MEMORANDUM

June 2, 2017

TO: Mayor and City Council Members

FROM: Ben Canada, Budget Manager

SUBJECT: June 5 Council Budget Work Session

City Council will meet Monday, June 5th, to discuss the FY2018 Manager’s Proposed Budget. This first budget work session provides an opportunity for City Council to discuss the budget and resource allocation decisions identified by Council Members as meriting closer attention. City Council does not, however, need to make any budget decisions in this work session.

The attached packet of information includes several Budget Notes responding to Council Member requests. Staff provides these “Budget Notes” when City Council specifically requests information and may need to make a decision, often in the form of a trade-off, that affects the Proposed Budget. Other follow-up information that has been requested for clarification is also included.

For this first work session, attached Budget Notes include:

1. Allocation to the Human Services Agency grant program
2. John Chavis Memorial Park
3. Small Business Grant
4. Early Voting
5. Youth Fare Transit Proposal
6. Mayor’s Committee for Persons with Disabilities Funding

In addition, please find attached the following information:

- Questions on the Classification System Summary (CSS)
- Fee Comparison Chart
- Information on Primary Arts Funding Sources
- Memorandum regarding the ARC of the Triangle human services grant for FY18 and related attachment

Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions in advance of the session.
Nancy McFarlane, Mayor
Kay C. Crowder, Mayor Pro Tem
Mary-Ann Baldwin
Corey D. Branch
David N. Cox
Bonner Gaylord
Russ Stephenson
Dickie Thompson

MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017
4:00 P.M. BUDGET WORK SESSION
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
A. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY THE MAYOR

B. AGENDA

The work session agenda includes time for City Council to discuss specific budget and policy decisions identified by Council Members. No final decisions need to be reached today.

Moving forward in this budget process, should City Council desire to change the Proposed Budget, Council will need to direct staff on what amounts to appropriate for specific programs and what funding sources to use. In some cases, a formal vote may be necessary. Staff will identify the action items needing a Council vote.

1. Allocation to the Human Services Agency grant program
2. John Chavis Memorial Park
3. Small Business Grant
4. Early Voting
5. Youth Fare Transit Proposal
6. Mayor’s Committee for Persons with Disabilities Funding

C. OTHER ITEMS IDENTIFIED BY CITY COUNCIL FOR DISCUSSION

D. NEXT STEPS

- Tuesday June 6, 7 p.m., Public Hearing on Proposed Budget
- Monday, June 12, 4 p.m., Budget Work Session
MEMO TO: Ruffin Hall, City Manager

FROM: Kirsten Larson, Grants Program Administrative Manager

SUBJECT: Budget Note 1 – Human Service Funding Level

At the November 1, 2016 Council meeting (minutes attached), Council Member Baldwin requested a budget note about increasing the human services agency grant funding. This memorandum provides background information on human services funding and discusses two options City Council could consider to increase human services funding.

Background

From 1988 through 2014, the city annually appropriated $500,000 in human services agency grant funding. In January 2015, Council adopted a policy to increase the human services grant funding allocation annually by the same rate as arts per capita funding. Arts per capita is currently calculated using the U.S. census population data for Raleigh multiplied times the per capita rate of $5. The percentage change between the previous fiscal year and current year is then calculated to determine the annual change in the level of human service funding.

The new policy resulted in an increase in human services grant funding increased of two percent in both FY16 and FY17, equating to an allocation of $510,000 and $520,000, respectively. The calculated increase for FY18 is 2.5% which results in an allocation of $533,200. Recommendations regarding which human services agencies to fund are presented to Council by the Human Relations Commission (HRC) each year during the budget process.

In addition to the human services grant funding recommended by the HRC, additional general fund support is provided to selected human services agencies outlined in item two below. In the current FY17 budget, human services appropriations total $1,019,000:

1. $520,000 in grants awarded by the Human Relations Commission (HRC), and
2. $499,000 in General Fund support for grants awarded by City Council outside the HRC competitive process or as a supplement to HRC grants for agencies historically supported:
   - CASA ($84,000)
   - Healing Transitions ($95,000)
   - Interact ($70,000)
   - Interfaith Food Shuttle ($95,000)
   - Legal Aid of NC ($45,000)
   - Tammy Lynn Center ($95,000)
   - SE Wake Adult Daycare ($15,000)
Funding Options

The tables below provide human services funding levels using the current-approved approach and two potential options for annual funding adjustments.

The first table depicts the current approved approach which, as previously stated, provides the same percentage rate increase as the arts per capita funding. The FY18 grant funding amount is calculated using the actual growth, per adopted policy, of 2.5%. A 2.1% 3-year average growth factor is used to calculate the FY19 and FY20 amounts.

Current approved human services funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY17 Adopt</th>
<th>FY18 Proposed</th>
<th>FY19 Projected</th>
<th>FY20 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funding</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>(2.5% growth)</td>
<td>(2.1% growth)</td>
<td>(2.1% growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Council Support</td>
<td>$499,000</td>
<td>$499,000</td>
<td>$499,000</td>
<td>$499,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,019,000</td>
<td>$1,032,205</td>
<td>$1,043,402</td>
<td>$1,054,834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 1 – Current approved applied to full human services allocation

Option 1 applies the current approved policy to the full human services allocation. In FY17 the full allocation was $1,019,000 (which includes HRC grant allocations and General Fund support). The FY18 growth factor of 2.5% is applied to the FY17 total. The FY19 and FY20 calculations use the 2.1% average growth factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY17 Adopt</th>
<th>FY18 Proposed</th>
<th>FY19 Projected</th>
<th>FY20 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Human Services Allocation</td>
<td>$1,019,000</td>
<td>(2.5% growth)</td>
<td>(2.1% growth)</td>
<td>(2.1% growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,044,475</td>
<td>$1,066,409</td>
<td>$1,088,803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2 – Per capita allocation

Option 2 applies a per capita method in annually adjusting the full human services allocation. A per capita rate of $2.30 provides the current FY17 adopted amount of $1,019,000. FY18 is projected using the same population figure from the U.S. Census website as is used in the arts per capita calculation. An annual population growth of 10,000 is projected for both FY19 and FY20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY17 Adopt</th>
<th>FY18 Proposed</th>
<th>FY19 Projected</th>
<th>FY20 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita</td>
<td>$1,019,000</td>
<td>$1,127,665</td>
<td>$1,152,665</td>
<td>$1,177,665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget Impact by Fiscal Year

The final table outlines the budget impact of each option by fiscal year as compared to the current approved approach. Please note any additional funding provided for human services grants impacts the General Fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>$12,270</td>
<td>$23,007</td>
<td>$33,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>$95,460</td>
<td>$109,253</td>
<td>$122,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the remaining questions regarding the human services funding is:

- Should the HRC continue to provide grant award recommendations on a portion of the total human services allocation or should they provide recommendations on the entire amount?
- If the HRC continues to provide recommendations on a portion of the total, does their portion include any increases in human services funding level?

If you or Council Members have additional questions regarding proposed options to increase the human services funding allocation, or would like to see additional details, please let us know.
AGENCY GRANT PROCESS – OPTION 2 APPROVED; BUDGET NOTE REQUESTED

The Other Outside Agency grants process provides funding to non-profit organizations for programs and projects that fall outside the parameters of the established Arts, Human Services or Community Enhancement grant programs. Staff will provide a brief overview of FY17 agency grants and, in preparation for the FY18 agency grant process, will provide options for revising guidance in the area of funding agencies from multiple grant categories. Included with the agenda packet was an excerpt from the adopted budget with information on annual grant appropriations.

