

**Redevelopment Commission
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 4, 2016
Greenville, North Carolina**

Present:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Angela Marshall | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tracie Gardner | <input type="checkbox"/> Sharif Hatoum |
| <input checked="" 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"/> Tracie Gardner | <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 type="checkbox"/> Merrill Flood | <input type="checkbox"/> Christian Lockamy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> McClean Godley (City Council Liaison) | <input type="checkbox"/> Betty Moseley |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Roger Johnson | <input type="checkbox"/> David Holec |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Wisemiller | <input type="checkbox"/> |
-

I. Welcome

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of Minutes – September 6, 2016

Ms. Dunn requested clarification for City Attorney David Holec’s response to her question on page 3 regarding the responsible parties for live music violations.

Motion was made by Ms. Siguaw and seconded by Mr. Patterson to approve the amended meeting minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. Update on Uptown Theatre Remediation and Building Stabilization Project

Mr. Wisemiller gave a summary of the Uptown Theatre Project. The amended Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) sub-grant was increased from \$125,000 to \$175,000. This RLF will not need to be repaid. Change orders 4 and 5 for additional structural repairs will cost approximately \$30,000. The revised budget will cover all necessary project costs to repair deteriorated roof beams.

Uptown Theatre Project			
Revised budget = \$340,000			
	TOTAL =	Environmental Cleanup	+ Repairs
Original contract	\$168,200	\$107,350	\$60,850
CO1	\$34,995	\$29,675	\$5,320
CO2	\$24,921	\$20,600	\$4,321
CO3	\$28,565	\$23,800	\$4,765
Repair plan CO	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
CO4	\$26,555	\$0	\$26,555
CO5	\$4,330	\$0	\$4,330
Parking Study (RDC)	\$12,500	\$0	\$12,500
TOTAL	\$302,065	\$181,425	\$120,640

Mr. King asked what the original budget was for this project.

Mr. Wisemiller replied that it was approximately \$290,000.

Mr. King asked if restriping the parking lot was included in the budget.

Mr. Wisemiller replied that the expense for the parking lot was planned to come out of the remainder Center City funds. At this time, there should be sufficient funds to cover that as well.

Mr. King asked if change orders 4 and 5 were the absolute last change orders or should the board expect another one.

Mr. Wisemiller replied that based on the last updates from the contractor, these are the final change orders that will be required.

Mr. King asked if there was an update on the contract for the developer.

Mr. Wisemiller replied that these totals conclude the Redevelopment Commissions contributions to the contract. The developer should be closing on the deal in about thirty days. This does include restriping the parking lot. We are still under budget and still on schedule.

Ms. Dunn asked if there was an anticipated occupancy date.

Mr. King replied that according to the contract, they anticipate occupancy before 2018.

V. Consideration of GO Science Lease

Mr. Wisemiller gave an overview of the GO Science Lease process. RDC purchased the property at 729 Dickinson Avenue for the purpose of supporting the GO Science project. GO Science is a nonprofit that provides informal science education experiences.

In 2013, RDC and GO Science entered into a two-year lease agreement at \$1 per year. At the October 2015 RDC meeting, GO Science requested a two-year lease extension. RDC asked GO Science to provide a detailed report on finances, business and marketing plans, and programs. GO

Science presented a detailed report at the February 2016 RDC meeting. RDC asked staff to draft a new lease. There were a couple of minor changes made to the new lease.

2013-15 Lease	2016-18 Lease
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two-year lease for \$1 per year, with GO Science option to extend the lease for two additional one-year terms upon written request • GO Science may terminate the lease with 30 day notice; City cannot • City can use garage bay for PWD/GUC storage, but not for other purposes • \$200,000 Allowances for repairs and alterations • City pays for roof and wall repairs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three-year lease for \$1 per year, with GO Science option to extend the lease for two additional one-year terms upon written request • GO Science may terminate the lease with 30 day notice; City cannot • City can use garage bay for PWD/GUC storage, but not for other purposes • No allowances this time; improvements allowed, but paid for by GO Science • City pays for roof and wall repairs • GO Science pays for electrical, plumbing, heating & air, mechanical structure repairs

Staff requires approval from the Redevelopment Commission to execute the lease.

