

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for an Action Review on Monday, November 28, 2022, at 5:00 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Lyles presiding. Council Members present were Danté Anderson, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Lawana Mayfield, Marjorie Molina, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston II.

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmembers Dimple Ajmera, Renee Johnson, and James Mitchell

* * * * *

ACTION REVIEW

ITEM NO. 1: MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Mayor Lyles said alright. Ms. Harris, do you have any questions? I think everyone should have the latest update. Mine says 2 p.m. update on City Council business consent agenda Q and A's. Ms. Harris, do you have anyone of these that you'd like to have reviewed?

Marie Harris, Strategy and Budget said good evening. As you mentioned, they're all before you right now and updated as of 2 p.m. and most of you I was able to catch and follow up with, but does anybody else have any additional needs for information or any follow up questions at this time?

Mayor Lyles said Hearing none, thank you very much Ms. Harris for the information that you provided in advance. Alright. So, the staff has asked for Item 44 to be deferred until December the 12th. So, we'll take that out of the list of items.

Ms. Harris said excuse me ma'am in addition to Item 44, I also need to defer Item 34.

Mayor Lyles said which will be deferred until December?

Ms. Harris said yes ma'am.

Mayor Lyles said alright. Thank you. Ms. Mayfield had a comment about that. So, we'll ask for that comment to take place in December.

Councilmember Mayfield said yes ma'am. The question is actually going to just lead into a longer discussion for our Council when we get to our retreat, but for 29, 32, 33, and 34, the same question is the CBI (Charlotte Business INClusion) goals for these contracts. On a couple of them, we were able to considerably far out identify on some of the goals. On some of the goals, they were just met at three percent. So, a question that I have is, is it time for us to reevaluate the goals to make sure that they're in alignment of today and moving into the future versus are we still looking that were identified many years ago.

Mayor Lyles said you're suggesting that be an item on the Council discussion at the retreat?

Ms. Mayfield said correct.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

ITEM NO. 5: CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 29 THROUGH 48 MAY BE CONSIDERED IN ONE MOTION EXCEPT FOR THOSE ITEMS REMOVED BY A COUNCIL MEMBER. ITEMS ARE REMOVED BY NOTIFYING THE CITY CLERK.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Molina, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, with the exception of Item No. 34 which was deferred to December 12, 2022; and Item No. 44 which was deferred to December 12, 2022.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 29: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Animal Care & Control Facility Renovations, Phase II

Approve a contract in the amount of \$4,735,100.00 to the lowest responsive bidder Randolph & Son Builders, Inc. for the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Animal Care & Control Facility Renovations, Phase II.

Item No. 30: Construct Bryant Farms Road Extension Phase 1 Design-Build Project

Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and approve a guaranteed maximum price up to \$20,000,000 to Blythe Development Co. for Design-Build construction services for the Bryant Farms Road Extension Phase 1 Design-Build Project.

Item No. 31: Cooperative Purchasing Contracts for Vehicles and Equipment

(A) Approve the purchase or lease of vehicles and equipment from cooperative contracts, (B) Approve unit price contracts with the following vendors for the purchase of vehicles and equipment for a term of one year under the North Carolina Sheriff's Association (NCSA): Capital Ford, Inc. (NCSA contract # 23-09-0912), Equipment Works, Inc. dba Virginia Truck Body Equipment (NCSA contract # 23-07-0421), Knapheide Truck Equipment - Midsouth (NCSA contract # 22-06-0426R), Parks Ford (NCSA contract # 23-09-0912), (C) Approve unit price contracts with the following vendors for the purchase or lease of vehicles and equipment for a term of one year under Sourcewell: Enterprise Fleet Management, Inc. (Sourcewell contract # 030122-EFM), McNeilus (Sourcewell contract # 091219-MCN), National Auto Fleet Group (Sourcewell contract # 091521-NAF), Terex (Sourcewell contract # 110421-TER), (D) Approve a unit price contract with Tesla, Inc for the purchase of vehicles for a term of one year under Washington State Department of Enterprise Services contract 05916, and (E) Authorize the City Manager to extend the contracts for additional terms as long as the cooperative contracts are in effect, at prices and terms that are the same or more favorable than those offered under the cooperative contracts.

Item No. 32: Belmont Lift Station and Forcemain

Approve a contract in the amount of \$3,415,000.00 with GHD Consulting Services Inc. for design services for the Belmont Lift Station and Forcemain project.

Item No. 33: Clarke Creek Pump Station and Forcemain Construction

Approve a guaranteed maximum price of \$19,571,331.00 to State Utility Contractors, Inc. for Design-Build construction services for the Clarke Creek Pump Station and Forcemain project.

Item No. 35: Waste Removal and Container Rental Services

(A) Approve a unit price contract with BFI Waste Services, LLC for waste removal and container rental services for an initial term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to one, two-year renewal term and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 36: Water Transmission Main Improvements and Repairs

Approve a guaranteed maximum price of \$3,253,015.00 to State Utility Contractors, Inc. for Design-Build construction services for the Water Transmission Main Improvements and Repairs project.

Item No. 37: Airport Fuel Line Repairs Design Amendment

(A) Approve contract amendment for \$156,000 to the contract with Delta Airport Consultants, Inc. for Fixed Base Operator Fuel Line Repairs Design Contract, and (B)

Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 38: Airport Telecommunications Lease

(A) Approve a five-year lease with BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC to accommodate communications in the Terminal, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the lease for up to two, five-year extensions.

Item No. 39: MedCenter Air License

(A) Approve five-year license with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Hospital Authority d/b/a MedCenter Air, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the license for up to five, one-year terms.

Item No. 40: Wilson Air Center North Parking Lot Improvements project

Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,160,981.00 to the lowest responsive bidder Zoladz Construction Co., Inc. for the Wilson Air Center North Parking Lot Improvements project.

Summary of Bids*

*The complete Summary of Bids is available in the City Clerk's office.

Item No. 41: Bond Issuance Confirmation for 8th and Tryon

Adopt a resolution reconfirming the December 13, 2021, resolution granting INLIVIAN's request to issue multi-family housing revenue bonds, in an amount not to exceed \$17,000,000, to finance the development of 8th & Tryon.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 542-545.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 42: Aviation Property Transactions – 5508 Wilkinson Boulevard

Acquisition of N/A at 5508 Wilkinson Boulevard from Sheryl McNamara, Michael McNamara, Robert Johnson, and Kenneth Johnson for \$500,000, and all relocation benefits in compliance with Federal, State or Local regulations for Aviation Master Plan.

Item No. 43: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – N. Tryon Pressure Zone Boundary Change and 960 Zone N-S Transmission Main (Hidden Valley), Parcel #221

Resolution of Condemnation for 8,000 square feet (0.18 acres) in Fee Simple, 2,199 square feet (0.05 acres) in Permanent Utility Easement at 1408 W. Sugar Creek Road from Kinza, Inc. for \$127,725.00 for N. Tryon Pressure Zone Boundary Change and 960 Zone N-S Transmission Main (Hidden Valley), Parcel #221.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 546.

Item No. 45: Property Transactions – Goose Creek SS Extension to Cresthill Drive, Parcel #7

Acquisition of 23,420 square feet (0.54 acres) Sewer Easement and 23,420 square feet (0.54 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 12223 Lawyers Road, Mint Hill from Joel Carriker and Carolyn M. Carriker for \$29,565 for Goose Creek SS Extension to Cresthill Drive, Parcel # 7.

Item No. 46: Property Transactions – PS-Monroe at Ashmore Pedestrian Beacon, Parcel #1

Acquisition of 95 square feet (0.002 acres) Permanent Shelter Easement and 37 square feet (0.001 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement at 5820 & 5822 Monroe Road from 5820 Green CLT, Inc. for \$28,450 for PS-Monroe at Ashmore Pedestrian Beacon, Parcel # 1.

Item No. 47: Property Transactions – Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel #82

Acquisition of 446 square feet (0.010 acres) Fee Simple, 960 square feet (0.022 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement and 476 square feet (0.011 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 2515 Shamrock Drive from Freida A. Kiser for \$15,000 for Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 82.

Item No. 48: Property Transactions – XCLT Orr Road to Rocky River Road, Parcel #15

Acquisition of 39,229 square feet (0.901 acres) Permanent Greenway Easement and 39,906 square feet (0.916 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 6028 McDaniel Lane from Charlotte Hills Mobile Home Park LLC for \$78,500 for XCLT Orr Road to Rocky River Road, Parcel #15.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: ACTION REVIEW AGENDA REVIEW

Mayor Lyles said okay. Now I'm going to turn it over to the City Manager for a review of the items that he has on the agenda for action today.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so, thank you Mayor, members of Council. We have two items on the action review today, a mobility update and then the Green Source Advantage Service Agreement Overview. I do believe that you received in your packet, either this past week or the week before, a write-up on the Green Source Advantage Service Agreement Overview.

Councilmember Ajmera arrived at 5:06 p.m.

If the mobility discussion takes a little longer than expected, there's time during the Manager's Report for Sarah to come up and give us an update on that. The mobility update and the reason I'm saying that this may go a little longer than on the agenda because I believe it's the right time to have this discussion to talk about not just transit, but also transportation and its impact. So, with that said, no closed session but those are the two items that we have for the action review.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: ACTION REVIEW ITEMS

Mayor Lyles said alright. So, let's go with our presentation on the mobility update.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so, again thank you Mayor and members of Council. I guess hopefully third time's a charm. So, over the last couple of years we've had discussions about it. I hate to use the acronym. So, I'll say it one time and then we'll bury it. So, whether it was TMN (Transformational Mobility Network) or Charlotte Moves, there were a number of discussions about mobility in the area. I think where we missed an opportunity is that many of those discussions were around transit. When we think about transit we're talking really about rail and bus. Also, a part of that is transportation which I know that you hear from your constituents on a daily basis because we're talking about sidewalks and roads and bike paths and greenways. So, I think we've assembled a pretty good team and Ed McKinney is going to walk us through what we call this mobility presentation this evening to set the foundation for future discussion that you will have, whether it's infrastructure or the CIP (Capital Investment Plan).

Working along Ed has been Liz Babson and Ryan Bergman and Sarah Hazel. So, while you may not hear them all talk tonight, over the course of the next few months as we try to sort through this, you will hear those voices. One thing that I do want to start in with is I believe that all of the things that the Council has done up to this point have been exceptional. It has been consistent with the methodology that we move forward with. So, what do I mean by that? When we start to talk about our CIP and those two-year bond cycles, we wanted to make sure that they were affordable, that they were stable. As we start to think about some of the plans that you have approved over the last five

years, that methodology will change a bit. So, the good news is before projects go fully through that methodology, we want to talk with you a little bit about that tonight. So, with that said, I'd like to turn it over to you Ed.

Ed McKinney, Charlotte Department of Transportation said thank you. Good evening, I'm Ed McKinney with the Charlotte Department of Transportation. As it was just teed up, we've got a few topics we want to share with you tonight to really inform the discussion realm of mobility and all the topics the manager just teed up. Just walk you through the things we want to do tonight. I'm going to give you the foundation for some things that are really driving the work that we've done, sort of the sense of urgency and the why now. So, I'll walk you through that to really to tee up really where we want to go and talk through how we get from the broad policies that we've laid out the Comprehensive Plan or Mobility Strategy to get to projects to talk about where and how we want to invest and how we prioritize. Then as the Manager described, we'll talk about the work that's underway right now as we look to take those policies, transform them into a set of project investments and ultimately tee those up for prioritization and ultimately implementation. Then I'll turn it over to Ryan to talk more about the challenge ahead for us, really around how do we fund and invest and in those projects.

So, again let me tee up a few topics just to set the stage and talk a little bit about the high-level drivers that are really important for the work that we've been doing and hopefully shapes the conversation for us around the importance of the mobility work that we're doing. I start with this. It's a reminder for you all and certainly I don't need to remind you about the work that has happened in the last five years. What I would say is as you all know, it's transformative. In the last five years, you have adopted five incredibly significant plans. You know that the history behind this Comprehensive Plan obviously was the first in the last 45 years. Related to that was the Policy Map which really takes those goals and starts to put them on the ground. Again, these are all things you know from the work you're doing every month around land use decisions.

The UDO (Unified Development Ordinance) is the tool that takes all of that policy and starts actually making it part of how we build our community and shapes private investment. Obviously, the context of that around our sustainability vision and then what I would describe as the Strategic Mobility Plan that you adopted in June is really the lens by which we take all of those policies and shape really the mobility investment around them. Again, it's really important to remember the aspirational and the big ideas around this and to know, if you look around the country, I would argue there isn't another city that in the last five years has done this amount of work to really set the stage for a pretty bold vision and some really important implementation tools. What you'll see tonight is we'll talk about how we're taking all of that aspiration and translating it into practical ways to think about mobility investment.

Let me just talk a minute about the Strategic Mobility Plan. So, again as a reminder, back in June essentially around the time as we were teeing up the final adoption of the UDO and had just followed up on the Policy Map adoption, we worked towards, and Council adopted the Strategic Mobility Plan. Two big key ideas around that were Safe and Equitable. Again, nothing dramatically new but really a new focus. So, Safe as you know has really just been building on the commitment you already had in Vision Zero and how it's really taken a very focused look at how we invest and make sure the infrastructure and the road network we're building is essentially safe and ensures that we're building a system that makes sense for our community. Not new, but in this Strategic Mobility Plan, we've elevated it in a way to make sure that it's guiding every decision we make.

On the Equitable side I'm going to dumb it down for us from a transportation standpoint. It's really about making sure that if we want to be a city that's equitable, we need to think about our mobility in a way that's not creating a city to be upwardly mobile to have economic mobility, you're not relying on or we're not forcing our residents to do that really through moving by a car. So, that notion, that focus on the automobile puts us at a disadvantage, it puts our residents at a disadvantage to be successful. It has a huge impact on our capacity, just a practical standpoint from an investment. The key metric

for that is mode share. We've talked about this before in terms of how we begin to shift. I'll go into this in a little bit more detail, but the notion is today we move in a way that's predominantly a single person in a single car commuting to work. If 75 percent of our trips are doing that, the stress on our infrastructure is significant. Again, it's really prioritizing and privileging the ability to move by having that access to a car.

So, for us it's really making that shift. I'll talk about how we're going to do that, but the notion is if we can move that mobility in a way that provides more equitable access to other modes, it's going to have some really important equity outcomes and have some very important infrastructure outcomes for us and ultimately leads to a really important strategy for how we deal with our growth in our long term vision for how we're going to grow as a city.

Another reminder, again, looking back at the last five years I won't go through all of these in detail, but it's a reminder of all the things that are already going on. Both by the city at a regional level and at a local level around a momentum of investment planning design building of things that we're doing around mobility. So, none of this is new. Really what we're trying to do is build on the momentum, build on these great investments around building things like the Blue Line, around planning things at a regional level, connect beyond, around designing the work and thinking ahead like Silver Line. Then ultimately funding. As you see on this diagram, it's important to remind ourselves that the community has given us over these bond cycles the confidence that it's important that we continue to invest in mobility and transportation. We see that support pretty consistently over time.

Another point about why now is really about making sure that we're taking full advantage of the partnerships that are available to us from a funding standpoint. Now given the constraints we have both at the state level and the local level on funding, it's never more important for us to think about those partnerships. So, we are doing things. A couple of reminders on this slide about the partnerships we already have with the state, the two projects you're certainly familiar with in our current capital investment plan. The Eastway/Shamrock intersection and the Rea Road widening. Those are two great examples of our capital improvement dollars being married with state dollars to really take advantage of that partnership, extend the return on our investment in a way that helps us move the needle and make the right kind of investment with the right kind of partnerships. It's a good reminder that the state at a regional level has already planned for doing \$3 billion worth of investment regionally. Primarily obviously in our interstates and arterials and highways, but it's really part of that regional infrastructure and it's part of that regional approach to how we're dealing with mobility and growth.

Again, the point here is it's really important for us to take advantage of this and to actually have a clear local funding strategy so that we can continue to grow and foster these partnerships. Certainly, don't need to go into detail, but the federal infrastructure opportunities we have available to us in the next few years are as equally important in having that strategy and thinking about those partnerships, whether they be important for us to be successful in capturing those dollars. We can't do it alone. So, this is to describe this notion that we're part of a much bigger system both regionally, local and county but also with our towns and other partners within the county. So, you start at the regional level. Think about Connect Beyond in terms of this regional transit vision ensuring that we're connected to the growth that's happening around us. It's important to remember that how that impacts us is over 50 percent of folks that work in Mecklenburg County are actually living outside of the county. So, that pattern, the fact that those trips are coming into the county every day, it's important to our growth. It's a signal to the economic vibrancy we are as a center, but also certainly has transportation impacts for us and is part of an acknowledgment for how we think about our partners regionally and how we solve for our mobility challenges.

