
REDEVELOPMENT



COMMISSION

MEMO

To: Redevelopment Commission Members
From: Tom Wisemiller, Economic Development Project Coordinator
Date: November 2, 2015
SUBJECT: Redevelopment Commission Meeting

The Redevelopment Commission is scheduled to meet for a regular business meeting on Tuesday, November 3rd, 2015 at the Greenville City Hall.

The main business item for this meeting is for the Redevelopment Commission to elect new committee members to serve on the Small Business Plan Competition Selection Committee. This committee must be in place to facilitate the next round of applications, which will be submitted and under review *prior to* the end of this RDC term.

Given the limited number of business items, this packet includes only the Agenda and Minutes. And, thankfully, this Election Night meeting is expected to be brief.

We look forward to seeing you at the meeting. If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to call me at 329-4514.

Redevelopment Commission Meeting
Tuesday, November 3rd, 2015 ~ 5:30 PM

City Council Chambers ~ 200 West 5th Street

Agenda

- I. Welcome
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Minutes – October 6th, 2015
- IV. Update on Hodges Alley Improvements
- V. Public Comment Period
- VI. Election of Small Business Plan Competition Selection Subcommittee
- VII. Report from Secretary
 - a. Monthly Financial Report
- VIII. Comments from Commission Members
- IX. Adjournment

DRAFT OF MINUTES PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION
Redevelopment Commission
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 6, 2015
Greenville, North Carolina

Present:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Angela Marshall | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mark Woodson | <input type="checkbox"/> Sharif Hatoum |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jeremy King | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patricia Dunn | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judy Siguaw | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Patterson | |

Absent:

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Angela Marshall | <input type="checkbox"/> Mark Woodson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sharif Hatoum |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jeremy King | <input type="checkbox"/> Patricia Dunn | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Judy Siguaw | <input type="checkbox"/> Richard Patterson | |

Staff:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barbara Lipscomb, City Manager | <input type="checkbox"/> Casey Verburg |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Merrill Flood, Assistant City Manager | <input type="checkbox"/> Christian Lockamy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Kandie Smith, City Council Liaison | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Betty Moseley |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Wisemiller | <input type="checkbox"/> |
-

I. Welcome

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of Minutes – September 1, 2015

Motion was made by Mr. King and seconded by Mr. Patterson to approve the meeting minutes for September 1, 2015 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. Presentation on the Proposed Bond Referendum

Ms. Lipscomb gave the presentation for the proposed bond referendum.

The City of Greenville will have one bond question related to Street and Pedestrian Transportation on the November 3, 2015 ballot. The question will ask voters if they want to spend \$16 million to improve streets, provide sidewalks, and other improvements and transportation projects. A bond is an issuance of debt, similar to a home mortgage. This is a General Obligation bond which means that the City will use its taxing powers if necessary. The City will have seven years to issue the bond. The City has a legal debt capacity of \$444 million. Currently, outstanding debt is about \$41.1 million. Annual debt payments per year are about \$5 million. The last bond referendum was in 2004 and

included \$20.8 million for street improvements, the West Greenville revitalization plan, the Center City revitalization program, and storm water improvements. The bond rating for the City is AA. This is an excellent rating.

Street Improvements: \$10,000,000:

The City of Greenville is responsible for more than 700 lane miles of streets throughout the City. This ongoing project is designed to repair and maintain some of the worst of those roads. Project funds will be used to mill, repair, and resurface City-maintained roads. Streets are selected using a roadway conditions analysis (performed in 2014), Public Works maintenance records and sample road cores, utility coordination, suitability for resurfacing, and road classification - major or minor roadway.

Streets that are being considered and have been evaluated for repairs include Arlington Boulevard between Stantonsburg Road and Fire Tower Road, Elm Street between 14th Street and the Tar River, portions of Hooker Road, and several other major road segments.

West 5th Street Streetscape: \$1,950,000:

The design and construction of functional and aesthetic improvements to streets in West Greenville send a clear signal to residents and investors that West Greenville is in the midst of a revival. The streetscape project for West Fifth Street started with the 2004 bonds and included an area from Memorial Drive to several blocks east. Funds from this bond would continue streetscape improvements from Cadillac Street to Tyson Street. Improvements include modification of sidewalks and streets to enhance pedestrian safety, lighting improvements, public transit stops, planting of scenic trees and vegetation, storm water improvements, and the potential for civic art projects that celebrate the history and sense of place that make West Greenville special.