Mr. Austin Bunch, Chairman of the GO Science Board, requested that the board consider renewing the GO Science lease. He stated that GO Science has experienced structural and atmospheric issues with the building. The center was closed for a few days during the repairs. A taskforce has been working with contractors regarding the next phase on the building and getting final estimates.

Since the last update to RDC, the center has serviced over 50 school and community groups with hands-on activities, provided over 38 free community educational programs, and served 4,378 visitors.

Partnerships include Trollingwood and Simply Natural Creamery for a joint science café. Parents were able to attend a science café at Trollingwood while students attended Simply Natural Creamery to learn how to make ice cream.

Another featured class was taught by Councilmember Calvin Mercer who discussed *Human Enhancement and Practical Mortality*.

GO Science hosted the Boys and Girls Club for exhibits and tours. Also, their staff was provided capacity and building instruction in STEM.

The traveling exhibit *Eat Well, Play Well* is a nationally recognized interactive exhibit developed by the Institute of Health. Vidant provided funding for this exhibit. October 18 will be the grand opening.

Having a lease in hand will assist us with our fund raising efforts.

Ms. Dunn asked if the schools served were just Pitt County or if some were from other counties also.

Mr. Bunch replied that there were some of both.

Ms. Marshall asked if most of the schools were Pitt County or just some.

Mr. Roger Connor replied that it was a mix. Because GO Science is a regional center, efforts are made to meet the needs wherever they are presented.

Mr. King asked how many groups outside this area had used the facility this past year.

Mr. Connor replied about ten. Many groups traveled here from the coast for a tour. They were encouraged to visit other institutions in the area.

Mr. King gave an overview of the process of acquiring the property and the original expectations. He asked if the Challenger Learning Center was still intended to go into the bay area.

Mr. Bunch replied that the Challenger Learning Center they currently own is out of date and most of it is not salvageable. The suggestion was to convert it to the Emerging Science Center. Cost is about \$2 million.

Mr. King asked what the anchor exhibit would be since the Challenger is no longer a viable option.

Mr. Bunch replied that the board was currently reviewing options.

Mr. Connor stated that this was being viewed as an opportunity to consider use of the whole building as opposed to just the bay area. Public meetings are planned to get a feel for the community needs.

Ms. Marshall stated that so far, every time GO Science has presented, they have been in a planning process. Is there indication of when there will be some definite responses regarding what is replacing the Challenger exhibit?

Mr. Bunch replied that possibly in six months there could be something more definite.

Ms. Dunn stated that it is apparent that Charlotte got rid of the Challenger for a reason; obviously it was not working out. You have shown some progress with the schools and visitors. Every organization is trying to raise money. However, to get people to donate, there needs to be a time frame or expectation for results.

Mr. King asked if the 4,378 visitors were offsite or actual visitors to the location. Also, how many were paying people and what is the individual cost.

Mr. Connor indicated that these were actual visitors to the location. The cost is \$5 – 6 per person depending on the program. Since February, there have been 308 paying visitors for the special programs and 1889 individuals for the groups.

Mr. King stated that revenues since February are about \$8,000. How much of the budget is going to executive salaries, how much is going to programming, and what are the revenues coming in? We are trying to determine if your entity is a stable entity. Where are the recurring revenues?

Mr. Bunch replied that a large portion of the budget for operating personnel has come from the State Graduates Campaign. They award about \$60,000 per year for the last few years.

Mr. King asked if the operating budget was still around \$150,000 per year.

Mr. Connor replied yes. Nationally, science centers are not sustainable from earned income. To be accessible, the centers cannot charge market rates. We try to off-set the costs with fundraising, and providing free community events.

Mr. King asked how many traveling events they held per year and what the cost was.

Mr. Connor replied that the exhibits vary in price. The current exhibit is about \$12,000, which is on the lower end of exhibit prices. With the assistance of partners, we are able to provide a new exhibit about every three to four months.

Mr. King asked what permanent exhibits or programming did they have on location.

A programming calendar was distributed to the board.

Mr. Connor stated that the schools usually liked the traveling exhibits. On location, they have exhibits that are hands-on, self-directed or instructor lead. Many of the exhibits get changed daily.

Mr. King asked what the operating hours were.

Mr. Connor replied that the summer and fall hours are different to accommodate schools and working families. Hours are Monday – Friday, 11-6, with one day opening at 8:00 for school groups. Each month they are open two Saturdays.

Mr. King asked how many paid employees were at the facility.

Mr. Connor replied two.

