

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for an Action Review Meeting on Monday, April 23, 2018 at 5:04 p.m. Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Tariq Bokhari, Edmund Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, LaWana Mayfield, Matt Newton, Greg Phipps, and Braxton Winston, II.

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmembers Justin Harlow and James Mitchell

ABSENT: Councilmember Dimple Ajmera

* * * * *

ACTION REVIEW

ITEM NO. 1: MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS

Mayor Lyles said before we do the Consent Agenda may I make a few remarks. Item No. 26 is on our submissions for the Housing Trust Fund dollars, going to the State for the Housing State Financing Agency. We are going to move that to policy. It will follow Charlotte Walks. We have four settlements under Property Transactions: Item Nos. 43, 56, 57, and 60 all property settlements, so if you would mark those and Item No. 64, the Clerk will read a correction to the property owner's name. That owner's name is not Jason but James.

Randy Harrington, Chief Financial Officer said at your seat, you do have a hard copy of the email that I sent out around 4:00 p.m.; I think that I have answered all of the questions from today, but I would be happy to take any others if there are any others out there.

Councilmember Bokhari said I did have one question, Item No. 26, where you break down, and I know in Committee we had been shown this breakdown of how we got from the \$1.4 million in the Housing Trust Fund balance to \$6.8 million, which is something that I think we are moving to tonight. I was just curious; I did not remember getting a real detailed breakdown or just a deeper view of that \$1.8 million temporary project reallocation and what that exactly means. I just do not remember seeing that.

Councilmember Driggs said Weddington Road?

Mr. Bokhari said yes. Is there are quick sentence description of what the Weddington Road fund?

Mr. Driggs said the Weddington Road project was approved a couple of years ago; it got involved in litigation. It has been postponed over and over again. It is now on hold, pending a possible redesign; therefore, the funds that were set aside for it are not going to be needed within the current cycle, and one of the suggestions staff had made in addition to the other ones that I think that you knew about was that they go ahead and use that money for the nine percent projects that are currently being proposed and that we will then have other funds by the time that we need to fund Weddington Road.

Councilmember Mayfield said I do have one that I would like to pull for comment; that one would be Item No. 33 for comment. Staff did respond, but I wanted to make a comment.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: AGENDA OVERVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said tonight, we have two presentations related to our Municipal Services Districts, and I would like for our Budget Director Phil Reiger to introduce our two speakers.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: MUNICIPAL SERVICE DISTRICTS ANNUAL UPDATE

Phil Reiger, Strategy & Budget Director said it is my pleasure tonight to kick off the first couple of presentations, and just for context, by law, annually the providers of MSD or Municipal Service Districts services, are required to present their annual work plan. Tonight is the opportunity for our financial partners to do that. So, we are going to take them in order. Michael Smith, the President and CEO of Charlotte Center City Partners will present first; he oversees and administers the services for our Municipal Service Districts one through four. Following Mr. Smith, Darleen Heater, Executive Director of University City Partners, will give her presentation, and she administers the services for Municipal Service District Five. There will be an opportunity for Council to ask questions in between.

Michael Smith, Charlotte Center City Partners said what a treat to be with you. We love this opportunity each year to be able to come and share what we are hearing from our constituents, and how we plan on acting on that information through our program work and budget that we vet through our Board of Directors. What I am about to share is a product of four decades of an incredible partnership that was intentionally created to bring the interests of our private sector, businesses, and residents of the Center City and for their voice to be heard and brought together with the best practices of government and really to create incredible outcomes. So, as we look at the way that we were founded, we were founded by Mr. McColl and Mr. Crutchfield, Belk, Ivey Lee, Gant, and they had a vision that in order for us to have a thriving region, we needed to build it on the foundation of a vibrant downtown. That has been our look, our aspiration, across those four decades since 1978.

Our mission is to envision and implement strategies and actions that drive economic, social, and cultural development of the Center City. Our focus is on job growth and investment and recruiting and retaining the best talent. We lead with research and planning, but then we quickly get into story telling. That story telling is for a purpose. It is activating that research, recruiting, marketing, communications, and also through programs and events. Our service area covers four different areas. You are seeing uptown now, being the first, then Midtown and of course our South End, which is MSD Four, then also the Five Points Historic West End. That is an area that we serve through our grant from the Knight Foundation that has allowed us to provide MSD services there for the last three years. It has been really a great partnership as we lay that foundation for some really great outcomes. So, how do we come up with our program of work? We work hard to engage our stakeholders prior to the budget process so that we can incorporate their input into creating our program of work. We incorporate the public input from the 2020 Plan and from small area plans from the South End Vision Plan, which we are looking at a new version of right now, the input of the North Tryon Vision Plan, then we have these neighborhood directors that serve in Uptown, South End, and of course in the Historic West End. They are constantly gathering information. We conduct research through surveys, including an annual perception survey. We have a lot of focus groups that we work with, then of course we employ the communication tools of newsletters and social media, traditional media, neighborhood meetings and such. We have advisory committees, a Planning and Development Committee, South End Committee, a Historic West End Committee. We pull all that together to identify and see what comes to the top, then we bring that to our Board of Directors, and we identify the program of work and then a budget in order to achieve that. That is our process.

Jumping into some of our concentration areas, the first being business recruitment, our work, we facilitate the retention and growth of businesses and the employment in the Center City. Center City is a defined term for us. It was Mr. McColl's vision that Center City should be uptown and the adjacent neighborhoods, really thinking about our urbanity. It goes back decades, and it was really smart thinking, because then you think of all the pieces of the whole that make it so that it is not just the central business district, but it is all of those quality urban neighborhoods. Jobs are the foundation of any great downtown, because jobs are enabled through creating office space; therefore, we are in the sweet spot of this economic cycle. We play the lead recruiting role for the Center City, but our team works seamlessly with the staff at the Chamber, the City, the County, the State, and the regional partnership and of course the brokerage community, because they are what

creates the liquidity for our economic development efforts. We host monthly Economic Development meetings with those partners. When you look at where we are today, more than half of the Class A office space in our market is in the Center City. We delivered two new towers last year, 300 South Tryon and 1615 South College. We were the seventh busiest for downtown office construction in the US, not bad for the 18th largest city, but what makes that even more impressive is when you put it in context. We were the fourth best for adsorption, only behind Seattle, New York, and Chicago. What that means from an investor's stand point is this was not speculation. This was demand that we were responding to. That is the entire system working together. In fact, we are on track right now to have a seven million square foot decade for office creation. You have to have that supply in order to go out and recruit the jobs. We are looking forward to hopefully getting that done.

So, from a planning and development standpoint we facilitate the development of Uptown, South End, and Historic West End through the fulfillment of our adopted vision plans. We do this through subject matter expertise and urban design research and project management. We are approaching fulfillment of the 2020 vision plan right now. It is amazing how fast this decade as gone, so we are beginning those first steps of thinking about how much has changed and what we should be looking to next. Some of the ways that we do this are collaborative like the one that we organized on Stonewall, where we have 40 different developers that come together across that one mile stretch. There is \$2.7 billion of planned development on it, and what we are trying to do is take these competitors and come up with a common vision for the development and the public realm and the pedestrian experience and how to be a better complement to those investments that we are making in our Convention Center.

Councilmember Harlow arrived at 5:09 p.m.

Efforts like the North Tryon Vision and Implementation Plan across those 50 blocks of our Center City, that effort is being chaired by Kathy Bassant and there is great focus on affordable housing, comfortable scale, and catalyst sites. There are retail initiatives, and there is research. We try to lead with data. We feel like it differentiates our efforts if we are able to help perspective investors or major employers to quickly underwrite whether or not Charlotte makes sense for them. We are constantly curating data, constantly creating data. There are a couple of times a year where we would do major publications. In the packet in front of you is our state of the Center City report. We publish that once a year, and in partnership with the Business Journal, we publish an update in the August time frame. From an urban neighborhoods standpoint, we look to serve our three major neighborhoods, helping them become stronger, healthier, transit oriented, and also with business districts that have a variety of desirable businesses and urban living conditions, quality schools, great urban parks. It is amazing where we are; in the last 20 years, we have grown our center city residency by 600 percent. There are now 33,000 Center City residents. Fifty-Four percent of the multifamily units that are under construction are in the Center City. It ends up being this great place to attract people to begin their life in Charlotte here. When you meet someone who just moved to uptown or South End, more than one third of them will have moved there from out of state. It is almost like the welcome wagon of urban America by being able to offer that, and I think that it helps be able to differentiate us.

In the South End, there is a million square feet of new office planned that is a real break out for us this year that has not been a major employment center. It has been more of a design district for us. It is awesome. There is about 350,000 square feet of retail that is either planned or under construction, 1,400 new residential units that are under construction and 300 hotel rooms that are planned or under construction. In the West End, that initiative, we are in our fourth year with the Knight Foundation providing those MSD services. It is really a community driven vision where we have sought to hear from the neighborhood, what are your aspirations so that we can serve and help facilitate achieving those? We've got this inclusive marketing and branding initiative that is really ramping up and this new approach to equitable economic development that we are really excited about. From a hospitality and entertainment stand point, we work with our partners at the CRVA and hotels, restaurants, all of our cultural venues, and sports and entertainment

partners. We try to create free programming that creates social capital and experiences in places that pull our entire City together. We have great partners and sponsorships that allow us to do that. We do that virtually all with private money, except the staffing side. That is part of how our partnership works so well by having those property owners fund us to be able to identify more free events and programs. Hotels are a big part of creating this hospitable 21st century downtown. In this decade, we will grow 68 percent the number of our hotel rooms in our downtown. We are at 5,000 now, and there is a little over 2,200 that are planned or under construction. We have had eight years of consecutive RevPAR going up. The market saw it and responded in an incredible way. That is our collective work. We are proud to be working with the City on things like CLT250; we are proud to continue to produce the Novant Health Thanksgiving Day parade, Soul Junction in the West End, Art and Soul South End, CLT New Year's Eve, and so on.

On the go, we partner with CATS and with C-DOT regularly to try to be great partners and try to get the private sector to the table and be able to get their voice. There is a number of projects, one that we spent a lot of time on this year and we will next year is Gateway Station; we think that piece of infrastructure is a game changer. It is like a downtown airport. We are excited to be working with your team at CATS on that. We continue to operate and launch Charlotte B-Cycle through private grants. We are entering a new phase where we are partnering with C-DOT even closer utilizing some federal funds then some private money that we were able to raise through matches to expand the density of that program, particularly looking for density in uptown, but then also hitting some underserve neighborhoods. We think that the beauty of this program is it can be mission based. This one is a C3, and we are proud of the way that has been delivered today. Diana Ward does such a good job for us.

Now moving on to special initiatives, at the request of our Board, one of the initiatives that we are looking to launch next year is an Ambassador Program. So, if you could picture, these are uniformed trained personnel who will provide active management, hospitality services, crime deterrence and reporting, as well as the facilitation of social services, identifying our homeless, illegal pan handlers, those that are in crisis and connecting them more efficiently with the services that are offered so well across our community. I imagine having these folks with having mental health services on speed dial and Urban Ministry, as well as one touch communication to CMPD. While we were studying this option, we went on an exploration trip to Cincinnati in February, and Julie Eiselt joined us, as did CMPD's Central Division Major Jerald Smith and Assistant City Manager Deborah Campbell, among other major constituents and property owners. The response to this was so positive, both the trip and our studies, that we came back and started having one-on-one conversations with major property owners, major stakeholders, major employers, and neighborhood associations, hospitality leaders, then our partners in public safety and social service. The response from all of these groups was unanimous support for let's launch this program. This is a best practice for downtown management and something that we want in our community. Our Board on April 13, 2018, sent a letter to the Manager and Mayor, making a request that we launch this Ambassador Program. We would love to have this be something that is operating in the fall. Also, in the areas of special initiatives, we will have a number of initiatives around economic mobility that we continue to work on and expand. One is Housing First Charlotte-Mecklenburg. It has been a great partnership of 27 organizations, including the City of Charlotte. It is now in its fourth year and is continuing. This initiative focuses on the chronically homeless. To date, we have housed 637. We are also proud of the work that we are doing in a partnership with social service organizations called Real Change, which is looking to address aggressive panhandling, partnering with these human services agencies, we are putting outreach councilors out to connect with people where they are in crisis. We had such good luck with the way that happened with Housing First Charlotte-Mecklenburg, we look forward to seeing the results. We continue to operate the 7th Street Public Market, we are moving into what we are calling Market 3.0. We have renewed commitments from Atrium Health and Blue Cross Blue Shield of North Carolina and Bank of America. We are in our sixth year there and have incubated 34 businesses; there are 14 currently incubating and 87 employees, great mix of minority and women owned businesses, 10 of the 18. We also like the work that we were able to achieve this year around affordable housing. We are trying to join the conversation and

bring the private sector to the table to complement all the good work that you all are doing. That was produced in a product called the Evergreen Report.

Now to budget, that is the program of work. That is the staff we are focused on. What is represented here is the Municipal Service District funding, then the private funding that we go out and get through earned income, grants, and sponsorships to be able to fund this program of work. You can see the way that it is represented here on the revenue breakdown. I did it functionally on the right in that chart but then programmatically on the left to let you know the concentration areas of transportation, planning, and development. Arts Fest is our events, the work in Historic South End, work in West End, the idea of that Ambassador Program and on. I am glad to answer any questions.

Councilmember Eiselt said I did not realize that Center City Partners covered Midtown. Has there ever been a plan for Midtown or is that on the horizons for you all to sort of map that out as well?

Mr. Smith said it is not all of Midtown, and this was part of the original area. That is part of MSD one, which is the big one, and it actually goes down, like it splits the metropolitan in two.

Ms. Eiselt said so, right to the greenway really.

Mr. Smith said then it goes up to Charlottetowne Avenue and up past Memorial Stadium, then comes back around I-277.

Councilmember Driggs said a couple years ago, Council set aside a half million dollars for the Charlotte regional fund for entrepreneurship. They are now in a joint venture with the Chamber. I am just wondering if Center City Partners has any connection with that.

Mr. Smith said we do not today. Rick Thurmond, who is our Senior Vice President of Neighborhood and Business Development, works closely with them and has served on committees, but it is not part of our program of work.

Councilmember Winston said I would love if next year's annual report we as a Council got introduced to a term and concept in our Retreat last January about the term circular economy. I would love to see you guys get smart about that concept, because it really does seem like Center City Partners would be an excellent partner at getting Charlotte's circular economy off the ground. I think that it really does cover a couple of different areas in the vision that already exists within Charlotte Center City Partners of being innovative in terms of creating new economies here in Charlotte. Having tools to deal with the chronically homeless right in the middle of Center City, you also have one of the largest detention facilities in the County. It really does focus on giving opportunities back to the folks that are being reintroduced into society that are going to be coming back through that detention facility. As we kind of explore this as a City, I think that it would be a good thing on top of giving the kind of minds and wealth capital that does exist in the Center City to have a good partner in you to really get that up and running off the ground.

Mr. Smith said I would love that, because my understanding of the term circular economy didn't connect like you just made a connection for me. I am on the Board of Envision Charlotte and really support the work that Amy Oscar and her team are doing, and we are one of their major funders. I did not make that connection, so thank you.

Councilmember Mayfield said can we go back to the last slide that had the break down to expenses and everything? Can you give me a little more information on the Ambassador Program? We have an \$800,000 line item on the Ambassador Program but only \$239,000 line item for the planning and development, so can you help me understand the Ambassador Program a little bit better?

Mr. Smith said in your packets is a full brief on it. I did not want to take 50 percent of the time when we were together on it, and I am glad to meet one-on-one if I do not cover it all. It is a personnel driven model, and you have probably seen these folks in other cities.

When you look at the top 25 downtowns in the US, 23 of them have ambassador programs. Two do not, Austin and Orlando, and Orlando is creating one. That is not a reason to create one, but it is a reason to look into it and figure out is this a tool that the best places in the world are using? Our assessment and the assessment of our Board is yes, and it will mean hiring a lot of Charlotteans and training them so that we can be prepared when we host the CIAA or the Baptist Convention or whatever it is or every time we have a basketball game in town, that they are prepared to receive these guests. The Chief of Police does endorse this and thinks it would be a good program. We would have daily connections with them, just so that these folks have push button communication to the shift commander. It is just another set of ears and eyes on the street, and we want to hire a couple of social workers, so that on most shifts we would have a social worker who could be a part of this crew again just bringing our social service network to the street.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you for explaining that, because I wanted to capture it on record, because not everyone has this, and that was a good snapshot of what it is.

Councilmember Harlow said I have a comment and also a question. I am very familiar with your work, particularly in the past three years in the West End; I am glad you guys decided to make the leap across the interstate and helping a lot of branding and programming over these first three years. I am curious on the nine percent West End expense there, is it different from the past? Is it a flat expense? Do you project seeing more dollars spent in the West End moving forward?

Mr. Smith said the requirement of the state law that enables our organization and the funding is that the dollars that are raised in any district has to stay in that district. So, MSD's one, two, and three have to stay in Uptown; MSD four has to stay in South End, then the grant money that we receive and potential partnership with the City would stay in the West End. It is \$500,000 a year, but then in addition to that, we will go out and secure sponsorships for events as possible. Part of what we are trying to do is we are also trying to bring other partners to the table like the Duke endowment, like more of the Knight Foundation and also some of the federal granting organizations that we think could be good partners as we build out more capacity, more vision, things that is easy for them to see okay, I see how that connects to our program of work.

Mr. Harlow said how do you see, we have the map and the nice I-277 ring and South End leveraging the Blue Line, then you have the interstate, and we could go into separate conversations about interstates being there. How can Center City Partners help facilitate more movement in that direction, knowing that in the market a barrier is a barrier to developers sometimes, and 77 is one of them.

Mr. Smith said well, we think it is these municipal district services that create a place that is treasured by its residents but then is also a place that the market wants to invest. We are working together to define what equitable economic development is and what are the tools that we want to have in place to retain affordability for businesses and for residents in that district while bringing more vibrancy, more tax base, more options, and more food service, both prepared and groceries. It is right there, and the market is hungry to spring across I-277. We think that it is the right time to be there and be intentional so that it doesn't just happen to the neighborhood. We also think there are some big moves that we can make collectively, whether it is looking at the clover leaves on I-77, working with the federal government to change them into diamonds, then also working with the Housing Authority to see how we can all partner together intentionally, get the outcomes that neighborhood is looking for.

Mr. Harlow said thank you. I am glad that you are thinking that comprehensively around it as we think of some of that available land. I think of what we have done with Stonewall Station and everything around it and adjacent to an interstate, clover leaves, and green space and all of that. There is a lot of potential, so thanks for the work.

Mr. Smith said yes, it is not abstract when you look at Stonewall, right?

Darlene Heater, University City Partners said I am the Executive Director at University City Partners. University City Partners manages Municipal Service District Five, which according to this map, is everything that you see in the blue and green, so our northern boundary is Mallard Creek Church Road; I-85 runs down the middle of it, on the west side, Mallard Creek Road, on the east side, University City Boulevard, which loops all the way down to the south side of our MSD. My presentation is going to be much shorter than Michaels, because the work that we do in MSD Five and as University City Partners, is very much in line with the work that Center City Partners does. For those of you who have been around for some time, both myself and my colleague who works in planning and development spent myself six, my colleague five years at Charlotte Center City Partners. I will tell you, it was the best training ground that we could have had the opportunity to experience, and we have taken most of those lessons that we have learned, managing for Charlotte Center City Partners to the University City MSD. Our work too is focused on economic development, planning and development, marketing communications, events and programing. We work to recruit and expand our businesses and grow investment. We build to our vision, creating both a sustainable city and an inclusive community. We take that very seriously. We work very hard to implement our area plans. It is what guides the work that we do each year. We also shape growth and development that happens in University City, and you all hear from me pretty frequently when we have rezonings in University City or when we are grappling with a really tough issue, because I reach out with you on behalf of the community stakeholders in University City, to help shape the development that is occurring. We also protect and grow our natural assets. We enhance UNC Charlotte. We also work really hard to maintain a safe city.