10th Street Connector Enhancements: \$1,750,000:

The 10th Street Connector is an NCDOT project currently underway that will connect 10th Street and Stantonsburg Road. This will become the primary route for visitors coming from areas west of Greenville to easily get into the downtown area. It will be a gateway to the heart of our city and one of the first impressions created for visitors.

The \$1,750,000 would fund the costs associated with the improvements that are above NCDOT's standards. In essence, this money will allow for extended and larger sidewalks, street lights, trees and other items to present a more beautiful first impression of our city. These enhancements will provide for pedestrian safety and encourage walking as a viable means of transportation.

Sidewalks: \$1,400,000:

This project would build about nine miles of sidewalks along thoroughfares and other high priority locations. Presently, many streets and major thoroughfares do not have sidewalks to provide safe travel for pedestrians. Projects have been evaluated and prioritized and will be completed as money permits. The City Council has prioritized approximately 33.5 miles of sidewalks for construction. The additional sidewalks and

sidewalk improvements throughout Greenville will improve pedestrian safety, community character and appeal, as well as encourage walking as a viable alternative means of transportation.

East Side Greenway: \$750,000:

The Federal Highway Administration recognizes greenways as shared-use paths that serve as “the arterials of the bicycle and pedestrian transportation system.” These paths, which are often referred to as linear parks, are really designed to create safe routes for non-vehicular traffic. Greenville’s greenways are primarily located in conservation areas along streams and the Tar River which lends to their use for relaxation and recreation; but their portions adjacent to streets helps provide access to various parts of the city. The greenways create a safe alternative for people who wish to travel via bicycle or on foot, but want to avoid traffic.

Funds for this extension would start to provide connection from the eastern side of Greenville all the way across town to the soon to be completed western extension (which ends at the VA Clinic near the hospital). Joggers, bicyclists, and walkers would have a safe path where they do not have to worry about competing with cars for road space. Greenways are also often cited as critical components leading to a higher quality of life which can help Greenville’s economic development teams attract and retain new businesses and investment along or near greenways.

Under North Carolina law, a local government holding a referendum for the purpose of issuing general obligation (G.O.) bonds must specify general categories of capital projects for which bond proceeds may be used. Within these categories, a local government may identify specific projects that are intended to be funded by the bond proceeds. However, due to the lengthy process involved with identifying, designing, and implementing projects, as well as the lack of detailed cost and other project information available at the time of the bond referendum, the specific projects identified in the bond package may change over time. The question that the actual bond referendum therefore asks of voters is whether the local government is authorized to use the G.O. bonds as a financing tool for the general category of projects up to the amount specified in the question.

Ms. Marshall asked if the 10th Street Connector and all surrounding areas will have sidewalks.

Ms. Lipscomb replied yes, the City will be doing the lights, shrubbery, and sidewalks.

Mr. King stated that these improvements are actually called betterments, which the City can do if done in conjunction to DOT’s work. It will save the tax payers money. He asked if the sidewalks around the 10th Street Connector will be walkable (due to the slope).

Ms. Lipscomb replied that even though the connector will go up, there will remain a section under it. Eventually, the two sections will meet up.

Mr. King stated that the portion of bond funds for the sidewalks, Reade and Cotanche Streets, and 5th Street streetscapes are being done in three phases. Phase I and II have been completed and the designs for Phase III have already been paid for by 2004 bonds.

Ms. Lipscomb replied that this project is “shovel” ready.

V. Update in GO Science Lease

Mr. Wisemiller introduced Mr. Roger Conner, Executive Director of GO Science. He gave a brief overview of the property purchase process and the lease agreement between RDC and GO Science. The RDC purchased the property at 729 Dickinson Avenue for the purpose of supporting the GO Science project. In 2013, the RDC and GO Science entered into a two-year lease agreement at \$1 per year to help facilitate development of the facility. The goal is to eventually transfer the property to GO Science when the facility is fully operational. Section 1 of the lease agreement stipulates that the lease agreement may be extended for another two-year period upon written request from GO Science. GO Science has submitted a letter requesting the extension.

