Hickory Bond Commission
January 13, 2016 at 5:00 P.M.
SALT Block Keiser Community Room

A meeting of the Hickory Bond Commission was held on Wednesday, January 13, 2016 at the SALT Block Keiser Community Room.

Members Present: Alan Barnhardt, Jennifer Beane, Mike Bell, Patricia Bowman, Paige Brigham, Dana Chambers, Jennifer Clark, Rob Dickerson, Charlie Dixon, Ed Farthing, Kimberly George, Charlie Hayes, Jennifer Helton, Allison Holtzman, Andrew Howard, Alan Jackson, Anthony Laxton, Will Locke, Norm Meres, Hani Nassar, David Roberts, II, , Katherine Rogers, Carolyn Sinclair, Mike Thomas, James Tilton, Suzanne Trollan, Susan Walker, Bee Watts, Burk Wyatt, and Frank Young

Members Absent: Norm Cook, Ryan Edwards, Jerisha Farrer, Shauna O'Brien, Adelia Parrado-Ortiz, Dean Proctor, Stacee Rash, Ernie Sills, Nick Walden and Jason Yates

Others Present: Multiple City Staff, Freese and Nichols Staff, and community members

Chairman Burk Wyatt opened the meeting at 5:17 p.m. He said the group would be making a final recommendation to Hickory City Council, which would be presented to the Council at their Special Workshop on Tuesday, January 19, 2016 at 5 p.m. at City Council Chambers. He stated that the unity of a recommendation would be most important to the Bond Commission, the community and City Council. He reiterated that not everyone will get what they want in the projects and recommendation for City Council. Chairman Wyatt asked the group to get behind it all and to remember that anything that was not included in the recommendation could be considered for inclusion in phase two of the bonds. Chairman Wyatt introduced Assistant City Manager Andrea Surratt.

Ms. Surratt greeted the group and thanked Bond Commission Bee Watts and Shell's BBQ for the delicious dinner. She said the group would have a couple of hours of work and the priority of the projects are still being determined but the recommendation would be presented to City Council next Tuesday.

Mr. Charles Archer of Freese and Nichols, Inc. said that the work tonight would be in the spirit of compromise. He went over the day's objective, which included the decision and endorsement of a final recommendation to send to City Council. The recommendation would be presented to Council next week. Mr. Archer stated it will probably be five years to finish all the design work for all the projects. The group received clickers and handouts to review and vote for the final recommendation.

Mr. Mike Wayts provided an overview of the December Bond Commission meeting and reviewed all the options and their pros and cons. The options from the December meeting were Options A - C , which were prepared by Freese and Nichols and Group 1 – 4, which were crafted by groups ("CYO - Craft Your Own"). The end result was three Freese and Nichols, Inc. options and three CYO options, which included Group 3 endorsing Option A.) Mr. Wayts showed a recap video of the December meeting taken by City staff that was shown and was well received by City Council.

Mr. Wayts stated that at the end of the December meeting there were 27 votes. Option A received 8 votes (30%), Option B received 1 vote (4%), Option C received 0 votes (0%), Group 1 received 6 votes

(22%), Group 2 received 4 votes (15%), Group 3 endorsed Option A, and Group 4 received 8 votes (30%). Two citizens voted that same day with both votes for Option A (2 votes at 100%). Their comments were provided to the group verbatim. He stated a lot of the Bond Commission was present at the Council Workshop where all the options were presented. The voting dots from the Bond Commission were hidden and several Bond Commission members helped explain their reasons for their decisions in the options. Additionally Council was shown a video created by City staff displaying the work the Bond Commission did to reach their decisions on the options. Mr. Wayts said that City Council was provided votes as well to vote on the options presented. Interestingly enough, their votes were almost exactly the same as the votes from the Bond Commission. Option A received 1 vote (17%), Group 1 received 3 votes (50%), and Group 4 received 2 votes (33%).

