for them to prepare the application. I think the world is sort of moving toward two-year funding cycles and it is a better outcome for everyone. Our recommendation going forward is that we take a look at a two-year funding cycle.

Barnes: I would like to include that in our recommendation to the full Council. If we go to the two-year cycle and the CDBG funding drops next year we would make it clear to those funding partners that given if they lose CDBG funding that their contribution would be adjusted accordingly.

Mumford: I just want to make sure that it is clear the two-year funding cycle is already approved by Council through all the Committee work so in FY16 it will be a two-year window of funding so that is good. It can be pointed out but it doesn't need to be added.

Barnes: We need to do it. We thought we had approved a lot of stuff last year but it was disregarded.

Carlee: We would also like to have the opportunity to bring you back some other recommendations as well on ways to mitigate the dramatic swings, the all or nothing kind of situation that we face this year. We brainstormed a few ideas this morning. We would find it very helpful any ideas that any of you have thought of that you would like for us to put on the table. We also want to circle back to the providers, but we believe there are some ways that we can modify the process that provides better transition for providers as their amounts may go down, but still meets what I think was the Council's original objective of being able to bring in some new providers and some innovative programs.

Lyles: I'm going back to the recommendation that you made yesterday so we've increased our funding by the $175,000 amount and the recommendation for the percentages of funding. The green is what was recommended in the Manager's budget for the number of children served reflects that recommendation, so we will be increasing a number of children served because we added the Y? I'm still trying to figure out what makes the best decision on making these kinds of decisions. I think that it is not necessarily cost per child; that is not necessarily a factor, but I wanted to ask that question, is there a number that you are looking for, the $1.2 million service and this is another way of asking this question I think is how much is allocated for administration and program costs. Just another way of looking at it, do you consider that?

Warshauer: We do. We take a look at the budget and we take a look at how the budget and programs are a little different. Some people provide transportation; some provide more around services for families. Some bring additional funding to the table so their cost per child would certainly be greater, some have summer programs, the there are lots of different variables in terms of the way the program exists and how the cost per child, some have more donated services some have to pay for their buildings, but there is a wide variety and we take a look at their budgets to make sure we can get those fees and charges to make sense for the kind of program they have.

Austin: I'm looking at our numbers here and YWCA, how many children are served?

Warshauer: They were serving 300 last year; this year and previously, they were serving 260 when they were receiving less fund.

Austin: So this year you will be serving about 200?

Warshauer: Probably closer to 250.

Austin: That gets us over 1,000.

Barnes: What is the worse case scenario?

Kirsten Sikkelee (YWCA): We would close one or two centers with the reduction in what we are currently funding.

Barnes: Hold on one second, one is because you get that, and secondly, we are talking about the number of kids being serviced, but I don't know how many kids are in the center. How many kids worst scenario? The question is if under the proposed scenario of $150,000 in funding you will be serving fewer kids, what would be the worse case in terms of the number of kids being served?

Sikkelee: We currently serve 300 children; seven of the centers have 30 children and two of them have 45. We would not necessarily know at this point in time how many centers we would have to close and which would remain open. It could potentially be of the 45 children centers and it could be a 30 child center. We know we would have to close one center and we might have to close two; it could be up to 60 children.

Barnes: So last year with the $158,826 you were serving 300 total with our assistance? In 2013 you got $158,826?

Sikkelee: We opened another center in Charlotte with new partnership with a church and we were able to leverage additional funds to open that other center and not a lot of City money goes to that center.

Barnes: So how many kids are served with the $158,000 that we gave you in 2013?

Sikkelee: I don't have that figure in my head, I'm sorry. The $158,000 which you shared with us about a half hour ago. I don't have that information.

Barnes: Last fiscal year we gave you $158,000, right?

Warshauer: No, $307,000.

Barnes: In 2012, we gave you $158,000 and how many kids were served then? Do you know?

Sikkelee: 260. We had also not opened the 9th center in Charlotte at that time, which is afforded by the Child Center at Billingsley Elementary.

Austin: In 2012, you served 260 with the $158,000 that we gave you?

Sikkelee: Yes, that was 15% of our Charlotte Youth Program budget.

Austin: So with the $158,000 at this time you can serve, you said you don't know right now.

Sikkelee: Correct. Some of our other funding partners have changed. We at this point bring 70% of the funding for those programs from other sources and 30% comes from the City, but if it drops back down we don't know the answers to those questions right now. We know we will have to close one center and possibly two.