**Recommendation:** Revise the guidelines for the annual grant process.

City Manager Ruffin Hall announced this would be an update on the agency grant process and a request for guidance relative to application parameters. He reminded the Council that various changes had been made to the grant application process over the last couple of years to organize the process in a way that would improve the level of applications and improve the review process. Staff has noticed the City is receiving duplicate applications, i.e., applications in multiple categories. If this trend continues, it will create issues for the Council relative to the Other Outside Agency category. The application process has just opened and the deadline is January 2017.

Grants Program Administrative Manager Kirsten Larsen provided the following information about agency grant funding with the assistance of a PowerPoint presentation.

**FY17 Total Agency Appropriations – $5.1 Million**
- Arts Agency Appropriations $2.77M
- Human Service Appropriations $1M
- Community Enhancement Appropriations $175K
- Other Outside Agency Appropriations $1.18M

**Arts Grants**
- Support arts programming within the City
- FY17 budget: $1.79M
- Arts Grant Program Funding Categories
  - Operating Support (FY17 grants = 19)
  - Program Support (FY17 grants = 11)
    - Must be arts programming (carried out within Raleigh)
  - Innovation Grants (FY17 grants = 0)
- Excluded: The Arts Grant Program does NOT fund capital projects.

**Human Service Grants**
- The City of Raleigh policy on the funding of human service agencies reflects the desire to provide supplemental funding to agencies for support of programs that
address human needs within the City, especially the needs of the targeted groups below.

- Serve targeted groups
  - Youth
  - Elderly
  - Persons with handicaps or disabilities
  - Substance abusers
  - Homeless individuals
- FY17 budget: $520K

Community Enhancement Grants
- Community enhancement grants are for public services
- Serve households with incomes below 80% of median household income for the area (federal regulation)
- Priority given to:
  - Homeless individuals
  - Individuals with incomes at or below 30% AMI (average median income)
  - Low-income youth
  - Persons who are disabled
  - Victims of domestic violence
  - Persons living with HIV/AIDS
  - Seniors
- FY17 budget: $175K (funded through Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds)

Other Outside Agency Grants
- City was receiving agency requests for funding throughout the year outside the agency grant and budget processes
- Established with FY15 budget process to capture requests that fall outside parameters of the City's other established grant programs
- Intended to provide consistency and transparency (arts, human services, and community enhancement)
  - Requires all agencies to out an application and go through standardized process
- FY17 budget: $1.1M

Number of Agencies Awarded Funding in Multiple Grant Categories
- FY15 – 4
- FY16 – 3
- FY17 – 7 (in two grant categories)

FY17 Agency Award Details
- 4 agencies received Human Services and Other Outside Agency grants, including Advance Community Health, Boys and Girls Club, Transitions LifeCare, and Triangle Family Services
2 agencies received Human Services and Community Enhancement grants, including Interfaith Food Shuttle and StepUp Ministry.

1 agency (Wake Enterprises) received Human Services and Arts grants.

Questions for Council

- Does the City wish to allow agencies to apply in multiple categories?
- If so, what is the potential impact?
- The grant processes for all categories are ramping up now, so staff requests guidance from Council so information can be shared with potential applicants.

Options

1. Agencies **may only apply** for Other Outside Agency (OOA) grants when the service/program **does not qualify** for one of the other three categories.

2. Agencies that **qualify** for Arts, Human Services and/or Community Enhancement grants **can apply** through OOA but for **capital-related funding only**.

Next Steps

- FY18 OOA applications available now.
- December 2016 – January 2017: All grant category applications due.
- February budget work session: Staff provides Council with an initial look at agency grant requests.

Mayor McFarlane confirmed with Grants Manager Larsen that the OOA grant application process had opened. Grants Manager Larsen added that even though it had opened, no communication has been sent yet to the agencies. City Manager Hall stated the City was still within the timeframe of being able to communicate the expectations to the applicants. The Mayor said staff and the Council had discussed several times in the past six years that the City should provide clarity in the process for everyone so it is fair to everyone. Her opinion of the Arts and Human Resources grants is that it is only fair to staff and the applicants that an applicant only apply for one or the other, not both. She asked if the City still needed the Other Outside Agency grants, and if there were many grant applications that did not fall into one of the other three categories. Grants Manager Larsen responded there are still a few applications that don't fall inside the other grants. Affordable housing is one; economic development and capital requests are additional examples.

Ms. Crowder asked if the problem the City is trying to solve is agencies double-dipping. The Mayor and Grants Manager Larsen replied "yes." Mr. Thompson said he agrees that agencies should only be able to apply for one grant. Ms. Crowder asked into which category alliances like the Hillsborough Street Community Services Corporation and Downtown Raleigh Alliance would fall. Grants Manager Larsen responded OOA grants, because those groups are in the economic development category.
Ms. Baldwin commented the recurring theme is capital campaigns and the City does not have a "neat bucket" to address that. She believes that should be what OOA grants are for, for example, the Food Bank, the Teen Center, and the Boys and Girls Club. Mayor McFarlane said that is basically Option 2, and Mr. Gaylord and Ms. Crowder said that sounds reasonable.

Mr. Thompson, seconded by Ms. Baldwin, moved to approve Option 2. Approval was unanimous, and the Mayor ruled the motion adopted on a vote of 8-0.

City Manager Hall confirmed with the Mayor and Council that Option 2 is only for capital requests even though there may be duplicate applications, because one application is for operating expenses and one is for capital projects. The Mayor said Council does not mind considering separate requests for capital funds and operating funds from one agency.

Ms. Baldwin requested a budget note relative to increasing Human Services funding. Mayor McFarlane said she had already considered increasing their funding since all the capital funding requests would be going through the OOA process. However, she has no objection to a budget note to be discussed during budget work sessions. City Manager Hall stated staff would interpret from this discussion that there are existing categories in OOA right now that are operating, so this will be for new requests, and the Mayor replied affirmatively. City Manager Hall said staff will put this together and bring it back to the Council at its February work session.
MEMO TO: Ruffin Hall, City Manager

FROM: Shawsheen Baker, Capital Projects Administrator, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources

SUBJECT: Budget Note 2 – Funding Gap for John Chavis Memorial Park

Background

In January 2012, the City of Raleigh Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources (PRCR) Department initiated a Community Conversation and planning process to develop a revised Master Plan for John Chavis Memorial Park (JCM). In May 2014, the revised Master Plan was adopted by City Council. The 2014 revised master plan is a result of a collaborative community effort to reach consensus on shared interests, identify options for additional amenities and improvements to the park and develop a mutual understanding and respect of the history and the future of the park.

In November 2016, Council Member Branch requested a budget note outlining the costs associated with completing the John Chavis Memorial Park master plan.

Revised Master Plan Budget Summary

The 2014 revised Master Plan identified probable budget cost necessary to implement all master plan elements. The total construction would range from approximately $22 million to $40 million based on which elements were included in the final design. The attached excerpt from the revised Master Plan shows the estimated cost breakdown. With associated design and planning costs, including professional services, the total project cost for master implementation would increase to approximately $30 million to $50 million. The cost estimate is based on master planning concepts only, and would be difficult to refine. The final cost of implementation will be dependent upon detailed scope, design and project process costs, and construction market climate.

The master planning process was guided by a 16-member Public Leadership Group (PLG) approved by City Council. The PLG members were selected to include a diverse representation of interests and stakeholder groups reflecting the diversity of residents and users from the surrounding neighborhoods as well as regional historic focus.