The Bond Commission received a Riverwalk Survey Monkey to clarify their reasons for their votes between the two Riverwalk Options. The survey provided a way for Bond Commission Members to share any comments for their decisions to Freese and Nichols and staff. This was to address some of the questions and comments that Freese and Nichols received from Bond Commission members as to why they voted in the way they did. Members were receiving information from various sources. Mr. Wayts shared the comments from the Commission and addressed any concerns or myths behind some of their votes. He stated there were 28 or 29 respondents to the survey. Upon receiving the survey, Riverwalk Option 1 received 41% of the votes while Riverwalk Option 2 received 60%. Some of the reasons shared for the voting were: diversity at 25%, cost 20%, diversity in cost 16%, iconic 25%, miscellaneous 8%, and other contributions 6%. Freese and Nichols categorized the section of other contributions (6%) with many myths and concerns by the Bond Commission members.

One of the myth "There is no shade on Option 1" is false, Mr. Wayts clarified. The way the Riverwalk faces west, it will be in the shade most of the day except for sundown with the sun setting for two to three hours. "Option 1 will be harder to permit" is false Mr. Wayts said. He continued, We have met with Duke (Energy) and we have met with NCDENR (North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality) and talked to them about Option 1 and neither agency has given us any concern that Option 1 cannot be permitted. He explained that both agencies are involved in the permitting process due to the location at the water. "Option 1 could flood or catch run-off" is also false, Mr. Wayts added. He clarified that both options will be designed to drain themselves and will be adjacent to the water. Option 1 would be built above the flood elevation requirement. Chairman Wyatt asked about the needs from Duke Energy to focus more on the details regarding the plans for the Riverwalk before they can provide final approval of the project. Mr. Wayts clarified that they need to see the final plans on the pieces that are over the water. A lot of Option 1 is just adjacent to the water and not over the water. Option 2 has those exact same pieces.

He continued that Riverwalk Option 2 also had some myths. "Option 2 has more varied grades" which was true, "Option 2 has more varied elevations" which was true. Both options met ADA standards, which meant that they are usable by all. There was some questions about changing the grades and trails to make something different. Option 2 will have more varied grades. At different elevations, there will be varying grades. Bond Commission Member Carolyn Sinclair asked about the connection to the existing trails. Mr. Wayts clarified that there are things already there, but the plan is to cut more trails. Ms. Sinclair asked if they would be more dirt trails. He responded that it would be. "Option 2 has better views" is false. Option 2 will have different views. Views and scenery are very subjective based on individuals. Among other differences, there will be some areas where the river will not be visible due to tree coverage. The views will be different from every location of either Riverwalk and preference on those views are subjective. Mr. Wayts said that either of these options would be iconic and are great options. They provide great experiences.

The Bond Commission reviewed the handout of the sheet that broke down the differences between all the six options that were presented to the Bond Commission at their December meeting.

OPTION A VARIATIONS			NEW OPTION
OPTION A	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	COMBINED OPTION A
Lenoir Rhyne Blvd	Lenoir Rhyne Blvd	Lenoir Rhyne Blvd	Lenoir Rhyne Blvd
Old Lenoir Road	Old Lenoir Road	Old Lenoir Road	Old Lenoir Road
Lenoir Rhyne Blvd & IH-40 Gateway	Lenoir Rhyne Blvd & IH-40 Gateway	Lenoir Rhyne Blvd & IH-40 Gateway	Lenoir Rhyne Blvd & IH-40 Gateway
City Walk (CW) "Spine"	City Walk (CW) "Spine"	City Walk (CW) "Spine"	City Walk (CW) "Spine"
City Walk Pedestrian Bridge	City Walk Pedestrian Bridge	City Walk Pedestrian Bridge	City Walk Pedestrian Bridge
Riverwalk (RW) Option 2	Riverwalk (RW) Option 2	Riverwalk (RW) Option 2	Riverwalk (RW) Option 2
N Connection between CW and RW	N Connection between CW and RW	N Connection between CW and RW	N Connection between CW and RW
S Connection between CW and RW	S Connection between CW and RW	S Connection between CW and RW	S Connection between CW and RW
US 70 & Hwy 321 Gateway	US 70 & Hwy 321 Gateway	US 70 & Hwy 321 Gateway	US 70 & Hwy 321 Gateway
CW Union Square		CW Union Square	CW Union Square
CW Main Ave 1st - 3rd	CW Main Ave 1st - 3rd	CW Main Ave 1st - 3rd	CW Main Ave 1st - 3rd
CW 2nd Ave Realignment	CW 2nd Ave Realignment	CW 2nd Ave Realignment	CW 2nd Ave Realignment
	US 321 & Clement Blvd Gateway		**US 321 & Clement Blvd Gateway**
	Lenoir Rhyne Additional Plantings		
Addt'l Projects: NC 127, City Walk - Depot Station and Main Ave 3rd - 5th	**Addt'l Projects:** NC 127, CW Depot Station and Springs Rd	**Addt'l Projects:** NC 127, CW Depot Station and **Riverwalk Option 1**	**Addt'l Projects:** NC 127, City Walk Depot Station, and **Riverwalk Option 1**