In FY18, we came to you and said that we are going to invest our MSD funds; 84 percent of it came from the City, and just three percent from sponsorships. You will see that is going to change this year. As a small MSD, that fluctuates for us each year, depending on what types of programs and initiatives we are working on, \$36,000 in grants. We pulled from our capital reserves \$75,000. Most of our capital reserve money is applied to planning and developing projects, because those are one off. They are not annual programs that we initiate each month. Last year in FY18, 42 percent of our revenue went to salaries and personnel, \$135,000 just to operate the business. We put \$374,000 into the work that we do in the community and investment in capital programs. By allocation, I broke this down a little bit further, because I know that you all are always curious about this. Personnel is he same. We pay \$29,000 in quarters; operation is at \$100,000, then that work that we invest in the community was broken down into marketing communication and events at \$215,000 and planning and development at \$158,000. For several years, we have been under construction in University City. This is the first year that we haven't had a ton of orange barrels down the middle of Tryon Street, so we have really shifted gears. We are still doing some planning and development work, because we have a lot of work to do in that area, but we are shifting gears in that now that the traffic barrels have been picked up, we are inviting the community to come back to University City, so you are going to see us do a lot more events. Last year, we kicked off the inaugural wine fest. That event benefits two libraries in University City, both the Sugar Creek Library and the University City Library. Last year, we raised \$5,000. I think that this year we are going to be writing a check to each library for \$10,000 each, so very successful event. We tripled our attendance at that event this year. We had that event two weeks ago. We also launched last fall Charlotte's Kids' Fest, which we felt is an event that is really perfect for our area. We do that event in partnership with UNC Charlotte, and first year attendance without rail operating, which we were expecting, remember that was delayed without rail operating was 5,000 people, so really great events for University City.

Some of our successes, if you look in your folders, there is a document in that folder that spells out the report that we give to our Board of Directors and shows the successes and the impact and our accomplishments. It is a stapled document that I think is two or three pages. Just to summarize, our office vacancy is very low in University City for the first time in five years since I have been here. Our office rate when I started was above 20 percent. We are now down to under nine. Our property sales for the past 18 months are now topping \$647 million. We are now one of the top submarkets in the southeast for property transactions. We have seen significant organic business growth. We launched several events, including a Healthy You City Race Series, which includes a 5k or a 10k every

month. As I mentioned, the University City Wine fest, and we kicked off Charlotte Kid's Fest. We also, in the planning and development work, we executed a station area plan for the J. W. Clay Station, which is going to be our Town Center. We facilitated owner and city discussions to create some more access in the University Research Park. For those of you who are not aware, that is our economic engine in University City and also for the City of Charlotte. Many folks do not realize that University City is the second largest employment center for Charlotte. We have about 80,000 people who work in University City, and keeping those business centers viable and vibrant is critical to the economic vitality for University City but also for Charlotte. We also completed easement for URP Greenways. We have a greenway that runs through the middle of the Research Park, and for three years I worked on getting these easements for both the greenway and the trail connectors, and we finally completed that. Lastly, one of our highlights was creating a foundation for University City. Charlotte Center City Partners has one of these, and we took a page out of there book, created our own foundation, and it has really helped us in the areas of raising grants and sponsorships.

In developing our FY19 budget, we worked very similar to the way Charlotte Center City Partners does. We have a lot of board and committee input. We do continual focus groups and surveys. We have a lot of regular stakeholder meetings with our university and our hospital. Those are the two largest institutions. I do countless public presentations and neighborhood engagement. In fact, I am leaving here and going to one right after tonight's meeting, then of course, we use out University City Partners communication tools, which are really relied upon by our community, as a way to stay informed on what is happening in the community and where our community is growing and developing.

Our priorities for next year for FY19, we are really working hard on creating strong centers. I was telling the folks when we did this dry run. We create a program of work just like Center City Partners does, but our Board asked me to drill that down to 10 top priorities. I worked and worked at it and could not get down to the 10, so we have 11 priorities. Our number one priority was to create strong centers. We have a remarkable opportunity with the introduction and now operations of the Blue Line Extension to do this right and to get our transit stations right, and in order to do that, we have to start in the center first. Getting some of that critical infrastructure in place now, before we lose that opportunity, is what is going to determine if we are successful or not. Fortunately or unfortunately, most of that money resided in the County, because they invest in parks, libraries, and schools, so we are doing a lot of work and communication with the County to try to get some parks build. You will hear me say this, and I say it often, University City is park poor.

Councilmember Mitchell arrived at 5:41 p.m.

We have zero parks in University City and what greater opportunity as we start to develop these centers at each of our transit stations, to work to try to provide some green space and open space at the stations. We are working really hard to create a mix of housing. We are going to be investing in the public realm. I am going to have some more information on that in a minute, then lastly, we are really focused on place making, so outside of doing major events, we are also working with the University and several other groups to do smaller programed events and start to create a sense of place, that we are working really hard on building the place and identifying the place, and now we are inviting folks to come in and enjoy it and have a great experience.

Another one of our big priorities and I would say equally as important as creating strong centers is enable transportation but not just transportation that is going to move cars. We want transportation that is informed by the vision of our community. We are struggling a lot in this area. Last year, I stood in front of you and said we cannot keep making big roads bigger, because then we are just going to choke ourselves off. Unfortunately, our University is surrounded by big roads. That seems to be the easy target for how to handle the growth that is coming. We believe that there are other sollutions that we need to be paying attention to, and a lot of that is in building more options for people to get around and not pushing everybody down those big roads. It is going to be some heavy lifting for us. In fact, we have teed up a transportation study, in partnership with C-DOT, NC-DOT, the University, and University City Partners. All of these items under the transportation

priority are going to be equally important, but I would say our heavy lifting this next year is going to figure out our arterials, because it is those arterials that the State manages and owns that are going to dramatically impact our University, and we should all care about what cares at that University, because that University is our talent pipeline. They produce 7,000 graduates every year that enter into our workforce, and 86 percent of them stay in Charlotte.

Another one of our priorities is to sustain and grow business, obviously. We work to share data with commercial real estate industry. We hold two or three events a year; I am in constant contact with the brokers in our area, and we work really hard to support the work that we do. We also inform and facilitate redevelopment, retain and grow business to support our vitality. I have been doing a lot of work, more work in fact, not in recruiting business to University City but supporting the organic growth in University City. We are very fortunate that these businesses have found a place where they can grow and they can continue to succeed. One of our biggest challenges is going to be around talent pipeline. I know that a lot of our Councilmembers who are out in the community are hearing his too. We have some industries that are having a really tough time hiring right now. A lot of those industries are in our trades, and I will talk about that in just a moment. Lastly, we are supporting the development of a hotel conference center at UNC Charlotte. We feel that this is incredibly important for our University as a research University. If we are going to continue to grow that University as a research University, we have to give them the opportunity to convene experts at their place, at their home.

We also work to strengthen safe communities. We work very closely with our police department. We have a remarkable Division in University City. They engage in our community like I have never seen before. In fact, we just bought them our own tent, because we invite them to so many events, and we find them standing around. We think if we give them a tent, maybe they will figure out how to program it. We advocate for the use of technology and cameras, because we know that resourcing for CMPD is getting tougher and tougher to do, so how can we work smarter while we are growing? Lastly, we are really excited about the development of a new CMPD Fire Station Civic Campus. The fire station is in existence. We are going to put a police station right in front of it. We saw the first preview of that station a few weeks ago, and it is beautiful, and we are really excited about the opportunity to actually create a civic place in University City. Finally, we do have a commitment to economic mobility. We are working really hard to build community partnerships with and for CMPD. We drag those folks everywhere. This work is being done in partnership with UCP, University City Partners, our University, our businesses. Believe it or not, we do a lot of work with our faith houses, schools, and our neighborhoods. We are digging into quality affordable housing, and we are working to strengthen neighborhoods. Most of this work, many of you have heard me talk about it, is being done in the Hidden Valley and Newell South neighborhoods. I will tell you, they have not been easy neighborhoods to engage with, but we are really committed to the work that we are doing there, and we understand that we have to do this work with them, that we cannot do it for them, and I have been working with probably six community leaders in those neighborhoods to advance that work around quality affordable housing. It is a really sticky wicket for them, because I got several emails and phone calls two weeks ago about the number of affordable housing development projects that are in north east Charlotte. We have eight of the 11 affordable housing projects have been approved for University City Partners, so you all are going to be hearing more from those neighborhoods. They are convening this weekend, but at the same time, we have to create places for people to be able to stay in their neighborhoods. There is a balance that needs to go on there. I think that what our neighborhoods are hoping to hear from City Council and from the City is that there will be more affordable housing developments coming, and we are working really hard to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to share in providing affordable housing for the people in this community. It just so happens that in north east Charlotte, we have available land, and the land is inexpensive, but we think that by concentrating all of the affordable housing in one district, you are also putting a burden on infrastructure. You are putting a burden on schools. We have got to make sure that we are doing the best thing for the future of Charlotte. So, we are looking forward for some really good dialoged with those neighborhoods.

Lastly, we have a community focus on access to jobs and increasing incomes. This is a project that I started working on last year, and I am thrilled to tell you we had our first start of this at Vance High School, so we are working on creating a trade training center at the County facility that is being envisioned for the Old Concord Station. The County just purchased 25 acres there; they have more property than what they need for the CRC. They have agreed to put a trade training center there that is going to house CMS students during the day and community training in the evenings and weekends, and at Vance High School, we just launched the first program. We are going to be offering an electrician training program there for 20 students. We had 23 students sign up, and at the end of their high school, when they graduate, they will have 120 hours at no cost paid toward their journeyman's card, and we piloted this at Hopewell. We had seven students that went through this program. All seven ended up with a job and are now on to a formal training program. So, we are now kicking this off at Vance High School this next school year, and I think that we are going to have a full program, so very exciting stuff that we are working on. I will tell you, I started working on that program in response to some of the input that I was getting from our smaller businesses, and when I told you that we have some of the industries that are really struggling to hire folks; it is not limited to electricians. We need plumbers; we need drywall hangers. We need folks who can work in construction; we need HVAC. We need automotive. The list goes on and on, and we cannot keep doing the same thing and expecting different results. I am fully committed to this. I work in a very small corner of our community, but if we can do it right in one place, I think we can do it right in more places.

Our FY19 budget needs, 84 percent we are requesting from the City. We are going to raise \$105,000 in sponsorships. We are going to pull \$45,000 from our capital reserve to support planning work and those two plans that we are working on, we are creating a vision plan that is going to wrap together all of our area plans. We have several plans in University City. That makes it very difficult for us to talk with developers, and then the other program planning exercise that we are funding is the transportation study that I mentioned in partnership with City, State and UNC Charlotte. That concludes my presentation.

Councilmember Phipps said after that spectacular presentation, I have to make some comments. I am honored to be on the Board representing the Charlotte City Council on University City Partners, and as you have heard from Ms. Heater here, the boundless energy that she possesses in terms of her duties with the University City Partners, her whole program of work, and I have been the beneficiary of laundry lists of things that we need to get done there, so in addition to the things that she has mentioned about economic- foremost, the MSD requires a lot of working with businesses to promote economic development and growth and job sustainability, and we have worked a lot on transportation initiatives and such and have a very close relationship with UNC Charlotte and the hospital there at Carolina's Medical Center, but apart from that too, we have been reaching out to the community and business leaders, and we have developed certain programs like University City Connect and the University City Family Zone that is described in here too, so we are really reaching out in a broader context in addition to those economic drivers, just trying to make livability just paramount in everything that we do. I think out of these five MSD's, I think there is no coincidence that all five MSD's are tied to rail transit corridors, so I do not know. It just so happens to be that way. This morning, we have a presentation about the South End Vision Plan, and they made a point of saying that one of their primary focuses was to develop vibrant neighborhoods along the transit corridors, but I would hope, and I know that Planning agrees that we are looking to inspire vibrant neighborhoods all around, even if you are not in a rail transit corridor. University City Partners, they deserve every penny that they get in terms of how they are going out and reaching out to the community, and I know they have a request coming before us and so does Center City Partners, and it looks as if to me that is money well spent, and hopefully I look forward to approving those appropriations. I just want to thank them both for the fine jobs that they have been doing in our MSD's.

Mr. Winston said I met Ms. Heater a couple weeks ago, and we talked about being park poor, and I know that is not necessary anything that is directly under our purview, but I think that was very surprising to me, and we kind of talked about it on kind of a different level as well and said this might be an opportunity and again how we kind of visioned our

development, we have to think about things like parks and schools and I think that there is a real opportunity there if we all kind of think across lines and talk to one another, but there is an opportunity to make a real landmark park in this area. As you really do kind of grow into an urban center, I think of other cities that really do have landmark kind of central parks that I think we kind of lack here in Charlotte. I know that we have some great ones, but I think as we continue to develop and consider our visions, we should look to do something really great up there surrounding a big landmark park in the University City area.

Ms. Heater said thank you for your support on that; we work continuously at that. We have a couple of projects in front of the County, in front of Park and Rec, and we are hopeful. I will tell you, if you could do one thing differently when you look at investing in other rail lines as we start to expand our rail system, I will tell you not only look at affordable housing, but get the County on board and start getting this land in advance, because it is hard as heck to do it afterwards.

Mayor Lyles said I think that we all agree with you Ms. Heater. We really appreciate you guys and the work that you are doing. The next step in this process is for the budget presentation. The Manager will make a recommendation, then we will be able to approve. They come as a separate fund with a separate tax rate, so everybody is on board with that, and we will look at that as a part of the budget deliberations.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: ANSWERS TO MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS

There were no Consent Item questions to answer.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Newton, and carried unanimously to go into closed session pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 143.318.11(a)(4) to discuss matters relating to the location of industries or businesses in the City of Charlotte, including potential economic development incentives that may be offered in negotiations.

* * * * *

The meeting recessed at 6:00 p.m. to go into closed session in Room 267. The closed session recessed at 6:28 p.m. to return to open session in the Meeting Chamber for the regularly scheduled Business meeting.

* * * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina reconvened for a Business Meeting on Monday, April 23, 2018 at 6:33 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Tariq Bokhari, Edmund Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Justin Harlow, LaWana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Matt Newton, Greg Phipps, and Braxton Winston.

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmember LaWana Mayfield

ABSENT: Councilmember Dimple Ajmera

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Phipps gave the Invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Councilmember Mayfield arrived at 6:37 p.m.

* * * * *

PUBLIC FORUM

Police Benefits, Pay, and Retention

Lindsay Brown, 8317 Browne Road said I am not in law enforcement officer; I have never been one. In my immediate family, we do not have any, but today I am here to speak to you on their behalf. I want you to listen to what the officers are saying, their actionable plans to attract and retain officers to our City. I felt so strongly about this, that I made the trip down here, and as a disabled person, it does take considerable time and significant planning for me to do so, and this is why. Last year, I met Officer Dr. Shaun Ward at a Transparency Workshop. I came because I was skeptical about police and what they were doing in our City. It was the first CMPD officer that I had taken the opportunity to connect with, and it had a huge impact on my life. He inspired me to learn more and to do more, so here is what I have done. I got to meet Major Campagna; him and Shaun, they helped me set up two more Transparency Workshops in my area, north Charlotte. I got to meet community coordinating officers for North and University City Division, Officer Bisulto, Officer Petes, Officer Meadows, and then I learned about more community meetings where I got to listen to Captain Butler speak. I got to meet Captain Rutledge. I did a RideAlongs with Officer Cavette. I am currently enrolled in the Citizens' Academy, and I can list half a dozen more officers that I have met and taken the time to speak with, but to keep it short, they were all positive interactions. Everyone I met was absolutely dedicated to keeping Charlotte safe, and what I am terrified of, is that other cities are going to take them. We have to be proactive to keep Charlotte safe as it grows; a lot of more knowledgeable people than I have numbers and plans, and I am just begging you to listen to them, because as a citizen, I want us to stay safe. On the Charlotte city website, it says Charlotte's government works hard to ensure that the community will be a Winning City for everyone. No one wins if we are not safe. We need to be competitive.

Frank Cantrell, 1834 Manor Mill Road said my name is Wade Cantrell; I have been a member of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department for 23 years. I grew up in Charlotte, and my family lives here. My parents as well as my brother live here as well. I tell you this, because Charlotte is my home, and I am concerned about its future. I believe that it is time to invest in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department, specifically the salaries for police officers. After graduating college, I applied to two law enforcement agencies. I was accepted to both, but I chose CMPD. I believe in CMPD's ability to positively affect the lives of others, and I am glad that I stayed. Other officers have similar stories in that they have been accepted to other agencies, but they stay and come to Charlotte. That trend is changing as a result of the lack of payment for Charlotte-Mecklenburg police officers. Officers are coming, and they are leaving. The vast majorities of police officers do not live in the city limits of Charlotte. They simply cannot afford to. They work here then go home to other communities where they continue to give. They are athletic coaches, mentors, and volunteers. Charlotte loses out on the time that they give their communities instead of the residents of Charlotte. Charlotte expects CMPD officers to be the fabric of our community, but yet you do not pay them enough to afford them the opportunity to raise their families here. Everyday CMPD officers invest in the community of Charlotte. We fill up a tank of gas for a stranded motorist on East Independence Boulevard. We pay the fine to remove a boot from a senior citizen who cannot make it to a doctor's appointment, because she misread the parking restrictions. We pay for a week at a motel for a homeless family during the winter so that they can stay warm. We are investing in the individuals in our city. We ask you to invest in us. Before I had a family, I didn't worry about my salary much. I could work extra jobs to make up for gaps in the cost of living. Officers depend on this extra income to support their families. My wife and I have two children, and we both work full time. Time is limited and does not afford me the ability

to work the extra jobs. I miss the extra pay. The extra pay made a difference to me. A paid increase would alleviate some of this burden for me and my family. The most important asset that any organization has is its people. CMPD has great people, and the City should support us and fight to keep us here. I know these are difficult financial decisions to make, but I also know that the City spends millions of dollars every year in community investment products. We are community investment. Invest in us so that we can continue to make a positive difference in the lives of the citizens of Charlotte.

Michelle Hummel, 601 E. Trade Street said some of you know me and probably are wondering why in the world is she standing in front of you to talk about issues of pay and benefits when I am nearing retirement. Let me explain why I am here tonight. Look around this chamber for me please. It is kind of hard to miss them. What you see surrounding you are sheepdogs. If you have not heard that term, they, the sheepdogs are the protectors. They are what stands and faces the wolves, danger, evil, that many do not want to believe or remember exists. So, why am I here? Because, I am there protector, even the sheepdogs need someone to look after them sometimes, and your time is now. You have the ability and power to show the sheepdogs that you appreciate their hard work, dedication, and sacrifice. We all know why we are here, pay and benefits issues, but it didn't get this way over night. I am here to tell you that this have been a long time coming. There have been many tweaks and tinkers with officers' pay, pay steps, and merit dates, that have gotten us to this point, but the time has come for a wholesale, independent, inspection and assessment of the department's payroll with regard to years of service, lateral status, and merit step for the entire department. This should be done by a group unaffiliated with the department or the City; it must be independent. Your employees' trust depends on it. This is no one person's fault. We are not here to point fingers or establish blame. We are pay past that. There have been years of trying to get it straightened out, only to find that the next year, there is another issue caused by the tweak that was made the year before. Look into it; straighten it out. Fix it. Your sheepdogs deserve it. Now, for something that does affect me and all the folks that you see standing around, insurance, a hard look should be taken at grouping all these people you see standing before you, police and fire, in to one group for insurance purposes. These folks are a unique group of people when it comes to their jobs, and their benefits should reflect that. All City employees are not the same, and the benefits do not have to be either. What good is insurance that causes you to need a second job to pay the cost to cover your family or work in retirement to make ends meet because your insurance costs are so high? No one comes away from a police or fire career unscathed mentally. The job takes a toll on you mentally and physically, much of which is not realized until after retirement. Look into it. Straighten it out. Fix it. Your sheepdogs deserve it.

Eric Stout, 810 Cone Avenue, Pineville said I have been with CMPD since September of 2006. I am here today to talk to you about the current state of officers. I will sum it up for you in three simple words: we are tired. We are tired from working all night long, then spending all day in court, only to have our cases dismissed for no apparent reason. We are tired from being assigned training on our days off. We are tired from the City landing a major event so it cancels more of our days off and our vacations. We are tired from continually defending ourselves against false accusations and outright lies. Worst of all, we are tired from not being able to count on our employer. When I took this job, I signed a contract with the City that said I would be topped out in nine and a half years. That time passed two years ago, and I am only now on step eight of 13, because the City changed the pay scale. The Department recently decided to hire lateral officers with less experience at step eight, the same step I am on, then it decided to bump over 100 officers from step seven to step eight. Many of these officers will reach their merit date and get to step nine before I will. This means that multiple officers, with less time on, will soon be making more money than I do. Some of them have as much as three years less time on. At this current pace, it would take me 17 years to top out; 17 long years of serving my community before I reach top pay. I personally am tired of the City changing the playing field. Councilmember Winston, at December's meeting, you stated "I know Mayberry is set in North Carolina, but Charlotte is no Mayberry." I agree with you 100 percent on this. This is not Mayberry; it is Charlotte, one of the fastest growing cities in the country. Every day, new residents flood into our area. The City is growing at an astronomical rate, yet our department stays the same size. Major events are continually coming to Charlotte, bringing revenue with them.