Mayfield: I'm going to also ask for the same opportunity to get an idea because I believe we will have a representative here from Above and Beyond so looking at their request of $162,000 if you would say your name and organization. Looking at the $110,000, if we were able to move forward with today's proposal what would the impact be on the youth?

Carmen Blackmon: I'm the Executive Director for Above and Beyond Students and the impact for us would be to downsize one of the requirements that the City requires us to do anything which is to

provide enrichment services. We could remain at our same amount of children and the only reason we can remain with the same amount of students due to reduced funding is because we have done exactly what the City asked us to do which was to apply for additional funding. We did in two areas; we applied for funding from Sisters of Mercy, a North Carolina foundation, and we didn't receive funding from that organization and we applied for funding from the Foundation of the Carolinas which would also leverage the funding that would be cut. We would not have to reduce the number of children we serve, but we would have to reduce the quality of services that we provide. This would be all of their enrichment which is a part of the requirement of the grant. We could still afford to pay our teachers, we could still do the snacks and the cultural enrichment activities but we would not have funding enough to bring in enrichment activities for them.

Mayfield: Mr. Warshauer, to get an idea since we have our criteria, if we weren't able to fund at the full amount so that leaves a difference of $50,000 but if they are not able to meet all of our criteria then that could possibly hurt or that future scoring if we are not able to identify this funding. I am wondering on you end will we be taking that into consideration or not, even thought they have some other partners out there, if they are not able to identify partners to identify that additional $50,000 and if they are not able to hit all of our scoring points, what does that do?

Warshauer: We want to work with the best programs there are in the community so we would take a look at not only what they are doing but what their plans are for the future. We kind of wrap all of that into how we evaluate their program and being able to provide the best program for our kids. It depends on what happens this year and then what else is going on.

Mayfield: Do you hear my concern as far as if we are not able to move forward and basically identify that additional $50,000? If we are not able to fully fund if there was a way to identify additional money; what I'm concerned about is that our organizations are going to be penalized on the back end because since we are not able. If we aren't able to fund at the greater level, then they are going to be penalized for not being able to hit the scoring system that we put in place. For Mr. Manager, while we are having this discussion, one of the things I brought up yesterday is that we are looking at this application process, geography was something that was mentioned by our community partners, but I don't think when I was reading through the scoring that that made its way in and that is a factor that I do believe needs to be taken into consideration. Unfortunately, we have some areas of town that have higher concentrations of poverty and have higher concentrations of need. Even though this may be a great program over here that access transportation how connected the parents are to getting that youth to that program opposed to a program that needs additional funding for a van or a shuttle or whatever to help offset that. I want to make sure these are things that are part of that conversation, while you are looking at how to streamline this. I want my colleagues to think about are we setting ourselves up to penalize an organization for not being able to hit all the scoring when we are not able to fund to the highest level and maybe that is something the Manager can speak to.

Carlee: One of the things we want to do, going by her earlier comment, is to examine the process which would include the scoring and so variables such as geography are things that we can factor into that discussion as we evaluate the results that we got this year and results that we want, especially in terms of mitigating the all or nothing kind of impact. Those would be proposals that we would bring back to you for review before we launched next year's two-year process. Since next year is the two-year process, we do want to make sure we get that one right. If we get it right, it will be okay.

Driggs: I just want to say first of all I think this is a very constructive proposal; finding these reallocations and using the prior year funding as targets. One concern I have is that we are allocating more money to this program essentially because we got into a situation where adherence to our policies created an outcome that we weren't comfortable with. I wouldn't want to lock that diversion of resources into this program end, so I think this is something that we should do this year to avoid the impact that the original solution would have had but that we should try to get back to the funding level we had targeted in the past in the future because it sounds like what we are doing is diverting some of the Block Grant money into this program that we otherwise wouldn't have allocated to it. I'm just saying that is something I think we can do on a one time basis to solve the program we have right now, but it should not then create kind of an open ended increase in the size of this program.

Mumford: Let me speak to a little bit of history on that; the previous Committee discussed the desire to not have the General Fund component of this backfill if the Federal money went down. What we are facing is if the Federal money went up so there is a cap of $590,000 of City funds not to ever decrease. The flexibility is if the Community Block Grant Fund goes up or down then the total will vary.

Driggs: You do have discretion; you could be spending this $175,000 on other things, is that right?

Mumford: That is not correct, you could.

