

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Budget Retreat on Wednesday, May 18, 2011 at 3:16 p. m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Anthony Foxx presiding. Council Members present were Michael Barnes, Patrick Cannon, Nancy Carter, Warren Cooksey, Andy Dulin, Patsy Kinsey, Edwin Peacock, and Warren Turner.

**ABSENT:** Councilmember Jason Burgess.

**ABSENT UNTIL NOTED:** Council Members David Howard and James Mitchell.

Mayor Foxx called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m. and said we are getting close to the climax of our budget season. This is the moment in which the Council has received the report of the City Manager on his budget recommendations and the opportunity we have to consider changes to that budget based on our own perspectives. This will not be a meeting in which we made decisions on those adjustments, we are simply putting these adjustments on the board for a vote at a later time which will be June 1. I think for the Council we've got a couple of things to think about. One of them is with our Capital Plan, we've had a run of several years with a bond referendum in every even numbered year and we've reached a point where our capacity to do another bond referendum for next fall doesn't exist. We have to make some strategic choices, short-term and long-term about how to answer that question. The City Manager has indicated to us that we could perhaps ride it out through 2014, but we do risk having to have some difficult conversations with the bond rating agencies about our capacity to manage our capital plan. I think the conversation we have to have and I referred to it as an adult conversation in the City Manager's presentation, and the adult conversation is whether we do or don't create capacity for our capital program next year. I think we need to be very clear on what our approach is to that and try to figure out what the best answer to that question is.

The second issue is that I think the City Manager had done an exceptional job of taking the Council's priorities and folding them into a budget and I don't expect that we are going to have a bunch of stuff flying around here on adds and deletes, although I have been proven wrong before, but I think that is a reflection on the work that the City Manager and staff has done to this point in reflecting our conversations so far. The one area of difference that I have with the Manager's recommendation, and I had it last year with the Council's decision on the School Resource Officers and the Crossing Guards, is our decision to scale that down. I think that all things being equal, assuming no external changes at the State level in terms of our funding, we have the ability to figure a way out to not do that shifting down of our costs on those programs and shifting those costs over to the school system at a time when they are facing \$100 million shortfall. I realize last night that the County Manager has proposed a budget that replaces some of that decrease and that does create potentially some options for the school system to patch up some of the losses out of this program, but it just seems to me that the cost shifting in a year like this is something that we can avoid and in the course of doing so give the school system the capacity to keep 10 to 15 more teachers in place as the economy continues to heal. I would love to fight the battle to keep School Resources Officers in our program long-term but I think more practically at this point, knowing where I think most of you are, I'm trying to argue for trying to hold things in place for a year or two so that we can at least allow the school system and their revenue streams to stop going down the downward spiral and maybe getting back on the upward spiral at some point. I had some conversation with the City Manager about how we might do that as we get into the add and deletes we can talk about it some, but I know there are other thoughts about how to accomplish that also. I'm interested in having more conversation about that, but let me be very clear that if we don't figure this out one way or the other I will veto the budget and we will have to go into extra endings. I would very much like to avoid it and I think we can. The table is now open for add and deletes and in our tradition, you can't put something on the board to add an expense without taking something off the board that is an expense.

**Councilmember Howard arrived at 3:20 p. m.**

Councilmember Barnes said I would like to begin by asking a question regarding the School Resource Officers (SRO) and the Crossing Guards. The question I have is concerning whether or not the School Board and/or the County have budgeted for the cost shift that we have made them aware of and, number two whether in last night's announcement from County Manager Jones there was any anticipation of picking up that cost. Thirdly, as I understood it last year and this year, Manager Walter indicated that his concern was our ability to cover costs that we have

been primarily responsible for, namely paying for those Police Officers who have been paid for under the ARRA Program and having the City pick up that tab over the next couple years. In other words I wanted to have him talk a little bit about his expectations regarding why he recommended what he did relative to the SROs and Crossing Guards and then with respect to add and deletes I wanted to revisit the \$445,446 that was set aside in that alleged technology budget that was in our general fund and Mr. Walton had recommended moving part of that over to CMPD. I want to use it for another public safety issue and that is street lighting. It would cost us about \$300,000 to reinstitute the street lighting program. There are a number of communities in all of our districts that have had some challenges with respect to street lighting. I would move to add \$300,000 to reinstitute the street lighting program from that pool of money that the Manager recommended putting in CMPD's budget. I think that would go a long way to helping a lot of communities who have some concerns about street lighting. I have talked to Mr. Walton about this so he is aware of it.

Councilmember Cannon said this is related to Mr. Barnes' ask, but since he has already had the conversation with you, is that with regards to the installation of new lights?

**City Manager, Curt Walton** said those were the neighborhood petitions for street lights that had been put on hold as of June 30<sup>th</sup> last year. There are already a number of petitions in queue but I think Mr. Barnes is suggesting that we fund those petitions and catch back up with the street lighting program instead of the phase over three-year suspension.

Mr. Cannon said it would be helpful to get some information on where those street lights are located. Public Safety issues are Public Safety issues, some people will call it Public Safety and others will call it something else. I would like to know exactly where those lights might be that would fit within this program for the areas he is referring to.

Councilmember Dulin said it would be interesting to see that list of the queue as you called it. We didn't stop the replacement street light program, did we? Duke Energy replaces them and then we pay them for the juice, but we are still replacing broken street lights around town.

Mr. Walton said it is the installation of new or additional lights.

Mr. Dulin said I remember last year it was \$200,000 plus and he has requested \$300,000 so he has added to that a little bit and it would be interesting to see that queue. If it is five neighborhoods or 25 neighborhoods, that would be an interesting number, but I don't know if I'm willing to delete that technology budget for street lights at this time. Do you have anything you can delete?

Mr. Barnes said the technology budget had already been deleted, based upon the Manager's recommendation last time. The discussion I had with him was to spear money that is essentially uncommitted in our general fund to a program that is important to a number of neighborhoods. In other words, it wasn't earmarked for anything and I'm trying to earmark it to serve a specific purpose.

Mr. Walton said regarding the SRO reduction, that was one of the 52 reductions from last year's budget that I recommended to you and it didn't go into effect until this coming July so we gave them about a 15-month notice that it would begin with a 10% reduction effective July 1 and then 10% more effective July 1, 2012 and 2013. I think SRO are a very valuable program both to CMPD and to schools, it is just a matter of who pays for it and how we manage our priorities. One of the priorities for me is not letting the expiration of stimulus dollars sneak up on us and some governments have allowed that to happen over the last few years and it puts them in a very difficult position if you don't deal with it until the year of expense. The saving was a way to get there by 2014 and 2015 when the full funding of those become completely our responsibility and that we didn't have to find ½ cent on the tax rate in order to fund the officers that we've had for several years. At that time they will have been year for 3 or 4 years and it wouldn't be additional officers so it is more reasonable to me to realign the policing priorities with the additional officers that we'd added for the neighborhoods and increase the funding formula slowly for CMS. CMS did request the money in their budget to the County in the amount of \$958,000. That is in their continuation of basic service category so that request has been made of the County. From what we understand from the County Manager's proposal it is not

prescriptive of anything on the operating side for CMS so it doesn't address the School Resource Officers in that \$958,000 nor does it specifically address any particular need. There is a debt service pot of about \$25 million that is related to schools and an operating pot of about \$25 million. It would be the prioritization of how CMS, if the County Commission agrees. The County Manager's recommendation is ultimately a prioritization of School Board as to where they put that \$25 million.