The money is there. We are tired. We are tired, and it is up to you to fix it. Like many other officers, I have been forced into a corner. Do I stick it out with CMPD? Do I take a job in the private sector, or do I leave for the Raleigh Police Department? It is not a decision I want to make, because I am afraid of what that answer might be. You know what we want, and you know how to get us there. I implore you to take action before it is too late. We are looking officers left and right, because we are tired. If you fail to support your officers and your city, you are going to see a lot of badges turned in at property control, as we leave for better options.

Peter Grant, 8050 Corporate Center Drive said I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you tonight regarding the current and upcoming budget proposal for the public safety sector of the City of Charlotte. The City of Charlotte has been using an equation to determine employee pay that is over 25-years old. Public safety employee's pay is based on being within the 50 percentile of the national average. Even using that simple equation, the City of Charlotte has fallen short in how it pays the public safety sector of the City. Entry level salaries are nearly seven percent below the average of comparable cities. The pay disparity did not happen overnight, according to data provided by the City, officers have been receiving an average of 1.6 percent raise per year for the last 11 years. This 11-year snapshot includes raises for some officers for up to 3.7 percent to two years with no raises. As you already have heard, this does not cover increases in insurance premiums or officers who are still in a step process. It is a holistic stat for the entire department. If we were an average city, the 50 percentile equation would make sense, but we are not average. We are the 17th largest city in the United States, the 17th largest metropolitan area out of 50 largest MSA's, second largest city behind the southeast behind Jacksonville, Florida, largest population of North Carolina, third largest banking city in the country, sixth busiest airport, fourth fastest growing job market, 20th overall for growth, fourth for attracting families, 10th for fastest growth in the nation, number one city for net millennial migration, voted most up and coming city in the nation, home to both NFL, NBA, and MLB and NHL farm teams. Not one of these statistics represents an average city, rather above average in every sense of the word, still public safety is based on being within the 50th percentile of the national average. We currently have one officer forever 450 citizens. That changes drastically every day. Over 230,000 people commute to Charlotte daily from surrounding counties. This increases our daily population to over a million, which means one officer for every 656 citizens or 15 officers for every 10,000 citizens. Based on these numbers and the fact that there are over 60 new people coming to the City on a daily basis, we would need to hire a new officer every 11 days to keep up with growth. Unfortunately, we are currently in a deficit of 174 officers, and every 11 days that deficit increases. We have also seen a 20 percent decrease in applicants since 2016. As I mentioned, we are seven percent below the national average for entry level salaries, but unfortunately we are 20 percent above the national average of top out pay. It shows our inability to maintain a competitive pay skill. That is why we lose so many officers after five to seven years. They take the value of the training and experience gained here to get a job offer and more competitive pay. There is not secret that CMPD produces some of the best trained officers in the nation, but we are losing them in their own investment. A conservative figure based on pay alone estimates the cost of \$300,000 to \$380,000 to train officers to the five to seven year mark. It doesn't include the cost of benefits. It is an investment that we cannot afford to keep on loosing on an annual basis. The retention of officers is not just an issue with CMPD. It is a nationwide epidemic. Officers are leaving the profession for more lucrative jobs and seek our police departments that are willing to pay premium salaries and accompany good benefit packages. It has become the norm. The level of decision making and accountability, scheduled demands, and job related stress, accompanies with modest pay is not an accommodation that most job seekers are looking for. We have done a phenomenal job of promoting the City, and it shows. Our growth the City has experienced over the last ten-years is remarkable. Our economy remains stronger than most during the 2008 recession.

Henry Rozell, 1822 Seefin Court Indian Trail said thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak tonight; I will try to not repeat what has already been said or proposed these last couple of months, as by now, you have all those details. Tonight, I would like to take a different approach and talk to you about the life of an officer, so you know what you are investing in. I am here speaking on behalf of the 99 percent of those officers who are

loyal, selfless, and would not hesitate to enter a school during an active shooter event. I have been an officer for the last 18 years. Seven years ago, I was promoted to Sergeant, and seven years ago, my job responsibilities changed. I no longer come to work to answer all the 911 calls or investigate a case that was assigned to me; I come to work every day to take care of these officers, such as the ones here tonight, the best I can. If I take care of them, they take care of the citizens of Charlotte, the citizens of Charlotte then get the best possible service out there, but I cannot do it alone. I need your help so that we can take care of these officers together. I cannot provide them with a pay raise or retirement benefits, but you can. Every day, an officer leaves their families just like all of you do and heads off to work. We put on our pants the same way; we drive in the same Charlotte traffic, and we shop at the same stores. I say this to remind all of you that we are all human and not much different than one another; however, there is one huge difference that is priceless. An officer starts their work day preparing themselves on how not to get hurt or killed, trying to figure out how he or she can return home to their family in one piece. For starters, yes, we do put our pants on the same way, but in addition, we wear something that other jobs do not require, a bullet proof vest. Why doesn't every job require one? I think you know the answer. People do not call 911 to invite us over for dinner. Whenever we answer a 911 call, it is because someone in Charlotte is in need of help. It could be a disabled vehicle, robbery, or a helpless young child that was sexually assaulted. We are coming to help resolve their problems no matter what. Every call is different, every call requiring a different solution. An officer goes through emotional ups and downs consistently throughout their shifts. One minute they are working on an accident report; the next minute, they are chasing an armed suspect. Finally, after doing this all shift long without getting hurt, killed, complained on, sued, or fired, they head back to see their family and have to be a father, mother, husband, wife, friend, or coach, then wake up the next day and do it all over again for 30 years. In addition, these officers have their days off canceled to work for base pay, so that they can provide security for events that bring millions of dollars to our city. As the saying goes, no one signs up for this job to get rich. If our pay was based on the extraordinary and brave work that these officers do each day, we would all have Tom Brady's salary, but we do not. You have a great opportunity here right in front of you to show these officers that you truly appreciate the work that they do every day, so when you make your decision next month, please ask yourself what it would take for you to put on a bullet proof vest, not football pads, and do this job.

Tree Canopy

Kim Hombs, 16303 Farmchase Court said I am here as a resident of the Ballantyne area and the City of Charlotte, representing countless voices who could not be here this evening. We have an ongoing great concern regarding our tremendous loss of trees and greenspace due to our rapid growth and development. Mature tree save and greenspace save and growth and development can harmoniously coexist. It requires attention, education, organization, ordinance changes, and funds to achieve this, funds to educate and disseminate the information for all involved, that being our citizens, developers, corporations, tree services, and law makers, regarding the critical importance of tree save and greenspace save. There are numerous statistics and studies elucidating the many profound positive effects of trees and green space in all environments, in particularly in the urban and suburban settings. Without daily addition of new residents at the rate of 40 to 80 per day and they are accompanying vehicles, we are increasing our Co2 emissions significantly. Trees reduce the Co2 emissions by 25 percent. In addition, they provide flood water mitigation and given the increase of impervious surfaces, that becomes more critical every day. Trees also reduce the ambient temperatures on hot days and mitigate winds on stormy days, and of course trees add a sense of belonging and peacefulness that is difficult to quantitate. Although there are studies improvements of quality and equality of life in urban development's proportional to the number of trees, Charlotte's crown jewels are her trees. We employ our city government, whom have been so forward thinking in so many environmental regards, to continue that forward thinking, continue to be creative and proactive, and do allot funds to protect, preserve, and care for our trees. We could use existing vacated big box stores in strip shopping centers to be converted and remodeled to wonderful affordable housing, thus costing land efficiency. Regarding tremendous increase in traffic due to development, trees have been shown to calm aggressive driving and

reduce crime. Design elements can be incorporated to mitigate speeding and increase driving aesthetics, such as along Selwyn Avenue with big trees and islands and round about that slow traffic and improve pedestrian safety. More parks and greenways for bike and pedestrian travel, connectivity is ideal and more education for our citizens in the value of trees to their property and health and how to care for their trees. For those without funds to care for trees, perhaps a program of share the shade, like Duke Power has for Share the Warmth, so funds could be donated to help others care for their trees. Education and media coverage all require funds. We want to see more green for our green scene and more ordinances and incentives to save our trees and greenspaces as a reflection of our citizen's hearts desires. Charlotteans are indeed passionate about saving their trees. They are just not sure how to usher the implementation of mature trees and greenspace save in the face of aggressive and rapid development. Please let's focus attention and funds on preserving Charlotte's crown jewels, her trees and greenspace.

Charlotte Mecklenburg Youth Council

Jalen Lowery, 5570 Whisperfield Lane said I am a junior at Hawthorne Academy. I am also the student body vice president. I am also vice president of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Youth Council. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Youth Council is the unified student advisory for the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County and CMS. There is an innovative partnership between youth, local government, schools, and Generation Nation. We represent every high school. We advise community leaders and are active in helping solve issues that we care about, such as opportunity, education, and safety. The Youth Council reported to you here on September 25, 2018, November 27, 2017, and on February 26, 2018. We are back to update you on our most recent work. Thank you Mayor Lyles, Councilmembers Ajmera, Winston, Eiselt, Egleston, Harlow, Mayfield, Phipps, Newton, and Driggs, who took the time out to meet and speak with us to help us learn more about and share our views on housing, neighborhoods, safety, transportation, economic development, and other topics. This winter, we met with and advised the School Board and County Commission about ways to improve our school's safety, equity, and opportunity and help CMS to find ways to improve the budget. With the County, we have launched the Imagine Mecklenburg Student Art Contest. We advised a new CMPD recruit class on best ways to engage with youth. We will meet with the next class in July. We met with the media to better understand how they could cover the news, get interview tips, and to share our feedback on local news. After the Parkland shooting, we held several meetings to talk about what we could do to help. We talked to CMS and CMPD about the need for improved active shooter training for students. We did many media interviews and even had state and national news interest. Patricia Venegas and I were on flashpoint and the NLC Legislator invited us to work with them on this issue. Speaking of Raleigh, we represented Charlotte at the North Carolina Youth Legislative Assembly, where my co-voice president Righteous Keet was recognized as the State's outstanding committee member. Nationally, Morgan Herrin and I represented Charlotte at the NLC DC Conference last month. We served on the planning committee. Morgan led a panel on the International Relations Committee, and I led one on Youth Voices and Local Government. We also heard from cabinet members and senators and spent time with our own local officials. I attended my first meeting as a nationally appointed youth board member for the National League Youth Education and Families Council, and I look forward to representing Charlotte-Mecklenburg Youth Council in the City of Charlotte at NLC this summer. As Charlotte's young leaders, we are proud of what we have accomplished and how we have built and grown the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Youth Council what it is today. Issues like safety, education and opportunity impact everyone. We must work together to create solutions. As always, please reach out if we can be of service to you. We are your Youth Council.

Pay and Benefits for Firefighters and Police

Gregory Sharpe, 9400 Nations Ford Road said I am with the Charlotte Fire Department and Charlotte Firefighter's Association Local 660. We are here today to stand in solidarity with our brothers and sisters in law enforcement and there as their first responders who protect this great City from harm. We are also here in support of the Council's vision of a world class city and the City Manager's vision of the City being the employer of choice. To go along with this, we need to also be the provider of choice, and the investment of choice.

Hitting this triple bottom line, we will have a highly skilled and educated workforce that is representative of our City in their demographics. I am a 24-year City employee, have worked for both CMPD and CFD. I have put my life on the line several times in defense of this City's residents and their visitors. I never expect to become wealthy for risking my life, but I did expect that I would be able to live a basic life and retire when I was no longer physically able to adequately protect those that I swore to serve. Currently, that ability to step aside and allow those more physically capable is threatened. Our City HR has made the statement that they are trying to price out retirees from health insurance plans. I cannot retire without the option to have affordable health insurance, to protect myself and my wife. I swore to protect all of you and have done so for over 24 year and will do so for several more. All I ask is you protect me and my wife for the few years between retirement and Medicare age of 65. We support our brothers and sisters with CMPD in their quest for compensation that is in line with the current market and the reinstatement of retiree health insurance. We have identified several compelling reasons that the City should look at reinstating retiree health insurance. Other cities offer some form of retiree health insurance and are enticing employees away from Charlotte, thus to be the employer of choice, we need to reinstate entire health insurance in some form. To recruit and retain a diverse workforce, we need this benefit. Employees who do not have health insurance may not retire until they reach Medicare age, which may mean that the cost of savings that was projected by dropping retirement health insurance may not be realized. Those over age 55 in police and fire are injured at a greater rate than their younger counterparts, thus increasing workers compensation costs. This same group takes twice as long to return to work from injury, therefore increasing overtime costs to cover their shifts. Again, this same group is at a higher risk of cardiac events and contracting cancer as they will continue to be exposed to increase risks of these events, which increase the health insurance payouts. This same group once again will be at top pay of their respective ranks and remain there longer, preventing those coming in at the lower ranks and a lower payroll, increasing payroll costs. We continue to research all of these affects to get strong and accurate numbers for your consideration. On the surface, it is clear that the City's decision to eliminate retiree health insurance most likely will not result in any savings but may very well result in an increase in cost to the City, as well as a reduction in the effectiveness of employees.

Jonathan Griswold, 9225 Bryant Farms Road said I stand here as well as other members of the Charlotte Fire Department and Local 660, with our brothers in blue that help protect this great City. I have only been a member of the Charlotte Fire Department for just over three years and still have many more that I look forward to. The other thing that I look forward to is retirement; however, because I was hired after 2009, neither I nor my wife will have affordable health insurance when I retire. It seems just like yesterday that I swore to protect this City. The saying is, I am not here for me. I am here for we, and we are here for them, them being all of you and the other citizens of Charlotte. I too am asking that you protect and be there for me and my wife between retirement and the age of 65, when Medicare is initiated. We support CMPD and their request for compensation that would bring them up to the current market rate of pay, as well as the reinstatement of retiree health insurance. There are several different reasons why the City should look at reinstating retiree health insurance. Without affordable health insurance, employees may not retire until they reach Medicare age. Police and firefighters over the age of 55 are prone to be injured at a higher rate than their younger brothers and sisters like myself, which could increase workers compensation. If injured, they take twice as long to recover and heal from their injury, which could potentially increase overtime to cover their shifts. Another point, they are at a higher risk of cardiac issues, as well as cancer and they will be in these environments which will increase health insurance payouts. At this age, they will also be able to top out at their pay and ranks, preventing new hires and newly promoted members from entering the first pay step, which would lead to hire payroll costs. To recruit and retain a diverse workforce, we need to reinstate retiree health insurance in some form and match what other cities are offering that they are using to lead employees away from Charlotte. This decision to eliminate retiree health insurance will most likely not save any money, yet may increase the cost to the City of Charlotte.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion was made by Councilmember Eiselt and seconded by Councilmember Newton to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, with the exception of Item No. 26, which was moved to Policy; Item Nos. 43, 56, 57, and 60, which were pulled by staff because they have been settled and with a noted correction to item No. 64: property owner's name is James Crabb.

Councilmember Mayfield said regarding Item No. 33, the Sugar Creek 54 inch sanitary sewer rehabilitation, for that one, this particular project is another multi-million dollar project, and we did not have MWSBE participation. They had a seven percent goal, but I do want to thank staff, because I asked for a little more detail and background, and we actually had 41 MWSBE that were identified and contacted, and I think that it would be helpful that we continue when we are unable to reach the MWSBE goals, to be able to show at least give us an idea of who was outreached, because then that helps with staff when we continue to have the conversation of where we have gaps and creating more job opportunities for small businesses to be a part of this conversation. I did want to acknowledge if anyone was reading and saw online that they could not achieve a seven percent goal there was a reason why, but they did actually contact 41 different MWSBE's.

Councilmember Mitchell said I think that Councilmember Mayfield brought up a good point. One was 41 firms that we identified; I guess for me, it is the good faith effort. So, how many points did they earn for the good faith effort?

Nancy Rosado, Management and Financial Services said 60.

Mr. Mitchell said just for information, could we see that sheet later on? I think that we had a brown bag conversation, some of us, about good faith effort, so I think that it would be very helpful this Council to find more ways that we could strengthen that, because I think around this dais, we try to make sure our MWSBE participate in our City projects, so Nancy, if you could send that to us, particularly on this one. We had 41 companies that were contacted what is the reason why we did not select anyone out of 41?

Carl Wilson, Charlotte Water said the majority of them did not respond back to the contractor that put out the questionnaires and the contact information. The others, there was one that responded that I know of right off hand that responded; however, what they responded for, the contractor got it done cheaper using s person that they had under contract, and it was in a different scope of work.

A vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimous.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 23: Fire Thermal Imaging Cameras

(A) Award a unit price contract to the lowest responsive bidder WS Darley for the purchase of thermal imaging cameras for the term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two (2), one year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

| <u>Summary of Bids</u> | <u>Location</u> | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| WS Darley | Itasca, IL | \$191,930.00 |
| Stevens Fire Equipment | Morganton, NC | \$194,545.68 |
| Team Equipment | New Port Richie, FL | \$196,632.00 |
| NAFECO | Decatur, AL | \$210,597.00 |
| TS Rescue | Tega Cay, SC | \$243,083.65 |
| Kratos Southeast | San Diego, CA | \$248,571.88 |
| Rhinehart Fire Services | Asheville, NC | \$277,971.00 |
| Allies Universal Security Systems | Charlotte, NC | \$283,167.00 |
| MES Carolinas | Charlotte, NC | \$416,744.00 |

Item No. 24: Fire Escape Bailout Kits

(A) Award a unit price contract to the lowest responsive bidder EVAC Systems for the purchase of fire escape bailout kits for the term of one year, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to four, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Summary of Bids

| <u>Summary of Bids</u> | <u>Location</u> | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| * Safe Industries | Easley, SC | \$315,383.50 |
| EVAC Systems | Moline, IL | \$465,187.99 |
| All Hands Fire Equipment LLC | Neptune City, NJ | \$469,258.50 |
| Newton's Fire & Safety Equipment | Graham, NC | \$493,970.00 |
| MES Carolinas | Charlotte, NC | \$524,452.29 |
| NAFECO | Decatur, AL | \$535,855.71 |

Item No. 25: Fire Compressed Air Refill Stations

(A) Approve the purchase of compressed air refill stations, as authorized by the sole source exemption of G.S. 143-129 (e)(6), (B) Approve a unit price contract with Safe Air Systems Inc. for the purchase of compressed air refill stations for the term of three years, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 27: Private Developer Funds Appropriation

(A) Approve Developer Agreements with Profile Homes, Eastside Connections JV, LLC and Teramore Development, LLC for traffic signal installations and improvements, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9323-X appropriating \$99,000 in private developer funds for traffic signal installations and improvements.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 61, at Page(s) 363.

Item No. 28: Independence Boulevard Reimbursement Municipal Agreement Modification

Adopt a resolution modifying a Municipal Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation for the Independence Boulevard Project in the amount of \$1,088,674.98.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48 at page(s) 707.

Item No. 29: Michael Baker Place Bridge Replacement Project

(A) Award a contract in the amount of \$1,703,982.95 to the lowest responsive bidder Dane Construction, Inc. for the Michael Baker Place Bridge Replacement project, and (B) Award a contract in the amount of \$204,659.47 with KCI Associates of North Carolina, PA for bridge construction administration services.

Summary of Bids

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Dane Construction, Inc. | \$1,703,982.95 |
| Lee Construction Company of the Carolinas, Inc. | \$1,937,498.75 |

Item No. 30: Land Purchase for Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department Independence Division Station

Approve the purchase of a 5.05-acre parcel (parcel identification number 165-012-01) located at the intersection of Independence Boulevard and City View Drive in the amount of \$1,541,200 from the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NC-DOT).

Item No. 31: Lilly Mill Storm Drainage Improvement and Stream Enhancement Project

Award a contract in the amount of \$8,127,786 to the lowest responsive bidder Blythe Development Company for the Lilly Mill Storm Drainage Improvements and Stream Enhancement Project.

Summary of Bids

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Blythe Development Company | \$8,127,786.00 |
| OnSite Development, LLC | \$8,147,769.00 |
| Zoladz Construction Co., Inc. | \$8,875,831.06 |
| Sealand Contractors Corp. | \$9,413,813.10 |
| United of Carolinas Inc. | \$9,964,371.89 |

Item No. 32: Cedars East Storm Drainage Improvement Project

Award a contract in the amount of \$10,335,727.50 to the lowest responsive bidder Blythe Development Company for the Cedars East Storm Drainage Improvement Project.

