<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type:</th>
<th>SPECIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>01/30 &amp; 02/01/1997 RETREAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office
City Council Retreat Agenda
Thursday, January 30 - Saturday, February 1
Pine Crest Inn - Tryon, NC

Thursday, January 30, 1997
5 30 pm  Arrive (Check In Available at 3 00 pm)
6 00 pm  Social
7 00 pm  Dinner
8 00 pm  Opening Remarks by Mayor and Retreat Planning Committee
8 15 pm  Council Discussion of Lessons Learned from December Retreat

Friday, January 31, 1997
7 45 am  Breakfast
8 30 am  Discussion of Agenda and Group Norms
8 45 am  FY98 & 99 Budget and Finance Projections
10.00 am Break
10 15 am Continue Discussion on Budget and Finance Projections
12 noon Lunch
1 00 pm  Transportation Policy and Direction - Five-Year Plan
2 45 pm  Break
3 00 pm  Continue Discussion on Transportation Five-Year Plan
5 00 pm  Free Time
5 30 pm  Social
6 30 pm  Dinner
8 30 pm  Wrap Up Transportation Policy and Direction
Saturday, February 1, 1997

7:45 am      Breakfast
8:30 am      Discussion of Goals for Economic Vitality/Direction for Neighborhoods
10:30 am     Break
10:45 am     Discussion of Goals for Regional Strategy
12:00 noon   Wrap Up
12:30 pm     Lunch
Overview of City Council Retreat

Retreat Goals

Provide an environment for City Council to discuss priority issues for 1997 including:

- **1998-99 Budget Development**
  Establishing policy direction for the FY98 & FY99 Operating Budget and the FY98-02 Capital Investment Plan

- **Five-year Transportation Plan**
  Reviewing and providing direction on the proposed Five-year Transportation Plan and the outlined action steps

- **Economic Vitality/Direction for Neighborhoods**
  Discussing the goals for Economic Vitality/Direction for Neighborhoods to give staff a framework for developing this component of the Economic Development Focus Plan

- **Regionalism**
  Receiving information on current efforts in regionalism and discussing regionalism goals to give staff direction for a strategic plan

---

**Thursday, January 30**

- **Dinner/Opening Remarks - After dinner, the Council Retreat Planning Committee will share the ideas that were incorporated in the planning for the retreat**

  David Norman will act as facilitator for the retreat. He has years of experience working with senior executives and strategic planning

- **Lessons learned at the Partnership Retreat - The Partnership Retreat focused on learning styles, how to handle conflict and role definition for Mayor, Council and the City Manager. A report is included. This is an opportunity for the Council to discuss lessons learned from the retreat**
Lessons learned from December
- group norms
- learning styles
- negotiation style
- roles
- group interaction
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

→ Focus On Future
   Future ≠ Past

→ Look To Charlotte As A Whole - “Best” For OUR Community

→ Results Produced Only By Working Together

→ Simple Actions Lead To Sustaining Differences
   MR = R - E
   Max Result Reality Expectation

→ Listen Before Judging!

→ Concentrate On Issues - Not On Personality

→ Enjoy Governing - Have Some Fun

→ Your Actions - Set The Tone

→ Result from Workshop - Controlled By You
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Compete</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
<th>Accommodate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Council’s Role Expectations
City of Charlotte

PRIMARY IMPORTANCE

Interpreter
Goal Setter
Strategist
Decision Maker

SECONDARY IMPORTANCE

Advocate
Educator
Problem Solver
Community Leader
Mayor’s Role Expectations
City of Charlotte

PRIMARY IMPORTANCE

Advocate
Moderator
Image Maker
Spokesperson

SECONDARY IMPORTANCE

Educator
Community Leader
Representative
City Manager’s Role Expectations

City of Charlotte

PRIMARY IMPORTANCE

Communicator

Innovator

Team Builder

Visionary

SECONDARY IMPORTANCE

Policy Analyst

Systems Analyst

Community Leader

Organizational Leader

Staff Developer
Lessons Learned Group Interaction

1) Cities that are winners
   - concentrate on goals
   - identify a leader
   - claim credit
   - have a game plan

Cities that are champions
   - refocus goals
   - share leadership
   - market success
   - have strategies

2) Council needs
   - two types of information
     (detailed for some, brief for most)
   - to get out in the field
   - to talk with patience

3) To resolve conflict, Council must
   - take time to discuss major issues
   - identify sources of conflict where negotiation needs to occur
   - consider options
   - have tolerance for each others style
   - listen before judging
   - do things as a whole
Friday, January 31

♦ Retreat Agenda Review
This session will review the Retreat agenda and norms for the group interaction

♦ Financial and Budget Projections
The Business Executives for Finance and Budget and Evaluation will make presentations on revenue and expense projections for the next four years. The projections will focus on the General, Debt Service and Public Transportation Funds.

▶ Council will be asked to set a policy framework for the City Manager to develop the recommended operating and capital budgets.

♦ Five-year Transportation Plan
The Five-year Transportation Plan was presented at the January Council Workshop. The plan built upon prior professional studies, the Committee of 100 Report and the work of the Committee of Ten. The retreat gives Council an opportunity to discuss in detail the goals, the action steps and the data supporting the recommendations to provide staff with direction for implementation.

▶ Council is asked to approve the goals and determine for each action step whether to:
  - proceed to the next step,
  - review further, or
  - defer

♦ Evening Session
After dinner, the transportation discussion will be summarized and Council will have an opportunity to check whether the discussion from the afternoon session meets the long-range goals for the community.

City Council Retreat, January 1997
Saturday, February 1

♦ Economic Vitality/Direction for Neighborhoods
During the Partnership Retreat, Council asked that this component of the Economic Development Focus Plan have further discussion to determine what we are trying to accomplish. Staff has proposed strategies that require integration of business support, infrastructure investment and development initiatives. Council is asked to develop goals to give staff a framework to develop this part of the Economic Development Focus Plan.

♦ Regionalism
Several initiatives have been successful in establishing regional partners. Council will receive an update on the Centralina Council of Governments and the Urban Coalition.

- A discussion of outcomes from these existing partnerships as well as discussion of goals for regionalism will give the staff direction for a strategic plan.

♦ Wrap Up
The purpose of this session is to check and be sure there is consensus on

- the direction for budget development,
- the process for the Five-year Transportation Plan,
- the focus for Economic Vitality/Specific to Neighborhoods, and
- the mechanisms employed and the direction for regionalism
PRIORITY ISSUES FOR 1997

City Council Retreat
January 30 - February 1, 1997
Retreat Information

How to Get There: The Pine Crest Inn is located in the heart of Tryon, NC near the intersection of I-26 and the recently completed U.S. 74 extension. The Inn is about 120 miles from Charlotte via U.S. 74. Allow about two hours for the trip. We recommend that you use U.S 74 now that it is open from the Forest City area to I-26. Follow the signs to Tryon and refer to the attached map for the location of the Pine Crest Inn.

Check-In: When you arrive please park and come to the Inn for room check-in. Rooms will be available starting at 3 p.m. Please refer to the attached map for the location of cottages and rooms.

Dress: Plan to dress casually for the retreat. Slacks, sweaters and comfortable shoes are recommended. Sweat suits and blue jeans are not permitted in the dining room. Remember to also bring a coat for the cool mountain temperatures.

Personal Expenses: Lodging, food and conference expenses are covered for elected officials and staff; the news media will pay for these costs. The Inn will keep accounts by name for personal expenses to include beverages, etc. These personal charges will be paid by individuals at check-out. Persons staying over will pay regular room and meal costs.

Meals: All meals will be served in the main dining room located in the Pine Crest Inn.

Meetings: Meetings will be held in the Conference Center located adjacent to the Inn.

Messages: Friends may reach you by calling the Inn at (704) 859-9135. After 9 p.m. an automated system will ask callers to enter your room number on a touch tone phone.