At the county level, things like their Greenway Master Plan. Certainly CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System) 2030 Transit Plan that thinks sort of holistically around how we move in the county both walking and biking but also moving by transit. Then again, it's very important to remind ourselves that we're part of a system with the local towns. So,

the connection to how they grow, the investments they're making and to know that we're all thinking about these issues all the way down to the towns. If you look at even recent bond improvements in some of the towns, the plans that they're putting forward. They're all thinking about it on their own scale, the challenges that we have around mobility. So, it's really important to know that we've got to do those things together and really connect our common vision.

So, this is a really important next discussion. So, I'm going to just take a moment to unpack this a little bit but it's really important to our strategy. So, this begins to describe the magnitude of the challenge we have from a mobility perspective and starts to describe how we might approach that challenge. If you look at this, it's trying to take a look at the next 20 years of growth really from the lens of transportation and mobility. You start with that first box, the notion of where we are today. It's sort of a diagram of this conversation that y'all have been having every month around land use decisions and cumulative traffic. So, this is just an isolation, a snapshot of today's condition really just looking at the single occupancy vehicle of one person in one car. There's a little over 1 million trips that happen within the City of Charlotte, really just those vehicle trips just to isolate. It's a reflection of our growth and it's a reflection of the strength of our economy and the economic vibrancy that's happening today, but it's also a mobility challenge. We need to think about how we move folks within that system.

The other point I want to make here is back to the notion of cumulative trips. What I want to illustrate is that one of the better ways for us to think about that issue, which is an important issue, but we've got to think about it on a citywide scale. The notion that we can solve that challenge project by project or corridor by corridor won't be as successful as looking at it from a holistic standpoint. So, the strategies I'm going to talk about are thinking about that growth long term and thinking about the investments, the way we grow and the opportunities we have around innovation to manage and think about that cumulative growth challenge.

So, where are we heading? So, if you look at the trajectory of growth, if you look out 20 years and if we continue to move the way we are with that mode shift of 75 percent of our commute trips being done in a single car, we would essentially grown trips by almost double. So, those are vehicle trips 20 years from now and the notion that that growth would sort of imply that we would have to take our existing infrastructure and double the capacity of that from a vehicular standpoint. If you take a moment and think about what that would look like. Is that even possible? Could we fund that? Would it even be acceptable from a community impact standpoint? In our minds, it's probably not even practical.

So, the notion that we can invest our way to that scenario is a huge challenge and probably an obstacle to us really thinking about this in a different way. So, you see the other line, the other trajectory here is if we took that vision back to the 50/50 mode split. If we said we are going to move as many of those trips from the car into these other modes, what might that look like? So, again in 20 years if we followed that 50/50 split, we would still have more vehicle trips and, in this case, we're showing aspirationally we would still have about 20 percent growth. We'd still have to continue to invest in congestion solutions and manage ways to think about those trips. We would then take that increment and think about it in a different way. We would think about it in terms of other modes. Transit is probably the first and foremost of those. If we have the right transit infrastructure, we can move more people by that mode than we could any other.

Work from home. You know, the change that's been happening in the economy. Biking and walking, the investment that we talked about in the Strategic Mobility Plan. I'll walk through some of those details in a moment, but the notion is if we think about that challenge in a different way, focus on shifting those modes and essentially adding capacity to our system by moving people from cars to other ways to move, it's the way we would begin to solve for that growth challenge and give us a way to shape our future in a completely different way.

Just a notion about how we achieve this and is it achievable? I would say it's more than aspirational and it's practical. You see on this diagram the notion that other cities, some of our comparable cities have set similar goals. They're in actual similar places as we are. Austin and Denver are good examples. We put Seattle and D.C. on there as well. Not to say that we are those kinds of cities and certainly those two cities have a density and a transit infrastructure that we certainly don't have today, but it's a good benchmark to show that other U.S. cities with the right kind of growth and the right kind of investment are achieving similar things. So, it is possible. It's certainly aspirational for us as a city, but what other solution do we have? The notion is we're not going to stop growing and in fact, if you are not to make any other rezoning decisions, if we didn't do any more rezonings and change any of those decisions, we're going to continue to grow. The pace of our economy is happening regardless.

So, really the approach to this should be thinking about how we grow, the way we invest, and ultimately making sure we take advantage of the innovation that's in front of us. The way we grow is really again following the 2040 Plan. If the decisions you make from a land use standpoint are founded in that plan, then it allows us from a mobility standpoint to solve for it. If we're building centers, if we're building 10-minute neighborhoods, if we're putting land uses in the right places, adding density where it needs to be, we can support it by transit. We can make trips shorter. People will walk and bike in places that they don't today really based on that land use vision. You've got to be committed to that vision long term at the big scale and know that in the short term that the specific decisions you make project by project, the cumulative success of that is around this vision, around the plan and around the way we invest.

The Strategic Mobility Plan and the things I'm going to talk about from a project standpoint are as important. We need to invest in transit, we need to invest in our bicycle infrastructure to make walking more safe and comfortable. All of that infrastructure needs to be in place to support the land decision. Then, won't go into detail but we all know that innovation is in front of us. Autonomous vehicles, the way we move, ride sharing, micro mobility, all of those things are dramatically changing how we move. Certainly, there are some things that we'll share with you about how we're preparing for that infrastructure and that future in a way that allows us to take advantage of that innovation and those changes.

So, let me now transition to how we're going from the policies to the projects and start to narrow down the approach that's embedded in the Strategic Mobility Plan. I'll start with a simple diagram. The notion again to remember is we're moving people. So, we're moving them in different ways and this diagram begins to describe the interrelationship of how we move and the interrelationship of our partners. So, again, I'll talk about it in a minute, the Greenway System is incredibly important to us, particularly how it connects to our bike network. The investment we make in roads is certainly part of that strategy. The foundation of that is from pedestrian walkability and then transit. So, we do some of those things, we can partner and support the work that the county's doing from a greenway standpoint and certainly the foundation for that particularly around the mode shift is around transit.

So, that's CATS, it's the county, it's us, there's a regional perspective to this, but the notion is these things work together. You've got to invest in them holistically and you've got to know the way we're going to do that is through our partnerships. I'll walk through a couple of those layers just as a quick walk through. Most of this again I don't need to remind you. This is the 2030 Transit System Plan. Don't need to talk through the details of this, but just to know that for us it really starts with that foundation. This is a part of a regional strategy. It connects to the vision of Connect Beyond and as I mentioned before it's really fundamental for us if we really want to achieve that load shift that ties to our 2040 Plan. It's the foundation by which we're thinking about land use, and ultimately, it's an important foundational structure for how we think about mobility long term. It's really the key to the load shift conversation and we have to start there.

It's not just about rail though. It's a lot of the way we connect really into the neighborhoods and across the city is really through a bus network and our bus system.

Lots of change has happened over the years and certainly the pandemic has completely changed the way we think about that. Regardless, long term it is fundamental to our strategy. CATS is already thinking in completely new and innovative ways about how that might transform the notion that it's really about first and last mile. How do you connect to the neighborhoods that are low density but have populations that need access to transit. So, this new thinking they're doing around micro transit zones where you've got the ability to have on demand service that connects you to higher frequency routes. Then ultimately this notion of mobility hubs. How do you connect to other modes of transportation?

The bus system can connect you in hubs to share access to on demand services to micro mobility choices, to walking to 10-minute neighborhoods. So, the notion isn't just about service. It's really providing the kind of infrastructure and structure by which you're connecting and extending that bus system to other modes and to other neighborhoods and connecting it really in a much more fine grain way than just simply the rail system can long term.

I'm going to now transition to the non-transit transportation projects. Probably one of the more important questions you have in your mind particularly as we move forward to think about how we invest from a capital standpoint and how do we take the Strategic Mobility Plan and actually make it operable. Before I do that, I have to talk about the elephant in the room. How much does all of this cost? How many projects will we get and how are we going to invest and how can we prove that the projects that we put out, we can actually achieve with the dollars that we have available? It's important to kind of set the stage. There're things we know and there's things we don't know and there's things we're doing to make sure we have a better handle on the long-term investment costs and really the long-term strategy for how we commit publicly and to the community about the investment that we can make from a mobility standpoint.

We certainly know all the things about the historic cost of projects. From that work, we've got rules of thumb. I know you're familiar with a lot of the discussions we have around sidewalks. They're variable, the conditions are unique for every project, and we have this sense that per mile that could be \$4 to \$8 million. It gives you a sense of the kind of rule of thumb but also the importance of understanding the site specifics of projects. What we don't know, there are some big things that are happening that are huge challenges for us. Certainly, cost escalation has always been a challenge but certainly, in this current time, it's even increasing. There's lots of technical details about projects. Utilities, right of way needs, the things that are sort of invisible, but when you really get into them, they're really the things that change in effect cost and schedule.

So, those aren't your problems, but we want to make sure you understand the challenges that we face as we think about defining the cost and expectations around these projects. Then again, as you know, probably all the easy projects are already done. So, the projects that we're doing now are complex, they're extremely site specific and they're challenging. So, the easy work is past us, and the hard work is ahead. Certainly, that makes it much more challenging for us to get a handle on the specifics of cost and schedule. What we are doing, you're familiar with the advance planning work we're doing. We're ensuring that the anticipated projects that we're thinking about and spend a little bit more time on the front end to better understand the site characteristics, the nature of those projects before we really commit to them specifically, that way we can be more clear about what the ultimate cost of those projects are.

Then, I'm going to talk about this more in a minute. We're also taking the Strategic Mobility Plan and devising sort of through those goals a way to accelerate project identification prioritization and ultimately feasibility. So, we're going to work in a little bit of a different way to kind of accelerate the planning feasibility exercise so we can understand the kinds of projects that are out there. Get more projects into the Advanced Planning process and then essentially have a stronger pipeline for how we identify and determine the nature of the projects.

There're some examples on this slide just to illustrate the notion that even what seems like a simple project, a bike facility, depending upon where it is and how we implement it, it's dramatically different. It could be a resurfacing and a restriping which is hundreds of thousands of dollars, or it could be something as complex as what we've done in Uptown, which is millions of dollars. So, again, just the notion that the easy things are done. The challenges that we have are unique and that makes it really hard to estimate simple ways the nature of some of these projects. Again, we know that's important and part of the strategy we have around project identification.

A couple of other layers just to talk about now through the non-transit projects and our strategy around being multimodal. It starts with the pedestrian. That's the foundation of everything we do. Again, this is a reminder of things you already know and face every year in terms of decisions you make around capital investment. It's around Vision Zero and safety and the investment we make to make our streets more safe. Ultimately, it's very practical. It's about filling the gaps of sidewalks that we have. So, it's all important, but as you know, this project, the need is far greater than our resource. Really what we're doing now and we're even more focused on as we go into the project identification process is making sure we're really clear about the way we're prioritizing so that we can focus the limited resources on the places that will have the most impact.

So, again you're struggling with the notion of sidewalk infrastructure related to rezoning and development projects. We certainly understand that struggle. What we're trying to do is make sure that the public investment we make in that system is targeted to where we can have most impact. Whether it's access to schools, whether it's access to transit. It's really important that every dollar we put into that has a really meaningful impact. It isn't just sort of a scattered shot to how we think about filling those gaps. The next two systems I've already mentioned are really important to think about together. This is where the partnership is really important as well. So, the Strategic Mobility Plan spent a lot of intentional time working and thinking through at the county what their short term and long-term plan is for their greenways systems so that as we thought about our bicycle network, we're essentially building them together. There should be one system because essentially, they extend each other if the notion is we've got a greenway and a bike network that is accessible for pedestrians, for cyclists, we've actually been able to extend that system. It really is one system and it's important for us to think about that together in partnership with the county.

The other notion on this slide is the county knows this and we know this, just like sidewalks, we have a huge need. We've got and made some great success over the last 10, 20 years on building that bike network, but our vision in the SMP (Strategic Mobility Plan) this notion of a priority network says that we have a long way to go. The greenway system similarly. They've obviously had great success in building the system, it's one of the highest priorities of residents in the county, but their vision is ambitious as well. So, the notion is a huge need and it's important for us to think about ways to fund that and ways to prioritize where is the best impact and how can we extend those systems together.

Finally, and probably just as important as any of them, is the road network. We've already touched upon this. The challenge is we're never solving congestion and traffic. We're managing it, and if we hold true to this notion of our land use vision and this mobility strategy, what we're really trying to do is move those trips but then focus where we need to. So, we're still making investment in roads, we will still need to build our streets to be more complete, to be more multimodal. We'll still need to make strategic investments in intersections and other places where there's true capacity we can add and safety that we can increase, but it's got to be part of this bigger strategy. It can't be roads alone and we've got to think about it more holistically. Partnerships are a part of that. Certainly, there's lots of ways we've already mentioned that we can partner with state and federal dollars to make these investments more strategic and really take advantage and extend essentially our public dollars.

Just to mention this, on the part of the slide about innovation. Lots of things that will change that we can't predict as we sit here, but a couple of things we want to mention

both as a reminder and to let you know that we're also thinking about this. Over the last 20 years we made a huge investment, an invisible investment in our fiber optic network that connects our signals and all the technology that makes those able to be connected to be managed in a way that is unique and allows us to manage the system in real time and to adapt. That infrastructure is helpful to us today but it's also part of an infrastructure that will be needed as we think about connecting vehicles to that infrastructure. So, the cars and our pedestrians can access that information, it can connect us. The Travel Safety App that Council approves and that we're piloting in Southend is an example where you've got real connections and pedestrians and vehicles can read and understand where they are, what's happening at the intersection all because we have the infrastructure and those signals for that communication to happen.

So, we've been thinking about that both short term and long term and that investment certainly that you have helped us make through the Capital Investment Program is a big start to being ready for that innovation. On the horizon, there's some very practical things, pavement markings. We do a lot of work at the state level thinking about this transition to autonomous vehicles and one of the emerging trends out of that is something very simple. You have to have markings on the roads that those vehicles can respond and understand and operate in the system. So, that's something we need to be thinking about. That's something that will have a cost implication for us long term, but it's sort of a simple practical way to think about our infrastructure and being ready for the long-term innovation and take advantage for the opportunities for capital and capacity improvements that could be made in essentially a very simple way.

So, let me talk about what's next. How do we take those policies, how do we take the notion of those different mode strategies and start to apply them to get to real projects. I want to talk a little bit about how we're doing that, how we're prioritizing, give you a sense of the work that's in progress. Before I do that, I think the Manager mentioned it. None of what I'm about to say, I want you to think as new or different. Essentially what we're doing is rethinking the way we prioritize. Really just to be in line with all these big plans we've talked about. We've always been prioritizing projects. We've always been doing that based on the goals that our Council stated that are community important. Safety, congestion, connectivity, making sure we have access to schools and services, leverage like we've talked about funding partnerships. So, we've always been doing that to make sure that we capitalize and take advantage of our public investments.

What is new is all the plans we just talked about. The notion of this mode shifts to align our work in a completely different way to make sure that we're thinking about it holistically. Then ultimately, I'll talk about it really is also about identifying projects and thinking about how we figure out their feasibility and prioritize them in a more rapid way so that we can be ready with a larger stabler projects for you to consider and for us to think about long term funding opportunities. So, it's all about taking this vision, getting it to a set of priorities and then really ultimately identifying projects. A vision, again, we talked about this already, but it starts with all the things we've talked about. The plans and policies that we've put in place. I'll talk about how we've started to transition those policies to real metrics. I do want to make a note that it's dynamic even in the last several months. The notion that equity is important is important to the Council. We understand that and certainly we continue to think about how we refine our prioritization process to keep in tune with where Council wants to be and where we all want to be particularly around things related to equity and making sure our investments are all in our community.

So, how do we take those goals and start to identify projects? We've essentially taken all of those expectations in those plans and said, "Okay, what data do we have? How would we measure that and how might we use that process to narrow in on where the priorities that Council has?" So, this is a snapshot of what that looks like. We looked at safety. Where is our high injury network? Where are those pedestrian gaps? Complete streets. Where are those corridors that don't have bike facilities or sidewalks? Congestion. Certainly again, we're not losing sight of those needs. Equity. Where are the populations that are disadvantaged and don't have access to a wider range of

modes of growth? Certainly, we know, and you see this by the land use decisions you make, we need to make sure the way we're growing, the more intense activity centers we're prioritizing investments to make that land use vision real. Then we've already talked about that infrastructure of bike and transit. So, if you begin to layer those things together and this is sort of a diagram of what that might look like. Take that data, start to layer it on the ground with the city and you get this sort of little bit of a heat map. You begin to identify the overlaps of those goals.

So, what we're doing now is taking the potential project areas. It's important to say that they're driven by, again the goals of these plans, real data but taken by the vision and goals of these plans so that we ensure that we're spending our time looking at projects and feasibility only where they align with the goals that you set so that we're really focused on moving the needle and implementing that vision.