Mr. Conner gave an update on the progress and program implementation at the new facility. GO Science is a publically supported nonprofit social enterprise that provides informal science education experiences to the general public. We have been providing outreach services to 29 counties in Eastern, NC for over ten years. GO Science is a part of the official Redevelopment Plan as approved by City Council, and we have been working towards the establishment of a City science and technology center in Uptown Greenville. The location, 729 Dickinson Ave, is centrally located with easy access from the West Greenville Community, East Carolina University, The City Center, and Central Greenville. It is located in a block positioned for both private and public development and redevelopment. It is also near the planned Intermodal Transportation Center and close to existing attractions such as the Library, Art Museum as well as Uptown Dining & Entertainment district. He delineated the location on a map. Environmental contamination was abated and cleaned-up at the facility. After signing the lease agreement, we were able to have a ground breaking ceremony.

During Phase I fundraising, GO Science raised over \$125,000 from private contributions. GO Science recently completed construction of Phase I of the center. Construction took longer than originally anticipated. Phase I includes a learning center, a store, a meeting space, innovative area, and two ADA accessible restrooms. Phase I of the Learning Center has a particular architecture: hands on, minds on program; workshop for the work force program; educational counseling program; teacher professional development program; and diversity & equality in STEM.

Over the summer, several preview events were held featuring our first traveling exhibit on Nanotechnology. Over 1,000 citizens visited the center during these preview events. Ms. Kristi Walters was hired as the full-time Director of Education to lead STEM programming and coordinate collaborations with partner organizations. Partnerships include work with A Time for Science in Ayden, River Park North, and the Marine

Laboratories on the Coast. The center averages two – three programs per day. Phase I Grand opening is scheduled for November 18, 2015.

GO Science is now focused on privately fundraising and planning construction for Phase II of the Center. This includes the Challenger Learning Center and expanded interactive exhibit space. Currently, half of the space will be allocated to traveling exhibits, and the remainder set up as multi-purpose space, hands on programs, science exhibits, cafes, and presentations. The rear area of the building has two large rollup doors that will be essential to bringing in the traveling exhibits.

Phase III will be focused on developing the remainder of the parcel. The goal is to create an urban science center. We are evaluating potential private mixed-use development partnerships.

GO Science as a keystone attraction, has increased the productivity of private investment in the area. Several large developments have been announced or planned near the center since redevelopment. The location of GO Science has strengthened infrastructure investment and prioritization. That area of Dickinson Avenue was denied high speed internet service. By bringing in the center, Suddenlink agreed to expand their network along that area of Dickinson Avenue so all businesses there could benefit from HSI. Ultimately, it all impacts the lives and futures of our children. The focus is on providing the science, mathematics, and technology that will make them competitive adults in the future and create jobs that don't even exist today.

Mr. Woodson asked if the main issue before the commission was the extension of the lease.

Mr. Wisemiller replied yes.

Mr. King asked what the acquisition date of the building was and what the price was.

Mr. Flood replied December 2010 and the purchase price was \$378,000.

Mr. King asked if the RDC put in \$200,000 for up fit.

Mr. Flood replied yes. Part of that and the Brownfield grant was used for the cleanup of environmental issues.

Mr. King stated that with the purchase price, RDC input and the Brownfield grant, there has been approximately \$600,000 invested on this piece of property. The commission owes it to the tax payers to see what they have accomplished thus far before extending the two year lease. The original lease was entered into in November 2013. The first time Mr. Conner appeared before this board was in 2009 regarding the purchase of the building. So in 2013, the purchase was complete, the contractors were hired, and the cleanup had been done. Two years ago, before we turned over the property to you, I asked specifically, if we set up the lease for \$1 per year, when would there be people in

the seats. You responded ten weeks. Construction would be ten weeks and then programming would take place. After that would be the grand opening. How can we possibly have a grand opening in November 2015 when you've had a two year lease?

Mr. Conner replied that the construction did not go as well as planned. We had to focus on selecting and working with a local contractor for this particular project. There are no contractors in this area with museum based institution experience. Once the construction started, it was noticed that there were definite misunderstandings about our intent for redevelopment of the property. As a result, there really were significant construction delays. In addition to that, there were roof repairs, façade improvements, and a huge amount of rain. It really was construction related lateness. We couldn't start any repairs until the lease had been signed and the contractors could get in there to see what was required. It was an unfortunate series of events. The estimates that I provided you are the estimates provided by the contractors.

Mr. King asked how many full time employees does GO Science have.