Rooms: All accommodations have private bath, telephone and cable television. Most have a fireplace.
LEADERSHIP AND PARTNERSHIP WORKSHOP
FOR THE
MAYOR - CITY COUNCIL - CITY MANAGER
CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA

OUTCOMES

⇒ Strengthen The Partnership - Ability of Mayor - City Council - City Manager To Work Together To Produce Results
  • Understanding and Appreciating Individual Contributions and Style
  • Clear Understanding of Roles and Responsibilities
  • Refinements - How We Operate, How the City is Governed

⇒ Direction for 1997 - Policy Agenda of Key Target Issues
  • “Importance” Priority
  • Finalization of Policy Agenda 1997

⇒ Foundation For Sustaining Action Beyond the Workshop
  • Specific Action Plan for City Council, Mayor, City Manager
  • Commitments to Leadership and Our Partnership
AGENDA

⇒ Challenges for City Leaders
  • New Realities of the 1990's
  • Emergence of "Community Based" City Government
  • Making "Winners" into "Champions"
  • Keys to City Success - Partnership/Leadership

⇒ Understanding Our Partners - How We Operate, What Each Partner Contributes
  • Problem Solving and Decision Making
  • Conflict Resolution and Negotiations
  • Keys to an Effective Partnership

⇒ Mayor - City Council - City Manager Success
  • Success Means . . .
  • Avoid Becoming . . .

⇒ Our Goal: The Policy Agenda 1997
  • Identify Target Issues
  • Focus Target
  • Priority of Importance
  • Our Common Agenda

⇒ Our Roles: Expectations and Actions
  • City Council
  • Mayor
  • City Manager
  • Performance Standards and Guide for Action

⇒ Our Execution - How We Produce Results
  • Our "House" Rules
  • Our Operations - Governing Refinements
  • Action Plan for Enhancing Governance Process

⇒ Our Leadership Challenge and Opportunity - Turning Commitments into Actions/Results
AGENDA

⇒ Challenges for City Leaders
  • New Realities of the 1990’s
  • Emergence of “Community Based” City Government
  • Making “Winners” into “Champions”
  • Keys to City Success - Partnership/Leadership

⇒ Understanding Our Partners - How We Operate, What Each Partner
  Contributes
  • Problem Solving and Decision Making
  • Conflict Resolution and Negotiations
  • Keys to an Effective Partnership

⇒ Mayor - City Council - City Manager Success
  • Success Means . . .
  • Avoid Becoming . . .

⇒ Our Goal: The Policy Agenda 1997
  • Identify Target Issues
  • Focus Target
  • Priority of Importance
  • Our Common Agenda

⇒ Our Roles: Expectations and Actions
  • City Council
  • Mayor
  • City Manager
  • Performance Standards and Guide for Action

⇒ Our Execution - How We Produce Results
  • Our “House” Rules
  • Our Operations - Governing Refinements
  • Action Plan for Enhancing Governance Process

⇒ Our Leadership Challenge and Opportunity - Turning Commitments
  into Actions/Results
WORKSHOP - GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- Focus on Future
  Future ≠ Past

- Look To Charlotte as a Whole - “BEST” for Our Community

- Results Produced Only By Working Together

- Simple Actions Lead to Sustaining Differences
  MR = R - E
  Max Result Reality Expectation

- Listen Before Judging!

- Concentrate on Issues - Not on Personality

- Enjoy Governing - Have Some Fun

- Your Actions - Set The Tone

- Result from Workshop - Controlled By You
Our Policy Agenda for 1997
Mayor and City Council
City of Charlotte

TOP PRIORITY

Transportation Policy and Direction (Comprehensive/Multi-Modal)

Economic Vitality Strategy/Direction for Neighborhoods

Regional Strategy

“Community” Safety Strategy

HIGH PRIORITY

Stormwater Policy and Direction

Zoning: Policy and Direction

Airport Direction

Housing Policy and Direction
Target Issues 1997
Mayor and City Council
City of Charlotte

TOP PRIORITY

1. Transportation Policy and Direction (Comprehensive/Multi-Modal)
   - Define Our Outcome
   - Analyze and Evaluate Charlotte - What is Our Real Situation and Options?
   - Define City's Role
   - Explore Realistic Options Based on Analysis
   - Address Road - Direction and Funding
   - Review Mass Transportation Needs
   - Develop Integrated Policy - Clear Direction
   - Decisions
   - Develop Strategy for Obtaining Dollars from State/Federal Government

2. Economic Vitality Strategy/Direction for Neighborhoods
   - Review and Inventory Current Programs, Activities and Needs
   - Define City's Role and Outcomes
   - Explore Options, including Approaches Used by Other Cities, Incentives
   - Evaluate Coordination of Effort - Accountability
   - Develop Strategy with Short Term Action Plan
   - Decisions
   - Work Groups to Define Outcomes and Strategies
TOP PRIORITY

3 Regional Strategy

- Work with Counties, Other Cities and State Governments
- Develop Strategy for Building Relations
- Identify Areas of Common Concern
- Define Charlotte's Interest
- Decisions: Direction, Strategy
- Explore Areas for Regional Contribution


- Review Outcome: Safe Community for People, Work with People
- Evaluate Community Oriented Policing, Staff, Use Technology - Involving Community Neighborhood Churches, etc.
- Determine Resource Needs and Funding
- Establish Trust with Community
- Decisions
- Incorporate in Budget (e.g. Crime Stoppers)
- More Dialogue with City Council
HIGH PRIORITY

1. Stormwater Policy and Direction
   - Review Current Situation and Needs
   - Define Outcome
   - Explore Options (e.g. Stormwater Management Policy for Single Family Areas)
   - Determine Funding Strategy, Other Funding Sources
   - Decisions
   - Talk with State/Federal - Potential Resource Support

2. Zoning: Policy and Direction
   - Review Current Policies, Rules, Process
   - Analyze Our Abilities to Effect Outcomes
   - Define Outcomes for Community
   - Define Roles & Responsibility
   - Review Zoning Policy and Process
   - Decision
   - Address Intell/Density (???) Policy

3. Airport Direction
   - Review Master Plan
   - Analyze Needs
   - Decision: Airport Expansion
   - Address Airports as Economic Assets, Real Economic Impact on Neighborhoods
   - Outcome - Viable Hub
   - Work with Neighborhood

4. Housing Policy and Direction
   - Evaluate Current Situation
   - Define City’s Role, Desired Outcome
   - Develop City Policy
   - Decisions
   - Address Issues of Fixed Income;
     50’s, 60’s, 70’s Housing - Next Uses; Code Enforcement/Demolition of Homes/Rehab. Policy
City Council’s Role Expectations  
*City of Charlotte*

**PRIMARY IMPORTANCE**

- Interpreter
- Goal Setter
- Strategist
- Decision Maker

**SECONDARY IMPORTANCE**

- Advocate
- Educator
- Problem Solver
- Community Leader
Mayor's Role Expectations
City of Charlotte

PRIMARY IMPORTANCE

Advocate

Moderator

Image Maker

Spokesperson

SECONDARY IMPORTANCE

Educator

Community Leader

Representative
CITY OF CHARLOTTE
FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS
1997 - 2001

- BACKGROUND
- CONCLUSIONS
- PROJECTION ASSUMPTIONS
- INDIVIDUAL FUNDS
BACKGROUND

- TAX GROWTH SLOWS
  - STATE ACTIONS
  - DISTRIBUTION FORMULA
  - DEVELOPMENT SLOWDOWN
BACKGROUND - CONTINUED

- REVENUE OUTLOOK - FAVORABLE
  - SALES TAX
  - UTILITY FRANCHISE TAX
  - INCREASE IN ASSESSED VALUES
  - ANNEXATION

- OPERATING COSTS - REDUCED OR CONSTANT
PROJECTION ASSUMPTIONS

- ECONOMIC FACTORS

- ANNEXATION

- TECHNOLOGY
FY98 ANNEXATION REVENUE IMPACT
FOR FY99 - By Type (In Millions)