**Councilmember Mitchell arrived at 3:29 p.m.**

Councilmember Kinsey said of that \$958,000 how much is it that they already pay or how much is the reduction from us? They already pay for some of it and what is the percentage?

**Budget Director, Ruffin Hall** said right now for the current year they pay us about \$2.4 million to cover the cost of about a \$6.1 million program. That number would grow from \$2.4 million up to about \$3.4 million, with some rounding in there, which gets you to the \$958,000. The \$958,000 is the additional.

Councilmember Peacock said I'm seeing where you are coming from the numbers Mr. Hall. You are referring to the presentation you gave when you presented the budget, which is Page 12 of the PowerPoint presentation. This is your chart that shows the \$958,000 of the year to date difference and that is the \$958,000 that Mr. Walton is referring to?

Mr. Hall said yes.

Councilmember Howard said with some thought and some knowledge that the Resource Officers would come up, have you and Ruffin thought about any place that could absorb that if we were to do it one more year to give them more time? Where would you go to find that kind of room in the budget if we did vote to put it back in?

Mr. Walton said that is a really hard question to answer. I think if we had the capacity we would have told you when we presented it. We don't know that additional million dollars, I think it depends on the level of risks that the Council is comfortable with. If you are comfortable that the State Budget is not going to require all of that \$18.4 million, that is a million. If you are confident that the annexation bill that is currently proposed is going to pass and we would not need the \$1 million reserve that is in there, but it requires some assumption on risks to be made that I was uncomfortable making when I presented those to you. It ultimately comes down to that. The second point is, even if you get comfortable with the risks or the annexation bill passes and it is clear that we don't need that million dollars to offset the loss of annexation revenue, those are still one-time revenues so it would fix it one more time, but then next year if we are going to continue the program in perpetuity or for a year or two, as the Mayor suggested, that second year we would by then have a \$2 million hole because the \$958,000 is cumulative. I don't have a suggestion for the \$2 million at all unless we go into our reserves.

Mr. Howard said what I'm leaning toward is seeing if we can at least get 5 votes on it so we can keep it in the process because if we don't we kind of end that tonight. What we are doing is adding for the sake of getting more information. I would like to see us add that back and use those two sources as possibilities in between now and when we come back we get some feedback from Dana and whoever else can tell us what the likelihood of both of those are to manage that risk. Would that be the appropriate way to go?

Mr. Walton said that would be the appropriate process if you are comfortable with those. We would know by June 1<sup>st</sup> that the State Budget would not be adopted. I don't think it will be out of the Senate before then so it is possible the annexation bill could be adopted by then, but I think we can pretty well say that we won't know the State Budget impact.

Mr. Howard said I would like to put it that we add it back and use those two sources, more as a way for us to get information back from staff about what is going on with those two items.

Councilmember Carter said there are two suggestions that I would like to make. I am concerned about keeping the SROs in place. I think it is a valid exercise to have the police in the schools and I've done some studies since we talked. Council and Children's Rights, talking with former

School Board Members, Police Officers who are involved, teacher, I've tried to hit the road to see where we stand in the schools and gotten very valid feedback that those SROs as CMPD officers are truly a great value, both to the students, to the teachers and to our community. Two suggestions, looking at the Technical Fund, so this would be in competition with Mr. Barnes' suggestion, as half, a little less than half of the cost of those police officers to us and because it is only half, to look at perhaps CMPD in the high schools versus in the middle schools. This might be a way to diversify to look at those costs to see if we can manage it in that fashion. The other component that I would like to suggest is to being negotiations with the School Board about the Safe Light Program because that revenue could cover these costs and if they would cover the expense of running that program by paying us money for CMPD Officers then we can do that split pea thing and I think that is a way for us to get around the expense and give them the revenue they need for this program.

Mayor Foxx said is that a request for information or an add?

Ms. Carter said it is information. It is a suggestion and not an add on at this point, but to put it on the table because I do want to continue this discussion.

Mr. Hall said what I would interrupt is that we can give you a cost estimate on the difference between a high-school versus the middle school and you can consider that as a part of the existing amendment.

Ms. Carter said it might not be part of the existing amendment because it is a separate person and it is something I would like to put on the table for discussion, as well as information.

Mr. Hall said we will provide the calculation.

Mr. Cannon said while this is on the board, I want us to be cautious that we don't put something out there that folks see as a means to actually go through the process and fund the SROs largely in part because there are a lot of assumptions that are still out there. To give someone the idea or notion that this is the way we are going might drive the funds up somewhere else where it could have normally been applied from another governing body. The second thing, we don't want to get into a situation where we are robbing Peter to pay Paul. That is the City finding itself in its own negative status by way of trying to be a good neighbor, which I think is always a good deed, but if you can't afford it, you can't afford it. The County has an adoption date of June 7<sup>th</sup> I believe, before us. Another assumption, we don't know what is going to happen there and as the Manager has said the County hasn't earmarked anything. I took a trip down to that floor and had some conversation and it appears, and you have all heard me talk about that "but for" thing and I don't know that everything has been explored before we are beginning to try to assume someone else's debt or dilemma or situation. It would appear that the Board of County Commission should be approached and there should be some level of discussion with County leaders who can make a decision about to go with the County Manager's recommended budget or to add in another \$958,000 to cover that costs. I want to commend Superintendent Gorman for going to the appropriate place to ask for such a request and also commend him for taking the leadership to say that they would be looking to budget for that money anyway. Whether that comes from the City of someplace else, if you are looking to budget for it, it tells me they've got a plan in mind somewhere along the way to fund it. Obviously some may say that money may be going to the teachers, but who knows. We are in politics too, but who knows. I just want to state that we have a lot of things that we've got to fund in the future, or account for i.e. police when those stimulus dollars dry up and you can pretty much say they are gone now, that we will have to deal with. Mr. Mayor thank you for bringing this up and continuing to fight the fight, but the last thing I would want to see happen is for the budget to be vetoed for all the other needs that the citizens of Charlotte expect to have met and I know you are conscious of that. I want to make sure we are continuing to keep our options open and not putting too much out there on this issue.