Ms. Dunn asked Mr. Bunch if, as chairman of the board, was he confident that this organization was headed in the right direction and will deliver increasing programs and participants.

Mr. Bunch replied since the Challenger question has been answered, we now have the opportunity to expand our services, be more creative, and be more responsive. This is a difficult phase, but one we will go through to become more financially viable.

Mr. King asked if they had considered STEAM.

Mr. Bunch replied that they had discussed the possibilities with Ms. Holly Garriott, Director at Emerge. Consideration has been given to creating an art studio in the bay area.

Ms. Siguaw asked if they had considered using virtual reality.

Mr. Connor replied that they have done some pilot testing with augmented reality and Google Classroom.

Ms. Christi Walters, former Director of Education, stated that she was employed with GO Science for one year.

Mr. King stated that one of the reasons he voted for GO Science to extend their lease in February was because they had someone in the position that could grow the organization and get people into the building. At that time, you were responsible to developing programs. Did you actually develop some programs?

Ms. Walters replied yes, about two dozen programs for ages two through teens. She also coordinated field trips and instruction.

Mr. King asked how many people she saw during the year she worked there.

Ms. Walters replied that there were about 4,000 people during that year. Majority of those were people visiting the facility.

Mr. King asked what kind of programs did GO Science already have established before she began developing programs.

Ms. Walters replied none, other than the occasional special event.

Mr. King asked if the facility was open to the public while she was there.

Ms. Walters replied yes, she was there Monday through Friday, 9:00 to 5:00 and every other Saturday. She offered two programs every day; however, quite often there were no attendees. The fee at that time was \$12.99 per participant. The fee per participant for groups was \$6.

Ms. Marshall asked for a description of the advertisement methods used for the groups.

Ms. Walters replied that a lot of it was word-of-mouth, some was from the Facebook page, and a few was from RedSci.

Ms. Marshall asked if there were any underprivileged groups or families served.

Ms. Walters replied some. Groups, such as the Boys and Girls Club represented 5 – 10 percent of the overall participation. The free events did not get monitored as far as income was concerned.

Mr. King asked if they partnered with other organizations to have joint events.

Ms. Walters replied yes, for her component of the program.

Mr. King asked if the events were adequately staffed.

Ms. Walters replied that she was usually the only staff member present.

Ms. Marshall asked if there was a new Director of Education.

Mr. Connor replied yes, Ms. Joanna Thompson.

Ms. Marshall asked how one person was managing all the programs while all the environmental and construction issues were going on.

Mr. Connor replied that paid staff only represented a part of the staffing. There are approximately 200 volunteers in Greenville that work with GO Science. Partner organizations, such as Gold Leaf, pay interns to work with GO Science too.

Mr. King asked if all the employees and vendors were paid up to date.

Mr. Connor replied yes.

Mr. Bunch stated that they had requested \$60,000 in operating capital from the State and were waiting for a response. There are also several other contributors and organizations assisting with funding.

Ms. Marshall asked what would happen if the funding from the State was denied.

Mr. Connor replied they have several funding proposals pending along with several private contributors.

Mr. Patterson asked who was in charge of fundraising.

Mr. Connor replied that it was a joint effort of the board and GO Science staff.

Mr. Patterson asked who was in charge of programming.

Mr. Connor replied Ms. Joanna Thompson.

Ms. Marshall asked how much funding had been raised thus far.

Mr. Connor replied about \$38,000.

Mr. Patterson asked if there was an advisory board comprised of people who are in the science field to give GO Science direction regarding the programming and exhibits.

Mr. Bunch replied that the GO Science Board is comprised of individuals from either ECU Science Department or Pitt County Schools or other advisory educational capacities.

Mr. King opened the board for discussions.

Ms. Dunn asked Mr. Bunch if the calendar of events given to the board members reflected an improvement of programs offered.

Mr. Bunch replied previously there were not as many programs or as much variety.

Mr. Patterson asked if the scale of operations was larger than the capacity to fund.

Mr. Bunch replied not really. There is a limited budget and they are doing the best they can within the budget and with the help of volunteers.