This is a lot of areas, right? This is really just at a high level what we do. Next is think about how do we identify those projects? Just to give you a quick snapshot of some of that layering. So, you see on these two diagrams, the notion of a couple of those layers, the High Injury Network. On the top there is sort of a geographic mapping of this notion of populations that don't have access to automobiles or populations that are older that simply don't have the same mobility options. You see where some of those heat maps are still overlays. So, really to illustrate the point that the data to this draws some real decisions about where we focus on projects.

Then, this is the work ahead. We don't have the list of projects for you tonight. We've got lots of work ahead of us to think about. The feasibility work, we're doing that now. So, one of the things is that we've got our design and planning teams and working across the city departments to begin to identify those projects. We conduct some initial feasibility. Start to screen through the projects that make sense that will have the most impact that we can ultimately understand the cost implication of those and then be able to have a broader list of the investments we think are important to get to all the goals we've talked about. Then can come back to you with a more realistic sense of what that order of magnitude needs is. So, lots of work ahead to us. It's really the beginnings of this discussion to give you a sense of where we're going with this process. Get some input and talk about ultimately, I'll hand it over to Ryan, to talk about the big challenge which is once we have that list and that sense of the infrastructure investment, how do we fund it? What's the gap and what's our next steps in terms of implementing that vision with a serious and clear funding strategy.

Mr. Jones said so, thanks Ed. It's great to hear you walk through something. I appreciate it. Before I turn it over to Ryan, there's one slide that I want to show you, if we can go to the next slide, it's in your booklet and I think that's 11 by 17 or something like that. So, this is really taking what's in the CIP and putting together more or less a diagram for it. So, let's talk about what's good about this. So, these are the next three bond cycles in a four bond cycle series. If you go back in time before we started the 2022 bond that just was approved, we started off saying for the next four bond cycles without a property tax increase, this is what we could do in terms of capacity, \$226 million each bond cycle.

The good news is that in the out years, you did not use up all of the capacity. So, that box up top that's unprogrammed is \$38 million for the next bond cycle not programmed, \$39.3 million for the following bond cycle and \$47.7 million. So, as we got our final numbers for this last budget process, you programmed all of the excess capacity for the 2022 bond, but this was not programmed. Call it maybe we were running out of time, or call it something that was smart or clever, that we may have some pressures. So, as we start to think about that, anything that we're dealing with in terms of existing project cost escalation or increases in interest rates, that's an area that again is unprogrammed. As you start to go through this, this is I guess some of the challenges. So, the great news I think you will agree, the Advanced Planning Fund and what strategy and budget and finance does I think has put us in a very good position to address the needs up to this point. Up to this point, the concept was \$50 million for the Housing Bond.

You have infrastructure projects for the roads or neighborhoods, but as Ed was mentioning earlier, as we start to think about something above what has been planned, that's where the challenge comes in and how we would be able to afford that. We are spending a lot of time on transportation by design. So, Jason Lawrence, I'm sorry I missed you at first. Jason has really been helping us with the transit piece of that. Again, holistic approach, here's some of the challenges. I'll leave with this point and then you have this in front of you. Some of the things that you were able to do in the 2022 bond, like having \$50 million for sidewalks and \$17 million for Vision Zero. We took all of the savings that we could find to apply to those things that are priorities to you. As you start to look in the out years, we don't come close to those numbers in terms of sidewalks and Vision Zero.

So, just things to think about as you start to think about this additional unprogrammed capacity. Now Ryan.

Ryan Bergman, Strategy and Budget said alright. Good evening, everybody. The Manager took all my positive talking points. So, now I'll just talk about the challenges. So, I'll talk a little bit about this, but there's a lot on this slide. The Manager mentioned that these are the next three bond cycles. I think it's important to note that when City Council approves a budget, they're only approving that year's budget. We also include in the budget a multi-year CIP for planning purposes, but none of this has been formally approved by City Council and it won't be. Actually, that first bond, the 2024 bond is not in this upcoming budget. It's actually the budget year after it. Some of the changes the manager talked about with Advanced Planning where we take a longer view and some of the policies and strategies that Ed talked about means that we are starting to talk about this earlier than ever. We're now into the budget development part of the year where I kind of come out of hibernation and you guys get to hear an awful lot of me through the budget workshops. I can assure you that's whether it's the first budget workshop or the second, we will be digging much deeper into a lot of this information around our capital program.

So, we did leave the \$38 million unprogrammed. The \$38 million, the \$39.3 million, the \$47.7 million because we were already clearly into an inflationary environment, and we could kind of see what was coming. Let me talk a little bit about the pressures that are on the right side of the screen there. So, the first box has our two biggest pressures. So, if you think about our CIP, we're essentially getting squeezed from two different directions. The first is the cost of borrowing. Just like every other CIP in the country that relies on debt, the cost of borrowing has gone up. So, rather than \$226 million, because it's more expensive to borrow, when we get into the spring and we settle on a steady state, it's possible that may be something like \$210 million or \$215 million. So, it won't go down into the named programs and projects, but it is possible due to the cost of borrowing that that capacity will go down slightly.

The second pressure is based on what we call the Municipal Cost Index which our city economist Dr. Tazifor tracks for us. What it basically says is that for about the last 10 years up until the last two, the Municipal Cost Index would increase an average of about 2 percent a year. So, we could kind of plan on that with the inflation. The last two years it's averaged about 10 percent. So, what that means is that not only is it possible that the \$226 million gets reduced to \$215 million let's say, but on top of that, what we can afford with that \$215 million is really equivalent to maybe \$180-\$185 million two years ago. So, those are two main pressures on us as we plan our mobility investments. As you look into the CIP, you can see some additional pressures. The Manager mentioned that we were able to make a significant investment in sidewalks and Vision Zero. Part of it was because we were in the process of planning some of those named projects. So, we used those funds, but in the out years as currently planned, that is returning to pre-2022 levels.

Beyond that in the gray, you see that we have \$8 million built in normally for street resurfacing in the past bond. We had to increase that to \$21.6 million because of a state reduction to our power bill funds. If those funds aren't replenished by Fiscal Year 2025, we would likely have to increase the street resurfacing again to stay where we currently

are today. Then finally, logically the named projects that we have planned in the budget, they were at 30 percent design because all four went through our Advanced Planning Fund, but the unusual inflationary environment for the last couple of years means that we will likely need to revisit those as we get further into each of these bond cycles.

So, when we talk about options to enhance our mobility funding, just like everything else we do as a city, it's got to come from one of two ways. It can either come from expenditure reductions elsewhere that we would use for the purpose, or it has to come from additional revenue. So, you'll see on the screen on the expenditure side, options could include reducing operating funds so that we could put additional dollars to our CIP, but what I would note is when we get into budget development in our workshops, we'll talk about our operating budget, our general fund budget where we're feeling a lot of similar pressures. So, to get the kind of investment to enhance mobility funding from that source, it would likely require some pretty significant service level reductions.

On the revenue side, City Council always controls property tax and then the other item that we have listed here is the county sales tax, the mobility tax that has been discussed before. It of course currently does not have legislative authority. One thing I would note about the sales tax is unlike a property tax, a county sales tax is paid by visitors and commuters to Mecklenburg County. Some estimates our economists estimate that that's about 30 percent of the revenue that's generated.

So, all of these options, I know this is just kind of a quick dive, but we did think it was important to get up and frame the mobility discussion with some of the discussions that we're going to have in our workshops starting in February. So, with that I will turn it back over to the City Manager.

Mr. Jones said so, thank you again Mayor and members of Council. Just wanted to begin the discussion today. As I mentioned at the beginning, there's no action required, but as we start to think about housing and jobs, mobility is also that third leg to the stool and we haven't spent enough time talking about non-transit. So, tonight was the beginning of that discussion and as Ryan said, right out of the box in one of the budget workshops, we believe that talking about the CIP and the infrastructure would be important.

Councilmember Winston said I certainly look forward to the conversations next year and figuring out this budget and how we deal with new realities. I'll be quick. There was something that was left out and I think we need to address in the conversations moving forward. This slide number 12, it says our goal is to move people and I love that, but Charlotte is built and sustained by moving people and goods and items. So, I don't really see where that fits. I think it fits into the road networks, but I know from an infrastructure standpoint, especially some rezonings in our ETJ (Extraterritorial Jurisdiction), we're running up to a place where because of our airport, because of our intermodal port, we're increasingly becoming a logistics city and that real estate is running up on each other. So, you have industrial moving right next to residential and the people are asking how do we answer for that.

We don't have sufficient infrastructure to deal with the existing tractor trailer traffic. We talk often times about lack of parking, those big rigs piling up in and through neighborhoods. So, I think that's going to have to be something that we consider and something that we talk about and deal with directly. Just thinking about it from the regional standpoint, goods, even if they're not moving to Charlotte, they have to move through Charlotte. How are we going to deal with that? So, I hope we hit that on the head when the time is appropriate. Thank you.

Councilmember Mayfield said you took some of my notes. Also, if you could fast forward to page 22. As we're having our conversations, I think it would be helpful if you all, when we're looking at that equity transportation disadvantage index, if we can get a snapshot of where routes were redirected over the last decade. So, the last 10 years, that might also give us an idea when we're looking at the growth under this mobility

criteria because some of these potential challenges that we see came from direct action of transportation staff with the redirecting and reallocating of certain routes.

So, it would be helpful to see what that map previously looked like over this one to see if we can make some adjustments there because as was mentioned by Mayor Pro Tem, when we think about moving product as well as people, we have to look at our impact. This is great that we're going towards a more mobile society, but everyone does not have a mobile phone. Everyone doesn't have a bank account. We still have a lot of people in our community that use cash and use money orders. So, if they don't have access to some of these things, we're still creating a potential divide in our community. So, it would be helpful for me to also know while we're having these discussions, how are we making sure that we're not making an assumption that everyone has the ability for that last half mile access or have the ability to pull up a Park It or whatever the app is on a mobile device. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you for the presentation. It was a great comprehensive vision. I wanted to talk about the priorities as well and lift up District 4 specifically because of the Blue Line and also the Research Park and the Wells Fargo and being the second largest job driver in the city. So, I want to know, I think this is great and aspirational, but are we looking at express buses to solve the problem for now? I just think that's a low hanging fruit if we added more buses, we could move more people immediately instead of looking at a 20-year plan. Again, with having the Blue Line and this large economic area, it just seems like a very obvious or simple solution. So, are we looking at employment area when we're looking at the mobility criteria?

Then my second question is, again District 4, there are so many state-owned roads. W.T. Harris, Mallard Creek, Sugar Creek, Prosperity Church, are we working with NCDOT (North Carolina Department of Transportation) in developing plans? Even the lighting and the sidewalks. Are we considering those state-owned roads as we're developing the plans? Thank you.

Mr. McKinney said I'll go back to your first question around transit. I want to go back to this and maybe Jill could say a couple of things. One of these areas, and this is sort of a small diagram, but one of the areas that's been focused around in terms of back to this notion is micro transit zones and University City is one of the great examples. It's hard to tell on this map, but it's on there. The notion that we've got employment concentrations in areas that are more suburban. So, the challenge of getting access to transit is completely different and that's really what this micro mobility, micro transit zone strategy is about. How do we connect from our high frequency bus corridors and connections in places like University City through other ways.

Using the mobility hubs as sort of a starting point for how you get from where you work to that transit location, the station. Whether it's Blue Line or a high frequency bus route. So, more to come but that's really what the next generation, the kind of thinking that CATS is doing around the bus system is to address the areas that you're describing. Particularly around more suburban but high concentrations of employment.

Then the discussion, I'll go back to the notion of partnerships just at a high level. Again, you're absolutely right, certainly in the University City area and many other parts of the city we are in partnership with the state essentially. There're some roads that we maintain and there's some that they do. So, we're working together to make that investment. In some cases, it looks like these partnerships where we find ways to use our capital dollars with their investment to make the right kinds of changes. That includes everything from these kinds of improvements on roads, partnering in ways to get street lighting, partnering in ways to get sidewalk connections. Again, our investment but in partnership with the state. So, it is an important issue, and you're absolutely right. It's one of the strategies embedded in here to uncover those kinds of projects where they align with those goals that we have and make sure that we prioritize that investment in the right way and the right places.

Councilmember Molina said first, I'd like to echo my colleague and say that this is a very good presentation. It's extremely comprehensive and I feel like you've attempted to cover more than enough information for us to get a view for what you'd like to achieve. The only thing that I would lift up of course, you both have talked to me, I'm going to of course lift up District 5. You know that we have unique needs in District 5. Rapid transit, I realize that's a long-term infrastructure project. So, I appreciate that we are attempting the lift to take our city to the next level. I do realize it's time consuming for the long-term infrastructure projects, but I'm really interested in what our short-term solutions are for our residents of District 5. Of course, you and I, we've talked to Ed about FinCo in particular. That's what comes to mind with me immediately specifically because our far east neighbors lack complete infrastructure. So, I really look forward to working with you all and to connect the leadership in that area so that we can speak to what those needs are specifically, and we can plan out strategically what and how we're going to integrate that area into our fabric in our city.

So, that would probably be the highest concern for me from an East Charlotte perspective, but then we also have mobility concerns. East Charlotte, actually we have some of the highest usage rates for people who are in need of public transportation. We don't have jobs in East Charlotte. So, I want to talk to a few other departments about how we can get some jobs in East Charlotte along with some transportation so that we can deliver real true solutions finally. Listen to me, finally for the people who live in the district that I represent. So, I definitely look forward to having some real conversations during my tenure and my leadership so that we can better serve the people of East Charlotte. I'm looking forward to it.

Councilmember Ajmera said great presentation, Ryan, and Ed. Great job. I always like how you end it with numbers because that's where the rubber meets the road. We can have all the plans but if we don't have funding or if we don't figure out the funding behind it, it's just a plan. So, we have to figure out the next steps here in terms of this increase or unprogrammed capacity. Really my question is out of this \$38 million, \$39.3 and \$47.7 million in unprogrammed capacity what is really left after we account for increased CIP dollars. There are four projects, and we don't know what that increase will look like.

Then also after factoring in increased cost of borrowing, what does that number look like? I think having that number would help the Council figure out where is additional capacity that could be implemented to release some of this pressure. I agree with what some of my colleagues have said. I know Ms. Johnson raised the issue of streetlights and sidewalks. We have major roads like W.T. Harris that connects to Blue Line extension, but guess what? There are not streetlights and sidewalks. So, how do you encourage someone to take the light rail? That's a real issue that we need to solve.

Ms. Molina brought up the issue of area plan. We don't have an area plan in the far east. I firmly believe that a lot of private investment is followed after the investments that we make in public infrastructure. So, we really need some sort of area planning for the far east. I can go on about other districts. I know District 7 has Mr. Driggs. I feel it's a broken record. He has brought up sidewalks over and over and over again, especially around the schools. We have schools in all parts of our city where we do not have sidewalks where children can walk on. It's just really unsafe. I'm holding my breath each time I pass by several schools where children can't even walk to the school. So, we have to prioritize some of these infrastructure needs and as Mr. Jones said earlier, I think we have put so much emphasis and focus on light rail discussion. That's valid, however, we need to really focus on other mobility areas such as sidewalks, bike lanes, street lighting and other safe ways to get from point A to point B.

So, I'm very appreciative of this presentation because this really puts focus on the items that needs to be addressed immediately and short term. So, at every rezoning meeting, there is this theme, and the theme is infrastructure. Lack of infrastructure. There's congestion and traffic. There's sidewalk gaps everywhere in our city. So, I think having some sort of assurance around what is left in our capacity would help us, would help the Council make decisions.

The other question I have, \$38 million is not going to fulfill so much gap that we have today. What are other ways that Council can look into to address some of the short-term immediate needs that we have without looking at the revenue side? The revenue side, especially during high inflation, will only cause undue burden on our residents, especially during uncertain economic times. We don't know what 2023 is going to look like with high inflation and potential recession as economists have said over and over again. So, I would really like us to focus on the expenditure side and see how we can figure out ways to increase our capacity while lowering our expenditure and increasing the capacity on the infrastructure side.

The other thing I would also like us to focus on is, but I think some of my colleagues have already addressed that. That's a loaded question here, but if you want to respond Ryan.

Mr. Bergman said I think it's important that we understand that with our capacity, what really matters is we get to the spring, all the inputs are put into our model, and we come up with our steady state capacity. So, right now it being November, there's a lot that can change over the next three months. I would think that at the budget committee in February we would bring in Teresa Smith, our CFO (Chief Financial Officer), we would walk everybody through the model and what our steady state says. So, what that \$226 million will become based on the cost of borrowing, I think it's important to wait another few months because there could be some things that help the cost of borrowing a little bit. Perhaps revenue is a little bit higher than we currently plan and things like that. So, the steady state is just a point in time each year that we go with during budget development. I think it would be important to wait for that.

Ms. Ajmera said I understand. Well, I look forward to reviewing that. Also, the other question I have, I know we have ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) dollars. Could that be used for any of our infrastructure capacity Mr. Jones?