Mr. Peacock said Randy, I'm going to get you to go ahead and copy Howard's record there, to continue the SRO formula, for the \$958,426, I'm going to have Council Members refer to Page 4 of the Manager's Transmittal, under Executive Summary, at the first tab, last paragraph is the restoration of the 1% to the 401-K. My delete here will be restoration of .53% which is \$958,000 or some factor thereof, so this is from 1% to .53% to the employees. Council will remember as he has written up here that this is not affecting sworn Police Officers, it is just

May 18, 2001  
Budget Retreat  
Minute Book 132, Page 5

affecting those outside of that, so we reduce our contribution back to the 401-K to .53 and if you will refer to page 103 in the booklet, this is the General Fund Operating Budget Reserve that Manager Walton was referring to, that would be the revenue source in 2013. That is my proposal.

Mayor Foxx said the General Fund?

Mr. Peacock said yes. It gives us some time.

Mayor Foxx said you are doing year one out of the 401-K match and year two out of the General Fund to give two years. Is that right?

Mr. Peacock said correct.

Councilmember Cooksey said I don't think that is quite correct. The FY13 continuation has got to be \$1.9 million.

Mr. Hall said that is just what we were discussing. It depends on what the amendment is. If you follow the formula proposal that the recommended budget includes, it is a 10% step down every year. Since you only have \$1 million in FY13 you would have to step it down one year and then hold it flat, otherwise it grows.

Mr. Cooksey said the deletion of restoration of .53% is an ongoing, so you've got \$958,426 available in FY12 and FY13, then the General Fund Operating Budget reserve is \$1 million in FY12 and \$1 million in FY13. If you have \$1 million in FY13 out of General Fund Operating Reserve plus carrying over year two of 401-K \$958,926 that gets you closer and it again there is wiggle room in the tens of thousands to the \$1,992,240 to add for maintaining a 50% of 80% in FY13. The General Fund Operating Reserve number is \$1 million.

Mayor Foxx said is that the gap between the current funding level and FY13?

Mr. Walton said the \$1 million is the gap between the annexation revenue and the annexation expense if we don't get to annex.

Mr. Hall said you are still going to be a little bit short.

Mr. Dulin said what is that number?

Mr. Cooksey said it will be short by about \$36,000. The first question I had since I jumped on Mr. Peacock's proposal, also on Councilmember Howard, what was the number on the FY13 delete to add the \$1.992 million?

Mr. Howard said I just did one year. I was going to come back to that when we circled around. I was talking about one year and I didn't go as far as FY13.

Mr. Cooksey said I'm fluctuating on the SRO item also. I've talked around and done some research and I see the utility and the value as well. Where I differ somewhat from Ms. Carter's approach and will add this to the list and hope maybe she gets 4 hours and I get 4 hours. I think high school versus middle school is the wrong way to look at it. As I understand it we currently have officers in all middle schools and all high schools. I think the question would be do we need officers in all high schools and all middle schools or in just some of them. Part of my research was speaking with an Assistant Principal at a middle school who said she had had 12 marijuana possession arrest this year in the middle school, which suggest to me that there is an SRO role in middle schools also, but do all middle schools need them and do all high schools need them. My suggestion on our research for additional information would be to look at it that way on a need basis at the school level versus we will cut it out at the middle school level and have it only at the high school level or vice versa. The additional item I want to respond to and to say my position on it, I'm absolutely opposed to initiating Safelight Program at all. I think the research and we talked about this around this table about a year or so ago and the research that has come out for cities that have tried a safelight program in an attempt to reduce accidents is at best an analysis of safelight that the results are inconclusive. At worst they don't help at all and

mpl

in some cases increase the rear-end crashes even though angle crashes are decreased. I remember the last time we talked about safelight program around this table at a Workshop, I brought up that research and I think Councilmember Barnes was fairly persuaded by it also. I am not interested in pursuing the safelight issue because the research I've seen says that they don't reduce crashes. I'm not interested in it as a revenue format because that is not what it supposed to be about. It is safelight, not money light.

Councilmember Turner said I want to comment regarding the crossing guards, and I know this has been a debate that we've had for a couple year of now. The reason I'm going to continue to support the recommendation of the City Manager in regards to this is because we took on 15 new officers with stimulus money and I think properly preparing our budget for the unseen and our responsible after 2013, I think it is only reasonable and I think it is the responsibility of this Board to prepare ourselves for that. Unfortunately, we don't have a crystal ball that we can look into and tell us what is going to happen in regards to the County tax and budget situation in order to look at our own and know what the future is going to hold. I think things that we can control, we need to start preparing for that. I know we will go back and forth about the safety aspects of that and the need. I don't believe it is our responsibility to oversee or overshadow the school system. Obviously, they believe there is a need to have them in middle school and high schools and that is why they are there. I also believe they have a responsibility to come up with a way to fund those things in the future. At this point I think we should stay our course and leave that item in there and phase it out over the next three years as we have started and I'm going to stick by that as I believe that is the right thing to do. I want to comment on Mr. Barnes' \$300,000. I find that interesting and I like that discussion we had. I have a couple of questions that I would want to make sure I understand because I think someone might have alluded to that. Can you tell us Mr. Manager, how far the \$300,000 would go based on what is in the pipeline today with those neighborhoods that have already applied and met the deadline before we trace that budget?

Mr. Hall said the backlog is larger than the \$300,000 could address. There was a backlog before when you had a moratorium so that has always been true. The \$300,000 represents a restoration of your previous level of trying to add so many neighborhoods per year as well as the amount of actual installation work that Duke Energy thinks they could do. Even if you added a little bit more money, or even a lot more money, it probably couldn't speed up the program without an additional year of relationship with Duke Energy to ramp it up. I don't know exactly how many neighborhoods \$300,000 represents, but it represents about the number you were adding every year before. We will do that in the write-up response.

Mr. Turner said I as of right now without having that information, I think it is a good idea and one that I would like to get that information to me for my final decision.

Mr. Cannon said this is regards to the Children's Theater. Currently, I think they get around \$283,000 and they are part of our phase out where they would be phased out over three years at about \$95,000 per year.

Mr. Dulin said what page are you one?

Mr. Cannon said I don't know.

Mr. Turner said it is on Page 12.

Mr. Cannon said right now with the Children's Theater looking to be phased out over a three-year period, I would like to explore the option if we could consider much like what is happening with the Levine Cultural Campus, that there be a phase out of six years instead of three years, at a number of \$47,500 per year over six years. Where is the \$95,000 allocated for the three year phase out coming from?

Mr. Hall said you mean the funding for the contribution?

Mr. Cannon said yes sir.

Mr. Hall said the general fund.