Total
Annexation
Revenues = $14.6 Million
FY98 ANNEXATION REVENUE IMPACT
FOR FY99 - By Fund (In Millions)

Total Annexation Revenues = $14.6 Million

$10.8

$0.1  $0.9  $0.7  $0.3

- General
- Debt Service
- Pay-As-You-Go
- Transit
- Powell Bill
- Stormwater
GENERAL FUND PROJECTIONS - EXCESS/SHORTFALL
CURRENT vs PREVIOUS (In Millions)
Percent of Fund Balance to general obligation debt payments

Council policy - Fund Balance 50% of debt payments for following year
SUMMARY

- LOCAL ECONOMY AND STATE ACTIONS

- ANNEXATION

- CONTINUED OPERATING EFFICIENCIES

- NO GENERAL FUND SHORTFALLS NEAR TERM

- $46 MILLION ADDITIONAL DEBT CAPACITY
CONCLUSIONS

- GENERAL FUND
  - NO SHORTFALLS NEAR TERM

- DEBT SERVICE FUND
  - $46 MILLION ADDITIONAL DEBT CAPACITY

- TRANSIT FUND
  - SHORTFALL COVERED BY FUND BALANCE
City of Charlotte
Financial Information
1997-2001

Council will review the following material at the Retreat:

- Major budgetary decisions included in the FY97 budget,
- The financial projections for FY1998-2001, including the General, Debt Service, and Transit Funds,
- Goals for the FY98-FY99 Operating Budget and the FY98-02 Capital Investment Plan,
- Upcoming budgetary issues for the FY98-FY99 two-year budget cycle, and
- Policy questions that guide the development of the next two-year budget.
Review of Major FY97 Budget Decisions

Council made several major decisions during the FY97 budget process that remain in effect for the FY98 - FY99 budget cycle. A review of these issues follows:

- **The End of Police Tax Equity**
  
  **Impact**
  The end of Police Tax Equity with Mecklenburg County shifted $28.4 million away from a contribution from Mecklenburg County back to the City's property tax rate. The City's tax rate for the General Fund increased by 97¢. Mecklenburg County's tax rate decreased by 946¢.

- **Storm Water Enterprise Fund**
  
  **Impact**
  Storm Water began the transition to an Enterprise Fund, as storm water rates were increased from $2.92 per month to $3.13. Beginning in FY98, the 1¢ property tax dedication to Storm Water will be phased out over 4 years. Annual increases in the storm water fee over the next several years are anticipated to average about 8%.

- **Capital Investment Program**
  
  **Impact**
  In November, 1996, $98.4 million in General Obligation Bonds were approved, $66.4 million for roads and $32 million for Neighborhood Improvements.

- **The Solid Waste Fee**
  
  **Impact**
  Mecklenburg County shifted $6.2 million in garbage disposal collection costs to the City by reducing the County's annual solid waste fee from $38 down to $10 dollars. The FY97 budget includes an annual solid waste fee for City residents of $38 for single-family residential units and $23 for multi-family residential units. Future fees will be anchored to landfill disposal costs.
Reallocation of the Property Tax Rate

Impact

In addition to the 97¢ tax increase for the end of Police Tax Equity, the following shifts in the tax rate were approved:

- ½¢ was shifted from Pay-As-You-Go (PAYG) to the General Fund to fund operating expenses for new facilities, particularly the new Police headquarters and the Westside Service Center,

- 1¢ was shifted from PAYG to Debt Service to support the November, 1996 bonds,

- the 1½¢ reduction in PAYG was replaced with a $102 million capital reserve contribution from General Fund Balance,

- Beginning in FY98, the 1¢ property tax dedication to Storm Water will be phased out in ¼¢ intervals over 4 years, with ¾¢ going to debt service to support the November, 1996 bonds and ¼¢ going to the General Fund to support the City’s increasing storm water fee.

The summary of the changes to the tax rate is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY96</th>
<th>FY97</th>
<th>FY98</th>
<th>FY99</th>
<th>FY00</th>
<th>FY01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>33.05¢</td>
<td>43.25¢</td>
<td>43.25¢</td>
<td>43.25¢</td>
<td>43.50¢</td>
<td>43.50¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>5.75¢</td>
<td>6.75¢</td>
<td>7.00¢</td>
<td>7.25¢</td>
<td>7.25¢</td>
<td>7.50¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay-As-You-Go</td>
<td>3.00¢</td>
<td>1.50¢</td>
<td>1.50¢</td>
<td>1.50¢</td>
<td>1.50¢</td>
<td>1.50¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water</td>
<td>1.00¢</td>
<td>1.00¢</td>
<td>0.75¢</td>
<td>0.50¢</td>
<td>0.25¢</td>
<td>0.00¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.80¢</td>
<td>52.50¢</td>
<td>52.50¢</td>
<td>52.50¢</td>
<td>52.50¢</td>
<td>52.50¢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following are the financial projections for the General, Debt Service and Public Transportation Funds for fiscal years 1997 through 2001. A brief general background and summary of the detailed projections are presented below. Richard Martin, Director of Finance, will be making a presentation of these projections and providing additional information and explanation.

**Background:** In the late 1980's and early 1990's the City experienced a substantial reduction in the growth of revenues. This negative trend was primarily the result of State actions, the impact of the City-County sales tax distribution formula and a slowdown in real estate development within the City. Recently, within the last two years, the revenue outlook has become more positive. This can be attributed primarily to significant increases in sales and utility franchise taxes as well as increases in property tax assessed values. In addition, the FY 98 annexation has a very favorable impact on revenues. Pertaining to expenditures, the City’s Restructuring Government Program, including competition/privatization efforts, has resulted in operating costs either being reduced or remaining constant.

**Projections:** The attached projections provide an analysis of the General Fund, Debt Service Fund and the Public Transportation Fund. In developing these projections the FY97 budget was used as the base year. In addition to the projections, the following pages outline the assumptions on which the projections are based. Additional information relating to historic revenue trends is also provided. The following is a summary of the attached projections.

**General Fund**

- Even though the detail revenue and expenditure items have changed, the overall excess projection for FY97 and 98 remains basically the same as the projections made in FY96.

- The overall projection for FY99 and 2000 is approximately $5 0 million better than the projections made in FY96. This improvement is primarily the result of annexation and expected increases in sales and utility franchise taxes. However, the FY97 projections still reflect a slight shortfall for FY2000 and approximately $6 5 million shortfall for FY2001.

**Debt Service Fund**

- Increase in property tax revenues resulting from annexation as well as more positive assumptions for other dedicated revenues will result in a projected general government debt capacity of $46 million.
Public Transportation Fund
- The existing fund balance position is sufficient to make possible the continuation of current service levels through FY2001

Conclusion  The current projections in these three funds (General, Debt Service and Public Transportation) are more favorable than in the past. However, changes in the assumptions on which these projections are based would have an impact on these projections.
City of Charlotte
General Fund
Revenues and Expenditures
(In Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues and Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$131.4</td>
<td>$142.7</td>
<td>$145.7</td>
<td>$148.2</td>
<td>$150.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Franchise</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Fees</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance (for Technology)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues and Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$250.5</td>
<td>$257.3</td>
<td>$264.0</td>
<td>$268.5</td>
<td>$274.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Expenditures:        |      |      |      |      |      |
| Public Safety        | 145.0| 148.1| 152.0| 162.4| 168.6|
| Solid Waste Services | 26.1 | 26.9 | 26.8 | 28.2 | 29.4 |
| Transportation       | 10.6 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 12.4 | 13.0 |
| Engineering and Property Management | 13.9 | 14.4 | 15.0 | 15.9 | 16.7 |
| Administration       | 24.4 | 24.9 | 26.0 | 27.2 | 28.3 |
| Community Planning and Development | 11.6 | 11.9 | 12.3 | 12.7 | 13.2 |
| Debt Service Payments | 11.8 | 11.4 | 9.6  | 8.0  | 8.6  |
| Technology           | 5.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 3.0  | 3.0  |
| **Total Expenditures** | 248.4| 254.0| 258.2| 269.8| 280.8 |