Mr. Jones said so the ARPA dollars are very different than the CARES (Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security) dollars. I'll try not to make this too geeky. You can do revenue replacement, and once you do revenue replacement, it frees you up to do so much more with these ARPA funds. So, in other words there would be something that we would spend on, let's call it public safety. You would do a revenue replacement on that. It would free you up to be quite flexible with the ARPA dollars. I would like to give you an early warning on the last question that you asked though. When we put together the Advanced Planning Fund, we also wanted to make sure that we gave you updates on project status.

I think the colors were blue, yellow and red. Red meant exactly what red means. So, a project's in danger. I think we may have patted ourselves on the back last time, you got a lot of blues. Expect yellows. So, the same pressure for projects that you're seeing whether it's housing or in the economy, we're in the short term now, seeing those pressures on our projects.

Ms. Ajmera said right. So, to Mr. Jones' point, I think we also ought to consider ARPA dollars to figure out how can we address some of our immediate needs using those dollars, since it can be used towards infrastructure needs. That's what I'm hearing correct?

Mr. Jones said Ryan will correct me if I'm off base. The concept is that you could use the ARPA dollars for revenue replacement, and it frees you up to spend those dollars differently.

Ms. Ajmera said other capacity.

Mr. Jones said yes.

Ms. Ajmera said so, if that frees up additional capacity, because obviously this capacity is not even enough to do 10 miles of sidewalks. It costs \$6 million for one mile of

sidewalk. So, if you factor that in this is not going to really put a dent in the problem that we have. It's a billion-dollar problem. So, we have to look at other revenue sources without looking at the revenue increase where it puts undue burden and causes displacement. I'm glad to see that we have capacity. I mean certainly that's a big plus. So, I appreciate that. That's all. Thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said a lot of the discussion tonight has been around funding and certainly that's important. I'd like to spend a little time focusing on another part of the project management piece, the scope. I'd like to understand a little bit more about the execution and the operations of this because I think that if we really truly had our minds wrapped around the scope, then we can talk what's realistic funding. I think it's important to deal with what is in terms of the funding, however, I think if we look at what is the work to be done, then that reframes how we approach what kind of money we need to go get and where we hunt it.

So, I just want to make sure I understand a few things. Thank you for the presentation. Much of it is familiar. I will say that I am most interested in some of the areas around actual projects because I know, as several of my colleagues have mentioned before, many of us have been talking for some time about the various issues in our district. I was really hoping to get a clearer understanding of how this project prioritization work that I see on page 25 and 23. I was hoping to see those dots connected. These are the areas we have high congestion and I see that as a mobility criteria. What I don't see is these are the areas where we're seeing growth and what is the "so what" there.

My hope is that we can use this information to truly say these are the areas where we need to invest in infrastructure, or we've got to have some real critical conversations about our growth. I think the pieces are here, but something's missing in terms of the bringing a package that's actionable to Council. These 200 plus project areas. Can you help me understand how that lines up with the CIP, the C-NIP (Comprehensive Neighborhood Improvement Program) projects? I know that I had a discussion with several members of staff a few years ago now as it related to Steele Creek and wanting to understand what are the projects that are in flight, what are the needs, what are the funding gaps so that the residents could respond with where their priorities are. Where are the pieces to that puzzle?

Mr. McKinney said great set of questions and a good start to a lot of the work that we haven't shared with you yet. In fact, if it took 30, 40 minutes to kind of get to this point, it probably begs some more time for us to walk through all the details you're describing. So, some of what you've talked about is embedded in the work, we just need to pull it out and share some of the details so we can do that. I would describe what we're doing with this process is exactly what you're asking, which is let's align with our goals, but let's look at where we're currently investing. Let's make sure we understand where the community is on key issues and things that we're facing in Charlotte East and things that we're facing in Steele Creek.

Then when we go into these more detailed feasibility work around these project areas, our actions then are to make sure that we're defining projects and testing projects that are really context specific that are really facing the challenges of the unique parts of Charlotte, and testing again where are we investing already. Where are the real gaps and what are the right projects to do? So, this is very high level. You're absolutely right. There's more work that's ongoing. What's described here is we're just now beginning to take those areas and kind of do a deeper dive. We're testing like is the state already investing in these areas? What have we already been doing from a capital investment? Potentially we can build upon things that we're already doing. We can certainly not do things that are already being taken advantage of by other partners. There's growth in private development. So, where are we aligning with the private investment that's happening?

So, lots more detail. We're doing some of that work now. It's still ongoing and maybe this is a good opportunity to tee up a more detailed future conversation around some of those questions.

Ms. Watlington said yes, when will we see that? I was expecting actually to see a little bit of that in December.

Mr. Jones said so, what we have right now for the first look, and I believe on the plan that by spring you'll have some more depth to these projects. At first it was summer. I said summer wouldn't work because we need to get this done before we have a budget process, but that's where we are. First quarter.

Ms. Watlington said so, first quarter we will see projects?

Mr. Jones said you will have a deeper dive in these areas, these 200 areas that he has been talking about, yes.

Ms. Watlington said okay, because for me those are really the building blocks to the rest of the work. So, without that, I'm not sure how far we can go on an infrastructure conversation and I'm really not sure how we have a realistic budget conversation either. So, the sooner we can do that certainly the better.

Mr. Jones said so Councilmember Watlington, the other thing, Ryan said this earlier, we're actually trying to get out in front. The next time that you have a vote if you will on a CIP will not be this upcoming budget but the following. What we're trying to do is have early warning signs in the process that we're talking about this in the off years.

Ms. Watlington said understood. I do have a couple of questions about the CIP dollars in particular. Am I understanding that what is listed here through 2028, all of these dollars are already programmed?

Mr. Bergman said no.

Ms. Watlington said besides the piece at the top that's [INAUDIBLE]?

Mr. Jones said no. So, you haven't voted on these. These are out years.

Ms. Watlington said understood, but what I'm saying is the things that are built here is essentially if these are not approved, something's hanging in the balance. What I mean is here where you've got named projects in the middle this highlighted turquoise area, \$28 million, \$66 million and \$42 million, those are projects that are named. These dollars are going to be assigned. They haven't been approved but the idea is that they will be assigned to these projects. So, in the event that something changes, or we have to reallocate, does the bottom fall out of these projects?

Mr. Bergman said I guess what I would say is the name projects are made up of four projects. Two road projects, two intersection projects that we've ran through Advanced Planning the last three years. One of those actually did start. Eastway Shamrock received funding in 2022. So, that one would certainly need to maintain in 2024. Council would be able to have discussions on the other projects. I guess what I would say is Bryant Farms Road is a Phase 2 off of a Phase 1 that were intended to be together. The other Robinson Church Road and the intersection. City Council of course always has the authority before we actually start the project. We're at 30 percent design on them right now.

Ms. Watlington said so, essentially then for the next eight or so years, we've got four projects, and all of the money is gone. That is frightening. It begs the question what needs to get done because we don't need to keep having this conversation every month in zoning if the reality is we have no money for 10 years. We might as well start telling people it's going to get worse unless six of us are willing to say no or find the money somewhere else. I think that until we have that conversation, we haven't done the level of work that is really required to move to an actionable plan.

The other thing I wanted to ask about is when it comes to transit, I see the plans in here and I noticed that all of our lines with the exception of perhaps the Silver Line

terminated in Mecklenburg County. I think that we are at a point where we've got to reevaluate that strategy. Obviously, I'd love to see something in the way of Steele Creek enhanced bus service like Councilmember Johnson mentioned, but across the county, I think we've got to get realistic about who is going to be using this and what more do they need. So, I just really would implore us to really start thinking about how this strategy can extend in a more meaningful way into our surrounding counties and what kind of structure needs to show up to be able to support those kinds of decision makings.

Mr. Jones said so, I would say Councilmember Watlington, on that slide, it was just designed to talk about those lines that would be funded by Mecklenburg County. The Silver Line does go into Gaston County. The Silver Line also goes into Union and the Red Line would go into Iredell also.

Ms. Watlington said right, I can appreciate that, but we're looking at about three miles worth into Union County. So, when I think about again who's most likely going to use these lines, I think that the further we can go into our existing counties, the more likely our neighbors would be inclined to be a part of that decision making process, and of course in exchange we certainly would expect some kind of contribution. Thanks.

Councilmember Anderson said I'll try and be quick. I do echo the sentiments from my colleagues that this is a very good presentation, and it lays out a comprehensive approach rather than a hit here a hit there which I really like quite a bit. I also appreciate that we are prioritizing mobility investment through a lens of mobility criteria that you've laid out on slide 22. That centers some of our biggest challenges in combination with public safety issues that we have. So, I appreciate that. One thing that would be helpful as we think about how we would prioritize these 200 potential projects in Q1 would be to see where of the eight areas that you've laid out here on the slide, where is there overlap? So, where are there public safety issues overlapping with some of the demands that we need? You tried to do that. You did it on slide 24 here, but I think that would inform how we can prioritize getting the biggest bang for our buck.

The second point I'd like to make is given that we're in an environment where the municipal cost index is substantially high and of course we're in an inflationary environment. Our buying power is much lower for that \$226 million and the \$115 million unprogrammed capacity. It might be interesting to see also in some of these asks where some of these industries might not be hit as hard due to inflation because we get more buying power out of prioritizing some of those projects ahead of time, if that makes sense. Certainly, for District 1, I'll echo everything my colleague said. We have challenges across the board. So, I think if we focus here and look at the overlap and then also think about how we can get the biggest mind power out of the existing dollars, I think that would serve a great deal. Thank you.

Councilmember Bokhari said I can't believe I'm going to say this, but guys that was a very good start. I will say I almost moved to this city 20 years ago to the day and I was part of the initial transportation, transit discussions then. We've had a lot since then. I think this was the first time I've ever seen a strategic comprehensive view really from a non-transit transportation perspective, roads, sidewalks and all of that. So, when I say a great start, and literally that's what I'm referring to, but I also say start because where we go next will determine what happens and if we capitalize on this. So, the role of roads being forefront I think that's a box that's been checked here that I haven't seen before.

I think the next point, and there's three things that I think are the keys to the success of where we go. The next one is how we fund it in this conversation. I think if we get bogged down looking at this, we miss the boat. We completely miss the boat whether it's \$185 million or \$226 million steady state, that's rounding errors from where we need to head if we're going to do something strategic. I view these buckets of money in two buckets. There's CIP and that's really table stakes.

Councilmember Mitchell arrived at 6:30 p.m.

That's us treading water and then there's transformational, federal, state, other forms of dollars and that is doing something visionary. One is in the tens and hundreds of millions, and one is the multiple billions.

So, if this is where we're going to end and we're going to say, "Alright, well what's this project or that?" Then we're just going to jockey over projects and it's going to be small potatoes. If we're talking about the big unlocking of transformational money which I think could be \$4, \$6, maybe even \$8 billion in something strategic like this. Well, that may kill a couple birds with one stone on our plate right now, but we've never had that conversation with roads before. So, if we're going to get serious, I think we have to have the conversation. What is a road heavy strategy like this look like that isn't just a light rail heavy strategy and could that unlock the federal funding? Could that unlock state funding. I believe with initial conversations it could, but if we're worried about the effects of the next couple macro-economic trends on this or how we're going to re-divvy that up, we could clear that entire stack out and it wouldn't make a difference to something strategic.

The third point, if the role of roads is one, how we fund is two, I think the third secret to success that has been lacking in it, to be honest, you've got a couple of buzzwords. I know you guys have been working on it behind the scenes but it's still lacking is the technology lens in all of this and where the puck is going to be in relation to 20 years out. If that feels like it's close, it's kind of is. I moved here 20 years ago and if you think about what was happening then in 2002, 2003, at those conversations it was just transit, and they were looking at a world where 3G had just been launched. 3G, right and if they were looking five to seven years in the future, they would've known that 4G was coming and in 2007 the iPhone was coming, in 2009 4G got rolled out and then ultimately Uber started in 2009.

So, imagine in 2003 that the entire world of how people moved around in ride share would change. It was not impossible. It was really hard, not impossible. It's not impossible for us right now to think about 5G, to think about IOT (Internet of Things), to think about autonomous vehicles and think about what a transformational investment in our roads look like. We have to start with that big picture lens and then work our way back and then finish allocating the projects how they fit in that thing, not start with them.

Finally, I think the fourth point is equity. The equity lens is the same thing in the rule that applies with the funding lens which is if we're going to look at an equity lens and say transactionally these projects are needed here and my district needs this and that, we'll have already lost. It has to be something that is so big and powerful and important for where the puck's going to be in 20 years that not investing in a portion of our city means the whole thing doesn't work. That's the equity lens. If we think at a big enough level of all this, it won't be one or two or three districts not get their fair share. If they didn't, it won't be ubiquitous enough to draw the vision of where we're going.

So, I know we're stuck on time. There's a lot more I wanted to say. I think those are my punchlines of it's a great start. I have not seen that in 20 years here to get to this point. The question is, what do we do next?

Councilmember Driggs said I actually had a similar comment. I think this is actually a major step. I haven't seen us acknowledge the interdependence of our funding capacity, our different plans, the Strategic Mobility Plan, the UDO. So, in that sense it is a very important step. To me it basically acknowledges a question rather than answering it. So, I'm glad to see the question finally out in the open and I've heard responses now. How do we make this work? What is our actual capacity? The distinction between the TMN and the CIP capacity isn't very clear to me. I don't see how CIP does anything. To Mr. Bokhari's point, the CIP is not adequate. One way to illustrate that is ask yourself what these proposed allocations actually buy. Here we are with bikes and sidewalks as a centerpiece. \$20 million for sidewalks, \$3 million per district, \$1.5 million per year per district. The sidewalks cost about \$6 million. So, each district gets a quarter of a mile of sidewalk a year. How much closer does that get us?

You can do kind of similar calculations on the other line items. So, I think as we talk about our future budgets and our capacity, we need to have in front of us all the time what these numbers actually represent in relation to the identified need. I started raising the subject of sidewalks. I started talking about this because we had a like a 20-year waiting list and if you're talking about safety, about equity, whatever you want to call it, allowing people to go places on foot if that's what we want them to do, ought to be a pretty critical priority.

Finally, I'm going to touch on something and I'm glad Mr. Graham is next because I'm sure he has a different view. I believe that protecting the \$50 million for housing in bond cycle after bond cycle is extravagant. I've said this before. In essence what we're doing is we're providing a \$6,000 per year or more benefit for certain lucky households and we're not doing anything for the others, everybody else. That represents only about 10 or 15 percent of the income of eligible households. So, I feel that there is a way that we can pursue our equity goals and our social goals spreading some of this wealth around a little more, focusing on training and sort of crisis relief type of things. I just feel that especially in light of the news that we just got about housing in our latest round on the Housing Trust Fund, that continuing to pursue the goal of providing this housing at these affordability levels is simply something that we're not going to be able to do along with all of the other things we want to do. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Driggs, I think we're going to give you the opportunity to debate that with Mr. Graham when we have the Housing and Jobs Summit. I appreciate it and looking forward to that.

Councilmember Graham said so, I generally write T and K. T for trash, K for keep. The presentation's a keeper. So, this is something that I'll definitely keep on my desk. It's a really good document and I want to appreciate the work. I kind of agree with Mr. Bokhari. How do we fund it and if we pick winner and losers by looking at projects and not looking at the big picture, then I think we are really going down a lane that may not be beneficial for the long term. My basic notes were one, right from the beginning, behavioral change. This concept is starting with getting people out of their cars as we have to change behaviors and that only starts once the transportation is safe, reliable and dependable. That starts with the most basic form which is the bus system. We have to focus on that. That has to be a long-term deal.

Then it's the regionalism. We can't do this alone. We can't do it without regional partners. My question to the Manager is what happened to the infrastructure dollars from the federal government that was passed? Has it trickled down this way yet and if so how are we going to utilize those portions for infrastructure needs? One thing for certain as I think Ryan said in his presentation, we can't stop the growth and it's regional growth. So, I think our approach needs to be regionalism in scope. Certainly, there are needs that we have to take care of in. The City of Charlotte for sure, but how do we connect with the NCDOT in a very meaningful way in terms of infrastructure needs? How do we interact with the federal government as Mr. Bokhari said. How do we have a big vision, a big plan and really try to fly this ship at 30,000 feet versus getting really in the weeds in terms of trying to pick winners and losers per district. That's problematic I think for sure.

Lastly, I know we have to get downstairs. It's a lot of work and it's a lot of money. I agree with Councilmember Ajmera as well, but I don't think we could cut our way to funding the projects. So, we have to look at the revenue side as uncomfortable as it may be. That kind of gives us the indication of where dollars can come from if we're trying to fund and we're really serious about tackling sidewalks and tackling infrastructure needs in our community. There's no free lunch. So, I think as we move forward I think we need to have some grown up conversations around the table in terms of what can be cut, how can we streamline our budget, but also where can we get additional revenues from to support of the items that we know will be getting worse because the city will not stop growing and delaying items that come through our Zoning Committee meetings won't stop the growth. It just stops the process. So, I just think this was a very good start and let's see if we can keep the plane at 30,000 feet.