Mr. Cannon said this amount of \$47.5 thousand would certainly reduce the number in half and I think it would help to continue to allow a good business model to exist as it has done so for the cultural campuses and probably makes better sense. I don't know that there is any angst about where the money comes from, but right now it looks like the discretionary fund may be one of the options for consideration if the other ideas that Council might have, as well as you Mayor and even City staff, I'm open to that.

Mayor Foxx said that would be on a scrolling basis going forward?

Mr. Cannon said on a rolling basis with a phase out after the 6 years.

Mr. Turner said Mr. Manager can you help us out on the history here? It was my understanding that this is going toward their maintenance operations, is that correct? Have we not been pretty good to them I think. Shouldn't this have ended sometime ago and we continue to fund their maintenance.

Mr. Walton said the history is the Children's Theatre which used to be on Morehead Street, was a City owned facility and I think we paid about \$75,000 or \$77,000 per year to maintain that. When they moved into ImaginOn which is a County owned building the Council make the decision to go ahead and pay operation and maintenance of that building and then it went up to about \$270,000. We've been doing that for several years. The basis from my recommendation last year is that we are maintaining a building that we don't own so as we had to make a number of cuts, that was one that was on the table. The six year, the only thing I would say about that is we are doing that six-year phase out as part of a larger Levine Capital Cultural Campus Program and we own those buildings. Children's Theatre wasn't part of that program and isn't City owned.

Mr. Cannon said we haven't owned the Children's Theatre Building for five years and yet we continue to still find a way to be supportive. I would just ask Council to still consider that in their thought process as well. This is still looking at a phase out. It is still the same money per se number wise. It is just half of the amount that we are currently paying over three years and would be \$47,500 over 6 years.

Councilmember Kinsey said I don't support a six-year phase out. I think we made a tough decision last year and it really was tough for those who have been involved in the arts and cultural arena for a number of years like Nancy and I have. Plus it was tough for me because I was President of the Library Board when we did the Children's Library and Children's Theatre, which is what it was called at the time, Children's Learning Center. I think we ought to stick with the tough decision that we made last year. It is not a building we own and actually what I'm hearing and wasn't aware of, is apparently we stepped up what we were paying in maintenance when they did move. I think we've given them notice and I think we actually stretched it a year and gave them an extra year so I would not support stretching it out further.

Mr. Barnes I wanted to respond to a couple things that Mr. Peacock mentioned. I'm not comfortable with the reduction of the 401-K contribution and the reduction of payment from the general fund the following year. In light of the question Mr. Turner asked and the response Mr. Hall gave, I want to increase the streetlight funding in an amount equivalent to entire \$445,446. Since there are actually more projects that need to be done than I was aware of, so that would be that entire amount that the Manager referenced at our Budget presentation last week. Additionally, you all are probably aware that the County handled the other hundred million dollars or two and in an effort to partner they should be willing to step up to the plate more and help us with the SROs, in fact pay for them. The same pressure that we are under, they are under and all elected bodies are under and I think there should be some direction given in that regard because no-one has ever come to me and said we'll hire a cop for you, we will pave a City street for you or build you a fire station. People are always asking us to take care of responsibilities of the State and of the County and other entities and it concerns me because of some of the uncertainty in our current economic environment that we continue to pick up the tab for things that are not necessarily within our bailiwick of activities. I would suggest that the County be asked to pick up that tab out of their own reserve and before we are done, I want to get over to Center City Partners issue that I have discussed with a couple of people and put some information out. I guess now would be the appropriate time to do that. I want to delete \$560,000

from their budget and this is pending a response from them regarding what they have uncovered with the SouthEnd study that they were conducting. We and I believe certainly the Budget Committee had hoped that they would respond to the Council before we adopted a budget regarding their efforts in the SouthEnd and how effective they were. I am sure they are making some progress in that regard, but because this is my only opportunity to say something about it, I wanted to put that on the table. It is mainly for information Mr. Manager and Mr. Hall, to get information from them regarding their efforts. It is not a specific delete, but that is the only thing I could call it today.

Mr. Dulin said it has been with a lot of thought that I have been working through the SRO and Crossing Guard situation. We all get a lot of phone calls and e-mails about a lot of things, but I know District 6 very well and I know the streets and roads, etc. and in all of your Districts all over this City, I don't have specific information about walking paths and trends and numbers of people that walk to schools in your Districts, but I do know how many kids walk to Beverly Woods with their parents. I know how many kids walk to Huntington Farms and Selwyn and AG and Smith Learning Academy, etc. in my District. With that Mayo, I've done some work about adding for a two or three-year period back in the Crossing Guards. That is a \$229,000 add. Now, unlike a lot of folks I'm not willing to deplete the discretionary fund or whatever fund. We've got some tough cuts and this is an add and delete, I'm adding \$229,000 and I'm willing to make tough cuts to delete \$229,000 from some other places, or at least move some stuff around. The \$229,000 I would like to discuss today, currently we pay the CIAA \$200,000 out of the General Fund. I would like to move that payment out of the General Fund into the occupancy tax dollars that is paid in and let the tourism industry, which we support, also pay for the largest tourism conference that we have every year, which is the CIAA Basketball Tournament, which I support. That is \$200,000 of the \$229,000. I would like to reduce the Mayor and Council staff from 9 to 8 with the reduction of \$70,000 position. That gets us over the \$229,000 and up until the time that we had presentation by Mr. Cannon for the Children's Theatre, I was going to suggest we put the overage above \$229,000 into the discretionary fund. I would now like to take whatever the number there is Ruffin, \$270,000 and then subtract \$229,000 and then take that money and use it to fund Mr. Cannon's idea for the Children's Theatre until it sunsets. I would like to pay for the School Crossing Guards, and we made a hard call last year, unanimous call, everybody on this Council, including those members that aren't with us anymore and that was a hard call and I still support that call, but I'm not in complete disagreement with you Mayor, enough so that I've spent some quality time working on this and finding these numbers. If I have added something I'm going to delete something. I think it is the right thing to do, but we gave the School Board and the County Commission one good year to look at this and they didn't get much work done on it because they've had their hands full. I would like to give them another full 2 or 3 years where we will pick up this expense for them, but flat out tell them that there is a cold turkey day coming and we are going to drop it in two or three years. That gives them 3 more years to get on it and their get their planning done. How much is left so that we could use that for Children's Theatre?

Mr. Hall said you mean from the original proposal?

Mr. Dulin said I've got \$270,000 minus \$229,000 so that is \$41,000 and that almost gets us to the \$47,500.

Mr. Hall said you are about \$7,000 short.

Mr. Dulin said my suggestion to the Children's Theatre crowd would be to drop their ask by \$7,000 to \$41,000.