Summary of Bids

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Blythe Development Company | \$10,335,727.50 |
| Zoladz Construction Co., Inc. | \$10,359,481.95 |
| Sealand Contractors Corp. | \$10,622,438.40 |
| Crowder Construction Company | \$13,734,000.00 |

Item No. 33: Sugar Creek 54 inch Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation

Award a contract in the amount of \$3,142,477.65 to the lowest responsive bidder Insituform Technologies, LLC for the 54 inch Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation project along Sugar Creek.

Summary of Bids

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------|
| Insituform | \$3,142,477.65 |
| SAK | \$3,239,710.74 |
| AM Liner East | \$4,216,159.75 |
| Layne Inliner | \$4,287,453.98 |
| IPR Southease | \$4,478,901.00 |
| Atlantic Coast Contractors | \$5,976,096.72 |

Item No. 34: Asphalt and Concrete Cleaning Services

(A) Approve a service contract with American Pavement Cleaning Services, Inc. for street, driveway, and sidewalk cleaning services for an initial two-year term, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to one additional two-year term with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 35: Utility Management System Maintenance and Support

(A) Approve the purchase of Cognos Reporting Engine maintenance and support services from a federal contract as authorized by G.S. 143-129(e)(9a), (B) Approve a contract with International Business Machines for the purchase of Cognos Reporting Engine maintenance and support services for the term of 20 months under GSA, Contract #GS-35-F-110DA, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to extend the contract for additional one-year terms as long as the federal contract is in effect, at prices and terms that are the same or more favorable than those offered under the federal contract.

Item No. 36: Laboratory Equipment Warranty and Support Contracts

(A) Approve annual maintenance and repair service contracts with the following companies for a term of five years: Agilent Technologies, Inc., Perkin Elmer Health Sciences, Inc., Teledyne Instruments, Inc., Horizon Technology, Inc., Gerstel, Inc., ManSci, Inc., Mettler Toledo International, Inc., Spectro Analytical Instruments, Inc., Thermo Electron North America, LLC, J2 Scientific, LLC, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 37: CATS - South Tryon Facility Lighting Upgrade

Award a contract in the amount of \$448,804 to the lowest responsive bidder Globenet Telecommunications, LLC, for the replacement and upgrade of lighting fixtures for CATS' South Tryon Bus Maintenance Building and Paint and Body Shop.

Summary of Bids *

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|
| Globenet Telecommunications, LLC | \$503,030.03 |
| TEC Electric | \$588,350.20 |

* Bids were in excess of the Engineers Estimate and MARS Grant Budget. Negotiations were opened with the low bidder. It was agreed that twenty-four (24) Type A lights and one-hundred and four (104) Type V lights were eliminated to render a contract value of \$448,804.00. (\$408,004 value with a 10% owner's contingency of \$40,800.)

Item No. 38: CATS Special Transportation Services Scheduling Software

(A) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and approve a five-year contract with RouteMatch Software, Inc. to provide and implement a scheduling software system for CATS Special Transportation Services, (B) Authorize the City Manager to purchase maintenance and support for as long as the City uses the system, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to purchase such additional software licenses, services, and hardware as needed from time to time to optimize the City's use of the system.

Item No. 39: Financial Auditing Services Contract

Approve a one-year contract extension with Cherry Bekaert LLP, not to exceed \$169,000 to provide audit services for the City, optional report for Transit, and Charlotte Firefighters for fiscal year ending June 30, 2018.

Item No. 40: Citywide Temporary Staffing Services

(A) Approve unit price contracts with the following companies for Citywide Temporary Staffing Services for an initial term of three years: Allegiance Staffing, Apex Systems/Apex Life Sciences, AppleOne Employment Services, GoodWork Staffing (a division of Goodwill Industries), Elite Resources, GM Staffing, Jennifer Temps, Inc., Premier Staffing Resources, Randstad North America, Inc., Rapier Solutions, Inc., TECHEAD, Temp Me LLC, Workforce Unlimited, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 41: Refund of Property Taxes

Adopt a resolution authorizing the refund of property taxes assessed through clerical or Assessment error in the amount of \$2,627.48

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48 at page(s) 708-709.

Item No. 42: Meeting Minutes

Approve the titles, motions, and votes reflected in the Clerk's record as the minutes of: March 19, 2018, Zoning Meeting, and March 21, 2018, Budget Workshop.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 44: Property Transactions - Cutchin Drive Drainage Improvements, Parcel #7

Acquisition of 3,340 sq. ft. (.077 acre) in Storm Drainage Easement, plus 299 sq. ft. (.007 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 275 sq. ft. (.006 acre) in Existing Drainage Accepted as Storm Drainage Easement from at 3223 Mountainbrook Road from Duncan C. Porter and Allison Washam Porter for \$33,750 for Cutchin Drive Drainage Improvements, Parcel #7.

Item No. 45: Property Transactions - Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #2

Resolution of Condemnation of 8,480 sq. ft. (.195 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 7,594 sq. ft. (.174 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 6060 Piedmont Row Drive from CCP Property Owner Southpark, LLC for \$201,600 for Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #2.

The resolution is recoded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page(s) 710.

Item No. 46: Property Transactions - Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #3

Resolution of Condemnation of 8,186 sq. ft. (.188 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 25,465 square foot (.585 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 7,278 square foot (.167 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement Overlapping Existing Telephone and Utility Easement at 6115 Park South Drive from LPA CP Southpark, LLC for \$332,950 for Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #3.

The resolution is recoded in full in Resolution book 48, at Page(s) 711.

Item No. 47: Property Transactions - Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #4

Resolution of Condemnation of 7,299 square feet (.168 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 20,610 square feet (.473 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 1,965 square feet (.045 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement Overlapping Existing Duke Transmission Right-of-Way at 6135 Park South Drive from CCP Property Owner SouthPark, LLC for \$334,150 for Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #4.

The resolution is recoded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page(s) 712.

Item No. 48: Property Transactions - Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #5

Resolution of Condemnation of 3,217 square feet (.074 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 7,929 square feet (.182 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 6023 Park South Drive from H@park South, LLC for \$135,525 for Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #5.

The resolution is recoded in full in Resolution book 48, at Page(s) 712.

Item No. 49: Property Transactions - Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #6

Resolution of Condemnation of 7,977 square feet (.183 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 5,103 square feet (.117 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 3455 Royal Crest Drive from Royal Crest at South Park Homeowners Association, Inc. for \$64,650 for Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #6.

The resolution is recoded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page(s) 714.

Item No. 50: Property Transactions - Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #7

Acquisition of 1,707 square feet (.039 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 9,307 square feet (.214 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 6030 Park South Drive from John V. Moore for \$78,750 for Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #7

Item No. 51: Property Transactions - Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #8

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,835 square feet (.042 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 3,504 square feet (.08 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 6000 South Regal Lane from Roger Schulz and Marie Schulz for \$23,050 for Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #8.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page(s) 715.

Item No. 52: Property Transactions - Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #9

Resolution of Condemnation of 3,106 square feet (.071 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 3,234 square feet (.074 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 460 square feet (.011 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement Overlapping Existing Permanent Utility

Easement at 5615 Glenkirk Road from Donnell Cooper and Karen B. Cooper for \$34,675 for Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel#9.

The resolution is recoded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page(s) 716.

Item No. 53: Property Transactions - Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #10

Acquisition of 955 square feet (.022 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 731 square feet (.017 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 2,191 square feet (.05 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Overlapping Permanent Storm Drainage Easement and Permanent Utility Easement at 5624 Glenkirk Road for \$12,350 for Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Fairview Road Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #10.

Item No. 54: Property Transactions - Rocky River Road Improvement, Parcel #3

Resolution of Condemnation of 4,233 square feet (.097 acre) in Fee Simple and 238 square feet (.005 acre) in Storm Drainage Easement, plus 1,157 square feet (.027 acre) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement, plus 4,277 square feet (.098 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 2,353 square feet (.054 acre) in Utility Easement 911 Sanctuary Place from Charlotte Student Housing DST for \$26,625 for Rocky River Road Improvement, Parcel #3.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page(s) 717.

Item No.55: Property Transactions - Rocky River Road Improvement, Parcel #8

Resolution of Condemnation of 5,355 square feet (.123 acre) in Fee Simple, plus 3,231 square feet (.074 acre) in Fee Simple within Existing Right-of-Way and 654 square feet (.015 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 7232 West Rocky River Road from Oxford Gateway Apartments LLC for an amount to be determined, for Rocky River Road Improvement, Parcel #8.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page(s) 718.

Item No. 58: Property Transactions - Rocky River Road Improvement, Parcel #12

Resolution of Condemnation of 7,085 square feet (.163 acre) in Fee Simple, plus 1,521 square feet (.035 acre) in Fee Simple within Existing Right-of-Way and 2,976 square feet (.068 acre) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement, plus 3,269 square feet (.075 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 948 square feet (.022 acre) in Utility Easement at 511 West Rocky River Road from Janice Marie Ingram for \$11,700 for Rocky River Road Improvement, Parcel #12.

The resolution is recoded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page(s) 719.

Item No. 59: Property Transactions - Rocky River Road Improvement, Parcel #13

Acquisition of 2,684 square feet (.062 acre) in Fee Simple, plus 1,370 square feet (.031 acre) in Fee Simple within Existing Right-of-way plus 1,558 square feet (.036 acre) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement, plus 2,525 square feet (.058 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 2,138 square feet (.049 acre) in Utility Easement, plus 188 square feet (.004 acre) in Sidewalk Utility/Retaining Wall Easement at 527 West Rocky River Road from Neil P. Mangan and Lorri L. Elliott for Rocky River Road Improvement, Parcel #13.

Item No. 61: Property Transactions - Rocky River Road Improvement, Parcel #27

Resolution of Condemnation for 166 square feet (.004 acre) in Storm Drainage Easement, plus 3,565 square feet (.082 acre) in Utility Easement, plus 2,811 square feet (.065 acre) in Sidewalk/Utility/Retaining Wall Easement, plus 83 square feet (.002 acre) in Existing Drainage Accepted as Storm Drainage Easement at 7505 Rockland Drive from Maritza L.

Johnson and Yonue Johnson for an amount to be determined for Rocky River Road Improvement, Parcel #27.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page(s) 720.

Item No. 62: Property Transactions - Shamrock Drive Upgrades (Eastway to the Plaza), Parcel #1

Acquisition of 8,866 square feet (.204 acre) in Fee Simple at 3109 Florida Avenue from Lehigh Holdings, LLC for \$185,000 for Shamrock Drive street Upgrades (Eastway to The Plaza) Parcel #1.

Item No. 63: Property Transactions - Stevens Creek Sanitary Sewer Phase 1, Parcel #7

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,945 square feet (.045 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 1,295 square feet (.03 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 14709 Thompson Road from Ronald F. Cox for an amount to be determined for Stevens Creek Sanitary Sewer Phase 1, Parcel #7.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page(s) 721.

Item No. 64: Property Transactions - Tuckaseegee-Berryhill-Thrift Roundabout, Parcel #4

Resolution of Condemnation of 89 square feet (.002 acre) in Utility Easement at 2418 Tuckaseegee Road from James Crabb for an amount to be determined for Tuckaseegee-Berryhill-Thrift Roundabout, Parcel #4.

The resolution is recoded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page(s) 722.

POLICY

ITEM NO. 19: CHARLOTTE WALKS: SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION ORDINANCE REVISIONS

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston and seconded by Councilmember Newton to (A) Adopt Ordinance No. 9322-X amending the sidewalk construction requirements in Chapter 19 of the City Code, and (B) Adopt an amendment to the Sidewalk Retrofit Policy to reimburse eligible affordable housing projects that reconstruct substandard sidewalk on thoroughfares.

Councilmember Phipps said I was wondering Mayor, in view of the fact that we did have a public hearing last year in November and the subsequent changes that have come about in that ensuing period will there be an opportunity for staff to give a brief overview of the specific changes or not?

Mayor Lyles said you would like to hear a staff presentation of the specific changes?

Mr. Phipps said right.

Mayor Lyles said we will have a summary of what the revisions are going from and to.

Scott Curry, Transportation said I am happy to be with you all again this evening. I do not have PowerPoint slides to answer your question, Councilmember Phipps, but I think that it is a fairly simple answer. The last time that this came forward for Council consideration, concern was raised about the potential impact on affordable housing projects. Council directed staff at that time to work with the affordable housing development community to overcome any concerns that they had about these proposed amendments. We have done that in the time since that meeting in November, and I understand that they have sent you all a letter of support indicating that fact. That is the

update; that is the only thing that we were asked to look into to change between the meeting in November and now.

Mayor Lyles said we just received the Charlotte Walks Sidewalk amendment fast facts; I believe this is from the staff, and the questions are addressed there.

Councilmember Driggs said I expressed earlier a certain level of dissatisfaction with the way that this has been brought forward. I do not believe that it just closes a couple of loop holes as it has been represented. I think that it actually has pretty significant implications for certain types of development. I have heard objections from the developer community that they do not feel there was adequate consultation and that this is kind of minimizing, whereas I do support our sidewalk policy and I recognize the need for sidewalks, I am not sure that this was handled in the best way that it could have been. It was not taken back to the Development Services Technical Advisory Committee after changes were made that had been requested. For that reason, I am not going to support it. I hope that we can have a process that leaves all of the effected parties feeling comfortable that they had the opportunity to participate and to express their opinions about things like this, because in fact, this is quite a substantial requirement, and in some situations, putting 14 feet along the edge of a property could have a significant impact. So, again, just the general comment on process, I do support Charlotte Walks, and I will not be supporting this.

Councilmember Winston said to follow up on what Mr. Driggs said, it is my understanding that all frontage on thoroughfares already has that 16 foot set back, so you would not be actually adding 14 feet.

Mr. Driggs said it depends on what is there currently.

Mr. Curry said you are asking if the build setback on thoroughfares is at least 14 feet.

Mr. Winston said yes, so we wouldn't be actually asking to add any area.

Mr. Curry said that is correct. As part of our conversations with the development community, they raised a similar question about does the eight foot planning strip and six foot setback fit within the building setbacks on thoroughfares and the answer is yes, it does.

Mr. Phipps said I wanted to get a better understanding of the level of outreach that we have had with different stakeholders on this process. You mentioned several times that we had several meetings with the development community. Could you just briefly describe those outreach efforts and what was their relative feedback from the group in terms of the veracity of these changes or whether or not they were in general agreement with them, or did you note any kind of dissent from what we are going to put forward tonight in terms of trying to advance this forward?

Mr. Curry said we have met with the development community six times now over the past 20 months. We met four times with that Development Services Technical Advisory Committee that Councilmember Driggs mentioned. We met once with our UDO Advisory Committee and once specifically with the affordable housing development community and the folks who sent a letter expressing concerns to you all. So, those are the six meetings, and in the FAQ sheet that was just circulated, there are some details about those meetings and also the public hearing back in November.

Mr. Phipps said did you get any pushback from the community of such that would cast doubt on whether or not these adjustments are universally accepted? Did you get any feedback relative to that from a development community, that these changes are still not satisfactory?

Mr. Curry said I would say that most of the comments that we received in the six meetings related to the specific thresholds which trigger the new sidewalk requirements, our development community partners were very concerned about how and when those thresholds would apply, so we made some significant modifications based on their input to

try to figure out what are some commonsense triggers for when and how these would apply. You will notice that they apply on thoroughfares only. That is a result of the public outreach on the Charlotte Walks plan, where the citizens that we interact with said that the back of curb sidewalks and sidewalk gaps were really a big concern on our higher speed, higher volume streets like thoroughfares.

We also tailored it to the scale of development, so this is not applicable to a change of use, not applicable for someone completing an interior renovation. It is only triggered by significant site work and redevelopment. That is also something that the development community asked us to be mindful of.

Councilmember Bokhari said we talked about this at length in the TAP meeting earlier today, but I will just echo what Councilmember Driggs said as well, because I feel like there was a lot of meetings, as you said six, and we keep hearing that over and over again, but at the end of the day, we do not have a unified group, a coalition all coming and saying this is what we all have agreed to and negotiated to. I am a big fan of what the loophole that this ultimately closes but between the unintended consequences and costs, concerns from other legitimate parties and what I talked about today with we are going to see this administrative variance used in my opinion heavily when we move forward, and we have just kicked the can slightly down the road and not solved the major problem of contradictory ordinances at this time. So, there is tree save and sidewalks. Why can't we put out hard and fast, this wins out and then the exception can be asked for by the variance. I am going to be a no as well right now, not that I do not support sidewalks. I am a huge fan of it. There was a big rush to get to the end of it, and I am not sure why we did not take a couple more steps.

Mr. Phipps said as I can recall, at the public hearing we had I think you said something to the effect that we had nine speakers and only one spoke had some concerns about the affordable housing piece. Is that correct?

Mr. Curry said as I recall, it was eight speakers in support and the one speaker who mentioned the affordable housing concern.

Mr. Phipps said so, I thought even at that time back in November, we were almost at the cusp I think of approving this for that one vote where we went back to the community to get more input on the impact on affordable housing. I do not know; I would have a hard time saying that this was a rush job, in as much as we worked a long time on it, had a public hearing, and now it is five months later and we are coming back. I guess it would be up to us on the dais to see which way we want to go forward.

Mayor Lyles said that sounds like a good plan.

A vote was taken on the motion and recorded as:

YEAS: Councilmembers Egleston, Eiselt, Harlow, Mayfield, Mitchell, Newton, Phipps, and Winston

NAYS: Councilmembers Bokhari and Driggs

Mayor Lyles said thank you to the Councilmembers. I am often reminded of the courageous vote that Pat McCrory made when he was on the Council to get us sidewalks on both sides of the street and under construction, and I just find that when we are working on these kinds of quality of life issues for the long haul, it is truly important if we are going to be a walkable city, and this is in our walkable plan.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 61, at Page(s) 358-362.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 26: FY 2018-II HOUSING FUNDING SUPPORT REQUESTS

Councilmember Mayfield said let me start by thanking all who were in attendance last Friday. We actually hosted our very first housing retreat, and by all accounts, I do believe that we had a very productive meeting from 1:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Tonight, we do have another opportunity to take action that will assist us in this commitment to expand the supply of affordable and workforce, and I love diverse price point housing when we think about how the City is growing. As we outline this in October of 2016 in our Community Letter, by approving our Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee's housing support recommendations. As a reminder, the Housing and Neighborhood Services staff presented this information to the Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee during our March 27, 2018 Committee Meeting. The Committee unanimously voted to approve the housing funding support for each of these developments outlines in our request for Council action and grant the necessary housing locational waivers. Housing and Neighborhood Services staff also presented this information to us during our April 2, 2018 Strategy Session. I would want to pause and thank all the members of the Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee, my Co-Chair Councilmember Ed Driggs as well as my colleagues Councilmembers Harlow, Egleston, and Newton for being there and leading the conversation this past Friday. As a reminder, approval of the Housing Trust fund dollars in support of these tax credit requests provides local alignment with state supported developments through the awards from the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency and allows for leverage of our local Housing Trust Fund dollars, and as previously stated, several of these proposed developments require your approval for the waiver of our housing locational policy, which we are working to update as a committee. The State will announce these awards in August 2018. Due to the competitiveness and limited amount of available tax credits and the NCHFA's desire to disperse awards throughout the State of North Carolina, the NCHFA will not award tax credits to all of the recommended nine percent developments; therefore, any approved HTF funding for developments that do not receive tax credit award, will be returned to the HTF for future allocations.

Finally, I definitely want to again thank all of my colleagues on the Housing Neighborhood Development Committee but also to all that attended on Friday and took time out of your day; the work that we are doing around this important conversation and this topic is detrimental to our community, and with that, I want to turn it over to our Director of Housing and Neighborhood Services, because Ms. Wideman, I think that we have a couple of conversations happening in the community, and there is some information that may not be as accurate as some people think, so I am turning it over to Ms. Wideman to give us a full presentation.

Pamela Wideman, Housing and Neighborhood Services Director said I have the pleasure of serving as the Director of the City's Housing and Neighborhood Services Department and it is my pleasure to provide you with a brief update tonight on your housing funding support request. We talk a lot about how does Charlotte become a Winning City and our desire to become a Winning City. One of those traits is the ability to create affordable spaces. I will also harken back to the Council's Community Letter, post the Keith Lamont Scott shootings, where you all accelerated an existing goal to create 5,000 affordable housing units within three years rather than five. I am proud to report that we are currently 72 percent of the way there, and if approved tonight, you have the opportunity to add up to 550 units to that count.