Mayor Lyles said alright thank you everyone. I'm just going to say that someone said this is a billion-dollar problem and it is a billion-dollar problem if not more. I guess one of the questions I would ask is what is the cost of only doing what we can afford? What does that mean? I'd like to actually look and see what other communities are measuring when it comes to the place where infrastructure maintenance is an issue because we're not building on the maintenance, we're not allowing people to get to work on time. All of these things that we've talked about for so long, I think that we have to ask ourselves what is the cost of doing just what we can afford to do, or is there an opportunity to measure what the cost would be if we actually tried to grow a city that would have mobility options.

So, with that, thank you so much for the conversation. Team, thank you very much. You can see how much this is appreciated. I'm looking forward to the continued conversations that we'll have on this subject. Let's go downstairs and get ready. We have a public speakers list coming up right away.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: CLOSED SESSION

No closed session occurred.

* * * * *

The meeting was recessed at 6:42 p.m.to move to 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, November 28, 2022, at 6:49 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Lyles presiding. Council Members present were Dimple Ajmera, Danté Anderson, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Reneé Johnson, LaWana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Marjorie Molina, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston, II.

Mayor Lyles said okay, we're going to call this meeting to order. It's our November 28th City Council meeting. We begin our meeting with an invocation that's followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. The invocation is by a council member that's intended to help us make better decisions and to treat each other with kindness and graciousness. We celebrate religious diversity in our community even including those without religious faith. So, tonight I'm going to ask Councilmember Molina to give words of expression as our invocation.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Molina gave the Invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

* * * * *

PUBLIC FORUM

ITEM NO. 6: PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Lyles said so, the next item on our agenda is our public forum and our speakers tonight. You each will have three minutes to speak.

Budget Process Engagement

Yvonne Chamba, 11615 Spring Laurel Drive said good evening, Madam Mayor and members of the Council. My name is Yvonne Alexandra Chamba. I'm from Council District number 5. What I'd like to address tonight is actually a question of course. How is the City of Charlotte going about spreading awareness to the residents of each district of their abilities and benefits to participate in such important events for the well-being of our community? For example, the board meetings that you guys have established here in the city and public forums like this, of questions and answers where they can ricochet ideas and concerns and have their voices heard? Because me, myself would have never known about these benefits, especially like the Charlotte Civic Leadership Academy which I think is a brilliant idea. It's a start for people to start getting involved and engaged with the community. For me, myself, I came across this for other reasons that had nothing to do with this.

So, I would really like to know is there something established that's already existing where you guys actually reach out to the residents of each district? Are there letters or ways, a marketing process that you guys have already set forth to let us know because I think there's a lot of people that you'd be surprised have a lot to say. Then they could understand better why certain things are happening and why certain things may be delayed and what the priorities of the city are and why they're the priorities versus what their concerns are. I think there's a lot of people who just don't know. So, I think that this is a great start for me, myself because I didn't know I could do this. So, I'm glad to be here, especially in the presence of all you guys, really.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Chamba, thank you so much. We work really hard at it. We may not always make it possible, but we will get you a report and a follow up that will tell you about the ways that we can interact. If you have any suggestions for us, we certainly appreciate it. Thank you.

Ms. Chamba said thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you so much for coming down. We need more of you coming down. Thank you.

Jack and Jill of America Inc.

Zoie Washington, 11066 Telegraph Road, NW, Concord said to Mayor Lyles, the Charlotte City Council and all other attendees. Greetings from the Quintessential Queen City Chapter of Jack and Jill of America Incorporated. May the members please stand to be recognized. Thank you. My name is Zoie Washington, and I am the teen legislative chairperson of our chapter. The Queen City chapter is a part of the marvelous mid-Atlantic region and serves the greater Charlotte area. Jack and Jill of America Incorporated is an organization of mothers dedicated to raising the next generation of African American leaders while enhancing the lives of all children.

We work to accomplish our mission through diverse programs focused on leadership development, cultural exposure, community service, legislative advocacy and philanthropic giving. Jack and Jill offer annual programming for African American families under a five-point thrust, cultural awareness, educational development, health, civic and social recreational areas. Throughout the past two months, trendsetter teens of the Queen City chapter participated in a mock lawmaking event in a mock City Council meeting with the Salisbury Mayor and council members.

Given our recent activities, we are ecstatic to experience a live Council meeting. We are grateful for this opportunity to further our knowledge of municipal jurisdiction in action. This month we also worked with March of Dimes to raise awareness for the seriousness of premature births. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much Ms. Washington. As a Jack and Jill grandma, I'm really proud of all of you. Thank you so much. Feel free to stay as necessary or as long as you should. We're also live on television most Monday nights.

Housing for Convicted Felons

Shakiyla Pickens, 3773 Michigan Avenue said hello good evening. I've been coming to a lot of Council meetings because I'm also a senator at my school CPCC (Central Piedmont Community College). So, it's been informative to come and watch you guys. Thank you so much for allowing us to do that. Well, the issue I came here to address is homelessness for felons, which has been a very big issue here in Mecklenburg County.

With this, as a person that's convicted of a crime themselves, your life automatically changes, and you're often sentenced, and you really don't know what to do next. Once you are released you think that you may start your life over, but that is sometimes never the case due to an array of issues that affect newly released convicts.

In Mecklenburg County, 35 percent of offenders were rearrested within one year of their release. That is because most ex-offenders are released back into the same communities that are poorly equipped to adequately serve them returning back into their communities. Did you know that a person is seven times more likely to experience homelessness if they have been arrested just once? In Mecklenburg County per the rental housing handbook, when looking into a potential rental's history, it is at the renter's discretion whether they will allow the person to rent or not. Then that leaves most applicants without a return of the application fee or administration fee, which is money most applicants cannot afford after being recently released.

Even the low-income apartments and homes being built are not catered to ex-offenders because of the crime whether it was violent or not. I believe that should change. My question is, when you are released and you have served your time whether behind bars or probation, are ex-offenders not afforded the right to basic housing? Many of these people are having to go back through back channels or have family members to co-sign for them to live in a house that is up to code. In September of 2022, the number was reported via WBTV that 2,666 were homeless, while other reports are showing that that number has doubled since then.

In our county those who have not sought out assistance, the reentry services provided by Mecklenburg County are inadequately serving these communities that have already come back to the society feeling as second-rate citizens. I myself am one of those people that has served my time and I'm not currently enrolled at CPCC studying criminal justice. As a part of the student government, serving as senator there, I have moved past my past and have now moved to become a positive influence in my community, but without adequate affordable housing, almost 15 percent of felons will likely return to prison. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you. Many people on this dais support your efforts. We'll be glad to share your remarks also with the county commission tomorrow.

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM NO. 7: PUBLIC HEARING FOR BOSCH REXROTH CORPORATION BUSINESS INVESTMENT GRANT

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, a motion was by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera and carried unanimously to close the public hearing and approve the city's share of a Business Investment Grant to Bosch Rexroth Corporation for a not to exceed amount of \$959,426 over seven years.
--

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 8: PUBLIC HEARING FOR SOLVE INDUSTRIAL MOTION GROUP BUSINESS INVESTMENT GRANT

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Johnson, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing and approve the city's share of a Business Investment Grant to Solve Industrial Motion Group for a not to exceed amount of \$725,981 over seven years. the city's share of a Business Investment Grant to Solve Industrial Motion Group for a not to exceed amount of \$725,981 over seven years.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 9: PUBLIC HEARING FOR ATLANTIC COAST CONFERENCE BUSINESS INVESTMENT GRANT

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to approve the city's share of a Business Investment Grant to Atlantic Coast Conference for a not to exceed amount of \$40,914 over three years.

Councilmember Graham said just a quick comment. Based on the relatively small investment, this is a great return on investment for the community. It adds yet another jewel in our crown as it relates to sports and entertainment. I welcome the ACC conference to Charlotte and look forward to being a part of their outreach as well as the many universities hopefully that will be coming through Charlotte to perform and to add to our sports culture here in the city.

Councilmember Bokhari said yes, I just wanted to take an opportunity to call out a special thank you to the General Assembly of North Carolina, particularly Speaker Moore, Senator Berger and their offices and obviously a great job well done by Tracy Dodson and our own Economic Development Department.

Councilmember Ajmera said this is a great economic catalyst for our region as a sports mecca, especially a great boost for our hospitality industry which employs one out of eight people in our city. I certainly appreciate the effort by our staff working in collaboration with the county, the state and also with the CRBA (Charlotte Regional Business Alliance) the Business Alliance. Appreciate the work that you all have done and congratulations on the job well done on retaining the operations of the ACC in the state of North Carolina. It was a heavy lift. So, thank you Tracy.

Mayor Lyles said I think that there are two people that are significant in this. The President of Duke University who chairs the Board of Directors for the conference as well as the commissioner and how much work that they've done to make this a part of Charlotte's fabric is exceptional.

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

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 10: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so Mayor, members of Council, you have a 30-day memo in front of you that would outline the activities for the remainder of the year. That includes the committee discussions on Monday the 5th, the business meeting on the 12th. We will have a property re-eval process update and as you may recall, you had an initial discussion I believe earlier in the fall, and this is a follow up. Then lastly, we want to give you an overview of the North Carolina Opioid Settlement where funds are actually coming to Charlotte. Want to get some guidance from you because there's some options that we have with those funds.

Then lastly on the 19th, there's the City Council Zoning Meeting. I think there has been discussions amongst you in terms of the committee discussions on the 5th that would help outline what could be the part of an infrastructure discussion on the 19th of December. So, that is what I have in terms of the 30-day memo. I did mention in 267 that we would like to do the Duke Energy Green Source Advantage Program update. While you did get a memo, this is so significant I think it's important that we have a discussion about options related to this program.

Councilmember Johnson said I just want to clarify. The December 19, Mr. Jones said a discussion on the 19th. I think we, and you and I talked, it's the actual meeting on the 19th.

Mr. Jones said yes.

Councilmember Mayfield said Mr. Manager, for December 12th when we're doing the property reevaluation process, Mayor, I would like for us to consider at some point moving to our legislative committee to have a discussion with looking at if we have any flexibility with creating a conversation with our legislative representatives regarding property evaluations. Some other communities have looked at some progressive ways regarding investment properties, especially single-family investment properties having a different tax structure than properties that are owner occupied when we're looking at potential challenges and growth that is happening. That may be something that we can at least do a little bit of research on to see how it may be working in other communities and if that's something that we may be able to work with our partners with Mecklenburg County to discuss.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Jones, could you make sure that we get the research in how other places are doing this so that it's available for discussion in December as well?

Mr. Jones said yes. Now I'll turn it over to Sarah Hazel so she can provide you with an update with where we are with the Green Source Advantage Program.

Sarah Hazel, Chief Sustainability and Resiliency Officer said thank you. Good evening, Mayor and Council. What I want to do today is three things. I want to provide you an update about our Duke Energy Green Source Advantage Program, specifically I want to share the proposed increase in product charge requested by our solar developer and then the resulting cost to the city if we choose to move forward. I want to get direction from you all.

First what I thought I'd do because it's been some time since we've had this discussion as a group is just do a brief reminder about what is the Green Source Advantage Program. It's a Duke Energy program that is tailored for large North Carolina customers who want to invest in the development of renewable energy and lower their carbon emissions. So, for customers like the City of Charlotte. Large customers then select a solar developer to develop a large offsite solar project and then we get the benefit of that project through the renewable energy credits and all the environmental benefits that come with that project.

So, how does it work? So, we entered into this agreement with Ecoplexus who we selected through an RFP (Request for Proposal) process. They agreed to build a solar farm, 35 megawatts in Iredell County. Once that farm would come online, Duke Energy then takes that into our local grid which offsets their need to have to produce energy

from more carbon intensive sources and then we get the benefit of doing that on our grid with the workforce development and environmental benefits that come from the renewable energy. That also gets us about 17 percent of our energy use, and it closes the zero-carbon gap that we have when we look at what our existing Duke Energy grid is and what we need to do to get to our zero carbon building's goals for the Strategic Energy Action Plan by approximately 35 to 40 percent.

So, then the dollars and cents of it. We then, on top of our traditional energy bill every month that we pay to Duke Energy, pay a premium or receive a credit on our bill for the renewable energy. Duke then pays the solar developer, and we receive the environmental benefits.

So, what's happened? So, this is prior to the pandemic. In February 2020 we entered into this Green Source Advantage Agreement with Ecoplexus, a solar developer and Duke Energy. It's a three-party agreement. At that time, it was very advantageous to do so. Not only were we getting the environmental benefits, but over the life of the 20 years of the program we were saving on average \$100,000 every year on our energy bill. Since then, because of many of the pressures that I know you all are discussing on a nightly basis here at the dais, Duke Energy has granted several extensions, pushing back the start date of that project. Then more recently we received a note from our solar developer that in order to continue in this agreement with the City of Charlotte they would need to increase their product charge because of several macroeconomic factors that are really prevalent in a variety of industries, but certainly in the solar industry and in renewable energy. So, these are things like inflation, interest rates, commodity prices, supply chain, delays and tariffs.

So, pending a decision from the City of Charlotte to update the agreement for a 25 percent increase, they will be selling the project to Pine Gate Renewables. I share that just because Ecoplexus is not located here in North Carolina, Pine Gate Renewables is. They're also doing several other GSA (Green Source Advantage) projects. So, once we received this information, city staff, we looked at what they were proposing. We also worked with a third-party modeler to really understand what are the implications of this product charge increase. Because not only is it an increase in charge, but the way that the structure of the bill works is you have to look at the avoided cost rate which is in essence what Duke Energy doesn't have to produce. They're avoiding cost in producing the energy that we're bringing online. So, we needed a modeler to help us look at that.

So, what's the bottom line? If we can move forward to amend the agreement, instead of \$100,000 average benefit to the city for being in this agreement, it would be a \$750,000 premium on our energy bill on average for 20 years and split between our Enterprise Fund and our general fund which is in essence about 50/50 in how we use energy. That would break down and evenly split. So, for context, in 2021 our electricity spend was about \$28.5 million. So, you can see what the premium then is on this renewable energy to bring it online. Then I will just note that this product charge is in the range of several responses we got back in 2019, the GSA program that we did not select. It is in line with the market today based on the research that we've done.

So, just a reminder. The whole benefit really is all about how are we striving towards our Strategic Energy Action Plan goals to become zero carbon in our fleet and buildings, and buildings in particular. There are four focus areas. Energy generation is one of them. City council has continued to make efforts through investments, most recently just moving forward five solar projects onsite. If you see in kind of the left-hand quadrant of this diagram, that's our five stages to zero carbon energy. Purchasing renewable energy credits or entering into these types of green tariff programs specifically to bring renewable energy online in our state are always going to be a component of how we strive to reach those goals and evaluate these types of opportunities because you can just do so much more than you can in some of our properties which are relatively small in comparison.

So, we have four levers that we continue to pull when we're looking towards our 2030 target, specifically around buildings. So, that's investing in energy efficiency, as I noted

onsite renewable energy, working with Duke Energy and the Utilities Commission to advocate for a cleaner mix that helps to power our buildings and then these types of programs. So, if you see on the bottom section of this slide, it's just a comparison. If you look at the last 15 onsite solar projects that you approved, a total capacity of 1.25 megawatts and that's in comparison to the GSA project which is 35 megawatts. So, that is 3.5 percent of capacity there. So, just wanted to note that 3.5 percent of the capacity and then you also see the resulting difference in what that is equivalent to when it comes to reducing carbon emissions.

So, annually we look at what is the gap we need to close, and we use Duke Energy data on their current existing grid mix to understand sort of where are we, where do we need to go, how far is the gap that we need to close. So, this is a representation of the energy that we used in our buildings in 2021. I show this to just highlight the green section because that is how we've been modeling this Green Source Advantage program which again, is 17 percent of our overall roughly energy use. Then on this slide, it's about 40 percent of that gap that we need to fill. Depending on the year, pre-pandemic or post pandemic, it's between 35 and 40 percent.

So, we have top options. This is really where we're seeking your guidance. One is to amend the GSA agreement and then we would bring forward a Council action to do that. This would allow us to continue to maintain progress towards our SEAP (Strategic Energy Action Plan) goals. It also allows us to bring energy online in our grid in relatively close proximity to the city of Charlotte which supports workforce development and health and environmental benefits. The solar developer we would be working with would be local, actually has a presence here in Charlotte as well at Camp North End. This comes at a premium. So, I think that's really the key point of discussion. If we do nothing, we do have an existing agreement, but our developer has let us know that they will default on the agreement.

So, if that happens, we will continue to look for more opportunities. Right now, they are limited but we will test the market and confirm what other better deals to be done if and when we have a program that will allow us to apply. So, the cons there on that second slide are just that right now we have this capacity. It was a limited program. There are definitely programs being worked on right now through the carbon planning process, but we don't know what they're going to look like, if they're going to be better. We don't know what the timing will be. So, we'll continue to pursue those regardless, but there are a lot of unknowns, and we may not be able to replace this capacity. So, thought it was important to bring that forward and to get some of your guidance and feedback before moving forward.