Mr. Conner replied that they had two full time employees and thirty contractors.

Mr. King asked what hours they were open.

Mr. Conner replied from nine to five.

Mr. King asked for a head count of children on an average day.

Mr. Conner replied between 300 to 500 per day. The new programming will up that number.

Mr. King stated that the commission anticipated that in Phase I the center would be opening two years ago. The ultimate goal was to turn the building over to GO Science and raise capital for Phase II. How much capital have you raised for Phase II?

Mr. Conner replied that \$125,000 was raised in Phase I. All of that has been invested in the facility. We are in the silent phase of capital campaigning Phase II.

Mr. King asked what was the number that had been pledged, that is in the budget right now for Phase II.

Mr. Conner replied that the whole point of the silent phase of capital campaigning was they don't disclose where that number was.

Mr. King stated that the lease terms specified, for a \$1 a year, GO Science was to be an attraction for the downtown area. I have just visited a Dickinson Avenue place and they see GO Science as blight. We have created blight there because there is no street traffic and it is a hindrance of the Dickinson Avenue corridor. I am convinced that science education is great; I'm just not convinced that your organization is the right one to lead

this effort. When people ask me what is happening with GO Science I can't answer them – for two years. And now we are having a grand opening two weeks after the lease is to expire. I cannot in good conscience see how 1,000 children have come through during the summer when we have spent over \$600,000. That is \$600 per child for programming. This presentation looks good, but it is the same presentation we saw two years ago when approving the lease. There is no additional information except updating the dates. I cannot in good conscience vote to extend this lease based on the operations we have seen. Dickinson Avenue is redeveloping, but I think it would redevelop in spite of this project. If we brought in someone who could lead this project better, we would get a bigger bang for our buck. I'm not saying kick GO Science out today, I just can't agree to a two year lease renewal on this. I have heard this story before. I asked last year when you would bring people in and you said ten weeks. I look at the presentation that says you will create a museum organization with Sheppard Library and the Greenville Museum of Art. What co-branded programs do you have with the Greenville Museum of Art?

Mr. Conner replied that they were working with Uptown to create a combined marketing program for Dickinson Avenue to feature all the new things that are happening there and all the attractions there in one entity for Fall purposes.

Ms. Marshall asked what kind of advertising is being done to let people know about GO Science. You have mentioned collaborating with various organizations, but that is a specific targeted audience. What are you doing to reach the general public? There are underserved populations, so how are you reaching them? In none of your presentations have you told us how you plan to get people there. Also, you state that there are 300 – 500 people visiting per day. Is that every day? Everything you say is about what you plan to do. What have you actually done and completed?

Mr. Conner replied that it may be best to review the time line since it sounds like there may be some confusion there. Going back to the comments by Jeremy and the ten weeks, the amount of time we were not in the building was due to construction. We were close to litigation with that. Construction was actually what took so long to keep us from getting into the building. Earlier this year, about February or March, we were able to take occupancy of the building. We weren't able to get into the building until then because they weren't able to turn over a CO. We weren't able to do any programming in the building until then. Next was getting all of the business operations and things moved in. Then we weren't able to get internet. A lot of our systems run off of internet technologies. That was something we did not think that we would run into an issue with. That's when we started discussions with Suddenlink. It took them three months to build out a network service just to connect that parcel to the internet. So we weren't able to do some of our programming that was based on the internet. Once we were able to take occupancy of the building (we already own a travel exhibit that costs over \$50,000 which focuses on nanotechnology) we were able to promote that exhibit to the community. Some community members did come in to view it. We started introducing people to the museum. Then we hired our Director of Education. She was becoming familiar with our programming while developing new programming. She has only been with us three

months and she has already created fifteen new programs. I know everyone is looking at two years, but the reality is we have only been in the facility since January of this year.

Ms. Marshall stated we were actually looking at the time you were due in the building – after the ten weeks.

Mr. Conner replied that the reason they couldn't be in the building in ten weeks was due to construction issues.

Mr. King stated that it couldn't have been 18 months. You couldn't have given us a construction plan that would allow people in there in ten weeks. January or February of 2014 I could believe, but not March of 2015.

Mr. Conner replied that he could only communicate problems with construction and would be happy to share some of the correspondence and issues relating to this. We were not able to get into the facility until recently.