Mr. Barnes said it also occurred to me in some of the things Mr. Dulin just mentioned, that a few years ago, and this goes back to something Ms. Carter mentioned, we send the School Board \$4.9 million for the safelight program and we didn't even get an acknowledgement for the money. Not a thank you, not a glad we got it. That check cleared and they kept rolling. Once again I'm back to expressing my reluctance about our continued funding of the SROs and I think by doing it for two or three more years, Mr. Dulin, essentially provides a way for people to just keep kicking that can down the road. I do not support the \$200,000 reduction in the CIAA agreement. Isn't that a signed agreement Mr. Manager?



Mr. Walton said the contract is, the funding source is not.

Mr. Barnes said would that be a permissible use of the occupancy tax? And would that be coming out of the CRVA side of the pot?

Mr. Walton said it would come out of the hospitality taxes?

Mr. Turner said wouldn't they have to agree to that?

Mr. Barnes said I like that Dulin.

Mr. Turner said that part is in our budget though, right?

Mr. Walton said yes.

Mr. Turner said we are going to reduce their budget by that amount.

Mr. Howard said Mr. Barnes brought up a good point about the county's reserve fund. Since I just hypothetically put some stuff back under my recommendation for the Resource Officers I would like to add that one as well since you didn't formerly say that. If they have some flexibility in that, I don't know how much they need for their bond rating but if there is any movement that would be interesting. I wanted to ask Mr. Barnes about the MSD with the SouthEnd. Right now that is a tax that we levy to help them so if for some reason we don't get that information, we still have to figure out how to do that. Are you saying all the sales that comes back in house and we figure how to serve?

Mr. Barnes said as I understand in the conversations I've had with the City Attorney's Office we have the authority to delete a portion of the MSD and it would be that part of the MSD would no longer exist. I am fairly certain that Mr. Smith will respond to us, I just want it to happen so we have an opportunity to evaluate the information and again the only reason I put it on there today is because my only opportunity to do so. I'm fairly confident that he will respond soon, or at least I hope so.

Mr. Howard said so you are saying if we don't keep it we don't keep it serving that district.

Mr. Barnes said right, but I think they are going to continue.

Ms. Carter said I would like to request the information that we did on the research about the safelight because we went counter to the national trend and I would very much like to see that before us so that we have a little more factual basis of local conditions as we consider it. Number two, Mr. Peacock I respect your research, but I do not want to fund the SROs on the back of our own employees. I think that is a hit that they don't need to absorb after going through a lot of sacrifice on the part of their citizens. Number three, I would very much like to see the impact of stretching out the funding for ImagiOn over six years. To my mind it is a very minimal amount and a very large budget, but I don't anticipate any large impact and I would like to support them still. I think they are a value to our standing nationwide. They are still unique and still of great value to our citizens. Streetlights, Mr. Manager, I understood that you said the \$300,000 would move to the capacity that Duke Energy could institute those lights. What I'm hearing is that we would add \$145,000 to that that might extend beyond their capacity. If that is true I think we need to know that.

Mr. Hall said my first response to the question was just doing the calculation on what the \$300,000 could represent as a part of this follow-up we would go back and see how much more they could do beyond the \$300,000. The other indication is that if you are able to put money in the streetlights program going forward they can ramp it up and encumber it and then try to do it into the next year. All I was trying to say and I don't know that you get them all in the first year, but the funding can certainly go into the second year.

Ms. Carter said stretch over the two-year budget and that was going to be my comment.

May 18, 2001  
Budget Retreat  
Minute Book 132, Page 10

Councilmember Mitchell said let me go back to the CIAA because I want to make sure. Do we have a contract obligation right now in place for us to continue to fund the CIAA through 2014?

Mr. Walton said three years, yes.

Mr. Mitchell said that is the City and the CIAA or the City and the CRVA? Who is the contract with?

Mr. Hall said I think it is with the CRVA.

**City Attorney, Mac McCarley,** said there is a contract with the CRVA and I'm not sure there is one with us at this point. The one with CRVA doesn't touch every issue.

Mr. Hall said it is the City and CRVA.

Mr. Mitchell said so if we follow Mr. Dulin, the \$200,000 will come out of the allocation amount that we already send the CRVA for them to contribute to the CIAA?

Mr. Walton said yes, if I could elaborate, I would urge you to be cautious on that. The original arena agreement if you will recall had the City in the General Fund financing \$500,000 a year of deficits for Ovens and what was in Cricket. About four years ago through the good work of CRVA the deficits were lower than \$500,000, \$350,000 or so. We eliminated the funding from the General Fund and charged all of those operating deficits to CRVA. I'm afraid that there would be a fairly significant impact to CRVA's bottom line if we did that and their support of all of the buildings. I think it certainly could be done, but I would urge you to be cautious and think through all of the ramifications.

Mr. Mitchell said I knew there was more than just remove money that part of the contract I support for the CIAA and the City so thank you for sharing that background information.

Ms. Kinsey said we've been talking about the County reserve and it dawned on me and I'm not sure if this has taken place and what is in the County's budget, but they are planning to take over the expense of all Library maintenance expenses. It all might be in that budget for the ImagineOn Building. You might want to check that out.

Mr. Cooksey said I wasn't expecting to do an operating delete, but I think I've got one. I think the place to look for on that \$200,000 is basically the serve and marketing component that we deliver by contract to CRVA that used to go to CVB. We are not obligated by even the statutory permission for CRVA to do sales and marketing. As I understand it the City is not obligated to give them that revenue stream for sales and marketing which we also use for business development. That is part of what that revenue stream is used for by the CRVA is to give money to conventions to come here, basic development funds. The question I would have, understanding and appreciating all of the CRVA's bottom line, if we take the \$200,000 out of the optional sales and marketing contract out of the first 3% that affects their sales and marketing efforts, not so much their building management efforts. That would be the question I would have as we look further into Mr. Dulin's proposal about where that \$200,000 comes from. I'm looking at it as a part of the tax that we get to control the destination to and CRVA is simply the option we choose because we choose our options that we used to send to the old CVB back when I was on it and Mr. Mitchell was on it. That is my comment for further discussion about this one when we come back to it.

Mr. Dulin said we are not trying to do away with the CRVA or the City's obligation for \$200,000 for CIAA. I was just trying to free up cash for us and we've talked about getting the books right in other ways, letting the tourism industry handle the largest tourism event we hold every year.

Mr. Cooksey said I'm a little afraid because I haven't done a full amount of research on it, but in light of the conversation continuing about SROs and admittedly the waffling I'm doing right now, but I was with the decision last year that security in schools was a school function and the more I think about it, the more public safety in general again is our core function and that extends to any property in our city. To the extent of what is our primary versus our secondary, I

mpl

would like to delete \$185,576 that we give on the Charlotte Mecklenburg School After School Enrichment Program and add it to Council Contingency, for someone else to use, perhaps to help fund SROs. If we are going forward with cutting SROs but we are going to continue to help with the After School Program, I think SROs are more our responsibility than After School Programs, so let's take the \$185,000 help fund the SROs, keep the school system from having to cover those and we will get out of that one particular After School Program that we are giving to CMS.