Mayor Lyles said obviously a regrettable kind of choice to have to make.

Councilmember Winston said thank you. Two questions. How far along is the actual development and how is the project's viability connected to similar decision making by other large customers? If it is contingent upon those decisions, what is our vision with those customers, what kind of situation they're in, in terms of decision making?

Ms. Hazel said so, construction has not started. So, Duke Energy as the project manager has pushed back the completion date, but construction has not started either. So, this is really a request by the solar developer to increase a product charge to get started with the construction. Then what we do now is that other Green Source Advantage customers and some of those customers have been definitely pretty vocal and the public. There's Bank of America, Duke University. Everybody is going through very similar processes we are right now. This is not something that is unique to Charlotte. So, those conversations are happening, and we've been working with our colleagues across our networks and sustainability kind of understand is this in line with what you're seeing, and it very much is.

What I will say about Pine Gate Renewables is that they are doing a lot of work in North Carolina, and they have for many years. So, a high level of confidence. They have a

strong presence here in North Carolina and South Carolina specifically and they're developing many similar projects right now.

Mr. Winston said well, you know I would say we knew that we were going to have issues with inflation overall from a macro standpoint. I just say that the priorities of the SEAP and the necessary changes in our carbon are not nice to have, but they're a must have. So, we've obviously got difficult choices to make, but we have to keep pushing down this road somehow someway. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said do we have any measure of like tons of greenhouse gas reduced per dollar that we use to assess an investment like this? I mean, you could put that into the context of investment and other renewables. So, is there some sort of a benefit part, the cost benefit analysis?

Ms. Hazel said definitely. I think you can sort of slice that a bunch of different ways, but if you look at the slide that shows our energy use and our zero-carbon gap, the 35 megawatts is very large, and 17 percent of our energy use is a big slice of the pie. So, to see that much of our energy use offset through clean energy is a huge impact on our carbon reduction. We can demonstrate that in a bunch of different ways and follow up with you if there's one way that you think would be most valuable. If you go back to the slide with the gray box as well, I think it was a couple of slides prior, the comparison slide.

So, if you look at what is the equivalent of this work, you can see that powering 10,000 homes 12,000 passenger vehicles from the road, that's just plugging in what's the carbon emission reductions that we're getting from this project. Compared to what we can do onsite, it is very large. It is so costly to do this type of work within the city limits and we're doing through your sustainable facilities policy, we are really turning over all the stones we can on our buildings and looking at doing that strategically year over year with strategic Energy Action Plan investments. It's still a small slice of the pie compared to these types of large projects.

Ms. Mayfield said I have a couple of questions because unfortunately I did not receive this in my packet. So, the first time I had a chance to look through this was earlier this evening. We're having this conversation where it's saying pending a revised agreement, Ecoplexus will sell the project to Pine Gate Renewables. When this conversation was first started, why wasn't a local North Carolina solar developer at the top of our list?

Ms. Hazel said we had a variety of criteria, costs being one, where the actual project was located. We wanted to find a project that was within a regional footprint of Charlotte bringing energy onto our grid so we could see some of those other benefits environmental workforce development. So, I'd have to go back and look at the 2019 responses again, but we were looking at a variety of criteria in addition to where a developer was based. I'll say that Pine Gate Renewables did not fit on that initial RFP that we put out.

Ms. Mayfield said okay, so Pine Gate Renewables didn't initially submit an RFP.

Ms. Hazel said they did not.

Ms. Mayfield said second question. You stated that nothing has actually been developed yet with this particular company. Has the city paid any costs up to this point?

Ms. Hazel said we've paid nothing. So, we really only start paying when the renewable energy comes online.

Ms. Mayfield said so, with staying on the slide that we have up, I'm just trying to understand if where our target is in those for energy efficiency onsite renewable energy, everything that's listed, why when we look at the comparison scale is it giving us examples of how much power is going to homes and potential gas vehicles off the road? I need you to connect the dots for me. To me that seems like you're giving me an

apples and oranges because if our focus is governmental buildings, giving me that information I don't understand how I'm supposed to go to the community and explain that.

Ms. Hazel said sure. It was to demonstrate the relative size of what the project can generate compared to the relative size of what our onsite solar panels can generate. So, the relative size to the panel that will be constructed on top of where you are sitting right-now in the government center as one of 15 projects. A small scale is 3.5 percent of the size of this solar farm. So, the equivalencies were just meant to demonstrate kind of the environmental benefits, but there's a bunch of different ways we can share that.

Ms. Mayfield said okay, so the request that you're asking for is for us to consider maintaining the idea of us continuing down this particular road even though we already know Ecoplexus does not have the capability to keep up. So, they're going to be selling to Pine Gate Renewables. Since we have not made any financial payouts yet, is the question for us to now have a direct negotiation with Pine Gate Renewables?

Ms. Hazel said so, Ecoplexus will sell the project and Pine Gate will purchase the project. So, the question really is in my mind, this project has gone from having a net positive to now being a net premium on our energy cost year over year for 20 years of the program, and are we willing to do that? We will be working directly with Pine Gate when Ecoplexus sells the project, but we are in an agreement with Ecoplexus, and we will amend the agreement with Ecoplexus.

Ms. Mayfield said so, this question is for the attorney. Once this was deferred multiple times to Duke Energy, did we not have language in the contract that protected us where if you hit default opposed to us having to be in the middle of this conversation of them selling their business, opposed to us just being able to directly have a conversation with Pine Gate? We don't have any language in our legal contract that protected us from this possibility, or if a company were to file bankruptcy?

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said so, I haven't read the specific language of the contract for that particular question. I can look that up for you, but I don't know specifically what that contract says as it relates to your specific question.

Ms. Mayfield said that information would be helpful for me if I'm being asked to make a decision because the slide is pretty doom and gloom. We're either going to amend the agreement or do nothing and here's all the defaults and the things that happen. It would've been helpful to know from our legal representation since your eyes should be on all contracts that come before Council, to make sure that we are being protected. I have a disconnect with understanding if they sell, regardless of how much they sell for, I'm trying to understand how the city is now responsible for a potential deficit when this contract was brought to us as long term, here are the savings. I understand what's happening in the market, but I'm trying to understand where the residents of Charlotte were protected in the language of this contract.

Ms. Hazel said Councilmember Mayfield, we do have Karen Weatherly who's been working with us here today. Karen, do you want to speak to Councilmember Mayfield's questions?

Ms. Mayfield said please come forward and share.

Ms. Hazel said I will just note that it's a three-party agreement. So, we have an agreement with Duke Energy. We also have an agreement with Ecoplexus and the agreement very much states that we do not pay until they bring it online. So, that's a benefit to us. We've put nothing into it as of yet, however there is a remedy that Duke Energy has, I believe. It's relatively minimal if they default on the agreement. When you look at what that remedy is, it is not enough to move forward in their eyes and that's why they have given us this information and this request. So, Karen said it's \$50,000.

Karen Weatherly, Assistant City Attorney Senior said thank you very much Council members. This is a North Carolina Utilities Commission agreement template that provides that under default in this situation that Ecoplexus would pay to Duke is \$50,000. It's based on the fact that when you have default there's a calculation, but at this time since nothing's been built, it's based on energy production. So, that's why it's written that way.

Ms. Mayfield said so, the way it is written, Duke Energy receives a financial benefit from the default, but City Council is now being asked to have a decision on a potential increase in a payout for a contract with a new company that we're not directly working with. The current company who defaulted on our contract is selling their business to this new company who we then will have a relationship with moving forward?

Ms. Weatherly said this contract would be assigned from Ecoplexus to Pine Gate. They step into the shoes of Ecoplexus because they have the ability to carry out this contract that we already have and it keeps us in our place within Duke's GSA program rather than us coming out, getting back in line, not knowing what the terms are going forward. You're right, the product charge increases due to all the other factors.

Councilmember Mitchell said first Hazel, thank you. Rob Phocas kind of started us down this path about green initiative a long time ago. So, I'm glad to see you in that leadership role. Just a couple of questions. I think it would be helpful to share with Council our success with other solar projects. I know the parking deck, the transit center on South Boulevard and then at the airport. So, we've had some successes doing this and so I'm encouraged, but now I have a little question to follow Councilmember Mayfield about Pine Gate Renewables. So, we are inheriting this company and they did not apply for the first RFQ (Request for Quote). Is there a reason why they did not participate when the RFQ was first made public?

Ms. Hazel said I don't know the answer to why they didn't participate, but what I do know is that they've been working with a variety of large customers on these types of projects and programs. So, they're the provider for the GSA program for several other large customers who were able to bring them to table with Duke Energy.

Mayor Lyles said Sarah, I'd like to ask the question. You're saying that this is upcoming. It's not finalized yet. Does it have to go through any other regulatory process before a decision is made?

Ms. Hazel said no, we've been working hand in hand with Duke Energy letting them know kind of what the status of this project is as they have been letting us know what the status of this project is as we've been doing analysis. So, if we amend the agreement, we keep our 35-megawatt capacity and we just move the project forward. If we don't and they default, then we kind of get out of line and we will then be looking at what types of options are through the regulatory structure at the North Carolina Utilities Commission.

Mayor Lyles said I know that you've been steeped in this effort. Do you think that as a result of this action, which is probably not just related to the City of Charlotte but multiple customers that Duke Energy has, do you believe that there is an opportunity for this to be resolved or another option provided for us to meet our SEAP goals?

Ms. Hazel said so, I think the answer to that question is we're going to turn over every stone and so we're going to pull all of the levers that are on this slide. Energy efficiency or onsite energy, but it is such a large project we will always need to something like buy renewable energy credits as we are kind of staring 2030 in the face if we're striving towards that goal. So, we can bring those types of options forward, but there will be limited programs likely available over the coming years to do this type of a program that's North Carolina based versus another solution which could be kind of like buying wind renewable energy credits from Texas somewhere. This is a unique program which I believe there will be more programs. We just don't know what they will look like and if

they'll be any better and then we'll compete for them with other large customers who have similar goals.

Mayor Lyles said innovation often requires failure. It looks to me like this is perhaps one area that it didn't meet our expectations and the options are to walk away or to pay for a premium to maintain something that has perhaps not guaranteed to work very well for us. So, that's why I summarized from this. Am I inside the ballpark?

Ms. Hazel said so, I think the renewable energy will work really well for us. So, the outcome is exactly the same as it was, and it really is just the cost has increased. For example, I'll give you a small jurisdiction in North Carolina. Boone, North Carolina has met their 100 percent zero carbon goals I think sometime last year. Now let's just think about the scale of Boone, very small, not the City of Charlotte, but they're paying over \$100,000 premium annually to bring more renewable energy online. So, in this day renewable energy is coming at a premium. So, that is what maybe isn't working across the market, not necessarily just with this agreement.

Councilmember Ajmera said yes, I'm just really disappointed in this. When I read the memo that was in our package last week, I was just sad by the two choices, but then I realized that cost escalation has been an issue across the board. I mean we have seen cost escalation in affordable housing, now our CIP projects that are underway and SEAP is no exception to the rule here. So, if we are truly serious about tackling SEAP goals, we have to put money where our mouth is at. We made a commitment to our SEAP going carbon free by 2030 and if you look at the pie chart where this gives the biggest value for our investment, where this truly helps us get closer to our 2030 target, we have to invest in that commitment. So, if you could just go back to the slide where we can see the progress in our carbon free goal by 2030 and that's just the city operations goal.

I'm not even talking about the 2050 goal. Do you have the pie chart. So, you will see that with all the investments that we have made in electrifying our fleet, our buildings, investments we made in the Innovation Barn, it hasn't gotten us closer to our 2030 carbon free goal. This is the one that gets us the closest. So, if you look at it from the cost comparison perspective to Mr. Driggs' point and how this aligns us with our SEAP goals, I just think we have to do it if we're truly serious about our SEAP goals. Can we not bring that slide up where we made progress on buildings, innovation, waste? Maybe you can provide that pie chart that was part of the deck we received. It was part of our package last week.

Ms. Hazel said so, this is an example of our buildings. So, removed the fleet for a moment and this is a representation of our energy use in our municipal buildings and the different avenues that we are taking to step into the gap.

Ms. Ajmera said so, this Green Source Advantage, is that the 16.8 or is that the 57.9?

Ms. Hazel said so, the Green Source Advantage program is that 16.8. The 57.9 represents Duke Energy's existing zero carbon grid mix.

Ms. Ajmera said the existing gap.

Ms. Hazel said so, right now that is the percentage of energy that we get that is generated from zero carbon sources today.

Ms. Ajmera said so, I'm trying to figure out, to Mr. Driggs's point, do we have the percentage on going carbon free on how much we have reduced so far with the investments we have made in the Innovation Barn, in retrofitting our buildings? Do we have that percentage? I know it was somewhere when we were reviewing our SEAP presentation at our Triple E committee meeting. We had that data that I had referenced to, but I don't see that on here.

Ms. Hazel said for all of the things, we don't have complete comprehensive data on I think all of the items that you listed, but we have information on our energy efficiency projects, on our onsite solar projects and the investments that City Council has made specifically in the Strategic Energy Action Plan.

Ms. Ajmera said so, I think it would be a fair comparison if we can see with this investment, we are hitting 16.8 percent target of going carbon free by 2030 versus this is how much we have invested in our buildings, in our fleet, in our Innovation Bard, and this is how much we have reduced. That truly shows apples to apples comparison to some of my colleague's questions. I think we will come to a conclusion that this program, Green Source Advantage program really gives us more value for our investment of going carbon free by 2030. We also have to keep in mind that inflation has affected all segments of everything we do. So, this is no exception. I think we just have to take a hard look at our investment on SEAP. To the Mayor's point, if we can look at other options. I know that we were applying for grants that were federal grants, other sources of funds that we could potentially tap into, even from the infrastructure bill to help with this goal. I think that would be very helpful. I just see that these two options doesn't really give Council an option, but I think we just need to see more options here.

Ms. Hazel said I can follow up with some of the information that you requested.

Mr. Jones said okay, so, thank you Mayor and members of Council. This is a difficult one because as you approved the SEAP, we understood then that there would need to be technology improvements for us to even come close to a goal. Same thing with the electric buses. Same thing with electrifying a fleet. So, technology has helped us. I will tell you there's not a decision that we need from you tonight. I do believe that Sarah is it January that we need a decision?

Ms. Hazel said yes.

Mr. Jones said so, we need a decision by January. We've gotten great feedback tonight. We'd like to address some of those questions to get you more comfortable with making a decision one way or another.

Ms. Johnson said I just have one last question. Is there time for a RFQ or an RFP to solicit other providers?

Ms. Hazel said so, if we do nothing and the agreement defaults, we don't have that 35 megawatt capacity. We are exploring putting an RFP on the street for this bridge program, which is some additional capacity, but none is reserved for local government. So, to answer your question and maybe also to answer one of Ajmera's questions, there are limited and uncertain options for this type of program, but there are other options that will allow us to continue to strive towards making progress just not readily available options that are this large today.

Mayor Lyles said alright. So, we'll have this back on an agenda coming up soon after the staff can provide the questions that have been asked by council members. We'll try to get that out soon so that we can make a decision probably by the end of 2022.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 11: AMEND CODE OF ORDINANCES CHAPTER 3 - ANIMALS

Mayor Lyles said alright, the next item is to adopt an ordinance amending Chapter 3 in our Animals Ordinance. It says that it's about the idea of having the requirements for the city's ability to seize animals, providing owners of those seized animals the ability to appeal the city's decision to permanently seize an animal in Superior Court. This provision grants the owner of the seized animal 30 days to file a writ of certiorari in Superior Court.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said yes, so we have Joshua Fisher who is here with us tonight.

Joshua Fisher, Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Animal Care & Control said thank you. So, yes, the ordinance revision we are recommending, you some speakers that came forward and spoke to you previously about this. Essentially what we're asking is that the appeal, the writ of certiorari appeal after the city has determined that in an abuse or neglect case, ownership rights should be terminated. Currently the ordinance allows for 30 days for an owner to file that writ of certiorari. We're requesting that be reduced to 10 days because in the 30 days while an animal is waiting for that to be filed, it's just sitting in a cage. That's something that I can say in the eight years I've been here; we've seen two that have been appealed. Only one actually was fully appealed through the process. So, we have a lot of animals that will sit in cages for 30 days unnecessarily just waiting for a piece of paperwork to either be filed or not.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera to adopt an ordinance amending Chapter 3 - Animals.

Councilmember Ajmera said I just want to commend the staff for doing really, I see this as Six Sigma work, process improvement work. Over the course of last year, we have heard from so many of our public speakers about our Animal Care and Control Department having a capacity issue. This will free up some capacity to house additional animals. I think this is great. I look forward to seeing more of this process improvement kind of steps that will relieve some pressure that we have currently. So, I appreciate the work that you all have done. So, keep doing some Six Sigma work. Thank you.