Mr. Woodson replied that it would have helped if this had been communicated to the board. We have significant investment into this building. Whatever we put there we want to be successful. This board is very sensitive when it comes to putting money into a project and then don't feel comfortable with it after investing those funds in the project. To come back now and say renew the lease is something that raises a lot of issues and a lot of questions for board members. We need to see how we decide, if we shorten the lease or see what the return is going to be in a timeframe. The issue here is that we did not know what was happening. You are asking us to extend the lease when there is no guarantee that in two years we won't be in the same place.

Mr. Conner stated that he apologizes if it was not communicated clearly what the status was. I can say that we have already had our first traveling exhibit and have received our second travel exhibit that focuses on ocean acidification, and we have programs every day of the week. People can go online for registration. We are beginning the marketing to let people know that everything is active now and to come participate. For diversity and equity, we do programs with the Boys and Girls Club and the Little Willie Center. Every year we do regional training to help leaders of community based organizations of underrepresented groups better understand STEM based programming. We train them how to deliver the programs and give them resources so they can go back to their organizations and deliver programming. We are not doing the programs for them, we are equipping them with the skill set to grow their own plan internally and then connect to ours.

Ms. Dunn stated that per the presentation, GO Science does on site programming (which is down the street) and it covers 29 counties. Her question was if they would do both simultaneously or do one or the other. The City's position would be that the building by design was to have programs here and attract people to the downtown area.

Mr. Conner replied yes. There is a focus for here on site program while previously, during the planning stage for the future, our focus was on the outreach since there was not a building to do those activities. We do have a consultant pool as well as a regional network that we can access in order to deliver those regional services. Now our focus is primarily on the facility here in Greenville.

Ms. Dunn noted that per, the presentation, GO Science would partner with other organizations. Which ones besides the library will be partnered with to help promote the STEM program for the city?

Mr. Conner replied that they were fortunate that they have several programs that focus on STEM education in different areas which presents an opportunity to collaborate with these organizations. An example is A Time for Science which focuses on natural resources and doing science outdoors. We have done and are doing in November a program for astrobiology also with A Time for Science. We are partnering with A Time for Science to do some co-marketing to school districts letting them know that there are a lot of things here in Greenville that they can do. We try to maximize the time when they have to travel for school trips. By partnering with A Time for Science, they can spend part of the time with them doing outdoor projects and then come over here to do indoor activities. These include computer based activities, innovation activities, or interactive activities with which ever traveling exhibit we have in that space. We have partnered with organizations such as the Sea Turtle, which focuses on natural sciences. We have done work with the Nature Center here in Greenville. The hope is that we can package some of these things and make Greenville more of a destination for school groups and organizations. Similar to Raleigh, which has the different museums and a lot of things to do, we are trying to create that type of environment here.

Ms. Dunn asked if, for example, the package deal could be during the field trip, the students may spend the morning at A Time for Science, go to lunch, and then visit the GO Science Center. Neither organization would provide a full day's activities, they would work together to provide a whole day of activities.

Mr. Conner replied correct.

Ms. Dunn stated that the Challenger Learning Center in Charlotte was a donation and is probably outdated by now. It would probably cost a large sum of money to update it. Are there any plans to bring that Challenger Learning Center to GO Science so it could be an interactive learning experience which could be open every day? Do you know the cost to upgrade it?

Mr. Conner stated that the Challenger Learning Center is still part of the master plan for GO Science. We do have a contract to update the computer components. Then those computer components are integrated into the facility itself. That experience is a much more simulated environment that is scheduled. School districts will schedule the time to come in.

Ms. Dunn asked how much impact the new person (Kristi) will have on the programs that we've been discussing.

Mr. Conner replied that the fact that we were recently able to get into the building and get going with the programs, there has been a shift in outreach programming and onsite programming. By bringing in Ms. Walters, who has a background in informal science education as well as biology, to develop programming, she has already had an impact on programming and will have a significant impact on programming. As I showed you earlier, the whole month of October is full of programming as a result of her efforts over the past few months.

Ms. Dunn asked do you see her as the personality who will be developing the partnerships that were talked about.

Mr. Conner replied yes. She has the ability to see natural linkages and build those partnerships. I am supporting her on packaging those together and push them out to entities in the community and region.

Ms. Dunn asked if there were public funds provided for Phase I.

Mr. King stated that he thought the public funds had come from the RDC. The \$125,000 was private funds. The presentation did say that they were publicly supported.