Over the 28-month planning process, there were 15 PLG meetings including 11 formal meetings, one park tour and three optional working group meetings. In addition, 10 general public meetings were advertised and held to gather community input. Other public engagement opportunities included 9 reports to Central Citizen Advisory Council, frequent updates on project website, coverage and interviews with Shaw University UpFront radio and Raleigh Television Network, as well as hard-copy signage, handouts and mailings.
The planning process with extensive public participation concluded in May 2014 with the Council adoption of the master plan, which provided recommendation for improvement prioritization:

1. New Facilities (Community Center, Aquatics Center, Original Carousel Building)
2. Sports Facilities (track, field, courts)
3. Play, Creek and Open Space (play corridors, creek management)
4. Event Space (Heritage Plaza, Central Plaza)
5. Improved Circulation and Access (trails, bridge, wheeled train, new vehicular entrance)

Phase One Implementation

The 2014 Parks Bond Referendum included $12.5 million for John Chavis Memorial Park redevelopment. The Strategic Implementation Study for Phase One was then initiated to prioritize master plan recommendations in detail. The PLG members and citizens were re-engaged. Throughout the 15-month study phase, there were 2 PLG meetings, 4 advertised public meetings and 4 reports at Central Citizen Advisory Council. In addition to public engagement, the professional team researched a number of other parks across the country that share key similarities with John Chavis Memorial Park - urban parks, destination parks, historic community parks, parks that help to tell the African-American story, and parks that have undergone phased transformations.

The Strategic Implementation Study for Phase One was completed in June 2016 and identified the following priorities to meet the available budget:

- New Community Center Building
- New Central Plaza
- New Playground
- Renovation of the original Carousel to address structural issues and include water and electricity
- Restroom Addition off the original carousel building with external access

The 2014 Parks Bond included $12.5 million for JCMP phase I implementation for both design services and construction. In addition, $400,000 has been approved and $1 million is programmed in the Proposed Capital Pan for a total of $13.9 million to support phase 1 implementation.

Future Phase Planning and Budget Consideration

After Phase One implementation is complete, the funds needed for the remaining redevelopment will range from $16 million to $36 million based on initial estimates available in 2012. The following elements (in priority order) may be incorporated in future phase planning:

1. New Facilities (Community Center, Aquatics Center, Original Carousel Building)
2. Sports Facilities (track, field, courts)
3. Play, Creek and Open Space (play corridors, creek management)
4. Event Space (Heritage Plaza, Central Plaza)
5. Improved Circulation and Access (trails, bridge, wheeled train, new vehicular entrance)

If and when additional revenue source becomes available, a public process for Phase Two implementation will be engaged to prioritize improvement elements. Based on master plan recommendation, the new aquatic center followed by sports facilities ranks the top priority for Phase Two.
Development scenarios for the next phase may include:

Option 1
Budget: $21 million
Scope: New aquatic center development

Option 2
Budget: $25 million
Scope: New aquatic center development and sports facility improvements

Option 3
Budget: $36 million
Scope: New aquatic center development, sports facility improvements, and remaining improvements after Phase One implementation

Cost inflation must be considered when determining the total cost of the project. Particular scoping elements, extent of public engagement, timing of construction and local construction market factors would determine the total project cost.

Council Consideration

Should Council Members wish to fund one of the options listed above, the size and scope of this project would require additional revenue sources. These sources could include future bond issuances, major reprioritization of existing projects, or additional debt financing options.

If either City Council or you have additional questions regarding remaining unfunded elements of the John Chavis Memorial Park master plan or options to fund said elements, please let us know.

Attached

Excerpts from 2014 Revised Master Plan showing budget estimate ranges and development priorities.
MEMO TO: Ruffin Hall, City Manager

FROM: James Sauls, Manager, Office of Economic Development & Innovation
Leah R. Henderson, Budget & Management Analyst

SUBJECT: Budget Note 3 – Small Business Grant

Background
At the May 2, 2017 Council Meeting, Council Member Gaylord requested a budget note in regards to the Small Business Grant and options for funding the program in FY2018. The Small Business Grant would provide funding to companies based upon the creation of new jobs or retention of jobs within the City of Raleigh.

The Small Business Grant would continue the creation of tools within the Economic Development Toolkit and directly aligns with Toolkit’s goals to:

- Promote Economic Development in all of Raleigh
- Support small and large business growth and development
- Diversify our economy (international, small business, minority and women-owned)
- Offer different tools for different applications
- Promote a business-friendly environment
- Encourage economic prosperity and equity

According to the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA), small businesses with less than 500 employees constitute 99.9% of all businesses in the United States. Within Wake County, small businesses represent approximately 94% of all businesses.

Proposed Budget
In previous discussions within the Economic Development and Innovation Committee, the Small Business Grant was recommended at approximately $100,000 for FY2018. If City Council chooses to fund this grant in FY2018, Budget and Management Services (BMS) and the Office of Economic Development and Innovation (ED&I) propose Council consider the following funding sources:

- **Option One:** Fund the entire proposed Small Business Grant amount of $100,000 through the Innovation Fund.

Within the FY2018 Proposed Budget, there is currently $100,000 programmed for the Innovation Fund budgeted within the General Public Improvement (GPI) Capital Element. The Innovation Fund will also have an unused balance of approximately $70,000 to roll over from FY2017. This estimated balance is based on previous
discussions between staff and Council to reserve approximately $200,000 of the Fund’s available amount in FY2017 for future projects. The Innovation Fund was designed to support the City’s entrepreneurial start-up program by assisting entrepreneurs in multiple ways, to include: public/private matching grants, beta testing and prototyping programs, start-up challenge programs, crowd funding or kick-start matching funds, and entrepreneur exchange with other cities.

This option allows City Council to use some of the Innovation Fund dollars for a related purpose in FY2018, and to keep the fund’s appropriation from FY2017 for other known and unknown needs in FY2018 and beyond. If Council approves this proposed funding mechanism, the Innovation Fund will have a remaining $70,000 available in FY2018, assuming no additional Economic Development projects are funded in FY2017, to be used for other similar purposes that remain in-line with the Innovation Fund’s goals.

- **Option Two:** Fund $45,000 of the Small Business Grant through the Innovation Fund and fund the additional $55,000 by allocating one-time General Fund Capital Reserves.

As stated prior, the FY2018 Proposed Budget contains $100,000 for the Innovation Fund. Unless City Council chooses to fund additional Economic Development projects within FY2017, the Innovation Fund will also have $70,000 of unused balance within the fund that will be available in FY2018.

This option allows City Council to use some of the Innovation Fund dollars for a related purpose in FY2018, and to keep additional funding for other known and unknown needs in FY2018 and beyond. If City Council approves this proposed funding option, one-time resources of $100,000 will be available for the Small Business Grant in FY2018 and $125,000 will be available in the Innovation Fund, assuming no additional projects are funded in FY2017, for purposes related to the Innovation Fund’s goals described above. If City Council wishes to fund the Small Business Grant on an ongoing basis, additional funds will need to be identified during the FY2019 budget process.

- **Option Three:** Fund the entire proposed Small Business Grant amount of $100,000 through an allocation of General Fund Capital Reserves.

Option Three allows City Council to maintain the entire amount allocated to the Innovation Fund for FY2018 and the appropriated fund balance from FY2017 for other purposes outside of the Small Business Grant, and to fund the Small Business Grant in the amount of $100,000 for FY2018. Unless City Council chooses to fund additional Economic Development projects in FY2017, the Innovation Fund will then have $170,000 available to be used for other purposes related to the Fund’s goals in the next fiscal year. If City Council wishes to fund the Small Business Grant on an ongoing basis, additional funds will need to be identified during the FY2019 budget process.

If you or Council Members have additional questions regarding the Small Business Grant proposal, or would like to see additional details, please do not hesitate to let us know.
MEMO TO:  Ruffin Hall, City Manager  
FROM: Nicholas Sadler, Budget Analyst  
SUBJECT: Budget Note 4 – Early Voting for Municipal Elections  

Background  
At the May 2, 2017 Council meeting, Council Member Stephenson requested information on the cost of early voting for the 2017 municipal elections. The Wake County Board of Elections is responsible for conducting all elections held in Wake County. Generally, City Council approves voting dates, times and locations in December or January preceding an election cycle. The Wake County Board of Elections office located at 337 South Salisbury Street always serves as an early voting site, while additional early voting locations are funded at the discretion of municipalities.  