GROUP 4	COMBINED OPTION A
Lenoir Rhyne Blvd	Lenoir Rhyne Blvd
Old Lenoir Road	Old Lenoir Road
Lenoir Rhyne Blvd & IH-40 Gateway	Lenoir Rhyne Blvd & IH-40 Gateway
City Walk (CW) "Spine"	City Walk (CW) "Spine"
City Walk Pedestrian Bridge	City Walk Pedestrian Bridge
Riverwalk (RW) Option 1	Riverwalk (RW) Option 2
	N Connection between CW and RW
S Connection between CW and RW	S Connection between CW and RW
US 70 & Hwy 321 Gateway	US 70 & Hwy 321 Gateway
	CW Union Square
	CW Main Ave 1st - 3rd
	CW 2nd Ave Realignment
	US 321 & Clement Blvd Gateway
Addt'l Projects: NC 127, CW 2nd Ave Realignment, and N Connection to RW	**Addt'l Projects:** NC 127, City Walk Depot Station, and Riverwalk Option 1

Ms. Surratt added that she is a visual person and needed this cheat sheet to see all the information on each of the options and projects. She hoped it would be helpful to the group as they could use it as an elevator speech regarding the very lengthy and thoughtful process of

projects. There were six fully formed options that were turned into a final recommendation through a really complicated process some projects were added on the list and some were dropped off the list. Chairman Wyatt added he was part of Group 1 with the Lenoir-Rhyne change, and explained that the reason for his group's difference from the other groups was due to the potential for public-private partnership with the university to complete the connection in that area. Mr. Alan Barnhardt stated he was part of Group 2 and wanted to know the difference in the chart listing Riverwalk Option 2 in Combined Option A and Riverwalk Option 1 listed in the Additional Projects section. Mr. Wayts added that the similarities and differences were highlighted and colored in the chart between the options. Freese and Nichols brought forth the new option - "Combined Option A." He explained all the differences and how Freese and Nichols combined the similarities.

Mr. Ed Farthing asked for clarification on the discussion on the Riverwalk. He asked if there was additional funding available for the other projects, would the Riverwalk Option be upgraded from 2 to 1 in Combined Option A. Mr. Wayts responded yes. Mr. Barnhardt asked if that were the case, would it all be at the riverfront and not up in the trees for part of it. Mr. Wayts replied that was correct of course it depends on when the designer gets on board, but the simple answer is yes. Riverwalk Subcommittee Vice-Chair Mike Bell asked about Riverwalk Option 1 being an additional project, because if you did Riverwalk Option 2, you cannot go back. Chairman Wyatt stated it is a timing issue. Mr. Wayts restated the question that when Mr. Bell was in his Craft Your Own Group, they were confused as to how you could have Riverwalk Option 2 in the $35.5 million project listing but then have Riverwalk Option 1 in the Additional Projects. He said it was a timing issue and gives more time and flexibility to make conversions. There are some people who prefer one over the other due to costs and other reasons. Mr. Wayts continued stating that during the break, the group will have the opportunity to talk to one another and sway people to your opinions before the voting. He encouraged the members to read each other's comments shared on the wall and engage in active discussion.