Driggs: Right, we could; so I say we are in fact diverting resources from other uses in order to address a situation we have here and I just as soon want that to be the occasion for a change in our overall policy in terms of limit on this thing and therefore once we get better policies and get back on top of things we start adhering the same limits we established before.

Lyles: I want to echo Ed's comment on constructive. From last night, our thoughts of discussion that what happened is completely representative of every perspective that we could possibly have to come back today and have something that clearly work though in thoughtful ways. Secondly, I want to say I appreciate so much the comments that you made for ABC because all of us know that the need for these programs are much greater that if we are ever going to be able to help and you talk about learning and leveraging and applying to the Sisters and applying to the Foundation. Al really helped me think through those questions as he talked about his role as a grants writer and how difficult it is to often go out to this. I think the City is providing an amount that should be consistently used for leveraged community resources and that's what I think we are best at versus funding full programs and doing that. I also want to say how much I appreciate the collaboration. I know the YW hasn't had really time to absorb what the recommendation is, but just reaching out that is the groups can continue to talk with each other. Ms. Mayfield makes a great point, vans shouldn't be necessarily owned by one where there are needs all over. I think this is the opportunity to hear two years is coming up; you've got a real sense of the quality measures. The collaboration required among, particularly the legacy groups to sit down and think how best to serve outside of our own organization. There are different programs and I know that programs are driven often by donor needs and missions so not neglecting that; I think this is a real opportunity for the group to sit down and think through how does this best work because you have base and you have something that needs to grow. I want to say thanks for the collaboration between the agencies and we encourage that. For the short-term

the Committee meeting today, I believe Mr. Chair and Committee Members that we were going to come back and make a budget recommendation. I think the Manager has said and I think Ms. Mayfield referred for a longer term look at the system and the Manager has agreed to work on that. I want to endorse the recommendation; I'd be willing to make a motion for discussion specific to those for approval.

Barnes: I think we are all on the same page, but I want to get Mr. Austin's questions.

Austin: I was asking about the number of kids earlier, I was looking at our numbers related to the dollars and if this would be considering that using about $50,000 from the Discretionary Fund, to give $25,000 to ABC and the YWCA get them closer to the ability to serve 200 that could be about 270; 240 would be about $200 and the 140 would be around $150,000. Just as a consideration, I'm just throwing that out there.

Barnes: I would not.

Austin: I will say thank you to the Manager and staff for coming up with this; it is a great way to mitigate what we were doing. I was going back to the impact of how many kids are being served individually by this organization and the YWCA as well as these other four organizations. It looks like their funding is around $250,000 or $200,000 and the youth going to ABC, they are serving around 100 plus kids and it is about $150,000 if there would be consideration for that.

Barnes: Mr. Austin, just to respond to you, the reason I would be reluctant to doing this, if you are going to add $50,000 now and then another $150,000 and start getting down into the gray area and picking up groups that wanted the total request for $2.6 million; we are at $1.375 if we support this, you could just keep adding. I just think at some point we've got to be disciplined in our own process. We've used $1.2 million for years and we are up to $1.375 million because of the additional CDBG money and if we starting dipping into the Discretionary Funds, I just think it is risky.

Lyles: I think that the issue is going to be around the General Fund contribution of $590,000 and if we do another $100,000. If we do another $50,000, we are going into the $640,000 and then next year the General Fund has to pick that up in some way or we'll be back in this situation. I'm just a little bit reluctant. I had no idea how we were going to look when you put on the board yesterday, the $400,000; I had no idea how that was going to happen. I was really thinking that we would be wrestling with the $1.2 million. I think I agree with the Chair, but my principle is around the General Fund as an amount that is dedicated to this program and I think going to the General Fund to make that change takes us really further away from the direction of the Council Committee.

Austin: Just for consideration.

Lyles: I think you will get to raise it again on the 28th. It's not like our opinions count until the 6th.