In response to discussion comments, Mr. Bunch stated that he is committed to GO Science, and he is committed to keeping it open, but he and the other board members are all volunteers. As volunteers, they don't handle the day-to-day operations. Every organization has questions about leadership decisions and other actions taken. If GO Science is valuable to the community, then they will have to double their efforts to do a better job. However, to do that, then they will need a firm commitment to go forward. As board members, we will have to have a commitment to be givers. Many of the board members hold full-time jobs. You do have some serious concerns and if you do extend the lease, then we will work harder. But we cannot promise some grand thing like getting \$40 million dollars or even \$2,000. All I can say is that we will go to work on it as hard as we can. Some volunteers who are businessmen in the community have taken it on themselves to get estimates. So when you say that there may not be a GO Science in the community any more, then that is a tough statement to think about. If you do decide to extend the lease, then we will come back to you with something specific. We did have a strategic planning session. It covered what we were going to do right now for the next year. We didn't want a five year plan because those tend to get put on a shelf and forgotten. What we need to determine is how to operate this facility to be as economically and educationally enriching as possible.

Ms. Dunn asked what a six month lease would do to the fund raising efforts.

Mr. Bunch replied six months is a short period of time in the life of an organization.

Ms. Gardner asked if he felt they could reasonably make the changes and suggestions this board is requesting.

Mr. Bunch replied that they would require a specific layout of what was required. The best they can do it try to make it work.

Ms. Marshall asked if the idea of sending out an RFP/Q and allowing the center to start at the ground level and build back up would be more favorable.

Mr. Bunch replied that he was concerned if investors saw the RFP then they would assume GO Science was going under and not donate any more money.

Motion was made by Ms. Dunn and seconded by Mr. King that a subcommittee be formed consisting of two board members from the Redevelopment Commission and two board members from the GO Science Board to discuss the conditions of a new lease agreement. Motion carried with Mr. King, Ms. Dunn, Ms. Marshall and Ms. Gardner voting for and Mr. Patterson voting against.

VI. Public Comment Period

No comments were received.

VII. Revisions to the Board and Commission Policy

Mr. Wisemiller presented the revisions to the Board and Commission Policy. Notable changes include:

- Changes to talent bank solicitation shall be submitted to City Council monthly
- Appointment letters shall be sent within seven calendar days of appointment
- No holdover beyond term
- Any City Council member may make a nomination to fill a vacancy of more than three months
- The timing of the transition between serving on two boards
- Electronic participation in meetings is allowed but will not count towards quorum
- If a member misses two or more consecutive meetings or fails to attend 75-percent of meetings, he or she will be placed on a probationary period
- A member is considered absent if his or her absence contributes to the lack of a quorum
- New members will be required to sign Acknowledgement of Attendance form
- City Council will be notified by staff when a board or commission fails to have two consecutive quorums

Mr. King asked if it was possible to telecommute to a meeting.

Mr. Wisemiller replied that there were some boards with members out of town who participate electronically. You can participate; it just doesn't count as a quorum.

Ms. Marshall asked if you are considered absent if you participate electronically even if there is not a quorum.

Mr. Wisemiller replied that he would seek clarification on the electronic attendance provision.

VIII. Report from Secretary

a. Monthly Financial Report

Mr. Wisemiller gave the monthly financial report.

Redevelopment Commission Budget FY 2016-2017

Center City Bond Funds		
Uptown Theatre Repairs		
Date		Beginning balance: \$138,822.00
4/13/2016	IMEC remediation & stabilization of theatre (encumbered)	\$100,200.00
08/16/2016	IMEC - Change Order # 1	\$20,846.90
08/23/2016	IMEC - Change order # 2	\$14,845.62
		Total Spent in Account: \$135,892.52
		Total Remaining in Account: \$2,929.48
Uptown Alley Improvements		
Date		Beginning balance: \$20,000.00
08/03/2016	THE EAST GROUP - Merchant's Lot study	\$1,483.50
		Total Spent in Account: \$1,483.50
		Total Remaining in Account: \$18,516.50

Total of all Center City Bond accounts \$21,445.98

West Greenville Bond Funds	
All funds for West Greenville have been expended.	
Total of all West Greenville Bond accounts	\$0.00

IX. Comments from Commission Members

Mr. King stated that he appreciates the board and respects all of the opinions.

X. Adjournment

Motion was made by Ms. Dunn and seconded by Ms. Siguaw to adjourn the Redevelopment Commission meeting at 7:34 PM. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Signature on file

Thomas G. Wisemiller,
The Economic Development Project Coordinator
City of Greenville Office of Economic Development