He stated we would do a group exercise with the larger votes of the 75% by splitting the group into two groups (those who voted for Combined Option A and Group 4 Option). He restated the two options and explained their projects. He explained how funding was available for specific projects with adjustments of other projects. Streetscapes and Gateways Committee Vice-Chair Paige Brigham clarified that her group eliminated many of the CityWalk amenities because they thought they would have bigger opportunities to find support for public-private partnerships. She added that they felt as a group that Riverwalk would really become Riverwalk 1.5 and fall somewhere in the middle (of 1 and 2). Her group didn't want to leave Riverwalk 1 on the table so a compromise could be reached between the two. They felt with all the other variables, including Duke Energy, topography, etc., that it might not all end up on the water and the Riverwalk would end up between the two options.

Ms. Carolyn Sinclair asked for clarification on the CityWalk spine and whether it was just talking about CityWalk paved bikeways and sidewalks. Mr. Wayts said there is a substantial budget in that for landscaping, water features, pavilions, so it goes up beyond Union Square all the way to Lenoir-Rhyne. He added what is not included is the Shuford Crossing (brick paving), Union Square improvements, the parking garage improvements, Main Ave 1st and 3rd sidewalk from Transportation Insights to the CityWalk project there, Lenoir-Rhyne additional plantings, 3rd to 5th Street, 2nd Street realignment and roundabout. Ms. Sinclair asked if there was no sidewalk included in area she mentioned in the CityWalk. Ms. Morgan McIlwain added none of the amenities have been added here, but landscaping and parking, as well as some of the redo on the parking, all of that has been added. Ms. Suzanne Trollman and Ms. Jennifer Clark asked for clarification on the gateways in the options, particularly at Hwy 70 and Hwy 321, which should have been listed. The chart was incorrect and Mr. Wayts clarified the error that there should be two gateways listed (70 and 321).

A bond commission member asked about clarification on the parking spots for the Depot Station. He asked if it was about 100 additional spots or total spots. Ms. McIlwain said she thought it was 100 total. Mr. Wayts added he thought where the parking was going there was currently no parking there. Hickory Public Services Director Chuck Hansen stated that the information was not correct. There is an existing parking lot there and another layer would be added on top of that, so there is about 50 to 60. That would be 100 total with the 50 to 60. The bond commission member asked how many parking spaces would that be along the whole project, Mr. Hansen said that would be clarified in the design details. Ms. McIlwain stated that the parking would likely not add much more than what is there, it is just being repositioned to be on street parking. Mr. Farthing asked if the public could not use the parking at Transportation Insights after they empty it and on the weekends. Mr. Anthony Laxton clarified that yes that information is correct. Mr. Farthing added that is a lot of parking. Streetscapes and Gateways Committee Chair Rob Dickerson added after being at a cycling event in Asheville over the weekend, we don't have a parking problem. And if people want to be in a downtown, they don't care. If we end up with a parking problem, that's OK. Ms. Brigham asked about the transition on lower to higher elevations between the two options. Mr. Hansen added that doesn't mean there are not opportunities for flat surfaces for restrooms, etc.

At 6:03 p.m., Mr. Wayts announced the group break for discussion and decision making before the voting process began. (Break)

Mr. Archer brought the group back together at 6:26 p.m. He recapped the options for the vote for Riverwalk Option 1 and Riverwalk Option 2 before going over the rules for the vote. Riverwalk Option 1 is roughly $12.5 million and is essentially all boardwalk from 321 to the Lackey project at Rotary-Geitner Park. Riverwalk Option 2 is roughly $8.5 million and is boardwalk from 321 to about half-way, then transitions up the hill into the trees about 50 feet roughly, then transitions back down to the Lackey project with boardwalk. Mr. Archer clarified the trails would be paved but may have other materials.

CityWalk Subcommittee Chairman Frank Young asked the question, if money was not an issue, would you choose Combined Option A, if funding was available (for extra amenities for the other projects), would we then be able to go to the other Option (Riverwalk Option 1 rather than Riverwalk Option2). If the group chooses Combined Option A, we would not start with Riverwalk to see if funding was available. Mr. Archer clarified if funding was available, the question would be brought back before the group for decision and recommendation.