Mr. Cannon said one of the very reasons why I support the funding for After School Enrichment Program is largely in part because there are safety issues there. In fact probably more safety issues about what a child gets into or doesn't get into after school, than what they get into when they are in school. It is the whole issue around gang activity, giving them another place they can go instead of on the corner or somewhere to be recruited per se. From my perspective, it is a greater public safety issue after school than in school. We've got to be very careful about starting to reduce funding for such. It is really, really major for this community. We are not even touching the surface of the number of children on this after school piece that we should be. It was in the ED Committee that we got to see firsthand just how important having those programs actually are, so I hope you will reconsider that.

Mr. Barnes said I would really urge us not to eliminate the afterschool funding. The Mayor Pro Tem articulated it the way that it needed to be articulated. I actually had wanted to give more money to that portion of our budget, but CMS has never ask. You remember the data we've gotten every spring, that is one of the few financial partners that over achieves year to year. Deleting that funding would be a bad mistake.

Mr. Cooksey said just be clear on the number of it. I'm willing to give the school system \$958,000 more than we had said we would so we could keep the SRO split that we have and all I'm suggesting in return for that is delete a \$185,000 line item of our dollars going to their program. Let the \$772,000 for the good for CMS and they may already have the request in to the County for the \$958,000. If this is a good program, doing good work, let CMS fund it and we will stick to paying our Police Officers in the schools. They are getting a choice of their funding, I'm keeping our funding on a public safety concern directly with our public safety officers. If the afterschool program was a good use of resources CMS will have the money to do it because we are not scaling back our SRO funding. That is the gist of my proposal.

Mr. Peacock said going back to my proposal, and this is in response to Ms. Carter's comment. This is not off the back of any employees. Last year the Manager made the recommendation to give the pay increase of which this Council voted on and I was in opposition to that. Yet, at the same time we continued to contribute 2% to the 401-K so you got a raise and you get 2%. If you are an employee of the City of Charlotte and you don't contribute to the defined contribution plan yourself, you still get 2% put in. It is a very generous environment for retirement savings standpoint. Rather than not giving a full 1% I'm recommending we give .53% so I'm trying to find a middle there. I'm not trying to go against the grain here on that and I can understand the Manager's recommendation for this, but you are still in a very benefit rich environment as it relates to this. It is just splitting in between those two at .53% and I think to the larger point about what we are hearing about Crossing Guards and clearly what we are hearing about School Resource Officers is we are trying to find solutions here. We are trying to find solutions that address what the community is looking for which is help CMS out, help them bridge the gap right now until things get better and that is what this Council is trying to do. What I'm suggesting is that City of Charlotte employees, non-police, non-fire that they share in that. Am I correct Mr. Manager?

Mr. Walton said no, fire would be cut.

Mr. Peacock said fire would be cut, but not Police.

Mr. Walton said I agree about the solution finding, but I can't leave it hanging that the employee benefits are rich. I disagree with that.

Mr. Peacock and you and I have had that disagreement before so we'll agree to disagree.

Mr. Turner said I want to jump in because if I hear Mr. Peacock correctly what he just stated, you are asking us to fund the Crossing Guards at the expense of City employees and that is absolutely wrong. I would not support that and I respect your opinion on that, but she is absolutely correct whether you cut it to .5% or .25% you still reduce what they are getting to accomplish one thing to get to someone else. Before I do that I would say you are going to pay for it, let all the taxpayers pay for it and not the City employees.

Mr. Dulin said this is a delete and an add on operating. The list of City memberships and subscriptions that we have is long and interesting. UNC Capitol Hill School of Government \$73,000, North Carolina League of Municipalities \$76,000, US Conference of Mayors \$26,000, National League of Cities \$32,000, North Carolina Metropolitan Coalition \$16,000, Charlotte Regional Partnership \$149,000 and Centralina Council of Governments \$175,542. As best I can remember and we've had this conversation before, and for FY12 it is \$172,885 for Centralina Council of Government. We have a contract with them that we have to give them six months notice, so we would have to pay them half of whatever \$172,885 is which is roughly \$87,500 plus or minus. I'd like to move that \$87,500 over to the Carolina Regional Partnership under Ronny Bryant and add to his Charlotte Regional Film Commission budget. We've been giving him \$25,000 a year and they blow it out of the park with \$25,000 per year every year, bringing millions to our region in film, in commercials. The real money is in the backroom production stuff. That is when people are moving their families here and putting their kids in school. I'd like to delete the \$172,885 for 2012 and of course that would delete it for 2013 as well and add what half of that number is, roughly \$85,943 to the Charlotte Regional Film Commission to their allotment for this year. Centralina Council of Governments are better now than they were before, but they do studies for us, traffic studies and air study, studies that are done by other people as well. They used to do economic work for Cornelius and regional, Stanley County, Lincoln County and Cabarrus County. All of those counties now have relatively majorly ramped up economic development committees and economic development activities going on and they are all covered by Charlotte Regional Partnership as well. Ronny Bryant and his crowd is in every one of these surrounding 16 counties. In my opinion we can do without Centralina Council of Government. At least our portion of it and I think the \$87,500 will return to the community tenfold or more over years in economic development committee and in jobs. That brings jobs to our community when we bring films and commercials to our community. I would still like to keep jobs number one, not another traffic study that NCDOT or CDOT can do, or the Cabarrus Community College or whoever might do those studies.

Mayor Foxx said have you gone to a COG meeting?

Mr. Dulin said many.

Mr. Foxx said when was the last time you went?

Mr. Dulin said right before I got off the Economic Development Board, maybe two years, but the first four years I attended for four years.

Ms. Kinsey said I haven't missed one and for your edification Mr. Dulin, I have the 2010 annual report from COG. I knew you were going to do this.

Mr. Dulin said they make nice glossy reports, that is for sure.

Ms. Kinsey said actually they do a really good job. We have a new Executive Director who has really made a change in how the COG is operating. It really is important for the largest City in the region to participate in the COG because without Charlotte they would not be able to operate. They do a great deal of good for the smaller municipalities and for the smaller counties. Unfortunately, the various regional organizations don't really overlap, so the Regional Partnership does not cover everything the COG does and vice versa. I would highly recommend that we stay in the COG. I think it is important that we do so and important to those cities and counties in our region. I could not support cutting the membership fee.