Dates for Municipal Elections  
The City of Raleigh is scheduled to hold its municipal election on October 10, 2017 with a runoff, if needed, conducted on November 7, 2017. Legislation currently pending in the North Carolina General Assembly (H.B. 843) would move the elections to September 12, 2017 with a runoff, if needed on November 7, 2017.  

Per state law, early voting may begin no earlier than the third Thursday before the date of the election and may end no later than 1:00 P.M. on the Saturday directly before the election. The table below shows the dates that early voting would be allowed given the three possible election dates.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Date</th>
<th>Early Voting Days Allowed per NC Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 10, 2017</td>
<td>September 21, 2017-October 7, 2017 at 1:00 P.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7, 2017</td>
<td>October 19, 2017-November 4, 2017 at 1:00 P.M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Options and Cost for Early Voting

Council's first decision point is to determine service levels for the initial election. The cost associated with adding an additional early voting location depends on several factors: number of days offered, hours open, staffing and location. Staff worked with Wake County Board of Elections to determine an array of options, which are outlined below. Each option assumes that the city will request one location per Council district and will use a City of Raleigh facility. These costs do not include any facility costs, which would be incurred if a non-city owned facility was used as an early voting location. For each set of options below, the corresponding dates for each possible election are listed. Each set of options has two subsets; subset 1 represents shorter hours of operation while subset 2 represents longer hours of operation.

**Option A**

5.5 Days of Early Voting  
September 5-9 (4.5 days due to Labor Day)  
October 2-7  
October 30-November 4 (for runoff, if needed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subset 1</th>
<th>Subset 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>A-2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$64,900</td>
<td>$76,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monday-Friday 11:00 A.M.-7:00 P.M.  
Saturday 8:30 A.M.-1:00 P.M.

Monday-Friday 8:30 A.M.-7:00 P.M.  
Saturday 8:30 A.M.-1:00 P.M.

**Option B**

3.5 Days of Early Voting  
September 6-9  
October 4-7  
November 1-4 (for runoff, if needed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subset 1</th>
<th>Subset 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>B-2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$47,600</td>
<td>$53,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wednesday-Friday 11:00 A.M.-7:00 P.M.  
Saturday 8:30 A.M.-1:00 P.M.

Wednesday-Friday 8:30 A.M.-7:00 P.M.  
Saturday 8:30 A.M.-1:00 P.M.

**Option C**

2.5 Days of Early Voting  
September 7-9  
October 5-7  
November 2-4 (for runoff, if needed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subset 1</th>
<th>Subset 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>C-2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$41,800</td>
<td>$44,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday-Friday 11:00 A.M.-7:00 P.M.  
Saturday 8:30 A.M.-1:00 P.M.

Thursday-Friday 8:30 A.M.-7:00 P.M.  
Saturday 8:30 A.M.-1:00 P.M.

The Town of Cary offers one early voting location for its municipal elections. The single location is open Wednesday-Saturday (3.5 days) the week directly before the election date. The hours of operation are Wednesday-Friday 11:00 A.M. – 7:00 P.M. and Saturday 10:00 A.M.-1:00 P.M.

Staff suggests that Council mirror the offerings of the Town of Cary; opening five sites in each council district for 3.5 days, which is illustrated in Option B-1. The one difference that staff suggests is longer hours on Saturday to accommodate citizens that cannot vote during the work week. The total costs for this suggested option is $47,600.
Council’s second decision point is to determine if staff should budget for early voting in the case of a runoff in the Mayor or at large race. In this case, staff would suggest opening early voting locations in all five council districts for 3.5 days or what is illustrated in Option B-1. The total costs for this runoff option plus the initial election early voting would total $95,200.

It would be appropriate for Council to direct staff on which level of service desired for both the initial election and a potential runoff election.

Locations Used in Raleigh Early Elections
Staff from Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources (PRCR) have identified five potential sites, one in each Council district, which could be utilized as early voting locations. These sites have previously been used as polling locations and have the necessary infrastructure to serve in that capacity, which is required by Wake County Board of Elections. This infrastructure includes dedicated data lines in polling rooms and appropriate ADA accommodations.

Final site selection will be dependent on community center programming needs and the dates of the election. Staff expects to provide these final selection recommendations to the Wake County Board of Elections in July. Final site selection rests with the Wake County Board of Elections. A list of the possible sites, per Council district, is attached to this memo.

Funding
If Council wishes to proceed with early voting for the 2017 municipal elections, including potential runoffs, there are two options for funding this request.

- Council could direct staff to appropriate remaining budget from FY 17 Council contingency ($58,100) to fund early voting locations. The remaining costs ($37,100) would come from general fund capital reserve, or
- Council could direct staff to fund the full costs ($95,200) for early voting from general fund capital reserve.

If either City Council or you have additional questions regarding early voting or need additional information, please let us know.
### Possible Sites for Early Voting Per Council District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Previously used as an Early Voting Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimist Community Center</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sertoma Arts Center</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Gordon Center for Active Adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrook Exchange Community Center</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Road Community Center</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbots Creek Community Center</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Creek Community Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District C</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chavis Community Center</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Community Center</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax Community Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthdale Community Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwell Community Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanderford Community Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District D</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Road Community Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullen Community Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Pines Community Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Drive Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District E</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Lynn Community Center</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Hills Community Center</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Eden Pilot Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMO TO: Ruffin Hall, City Manager
FROM: David Eatman, Transit Administrator
SUBJECT: Budget Note 5 – Youth Fare Transit Proposal

Background
At the May 16 Council Meeting, Council Member Crowder requested a budget note regarding the impacts and opportunities associated with expanding free youth fares on all GoRaleigh transit services to include those between the ages of 13 and 18.

GoRaleigh currently provides free fares for children 12 years and younger, as well as a reduced fare for youth between 13 and 18 years of age. A one-way youth fare is $.60 per trip, half the base fare. Weekly and monthly reduced fare options are also available. Approximately 20% of 93,500 annual reduced fares are attributed to youth fares between 13 and 18 years of age. Proof of age is verified on GoRaleigh buses by showing a valid school ID. Students without a school ID may receive a regionally accepted GoRaleigh ID to show eligibility for the reduced fare.

During last year’s budget process, Council members suggested that GoRaleigh work collaboratively with the Wake County School System to promote youth ridership and foster greater transit use. In response to this request, staff has attended several meetings with representatives from the Wake County Board of Education and school transportation officials to share future plans and to develop strategies for increased coordination. The importance of future opportunities and coordination were discussed in light of increased transit coverage and frequencies related to the Wake Transit Plan. Access to schools during traditional school hours and after school program activities were also discussed as priority concerns. In addition, GoRaleigh has engaged charter schools located within existing Travel Demand Management hot spot areas. Travel training, GoRaleigh ID’s, and transit 101 courses have been provided to meet individual schools program needs. This work will continue into FY2018.

Next Steps
The loss in revenue from converting the 13 to 18-year-old reduced fare option to a free fare is projected to be $150,000. If City Council chooses to provide free fare and absorb the $150,000 loss in revenue, an additional $150,000 would need to be identified to offset this loss. Budget and Management Services (BMS) and the Transportation Department propose Council consider the following funding sources:

- **Option One**: Fund the entire $150,000 amount through an ongoing General Fund contribution.
Choosing this funding option would hold the current expenditures within the transit fund harmless and increase the General Fund transfer into the fund by $150,000. Identified funding for this program would need to be ongoing and will likely increase over the years as ridership increases, particularly with the implementation of the Wake County Transit Plan. Hours of service may double and possibly triple over the next decade with the implementation of this plan. If youth fares remain constant or increase, as new and expanded service levels are introduced, fares from 13 to 18-year-olds may reach $450,000 by 2026.