Tonight, we are going to be looking at affordable housing, and I would always like to remind us who needs affordable housing. We have various industries represented here today, but let me remind us that it is entry level health aids, folks in the retail industry, the restaurant industry, and many of our own employees as we heard tonight. I would also like to remind us that when we talk about affordable or diverse price-point housing, we are actually talking about rents ranging from about \$395 to \$900 per month. So, that is the type of housing that you all and we are trying to create as a City. I will remind us that we talked a lot about what are some of the strategies for creating more affordable housing. What you are looking at tonight are some of the strategies that we have been talking about, two specifically. It is the ability to unlock the potential of the four percent non-competitive tax credits that the State awards, and it is also the ability to support the

competitive nine percent tax credits that the State awards. Since the inception of the Housing Trust Fund, you all have financed approximately 6,797 affordable housing units. I would add that over half of those serve households who earn 30 percent or below of the area median income.

So, I will take a step back and talk about the evaluation criteria. We issue a request for proposal every year. Staff reviews the submitted proposals once received. They are processed according to our guidelines. These guidelines include the location to retail amenities close to in proximity to the transit. We briefed the Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee and then we are here tonight for your approval. Some of that evaluation criterion included the number of the years that the units will remain affordable. We want to serve this problem for the long term, so we have placed 30-year deed restrictions on any units that are approved with the City's funding. We also look at the strength of the development, specifically the number of units that will serve households earning 60 percent and below the area median income. That is about \$42,000 per year for a household of four. We look at the track record of the developers. We want to insure that we are parenting the developers who have a proven track record and who can get these units to the market as quickly as possible. We also look at how we have leveraged your city dollars. We achieve about a one to six leverage ratio. What that means is for every public dollar that we put in; we get six dollars from somewhere else. Each of these developments are subject to a market study, and independent market study. The purpose of the market study is to insure that there is a need for these units. Each of these market studies show that there is a high absorption rate, meaning that there is a waiting list for people needed these types of developments.

As I stated tonight, you all have an opportunity to consider both nine percent and four percent tax credit developments. Let me just spend a moment right there and just reiterate that not all of the nine percent competitive tax credit proposals that you see here will be awarded tonight. That is because the state awards tax credits across the State of North Carolina. These are very competitive. If we get our fair share in Charlotte, we will only get three of these deals in Charlotte, and the State undergoes strict scrutiny. They actually come down, drive the sites, so that they are insuring that they are not clustering these developments in one particular area. The four percent are non-competitive and they will be awarded if you all approve.

The developers will send up their final applications in May, and awards will be announced in August of this year. Any developments not receiving funding, the money will be returned to the Housing Trust Fund for future allocations. I also want to remind us of how we are funded these. We started with the Housing Trust Fund balance of about \$1.4 million. We received some program income. We also are using a federal tool, which is eligible for this type of use. It is called the home fund. We are using \$3.2 million of that fund. The way that we have \$3.2 million of unallocated home dollars, that is left over from previous years, when we did not do as many House Charlotte down payment assistance loans as we had done due to market dynamics, then we are also looking to reallocate \$1.8 million from a previous project. That gets us to a total of \$6.8 million to work with for the nine percent development.

You can see that we have no way of knowing which three developments we will get in terms of the nine percent, but we have added up, if we got the most expensive nine percent deals here, that would equate to about \$5.8 million, so we have enough money to cover those, and the four percent's will be awarded pending additional dollars that may be identified through the City Manager's and the Council's budget process or when we get a new bond in November.

The last thing that I would add is to call our attention to the number of units in this stack that are eligible to serve households earning 30 percent and below; that is about 26 percent or 173, and in the four percent's, 20 units there are eligible that will be used. The developer has agreed in corporation with the State's key program that provides a rental subsidy for households earning 30 percent and below, that they will allow 20 of those units to be occupied for residents earning 30 percent of the area medium income as long as the key program is eligible, and you all talked a lot about that on your retreat on Friday. Thank

you for your continued work around expanding the supply of affordable housing throughout this city.

Sam Todd, 8801 Brigadier Lane said I am a native of Charlotte; I am now in my eighth decade as a member of this community. I am proud to call myself a Charlottean, and I want to thank you for the sacrifice you are making as public servants. I am here tonight primarily as a member of some local civic groups: Carolina's Jews for Justice, Away Home, and OneMECK, all dedicated to improving housing options in Charlotte Mecklenburg. From personal experience, I know that government can make a big difference in people's lives. When my dad died when I was 12, it was a monthly government stipend of \$100 that allowed my under employed mom, my sister, and myself to remain in the home that my dad had built with his own hands. Having a stable place to call home is absolutely fundamental to strong families, communities, and cities. All citizens deserve a chance to have a home, because many of us have attended your meetings and workshops. We know that you have made diverse price-point housing a core deliverable. Also, you agreed that the policies of the past have not been successful in meeting the housing needs for many of our citizens. Madam Mayor, you are absolutely on point when you say that the number one way to build confidence and trust in government is to deliver on the needs that are most important to our people. An excellent starting point in this task is for all of us to ask the difficult and uncomfortable questions. Some sacrifice from all of our sectors of our communities is required if we are going to build a just and fair housing policy. We must be bold. I heard at the Housing and Neighborhood Development Retreat a consistent consensus to look at new ideas and stay determined to do a better job in the next year or two than we have done recently. The groups that I am representing strongly urge you to consider the following solutions have a better means to meet our housing needs. Number one, tonight, we urge you not to commit to \$9.5 million to the 4 percent tax credit, because the return on investment is weak. Only 20 units will be dedicated to those less than 50 percent of the area median income. Number two, expand housing subsidies to people in the 30 to 50 percent AMI through programs like master leasing and Away home. In the weeks ahead, increase the Housing Trust Fund to at least \$50 million, so that affordable housing can be reserved and built.

Angie Forde, 418 Neill Ridge Road said I am an advocate for affordable housing with Homeless Services Network and OneMECK. I too want to thank you for the time and effort you are putting into this work. We are gratified that the nine percent tax credit proposal now requires at least 25 percent of the units to be affordable for those below 30 percent of area median income; however, the proposed allocation of the \$9.5 million to support the projects for the four percent tax credit include no provision for those who make under 30 percent AMI a vague promise of possibility, which is what we have had in the past. Often, when we remind city personnel of the criticality of the need for housing those at extremely low income levels, we are told that the math does not work, so I decided to put my math degree to use, and I observed that this is because of an incomplete set of variables and faulty assumptions; for example, the assumption that the calculation must yield additional financial profit for those who have historically prohibited from the plight of the poor. I think that this is an item for negotiation. This math should also factor in the cost of all those enrichment programs that were destined to fail, because students who are insecurely housed are too traumatized to benefit from them. The Evergreen report and the report from the Opportunity Task Force tell us that we need new and creative approaches' to solving the housing and equities in our City. As the editorial board of the Observer recently pointed out, continuing to plow housing trust fund money into higher income housing will not make the biggest need go away. I ask you to revisit these two projects, with their business as usual approach, and either supplement them with additional funding or invest this \$9.5 million in new more cost effective ways like rental subsidies or preservation of naturally occurring affordable housing to benefit more people in the lowest income bracket. I am also a church lady, and in my prayers, I thank God for your willingness to serve this city, and I ask God to release in you're the courage to do what others before you have not done, and in so doing, to catapult their City up from 50th out of 50.

Aurthur Griffin, 16822 Crosshaven Drive said I wear many hats tonight. I wear the hat of Chair of the Black Political Caucasus of Charlotte-Mecklenburg. I am here tonight to support your comprehensive strategy to provide diverse price-point housing opportunities

for our citizens and to ask that you not delay adopting such policies. Affordable, decent, safe housing, fulfills a basic human need for shelter. It is like clean air and clean water. Children in stable housing do better in school and are less likely to experience disruptions from absenteeism due to unwanted moves. I will not repeat the volumes of research to you in support of diverse price point housing. By now, I know that you understand the data better than I do; what I want to do is urge you to act now. I in 1963, Jim Polk, an African American community leader was quoted in the Charlotte News fabricating for affordable housing before this very same body. It didn't look like this body though. In the 1970's a law suit filed Harris v. HUD. In the late 1980's I was here when Johnny Harris appeared before you asking for zoning considerations for a little bit of dirt out there, about 1,764 acres down south. We now call it Ballantine, on this commitment page. Let me quote to you "the housing element will include a variety of housing types for rent or sale, which are priced to accommodate various income levels represented by Ballantyne's workforce" waiters; waitresses; secretaries; teachers; teachers' assistants that we had back then; healthcare workers; managers; and owners. In 1993, former Mayor Richard Vinroot wrote me a personal note in support of affordable housing. In 1993 and 1994, I appeared before this august body to suggest several policy options supporting affordable housing. As an enlightened community, we cannot simple afford to continue to kick this can down the road. Since the 1960's since Ballantyne's request for zoning changes, the cost of land, rents, and just living, have sky rocketed. We have the most enlightened City Council in a half century with respect to this issue, and I look to you to approve a comprehensive diverse price point housing policy and strategy.

Adam Suprock, 19846 Deer Valley Drive said I am a member of the local Democratic Socialists of America. As Democratic Socialists, we believe in government truly for the people. We are fighting alongside the groups here today to transform our country so everyone particularly black, indigenous, immigrant, LGBTQ, Muslim, and other pressed communities can thrive, not merely survive, on the scraps of a wildly unequal capitalist system. We believe that housing is a human right. I would like to start with asking, who rents the apartments and homes? They are the people who prepare our food in restaurants, nurses at the hospital; the care for our children and our elderly. Tenants are doing the work that make our community run and are rewarded with low wages and high rents. We know that having safe, affordable housing is necessary to survive, and we will fight for that right until there is access for everyone. From school safety to health of a person, housing is a solid foundation for all people. With the precocity of living with high rent, any incident can domino to displacement and homelessness. Not only are individuals at risk of losing their place, but communities as a whole are blown to the winds of the market as they are forced to relocate. Solid communities provide support that help keep the bottom from falling off the residents. Putting pressure on the housing market by support public housing is an uphill battle but is a battle that must be fault. I have recently been attending a series on the history of west Charlotte; of course the land we stand on had been stolen from the native Catawba and other tribes of Turtle Island. The series started from World War I camps at Camp Greene. It is part of the story of farmer's intent and the history of redlining and zoning began. Time and time again, the history is though the power displaced those without power. The rich and vibrant history of those communities fighting for what they have. Learning about the history allows us to [inaudible]. This Thursday will conclude the final of the three week event. I pass out fliers to the Council. I invite you to the talk.

Joseph Margolis, 6549 Quarterbridge Lane said I hail from Derita, home for what many of you may know of a restaurant there called Maria's Dinner. I am here to speak about this part of the agenda item; I was pleased to hear Ms. Wideman say that clustering the state will make sure that clustering does not happen. That was going to be the crux of what I talked about, so I will just leave it at this point going forward. That would be the only thing that I would ever be concerned about in Derita, because what I saw on the proposal, within about three quarters of a mile, there is three of these affordable housing developments. I am supportive of everything that the previous speakers said before me, but I have also read in percale evidence against the prospects of clustering these types of communities, leading to long-term negative results. As a matter of fact, all of you heard from Darleen Heater earlier tonight speaking about this. Where I live, where Derita is, is very close to University City, even though it is not part of what University City Partners currently covers,

so she says something very similar to that. I will just keep my remarks brief, and I just hope that after this is done that you as a Council will get involved with the UDO. I have spoken with Councilmember Harlow and Councilmember Phipps, some of the at large people here would get involved in doing something to help Derita get its fair share of what is coming with the Unified Development Ordinance that is going down the pipe, once we get past meeting this critical need to our City, because I believe that a lot of the concerns that I have and maybe some of the people that I heard from in Derita as well, would be met and just helping Derita become a community center. There is a small town downtown feel about it along Sugar Creek; if you go up Gibbon Road to where it intersects with Nevin, you get a little bit of that too, so there is potential for it to be a place that could be a space where people who live there can go and want to be besides just Maria's Dinner. So, I hope that you will consider that, and I thank you for hearing me out.

Ms. Mayfield said the reason we had the Housing Retreat is because we had not ever had a real conversation for a committee or Council, specifically around what our goals are for housing. We all, if you have done any research or any studies around housing, then you know this is not a conversation that just started yesterday. We can go back- The reality, especially for minorities in the community, to the GI Bill and who had access for housing and who didn't and redlining and some of the other things, but even the PWA, Public Works Administration for the short period of time that they were around and the segregation that was created, and you heard from me multiple times, I am not a fan of concentrated poverty. Having 100 units that are all 30 percent and below, that is what created projects, but I do want you to explain a little more the specifics around, one, the fact that the State has instituted the 25 percent mandatory at 30 percent and below, and also, if you can speak to the conversation that the statements that were made specifically around why would we allocate \$9 million for less than 20 units? That would be helpful.

Ms. Wideman said let me just preface this by saying, I know this issue of diverse price-point housing is very complex, and there is no one size fits all. I thank everybody for coming down tonight. Thank you for your work at your Retreat on Friday, so I will harken back to your Retreat on Friday. We talked about clustering, and I do not like that word. It is a negative term, but I said it. People think about clustering, they think about as you alluded to when Housing Authorities use to build public housing, where it was all housing for folks earning 30 percent and below. We do not do this. We would never recommend it that way; the financing doesn't work for that. We are trying to balance the approach of providing diverse price point, a range of incomes, for folks, working families in most cases, you all heard that a little bit from our police and fire tonight, the ability to have affordable housing. We talked about naturally occurring housing, so kind of what you see particularly in the two projects that are four percent, they are in job centers near the Mount Holly Huntersville Road area, where new jobs are coming. So, we want to put affordable housing on the ground now, so people can have an opportunity to live in that center, then the Sugar Creek Road one. I will remind us of what happened on the Blue Line, and we do not want to repeat that on the Blue Line Extension, so this is a way to get some housing for working families in that area today. If you look at the nine percent and you do the averaging, that is about \$34,000 per unit for all of the units, so those would be my comments around. I know it is complicated. Certainly no one is saying that we have to forget about our brothers and sisters who need housing at 30 percent and below, thus the States mandate to include 25 percent of the units for 30 percent and below and also on the four percent. As I said earlier, the one development they have agreed to as long as the States rental subsidy holds up at the Key Program, they will have those units for folks earning 30 percent and below. So, I know it is a long answer, but it is complicated, so I just want to make sure that we all have an understanding of what is being proposed here tonight.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield and seconded by Councilmember Winston to (A) Approve a waiver of the Housing Locational Policy for five multi-family housing developments: 924 West Sugar Creek located at 924 West Sugar Creek Road, Abbingon on Mount Holly located at 3230 Mount Holly-Huntersville Road, Mineral Springs Apartments located at 1734 Mineral Springs Road, Springbrook Apartment Homes located at 2110 Alleghany Street, Sugar Creek Greene located at 6130 Bisaner Street, (B) Approve the Housing and Neighborhood Development

Committee's recommendation of Housing Trust Fund allocations for the following multi-family developments for a total of \$14,365,000: Bingham Park, \$ 775,000, Guardian Angel Villa, \$1,750,000, Mineral Springs, \$1,550,000, Nevin Road Apartments, \$1,150,000, Nolley Court Seniors, \$2,100,000, Northlake Seniors, \$1,500,000, Rivergate Greene, \$1,900,000, Sugar Creek Greene, \$1,840,000, The Park Seniors, \$1,800,000, and (C) Approve the Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee's recommendation of Housing Trust Fund allocations for the following 4% multi-family developments for a total of \$9,524,000: 924 West Sugar Creek, \$5,300,000, Brookshire Boulevard, \$4,224,000.

Councilmember Harlow said we had an arduous five and some hours and some change on Friday, really digging into this complex issue of diverse price point housing, the economics of it, what makes sense, how to you break percentages down, 30 percent AMI, 60 percent AMI. I appreciate many community members for coming out and witnessing that and also sharing with us your thoughts. It is also good to see the 'yes in my backyard' signs and diverse price-point for all signs housing in here. It is very different than some of the 'not in my backyard' that we hear a lot. I want to speak very directly. We have gotten a lot of emails, particularly in the Statesville and Derita area around clustering, so I am really glad that you made that point Ms. Wideman around how we had 11 projects that we were presented with tonight that we are looking to support with the Housing Trust Fund; however, with the nine percent tax credit, only three of them will be awarded. The State is very intentional about not clustering that. I hope that calms some of this concept of hey, we are not funding to cluster pockets of poverty, and I am tempted to not even say any of these create poverty at all with these nine percent proposals, but I do believe that we have to give these projects all a chance in leveraging what we can do from a city standpoint, then allow the State to make their decisions in August. I am a little concerned about the four percent; we are in this business of trying to unlock the four percent, in particularly the Sugar Creek one that commits zero. During the rezoning, we cannot really talk much about the breakdown of housing. We are not supposed to and until today, I see that as a fine fit. Could you speak a little bit more about this key program though for I and also for the community, because when we see the presentation of the two four percent, which are noncompetitive, those generally will happen just for community members to understand that. How does this key program help add in more of the lower end of the income spectrum into these units, especially in a project like the Sugar Creek one that says it is 180 units totally 60 percent, when we contrast that with the other Brookshire Boulevard one that actually commits about 25 percent.

Ms. Wideman said I want to be really clear Mr. Harlow; the development that I am talking about, who has committed, it is not the one on Sugar Creek. It is the one on Brookshire Boulevard who has committed 20 units for the Key Program. What the Key Program is, it is simply a rental subsidy that folks with disabilities and who earn 30 percent and below, have from the State to allow them to live in diverse price-point housing. That rental subsidy will help them pay their rent. The other thing that I would add too, not necessarily about the Key Program, but we talk a lot in this community about rental subsidies and rental subsidies are certainly a component of the strategy, but I will remind us that at the end of the day, the one who is holding the rental subsidy still needs a housing unit that they can afford to live in. Also, we talk a lot in this community about housing choice vouchers that are going unused. These types of units will provide a unit or property owner who will accept a housing choice voucher, so we are creating the units at the same time.

Mr. Harlow said thank you; that actually clarifies a lot for me, because it was actually my assumption that the four percent both had that Key Program addendum to it. I am in extreme support of all of the nine percent programs, but I do have a little concern, and I will use your comments around how do we make sure that we do not make the same mistake along the Blue Line Extension. Not mistakes, but you know we created some opportunities around the Blue Line Extension that maybe were not created along the original Blue Line, so when we think about our most vulnerable 30 percent, 50 percent and below AMI and we have our biggest ask in the four percent, \$5.3 million, I am a little concerned about the leverage on that particular four percent project, so I am not sure where the protocol sits as

it relates to how we vote as we break the individual projects up. I would request that we pull that one out for separate vote. That is the 924 West Sugar Creek four percent project. That is just my comment on that.

Mayor Lyles said why don't we go through the discussion and just see still if you want to pull that out we certainly can do that.

Councilmember Driggs said I wanted to comment first on the four percent program. I recognize that it is not as exciting as the nine percent program, and it doesn't provide the 25 percent guarantee, and I want to preface my comments by saying, I supported this in committee and I will support it tonight. Of course we want to go for the nine percent deals. Those deals fund 70 percent of the cost of a project. They include the requirement that we have the 25 percent 30, and they have 60's and others in there as well; however, that doesn't mean that the four percent deals are worthless, because the need exists across quite a wide spectrum, and if it doesn't exist today and this gets back to the NOAH point, it will exist. If you look at the curb the way that rents are going up versus the way that incomes are going up, we need to deed restrict properties in order to prevent tomorrow's affordable housing from becoming inaccessible and also protected from being redeveloped, so to that extent, I think that the four percent investment is worthwhile. It represents basically a gift from the federal government that pays for a third of the cost of those projects; granted at a different price point but not worthless, worth doing.