Mayfield: Actually I hate the fact that we are four today so we don't have a tie breaker because I do agree with Mr. Austin when looking at our Discretionary Fund, mainly because the Discretionary Fund is going to be replenished in six weeks. We are thinking about the fact that we know that we have $200,000 that is going to be there; looking at $50,000 and doing the $25,000 right down the middle;

I'm not concerned about the organizations that are in the gray. Today's conversations are only about these two organizations. Ultimately again and I will repeat the same thing I said yesterday, the big picture, I don't think we should be in this role, but we are and with us being here I'm more concerned about the impact in the community and the impact on the youth. If that $25,000 can impact more youth to have a better opportunity and for those that unfortunately start out behind the plate as opposed to starting on second or third base, if this can help, I don't have a concern or issue with using $50,000 from our Discretionary Fund to cover and make sure we are helping the youth with understanding, we are still tweaking this. Staff you have an amazing job and you already know that. We are going to give you the acylation, you are doing exactly what we asked you but again, yesterday I said I need to make sure that as a representative, I'm asking you the right questions so you can provide me with the right answer. The City Manager is going to look at the process; I don't see a problem with identifying an additional $25,000 each. I know today that I could not support the additional to bring up that $307,000 because I didn't support when Greater Enrichment came back to us last year and Council found the hundreds of thousands that we found for that. I thought that was above and beyond but I can support $50,000 with $25,000 being split. I couldn't support $200,000 just because where will we get it, but I can support $50,000 and that being able to help with knowing that we are going to be working towards a better process. My biggest concern which I mentioned is I don't want us to be the one that put these organizations in a position where next year it is going to be adjusted on what they couldn't do and part of what they couldn't do partially fell on us. I don't have a problem with the $50,000 being split $25,000 each.

Lyles: I don't think we have to worry about – we have two motions; we can have a motion to approve what's in place or a motion to approve a higher amount. Hopefully we at least have some action coming out.

Mayfield: I have an additional motion.

Lyles: The second thing I want to say is that in the ABC Program, if I understood correctly, it is not just the number of children, it is the number of activities each child can do that the increase might go to. I'm going to report on the number of children served. On the scoring aspect of it, we control that scoring and they can come in with a plan to do something in terms of when they apply for funding. They're applying for going forward, not based upon what they actually did, but the capacity to do further into the future so the scoring isn't based upon the history of what they did because we don't have a clue what Citizen Schools did and look where they rank.

Mayfield: I'm not happy with that.

Lyles: You may not be happy with it, but I'm just saying it doesn't hurt you in the process to not doing something to get there. I feel like at some point it is really hard and for me I can't tell you, I think I've served on the board for at least three of these organizations and I know how hard it is. I know it is particularly difficult but I think at some point we have to kind of say here is the line we can live with and do that. I'm going to base it again on the General Fund being a flat amount and not going into other General Funds. I think we may increase the number of children being served in a way that is still a quality aspect of focus on reading. I remember Keith Morrison coming to our visioning thing and saying that three steps back, that should be where we are going to focus.

Barnes: Could we have a motion on this sheet and then another motion on the $50,000?

Lyles: I think that's a great idea.

Mayfield: And a motion on the amended.

Barnes: No, send this to the Council clean and then have another vote on whether we add $50,000 to it and we'll let the Council know that comes out. Is that fair?

VOTE: Lyles made a motion to approve the Out of School Time funding recommendations from staff. Mr. Barnes seconded the motion. The vote was recorded (Barnes, Lyles, Austin and Mayfield) in favor. Councilmember Fallon was absent for the vote.

VOTE: Austin made a motion to use an additional $50,000 in Council's 2014 Discretionary Funds to add to Out of School Time funding for $25,000 each for Above and Beyond the YWCA. Ms. Mayfield seconded the motion. The vote was recorded as (2 in favor, Austin & Mayfield) and (2 against, Barnes & Lyles). Councilmember Fallon was absent for the vote.

Mayfield: Do you see? Did we oppose the first one; no we did not?

Barnes: But we are going to report it to the full Council though.

Mayfield: The way it is going to be reported to the full Council is that there were four votes in support of this recommendation and there were two votes in support of the recommendation of the additional $50,000.

Barnes: You do support this; it is just an issue about the addendum.

Mayfield: What I support ultimately is one recommendation and that is what the amended dollars that this was presented to us today. This is a great start but I think ultimately we really need to have a conversation around at least moving forward with when it goes to full Council the way that it is going to be is that there were two votes from this Committee in support of an amendment, but there were four votes from this Committee in support of this recommendation.

Barnes: We have another member here, how would you have voted?

Driggs: I just wanted to say I thought the solution that staff came up with was very elegant in the sense that it took a particular funding source and managed to get to the numbers that we have here. You cross a line when you exceed that and suddenly you've got to start worrying about housing and all the other needs in the City that you are diverting funds away from and personally I can support this. I have a problem with the idea of crossing that line. That is just the way I feel. I think you are getting into kind of an endless, bottomless need out there that you are not going to be able to address and you can't take the position that every time you commit money to anything you have to support it forever because you don't want to confront the prospect of maybe this continuing service or something. You have to accept the fact when you fund something that you might occasionally be in a position of not being able to fund it forever. I would be strongly in favor of this as presented.