Mr. Howard said I could say how I feel about it with my vote, but I want to add a little bit more to what Ms. Kinsey just said. I think what you said about the CRP film efforts are real. I don't take that takes away by me not voting for what you asking for and I don't agree with that. If

Ronnie asked for something more I would be trying to figure out how to help him because you are right, that is a great effort they are doing and it is a growing industry for this community. I have been extremely involved in what the COG is doing, even prior to being on Council. We are the engine that runs this region and a lot of the federal funds and other things that will be coming down are geared toward how we all plan as a region. The COG structure is standard across the country. It is one of those things that usually follows metropolitan areas to help with the metropolitan area and I think it is a small amount of money in the scheme of making sure that we all go together because that is what we are talking about. What Ronnie does with selling us as a region from jobs and other things is totally different from what they are doing with land use planning and trying to help us with roads and infrastructure, two different things. A lot of the smaller towns couldn't do it without us. In an area where regionalism is so important to not just go for the funding, that is the wrong time to send signal that we are not serious about regionalism and I think that is what defunding that would say so I can't support it either.

Mr. Dulin said if anybody that doubts our commitment to regionalism they are not paying any attention in my opinion. I'm confident in our regionalism and I would like to move the \$87,500 to where I think it can do our community more good and employ more people. COG doesn't employ anybody, 10 folks maybe, but the movie industry will employ hundreds. They are also uptown in their fancy office too.

Mayor Foxx said well we could debate this all day long.

Ms. Carter said I was going to make the statement about COG's involvement with the economic development attitude and the environmental push because I've served on both of those councils with COG having the experience of where we interact, bring together academics that are not addressed by the Regional Partnership, by the Chamber, by MUMPO, by MPC. There are points where we do interact that are very important and bring benefit to our community that are not addressed by these other issues. Sitting down with the locally elected officials from these other areas, personally and getting one on one interactions with them, seem where our streets meet, where our economic development plans meet, that is crucial and we don't always get that done in the City because we are focused on what we are doing. Reaching out to others and interacting with them to me is extraordinarily important and we reap the benefits. I respect your admiration for the film industry, it is valid and I would like to see more money go to them if we had it.

Mr. Cooksey said this is capital. I want to create a streetcar reserve fund to be funded with \$3 million from the ED Initiatives Capital line item and another million dollars from the Business Corridor Revitalization Strategy Program.

Mr. Dulin said Mr. Cooksey can you describe that to us a little bit please.

Mr. Cooksey said we know from the City's streetcar operation that \$12 million was the match we needed to make it work, given what the Federal grant amount was. The funding plan for the streetcar seems to be piecemeal and anytime a grant opportunity comes up we fund it. Part of what we had to go through and what I didn't like about the last time was we had to scramble to find money. The Manager found about \$24 million for us to choose from and the majority of this Council picked \$12 million of it to go with the 1 ½ mile phase one. I figure let's go ahead and block \$12 million for the streetcar reserve so that we are prepared if and when another grant comes along, to actually have some money for it. My votes have largely been based on that we didn't have any funding plan for it. This is helping set up a funding plan.

Mr. Dulin said would you go over the numbers one more time?

Mr. Cooksey said it is \$9 million out of the Business Corridor Revitalization Strategy Program, which was one of the suggested sources and \$3 million from Economic Development Initiative, which was another of the originally suggested sources that we pull money from back in January of 2010.

Mr. Howard said I missed part of that so what you are proposing is actually going back and changing the sources that we voted on before?

Mr. Cooksey said no, I'm proposing for the future, remember when we had to find \$12 million to match the Federal grant, the question was where is it, and the Manager came back with four sources for a total of \$24 million. We used \$2.5 million from the remaining streetcar planning and design capital line item. We used \$4 million to clean out the Smart Growth Capital line item. We used \$5.5 million out of a \$10.5 million reserve for ED Initiatives and we were also pointed to about a \$7 million availability of reallocation from a business corridor revitalization strategy program that still left about \$8.1 million in that program as of January 2010. What I'm suggesting is that given we had \$24 million brought to our attention, we used \$12 million for phase I, let's go ahead and identify that the other \$12 million is streetcar reserve phase 2 so when the grants are available we don't have to go through the exercise of saying where is the money coming from. Where it is coming from is we've got it locked in the CIP that we have it.

Mr. Howard said so you are suggesting that if there is another grant we just have some money set aside for it?

Mr. Cooksey said remember my objection to the Council taking on the streetcar as a project were twofold. One I thought it should be done as promised under the transit tax under the transit plan with whatever money became available or two, if the City is going to take it on, we need a funding plan for it and there was never any funding plan developed for it other than hoping that in the future something would manifest itself. I'm trying to push us forward to saying well, this is a funding plan in the future to manifest itself. We will already have the line item identified the next time a capital savings opportunity comes around.

Mr. Howard said it sounds like you have changed and are supporting the streetcar now.

Mr. Cooksey said what did I say at the MUMPO Meeting Mr. Howard, I lost my last vote to stop it so I'll be a good boy and carry out policy. Let's identify the line item and have the money ready.

Mr. Howard said the principle of what you are talking about I understand. The affect on the Business Corridor money while we are waiting on an opportunity is what my concern is. If we have opportunities I would hate to tie that up because I think when grants come that is what you do, you figure out matches then because it may be more requirement or less requirement and it could be \$24 million or it could be \$100 million. That is the only thing, the principle of what you are talking about I actually respect. That is my only problem of tying that up until we have an opportunity. I probably won't support it because of that but I understand what you are trying to do.

Mr. Cooksey said if we did lock that \$9 million out of the Revitalization Strategy Plan, how much would be left in it?

Mr. Walton said I think around \$5 million.

Mr. Cooksey said \$5 million would be left un-programmed. The ED Initiative is \$3 million unencumbered as of the end of FY11. It's got funding of a million a year for the next two years so it is going to continue to be replenished even after this decision if it goes this way. Furthermore, the bottom line is these fund are always within our control, much like the reserve that we created for Criminal Justice Technology Improvements that as the opportunity didn't arise we whittled away at it and whittled away it until now it is down to less than a half million for streetlights potentially. If we have it, we will stay in control of it and if a better opportunity than a streetcar comes along, we can pull from this line item to fund it. It is not getting rid of the money and it is not even pledging the money. It is simply saying we are going to call the \$12 million a streetcar reserve fund in the CIP so that if the streetcar opportunity come before hand we don't have to ask where is the money. If some unnamed, unknown, unplanned program comes along that needs a match, we can do the same thing we did with the streetcar, Mr. Manager, where can we get it from and one of the options could be, well you've got this streetcar reserve fund of \$12 million and there is no opportunity that we foresee in the next couple years so you can use that. That is what I'm trying to help with the planning on.

Mr. Turner said Mr. Cooksey asked how much would be left in the Business Corridor Revitalization Fund and I have my answer so I'll wait until this is debated further, but I won't be supporting it.