This option would therefore require City Council to identify an ongoing $150,000 amount in expenditures to decrease within the current Proposed FY2018 budget. Council would also need to consider the aforementioned increase in future years as a part of future budget processes.

- **Option Two:** Fund the entire $150,000 through the current amount allocated to the transit fund within the FY2018 Proposed Budget.

Choosing this option would require a decrease in expenditures of $150,000. If Council chooses this option, this decrease would most likely affect existing transit service. At a current average service hour cost of $82.50 per hour a service reduction of 1,818 bus route hours would be necessary to offset lost revenues. In comparison, the Route 102 Express Route from Downtown Raleigh to White Oak Shopping Center in Garner provides weekday AM and PM peak services and logs approximately 1,900 hours annually. GoRaleigh service hours for FY2018 will include 257,200 hours on regular routes, 17,800 on contracted routes and 15,350 hours for the upcoming Wake Transit Plan. If this option was implemented, staff would work with the Raleigh Transit Authority to identify the least impactful service level changes.

- **Option Three:** Ask the Transit Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC) to cover a potential fare reduction in FY2018 through the Wake Transit Plan.

During the FY2017 budget process, Council requested that staff consider this option. The non-supplantation work group, a group created by the TPAC, continues to work on a strategy for meeting legislative requirements for supplantation while allowing for future interpretation of the legislation. If Council wishes to pursue the Wake Transit Plan as a potential future funding source, this request may be more appropriate in FY2019, once these variables have been defined.

If you or Council Members have additional questions regarding the 13 to 18-year-old free fare proposal, or would like additional details, please do not hesitate to let us know.
At the May 16, 2017 City Council meeting, Mayor McFarlane referred a request for an increase of $3,000 for the Mayor’s Committee for Persons with Disabilities (RMCPD) to the June 5 budget work session.

RMCPD is requesting the increase due to cost increases in interpreter services incurred over the past three years. During the May 16, 2017 Council meeting, RMCPD Chair James Benton noted the Committee has also recently been informed they will no longer have access to a local college to host their “Employer Resource Day” event at no cost. Additional background information regarding the request and minutes from the May 16, 2017 Council meeting can be found in the attachments.

The RMCPD has been funded annually at $9,000 since FY04. From FY97 through FY03, the committee received $7,000 annually. Options for funding the requested increase in FY18 include the following:

- Use a portion of the remaining FY17 or the proposed FY18 Council contingency.
- Use a portion of the proposed FY18 Other Outside Agency grant reserve.

At present, boards and commissions have the opportunity to request funding increases through the annual budget process. Following the completion of their annual work plan in May, RMCPD made the decision to request a funding increase directly to Council.

If you or Council Members have additional questions regarding the RMCPD request, or would like to see additional details, please let us know.
The Raleigh Historic Development Commission has reviewed the applications and found that they meet the criteria for designation contained in the General Statutes and Unified Development Ordinance. The Unified Development Ordinance sets out certain actions for the City Council to take in regard to the applications.

**Recommendation:** Refer the applications to the Department of Natural and Cultural Resources, Office of Archives and History for analysis and recommendations concerning the reports; authorize a joint public hearing before the City Council and the Raleigh Historic Development Commission on the evening of July 5, 2017 to receive public comment on the historic landmark report and proposed landmark designations.

Tania Tully – presented. Routine request

MAB – moved approval
BG – second
8-0

I. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAYOR’S COMMITTEE FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

1. **Annual Work Plan**

The proposed annual work plan for FY 2017-18 will be presented, which includes a request for additional funding for the committee. Additional information regarding the request was included with the agenda packet.

**Recommendation:** Approve the annual work plan. Refer the request for funding to the scheduled budget work sessions.

James Benton – Chair of Committee. Laurie Millette (sec'y), Rev. Robert Owens (Vice Chair), Bob Evans (Chair of Subcomm on Recreation), Cathey Ector (City Liaison with Housing and Neighborhoods). Asked them to stand if they were in audience. Wonderful to be part of the City of Raleigh. Leave Sunday by bus for Phoenix and as I travel, I won't see a place better than Raleigh. Today asking for increase in annual budget. Currently $9,000 – respectfully request increase to $12,000. We've incurred significant cost increase over last few years for interpreters for deaf and hard of hearing at our meetings – happy and honored to provide this service so people can attend and be part of our meetings and activities. W/regard to activities we plan and want to be part of on an annual basis, it cuts deep into the funds that are currently allocated. In FY 2016-17, approx one-third of our budget will be for these interpreter costs. Over last dozen years or so, have hosted Employer Resource Day. Takes place in July near anniversary of signing of ADA – July 26, 1990 by President George H.W. Bush. ERD brings 75 or more employers together to learn about ways they can be more proactive in providing opps for people w/disabilities at work sites. It's opp to explain pros/cons of ADA. Great way to highlight recipients of our scholarship awards. Ms. Millette is Chair of Scholarship Comm. We've been
providing two scholarships $1K each to deserving members of community since 2003. We've been hosting this at local college in area and aren't charged for space to do this. However, will no longer have access to that after this year, so cost to put on this event will rise next year. One of our signature events, along with Awards Recognition Banquet. Gave you an outline of our work plan and more thorough description of need for addl funding and its purpose/use – but didn't add need relative to losing university space for ERD. Please consider request - vital for us. Want to make sure every mtg and every activity is accessible to everyone who wants to take part. Want to continue providing svcs we've been providing for so long. Don't want our services diminished at this point in City's growth. Raleigh is great place for people with or without disabilities.

Mayor – you do a wonderful job and I thank you. You're one of the best conflict resolution people I've ever met – always impressed w/things you do. Asked Admin for budget note.

BG – moved to approve work plan
MAB – second
8-0

J. REQUESTS AND PETITIONS OF CITIZENS

1. Joseph Hartman would like to discuss the voting policy on sidewalk petitions and request that they be considered the same as bond issues.

Joseph Hartman – sidewalk petition failed because the process has bias built in. Can vote one way FOR petition – yes. Can vote two ways AGAINST petition – either vote no or don't vote at all, which counts as a negative vote. Bond issues don't treat no-votes as negative votes. Treat sidewalk votes same way as bond votes for a safer city.

BG – interesting approach.

KCC – agree we wouldn't pass bonds if we counted no-vote as against the bond.

Mayor – often other factors come into play.

Speaker – 160A-217 states majority of property owners being assessed would get vote, need 50% plus one. We no longer have to hold to that procedure since we no longer assess for sidewalks.

Ruffin – this is a Council policy decision. You can change threshold for Council decisions. Staff can develop a report re same. May wish to consider relationship between 50% threshold and vote counting and whether it would make a difference.

TO TT
Memorandum

To: Ruffin Hall, City Manager
From: Larry M. Jarvis, AICP
       Director, Housing and Neighborhoods Department
Subject: City Council Agenda – May 16, 2017
        Mayor’s Committee for Persons with Disabilities
Date: May 3, 2017

During the past three business cycles, there has been a substantial increase in the costs for interpreter services for the Raleigh Mayor’s Committee for Persons with Disabilities (RMCPD) monthly meetings and special events.

As a result, the RMCPD has been unable to fund special projects such as the Summer Eye Retreat Camp, the Youth Leadership Forum, and seminars on housing and health care. The Awards Banquet has also been adversely affected as adjustments had to be made in order to keep the costs lower.