1997 PROJECTION - EXCESS (SHORTFALL) $2.1 $3.3 $5.8 $(1.3) $(6.5)

Projections are based on assumptions identified on the following two pages. Changes in these assumptions would have an impact on these projections.
City of Charlotte

General Fund
Financial Projections
Detail Assumptions

**General**
Base Year - FY97 Budget
Includes FY98 annexation

**Revenues**
No change in property tax rate

Assessed value increase of $500 million for FY98, $700 million for FY99 and $600 million for FY2000 and 2001

Sales tax revenue increase of 5.5% each year before adjustments for tax distribution formula

Utility franchise tax revenue increase of 5% each year

Reimbursement for police services based on agreement with Mecklenburg County

No change in major programs or agreements with Mecklenburg County or the State of North Carolina

Solid waste fees increase of 5% each year

Other revenues increase of 2.5% each year
City of Charlotte

General Fund
Financial Projections
Detail Assumptions

**Expenditures**
Service levels remain unchanged

Vacancy rate of 1%

Salary and wage increases based on Public Safety Plan for Police and Fire. Increases for general pay plan employees of 4.2% for FY98 and 4.7% each year for FY99 through FY2001.

Employee benefit increases as follows:

- Social Security - No change in rate
- Retirement - No changes in rates
- Health Insurance - No increase for FY98 and 5% each year for FY99 through FY2001

No increase in goods and services for FY98, increase of 2% each year for FY99 through FY2001.

Amounts for general liability and workers' compensation claims based on FY96 actuarial study.

No impact for future competitive bidding/privatization.

FY97 includes one-time police grant related expenditures of $4.7 million.

Includes $50 million for technology each year for FY97 through FY99 and $30 million for FY2000 and 2001.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fund Balance In Millions</th>
<th>Percent of General Obligation Debt Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$42 1</td>
<td>104 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$43 1</td>
<td>92 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$42 6</td>
<td>87 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$39 5</td>
<td>78 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$35 6</td>
<td>70 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$32 3</td>
<td>63 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$28 9</td>
<td>56 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$25 7</td>
<td>50 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$23 8</td>
<td>64 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$37 1</td>
<td>102 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City Council has adopted a policy that fund balance should be at least 50% of the general obligation debt payments for the following year.

As a result of the improved revenue outlook and the impact of annexation, there is additional general government debt capacity of approximately $46 million which has been incorporated in the above calculations.

Projections are based on assumptions. Changes in these assumptions would have an impact on these projections.
City of Charlotte

Public Transportation Fund
Revenues and Expenditures
(In Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fares</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Tax</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |      |      |      |      |      |
| **Expenditures**     |      |      |      |      |      |
|                      | 26.3 | 24.8 | 25.8 | 26.3 | 27.4 |

1997 PROJECTION - EXCESS (SHORTFALL)  
$(1.4)  $1.0  $8  $8  $1

Projections are based on assumptions identified on the following page. Changes in these assumptions would have an impact on these projections.
Revenues
No change in grants
No change in fares
Auto tax revenue increase of 2.5% each year and impact of annexation in FY98
Sales tax revenue increase of 4.5% each year before adjustments for tax distribution formula

Expenditures
Contractual personal services increase of 5% in FY99 and FY2001
No increase in goods and services for FY98, increase of 2% each year for FY99 through FY2001
Goals for the FY98-FY99 Operating Budget and the FY98-02 Capital Investment Plan

Goal 1  Align resources with Council priorities

Goal 2  Implement the neighborhood and road improvement strategies included in the FY97-01 Capital Investment Program

Goal 3  Provide financial capacity to implement key 2015 Action Plan steps upon approval of the Plan

Goal 4  Continue to reduce the cost of government services while maintaining customer service

Goal 5  Provide Council with budgetary information earlier in the budget development process

Key Action Steps

Align resources with Council priorities

1  Impact Council's top priorities through the FY98-FY99 operating budget and the FY98-02 Capital Investment Program
   - Transportation
   - Economic Vitality in Neighborhoods
   - Regionalism
   - Community Safety

2  Determine whether new revenues to impact priorities will come from
   - New, short-term capacity identified in the financial projections
   - Discontinuing lower priority services to fund higher priorities
   - New revenues

Implement the neighborhood and road improvement strategies included in the FY97-01 Capital Investment Program

1  Reaffirm funding decisions approved in the FY97 budget
   - Reallocation of the Property Tax Rate
   - Establishment of the Storm Water Enterprise Fund
   - Proceed with design and construction of the 2015 road list
   - Proceed with design and implementation of the neighborhood improvement areas in priority order
Provide financial capacity to implement key 2015 Action Plan steps upon approval of the Plan

1. Address key action steps with the recommended 2015 Plan, such as
   - Develop a comprehensive Open Space Plan for Charlotte-Mecklenburg
   - Implement neighborhood-based problem solving
   - Implement neighborhood action plans and the Community Safety Plan
   - Reserve designated rail and transit corridors for future needs
   - Devote more resources to alternative transportation measures, including bicycling and van/carpooling
   - Develop local coordination strategies for regional initiatives
   - Utilize the CIP as a platform for economic development

Continue to reduce the cost of government services while maintaining customer service

1. Use competition and benchmarking to provide the lowest unit cost with the best service to the customer
2. Use process improvement to eliminate unnecessary steps and reduce costs of service delivery
3. Invest in technology to reduce personnel costs, improve processes and improve customer services whenever possible

Provide Council with budgetary information earlier in the budget development process

1. Use the Council Budget Committee to assist in the development of issues for the half-day retreat and to identify related policy issues and questions
2. Use the half-day Council budget retreats to keep Council informed and involved in the development of the Manager’s Recommended Budget
Upcoming Budgetary Issues
in the Upcoming Two-Year Budget Cycle
and the Five-Year Capital Investment Program

The Five-Year Transportation Plan

Police Issues
(Such as Technology, Helicopter, Video Cameras, Staffing)

General Technology Upgrades
(Year 2000 Conversion, Infrastructure Upgrades, New system applications)

Fire Organizational Study Recommendations
(Such as Communications, Organization, First Responder Issues)

Solid Waste Competitive Bid

Financial Partners
(Such as Arts Organizations and Cultural Facilities,
Auditorium-Coliseum-Convention Center Authority,
Housing Authority, Housing Partnership,
Charlotte Uptown Development Corporation)

Review Requests to Reinstate Discontinued Programs within High Priority Areas

Review Service Levels Impacted by Recent Funding levels,
particularly those impacting customer service
Council Decision Point

Policy Questions for the Upcoming Budget

♦ **Property Tax Rate**

1. What is Council's policy on the property tax rate?

2. Is the policy the same for all Funds?
   - General Fund
   - Debt Service
   - Pay-As-You-Go
   - Storm Water

♦ **Storm Water**

3. Has Council's financial policy changed relative to Storm Water? Storm Water is now moving towards an Enterprise Fund supported by fees rather than by fees and property taxes

♦ **Council Priorities**

4. Is funding for Council priority areas (Transportation, Economic Vitality in Neighborhoods, Regionalism and Community Safety) to be accomplished within existing revenues?
QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM JANUARY 6TH COUNCIL MEETING REGARDING 5-YEAR TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Segregated by Topic

ALL

12 Critique of plan by Martin Cramton

4 Which studies support which recommendations?

9 Is part of recommendations from “Committee of 100”?

TRANSIT

TRANSITWAYS

1 Bridge at Eastway

3 No mention of rail transportation Do already have ROW’s? Why didn’t include protection dollars? Multi-purpose use of corridors

5 Where can we add density to reduce demand for transportation? Would Independence be the best place to add capacity? Bikes/sidewalks important for economic development/vitality or congestion?