I would also note that to try to create more 30 percent, you need to understand the ratio of the number of units at 30 percent that we can create from a certain amount of money with the number of units that we could create at these other levels of affordability and deed restrict. I believe that we need to have a balanced policy that covers the full spectrum. We need to do what we can about the 30 percent, but we don't want to go broke just funding those, then maybe exacerbate the benefits cliff too, where people who get up to hire income levels do not qualify for that kind of housing and are hit even more by the fact that they happen to have income in the 60 percent AMI range. The thing that I am a little concerned about in the proposal is, we did have the meeting on Friday, I think that it was a very constructive session, and I think to sum up, we came away with three principle policy initiatives that the committee was going to recommend to full Council and hasn't actually had a chance to discuss with full Council yet, but that had to do with NOAH housing, and I see signs up there. It had to do with the creation of new housing, then there were other funds, private sector funds and other initiatives intended to kind of approve the accessibility of housing and help people to basically earn enough to pay market prices. So, we are trying to close that gap as Councilmember Bokhari has pointed out a number of times. Let's not just work on bringing this down. Let's work that up. The situation that we are in right now though and this is what concerns me a little bit, is we haven't yet heard from the Manager what his recommendation is on the bonds, and our capacity to decide on exactly what we want to do this year. We have had some indications of our debt capacity, but I do not think that Council has really had a robust conversation yet about what kind of commitments we want to make, and the truth is at this point, we are kind of emptying the piggy bank, and we are reaching for the credit card. So, we are taking \$1.7 million out of the Trust Fund, which empties it completely, cleans it out. We are using money that is committed to a project that hasn't completed yet. That money is going to have to be replaced from some future funds, and we are talking about two four percent deals for which absolutely no funding has been identified. That funding also is going to have to come from future funds, so I really think that this proposal begs the question of what our plans are going forward, because whatever we do going forward, we will have already spent \$10 million or more, just by making these commitments. In that context, I would like to reiterate my proposal that we save some money in the CIP that was slated for amateur sports and that we recognize that the armature sports facility that was proposed in the CIP did not come to fruition. There is no armature sports facility; there's no public/private partnership, and I think that we should be able to redeploy those funds and allow the Link to be paid for, at least in part from hospitality funds. This is a way that we can create some funds currently to meet this gap that we are contemplating creating tonight and then we could start the future funding plans for affordable housing with a clean slate and not working against a deficit of \$10 or more million before we even start. I am not going to make a motion tonight, because I would like to hear the conversation about what

our plans are and the recommendations from the Manager, so I am just mentioning it again, that I hope this will be part of our conversation going forward and that I feel we can try to fulfill our promise on affordable housing and not just dig a hole for ourselves going forward.

Councilmember Winston said I wanted to start by, honestly thanking my colleagues. I think Charlotte, you should know that you do have a City Council and Mayor and staff that are really committed. We talk about and put pencil to paper, and we put real feet on the ground in trying to figure this issue of diverse price-point housing and affordable living seriously. I really do feel like every day we were learning something more about this. We know that this is not just a Charlotte issue. It is not a North Carolina issue. It is a nationwide issue. I thank Ms. Mayfield for convening that retreat was very enlightening. For instance, with one of the biggest things that I took out of it was how effective these four percent deals can be, especially when they are unleashed in the proper fashion, and they haven't always been unleashed. I think that some of that has been due to political will, especially around transit oriented development, so I am excited about the potential of using that tool in a better way moving forward. Ms. Forde, tonight you just mentioned in your comments about a master lease. That is something that I have never heard of but something that perhaps we should be looking at and learning more about to implore. There are many, many tools out here; what I would say, what is clear as well is government cannot handle and do this all by ourselves or alone. I got pretty frustrated at the beginning of this term of figuring out how to really push a button that it took eight weeks. I do not necessarily think citizens want us to be their landlords when their toilets break. So, with that said, as we see, there are 11 projects here; we know there is a demand for affordable housing or diverse price-point housing. Not all of these projects are going to make it. The way that the rules are set up and the way that we spend our money, just doesn't allow for that, but there is a market, so that market should be supplied. The demand should be supplied. We see the same people at these conversations. We see government. We see activists and citizens. We do see a bit of private businesses that want to bring solutions in the affordable housing developers, but I will tell you what is missing in this, other private sectors that we are going to depend on to partner with to come up with solutions to fund these projects, because when it comes down to it, we will fund five projects out of these 11, but there is potentially viable solutions here if we can create funding opportunities for the remainder of the projects. Where is private business in these conversations? Why do we not have business leaders from around our City in this room right here right now? I would invite those business leaders, especially again something that Ms. Forde said, that we are dealing with projects that have very slim margins, so we have to get creative in financing these projects, so that means not only do we need private business, but we need high-income earners to really help us come up with financing solutions that provide low returns on investment over long periods of time, to really create market solutions. I would really love to see private business in this chamber in these rooms when we are having these conversations, in trying to figure this out as we put pencil to paper, and too often they are not there. That is my two cents.

Councilmember Mitchell said just two comments. It would be helpful, because what is going to happen after tonight, a citizen will approach us and say, where are the projects located? I will ask if you do not mind. Put which district these projects will reside in. I think that it will be helpful for all of us, all 11 projects. Secondly, on our waiver policy we approved in 2011. I hope that we can have a discussion about that, because that waiver policy is outdated. It is not fair to you staff to keep coming back to us and asking for a location waiver, then the citizens always think, well we thought about that, we thought that you were going to protect us, so I do think that we need to have that conversation quicker than later about changing our locational policy. I will be supporting this affordable housing is very important to our community, and the presentation that you all had at dinner about a month ago was very enlightening for all of us. Thank you for your leadership, and the HAND Committee, I know it is tough, but I appreciate what you all are doing.

Councilmember Newton said I have a question for our City Attorney, but first, I am going to pontificate a little bit here. I think what we have heard is this is a very, very complex issue. I am also a very strong proponent of our locational policy and making sure that it is updated as well as maintained, but I cannot help but ignore and I do think that we are all

on the same page as it pertains to the nine percent projects, knowing full and well that only three will be selected by our state. So, some of the concerns pertaining to clustering maybe do not apply there, but I think from the stand point ends, I wanted to just elaborate on Councilmember Harlow's point. I think from the standpoint of the four percent particularly, the Sugar Creek project, I harbor some concerns. We know full well that the vast majority of the affordable housing problem that we face in our city pertains to our 30 percent AMI and below population, nearly by a figure of four to one. I feel like if we do not address that, we are kicking the can down the road. At the same time, if we are building, if we are taking about going 30 percent and above, building up in case there is more of a gap that will open up down the road, then what we are really doing is we are leaving the most vulnerable citizens of this city behind. I have a lot of concerns pertaining to those particular points. I wanted to ask the City Attorney if Councilmember Harlow were to move forward on this idea of pulling the Sugar Creek project, how would that look? How would that be accomplished? Is there a procedure to do that, and if so, what is it?

Bob Hagemann, City Attorney said let me clarify, you are speaking in terms of an action tonight?

Mr. Newton said yes, and I think that it is on point B, because it seems like we are all on the same page with A and I imagine C as well.

Mr. Hagemann said the motion that is before you is to approve A, B, and C. Your rules do allow dividing up a multipronged or pieced action, so certainly with a request of Councilmember, with the Mayor's approval, you can divide the question. Pull anything out that you want for a separate vote.

Councilmember Eiselt said I wonder if next time that we get these packages of different projects, even though we know they are not going to all be approved, could we get a map.

Ms. Wideman said sure, absolutely.

Ms. Eiselt said I think that is even going into hopefully we will be mapping what our City is going to be like and where we have aspirations to put affordable housing in relation to transit. The other point that I want to make is here we are in one night where we have all of our police officers here, and Officer Grant gave us a chart of minimum pay and top pay for Charlotte police officers, and the minimum pay of a Charlotte police officer is 60 percent AMI. So, this is exactly what the bulk of these units would be for police officers coming out of the academy that need a place to live, that we would love to have live in the communities that they serve, so with a high school degree, they tap out under 100 percent AMI.

Ms. Wideman said thank you so much for stating that; if I could just add one more thing, I talked about one rental subsidy program, but I would also like to strongly remind you all that the 60 percent units, all of the units in the four percent, they will accept Housing Choice vouchers and any other rental subsidies like the Away Home that you all provide, so that you still need the units along with the rental subsidies at the particular AMI. So, consider that as you are deliberating.

Councilmember Bokhari said I hope that anyone around this dais and those of you who are plugged into this would know that, while I did not come into this role on Council thinking this would be something that I would be waking up in the middle of the night thinking about, I have gotten to that point with it. I have gone full bore into learning as much as I can and dissecting it and breaking it down. I have made this one of my issues now. I am not a champion for years and years like many around us in this room, but I have worked very hard to get up to speed, and there is one thing that is very important to me on anything that I take my time out to try to focus on is, achieving results, solving the problem at its root, not necessarily doing things and having action to do them, so as part of this process, three principals have really risen to the top for me.

The first one is we are not going to solve it by ourselves, and you hear so many people around this dais saying that exact thing. City Council alone isn't going to solve it. Our

actions are going to be the things that are going to inspire the community and different groups, neighborhoods, and everyone you can imagine, to come to the table and say, okay, I see how this is solvable. The challenge there is we have to give them something in our actions with our limited money that has that inspiration that says oh, I see how that could be solved in that way. So, when a lot of people are critical, I am critical as well in some ways, of where is our private sector, where is it at, one of our flaws here is all we have asked them to date is to throw money in a pile next to other money that we throw at land cost essentially. This comes to my second point, which is your principal. We have to be innovative in how we approach this. If we do the same old things that we have been doing decade over decade, we will find ourselves in the same position that we are today, which is trying to treat water while 60 plus new people arrive here every day, 13 percent of which are in this bucket that we are talking about, and we are not even making a dent in that. This same old approach of asking the private sector to dump money to go put it into land, it has become very clear to me that, one that is not going to make the dent in the problem nor inspiring the community to suddenly take this up on their own in the way that we really need them to. We have yet to really have serious discussion on how to streamline regulation, reduce the cost of all this for affordable housing in creative incentivizing ways. How on the demand side of this are we looking at our job creation, workforce development work to nip away at again the numbers by which we are seeing the challenge and how do we approaching in a material way, non-real-estate based solutions like Away Home? I have mentioned this group a number of times. If you think that I am some part of the group at this point as much as I talk about them, I am not. It is the first actual Non-real estate based solution I have heard that addresses some of this. They kind of leaves me finalizing my third principal in the way that I am thinking about it, and I have changed how I talk about this now, because I do not want people to get the wrong impression of what the problem is. We need to address our areas of greatest need, and our areas of greatest need, right now, are 30 percent AMI and below. That is where the crisis is. There is need everywhere, but under 30 percent is the crisis, then 30 to 50 is another problem that exists. Those are our two areas of greatest need, and if you are telling me through what we have to vote on today, that we cannot put all 30 percent projects together because that concentrates this or every time we improve these deals and put \$9.5 million in, we are going to get seven percent of 30 percent housing, that is going to take us 1,200 years and \$11 billion to solve the actual area of greatest needs that exist today. Those two cannot be our only options. They cannot be. They are real-estate based, so we need to figure out a way to go after the nine percent money. I agree, smart, over 25 percent over a quarter of that is in the area of greatest need, then I would also mirror that, if I have not convinced him otherwise at this point of Councilmember Harlow, to break out the votes, because I did not know going into this where I would be, but I know that \$9.5 million dollars, if some of that other money doesn't get allocated and spent, is an awful lot of money for us to inspire this community to solve the problem. We just have to give them something to get inspired about.

Councilmember Phipps said thank you Ms./ Wideman for reiterating the fact that even with this four percent project that we have on Sugar Creek, that they will be able to accept vouchers at the 30 percent AMI level. I think that is important; another thing, in looking at this particular project of where it is located near the Hidden Valley community, we have a cluster of apartments at Tom Hunter, directly close to that light rail station that are 98 percent leased. They have been sold twice over to investors, and I can tell you that those investors are ready to make some value added renovations and upgrades to those particular units, and I predict with it being 98 percent rented with people living in them, very affordable, that they are going to be, in the words of the gentleman that spoke to us maybe several weeks ago and talked about the how the value added nature of improvements to his apartments escalated his rent, in terms of price increases. In as much as they are close to the line, they have been bought by investors. There is going to be value added, or some of them might be torn down and rebuild with new, more market rate apartment complexes; therefore, I see there is a definite need right there in the Hidden Valley area, that if we are not careful, that displacement, and if we do not have anything waiting for individuals there to be able to pursue, that could be something that we would regret on a go forward basis. So, I would like for people to really give this some thought in terms of what they want to do and was it a movement to want to break this out? It seems like to me that it would have been something that would have been discussed in HAND up until now, getting to the

twelfth hour at the dais, and all of a sudden, we want to make changes to the way that things are packaged, when these matters have been in HAND for I do not know how long.

Councilmember Egleston said I agree with my colleague Mr. Phipps. Also, I appreciate the fact that we take verbatim minutes at our meetings, because on March 19, 2018, when we rezoned 924 West Sugar Creek, we had a divided vote, and the voices of descent that night were that we were going to be concentrating poverty, and we should not do that. Now, there is discussion of voting this down, because the people who we are going to put in it are not poor enough. So, I would simply like to point out the disconnect between the descent on March 19, 2018 of people being too poor in a poor neighborhood, and now we are going to vote it down, because they are not poor enough.

Mr. Harlow said I just want the record to reflect that I was not in opposition because someone was not poor enough. I appreciate that reflection though, but my concern still rests, and we have spoken a little bit about vouchers, so does that assure us in our decision making tonight, especially around these four percent deals. I was at the housing retreat and spoke a lot about vouchers. I like vouchers. I like this concept of creating an opportunity to buy up mechanism, how I have referred to it, and I still heavily support that; however, we have not written that into a policy yet. That is one thing that I spoke about as well, that right now we have developers asking us for money, and I will speak again to the Sugar Creek one, \$5.3 million, our largest ask tonight for zero commitments. There are no commitments to accept vouchers. There is no requirement to accept the vouchers, because we have not written into our policy yet. We have not asked enough in a mandate. So, that is my reason for being against it and asking Madam Mayor to split out this type of a proposal. I know that there might be some concern for Councilmembers around why was this not brought up in the HAND Committee? I didn't realize that this was going to be presented in this fashion. I thought it was going to be presented in individual, let's deliberate on each one, fashion, but the way that we are grouping this, I cannot in good faith say hey, I want to just lump in one vote for all. I think that this conversation is actually very fruitful for the public to see. That is important. How are we spending our dollars for our biggest and most passionate issue that all of us ran on. I still stand by my request to split out item C. Also, further split out the 924 West Sugar Creek project separately from the Brookshire Boulevard.

Mr. Newton said I support Councilmember Harlow. I was one of those voices that said I was concerned about concentrating pockets of low income, becoming a red liner. I do not want to do that, and at the same time, I will say this too. The issue here is not that; we are beyond that. The issue is whether or not we are going to spend \$5.3 million to not solve the problem. That is the issue here, to not have any guarantees for 30 percent and below.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Newton I do not think that any of us think that this is going to solve the problem. I do not think that is an assumption.

Mr. Newton said let me rephrase that, to not address the vast majority of the problem that exists, 30 percent and below. We have no guarantees that this will accommodate any of that population.

Ms. Wideman said let me see if I can help you all out. Let me see if I can add some more clarity. These developments, both of the four percent's, will accept vouchers: Housing Choice vouchers, rental subsidy vouchers. They will accept vouchers. You are right Mr. Harlow. This is new. This is our first time around with four percent's. This is a typical spend, but both the developers are here. They will accept the vouchers.

Mayor Lyles said they have to by law. We have all said, this is very complex, and one of the things that is shown by us talking about this and not being yet on the same page, shows how complex it is. So, a couple of things that I just want to say, when you talk about the vast, greatest needs at 30 percent, you know that is \$75 a month in rent. So, I agree with Mr. Bokhari. We have got to have solutions, because that generation that is paying \$75 is probably never going to move up or out of that, because \$75 to just \$300 would be a tremendous leap for adults living in 30 percent right now. Then, the question is what are we doing to bring self-sufficiency to the children and other folks in that family? That is a

very difficult issue, but it is one that the community as a whole has taken on in the past by trying to make sure that the people who are in that 30 percent have opportunities, and we fund a lot of those opportunities. We fund Gethsemane Enrichment program. We fund Bethlehem Center. There are a number of people who are working very hard on trying to make sure that children get the advantage that they can have to be self-sufficient or at least get beyond \$75 a month in rent.

There are a couple of things. I heard a statement about the private sector coming here; publicly we have already had a statement made that there will be a private equity fund to work with the City on this. I want to make sure that we are saying this consistently, because the community has stepped up to say that they will create that. The other thing that I have heard is vouchers. We actually fund an endowment for Away Home and owe them an additional \$2 million. Those vouchers are directly related to a commitment that the City made for \$10 million. So, we have a lot of things that we do extremely well. Streamlining regulation, we have been working on streamlining regulation for at least November that I know of. Jason Key's job is about streamlining regulations, and he has made a huge amount of work and effort in that. That is particularly around the development regulations. So, I want this audience to know that when we talk, it is a robust debate. Obviously, we have that going on right now, but this problem that we talk about, having more pathways, I am just so glad to hear it, because we only have two or three pathways right now, and we cannot make any dent in this without doing something differently, so the thing about it is, instead of being critical of poor people and having to figure out who is more poor than the other, why are we making this a competition for how poor and how we are going to do this? We have got to get beyond and begin to get to that place where we have pathways for multiple efforts, and I thought that is most of what I heard at the Friday meeting, is that we were going to look at things that allowed us to have vouchers, look at new ways to work for new construction. We were going to look at acquisitions. So, when I hear this discussion tonight, it causes me to pause and say, are we really ready? Are we ready to really tackle something that we talked about for, I at least talked about it for 11 months last year, and I got elected in large part because I believe we can do something about this, and we quibble over \$9.5 million, when our last bond referendum was \$15 million? When we are trying not to leverage the dollars that we have for the nine percent projects, I am beginning to wonder if we really believe in upward mobility. What are we going to do as a Council as a whole, and what I would say to you is that we have to continue this dialogue and this conversation, because right now, what I hear is a need for us to get it written down on the same page so we can just go through this and say I am for this or I am against it. That is okay. That is a valid policy discussion, but the discussion that we are having tonight are over things that we have done historically, so if you are going to say that we are not going to do these things that we have done in the past, that is okay as well. Be recorded, vote the way you think you ought to vote, but I will tell you that giving up any tool in this tool box would be a great regret for our future in this City.

Mr. Winston said I will speak for myself, but I do believe all of my colleagues, like I said at the beginning, are really giving this their best effort. I think that quibbling sometimes is necessary, because I agree what we have been doing just hasn't worked sufficiently, and we have to do more, and we always have to figure out how to be honestly patiently urgent. We have to have urgency every day that we do this work and at every meeting every chance that we get to figure this out. Obviously, we have to have patience. We talk about things that we are doing and we will increase it. We talked about this private equity fund, but we know that is not going to be enough. You look at Portland, Oregon who has just past a \$250 million Housing Trust Fund, and they are a city of about 600,000. That is not going to sufficiently deal with the affordable housing crisis. I do not think that it is improper to continue to push ourselves and especially to push our community partners to come up with new and better solutions. We need it yesterday, not just now. So, I do not think that we are quibbling. I think that we are doing the work, and this is the sausage making of democracy of how we get to influence that discussion and influence that action, so I think that it is all in good faith of what you are seeing up here. I do not think that we should stop doing it or put a hard stop on discussion around it.

Mayor Lyles said I would agree with you, and if I implied that we were quibbling in a negative way, I did not really mean that. I always look at the world in a way of possibilities,

so I do not mean quibbling, but what I am saying is this action tonight is just one part of what has to be a bigger picture of multiple pathways. Either we are going to do something that has a path that is already tried and proven that we have done before consistently or we are not. That is what I am saying. That doesn't mean that there are not multiple pathways and there is great need, but we are talking about something tonight that again, I have just heard lots of conversations like well we do not do vouchers, and we do vouchers; 30 percent is the greatest need of self-sufficiency. It is all kinds of things, and I am not quite sure how it gets us to the path to vote on. This discussion has been going on for now a very long time, and I hope continues when we come out of committee with our strategic recommendation and have that work presented to us prior to, I hope, the time that we will be deciding on a bond referendum and that we will be working with our private sector partners to do this work. So, if I implied quibbling was negative, I did not mean to. If I implied that this was not about doing something great, I did not mean to.

Mr. Winston said I think that it gets down to a different point that we also discussed that when and how to have discussions as a body. This is the only time that we really get to do this. We get to talk when something especially when we get to vote on something of particular gravity, this is the time that we have to do this. So, if we cannot do this here now and in the present, when is the time for that? It is less about affordable housing. It gets down to the process of how we do government and how we govern and guide decisions.