In their Report and Recommendation to Council, during which the Chair will present the Committee’s 2017-2018 Work Plan, they are requesting $3,000 in addition to their annual $9,000 grant. The increase would assist in the development and support of the programs outlined in the attached work plan and would adequately cover the cost of interpreter services.

Attachments
Memorandum:

To: Mayor, Nancy McFarlane  
City of Raleigh  
May 2, 2017

From: James E. Benton, Sr.  
Chair: Raleigh Mayor’s Committee for Persons with Disabilities

Subject: Budget Increase

Dear Mayor, McFarlane:

The RMCPD has worked incredibly well in managing the funds set forth in the City’s annual budget for many years.

These funds have been used to support two annual scholarships, a citywide recognition banquet, sponsoring an employer resource day, and a variety of seminars and workshops designed to generate empowerment for people with disabilities in our community.

During the past three business cycles, we have realized a substantial increase in the amount of funds necessary to cover the cost for interpreter service for our monthly meetings and special events.

Due to the increase for the interpreter service, the RMCPD has not been in a position to fund special projects such as the Summer Eye Retreat camp, the Youth Leadership Forum, and seminars on housing and health care. Additionally, we have made adjustments to the Awards Banquet in order to keep our cost lower. This event has been adversely impacted by the funding adjustments.

Our organization is granted $9,000 each year and the funding is richly appreciated. We would however, like to request an increase of $3,000 in order to adequately cover the cost of the interpreter service and have a full budget to develop and support the programs outlined in our work plan.

We believe that the RMCPD, which has a strong membership and a history of dedication to our citizens, is deserving of this consideration. We thank you for reviewing this request.

If I as Chair can address any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

It is an honor to serve this committee, and to have the RMCPD be a beacon of hope for all people of the City of Raleigh!

James-B.

James Benton  
Ph-919-740-2398/c
RALEIGH MAYOR’S COMMITTEE FOR
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES
WORK PLAN 2017 - 2018

The Raleigh Mayor’s Committee for Persons with Disabilities hereafter referred to as the Committee, has been in existence for more than four decades. Since the mid 1980’s, the leadership of the City of Raleigh has provided the Committee with financial support and partnership with City departments to ensure that issues and concerns confronting the disability community are addressed.

The Committee meets monthly on the third Thursday of each month at the Avery C. Upchurch Building, 222 West Hargett Street, Room 305. Meetings are called to order at 12:00 noon and are adjourned at 1:00 pm. During these sessions, topics relating to advocacy for persons with disabilities are discussed and the sub committee chairpersons provide reports to the persons in attendance.

The Committee is composed of four executive officers and nine sub committee chairpersons who are appointed by the mayor annually. The public is welcome to attend meetings. The officers are Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary, and Treasurer. The list of sub committees are as follows: Awards Banquet, Employer Resource Day, Housing, Health and Wellness, Public Access, Public Information, Recreation, Scholarship, Transportation and Nominations.

Role and Purpose of the Sub Committees
Awards Banquet
Our annual awards banquet provides recognition of businesses and individuals who have made positive contributions towards the enhancement of life for persons with disabilities. Awards Banquets have featured a keynote speaker, comments from the Mayor or designee, and occasionally entertainment and vendor booths. The Awards Banquet is typically the largest event for the Committee averaging more than 100 attendees. Changes have been implemented to conserve funds such as a less expensive venue and inexpensive lunch.

Employer Resource Day
For more than three decades beginning in the mid 1980’s, the Committee sponsored an annual job fair. This event was designed to bring employers and persons with disabilities together to meet and discuss job options. For many years there were positive outcomes realized by both the employers and the applicants. Due to a changing job market in the late 1990’s, attendance by employers waned. Consequently, the leadership of the committee embarked upon a new approach and developed what is now known as the Employer Resource Day; a seminar for local employers to learn about laws and best practices in the employment of persons with disabilities. A breakfast is provided by the Committee to entice employers to attend. This event is scheduled during the last week of July to commemorate the anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which was made law by President Bush on July 26, 1990.

Employers learn about compliance with the ADA, best practices pertaining to persons with disabilities, and to dispel myths about employing persons with disabilities. The Employer Resource Day hosts approximately 50 employers annually.
Health and Wellness
This committee’s charge is to advocate for persons with disabilities as it pertains to both health and wellness, provide information to persons with disabilities who will be maneuvering through the Affordable Care Act and provide information on how this law affects them.

Housing
The Housing sub committee chair attends fair housing meetings and affordable housing conferences, and provides information regarding accessibility to affordable, accessible housing in the City. The Committee maintains a strong relationship with the Raleigh Housing Authority as well as with the management teams of several local apartment complexes that feature accessible housing.

Nomination
The nomination sub committee oversees the process for electing officers and sub committee chairs.

Public Access
The Public Access sub committee was formed to aid in resolving issues within the City that involve accessibility to public buildings, parking, sidewalks, entertainment venues and other public facilities. This sub committee chair attends meetings with City leaders and community advocates who are working to find resolution to various public access issues.

Public Information
The Public Information sub committee chair works closely with the Community Services Division of the City of Raleigh. This subcommittee handles updates to the Committee’s website, publicity, flyers for upcoming events, and committee brochures.

Recreation
This sub committee focuses on recreation and leisure activities in the City of Raleigh with emphasis on activities for persons who are disabled.

From audio described performances to the Special Olympics, our recreation sub committee is at the forefront. For the last several summers, the Sarina’s Song hot air balloon project has come to Raleigh. This project is specifically designed to provide persons with disabilities with the opportunity to ride in a hot air balloon. A portion of the Committee’s annual budget is made available to support this incredible life experience. The Committee plans to continue to support this event on an annual basis.

Scholarship
Annually the City has funded the Committee with $2000 for the purpose of providing a $1000 scholarship to two persons with disabilities. The Scholarship subcommittee chair administers the process. The recipient must be a person with a disability who is a resident of Raleigh and has been accepted or is attending an accredited school of higher undergraduate education. The applicant may choose an academic or a vocational award. The winners of the scholarship are recognized and given a plaque at the Employer Resource Day breakfast in July.

Transportation
The Committee has a pivotal role in developing and sustaining affordable transportation for Raleigh’s disability community. In 1989, the Raleigh City Council enacted legislation to provide what is known
today as the Accessible Raleigh Transportation Program (Tier I). Several years later, the City of Raleigh began to provide paratransit services, which are required by the Americans with Disabilities Act. Over the years, the program has endured necessary changes.

The Committee works closely with the Transit Administration of the City of Raleigh. Public forums and electronic feedback centers were developed to inform the users of Paratransit service (Tier II) of changes and adjustments in the program. The strong partnership with the Transit Administration and the Committee has ensured that Raleigh’s disability community continues to be a leader in exceptional transportation. The City Council aided in the development of a plan with the Raleigh Transit Authority that enhances and sustains transportation services for our citizens with disabilities for years to come.

**Conclusion**

The Committee is a group of individuals who believe that a person’s disability should not prohibit him or her from accessing and enjoying life fully on a day-to-day basis. People have the right to work, have appropriate housing, the ability to move from point to point, and have access to the ultimate empowerment tool, education. With these key building blocks in place, we can all realize positive life experiences.
June 5th Budget Work Session
Question and Answers

Compensation Study Recommendations

Council Member Cox posed the following questions to staff following the proposed budget presentation on May 16, 2017.

How do the pay structures get adjusted over time?

We will establish a system to regularly evaluate market data and assess the competitiveness of our pay ranges. Beginning in FY2019, we plan to review market pay data annually to determine if market changes require pay range adjustments to remain competitive. We also plan to conduct a more comprehensive market pay survey for specific benchmark positions at least every three to five years to ensure our pay structures remain competitive.

How are we addressing pay compression?