Mr. Barnhardt asked for clarification on whether or not Riverwalk Option 2 was the option with parking downtown. Several bond commission members clarified that neither option has that included. This is an issue with timing and depends on where we are in design at the time. Mr. Archer stated that Combined Option A does have an option for the station parking. Mr. Young asked about the lead-time on the Riverwalk options. Mr. Archer responded with information regarding lead-time and permitting as well as identifying grant opportunities. The State has said there is $9 million in funding in the next four years for NCDOT projects. He mentioned it would be a risk or gamble without working with the State to get the money moved up to be used and of course, to try for another round with the TIGER grant. A bond commission member asked what the $9 million from the State was available for with the projects. Mr. Archer responded it is for the CityWalk only.

Bond Commission Vice Chair Allison Holtzman asked about the funding opportunities besides TIGER and the State's funding grant of $9 million. Mr. Archer agreed that there are not many opportunities for grants in big dollars like TIGER. He stated that NCDOT and the federal money is going to be the biggest pots. CityWalk Subcommittee Chair Mike Thomas asked if people are leaning towards the Combined Option A (with Riverwalk 2), by choosing that one does not commit the City to Riverwalk 1 as Riverwalk Option 1 is only if funding is available. Would it be brought back to the Bond Commission and City Council to see if the group still wants to have Riverwalk Option 1 done before anything is finalized? Mr. Archer confirmed this is correct. He began going over the rules for the voting.

The electronic vote came down to 84% in favor of Combined Option A and 16% in favor of Group 4 Option. To clarify the votes, the group was asked to revote by hand for a total of 32 votes from the Bond Commission members with 26 votes for the Combined Option A and 6 votes to Group 4 Option. Mr. Archer went over the process and next steps and thanked the group for their efforts over the last year and during this process. He mentioned the recommendation would be presented at a special City Council Workshop on Tuesday, January 19, 2016 at 5 p.m. at City Council Chambers. All Bond Commission members were invited and encouraged to attend. Bond Commission Chair Wyatt thanked the group and Assistant City Manager Surratt.

Ms. Surratt went over some housekeeping items regarding an approval of the Minutes that was sent via email to the group and which had been posted over the course of the last year online. She would need a motion and second to this. She added that she received a statement sent to

the Chairman and staff regarding a potential conflict of interest from Bond Commission Member Dean Proctor. Mr. Proctor asked it be read into the minutes:

> Chairman Burk Wyatt, Chairman of Bond Commission
> Andrea Surratt, Asst. City Manager, Council Liaison
> Charles Dickson, River Walk Committee Chairman
>
> Gentlemen,
>
> Please be advised that I have a potential conflict of interest in any vote or discussion involving the Streetscape 9a, 9th Street NW, proposal and wish to abstain and excuse myself from any vote or discussion involving that proposal. I have an ownership interest in United Beverages of NC, LLC, which is located at 105 9th Street NW. While I don't anticipate any financial gain from any project on 9th Street NW, I wish to avoid any perception of any conflict of interest. For your information, I exited the meeting of December 8th before any final discussion and vote on the various proposals. My primary interest remains to serve on the Riverwalk Committee and see that project to its' conclusion. If there is any discussion on the connector corridor, I will take appropriate action to abstain and excuse myself from any discussion.
>
> I will not attend the meeting of January 13th, but please see that the above disclosure is read into the minutes of the meeting. Thank you.
>
> Best regards,
> Dean Proctor
> United Beverages of NC, LLC
> P. O. Box 818
> Hickory, NC 28603
> 828-322-1933 ext 110

Mike Bell moved, seconded by Cliff Moone approval of the Minutes of July 14, 2015, October 27, 2015, and December 8, 2015. The motion carried vote was unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

Burk Wyatt, Chair
Hickory Bond Commission

Yajdee Castillero Fox, Governmental Affairs Manager
City of Hickory