Ms. Mayfield said Ms. Wideman, Ms. Campbell and Ms. Wideman to your team Housing and Neighborhood Services, thank you, because you have been doing this work a lot longer. Ms. Forde, long before I thought about being crazy enough to actually want to be on this side, I was on that side when it was still homeless helping homeless then homeless to housing, so the conversation isn't a new one, but I also want us to recognize for my colleagues who are new to Council, last year, the Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee of which Mr. Driggs was my Vice Chair then as well, we have been tag teaming this for a while together. We allocated almost \$21 million for projects. That was the largest in the history of the Trust Fund. We also have a real conversation that we do not want to have in the community. That is the reality that we are not going to eradicate homelessness, but we do not need to create additional homelessness by saying, well we are not going to fund housing and create opportunities for those who are in that 50 to 60 gap. What does that look like on the ground? Last year was the first time I was appointed, so Mayor Lyles, thank you for giving me the opportunity to serve a second term as the Chair. We created a targeted rehab program, so we went into communities. We put \$42,000 plus into current homes; not just seniors who are in a financial position where they do not have the extra income to put that new roof, to upgrade the electrical, to repair floors because they are caving in, but also for renters, for them to be able to have the ability to stay in that unit and not have the owner just flip or come up with some crazy new price. I need us to think about what numbers we are talking about, because as you said Councilmember Egleston, the last meeting, we were arguing the exact opposite, so today is opposite world. Let's look at the numbers. I am going to support all of this, so that is unequivocal, but when we look at the four percent, specifically West Sugar Creek with rents that are going to start at \$748, I need you to understand that if any of us go to Apartmentfinder.com right now, because luckily we have computers, as most time that people are sharing information, it is like when the police were sharing information, I was pulling up additional information like okay City Manager, help us understand this. On Apartmentfinder.com, right now in Hidden Valley, the Silver Stone apartments that were built in 1974, that is NOAH, naturally occurring affordable housing, because we keep throwing around the acronyms and a lot of people do not know what it means so NOAH; Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing. Those are apartment complexes built in 1974 they are \$692 starting. In 1970, that is when Tryon Forest was first build. Tryon Forest, according to Apartmentfinders.com, start around \$625. Jump forward to 2017, your Blue at Northlake on Tryon in the Sugar Creek area, \$975. That is what the starting rates are. So, this particular project that is on West Sugar Creek, the goal because we did have a lot of conversation in committee regarding this project. What is diverse price-point housing? The reason I shared the idea of diverse price-point housing more than a year ago was because there was no diversity. You had these \$300, \$400, \$500, \$600 rents, and then you had \$900 on up rents that were coming in, or you had housing that was \$50,000 then \$300,000 housing put right next door to it. So, this is one of many options. Actually, it is three of many options that we are looking at. These are not the only ones. As the Mayor

mentioned, we are utilizing subsidies. We are utilizing our partners. The Realtor's Association has been one of our greatest partners. We just had Realtor's Care Day just last Friday. Without our partners, we could not do this, because government doesn't have the funding unless you as a community are ready for a 10 cent plus tax hike. Now, some people might think that is good, but let's think about that. Those who are in the lower income areas, including me, because I surely could not live in this City today if I did not buy my house back in 2001. My mortgage is less than what rent is, so you want to say oh well a 10 cent tax hike would be okay; I will pay it, but what about the same community that we are talking about that we are trying to help? It would impact them as well. So, if we are going to have a real conversation, and I agree Mayor, we have to have the conversation. I am a fan of the idea of us having different opinions, but on this particular project, I want us to recognize that what are we really talking about? It is not an apples and oranges. It is an and. We are not competing with us on it, but I need you to understand, this four percent is one of many tools that we have before us. You might not agree with it, but at the end of the day, six votes. This is going to bring in an area where I have rents that jump from \$625 starting up to \$975 to putting something in the middle that would start around \$700. I want us to consider that.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Harlow and seconded by Councilmember Driggs to approve A, B, and C with the exception of West Sugar Creek.

Mr. Hagemann said a point of clarification, your rules allow for dividing a complex question. Typically, it is done informally by request. You do not have to do it that way. I think that you called for a substitute motion, and the substitute motion as stated, would approve everything but Sugar Creek and would not leave an option for voting on Sugar Creek. That is how that was started.

Mayor Lyles said we would need an option to vote on Sugar Creek.

Mr. Driggs said do we need to vote at all on the idea of having separate votes for the two pieces?

Mr. Hagemann said in the past, when Councilmembers request had been handled relatively informally without forcing a vote, but that is the Mayor's prerogative.

A vote was taken on the motion to approve A & B and recorded as unanimous.

A vote was taken on the motion to approve C - West Sugar Creek and recorded as follows:

YEA: Councilmembers Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Mayfield, Mitchell, Phipps, and Winston

NAYS: Councilmembers Bokhari, Harlow, and Newton

A vote was taken on the motion to approve C – Brookshire and recorded as follows:

YEA: Councilmembers Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Harlow, Mayfield, Mitchell, Newton, Phipps, and Winston

NAYS: Councilmember Bokhari

* * * * *

ZONING

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION OF THE ZONING COMMITTEE

John Friday, Chair of the Zoning Committee introduced members of the Zoning Committee. The Zoning Committee will meet on Tuesday, May 1st at 5:30 p.m. in the

Government Center to discuss and make recommendations on the petitions that have hearings tonight. The public is welcome at that meeting, but please note it is not a continuation of the public hearings being held tonight. Prior to that meeting you can contact any of us or find out more information about the rezoning you are hearing tonight on the City's web site at charlotteplanning.org.

* * * * *

ZONING HEARINGS

ITEM NO. 8: HEARING ON PETITION: 2017-182 BY QUICKTRIP FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 11.96 ACRES ON THE WEST SIDE OF WEST W. T. HARRIS BOULEVARD NORTH OF I-485 FROM R-3 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) TO B-2 (CD) (GENERAL BUSINESS, CONDITIONAL), B-D(CD) (DISTRIBUTIVE BUSINESS, CONDITIONAL) BOTH WITH FIVE-YEAR VESTED RIGHTS.

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Tammy Keplinger, Planning said this property is located at I-485 and West W. T. Harris, as shown here with the star. I am sorry that this map does not show up very well, but you can see maybe some of the businesses that are located in this area. This is the Northlake Mall area. I want to talk a bit about the Northlake Area Plan, which was adopted in 2008. The subject property is right here; it is on the opposite side of I-485 from the Northlake Mall. The area plan recommends residential at eight dwelling units per acre for this site. Around it is low density residential at four dwelling units per acre and then of course it is abutted by the interstate. One of the things about the area plan is it identifies the center of the area plan, the Northlake Mall mixed-use activity center and the wedge. The subject site is right here, so it is in a wedge location. The reason that is important is because our wedges are recommended for predominantly residential development. I want to talk about what is going on in this area. If you are down in the Northlake Mall area, there are several shopping centers, of course the mall. We have the Target Center, Lowes Center, and I am sorry that I am not calling them by their proper names, but that is how we recognize them at my house. As you move up W. T. Harris toward I-85, there is some residential development, and there is a rezoning that occurred right at Treyburn Drive to illuminate a shopping center and replace it with a hotel in an out parcel that was done in 2017.

Once you get past I-485, you really see a difference in the environment that you are in. The property along this section of W. T. Harris is lined with trees. There are single-family homes that either front the sides to the road or they back up to W. T. Harris. As you move a little further north, you have another transition with townhomes and housing for the aged that are both proposed but not yet developed, then up at Mount-Holly Huntersville Road, we have another commercial center that includes a Food Lion and Exxon gas station and a Walgreens on this corner. So, why I point all that out to you is because the proposal that you have before you tonight is to talk about commercial development for this site. The area plan is recommending single-family residential at eight dwelling units per acre, be it multifamily or single family.

In looking at the site plan, there are five development areas that are proposed. The A parcel allows one principal building with a 5,000 square foot convenient store. Areas B and E are what we are going to talk about next. Area B will allow an eating, drinking, entertainment establishment. Area E would allow an automotive service station without a convenience store, and that also includes repairs of automobiles. In addition, areas B and E would also allow other retail uses, professional services, medical offices, dental laboratories, showrooms, government buildings, and a few other uses that are generalized. In terms of the next area, C and D, it allows climate controlled storage, regular self-storage, government buildings, financial institutions, indoor pet services, and office and showrooms. If they are doing climate control storage, they have some additional specifications. I am not going to read through those, but those are conditions that they will also meet. The site plan itself shows 56 foot buffer this area in here and a 75 foot buffer here. Access is along W. T. Harris; there are architectural standards for all of the

development areas except A. The reason that it is not on A is because they have provided the elevations. You cannot tell that but that is for a QuikTrip.

In terms of this request, there are several outstanding issues. One is related to the land use. There are issues related to the drive through location and the development square footage, the pedestrian crossing in the implementation of transportation issues, and there are a couple of requested technical revisions. Staff was not recommending approval of this petition. That is due to its inconsistency with the Northlake Area Plan. Also, because it is in a wedge where the plans predominantly recommend residential development, and because this location as I went through talking about the context or the area is not appropriate for commercial uses because of the surrounding single family residential. The single family residential that is surrounding the site are well established neighborhoods that are mostly single and two-story homes, and they have been in that area for some time. That is staff's presentation. I will be happy to answer any questions.

John Carmichael, 101 North Tryon Street said I am here on behalf of QuikTrip. All seven will not speak; we have allotted our time. With me tonight are Paulette Morin and John DiBernardo of QuikTrip, Duane Enser, the project engineer; Randy Goddard, the Traffic Engineer on the project; then Mr. D. C. Heilman, who is a resident of the adjacent Wedgewood neighborhood. We had another neighbor who was signed up to speak, Ms. Aronson. She was here last week but is unfortunately out of town and could not make it tonight. As Ms. Keplinger state, the site is located on the northwest quadrant of the interchange of I-485 and West W. T. Harris Boulevard. It is just under 12 acres. It is also located south of an intersection of Mount-Holly Huntersville Road and West W. T. Harris Boulevard. The site is right across from the I-485 off ramp. The Wedgewood neighborhood is located to the west and the north of the site as you can see from this aerial photograph. That is the off ramp for I-485. The request is to rezone the site from R-3 to B-2 (CD) and BD (CD). The front portion of the site if this petition was approved, would be zoned B-2 (CD). The rear portion would be zoned BD (CD), which is Business Distribution.

The purpose of the rezoning request is to accommodate a QuikTrip convenient store with gasoline sales and other commercial uses that are specified on the conditional rezoning plan. This is the rezoning plan. The access would be on West W. T Harris Boulevard. The vehicular access is right across from the off ramp from I-485. This intersection would be simulized. The site is divided into five development areas, as Ms. Keplinger stated: area A, B, C, D, and E. There would be a 75 foot buffer along this portion of the northern boundary of the site. It would be undisturbed, and along the western boundary of the site, that is also 75 foot undisturbed class B buffer. Along this portion of the southern boundary, it would be an undisturbed 56.25 foot buffer, then this portion of the northern boundary, it would be a 56.25 foot undisturbed class B buffer; this red line here denotes an eight foot tall masonry wall that would be installed along the perimeter of the site and those portions of the site. That was a request of the neighborhood. The buffer and the wall would have to be established before the first CO (Certificate of Occupancy) for a new building constructed on the site. That would be true if the first building were the QuikTrip located adjacent to West W. T. Harris Boulevard. There would be a minimum 25 wide planning strip and a 14 foot wide multi-use path installed along the site's frontage on West W. Harris Boulevard, and there would be connection from the 14 foot wide multi-use path to the existing sidewalk located along West W. Harris Boulevard, which really helps the pedestrian connectivity into the site.

Development area A could only be devoted to a convenient store with gasoline sales; the maximum size that the building would be is 5,000 square feet, up to eight fuel pumps and 16 fueling stations. These are the elevations that Tammy referred to. Development area E and development area B could be devoted to several different commercial uses, a maximum of 11,000 square feet in total could be located on these two development parcels. The uses would include restaurant, retail, office, medical clinics, labs, financial institution, and show rooms. A car wash could be located by only in development area E. A restaurant could only be located in development area B. Only one use could have an accessory drive through window, and the maximum building height would be 25 feet, and there are architectural commitments for development area B and development area E. Development area C and D to the rear of the site, would be zoned BD (CD) if this petition

were approved. The only allowed uses would be a climate controlled self-storage facility, financial institution, government building, laboratory, pet services indoor, offices, and show rooms. The maximum building height would be 40 feet. Any building would have to be located in this building envelope, so it is to insure a sufficient separation from the western property line. Once again, there are detailed architectural commitments for development area C and D. The existing trees in these development areas under the rezoning plan would be required to be retained until such time that those development areas are developed.

The petitioner had a traffic study performed. It was approved by North Carolina Department of Transportation. The petitioner would perform numerous off site transportation improvements that would approach a million dollars in value. One thing that the petitioner would do is continue a second north bound lane from Lake Spring Avenue to the right turn lane at the intersection of West W. T. Harris Boulevard and Mount Holly-Huntersville Road. It is about 1,200 feet in length. That would really help improve traffic flow in the area.

The petitioner held two community meetings with respect to this petition, one on January 9, 2018 and one on February 27, 2018, both meetings were very well attended. The petitioner's representatives also had numerous meetings with representatives of the Wedgewood neighborhood. Petitioners work diligently with the adjoining neighborhood on the design of the site and on the uses that would be permitted on the site if this petition were to be approved. There are some outstanding issues, as Ms. Keplinger stated, and petitioner met with Planning and C-DOT on Friday in effort to resolve those. I think that they have really been whittled down. In terms of the transportation issues, I think that they have been resolved in working with Mr. Grabowski and Mr. Obregon of C-DOT, so we fully expect there to be no issues. There is an outstanding design issue, and that is really dealing with the location of the drive-thru windows. If a drive through were to go here, one thing that the petitioner committed to the neighborhood was that if there were a drive through window, development area B, the speaker box would be located on the western side of the building and the actual drive through would be located on the southern side of the building. In order to do that, you would need to have circulation around the building. The Planning staff prefers not to have that circulation, but due to commitments made to the neighborhood, we really need to keep the design of that drive thru as currently postured.

Darwin Heilman 8944 Cypress Forest Drive said I do reside in Wedgewood North Community, and I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of this rezoning request at the I-85 and Harris Boulevard QuikTrip project. I was about to attend most of the meetings. They gave the opportunity to hear the concerns of my neighbors regarding the QT project and met with the project team. I have to say that the team met many of the concerns that were addressed by the neighborhood, primarily about the location, tree retention, and traffic, and the folks from QT were very helpful in trying to make sure that those concerns were met. They worked very hard to do that. There is a variety of additional business opportunities that have been identified on the remaining site so that parcel under the zoning consideration that we all felt would help us in that particular neighborhood with some retail and other opportunities as well. Traffic is a congestion problem in that area today. QT Group along with C-DOT and DOT have formulated a highway plan, a revised plan, to relieve the current congestions. It is very congested out there at times of high traffic in the afternoon when you are trying to get home and you cannot get across the bridge of I-485 to turn into the neighborhood. What they are planning is going to help us tremendously in that particular regard. The I-85 loop provides improved travel around Charlotte, as we all know, and the retail location and trying to redirect some of the traffic that goes around Charlotte off of I-77 that does not get to the Northlake Mall area. It gives them two opportunities to get into that area now that it is currently not available and does not get identified as much. I would just like to ask the City Council to approve the rezoning request in anticipation of control retail growth in the Northlake area.

Mr. Carmichael said we understand staff's position. The petitioner just feels that given its location at the interchange that it is in an appropriate location for the requested uses and the site has been appropriately buffered and screened, and there has been a lot of working with the community to try to, once again, limit the uses that could go on the site, address

adjacency issues, and to deal with traffic concerns. We are happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Phipps said Mr. Carmichael, the zoning category that is proposed for this development, does it allow for any truck parking or anything like that, like truck wash or anything like that?

Mr. Carmichael said the notes specifically prohibit a carwash associated with the QuikTrip. There could be a carwash only on development area E, but that would be a carwash, not a truck wash. It is not a very large tract. It is an acre, so there is no anticipation of having a truck wash, but the notes specifically prohibit a carwash in connection with the proposed QuikTrip.

Mr. Phipps said development area E, you spoke in terms of there were some vehicle repair services that could be done there, so no spaces for tractor trailer parking or anything like that?

Mr. Carmichael said no sir that is really envisioned to be, if it were to occur there like a Jiffy Lube or something small like that.

Mr. Phipps said for the neighborhood representative, I just wanted to ask the neighborhood representative on the road here speaking before us, are you speaking for your HOA's board or just a few neighbors around where you live?

Mr. Heilman said just for a few neighbors around. I am not speaking on behalf of the HOA board.

Councilmember Driggs said we are often in a situation where the area plan is kind of out of touch because it is old, so we often have to make decisions about setting aside the requirements of the area plan, but I often think there is always a reason for doing so, like it is infill or there are circumstances, as appose to just acting as if it wasn't there. I think that my question is, by proposing this redevelopment there, are you suggesting that residential development would not be commercially feasible at that location?

Mr. Carmichael said the property has been available since the plan has been implemented, and nothing has occurred there. The plan does recommend residential up to eight units and acre. I would be surprised that that would be a suitable location for single family detached homes. It certainly could be a location that I would imagine for a denser, multifamily development. That is a possibility there, but I think either that or something that has been proposed is more suitable or more logical than single family detached.

Mr. Driggs said I am concerned about the traffic generation, 12,000 trips. Maybe we could meet offline and if you could talk a little bit more about the demand for those particular facilities, like what the available alternatives are nearby and how we arrive at a justification for the 12,000 trips, when the entitlement is 400, and even if you went to multifamily at a pretty high density, I do not think that you would get much more than a quarter of the traffic that is created by this. Perhaps we could just talk and not keep the whole meeting waiting.

Mr. Carmichael said I would be happy to do that.

Councilmember Harlow said thank you guys for coming back and waiting patiently through the housing portion of the meeting. Question for staff, similar to Mr. Drigg's point, we always have a lot of times one or two every month where our staff does not recommend, inconsistent with the plan, and outdated or various reasons. I guess my question would be, number one, was the plan adopted because the future of I-485 there and now I-485 as being there and secondly, I had some conversations with neighbors and it seems most of those neighbors, especially immediate adjacent ones are in heavy support. When we think about is it staff's recommendation that this still should be single family adjacent to a clover leaf on an interstate? Where else on the west side, this may be something that you can bring back later, on the west side of I-485, especially one interchange up or one down, do we see single family adjacent to the clover leaf of an interstate?

Ms. Keplinger said we will certainly follow up on that. The area plan does not specify single family. It does say eight dwelling units per acre, so it could be in the form of townhomes, which is usually what you would get at about eight dwelling units per acre for an attached product. I think that one of staff's concerns that we also look at, there is an additional four acre tract that is across W. T. Harris from this site. Staff is also concerned that if this site redevelops for non-residential purposes, there would be additional pressure on that site. Granted this site does not have the direct association with the interchange ramp as this site does but it is another parcel on this strip that could also be proposed for something other than the eight dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Harlow said thank you, and I appreciate just getting back around and seeing what other land use types around the interchanges in similar proximity. I would just be curious of what that looks like.

Councilmember Winston said I think that this kind of piggy backs on Dr. Harlow and Mr. Drigg's question, but it is towards staff. We often go against area plans and deviate. What about this project, is it this project or this type of land use that we think that we would not get a good return on investment in terms of quality of life or for the good of the neighborhood? What about this project or rezoning?

Ms. Keplinger said as I mentioned earlier, when you are traveling along W. T Harris and you hit I-485, you really do see a transition. That transition goes from the commercial nature that you have down along the Northlake area, then as you cross I-485, this becomes more residential in character. You have the entrance to the neighborhood off of Lake Springs Drive. You have the entrance off of Forest Drive; the houses in this area either back up or front or side load to the street, so this area in the area plan was also in a wedge, and the wedge calls for predominantly residential development. So, in looking at this, not only is it inconsistent with the area plan and the recommendation for a wedge but it also changes the entire area and also puts pressure on other properties along the strip of W. T. Harris for redevelopment to something other than residential.

Mr. Winston said I imagine that the answer will be that we have to take this on a case by case basis, but would staff possibly be accepting of a different land use besides residential if this were a different type of project?

Ms. Keplinger said I think that there are some other uses that could fit in, such as some other type of institutional uses that might be appropriate. Our area plans usually do not tell us specific locations for institutional uses, so that might be appropriate in this area, something other than the eight dwelling units per acre, but again it would be on a case by case basis. I had to get that in.