Mr. Conner replied yes, we are a 501c3 nonprofit that is supported by the public.

Ms. Marshall stated that when Mr. King asked about the funds raised for Phase II, you replied that you were not at liberty to disclose the amount. Should we decide to extend the lease for two years, what can we expect to happen in those two years? Specifically, what is on the books that are planned for the next two years? While there were several delays, there were several things could have been doing while waiting. It sounds like you waited until you were in the building to develop programs and develop a marketing strategy. These things could have been done while you were waiting and then you would have had more to report other than we had delays.

Mr. Conner replied that currently they have the next year of travel exhibits already reserved.

Ms. Marshall asked for examples of the travel exhibits.

Mr. Conner replied for example, Eat Well, Play Well, which is an exhibit from NIH that focuses on health education. There is a program on Buried Treasure that focuses on the science of recovering buried treasures. We have a partnership with United Nations and will bring in an exhibit that focuses on the science of light and the societal impacts of light. We have programming that will continue at the facility and will only grow. We have the exhibits that people can visit anytime.

Mr. Woodson stated that at this time the board is not ready to extend a two year lease. Maybe a temporary shorter time frame. With reports back on the progress so we can at the appropriate time make a decision on the lease.

Mr. Flood stated that the commission has the ability to act in any manner it sees fit. It sounds like the commission wants frequent updates and a timeline for when the Phases are beginning, know how the fund raising is going, and regular updates on the programming and marketing if the lease is extended. Staff will facilitate this dialogue if that is the direction the commission wants to go. You have the ability to decide if it is a one year, two year, or other length of time lease.

Mr. Conner stated that this was an abbreviated presentation. He didn't want to take up too much of the committees' time. There is a lot of additional information that could be shared regarding programming. What was presented today was not the entirety of what we are doing.

Ms. Dunn stated that based on your presentation, the power point presentation and comments that others have made, if the board decides to vote into the agreement that you would present to us a specific plan, and then you could provide some specificity regarding the marketing and partnerships. What you are saying sounds like a very good idea but if you could bring some specificity regarding these then that would be helpful for you and the commission.

Mr. King stated that he was not there to kill GO Science, but he did feel like a steward of taxpayer's money. This project has been a concern of his since he first came on the board in January 2012. This is the exact conversation that I had with Mr. Conner in 2013. I said, *"We are certainly committed to GO Science and it is not a long lease. It is only two years. This is an amenity to bring people into the area. I would like to know a timetable to bring people into the seats."* Mr. Conner replied, *"As a nonprofit we are not officially recognized on tax rolls. We are in the silent phase of the capital campaign."* This is two years ago. The same answer I just got right there. *"Having the first phase open will encourage donors to contribute because they want to see progress. We have major equipment we are looking to bring in soon....If we can get the lease authorized we are looking at ten weeks for construction....GO Science has hired an architect and contractor so we just need to get the lease signed"* That was my timetable two years ago. What I looked for was, get the people in first. This is a dollar a year lease. It is to provide science education and be a draw to Dickinson Avenue and Center City. That has not been done in my opinion. The second thing was get ready for Phase II. I even said later on *"...if you get a major donation we can discuss about extending your lease."* I am not in favor of renewing this lease as we sit today. It is difficult to get long-term donations. But this answer is the same answer I got last year and the brochure is the same one I got last year. So what I am going to do is propose a motion that extends the lease for three months. That will take us to the end of the year. We will go on an interim basis. This is what I want to see: head counts of the people in there, a list of the programming, the GO Science board members saying this is a great project – we are committed to this project. I want to have closed sessions if we have to so you can tell us about these capital contributions to

make Phase II happen. I want to see somebody from Uptown Greenville, from the Greenville Museum of Art and I want to see your neighbors on Dickinson Avenue at the public comment saying this is a good neighbor instead of telling me this is blight on this street, these people do not participate on this block. That's what I want to see and I will give you three months to do it. I cannot in good conscience extend this lease. The lease states that we have to give them until November 19th, but when we do enter into a new lease, I want to put incentives and targets into this lease. Let's be honest, if this was a business plan competition and this was a return on investment, none of us would approve. We have to look at it the same way. It is a nonprofit. And science education is important. I am committed to science education. I'm just not so sure that we have the right horse in the race. So, that's the lifeline that I want to give to GO Science. That's the motion I make, that we extend the lease we have with them for three months to show us in periodical data and commitment, from the community, from their board, and from their neighbors. That's what I want to see.