6 Ridership should not be determinant but economic capacity/economic analysis needed to select Independence HOV lane and Eastland


10 Charlotte is not Ottawa or Portland Experts to review the recommendations Who has proposed the improvements? Independent consultants

ROADS

FUNDING

2 Lobbyist to help on securing funds at Federal level Need to put on table to get funds Ongoing effort

8 Scheduling problem with information to General Assembly

11 Finite dollars from people to look/address other needs besides transportation

- Stormwater
- Arena

4 areas/top priority from retreat holistic approach
Five Year Transportation Plan

Goal 1  Provide for the City's transportation needs by

- minimizing congestion & reducing travel
- addressing needs of Transit dependent workers
- benefit economic centers/citizens
- pursuing alternatives to congestion & giving people a choice
- doubling ridership by 2010 (12.5 million per year to 25 million per year)

Goal 2  Keep pace with 2015 needs toward finite road system

[Note  Cost estimates designated by each action step are five-year estimates and include operating and capital expenses ]

Transit  =  Key Action Steps

1  Expand Charlotte Transit's hours of operation and extend local bus service to new areas ($7.7 million)

- The 1990 General Development Policies for Charlotte-Mecklenburg included a recommendation for continued expansion of the local bus system.

- The Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services has identified the lack of reliable, convenient transportation as a major barrier to obtaining employment for many Work-First participants. Approximately 90 percent of Work First participants rely on public transit. The primary transportation obstacles encountered by Work-First participants are

  - No transit service for second shift work
  - No transit to suburban employment sites except during peak hours

- Beginning system operation earlier in the morning and ending service later in the evening is recommended by

  - Hospitality/Tourism Alliance
  - Suburban manufacturing/distribution companies
  - Construction industry

- Providing all day service to Arboretum area was 2nd-highest request in Charlotte Transit's 1996 "Tell Us Where To Go" campaign involving riders and the general public

- Significant new multi-family development along Albermarle Road and Independence Boulevard and near the Arboretum provide good markets for potential transit riders
• Businesses in Sunset Road/I-77 area have requested bus service to provide employees access to available jobs

• Central Piedmont Community College and Mecklenburg County Courts have requested extending bus service along Beatties Ford Road to place program clients in jobs in the Sunset Road/I-77 area

• Expansion of Charlotte Transit service area is designed to provide access to new suburban employment and shopping areas

• The 1990 Northwest District Plan included a recommendation for extended bus service to this area

2 Create transit hubs at economic centers, incorporating feeder service which uses small buses, add express service to Uptown, add crosstown service ($8.5 million)

Transit Hubs/Feeder Service ($7.2 million)

• Barton-Aschman Associates (1994 Public Transportation Review and Analysis) proposed community-based transit services in SouthPark, the Beatties Ford/Rozzelle's Ferry Road area, and the UNCC/University City area

• The 1995 "City-Within-A-City" Strategic Plan recommended expanded transit services for center-city residents, such as beginning community-based services in northwest Charlotte

• Four plans for areas in northwest Charlotte include recommendations for operation of community-based transit service The neighborhoods are Todd Park, Wingate, Seversville, and Druid Hills The Northwest Enterprise Community Board also has endorsed this idea

• First Union, IBM, the Governor's Educational Village, and other University Research Park companies have requested expansion of the Uni-Park Rider service which began in January 1996

• The Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services has asked for more frequent service to the Arrowood Industrial Park and the University Research Park to meet the transportation needs of Work-First participants First Union, IBM, AllState, Accurnde, Baxter Health Care Products and restaurants/small retailers located in these suburban areas have positions suitable for Work-First clients

• Barton-Aschman Associates (1994 Public Transportation Review and Analysis) and McCormick Rankin International (1996 Bus Rapid Transit Issues and Opportunities) identified SouthPark as a potential transit center Barton-Aschman Associates proposed replacing some local Charlotte Transit service with two new neighborhood-based routes using small buses/vans

• The Planning Commission and Transportation/Regionalism Work Group (2015 Planning For Our Future) recommended the provision of satellite transit facilities at SouthPark, Airport, Uptown, University area, etc
• McCormuck Rankin International (1996 Bus Rapid Transit Issues and Opportunities) recommended a transitway implementation program which begins by creating a core group of transit centers (SouthPark, Eastland, Airport, University City) with feeder service and convenient transit service between them.

• JHK and Associates (1996 Uptown Charlotte Transportation and Parking Study) recommended increased service frequency and hours of operation for the Uptown Circuit. The consultant also proposed expansion of the circulator to Midtown and CPCC during the day and to SouthEnd in the evenings. The SouthEnd Development Corporation has requested evening circulator connections between Uptown and SouthEnd.

• The 1996 Northeast District Plan included a recommendation for increased bus service along US 29 and additional transit services in northeast Charlotte.

More Express Service to Uptown ($0.4 million)

• JHK and Associates (1996 Uptown Charlotte Transportation and Parking Study) recommended improvements to express bus service to Uptown. They suggested selecting corridors of concentrated travel, conducting employee surveys, and performing specialized marketing to help in service design/ridership growth.

• The Uptown Transportation Council has advocated increased express service along Providence Road based on input received from Uptown employees. Route 61X, Providence Road Express, is currently Charlotte Transit's third most productive express route.

• McCormuck Rankin International (1996 Bus Rapid Transit, Issues and Opportunities) proposed an implementation plan for transitways which begins by providing convenient express bus service between potential transit centers, including Uptown Charlotte.

• Responses to a 1996 survey of over 6,000 Uptown employees indicated a need to increase the convenience and operating hours of transit services in order to change commuting behavior.

• A 1996 survey of 40 community leaders indicated their opinion that improvements to Uptown express services would be a key strategy to attract new users.

• The Planning Commission and Transportation/Regionalism Work Group (2015 Planning for Our Future) proposed increasing the frequency of transit services.

Add Crosstown Service ($0.9 million)

• McCormuck Rankin International recommended increasing bus services between potential transit centers as an action which could be implemented short-term to promote transitway development.

• The Planning Commission and Transportation/Regionalism Work Group (2015 Planning for Our Future) recommended transit services connecting major activity centers (SouthPark, University area, Airport, etc.).
Transitways - Key Action Steps

1. Confirm transitway approach and prepare Master Plan incorporating implementation priorities, protect rail right-of-way, and add bus service, stations, etc. in priority corridor(s) based on studies ($75 million)

   - Barton-Aschman Associates (1989 Transit Corridors Study) called “existing rail rights-of-way a unique, regional resource which could prove to be of incalculable, long-term value to the community”

   - Parsons Brinckerhoff (1994 Charlotte Transitional Analysis) recommended that the City take steps to preserve right-of-way which may be needed for future transitway use

   - JHK and Associates (1996 Uptown Charlotte Transportation and Parking Study) proposed public purchase of the North Carolina Railroad corridor (2nd to Brookshire Freeway) and the Norfolk Southern rail line (Stonewall through SouthEnd). In the consultant’s opinion, preservation provides options for meeting the vision of Uptown growth/development

   - The Planning Commission and Transportation/Regionalism Work Group (2015 Planning for Our Future) recommended protection of existing rail corridors as they become available for future transitways

   - The 1990 General Development Policies included a recommendation for rail corridor preservation for future transit use

   - McCornuck Rankun International (1996 Bus Rapid Transit for Charlotte, Issues and Opportunities) recommended the following short-term actions for transitway development

      1. Political, public and planning commitment to transitways,
      2. Identify and implement priority transit centers,
      3. Implement a new operating plan featuring convenient express bus service between centers,
      4. Perform corridor studies to define routes and staged implementation for rapid transit segments

   - Parsons Brinckerhoff (1994 Charlotte Transitional Analysis) proposed that the City take the next step in transitway development by performing Alternatives Analysis, now called a Major Investment Study by the Federal Transit Administration

   - The Planning Commission and Transportation/Regionalism Work Group (2015 Planning for Our Future) proposed completion of a Major Investment Study for transitways, including consideration of busways, light rail, and high occupancy vehicle lanes

2. Implement Independence Boulevard Transitway Demonstration Project ($97 million)

   - Rummel Klepper Kahl and Gannett Fleming (1986 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for US 74) developed a bus operations plan which nearly doubled the amount of transit service in the Independence corridor to take advantage of the travel time savings provided by the high occupancy vehicle lane
We learned several lessons from the partnership retreat with Council. Two of those lessons are: 1) Council works more effectively when the entire group is engaged, and, 2) Council wants active participation by staff to provide options in a brief and concise format.