Lyles: I hear what Ms. Mayfield is saying but I think that the votes are two separate votes. One was a vote on the recommendation for Out of School funding recommendations; the second one proposed that if I believe it was structured appropriately the first motion would be that you recommend moving $50,000 out of the Council's Discretionary Fund. Because you couldn't up it you are just saying in the motion, I move $50,000 out of the Discretionary Fund for these two purposes and I think that motion was not necessarily a tie, but you would be voting on transfer out of the Discretionary Fund, not Out of School Time programs. That means we have the 28th to say we have $200,000 in the Discretionary Fund. I think there was something yesterday that was prejudged to come out of it. Council can go from $200,000 to come out right away and that can be on the list, but I think that's a point to see how to get it done.

Barnes: And now we are in the third hour of my life on this topic.

Austin: I was just going to echo what Vi just said. It really gets down to the six votes.

Barnes: I think we have answered your questions on the 28th. Mr. Deputy Manager, talk about the upcoming agenda for the Committee since there have been a few things that have been moved and shifted and there are some things we want to get back to.

Kimble: Originally last Friday there was going to be the Business Investment Grant overview to give you an education background on where we've been over the last ten years. That will take multiple meetings to do that education and then related to the Energy Strategy, we're going to have Scott Carlberg and another person who are very deep into the E-4 Carolinas strategy concept try to come and present that as an overview. There is not any action on each of those as it is education. We also know that soon we are going to be talking about Bojangles, Ovens and Amateur Sports so we have those three topics that we need to figure out how we are going to start to put those back into the cue. There may be a few others but those are the three most immediate.

Lyles: I'm thinking about May 15th, June 30th and one of the other Committees I serve on, they will not be meeting in July.

Barnes: Which Committees?

Lyles: Transportation and Planning.

Barnes: Your Committee?

Lyles: Actually that is one of the things that I wondered about. I don't know what the practice is but I know that some of these things are really big and Transportation, actually the staff has so much more work to do on a number of issues that they needed some time to come forward, but I think on some things we are reviewing versus Bojangles, I think it was more immediate. I wanted to talk about the schedule about what is really a priority and how do we make sure that we do that over the months of May and June or are you expecting these to fall in July and August. A little bit more detail would be helpful.

Kimble: We are in the middle of negotiations on the Amateur Sports and we're not going to bring that back to you until we have more definitive decisions and agreement with GoodSports and we are working through a number of issues. You gave us a lot of feedback the first time and we captured all of that and we listened and we are going to work to make sure that what we deliver back to you meets the goals and objectives which you talked about the last time. We are hoping that I think it's June 5th is our next meeting if I recall from memory, if we are in a position to bring GoodSports then we will. If we are not, we will bring those other two issues, and you have two meetings in June. Maybe you don't, because I know we have the Inter-City Chamber trip. We only have one Ms. Grier?

Grier: You have two scheduled.

Kimble: We will have to figure out if we reschedule that because I think we need two meetings in June to capture all of those two topics.

Barnes: Let me just clarify, were you suggesting that you did not want us to meet in July?

Lyles: No, I was trying to figure out what we would be doing in July if we were going to have a meeting versus a review, versus an action item. Review, I can book a review.

Kimble: The review is first, but each one of those may have actions in future meetings, but you have to start out with the education.

Lyles: I'm trying to figure out when these things would require a decision and looking at that so we can make appropriate plans for our family.

Kimble: There is no deadline for when you must have recommendations on either Business Investment Grants or the Energy Strategy Plan. They have been referred and you would want to do them as quickly as you could; you wouldn't want to let them languish for months, but there is no specific deadline.

Barnes: The goal is to get through some of this stuff before the summer time.

Kimble: Right and you will have two meetings in June.

Barnes: Are you planning like May or something?

Lyles: I do plan to go in May. I would like to know a little bit about some expectations about an action.

Barnes: Past experience we've had Committee meetings in July and I will be comfortable with that.

Kimble: You usually take one month off, not two months in this Committee because there were so many issues. I think we are probably looking at maybe one of those two months off, July or August, but not both.

Mayfield: So to advise the Committee, I'm not going to be at the June 5th meeting. If we decide on a second meeting in June, if it's before the 19th, I won't be at that one either because I'm going to be gone.