Mr. Phipps said I think that it is probably relevant to think about the time period; I know that this plan was adopted in 2008. I do not know exactly when. My colleague said it was June of 2008, but as we all know, in September 2008 what really happened. We had a big recession, and I do not that development really occurred during that period for the next two years maybe, so I do not know if this plan is as old as it might appear, but even then, 2008 is really not that old for a plan. I would say that this plan, I do not know that it really had a chance to evolve because the recession hit and things just turned rock bottom, even for the City at that time in terms of rezonings and growth and things like that.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Egleston, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 9: HEARING ON PETITION: 2018-001 BY APOLLO HOLDING COMPANY, LLC FOR APPROXIMATELY 4.65 ACRES LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF WEST TYVOLA ROAD, EAST OF SOUTH STREAM BOULEVARD, SOUTH OF BILLY GRAHAM PARKWAY FROM MUDD-O (MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, OPTIONAL) TO MUDD-O SPA (MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, OPTIONAL, SITE PLAN AMENDMENT)

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Tammy Keplinger, Planning said the next three requests staff is supporting in some form, so hopefully these will go a little bit faster. This request is a MUDD-O, which is a mixed use development district optional site plan amendment. This property should look rather familiar. It is the site of the old Coliseum off of Tyvola Road. When you travel it here, of course you have the golf course and the recreational areas right on Tyvola. You have office off of South Stream and Crossbeam Drive, then you have the beginnings of the development of City Park; City Park originally came to us a little over 10 years ago as a mixed use development project that included multifamily office, retail and hotel type uses. Over time, we have had a lot more residential that has gone into this area, but it is still recommended for residential, office and retail uses as you can see by the Southwest District Plan of 1991. The site that we are talking about tonight is just a little portion that is on the edge of the overall development. It is located in the old Coliseum mixed use activity center. The request involves this interior tract that is a block. There is an existing hotel that is here and the proposal basically focuses on these two corners, and there is a request for optional provisions that will allow one drive through service windows an accessory to an eating, drinking, entertainment establishment on one of these two sites; they have not decided which one yet. The second option is to allow maneuvering between the street and the building for the one drive through service window, which is allowed on either one of the parcels. They have committed to a 20-foot long masonry wall, with screening scrubs, that will protect and provide screening along the outside of the drive through. They have notes that all buildings would contain a minimum of two tenants, and that was important to staff so that we didn't end up with free standing fast food restaurants or something of that nature. They also provide architectural details.

So, this property is located on the perimeter along Tyvola Road, where we have the areas more highway business in nature. It provides protection for the internal components around Potomac River Parkway and Spear Boulevard, where we want to have pedestrian oriented development. Staff does still a couple of outstanding issues related to the environment and a couple of technical issues, but we are recommending approval upon the resolution of those issues. The petition is consistent with the Southwest District Plan recommendation for residential, office, and retail uses, but it is inconsistent in terms of the uses that are associated with the drive through service windows; however, staff for the reasons that I talked about earlier such as the maneuvering that is allowed between the use and the street is currently not allowed, but the optional provisions would allow that in this case. The adjacent property was rezoned last year to allow some additional uses to have a drive through window. The current site plan allows additional drive through windows and associated maneuvering along Tyvola Road where it is on the outside of this development. It will not impact the pedestrian environment that we are trying to achieve on the inside, so staff is recommending approval.

Brittany Lins, 214 North Tryon Street said I am representing the petitioner Apollo Holding Company LLC. in their request for a site plan amendment for two out parcels within the City Park development. As Ms. Keplinger showed you, we are really just talking about those two little parcels in addition to that already existing hotel. This is just a brief view of our site plan; as you can see, what we are requesting is 12,000 square feet of commercial uses, as well as one drive thru use. As I will explain a little further in a minute, the commercial uses are already entitled for this site; what we are really here for this site plan amendment is this drive thru use. This is the original conditional rezoning plan, which was for the overall City Park development, and again, we are talking about just that tiny little corner parcel over there. This is viewing in on an already approved plan, and this shows these two out parcels that we are talking about as part of the retail district approved for retail commercial uses. Subsequently, the existing hotel, which is currently built out, was an amendment to the overall City Park rezoning to allow the foot print of the hotel, so then using my expert copy and paste skills, I through all that together to give you an idea of what is allowed so far, what is entitled. You can see that there is the hotel parcel that is the same as this foot print here that we are not doing anything to, then you have these two out parcels, which are similar to our proposals here for those out parcels, again for commercial development. Essentially, this project can be built today, but we are requesting

that additional drive thru use. That would be an additional entitlement on top of what is already allowed in City Park. This is again just looking at our use, and that is out site plan. You can see here that we are committing to multi-tenant buildings, at least two tenants per building, so as Ms. Keplinger said, we are not going to have a free standing Wendy's or McDonalds. This is architecture that is committed to as part of the rezoning plan to have architecture that is consistent with the City Park development and that will complement the rest of City Park. This is just another view. You can see possible multiple tenants within the buildings. The petitioner does believe that having a drive through use is in high demand for this area, and as Ms. Keplinger mentioned, there were some other rezonings in place for drive thru uses. A few years back, just a side note, there were two drive thru uses and a convenient store that were entitled back in 2009 across the street on the south side of Tyvola. That has since been rezoned as of last year from Laurel Street Residential in order to allow for residential development, so those drive thru uses essentially went away and the petitioner believes that demand fits in this location here.

Councilmember Driggs said for one, is the main change, just to cut to the chase, the vehicular maneuvering? You still have 12,000 square feet, right? It is still the same general nature of development. I am hearing a lot of detail, but this isn't a huge change, am I right?

Ms. Keplinger said it is not a huge change.

Mr. Driggs said I want to clarify also on the vehicle trip generation; you have existing use and proposed zoning. I assume the entitlement exists for 7,600 trips a day based on the zoning that is in place right now; is that correct?

Ms. Keplinger said correct.

Mr. Driggs said alright, so we are not changing the vehicle impact either?

MS. Keplinger said correct.

Councilmember Phipps said how many drive thrus are there allowed for the City Park development?

Ms. Keplinger said over all if this one is approved, there will be a total of five.

Mr. Phipps said so, four are already a part of the entitlement?

Ms. Keplinger said correct.

Councilmember Mayfield said Ms. Keplinger will you go back to the map? I am trying to get an idea. I know two, because there is currently one drive thru that is active, but I am trying to see where the potential five would be because there is a lot of land, and we are looking at the front side close to Tyvola, but there is still a good number of acreage on the backside of the land closer to the farmers market, so when you say that if we were to approve this and that would be five, can you give an idea of what that potentially could look like? Do we have any others besides the current one? I know that Starbucks has a drive thru.

Ms. Keplinger said I may have to get Ms. Lins to help locate all; I know that there is at least one here; there may be two. My understanding is the drive thrus are all associated with West Tyvola Road.

Ms. Mayfield said so we are talking about all five along West Tyvola?

Ms. Keplinger said I can definitely confirm that.

Ms. Mayfield said Lins, do you have a response to that question?

Ms. Lins said we will need to confirm that; we can get that information for you. I do not want to say something that isn't correct.

Ms. Mayfield said let's figure out a way to get together and have a meeting to look at that if there is the potential of five along Tyvola, because I am thinking about the inside that could possibly make sense, but that would be a challenge once we add housing across the street, because for my colleagues, this is the old Coliseum area, but across the street, we approved housing that is going to be developed by Jocks and Jill's. We want to really take into consideration, because I had not thought about five drive thrus along there.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 10: HEARING ON PETITION: 2018-004 BY LISCHERONG ENTERPRISES & HOLDINGS, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.51 ACRES LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF FOSTER AVENUE AND BANK STREET, WEST OF SOUTH TRYON STREET FROM I-2 GENERAL INDUSTRIAL TO I-2 (TS) (GENERAL INDUSTRIAL, TRANSIT SUPPORTIVE OVERLAY)

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Tammy Keplinger, Planning said the transit supportive overlay is a conventional request, so we do not have a site plan that goes along with this petition. I want to tell you a little bit about this area. It is a little difficult to see; this is Bank Street and Foster Avenue. It is right across the street from Marie G. Davis Middle School. There are two small-scale apartment complexes located on this site; the rest of the property is in this area for the most part are single-story office or industrial type buildings with things like cabinet shops and paint shops and things of that nature. There is some multifamily that is located on Bank Street at this corner, then multifamily that is up along Griffin Street. So, the request is for I-2 Transit supportive overlay. The area plan does recommend office, retail, and industrial warehouse distribution uses for this site. In terms of the transit supportive overlay, what that does is it is attached to the base zoning layer, and it allows for the accommodation and the continued existence of some of the uses that are already there and the expansion. What changes are basically two things. It will allow residential uses, and it will also change the form so that when new development comes it, it will be in the form that we would ask for for transit oriented development. This site is just a little over half a mile from two of our transit stations, so it certainly qualifies as an area that can be considered for the transit overlay district. It will allow a gradual transition to an urban transit supportive form in an area that is located close to those two stations. Staff is recommending approval, and I will be happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Mayfield said Ms. Keplinger, tell us again or give me a couple of examples of what could go in a transit overlay? What I am thinking about is the fact that there is a middle school right across the street. There should be some things that automatically shouldn't be within so many feet within a school.

Ms. Keplinger said right now, the property is already zone I-2, so any use that is in the I-2 district would be allowed to go there.

Ms. Mayfield said right now it is mostly industrial use. It is not like it is a convenient store or that type of use that is there currently.

Ms. Keplinger said it could go there currently. If someone wanted to tear down the buildings that are there now, they could possibly put a retail type use on that site. When you add the TS overlay, it doesn't further restrict the uses. It does allow residential, but what it will do is it will restrict the form of the development so that instead of having something like a typical convenient store that you would see, everything would have to be pulled up to the street and be in an urban form. A convenient store is not something typically that we see in an urban form. Most of the uses that you would be likely to see

would be more of an office nature, maybe even some residential going in on the property. Everything that is allowed in the I-2 district does have to be considered.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Newton, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 11: HEARING ON PETITION: 2018-008 BY THE DRAKEFORD COMPANY/SAUSSY BURBANK, LLC FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.72 ACRES LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF KELLY STREET AND DALLAS AVENUE, WEST OF NORTH SHARON AMITY ROAD FROM R-5 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) TO UR-2(CD) (URBAN RESIDENTIAL, CONDITIONAL)

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Tammie Keplinger, Planning said this property is located close to Sharon Amity Road and Monroe Road. It is right off of Kelly Street at Dallas Avenue. The site is currently developed with single-family homes. The East District Plan, which was adopted in 1990, recommends single family at four dwelling units for this site, as well as most of the adjoining sites. The proposed request is to rezone to UR-2 (CD) to allow six single family detached dwelling units. They will have a maximum of 40 feet in height with two stories, common open space, which is shown in this area, and do tree save. They do have specifications on the building materials and architectural treatments to minimize the appearance of the garage doors that will be at the front of the street. In looking at this area, I want to back up doing just a quick preview. Most of the homes in this area are either single family or single family residential one to one and a half story. There are sidewalks on one side of the street; every once and a while you will see a little bit of multifamily. There is a little bit right here on Summey Avenue. There is some more as you move up into this area and another little scattering down in this area.

So, the area plan recommends four dwelling units per acre, but the General Development Policy recommends eight. The request is for 8.3. It is just a little bit above what the GDP recommends, but we feel that this rezoning fits in with the character of the area, and we are recommending approval upon the resolution of outstanding issues.

Brittany Lins, 214 North Tryon Street said I represent the petitioners, the Drakeford Company and Saussy Burbank LLC. in their rezoning of a portion of the property in Oakhurst. As Ms. Keplinger explained, it is just these two parcels right here, currently with single-family homes, and the petitioners are proposing six single family for sale homes. As Ms. Keplinger also mentioned the setbacks are also consistent with what is abutting, and they are really trying to blend in with the neighborhood. Here is just a colored up plan to show you that there is a nice common open space and tree save area here. The petitioner is also committing to a street scape with eight foot planning strip and six foot sidewalk, as well as these pedestrian ramps to be installed on the site. That is just another look at the site plan. The petitioner is committing to architectural standard and is restricting certain building materials so that it is a higher quality product and is also doing pedestrian scale lighting and features on the garage doors.

Saussy Burbank is one of the petitioners; I think that a lot of you are familiar with their product. They are a local Charlotte developer, and they actually have product already being develop by right, just right across the street from Summey Avenue and Kelly Street, and this is a look at kind of what is being done just right over there. These are some images. We expect that this petition would have similar product as those that are right across the street. We have no outstanding issues and did not have any speakers in opposition in any of our meetings, so I will turn it over to questions. Peter Harakas and Bobby Drakeford are here as well if they can help with any of the questions.

Councilmember Newton said I will speak to this petition; this is in my district, and I want to thank the presenter here for those comments. I also wanted to thank Mr. Drakeford for holding a really fantastic community meeting. There were a couple of folks from across the street that showed up at that meeting and were actually very happy with this proposal. My question is to Ms. Keplinger; I believe that you said that the zoning density here could go as high as 8.3 units per acre?

Ms. Keplinger said the General Development Policies recommend up to 8 dwelling units per acre. The proposal is for 8.3, so it is just a little bit higher than what the GDP recommends, but staff feels that the form is appropriate and still recommends approval.

Mr. Newton said so, I see six. The plan is to have six buildings here; there is the green space with some- is there going to be trees there, shrubbery or something of that affect?

Ms. Lins said that is the required tree save area, so I do not believe that there would be active replanting in that area. It would be considered an open space and tree save area to be kept natural.

Mr. Newton said it being a required tree save area, it would prevent, so from the stand point of any additional units above and beyond six, which would otherwise be accommodated within the eight, that would not occur because of the tree save?

Ms. Lins said correct, there would not be a building in that area.

Ms. Keplinger said because the site plan specifically shows six, they would not be able to add any additional units.

Motion was made by Councilmember Newton, seconded by Councilmember Egleston, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM NO. 12: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE A PORTION OF EAST 16TH STREET

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Newton, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing and adopt the resolution to close a portion of

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution book 48, at Page(s) 682-685.

ITEM NO. 13: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE AN ALLEYWAY OFF OF NORTH DOTGER AVENUE

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Newton, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing and adopt a resolution to close an alleyway off of North Dotger Avenue.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution book 48, at Page(s) 686-692.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 14: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE AN UNOPENED RIGHT-OF-WAY BETWEEN BULLARD STREET AND JOY STREET

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, A motion was made by Councilmember Newton and seconded by Councilmember Egleston, to close the public hearing and adopt a resolution to close an unopened right-of-way between Bullard Street and Joy Street.

Councilmember Mayfield said I sent to staff earlier asking about the street, because I think that Wilson is the side; that is the street that we are talking about closing.

Jeff Boenisch, Transportation said we did respond to that question; this street is actually to the east of Wilson. It is an unopened portion of right-of-way between Bullard and Joy being requested to close.

Ms. Mayfield said I asked about it, so this street currently is not being used by any pedestrians, because there is residential around there; an example, Camden connects to Freedom Drive. It is a cut through that a lot of people use, but I do not know if at some point we are going to be trying to close it because of what is happening with the train. I just want to make sure that this street is not being used by pedestrians.

Mr. Boenisch said absolutely, it is a good question; the answer to that is the status is currently unimproved, unopened right-of-way

Ms. Mayfield said okay, because I went to Virtual Charlotte and just couldn't get a good view of it.

Councilmember Phipps said I think that we have to do something to wordsmith this a little bit better, because I do not think that the people can really understand. I think that it is sort of counterintuitive that we would close something that is unopened. I have brought this up before; it just does not make sense. How can you close and unopen right-of-way?

Mayor Lyles said I think that they just mean the paperwork.

Mr. Phipps said is there a way to phrase that? It doesn't sound like it makes sense to me.

Bob Hagemann, City Attorney said the phrase closing is a statutory phrase. That is what we do, and that process applies both to opened and unopened right-of-way. Right-of-way that has been offered for dedication and not accepted and that which has been accepted and maybe even improved as a street so it is statutory wording.

Ms. Mayfield said I am also trying to just get clarification we are closing a number of streets tonight, but at the same time, we have had staff come to us about stub streets and the fact of we just had a discussion last Monday where basically what was said is for the residents, expect for a stub street as some point to be connected. So, when we are looking at closing right-of-way, that still falls in that category of stub street, so I am trying to understand the logic of why are we closing this when we have other areas that have a stub street where we are practically mandating that the street connectivity has to happen, why do we not see value in this street connectivity?

Mr. Boenisch said I would expect you to ask that tonight actually. This is part of an improved rezoning where this was actually going to be incorporated as a buffer to the existing properties, and in return, the developers is going to build a street, so this is an unopened right of way currently not being used by the public. The developer is actually committed to building a new street to connect Haywood further east that will actually create more cross connectivity. Currently, the street that you mistook this for, Wilson Street is actually very close to this. You will create better block spacing actually with the Haywood

Avenue connection being created by the developer. That was kind of if you may, call it a tradeoff that we could support getting rid of this unapproved right-of-way for exchange for the developer committing to building us connectivity. So, it kind of stays true to Council's connectivity policies.

Ms. Mayfield said as we move forward, can we add that information in under the explanation so whoever is reading it will know? It seems like a conflict in general conversation that we are closing, but we say be prepared for a sub street to be connected.

Mr. Boenisch said absolutely, we will do our best.

A vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimous.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution book 48, at Page(s) 693-695.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 15: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE AN UNOPENED RIGHT-OF-WAY OFF OF MINGUS CABIN LANE

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Egleston, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing and adopt a resolution to close an unopened right-of-way off Mingus Cabin Lane.

Councilmember Mayfield said I will add my same comments as for the last one to explain why we would be closing when we talk about stub streets and the expectation of connectivity.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution book 48, at Page(s) 696-699.

* * * * *

ITEM NO.16: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE A RESIDUAL PORTION OF DEARMON DRIVE

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Egleston, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing and adopt a resolution to close a residual portion of Dearmon Drive.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution book 48, at Page(s) 700-702.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE AN UNOPENED RIGHT-OF-WAY OFF OF DUCKWORTH AVENUE

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Egleston, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing and adopt a resolution to close an unopened right-of-way of Duckworth Avenue.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution book 48, at Page(s) 703-706.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 18: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Mayor Lyles said do you have a report for us tonight?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said absolutely not

* * * * *

BUSINESS

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

ITEM NO. 20: APPOINTMENTS TO THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The following nominees were considered for two appointments for partial terms beginning immediately and ending June 30, 2019.

- Jesse Boyd, nominated by Council members Ajmera, Harlow, Mitchell, and Phipps
- Karen Gipson, nominated by Council members Egleston, Eiselt, Mayfield, and Winston
- Rochelle Rivas, nominated by Council members Ajmera, Egleston, Eiselt, Mayfield, and Winston
- Nicholas Wind-McJetters, nominated by Council members Mitchell and Newton

- Jesse Boyd, 4 votes – Harlow, Mitchell, Phipps and Winston
- Karen Gipson, 7 votes – Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Harlow, Mayfield, and Phipps
- Rochelle Rivas, 6 votes – Egleston, Eiselt, Mayfield, Mitchell, Newton, and Winston
- Nicholas Wind-McJetters, 2 votes – Driggs and Newton

Karen Gipson and Rochelle Rivas were appointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: APPOINTMENT TO KEEP CHARLOTTE BEAUTIFUL

The following nominees were considered for one appointment for a partial terms beginning immediately and ending June 30, 2018, and then continuing for full three-year terms beginning July 1, 2018 and ending June 30, 2021.

- Taelor Logan, nominated by Council members Eiselt, Harlow, Mayfield, and Newton
- Gita Patel, nominated by Council members Ajmera and Newton
- Qnubia Umazar, nominated by Council members Bokhari, Egleston, Phipps, and Winston

- Taelor Logan, 2 votes – Eiselt and Harlow
- Qnubia Umazar, 7 votes – Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Mayfield, Newton, Phipps, and Winston

Qnubia Umazar was appointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 22: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL TOPICS

There were no Mayor and City Council Topics presented or discussed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Newton, and carried unanimously to go into closed session pursuant to North Carolina General Statute § 143.318.11(a)(4) to discuss matters relating to the location of an industry or business in the City of Charlotte, including potential economic development incentives that may be offered in negotiation.

The meeting recessed at 9:58 p.m. to go into closed session in CH-14. The meeting returned to open session at 10:36 p.m. in CH-14.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Winston, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:36 p.m.



Emily A. Kunze, City Clerk, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 5 Hours, 32 Minutes
Minutes completed: May 22, 2018