This year, staff who have a specific role in the presentations and discussions will participate in the retreat. Further, the staff is being asked to attend on those days they are scheduled to work with Council. Attached is the Council Retreat Attendance list and the dates for overnight stay and a copy of the agenda. Please note as appropriate these dates on your calendar. If you have any special audiovisual needs for your presentation, please send an “e-mail” to Bill Guerrant no later than January 17th.

The retreat will be at the Pine Crest Inn in Tryon, North Carolina. Directions and other information will be included in the retreat notebook, which will be available the week of January 20th.

Please call me if you have any questions. Thanks.

Attachment

c: Support Staff
## Council Retreat Master List

January 30-February 1

### Thursday & Friday Night

- Pat McCrory
- Patrick Cannon
- Charles Baker
- Malachi Greene
- Mike Jackson
- Nasif Majeed
- Don Reid
- Al Russo
- Ella Scarborough
- Tim Sellers
- Sara Spencer
- Lynn Wheeler

### Friday Night Only

- Julie Burch
- Jim Humphrey
- Martin Cramton
- Tom Flynn
- Greg Mcginnis
- Stanley Watkins
- Charles Woodyard
- Boyd Cauble
- Julie Hill

---

* Julie Burch is only staying Thursday Night
City Council Retreat Agenda
Thursday, January 30 - Saturday, February 1
Pine Crest Inn - Tryon, NC

Thursday, January 30, 1997

5 30 pm    Arrive (Check In Available at 3 00 pm)
6 00 pm    Social
7 00 am    Dinner
8 00 pm    Opening Remarks by Mayor and Retreat Planning Committee
8 15 pm    Council Discussion of Lessons Learned from December Retreat
            (Pam Syfert & Del Borgsdorf)

Friday, January 31, 1997

7 45 am    Breakfast
8 30 am    FY98 & 99 Budget and Finance Projections
            (Curt Walton & Richard Martin)
10 00-10 15 am    Break
12 00 pm    Lunch
1 00 pm    Transporation Policy and Direction Five-Year Plan
            (Jim Humphrey & Martin Cramton)
2:45-3 00 pm    Break
5 00 pm    Free Time
5 30 pm    Social
6 30 pm    Dinner
8 30 pm    Wrap Up Transportation Policy and Direction
            (Del Borgsdorf)
City Council Retreat Agenda

Thursday, January 30 - Saturday, February 1
Pine Crest Inn - Tryon, NC

Page 2

Saturday, February 1, 1997

7 45 am   Breakfast
8 30 am   Discussion of Goals for Economic Vitality/Direction for Neighborhoods
(Martin Cramton, Tom Flynn, Stanley Watkins)
10 30-10:45 am   Break
10 45 am   Discussion of Goals for Regional Strategy
(Boyd Cauble)
12 00 pm   Wrap Up
12 30 pm   Lunch

Retreat Notes/Report Greg McGinnis & Charles Woodyard
Retreat Facilities Bill Guerrant
Retreat Communications Julie Hill
O DLTS

To critique bus study - 50 Days

FT 10

We'll bring you a proposal

O Demo Critique 2/10

Go ahead & apply for ISTEA

O 1994 PC/MN

O concepts of expanding transit

STATE RDS

MG/AR

Refer to Jean's Comm.

City Participation

options & involve Union
• Parsons Brinckerhoff (1994 Charlotte Transitional Analysis) proposed early implementation of bus route revisions which assigned express routes in the Matthews corridor to the Independence Boulevard high occupancy vehicle lane

• Barton-Aschman Associates (1994 Public Transportation Review and Analysis) concluded that an important factor in increasing transit patronage involved the City's taking advantage of opportunities to provide transit with a significant travel time advantage over the auto in congested corridors

• McCormick Rankin International (1996 Bus Rapid Transit for Charlotte Issues and Opportunities) mentioned that a pilot project undertaken in Ottawa in 1974 helped prove the viability and potential of the transitway approach to the public and local officials

• McCormick Rankin International (1996 Busway Demonstration Project Identification, Technical Memorandum No. 1) recommended the Matthews corridor, more specifically Independence Boulevard, as the best location for a busway demonstration because

1. It is one of the three corridors identified in the 1994 Transitional Analysis as a priority corridor for further action
2. It is one of the most heavily used existing transit corridors and has the highest current express bus ridership
3. It has the ideal combination of a grade separated right-of-way within walking distance of residential and employment areas which are already reasonably transit oriented

• The Planning Commission and Transportation/Regionalism Work Group (2015 Planning for Our Future) proposed development of a pilot transit project in a main corridor which offers a high service frequency to grow ridership in the corridor

Roads and Streets - Key Action Steps

1. Fund City road building to meet needs in Plan's fifth year in 2001 ($95 million), select option to address unfunded state road needs ($434 million)

In developing the 2015 Transportation Plan, roadway projects were ranked by a committee of staff from several agencies, including the City of Charlotte, Mecklenburg County, Union County, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission and the North Carolina Department of Transportation. The committee was formed by the Technical Coordinating Committee of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Metropolitan Planning Organization. Each of the projects included for consideration was there because projected traffic volumes for the year 2015 showed a clear need for an improvement to the roadway. In most cases, the need was also evident in the year 2005, and in many cases the need for improvement is already evident today. The projects were ranked on eight criteria. A description of the criteria is provided below, along with a code used to identify the criteria on the attached table (page 42). The table presents the key ranking that led to the priority for each of the projects

• Improve Safety (Saf) The project inherently improves safety beyond the level that would naturally occur from the congestion improvement involved in the project
- **Reduce Congestion (Con)** The degree of improvement in congestion provided by the project, including response to current congestion problems

- **Benefits Outweighing Costs (B/C)** All of the projects are expected to have benefits which significantly outweigh their cost. This criterion is based on the degree to which expected project benefits will outweigh projected project costs

- **Supports Growth in High Density Transit Corridors (Cor)** This refers to supporting growth in the corridors of the “Centers and Corridors Land Use Plan”

- **Improves Accessibility to Center City Charlotte (Cen)** This refers to the greater Uptown Charlotte area including such areas as Carolinas Medical Center

- **Increases Accessibility to Economic Centers (EC)** This would include locations such as the Airport, SouthPark and UNCC

- **Provides Positive Impact on Air Quality and Reduces Energy Consumption (AQ)** This benefit comes from the ability of the project to improve traffic flow and reduce vehicle idling

**Land Use - Key Action Steps**

1. Adopt 2015 Plan which makes land use recommendations that support transit and pedestrian friendly environments
2. Propose development regulations which promote connectivity and pedestrian mobility
3. Develop comprehensive land development plans for the 5 major corridors including potential transit stations
4. Develop and adopt urban corridor standards

**Funding - Key Action Steps**

1. Choose options to address 5-year Plan’s funding requirements
   - Parsons Brinckerhoff (1994 Transitional Analysis) proposed as a next step in developing a transitway system that the City work toward a local, possibly regional, funding source
   - The “Committee of 100” (1994 Final Report) recommended seeking enabling legislation to levy a sales tax to implement the transportation plan developed by that group
   - The Planning Commission and Transportation/Regionalism Work Group (2015 Planning for Our Future) advocated securing an adequate financing source for existing and future transit operations
• The "Committee of 10" identified two options for additional local funds to finance the 5-Year Plan's action steps

  1) Draw down a portion of the Transportation Fund balance
  2) Transfer revenues from the General Fund to the Transportation Fund

2 Endorse Governor's Transit 2001 Commission recommendations which increase State transit funding and provide new sources of local revenue

• The Transit 2001 Commission recommends increasing State transit support by $75 million per year. This would allow the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) to pay a larger percentage of Charlotte's capital and operating costs