Kimble: We will work with your calendars. Before we recess the June meeting we will work with your calendars.

Barnes: I want to take a moment and recognize and thank somebody for his service to the City. I've enjoyed working with Brad over the years and we've gotten an e-mail that you are going to pursue other opportunities and we respect that and appreciate you as a person, as a professional and just thank you for your service, Brad. You've always quietly done your job and when we have our Closed Session, you come in and tell us A to Z what is going on with these entities and we do our work and we appreciate the way you've done your job, so thank you.

Richardson: I'll be back through the end of June certainly. We will be back with those three items and a very long list.

Kimble: Remember the second part of the Out of School Time is that you have thought about the future and what we'd like keep and feel free to contact us.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:06p.m.

City Council
Economic Development & Global Competitiveness Committee

Thursday, May 15, 2014
12:00p.m.
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room CH-14

Committee Members:	Michael Barnes, Chair Vi Lyles, Vice Chair Al Austin Claire Fallon LaWana Mayfield
Staff Resource:	Ron Kimble, Deputy City Manager

AGENDA

I. <u>OUT of SCHOOL TIME - 120 minutes</u>

Staff: Tom Warshauer, Neighborhood & Business Services

Action: This item was referred to the Committee on May 12, 2014. Staff will provide an overview of the 2014 Out of School Time review process, respond to Committee questions and determine next steps.

II. <u>NEXT MEETING DATE: Thursday, June 5, 2014 at Noon, Room CH-14</u>

Tentative Schedule:

- Amateur Sports Development at Bojangles Coliseum/Ovens Auditorium
- Business Investment Program Review

Distribution: Mayor/City Council Ron Carlee, City Manager City Executive Team

CHARLOTTE.
NEIGHBORHOOD & BUSINESS SERVICES

Out of School Time Funding Recommendations

Economic Development & Global Competitiveness Committee

May 15, 2014

CHARLOTTE.

OST Funding Recommendations

Out of School Time Funding Recommendations						
Site	FY15 Final Score	$ Request	$ Recommended	% of Budget	Revised Recommended	Revised % Budget
Citizen Schools	265	$350,000.00	$350,000.00	27%	$306,342	24%
Police Activities League	258	$317,750.00	$317,750.00	48%	$287,410	43%
Greater Enrichment Program	254	$350,000.00	$350,000.00	44%	$350,000	44%
Youth Development Initiatives	247	$162,325.00	$162,325.00	25%	$162,325	25%
Above and Beyond Students	246	$162,786.00	$19,925.00	4%	$110,358	22%
YWCA	243	$350,000.00	$0.00	0%	$158,826	14%
Total:		$1,692,861.00	$1,200,000.00		$1,375,261	

CHARLOTTE.

Out of School Time Funding									
Site	FY13 Funding	FY14 Funding	FY15 Final Score	FY15 Request	FY15 Recommended (May 5, 2014)	% of Budget	# of Children Served (with City funds)	FY15 City Mgr Proposed Revised Funding (May 15, 2014)	Change from May 5 to May 15
Citizen Schools			265	$350,000	$350,000	27%	295	$306,342	-$43,658
Police Academy League*	$282,145	$287,410	258	$317,750	$317,750	48%	237	$287,410	-$30,340
Greater Enrichment Program*	$605,854	$400,000	254	$350,000	$350,000	44%	200	$350,000	$0
Youth Development Initiatives			247	$162,325	$162,325	25%	120	$162,325	$0
Above and Beyond Students*		$110,358	246	$162,786	$19,925	4%	140	$110,358	$90,433
YWCA*	$158,826	$307,000	243	$350,000	$0			$158,826	$158,826
CMS- ASEP	$350,012	$0	242	$350,000	$0				
Bethlehem Center	$170,357	$0	225	$184,942	$0				
BELL		$0	216	$390,440	$0				
St. Paul	$70,476	$0	n/a	$0	$0				
First Baptist Church*		$81,432	n/a	$0	$0				
Total:	$1,637,670	$1,186,200	n/a	$2,618,243	$1,200,000	n/a	992	$1,375,261	$175,261

*FY14 Out-of-School Time Programs

Notes

- PAL, GEP, YWCA - Legacy Programs eligible for 50% of budget
- FY15 City Mgr Proposed Revised Funding includes $175,261 from additional Community Development Block Grant funds that can be applied to programs such as Out of School Time Partners