Ms. Dunn stated that she would go more than three months. She would want to be more specific about what we ask.

Ms. Siguaw stated that she would also go six months.

Mr. Woodson stated that the motion did not pass due to a lack of a second.

Ms. Siguaw stated that she would go six months but with everything that Mr. King has required.

Ms. Dunn asked if the motion could also include they come back with a marketing plan, examples of how they formed these partnerships, and examples of the school groups that attended because of the partnerships.

Mr. Woodson stated that it was equally important that if GO Science is important to this community, that the board members be here to help sell this. You should not be taking the whole heat for what is happening at GO Science.

Motion was made by Ms. Siguaw and seconded by Mr. King to extend the lease for six months with the following conditions: 1. a three month progress report be given to the Redevelopment Commission, provide a head count, a list of the programming, the marketing plans, and how its moving forward, 2. a breakdown of budget operations: what is going toward salary and for programming, 3. The expectations for the building and daily attendance. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Patterson stated that he is on an email list for GO Science. Have all of the programs been successful?

Mr. Conner stated that they had worked very hard to cultivate an email list and communicate to people about the programs. An example of the effectiveness for the

email list is recently information regarding a program on nanotechnology was sent to everyone on the list. The program sold out in five minutes.

VI. Public Comment Period

No comments were received.

VII. West Greenville Property Acquisition

Mr. Wisemiller stated that this property was previously discussed. Staff has negotiated a price with the owner and now is ready to sell. The address is 606 Clark Street. The property owned and occupied by Ms. Deloris Purvis. The appraised value is \$33,750 and the proposed purchase price \$37,125. RDC will cover up to \$18,000 in relocation expenses (per URA guidelines) and additional relocation expenses will be provided by the Affordable Housing Loan Committee. Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Commission approve the purchase of 606 Clark Street for \$37,125 and provide up to \$18,000 in relocation expenses to the seller.

Ms. Dunn asked what would be covered in the \$18,000.

Mr. Flood replied that this is a comparable, so the value of a similar house to the one we are getting. We would look at properties at that range and the cost to move the owner. We have found a property with owner's acceptance. About \$16,000 will cover the relocation. Then we will factor about \$1,500 in for moving expense since this is a government action.

Mr. King asked if the owner was happy.

Mr. Flood replied yes, at this point. There will be a little more business to cover but we believe we can make this work.

Ms. King stated that she has done a good service for this commission and for the city.

Motion was made by Mr. King and seconded by Ms. Dunn that the Redevelopment Commission approve the purchase of 606 Clark Street for \$37,125 and provide up to \$18,000 in relocation expenses to the seller. Motion carried unanimously.

VIII. Report from Secretary

A. Monthly Financial Report

Mr. Flood gave the monthly financial report.