One of the benefits of implementing a step structure pay system is placing employees onto a step based on both their current pay and time in current position. This approach helps address issues of pay compression since typically an employee with more time in position will be placed in a higher step than another employee with less time in the current position. Likewise, typically a person who has been performing a job longer will have a higher rate of pay than another employee who has been performing the job a lesser amount of time. The combination of these two factors being used to make initial step assignments in the step structure pay plan should address issues of pay compression.

It should be noted that we have always had issues of pay compression and that we will never totally eliminate them. However, sometimes market conditions will create situations that create pay compression issues. Whenever it is possible, we will always try to make decisions that avoid or minimize creating pay compression.

Why are there concerns of newer employees being hired in making as much as or more than longer tenured employees?

With the exception of our entry-level police and fire academy hires who all start at the exact same pay rate, the starting pay of new employees is reflective of their relevant experience and skills for the position they are being hired into. In addition to considering potential issues of internal equity for current employees with similar or greater levels of experience, we also consider the local labor pool and market conditions when determining a new employee’s starting pay. This can result in newer employees being hired in at a salary greater than a longer tenured employee.
**Why is the minimum for Fire Battalion Chief lower than Captain? (Referencing page A-8 in the Compensation Study Recommendations booklet)**

In this specific example the two positions are in different pay structures. The Fire Captain position is in the proposed step pay structure while the Fire Battalion Chief is in the proposed broadband pay structure. Job Classifications are assigned to a range. Since there is not a separate pay range for each individual job classification, individual jobs are “grouped” with other jobs that have similar duties and responsibilities and market value.

Our consultant used the custom market salary survey data collected from the 27 municipalities that submitted data to our consultant in November 2016 to develop the proposed pay ranges. Each pay range establishes the midpoint as the target market rate for positions assigned to that range. The broadband structure has a range width of 85%, while the step structure has a narrower width of 62%, leaving the pay minimum of the Fire Battalion Chief slightly lower than the minimum of the Fire Captain. The range midpoint and range maximum of the Fire Battalion Chief is higher, however, than that of the Fire Captain.

**Why are questions being asked at employee meetings not being answered during the meetings?**

We have attempted to be very transparent with employees while in the process of developing our new compensation system. This transparency has means that there have been times when we share information and there are questions that have not yet been answered.

We held eight employee meetings across the City the week of May 15th that were attended by almost 1,000 employees. These meetings were led by Human Resources and an Assistant City Manager and were designed to review the proposed job classification and pay structure information contained in the letter employees received describing their proposed new assigned job classification and pay structure.

While many questions about the proposed new job classifications and pay structures were answered, there were also questions raised about how the pay structures are going to be implemented, how employees are going to be placed in the proposed new pay structures and the individual pay impact of these decisions (particularly the step pay structure) that were not answered since these decisions had not yet been finalized.

Many of these questions were addressed in the proposed FY2018 Budget, which includes recommendations for implementing the new pay structures. Employees will receive additional information in mid-July, including their step placement (if applicable) and their new salary effective September 30, 2017.
Council Member Stephenson posed the following question to staff on May 17th.

Can you provide fee comparison charts for the Solid Waste fee and the Public Utilities fee similar to the property tax rate benchmark bar chart?

Response: Included below, you will find a fee comparison chart for Public Utilities and a chart Solid Waste Services. The charts include adopted fees for FY17 and Raleigh’s proposed FY18 fee.

FY2017 Monthly Public Utilities Fees

The fees included below are based on an average residential customer with a 5/8” meter and a 5 CCF monthly usage.

*Garner, Rolesville and Wake Forest have the same utility rates as Raleigh and will be adjusted in FY18 to $56.10 per month for the average customer.
The chart below includes the monthly fee for comparator cities which use a funding model similar to the City of Raleigh’s model.

The following municipalities fund the solid waste function with General Fund revenues and do not charge a separate fee, and are excluded from this comparison.

- Garner
- Morrisville
- Wake Forest
- Chapel Hill
- Durham
- Winston-Salem
- Greensboro
- Carrboro

The City of Charlotte uses property tax revenues to support collection of garbage, recyclables, yard waste, and bulky waste. They assess an annual fee of $20.50 to pay for the disposal of trash at the landfill. Charlotte residents also pay an annual fee to Mecklenburg County for recycling and waste reduction services and facilities throughout the county.

The City of Fayetteville assesses a $44 annual fee for residential solid waste collection. Fayetteville also transfers funds from the General Fund to support service delivery.
Primary Art Funding Sources

Council Member Stephenson posed the following question to staff on May 25th.

What are the major funding sources for art and what are the percentage and dollar amounts for these funding sources?

Response: The major funding source for art in the City of Raleigh budget is General Fund revenues (including property tax, sales tax, fees, etc.). The allocation methods used for art funding include the Percent for Art allocation, the Arts per Capita, and general support for arts programming.

Percent for Art Allocation

The Percent for Art allocation is 1% of all eligible expenses for capital improvements that provide significant general public access. There are no additional projects proposed in the FY18-22 Capital Improvement Program that are eligible for the Percent for Art allocation.

Arts per Capita

The Arts per Capita allocation is $5 for each resident, a population of 451,066, for the FY18 Proposed Budget. This equates to $2,225,300 for FY18. An additional $575,970 of General Fund dollars are also appropriated for existing lease or operating agreements between the City and the Carolina Ballet, North Carolina Symphony, Raleigh Little Theatre, and Theatre in the Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts Per Capita Grant Awards</th>
<th>$1,801,058</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Raleigh Arts Commission Programs</td>
<td>219,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Commission Staff Support</td>
<td>234,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arts Agencies Appropriations</td>
<td>575,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,831,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arts Programming

The General Fund appropriation for arts programming in the FY18 Proposed Budget totals $993,012. These funds support both the Office of Raleigh Arts staff and expenses and Pullen and Sertoma Arts Centers staff and expenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Raleigh Arts</th>
<th>$504,169</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pullen and Sertoma Arts Centers</td>
<td>488,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$993,012</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arts Agency Grants

Overview
The City of Raleigh arts grant program is the official vehicle for municipal support to the City's arts organizations, providing support for a diverse range of opportunities, including city arts festivals, live theatre, dance and music performances, visual arts exhibitions and youth arts programs. The arts grant program has been critical to the development of many of Raleigh's cultural organizations, helping to bring stability to the city's arts community and providing leverage for groups to seek business, foundation and other agency matching grants. Arts and culture-related industries (collectively known as "creative industries") have provided direct economic benefits to Raleigh by creating jobs, attracting new investments, generating tax revenues and stimulating tourism and consumer purchases.

The current per capita allocation for arts is $5.00 which, based on a population of 451,066, brings the total arts per capita funding level for FY18 to $2,225,330, an increase of 2.5% over FY17. Arts per capita funding is disbursed by the Raleigh Arts Commission, and a portion of the funding supports three positions in the Parks, Recreation & Cultural Resources budget: a Public Art Coordinator, an Arts Grant Program Coordinator, and a Curator. In addition to the per capita allocation, an additional $575,970 is provided for through existing lease or operating agreements between the City and the following performing arts organizations: Carolina Ballet, North Carolina Symphony, Raleigh Little Theatre, and Theatre in the Park.

Adopted budget information as well as grant funding amounts requested by each agency for FY18 appears on the following page. Raleigh Dance Theatre, funded in FY17, did not submit a request for FY18 funding. A multi-year history of grant awards is available from the Office of Raleigh Arts.