Councilmember Winston said I would just say to echo what Ms. Ajmera was saying. I was able to spend some time over at Animal Care and Control with Dr. Fisher and his staff over there a couple of weeks ago. They do excellent work. I think we should just remind ourselves that that facility and that staff was built 20, 25 years ago and it was built to serve a city's population of about 400,000 and processes like this help them to make better use of a facility that is not up to par with the needs of our community. I think it was also an investment in the consent agenda that allows them to do some more repurposes of that. I would encourage council members to go and spend some time over there with the staff and ride around. So, we can consider what we might need to do to further invest and improve our facilities and the services that we need to provide to our community. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said I just wanted to acknowledge the efforts of the volunteer Judy Storey who has a great deal of passion around this. You can't help but be infected by it and the truth is we don't have a good situation there. We don't meet the state's health requirements on an annual basis. So, there's a need to invest for maintenance of the current facility but also as Mayor Pro Tem pointed out, the capacity at that facility is absolutely insufficient. We considered a few years ago, some of us will remember, a major investment in a very large new facility. That got derailed, but I think we're past due to do something about the situation over there right now. Thank you.

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as unanimous.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 65, at Page(s) 342-348.

* * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 12: AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT REQUESTS

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Mayfield to Approve \$9,200,000 in additional Housing Trust Fund allocations and \$6,600,000 in American Rescue Plan funds for the following multi-family rental affordable housing developments: Fairhaven Glen, \$1,150,000 (Council District 3); Ovata at Reedy Creek, \$2,000,000 (Council District 4); Galloway Crossing, \$1,000,000 (Council District 5); Bishop Madison Homes, \$250,000 (Council District 2); Grounds for Change, \$4,500,000 (Council District 1); Ballantyne Seniors, \$1,400,000 (Council District 7); Evoke Living at Morris Field, \$5,500,000 (Council District 3).

Councilmember Driggs said Mayor and colleagues, I just want to point out that the observation I made before about the cost of this particular priority that we've established which has doubled and here we are proceeding. So, I think that we should have more data and do more work to see if this money could be used productively. I realize these projects were kind of submitted to us, but we agreed to do those on the basis of 20 something million in commitments and then the number more than doubled. We've paired it back, we've improved on that, but in any case just consistent with what I was saying before, I just hope we can find more productive ways to help people than this kind of investment. So, I'm not going to be able to support it. Thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said I just want to thank staff for not giving up on our affordable housing goal. This was a huge undertaking. We were talking about cost escalation for the last two to three weeks now and I see this is not going to go away. We are going to have the next cost escalation topic on CIP, but this just shows our continued commitment to affordable housing. I think we need to show the similar commitment to our other goals including the SEAP. I look forward to supporting what staff has presented because this is one of our priorities, and I'll be supporting it. Thank you.

Councilmember Winston said so, I think what Mr. Driggs said is something that the community should pay attention to. We're going to have to have a different kind of conversation that we've had over the past few years over Housing Trust Fund come this winter in a couple of months actually. We have a fresh \$50 million that's going to be in the bank, but the economic climate, the realities of new construction versus keeping NOAHs (Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing) available to folks that need it. They're going to be different metrics that we're going to be dealing with and different ways we're going to have to digest that information.

What's on hand right now, I talked to staff a little earlier today. I was really under the belief that Council had asked to have an option where we were able to look at approving all of the projects that were on to let us decide amongst ourselves. I see that we have an action item B that includes the South Village Apartments, but there's no other action item that looks at the Easter Home Project that had supportive housing. I know staff thought that there was cost prohibitions, but it also does provide that supportive housing model which don't come often, we find very difficult to build, but it's on the table. My understanding, the construction could occur and some of those units come online next year in 2023. So, I would've liked to be able to consider that as an option, but we're not able to do that now. Not without making a motion from the dais off the top of our head. We know that doesn't go very well. So, before I make a substitute motion to include action item B in it, Mr. Manager, is there any suggestion of how Council could have a conversation about supporting all the projects right now?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said sure. So, thank you Mayor Pro Tem. I'll look to the City Attorney to make sure that this can work. Shawn was going to continue to work with Easter Home and in each situation. None of the previous dollars have been backed out. If the Council would like to include Easter Home, I don't know if maybe that could be a B1 after B, or if it's the will of the Council that you just want to approve them all, could we just roll Easter Home into Item B? It's \$1.9 million more.

Mayor Lyles said I wanted to ask. We've done a couple of supportive service housing units. We've done them in partnership with the county, aside from the one that was done by the daises I believe. So, I wondered if this was something that if we're doing this now, should we get some comments or do we know the comments from the county for supportive housing? I'm just asking. Shawn, do you know if we've talked to the county about supportive housing and what that means? I know that we have at least two in town. One that the city and county funded together as well as one that was funded in I think partnership with the city and the daises.

Shawn Heath, Director of Housing & Neighborhood Services said this will be an unsatisfying answer, but I've not spoken with the county about this particular project.

Councilmember Bokhari said I just think a theme has been rampant throughout our conversations tonight, let alone the last several months. We need to step back and take a look at our strategic priorities and what our investments are and their size compared to the return of what we're getting. Sometimes that's a hard economic ROI (Return on Investment) and sometimes that's a soft number of how many units are we shaving off of the affordable housing crisis. At the end of the day, this wasn't a good deal. This wasn't a good proposition moving the needle before and now it's another \$20 plus million for another under 1,000 units. That is not needle moving.

How much money are we spending here versus it's not solving affordable housing; it's solving upward mobility. When we look at that, when we look at the SEAP conversation we just had, when we look at the stack of the CIP dollars and what we could do, these are very small pools of funding relatively speaking and very large problems. If we just throw 100 pebbles in the ocean so we can say that we threw one pebble that had a word SEAP and a word affordable housing and a word road on it, we will have done nothing. So, we have to get more strategic in what we do and that means taking hard lines on some things that we want to solve for. We know the current approach isn't doing it, and this is one of them.

Councilmember Mayfield said I want to make sure that also the community understands that what we have before us that we're voting on. With each of these projects, just looking at Fairhaven, \$1,150,000 additional on top of the initial request. The funding that is not utilized comes back to us. So, we are allocating up to, but I would like to have it on record that the expectation is not for any of these partners to be coming back any time soon asking for additional funds again because when we redo this part of the request, it's to authorize the City Manager to execute, amend and renew contracts as needed to complete the transactions.

We know that we are going to see some type of recession. We are already seeing in the development community some pricing is going down, some pricing is leveling off. These projects are not going to be out the ground until late '23 going into '24. Those price adjustments, those funds should be coming back, but we need to make sure that it is very clear. I agree with my colleague. We have to figure out a better model than just putting money at it and putting money for me personally into a lot of rental versus ownership because you build generational wealth from owning. The only ones that's building wealth are the ones who own these buildings.

So, whether we're doing a rehab with a NOAH or not, that's not necessarily helping the community, but I do hope, and since some of our partners are sitting in this room, that you clearly hear that there is an expectation for you all to figure it out and not be coming back. We have to figure out a different model and when we get together as a committee, then we can really talk about what is our plan. I do want to make sure people understand. We have seen it before. We've been able to reallocate. We have money left over because a project wasn't able to move forward. We were able to redirect those funds to a different project. So, that the community understands, this is not the final ticket dollar, but it should be no more than this.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. So, the supportive housing question had come up. So, from what I read in our package is that just because we don't have supportive housing request on

our agenda today to approve under option A, that doesn't mean it stops here. I read in our package that you are going to continue to have conversation Shawn with supportive housing partners and try to figure out a solution moving forward. Am I interpreting that correctly?

Mr. Heath said yes. That's correct. Under a scenario where Easter Home is not advanced through a vote tonight, that does not mean the door has closed on that project. It simply means that we would continue to work with the developer, DreamKey in this instance, to evaluate is this the best proposal that can be brought forward? Then presumably it would cycle back in front of council either a retooled proposal or maybe something that looks very different, but still accomplishes goals related to affordable housing. That would be our desire. To continue the dialogue on this particular project.

Ms. Ajmera said that is very helpful Shawn because I think that gives me the comfort that I need because I have seen the Supportive Services Model because it's really wraparound services that goes with the housing. So, if you can find some of the collaboration with the county, to the Mayor's point, or with other agencies to truly make that happen, I would really like to see that. At the same time, I don't want us to hold on to these other projects that are ready to move forward, especially under the current environment that we are in with the interest rates that could go up. So, I just think we keep that option open while Shawn continues to figure out how we can make that work while approving the other projects that we have.

The other thing with supportive housing. I saw one of the reasons it was not recommended was because the per unit cost was really high. It was \$120,000 plus versus our goal was under \$40,000 to \$50,000 range. So, it really came down to the cost from what I understood. Is that correct?

Mr. Heath said yes. Cost was the primary consideration on this one, granted with permanent supportive housing, it's a different animal. I wouldn't suggest that it's a pure apple to apples comparison with, for example, of 4 percent multi-family LIHTC (Low Income Housing Tax Credit) sort of scenario. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the request and the cost per unit were large enough that we felt like additional time to work with the developer would be mutually beneficial.

Ms. Ajmera said yes. So, just the last one on this slide. Alright, well I look forward to receiving more updates on Easter Homes as we move forward, as you continue to have conversations with the county and other partners on this. I'm ready to move forward on Action A. Thank you.

Councilmember Molina said so, first of all Shawn, thank you for your work on this. From what I understand, the seven options that we have in front of us are a result of you shaving down our options to not have to tap into our new funding that has been recently approved by the Charlotte voters. Is that correct?

Mr. Heath said yes. Between the first and second time that we brought this particular topic to Council, there were additional conversations with the developers and a number of them were able to reduce the magnitude of the request and/or increase the commitment to a certain number of years of affordability. We felt like there was a very clear delineation between the seven projects represented in Action A here and all of the other projects that were a little higher in the cost per unit stack.

Ms. Molina said okay. Considering the substitute motion that could potentially come on the floor, how would that then affect what is being proposed in option A and the rebuttal that you just said?

Mr. Heath said if there's a movement this evening to advance Easter Homes, then that would simply add \$1.937 million to the amount of funding required from ARPA.

Ms. Molina said okay. Now, would that only be from our current allocated affordable housing funds, or would we then have to seek funds from our newly allocated budget proportion?

Mr. Heath said yes. So, even in Action A with the seven projects, the available Housing Trust Fund balance is \$9.2 million. So, even in action A it requires the use of some ARPA, \$6.6 million. So, as we progress from Action A to Action B, Action A requires \$6.6 million of ARPA. If you were to approve Action A and Action B that would entail \$11.3 million of ARPA. If you were to choose to include Easter Home tonight, that would add another \$1.9 million which would entail a total of \$13.2 million in ARPA funding. So, each one just adds more to the mix in terms of the stress of your available ARPA funds.

Ms. Molina said okay. So, just for a record, for our constituency. First of all, I want to say thank you to the Charlotte voters for trusting us with the bond referendum and allowing us to be able to make the decisions that could potentially impact their lives. With that being said, I think we're all asking these questions to make sure that we act as responsibly as possible. For the record, these are not sole infrastructure projects for the city. These are dollars that we're adding to developers who actually have these projects and have possession of these projects. Do we have any gauge of what our potential investment is as opposed to what the various investors in these particular projects are?

Mr. Heath said yes, yes, we do. There was a supplemental chart provided as an attachment to the RCA (Request for Council Action). It is not what we're looking at on screen. What we're looking at on screen was from the last business meeting. Then the supplemental chart, it shows the total proposed investment by the City of Charlotte in one column. In a separate column it shows the total development cost. So, you can get a sense for the leverage ratio even with these higher investments potentially from the city. There's still a leverage ratio of about one to five. So, for every dollar that the city is putting into these projects, other funders are providing \$5.00 of support.

Ms. Molina said okay. So, I will be moving to support this and I'm actually comfortable where we land and I'm comfortable agreeing with my colleagues on where we should go and what their comfort level is. I know that we have a large growing city and I know that we do not have the money to resolve every issue that we have in front of us. I know that and we all know that, but I feel like the most responsible thing we can do with what we have to allocate is to make an impact where we can. This is what we can afford to do right now at this moment, and I think we've all said that we intend to get better with our future projects. So, I feel comfortable with supporting it. Thank you for your work and that's all I got.

Councilmember Anderson said Shawn, I know we've gone a few rounds with this, and I thank you and the team for the diligence that you've provided. I also thank you for breaking out, because in our last meeting we asked to have an option where we wouldn't impact as many ARPA dollars within one vote. So, I appreciate you breaking this out. So, with this \$15.8 million we are able to support affordable housing in six of our seven districts with a mixed dwelling from seniors in Ballantyne to homeownership and bring online and keep ready 623 units for our Charlotteans who are dearly in need of affordable housing. So, I support this, and I appreciate the rounds that we went. I think we're in a good place with A. So, thank you to you and your staff Shawn.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you for the presentation. I'm also in favor of adding Easter to the selection because it is another \$1.9 million. I spoke to Mayor Pro Tem about that and some other colleagues because yes, it's the highest amount, but one of the reasons that developers say that they cannot build more affordable housing is because it's too expensive. I feel like these are public dollars and I feel like this is our duty to serve our hardest to serve and our most vulnerability residents. So, when someone brings affordable housing to the table, which will have a great impact through wrap around services, I think that that's the ones that we should be looking at as a city. Councilmember Ajmera said earlier put our money where our mouths are. So, I think this is an opportunity to do that. So, I'm certainly one for supporting these projects along with Easter Homes because again, and perhaps it's because I work on the frontline. I

know the needs. We all know the needs. I talk to homeless people every day. So, 21 homes is not a huge dent but how many children and how many families is that? So, I think our job is the impact business and I think this is an opportunity to make an impact through supportive housing and through these projects. So, I will support adding Easter Homes to the packet. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said I have a question, and this is just because I think that we can do all of these, but I do have a question. You talked about the revised cost per unit and the revised affordability commitment. If we're building a supportive housing, wouldn't that be permanent supportive housing instead of 30 years? The question about South Village, it's 60 years when we say our criteria is like around 30 years for \$30,000. Wouldn't that be something closer to 90 years of affordability for those investments? Tell me how you thought through that Shawn.

Mr. Heath said sure. The affordability commitments are all based on conversations and ultimately assertions made by our development partners. I think to DreamKey's credit, in those conversations they were willing to extend for both South Village and Grounds for Change their affordability periods up to 60 year which is noteworthy. For Easter Home, we didn't really have a lot of iterations on that one around affordability commitments. So, I don't want to speak for DreamKey and whether there's any opportunity to extend that beyond the 30-year period or not.

Mayor Lyles said well both of the homes that I am familiar with are owned and operated continuously as supportive service homes and it was not affordability issues. I guess what I'm saying is that I think all of these should be addressed and done, but I still think that there's some questions that I would ask of the development teams around some of this revised affordability. To Ms. Mayfield's point, these are not for sale units, but we're investing money as a large amount to make sure these things happen. I think one of our major criteria should be affordable commitments to them. So, I am a little bit concerned that Easter Homes is a 30-year commitment, and I don't know what the impact of that would be. I would like to, if Council approves this, I would certainly like to see something that's more substantial in that commitment for supportive services home as well as a conversation with the county about the wraparound services that are necessary or whether or not that's going to be provided. I just don't know what it is.

Mr. Heath said yes. I did want to clarify that the Easter Home project has already committed to providing the wraparound services that you referenced. So, there's not a void there that would need to be addressed.

Mayor Lyles said okay. So, I think we had a question about how to do this because I want to be really careful. We've had some questions about this before. So, Mr. Baker, we have A, B and C. The question that I think was on the table is adding B into A. Mayor Pro Tem suggested that?

Mr. Winston said my question was if I wanted to make a substitution motion adding B to it. A, B and C, if I can do it neatly to put Easter Home in there.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said so, if I could ask a question. Is there a motion on the floor now for which a substitute motion needs to be brought up?

Mayor Lyles said there was a motion for approval of A, not for B.

Mr. Baker said okay. So, then a substitute motion to that effect would be appropriate.

Mayor Lyles said alright. We have a motion and a second. I'd like to ask if the motion maker would be willing to have the staff come back and address the issues of revised affordability commitments for those two projects that were not perhaps looked at as diligently as the others were, as recommendation and just to provide that information for negotiation?

Ms. Johnson said you said two?

pti:mt

Mayor Lyles said there are two. The \$7 million one is 60 years. So, that would usually run up to like 90 years or 80 at least and then the supportive service one, I would assume should always be supportive services. So, I don't know what that means. I support them, I just want to make sure that our contracts are what we want them to be. I'm asking the staff to come back and let us know what that is and how that operates.

Ms. Johnson said Mayor, what's the name of the project you're referring to?

Mayor Lyles said I'm talking Easter Homes and South Village Apartments.

Ms. Johnson said well South Village is B.