• The Transit 2001 Commission also recommended that State and local agencies work in partnership to secure General Assembly authority to impose one or more of the following local option revenue sources

  1) Rental vehicle gross receipts tax
  2) Vehicle registration surcharge
  3) Parking tax
  4) Local option sales tax
  5) Land transfer fees

3 Pursue $50 million Federal "earmark" to be used for implementing transitway system

• The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 is scheduled for re-authorization this year. The development of new Federal transportation legislation in 1997 is an opportunity to secure Federal financing for a major transit capital project. This opportunity may not occur again for another 5-7 years

• The Transit 2001 Commission recommended that NCDOT aggressively seek Federal funding for transit programs and specific projects

4 Consider addressing unfunded State road needs by 1) funding all or part locally, 2) lobbying the State for more highway expenditures in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, or 3) do both

• The "Committee of 100" (1994 Final Report) recommended the following to address roadway needs in the Charlotte metro area

  - Regional funding should be considered to finance unfunded State highway improvements
  - Local Congressional delegations should work to increase the amount of Federal highway funds coming to North Carolina as part of ISTE A re-authorization

• The "Committee of 10" identified the projected shortfall in funding for State highway needs as a major issue which should be addressed
Develop a process to continue communicating and steering the Plan at local, State, and Federal levels.

- The "Committee of 10" identified a need for a mechanism which would ensure that the Plan's action steps are implemented and communicated. The Committee believed that involvement of persons beyond local staff was critical to obtaining Federal and State funds.
# Unfunded 2001 Roadway Needs

## Project Ranking from the 2015 Transportation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Big</th>
<th>Cor</th>
<th>Lu</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>AQ</th>
<th>Funding Cost (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>US 74/Sharon Arity Interchange</td>
<td>Phases 7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Albemarle Rd (NC 24-27)</td>
<td>Pierson Dr to Redman Rd</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>State 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freedom Dr (NC 27)</td>
<td>I-85 to County Line</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>State 31.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>US 74 Expressway / HOV</td>
<td>Sheron Arity Rd to Idlewild Rd</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>State 16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-77 Widening/HOV Project</td>
<td>Southern Outer Loop to I-85</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>State 140.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>US 74 Expressway / HOV</td>
<td>Idlewild Rd to Outer Loop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>State 21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>US 74 Expressway / HOV</td>
<td>28/49 Connector to Cabarrus Co Line</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>State 16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NC 16</td>
<td>I-85 to Hoskins Rd</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>State 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Albemarle Rd/Harris Blvd</td>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>State 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>West Blvd (NC 160)</td>
<td>US 521 to Outer Loop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>State 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NC 16 - Brookshire Fwy</td>
<td>Current End to I-85</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>State 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Graham St (US 29-74)</td>
<td>I-277 to Statesville Ave</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>State 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NC 49/Graham St Conn</td>
<td>US 29 to I-85</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>State 21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vance Rd</td>
<td>Outer Loop to County Line</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>State 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>West Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State 20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Billy Graham Pkwy/West Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>State 8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Billy Graham Pkwy (US 521)</td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>State 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Billy Graham Pkwy/Wilkinson Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>State 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NC 115</td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>State 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wilkinson Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>State 12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Arecilla Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State 4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>South Blvd (US 521)</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>State 8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>South Blvd (US 521)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State 8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Krefeld Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>State 3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **E** = Extremely high positive impact
- **C** = Considerable positive impact
- **s** = Significant positive impact

**Total Cost** $343.5

City Council Retreat, January 1997
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Council Decision Point

Determine which action steps of the Plan

- Are approved for next step for implementation
- Need more staff analysis and Council discussion before proceeding
- Should be revised before staff implementation
- Should be deleted
Action Steps

Transit
1. Expand Charlotte Transit's hours of operation and extend local bus service to new areas
2. Create transit hubs at economic centers, incorporating feeder service which uses small buses, add express service to Uptown, add crosstown service
3. Meet Federal Americans With Disabilities Act requirements
4. Aggressively pursue funding partnerships
5. Add customer service enhancements
6. Other (fare adjustments, marketing plan, new bus technology)

Transitways
1. Confirm transitway approach and prepare Master Plan incorporating implementation priorities
2. Protect rail right-of-way
3. Add bus service, stations, etc. in priority corridor(s) based on studies
4. Implement Independence Boulevard Transitway Demonstration Project

Roads and Streets
1. Fund City road building to meet 2001 needs
2. Select option to address unfunded State road needs
3. Make it easier for citizens to walk and bike

Land Use
1. Adopt 2015 Plan (in process)
2. Authorize staff to propose development regulations which promote connectivity and pedestrian mobility
3. Develop comprehensive land development plans for the 5 major corridors including potential transit station areas
4. Develop and adopt urban corridor standards

Funding
1. Choose option(s) to address Plan's funding requirements
2. Endorse Governor's Transit 2001 Commission recommendations which provide new sources of local revenue
3. Pursue $50 million "earmark" through ISTEA re-authorization to be used over next decade to continue transitway implementation, local match of $50 million must be addressed later if Federal funding approved
4. Consider addressing unfunded State road needs
5. Develop a process to continue communicating and steering Plan at local, State, and Federal levels
Economic Vitality/Direction for Neighborhoods

The City's current economic development strategy is a three pronged approach which focuses on providing business support services, infrastructure investment and geographic based development initiatives. This strategy is applicable to all levels of the community - regional, city-wide and neighborhood - that the City seeks to influence through public efforts and partnerships.

Within the overall City strategy, there are numerous elements which address neighborhood economic development. Those initiatives can be summarized in the following goal statement:

Support neighborhood economic development activities for distressed business corridors and neighborhood retail markets that will:

- retain, expand and recruit neighborhood businesses,
- reduce neighborhood unemployment, and
- support development of basic consumer retail services.

To accomplish this, the following action strategies are established:

Business Support
(Individual & Organizational)

Infrastructure

Development Initiatives
(Economic Development Planning, Assessment & Implementation)

Key Action Steps

- retain, expand and recruit neighborhood businesses,

1. Promote business retention and expansion through small business owner training and technical assistance programs (for example, Small Business Owner Management Program).

2. Align City business financing and development tools to support neighborhood based economic development goals (CWAC Loan Pool, review to support neighborhood consumer services).

3. Develop relations with local business organizations and businesses in targeted areas (Corridor Liaison Initiative and Neighborhood Matching Grants).
Develop a proposal to provide incentives for business retention, expansion and development along urban transportation corridors and within the City Within A City Area by May 1997

Present a proposal to Council by April 1997, for partnership with the Chamber, the private sector and non-profit CDC’s for developing a Westside Business Park

Present a proposal to Council by April 1997, to create a non-profit Economic Development Corporation to promote and assist development in the City Within A City area

reduce neighborhood unemployment

Support business employee recruitment and training needs (Employment and Training resources)

Promote coordination of City and County employment initiatives (e.g. Job Link Program, One-Stop, DSS “Work First,” etc.)

Coordinate expansion of transit services to improve job accessibility for unemployed or those seeking better paying jobs

provide basic neighborhood consumer services in distressed business corridors and neighborhood markets

Plan and coordinate City service delivery to business corridors and neighborhood markets (e.g. Corridor Team and Neighborhood Based Problem Solving - Police, Neighborhood Development, Transportation etc.)