Additional information regarding arts agency appropriations may be obtained by contacting Sarah Corrin, Arts Grant Coordinator, at (919) 996-4686 or via e-mail at Sarah.Corrin@raleighnc.gov.
## Budget Detail

### Arts Per Capita Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Adopted 2015-16</th>
<th>Adopted 2016-17</th>
<th>Requested 2017-18</th>
<th>Proposed 2017-18</th>
<th>Change FY17-FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts Access</td>
<td>16,496</td>
<td>16,037</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>19,753</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Together</td>
<td>150,209</td>
<td>164,603</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>170,188</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artspace</td>
<td>171,563</td>
<td>168,355</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>168,188</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artsplosion</td>
<td>168,319</td>
<td>169,516</td>
<td>172,490</td>
<td>163,434</td>
<td>(3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning Coal Theatre Company</td>
<td>84,515</td>
<td>91,722</td>
<td>102,500</td>
<td>82,700</td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Designer Craftsmen Guild</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Music Raleigh</td>
<td>33,650</td>
<td>26,917</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>20,187</td>
<td>(25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Voice of NC</td>
<td>10,416</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>10,648</td>
<td>(24.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Music School</td>
<td>38,133</td>
<td>39,630</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>34,664</td>
<td>(25.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Art Foundation</td>
<td>113,875</td>
<td>152,124</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>154,625</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Pueblo</td>
<td>22,670</td>
<td>23,514</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>21,054</td>
<td>(10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Focus</td>
<td>21,898</td>
<td>14,423</td>
<td>24,999</td>
<td>15,664</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Theater Project</td>
<td>53,923</td>
<td>66,500</td>
<td>75,600</td>
<td>74,736</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marbles Kids Museum</td>
<td>13,880</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>18,014</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Master Chorale</td>
<td>49,169</td>
<td>53,581</td>
<td>57,415</td>
<td>51,168</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Museum History Foundation</td>
<td>24,327</td>
<td>23,389</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>22,580</td>
<td>(3.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Opera</td>
<td>152,240</td>
<td>159,724</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>150,938</td>
<td>(5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC State University Theatre</td>
<td>12,177</td>
<td>15,224</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>15,621</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Theatre</td>
<td>168,563</td>
<td>160,755</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>155,963</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Raleigh Arts &amp; Creative Theatre</td>
<td>20,312</td>
<td>20,469</td>
<td>24,999</td>
<td>18,874</td>
<td>(7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuv Yug Cultural Organization</td>
<td>13,640</td>
<td>14,522</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>13,523</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Edge</td>
<td>6,314</td>
<td>7,037</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>9,411</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philharmonic Association</td>
<td>14,888</td>
<td>23,007</td>
<td>24,999</td>
<td>23,691</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PineCone</td>
<td>108,900</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh Boychoir</td>
<td>214,700</td>
<td>254,273</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>299,225</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh Civic Symphony Association</td>
<td>5,982</td>
<td>8,016</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,371</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh Dance Theatre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh Little Theatre</td>
<td>23,991</td>
<td>23,505</td>
<td>24,999</td>
<td>21,738</td>
<td>(7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh Ringers</td>
<td>20,357</td>
<td>18,430</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>18,051</td>
<td>(2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh St. Patrick’s Day Parade Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,408</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>18,034</td>
<td>18,421</td>
<td>16,960</td>
<td>14,401</td>
<td>(21.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art Exchange</td>
<td>969,875</td>
<td>971,455</td>
<td>104,055</td>
<td>104,955</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Enterprises</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>4,868</td>
<td>(15.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Arts Agency Grants</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,660,515</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,792,930</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,008,409</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,801,058</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Arts Agency Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Adopted 2015-16</th>
<th>Adopted 2016-17</th>
<th>Requested 2017-18</th>
<th>Proposed 2017-18</th>
<th>Change FY17-FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Ballet</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Symphony</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh Little Theatre</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>85,680</td>
<td>85,680</td>
<td>85,680</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre in the Park</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>40,290</td>
<td>40,290</td>
<td>40,290</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Arts Agencies</strong></td>
<td><strong>$573,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$575,970</strong></td>
<td><strong>$575,970</strong></td>
<td><strong>$575,970</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL ALL ARTS FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adopted 2015-16</th>
<th>Adopted 2016-17</th>
<th>Requested 2017-18</th>
<th>Proposed 2017-18</th>
<th>Change FY17-FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALL ARTS FUNDING</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,732,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,775,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,038,651</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,831,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 5, 2017

MEMO TO: Ruffin Hall, City Manager

FROM: Larry M. Jarvis, AICP, Housing & Neighborhoods Director
       Marionna Poke-Stewart, Community Service Program Manager

SUBJECT: Human Relations Commission Agency Grant – The ARC of the Triangle

At the April 5, 2017 budget work session, the Human Relations Commission (HRC) presented its agency grant recommendations for FY18 which Council subsequently approved. One agency recommended and approved for $8,000 in human services funding was the ARC of the Triangle. It was recently discovered, however, the agency is headquartered in Chapel Hill, NC which disqualified the agency from receiving any human service agency funds according to human services policy guidelines (attached). The ARC of the Triangle is a merger between the ARCs of Wake County, Durham County and Orange County. The ARC still maintains an office in Raleigh through which services will be provided to program participants.

The policy guidelines state that eligible applicants must be private non-profit organizations with experience in delivering the proposed service(s) to youth, the elderly, and/or the severely disadvantaged. Qualified applicants must have at least one year of recent experience in the delivery of services to the specified target group(s) and demonstrate sensitivity to the special needs of their clientele. The current guidelines further state that eligible organizations must also be those whose headquarters are located within the corporate limits of the City of Raleigh.

The ARC of Wake County has received funding through this process and was last funded in FY14.

Since the ARC of the Triangle had completed the entire process prior to the above findings, the HRC has granted a waiver for FY18, allowing, the ARC to receive the original amount of $8,000 recommended by HRC and approved by Council. The HRC and City staff will reevaluate the headquarters policy requirement and provide recommendations to Council before the FY19 human services agency grant process begins.
The City of Raleigh has established a policy and position on the funding of human service agencies. The policy reflects the desire to provide supplemental funding to agencies which address human needs within the City, especially the needs of youth, elderly, and the severely disadvantaged (disabled, homeless, and substance abusers).

Target group definitions as defined by the City of Raleigh are:

**Youth:** Any person 19 years old or younger.

**Elderly:** Any person 55 years old or older.

**Homeless:** Any person who does not have a permanent residence; to include a battered spouse who is facing loss of his/her residence due to threat of bodily harm and any person who is facing eviction (e.g., having received notice to vacate property).

**Disabled:** Any person who has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more major life activities; has a record of such impairment; or is regarded as having such impairment. This definition is consistent with the definitions found in federal law regarding a disabled person. The definition excludes active alcoholism or drug addiction and conditions that are temporary in nature.

**Substance Abusers:** Any person who abuses alcohol and/or drugs to the point that it affects his/her ability to cope with himself/herself and creates problems for his/her family, neighbors, and community.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Eligible applicants must be private non-profit organizations with experience in delivering the proposed service(s) to youth, the elderly, and/or the severely disadvantage. Qualified applicants must have at least one year of recent experience in the delivery of services to the specified target group(s) and demonstrate sensitivity to the special needs of their clientele. They must be organizations whose headquarters are located within the corporate limits of the City of Raleigh.

All funding recommendations will be based on available funds. Currently funded organizations may be given first consideration for continuing City support.

**ASSISTANCE**

The City of Raleigh’s Community Engagement Division (CED) staff is available for grantsmanship counseling relating to proposals to the City. Prospective applicants are encouraged to consult CED staff prior to submission of an application.

An application and information on the funding process may be obtained from:

**Mailing Address**
City of Raleigh
Community Engagement Division
P. O. Box 590
Raleigh, NC 27602
(919) 996-6100

**Street Address**
City of Raleigh
Community Engagement Division
310 West Martin Street, Suite 201
Raleigh, NC 27601
(919) 996-6100