



2029 CIP

Process & Outcomes

Citizen's Capital Budgeting Advisory Committee

April 9, 2024

CIP Process

- A new process for CCBAC
 - Met with departments over January and February
 - Opportunity to ask questions and review master plans
 - CCBAC charter revised after these meetings
 - Did not know scope of our mandate at the time
 - May not have been able to ask the right questions
 - Met with Finance Department
 - Learned their recommendation approach

CCBAC Views

- Informed by the discussion with the finance team and the meetings and materials provided by various agencies
- We focused on the process, the various project's, and the county's approach to CMS (regarding the dollar amount)
 - Finance department has asked our opinion about the latter
- This CCBAC assessment is a snapshot of a well - established robust institutionalized planning processes.
- With a newly defined mandate future reviews by CCBAC will produce more targeted recommendations and other proposed changes



Project Recommendations

- AFM
 - Submitted two requests
- Given the significant cost of the Sheriff's Office project and the competing priorities for CIP dollars, we agree with the recommendation to fund only the courthouse project.



Project Recommendations

- CML
 - From the the review of CMLs capital presentation, we observed continuity between the critical elements of the CIP process, observing a linkage of community engagement, detail need assessments, value analysis in project prioritization
 - Two capital projects to be included in the 2029 CIP were tightly connected to Masterplan, with supporting business details demonstrating the need for the requested funding.
 - Timing for the project reflects a full understanding of project management resource limitations and the critical importance of competing projects. These projects should be funded.



Project Recommendations

- CPCC
 - CPCC projects presented demonstrated a level of value and were connected to the masterplan.
 - Highlighting the importance of the student experience demonstrated a keen focus on the students and community partners.
 - However, some projects were weak in demonstrating a strong and immediate impact of the project.
 - This need not imply there is limited value in the project but rather more metrics supporting the benefits could ensure more robust support for projects and assist in properly positing the importance of each project.
 - While it is important to value the look and feel of our facilities and grounds, it must be quantified in a way to helps to compare and contrast such projects with other more tangible programs.
 - The department however, offered several forward-looking programs that present opportunities for strategic growth and should be invested in.



Project Recommendations

- Parks and Recreation
 - Submitted 12 requests
 - Per the P&R intake forms, of the 10 non-wayfinding (i.e., signage) requests recommended to be funded (representing \$59,190,853):
 - 8 projects representing \$44,773,962 (~76% of such recommended funding) are intended for Priority Communities
 - 6 projects representing \$35,970,471 (~61% of such recommended funding) are tended for Tier One investments
 - 9 projects are located in Charlotte, with the remaining project located in Cornelius
- We don't object to the recommendation, but note that:
 - Several of the projects, including those identified as Priority Communities, anecdotally appear to be located in gentrifying areas; and
 - We wonder whether there are any additional Tier One investments that were NOT submitted by Parks & Rec



Project Recommendations

- CMS
 - By the revised charter, CMS is beyond our remit
 - Still, Finance Department interested in our views
 - Is the \$150 million allocation sufficient given the projected new builds resulting from anticipated population growth and future deferred maintenance costs?

CCBAC

Observations and Suggestions

- Timeline was compressed
 - Establish a consistent timeline with more lead time
- Experience will allow for better understanding our mandate
- Need to develop better process for interacting with the various agencies and other county citizen committees
- Create a CCBAC template to aggregate the info we are receiving from various stakeholders (e.g. various departments, citizen committees)
- Pursue opportunities to interact with various sub-committees (e.g. environmental stewardship, sustainability)

CCBAC

Observations and Suggestions

- Access to expert resource(s) to digest some of the information and details
- Better understanding of the relative funding allocation to requesting departments
- Definition of “critical” must be defined and the rationale for drawing the line at a certain project
 - How are we supposed to interpret the question of “critical” needs?



Conclusions and Questions

- In principle, CCBAC supports the stability an annual CIP process can give county planners and commissioners
 - Especially in this sustained period of anticipated growth
- Establishing a process with clear timelines and parameters will help all stakeholders
- We appreciate the consistent engagement from the Finance Department and establishing the meetings with the departments
- The county should explore using reports showing investments made by the county by the district in capital projects over time.
 - While this should not be considered major criteria it should be viewed to ensure equitable distribution of resources and future funding and investments.
- While the CCBAC recognizes the importance of the siloed masterplans of each Department, the Commissioners should consider establishing an overarching set of expectations that all departments should adhere to regarding principles and priorities the board find to be of high strategic value.
 - This would call for creating a more strategic vision to guide investments of the County.
- Questions?