Mr. Barnes said I want to respond briefly to Mr. Cooksey's proposal. I'm reluctant to support it because as I understand it what we had hoped to do with the Business Corridor Revitalization money is address the challenges and things outside of my District, in Eastland, the North Tryon Corridor and other business corridors so I'm not going to vote to do that. It is fascinating to learn that you are in support of the streetcar program now.

Mr. Peacock said we could name it the Cooksey Line.

Mr. Cooksey said or Council goes on record voting no for streetcar funding, one or the other.

Mr. Barnes said what I just indicated, that money was for Eastland, it is for North Tryon Corridor, it is for our business corridors. It is an effort that we have undertaken to try to improve struggling corridors in the City, including Central by the way. So to just take that money and redirect it in one direction on a five-minute conversation in my opinion is not the wise thing to do.

Mayor Foxx said and I thought this was going to be an easy, fun exercise. Do we have any further adds or deletes? With none suggested, our tradition is that we will go through an exercise of voting on these, not to include in the budget at this point, but simply to keep them on the board until our actual straw votes later on. In our tradition, we need five hands to go up to keep any item on the board so we will go through each one from top to bottom, starting on the operating side.

Mr. Barnes' suggestion to add money for streetlights, removing money from Criminal Justice Technology.

The vote was taken and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Council Members Barnes, Cannon, Carter, Cooksey, Howard, Mitchell, Peacock and Turner.

NAYS: Council Members Dulin and Kinsey

Mr. Howard's suggestion to provide one year of current funding levels for School Resource Officers.

Mr. Howard said he want to speak on it before they vote because what I'm really asking for is information on the risk or the possibility of each one. I understand it may come back and in the final analysis we may say none of those makes sense so that is really what I'm saying.

Mayor Foxx said a placeholder?

Mr. Dulin said I think some of that work should have been done before we sat down today.

Mr. Foxx said some of it is ongoing because you have budget issues at the State level that we are still waiting to hear about.

The vote was taken on Mr. Howard's suggestion and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Council Members Cannon, Carter, Cooksey, Howard, and Peacock.

NAYS: Council Members Barnes, Dulin, Kinsey, Mitchell and Turner

Mr. Peacock's suggestion about School Resource Officers, provide two years of funding, the first year would come from a reduction in the recommended 401-K match and that would continue in the second year with the additional coming from the General Fund Operating Budget reserve.

Mr. Dulin said is your intention for that to sunset after 2013?

Mr. Peacock said yes.

The vote was taken and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Council Members Cooksey, Dulin and Peacock.

NAYS: Council Members Barnes, Cannon, Carter, Howard, Kinsey, Mitchell and Turner

Mr. Cannon's request to do a six-year phase out for ImaginOn, taken from Council's discretionary.

The vote was taken and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Council Members Cannon, Carter, Cooksey, Howard, Mitchell, Peacock and Turner

NAYS: Council Members Barnes, Dulin, and Kinsey.

Mr. Barnes motion to hold SouthEnd Municipal Service District funding pending the Center City Partner report.

The vote was taken and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Council Members Barnes, Carter, and Dulin

NAYS: Council Members Cannon, Cooksey, Howard, Kinsey, Mitchell, Peacock and Turner.

Mr. Dulin's effort to restore Crossing Guard funding by taking from ImaginOn.

Mr. Dulin said with the overage and we are \$7,000 short. If this gets passed and I hope it does that would solve the school crossing guard problem, the ImaginOn problem and move \$200,000 out of our General Fund, and save us \$200,000 in our General Fund. That is a win/win/win.

Mayor Foxx said it would come out of the staff position on the Council and Mayor's staff and the CIAA.

The vote was taken and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Council Members Cooksey, Dulin and Peacock

NAYS: Barnes, Cannon, Carter, Howard, Kinsey, Mitchell and Turner.

Mr. Cooksey's suggestion to delete after school enrichment to CMS and add that to Council's discretionary fund.

The vote was taken and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Council Members Cooksey and Peacock

Mr. Dulin's suggestion to delete dues to COG and add a like amount to Charlotte Regional Partnership Film Commission.

The vote was taken and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Council Members Cooksey, Dulin and Peacock

NAYS: Council Members Barnes, Cannon, Carter, Howard, Kinsey, Mitchell and Turner.

Mayor Foxx said on the Capital side, Mr. Cooksey suggested adding a streetcar reserve and deleting the Business Corridor Revitalization by \$9 million and ED Initiative by \$3 million to create a \$12 million streetcar reserve.

The vote was taken and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Council Members Cooksey, Dulin and Peacock

NAYS: Council Members Barnes, Cannon, Carter, Howard, Kinsey, Mitchell and Turner.



**Councilmember Peacock left the meeting at 4:52 and notified the Clerk he was leaving.**

Mr. Barnes said I wanted to ask if I might, regarding the film commission, during the Budget Committee's work on our financial partners we heard from Mr. Brian on that issue and talked about that issue. I'm sitting here looking for the balance in the Council's discretionary account and what I wanted to ask is whether we might, as a placeholder, set aside another \$25,000 which is what we currently give them to consider contributing for that purpose, pending a report from them regarding how they program the funding and the outcomes of the increased funding. Mr. Dulin said what are you going to delete?

Mr. Barnes said nothing, it comes out of the Council's discretionary fund, depending upon the balance. What is that balance?

Mr. Hall said in the current year is \$123,750.

Mr. Barnes said I will be replenishing two months so my proposal is to set aside \$25,000 for the film commission pending a response from CRP regarding how they program and the number of jobs. They gave that data at our Budget Committee meeting, the number of jobs created, the number of hotel stays, etc. For the purpose of at least hearing from them regarding how they program the money, I would propose adding that as a matter for discussion.

Mayor Foxx said so you've got another add and delete?

Mr. Barnes said yes.

Mr. Mitchell said Andy, thank you for your leadership and Mr. Barnes on the Film Commission, but being the representative to the Regional Partnership I want to make it clear that Mr. Brian has not made an official request to increase the \$25,000 for the Film Commission. He is like anybody else, if we would like to give him money I'm sure he would use it, but he is fine. I will get the report back for the Committee. I just want to make sure that we don't turn this around and Ronnie Brian is requesting additional money for the Film Commission because in our Board meetings that has not been a topic of discussion.

Mr. Barnes said in light of his guidance on that, however today is my only opportunity to make an add so I need to leave it.

Mayor Foxx said I hope we won't get into adding other ones since we have basically gone through this process.

The vote was taken on Mr. Barnes suggestion and was recorded as follows:

Yeas: Council Members Barnes, Carter, Cooksey, Dulin and Howard.

NAYS: Council Members, Cannon, Kinsey, Mitchell, and Turner.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

---

Ashleigh Martin, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 1 Hour, 52 Minutes

Minutes Completed: June 13, 2011