Redevelopment Commission Budget FY 2014-2015

Center City Bond Funds

Evans Gateway		Beginning balance:	\$159,000.00
Date			
7/10/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc.		\$1,480.00
8/5/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc.		\$2,020.00
8/28/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc.		\$1,900.00
11/12/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc., Evans Street Gateway		\$3,500.00
11/18/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc., Evans Street Gateway		\$690.00
12/9/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc., Evans Street Gateway		\$1,750.00
1/6/2015	Transfer to Evans Street Accessway		\$88,420.00
1/13/2015	Rivers & Associates, Inc., Evans Street Gateway		\$8,550.00
4/7/2015	Rivers & Associates, Inc. Phase Progress 423 Evans Street		\$4,400.00
4/15/2015	J & H Studios (encumbrance) (drawn \$12,500.00)		\$50,000.00
	Total Spent in Account:		\$162,710.00
	Total Remaining in Account:		-\$3,710.00
Uptown Theatre Repairs		Beginning balance:	\$254,000.00
Date			
12/9/2014	RPA Engineering, Chimney Evaluation		\$1,000.00
12/23/2014	Enviro Assessments East, Inc., Asbestos Abatement		\$4,175.00
1/6/2015	Transfer to Evans Street Accessway		\$63,500.00
	Total Spent in Account:		\$68,675.00
	Total Remaining in Account:		\$185,325.00
Evans Street Accessway		Beginning balance:	\$233,000.00
Date			
7/28/2014	Walker Parking Consultants, Uptown Parking Deck		\$3,600.00
9/9/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc., Evans Gateway Project		\$14,000.00
10/7/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc.		\$12,250.00
10/9/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc.		\$460.00
10/28/2014	Seegars Fence Company, Inc., Temporary Fence 120 West 5th Street		\$873.00
1/6/2015	Transferred from Uptown Theatre Repairs		-\$63,500.00
1/6/2015	Transferred from Evans Gateway		-\$88,420.00
2/16/2015	Barnhill Contracting (encumbrance) (drawn \$118,943.09)		\$189,460.07
3/11/2015	Barnhill Contracting - walkways around parking deck		\$110,500.00
3/11/2015	Barnhill Contracting (encumbrance) (drawn \$13,306.42)		\$50,000.00
	Total Spent in Account:		\$229,223.07
	Total Remaining in Account:		\$176.93
Cotanche to Reade Alley Improvements		Beginning balance:	\$252,000.00
Date			
9/2/2014	Transfer of funds from Uptown Alley Improvements		-\$5,500.00
11/18/2014	Dunn & Dalton Architects		\$1,008.50
1/15/2015	East Carolina Communications, LLC, Install Cable in new CVB		\$3,467.68
2/9/2015	Green Town Properties, Inc., Elevator Usage Fee		\$100,000.00

3/17/2015	A3 Communications Network Cameras	\$2,290.70
4/10/2015	East Carolina Communications, LLC, Install Cable in new CVB	\$600.00
9/11/2015	Carolina Earth Movers (encumbrance) (drawn \$91,929.34)	\$103,207.55
Total Spent in Account:		\$205,074.43
Total Remaining in Account:		\$46,925.57
Uptown Alley Improvements		
Date		Beginning balance: \$49,000.00
9/2/2014	Transfer of funds to Cotanche to Reade Alley Improvements	\$5,500.00
Total Spent in Account:		\$5,500.00
Total Remaining in Account:		\$43,500.00
Total of all Center City Bond accounts		\$272,217.50

West Greenville Bond Funds

West 5th Streetscape, Phase II design		
Date		Beginning balance: \$58,000.00
7/10/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc.	\$7,245.00
8/5/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc.	\$5,040.00
9/9/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc., West 5th Street Streetscape Phase II	\$945.00
11/12/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc.	\$8,530.00
12/9/2014	Rivers & Associates, Inc., West 5th Street Streetscape Phase II	\$31,600.00
Total Spent in Account:		\$53,360.00
Total Remaining in Account:		\$4,640.00
Acquisition		
Date		Beginning balance: \$270,000.00
7/17/2014	Moore and Piner LLC, Appraisals	\$1,600.00
9/4/2014	Avery, E. Cordell, Title examination 604 Clark Street	\$250.00
9/4/2014	Avery, E. Cordell, Title examination 606 Clark Street	\$250.00
9/4/2014	Avery, E. Cordell, Title examination 650 Atlantic Avenue	\$550.00
10/1/2014	The Appraisal Group, Appraisals 604 Clark Street	\$500.00
11/4/2014	Avery, E. Cordell, 650 Atlantic Avenue	\$100.00
11/4/2014	The Appraisal Group, 606 Clark Street	\$650.00
11/5/2014	Avery, E. Cordell, 604 Clark Street	\$500.00
11/5/2014	Avery, E. Cordell, 650 Atlantic Avenue	\$500.00
12/3/2014	HUD, purchase of Pamlico property from Housing	\$60,673.71
1/13/2015	Parker and Associates Land Surveying, Inc., 650 Atlantic Avenue	\$1,200.00
1/13/2015	Parker and Associates Land Surveying, Inc., 604 Clark Street	\$700.00
3/25/2015	Dunklee & Dunham Environmental Site Assessment	\$2,500.00
3/26/2015	Avery, E. Cordell, 604 Clark Street	\$74,133.63
4/9/2015	Darden Properties 605A Clark Street	\$600.00
4/9/2015	Icerlene King 605A Clark Street	\$1,050.00
4/9/2015	Icerlene King 605A Clark Street	\$2,129.79
5/7/2015	Icerlene King 605A Clark Street	\$2,729.79
5/14/2015	Avery, E. Cordell, 650 Atlantic Avenue	\$31,997.88