Provide market assessments and undertake planning initiatives to support distressed business corridors and neighborhood markets and develop baseline data and outcome measurements (e.g., Freedom Drive, North Tryon Street and Belmont Retail Study)

Provide infrastructure and streetscape improvements in distressed business corridors (e.g., South End and Central Avenue)

Seek grants and awards to address special situations affecting neighborhood business development (e.g., Brownfield Grant)
Council Discussion Point

1. What are the goals for economic vitality in neighborhoods? What does success mean?
2. Are the on-going or planned action steps aligned with the goals?
3. Are there action steps that need further Council review?
Regionalism

Promote effective intergovernmental relations as a critical element in maintaining both a strong, competitive region and Charlotte as a location of choice to live, work and do business, and as a place with a high quality of life

To accomplish this, the following partnerships have been established:

12 County Region & Metropolitan Area Focus
(Urban Coalition, MPO, Carolinas' Partnership, Council of Governments, etc)

State Agencies and General Assembly
(Governor's Office, Local Delegation, League of Municipalities)

Mecklenburg County and Six Towns

State Wide Coalitions
(Mayors of Large Cities, Resort Towns Coalition, Professional Organizations)

Functional Operations
(CMUD, CDOT, Police, Planning, Technology, etc)

Key Action Steps:

1 Promote personal relationships between Charlotte elected officials/key staff and our counterparts within our region
   * Centralina Council of Governments - Become actively involved in the Centralina Council of Governments. Establish personal relationships with representatives from within the eight County region. Coordinate staff planning with Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Department so that we maximize the use of available resources within the COG and become an integral player in their regional research efforts

2 Maximize the City's economic development potential by partnering with regional cities and towns
   * Carolinas Urban Coalition - Implement a strategic regional planning program for Charlotte and the 20 mule ring cities and other members of the Urban Coalition. Coordinate this effort with the Council of Government staff. The ultimate goal of this strategic plan is to identify areas of common concern to all members of the Coalition and develop an implementation strategy that is approved by all member governments of the Coalition. The member cities/towns will form a
joint legislative agenda and present it to the Southern Piedmont Legislative Caucus and visit, as a group, our delegations in Raleigh

3 Use Charlotte’s League officials to establish League Board support for State funding for transit and other local priorities

   ▪ North Carolina League of Municipalities - Fully utilize the North Carolina League of Municipalities to support our efforts toward achieving state legislative endorsements for increased funding of local programs and authorization for innovative approaches toward local problem solving

4 Initiate an advocacy group of larger urban areas to push for State funding for urban initiatives, for example transit funding, ‘brownfield remediation,’ criminal justice system enhancements, etc

   ▪ Mayors of Large Cities - Create and nurture a state-wide organization of mayors from the 13 largest cities Agree upon common objectives and develop strategies toward positively impacting legislation and programs directly related to larger urban centers

5 Involve members of the Mecklenburg Delegation in policy discussions and program evaluations that lead to a request for authorizing legislation

   ▪ Mecklenburg Delegation - Expand interaction with the Mecklenburg Delegation to include members of the Delegation serving on city-wide committees which ultimately need state legislative assistance Coordinate with the Urban Coalition and local Delegation a lobbying effort which will reenforce our local Delegation’s influence within the general assembly

6 Solicit private support for local enabling legislation

   ▪ Chamber of Commerce - Fully utilize the Chamber and local business influence in affecting state-wide legislation of importance to the City of Charlotte

Council Discussion Point

1 Does Council agree that the use of the above organizations and relationships are appropriate for supplementing the City’s established Focus Area goals - Transportation, Economic Development, City Within A City, and Community Safety?

2 Are there other partnerships that need to be established or that need additional attention?

3 What are these partnerships to accomplish? Are Council’s priorities aligned with the goals and the partnerships?
CENTRALINA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Background and Responsibilities

♦ Formed in 1968 as one of eighteen North Carolina Councils of Governments, whose purpose is to serve as a conduit of grants, a staff resource for members, and a forum for local governments to address current problems and future needs.

♦ Membership consists of approximately 50 local governments in an eight county area, which includes Mecklenburg, Gaston, Lincoln, Iredell, Cabarrus, Union, Stanly, and Rowan Counties. Funding comes from member dues, state and federal grants, and fees for services. Policy of the COG is set by a Board of Delegates consisting of elected officials from Member Governments.

♦ Centralina COG provides a variety of services for the region. It administers state and federal grants in the areas of:
  - aging
  - workforce development
  - emergency services
  - economic development programs

♦ The COG also maintains a comprehensive Regional Data Center for the public and private sector with information about:
  - population
  - economy
  - health services
  - education
  - employment
  - transportation
  - utilities
  - climate

♦ Finally, the Centralina Council of Governments provides local and regional planning and technical services to its local government members in the areas of:
  - community development
  - land use and zoning
  - water and solid waste
  - GIS mapping
  - personnel and management

♦ City of Charlotte member dues for FY97 $78,329
CAROLINAS URBAN COALITION

Roles and Accomplishments

♦ Created as a result of Charlotte reaching out to the 20-mile ring cities for support in regional efforts. This was done because cities have unique issues that cross county and state boundaries.

♦ Original members include Charlotte, Mooresville, Concord, Kannapolis, Monroe, Rock Hill, and Gastonia. The following additional members have been added: Bessemer City, Cornelius, Cramerton, Dallas, Davidson, Huntersville, Matthews, Mint Hill, and York. Any incorporated areas near the 20-mile radius of Charlotte are eligible for membership.

♦ Annual membership dues are based on whether a member is a charter city or a general member (those added later). For charter cities, the dues are $4000 for the City of Charlotte, which has four votes, and $1000 each for the remaining cities, which have only one vote each. For general member cities, the dues are $250 each, and they are allowed to vote only on the general membership.

♦ The Carolinas Urban Coalition is professionally staffed through the Centralina Council of Governments. The Carolinas Urban Coalition owes its many successes to the close personal relationships between its members. Each member city is represented by the Mayor, a Councilmember, and the City Manager.

♦ Major accomplishments for the Carolinas Urban Coalition over the last two years include:

- Joint lobbying in Raleigh to preserve state shared revenue for cities, as well as other urban issues such as local zoning, annexation, and amortization rights.

- Rock Hill-Charlotte commuter bus experiment.

- Police grant for regional communications improvements and closer coordination between jurisdictions.

- Hosting of reception on January 23, 1997 for the Southern Piedmont Legislative Caucus and entire elected body of member organizations.

- The beginning of a Strategic Planning process to be concluded by December, 1997. The ultimate goal of this plan is to create a process for regional cooperation in addressing our most common high priority objectives—e.g., water-sewer, transportation, police, planning, etc.
# Proposed Work Program

**Strategic Regional Planning Assessment**  
*(Draft 1/16/97)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalition Review and Approval Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening Meeting of Planners or Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame Refinement of Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legend Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on Priority Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define What Information Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Staff's Determination of Priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate Conclusions and Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Cities Review/Approval</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlocal Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- Agreement
- Agreement on Priority Issues
- Analysis
- Define What Information Means
- Reg. Staff's Determination of Priorities
- Formulate Conclusions and Recommendations
- Member Cities Review/Approval
- Implementation
- Development Strategies
- Interlocal Agreements
- Etc

P R. = Progress Report  
Pres = Presentation
CAROLINA URBAN COALITION
STRATEGIC REGIONAL PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Support of Concepts:
The idea that planners should develop a mechanism/process to coordinate land use and planning and identify common issues/opportunities in the region

Information Sharing:
What information would be relative to the strategic planning effort in the region

Time Frame Refinement:
Determine in more detail the necessary steps in the process and the amount of time required

Legend Agreement:
Agree on the various land use categories for the region, so that the different jurisdictions are classifying similar land uses in the same manner. Also agree on standard technical information issues (e.g., land use definitions, map scales, etc.)

Analysis
What does the collected information tell us about our region? Does the information indicate strengths and weaknesses and opportunities and issues? Does the information separate fact from fiction?

Priorities
Identify the 2 or 3 major priorities for the region so that the strategic planning effort focuses the available energy and resources on the important issues in the region. Are there several common priorities for each participant?

Formulate Conclusions/Recommendations
Develop a Regional Planning Assessment Report that describes the results of the assessment and outlines recommendations, strategies, vision, etc. for the organization

Member Cities Revision
There are steps within the process when each representative to the CUC reports to their respective boards/councils on the status of the strategic process. We need formal approval and “buy-in” of each participating unit of government

Implementation
  Development of Strategies
  Interlocal Agreements
  (Do-Able) Programs/Projects