Mayor Lyles said okay, we haven't voted yet. So, I'm asking for if he would accept a friendly amendment to get additional information from the staff on the revised affordability commitments necessary to meet the criteria that others have met.

Mr. Winston said is AV staff able to put the RCA on our screens down here?

Mayor Lyles said I'm talking about the \$4 million one is South Village Apartments and that is for 60 years, and Easter Home is for 30 years.

Unknown said supportive housing should be longer than 30. I just wanted to make sure that we're on the same page.

Mayor Lyles said yes.

Mr. Winston said so, the request is to not adopt B for the Easter Home but direct staff to come back to Council?

Mayor Lyles said yes. I'm okay with the vote being on approval with staff coming back with a negotiation to inform us on the level of the 60 and the 30 and a better explanation of what they are.

Ms. Mayfield said for clarification Mayor, I thought the conversation that you were just having was to not add Easter Home right now until we get further clarification because we do need to know what the county's role is if we're talking about supportive housing.

Mayor Lyles said I can read the majority wants to do this. That's okay, but I still say when that contract comes up, we ought to have something, but that's okay. It's an ask. It's an understanding for me and it's just something that I think we weren't sure what the staff was bringing us forward. I think we ought to look at these things on the revised affordability commitments. I'm okay with the vote being what it is.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Winston and seconded by Councilmember Johnson to approve A, B, C and to add Easter Homes.

The vote was taken on the substitute motion and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Graham, Johnson, Mitchell, and Winston.

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Bokhari, Driggs, Mayfield, Molina, and Watlington.

The vote was taken to approve action (A) approve \$9,200,000 in additional Housing Trust Fund allocations and \$6,600,000 in American Rescue Plan funds for the following multi-family rental affordable housing developments: Fairhaven Glen, \$1,150,000 (Council District 3), Ovata at Reedy Creek, \$2,000,000 (Council District 4), Galloway Crossing, \$1,000,000 (Council District 5), Bishop Madison Homes, \$250,000 (Council District 2), Grounds for Change, \$4,500,000 (Council District 1), Ballantyne Seniors, \$1,400,000 (Council District 7), and Evoke Living at Morris Field, \$5,500,000 (Council District 3), and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington, and Winston.

NAYS: Councilmembers Bokhari and Driggs.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell and seconded by Councilmember Mayfield to (B) approve an additional allocation of \$4,705,245 for the South Village Apartments multi-family rental affordable housing development, (Council District 3), from American Rescue Plan funds.

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Winston.

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, and Watlington.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell and seconded by Councilmember Winston to (C) authorize the City Manager to execute, amend, and renew contracts as needed to complete the transactions approved by this action.

Ms. Mayfield said Mr. Manager, for clarification, can you help me understand based on this conversation that we just had? What does it mean to authorize you to execute, amend, and renew contracts as needed to complete the transactions approved?

Mr. Jones said Councilmember Mayfield, that's the standard language that you would give me to execute what the Council has approved.

Ms. Mayfield said so, saying that's the standard language, I'm trying to get clarification. If I have an expectation for there not to be yet another request, I may have additional expectations of the fact that we have a long list of local residents who have needed assistance, but we have seen over the years where individuals have moved into our community and haven't had access to new developments and rehabbed developments that we have invested in. We don't have any language in here that clarifies who actually gets access to these facilities. So, that's why I'm asking for what does it actually mean when Council approves, for this case, the authorization for you to execute potentially in that contract since there is certain language that's not in here. What does that actually mean?

Mr. Jones said for your specific question, if there were some requirements that only residents who have been in the city for a decade or so would be eligible for these units. I don't believe that would be the authority that I would have in this instance.

Ms. Mayfield said right, I gave that as an example. That still wasn't really clarifying. I just wanted to make sure that I understood and also the community understood because again, just because I stated it, I expect for them not to come back to ask for any additional, that doesn't mean that they're not going to come back. So, that's why I'm asking if we are actually voting to authorize the city manager to do X. I'm trying to understand exactly what is the X that we're authorizing you to do.

Mr. Baker said so, I don't know that I can get in any more specific detail other than he has the opportunity to make minor adjustments that are not inconsistent with what's in front of you. What that actually looks like, I'm not 100 percent sure, but they would be minor adjustments. For instance, another project wouldn't come in to this that wasn't in front of you beforehand, but there may be minor adjustments that need to be made so long as they're not inconsistent with what's in front of you. That's really what we're talking about.

Ms. Mayfield said additional fund request. Would that be considered a minor adjustment?

Mr. Baker said I would say an additional funding request would not be consistent with what's in front of you and that would exceed his authority to negotiate these contracts. He's basically going to effectuate what you have given him.

The vote was taken on the motion to (C) authorize the City Manager to execute, amend, and renew contracts as needed to complete the transactions approved by this action, and recorded as follows:

The vote was recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.

NAYS: Councilmembers Bokhari and Driggs.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: EXCHANGE OF REAL PROPERTY WITH 401 S COLLEGE STREET NC, LLC

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham and seconded by Councilmember Driggs to (A) adopt a resolution authorizing the exchange of certain real property rights between the City of Charlotte and 401 S College Street NC, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, and (B) authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to execute any documents necessary to complete this transaction in conformity herewith.

Councilmember Mitchell said Madam Mayor and Council, thank you. First, I have to apologize to all my good friends at HTA. So, I hope Mohammad doesn't de-invite me for the board meeting on Thursday. I have to share from a historic perspective why this vote is so important for us. Everyone knows I'm pro-business and pro-tourism as they come to Charlotte. We have a viable piece of land that we own and just so that I can take everybody back down memory lane. This is probably our third piece of city-owned property we have owned on the 277 loop. The third piece, and City Manager correct me because I'm going by my memory. It was part of the land deal we put city land in for the parking deck we have right now in Whole Food. We put city land in the NASCAR Hall of Fame. So, now here we are with valuable land once again and we're putting city land into a potential 5 key hotel.

I think the question we have to ask ourselves tonight as we do every time we face citizens, is that the best use of city-owned land? What was interesting, we had the presentation, I think most of us was excited about if we thought having two 5 key hotel rooms would move the needle towards tourism. The reply we got back was we're still going to be competitive; we still can't compete as a Tier 2 destination city and so the 1,000 key hotel rooms to project was not going to take us to Tier 1. I just think when we talk about valuable property, we own Uptown, we need to tell the citizens that we finally got it right. I want to remind everyone the J. W. Marriott just built in this area. They didn't come to us for a rezoning, they didn't come to us for a land swap deal.

So, I will encourage us if the private sector continues to be a partner for us, and develop our hotel convention, we should let the market drive that. This is valuable land for us and I just want to make sure we get it right because I got marks on the other three deals we did with city owned land and the citizens are asking, "Why are you giving prime property away for not true community benefits?" I'm a big fan of having a hotel convention. I think the public sector can do a great job for us as well without us giving us valuable land as our last time to get it right in the 277 loop. Thank you, Mayor and Council.

Councilmember Mayfield said along with agreeing with my colleague Mr. Mitchell, I also have a question because we received in our packet some information that was a little different than what is in front of us right now and I need some clarification. In the packet the last bullet item had a sentence that the designation for a hotel was going to be reduced from 10 years down to five years. That is new information. I also feel like to be perfectly honest, the questions that were asked in closed sessions two separate times regarding this particular proposal were not clearly answered.

So, I would like some clarification. Also, this language that's in front of us, nowhere in here does it state that there will not be future ask for any investment for an additional hotel or anything that goes along with that. A catwalk, whatever it is, because years ago we had conversations about connecting to Westin in Uptown and as it was just highlighted, we've had hotels be built in Uptown without an ask because previously we were asked for \$30 million to \$100 million to make an investment on a hotel and we knew that wasn't the best investment for the community.

There's no language in here, and I actually when this was deferred last time had an expectation that a lot more of our questions would have been answered prior to it coming before Council for a vote. I agree that when we're talking about land in Uptown and I was a part of it along with my colleague the four to eight years I was here. We dropped the ball, and we did not really look at the long-term impact and when we're talking about the community benefit, again, this was highlighted as a land swap. Yet, all the information that was presented to us is information talking about the potential of if we were to get two 500 room hotels, but we're talking about a land swap. We have given up valuable land in Uptown in that loop that could have been transformational for not only the residents of our community but also for the business and small business owners in our community. I cannot support this in its current state. There are not enough protections in this language, and I really need someone to give me an answer as to why language was added that was sent to us via paper showing and stating a reduction for the hotel designation from 10 years down to 5 years.

Tom Murray, Charlotte Regional Visitors Authority said thank you for having me here again. As you know, this is the third time that we have been in front of you to discuss this issue. I think the first question was why did we do the 5-to-10-year language. We were just being transparent in that originally our potential partner had asked for a 10-year restriction on any other uses other than hotels and we, in our negotiations to finalize this equal value transaction, we lowered that restriction from 10 years to 5 years which is in the benefit of the city because it allows us to do other things with the land other than a hotel use.

So, we may choose someday in the future that we don't want to put a hotel on that site, and we want to do something else with that site including sell it. We'll own that land free and we will be able to do that. So, that's the reason for the change. As you'll note in the paperwork that was sent to you earlier that as we talked about before, we would make this an equal value transaction. So, we're not giving land away, we are trading parcels of land that have equal value and through the process that we went through the appraisal process that we went through, we showed that is exactly what happened. Now we had to change part of what we were contributing to make that equal value transaction happen. So, what was originally going to be 2.2 acres on the Caldwell lot, we revised to 1.9 acres on the Caldwell lot that we would contribute to the developer so that we would balance those values at equal value that the Council continued in the last presentation to remind me that what was essential in this transaction was that we

showed that it had equal value. So, that was the reason for that. The point of this land transaction, this is not a hotel deal. This is swapping a piece of land on a privately owned parcel with a piece of land on a city owned parcel. So, we are not giving away land, we are trading land of equal value.

The reason why we're not calling this a hotel deal is because we're reserving the city's rights to do something with the land other than hotels. I did point out to you all that we were anxious to have further hotel growth and if we can find the right deal, we will try to develop a hotel on those sites because it is the number one reason why we lose business to other cities in the convention industry and that's the reason why it's important to us. You asked my board and our organization to work on ways that keep up competitive as an industry in the hospitality industry and that is our collective recommendation. I would mention that I have numerous board members here today. Mike Evans who is our most recent past Chair. Boris Bunich who is our current Chair. Karen Bentley who is a past Chair. Lorie Spratley who is our Budget Chair. Vinay Patel who is also a past Chair and our Vice Chair currently. Tom Dolan who is a board member who is at the J. W. Marriott as their head of sales there as well. I also would mention this is the first time you've seen one of our partners. Alex Hayes is here. He is our development partner on this initiative as well. His partner is crime is as he said to me the other day, his wife is nine and half months pregnant and they're in Australia waiting for the birth of their child. So, that's why he's not here.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you for that introduction of who's in attendance. Mr. Baker, I have a question for our attorney because we're saying this is an even trade. What we have in this language in front of us that we're about to vote on was that the market value of the city portion of this land came in at \$18,456,000. For the 401 College Portion, that market value came in at \$12,017,500. We have a \$6 million differential there. The way that we're saying this is an even swap is through some clearing of land and other things. I'm asking a question specifically of the attorney right now just for clarification. Help me understand if what was just stated, is that we're not designating this for potential hotels since that is everything that was presented to me and I assume my colleagues in the packets, and the conversation of the what if of a hotel and the clearing of this path and the potential creation of a gathering space was all around the idea of maybe we're going to identify a hotel.

How does that conversation change when what was just stated is we decided even though what we submitted to you, Council was one proposal. We decided that we're going to reduce the time limit by five years just in case we decide we want to do something other than what we have spoken to you about of which that is what we would then go to the community and tell them this is what we voted on.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said I understand your question. How the property appraisal system works is that they're going to look at all the potential uses of the property and that's how they will arrive at the number that they arrive at. So, hotel is one of the uses and it's a use that has been touted significantly in this process. There's no question about that. The reduction from 10 to 5 I don't believe is going to change the valuation of the property because you're talking about any of the potential uses of the property is how you got to that particular valuation. I believe that's what being presented to you is that you've got more flexibility as opposed to tying it for just a hotel use for 10 years, that you have more flexibility to do other things which could still include a hotel in year nine if you want to do that.

Ms. Mayfield said it would not include a hotel in year nine because we're stopping it at five.

Mr. Baker said right. It's designated for hotel for the first five years, but then it can be anything else after five years which could include a hotel. It doesn't exclude a hotel. So, that's why you're not going to have the property valuation change based on the year designation. I understand from your perspective in terms of the public perception of what's going on, but I don't think that's going to play into the actual property valuation.

Ms. Mayfield said so, what I'm really thinking about is that \$6 million and some change since the way we're making up that difference of a \$12 million property valuation versus an \$18 million. Again, the last piece of land within the 277 corridor that the city owns, help me understand the legal ramifications if we were not to move forward with this project.

Mr. Baker said if you don't move forward and you vote this down, then the parcels stay where they are. We own our, they buy theirs.

Ms. Mayfield said we own our parcel that's valued at \$18 million and potentially we still can have the same conversation of whether it will be hotel or something other than that.

Councilmember Watlington said I largely agree with the statements of my former colleagues. I struggle with this one for a few reasons. The first one is this idea of a land swap versus a hotel. What we've been given as was previously stated is clearly selling us on the benefits of increasing the number of rooms in this city. We've already talked about how that doesn't give us a step change competitive edge versus the cities that we're losing out to. We spoke previously that we are under no danger if you will of a loss of revenue in this particular sector going forward. We're pretty much booked for what we can handle and what the capacity of our convention center seems to be. So, I feel like to say this is not about hotel and then give us a rationale that is based on a hotel, it doesn't add up and I don't want to go so far to say it's disingenuous, but it leaves something lacking in terms of the presentation and the business proposal.

So, I would've liked to see something a little bit more consistent. If it was just a land deal, I'd question what we would do with 0.3 acres. We removed 0.3 out of the 2.2 to get the numbers to jive. I'm not sure that 0.3 acres remaining is going to be anything significantly developable. So, that to me feels like still an additional loss.

The next piece is it seems has been pointed out with private development, there is certainly an interest in building a hotel or two here already, that's why this came to us in the first place. It's why the parcels were purchased initially by a developer. So, again, back to this hotel rationale. I may be misunderstanding, but it feels as if we're saying we're going to lose out on the possibility of hotel development if we don't conduct this swap. That's not really what I'm seeing here because the reason that this is even a conversation is because there's interest to build.

The next piece is as I think about if this is simply a land swap, I'm not seeing clear enough value that is equitable between going from a 2.2-acre lot to a lot that's third of its size that also has restrictions on it. I feel like it's written here that we will have the opportunity to enhance our convention center space at no cost to the city. Well, I would argue there's an opportunity cost in going to a restricted smaller area of land, particularly because some of the things on the left side of this balance sheet if you will, are things that are largely sunken cost. You're talking about demolition; you're talking about the building of a paseo that's going to have to be demolished later on to build something anyway.

So, when we start talking about appreciable value or capital, if we want to go build on this later one, it seems we're going to have to put up money anyway. So, that for me, it may be \$18 million is lesser than what we're getting, but when it comes to true taxable assets, it doesn't feel like it's a total match to me. So, for those reasons I've got concerns.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you. I wish the public could see the spreadsheet that Councilmember Watlington is referring to because it was mentioned three times that it's equal value. When we were looking at the numbers, the market value of our land is \$18,456,000 and the other land is \$12 million and some odd dollars. So, there's a \$6 million deficit and what Councilmember Watlington was just referring to were costs that were sunken costs. So, this is not equal value. So, if we're looking at this from a land deal specifically, it's not comparable. It's not a good land deal. If we're looking at it from an economic development perspective where it is going to be a hotel, what I heard

is that in five years the new owner could possibly sell the land. So, I was just arguing for homeless people to get an additional \$1 million or \$2 million and that didn't happen. So, I just will not support a \$6 million deficit that I see for economic development Uptown. Thank you.

Councilmember Graham said thank you. I'd like to take the opportunity to welcome everyone to the meeting. When I took the opportunity to study the proposal once we got their appraisals as requested prior to this meeting, I feel comfortable in supporting the transfer of property with the developer in question. I do see it as equal value, not value for the land but value for the transaction. \$12 million plus \$2.5 million which is the demolition and the site prep plus \$4 million will be invested on property that is currently owned by the convention center versus the appraisal of the land that we would swap which is \$18 million. So, there is some balance in terms of the transaction that the convention authority is proposing that they put in front of us.

In addition, it was always my understanding that the hotel was an aspirational goal. That we had the opportunity to place a hotel there and that it could yield on both sites an additional 1,000 rooms. That won't bump us up to another tier to get bigger conventions, but it will certainly add more hotel rooms in Uptown Charlotte versus I think the 16,000 in the region and a smaller amount that is in Uptown Charlotte. We need more rooms in Uptown Charlotte. So, if it were to be developed that would be a positive deal in my perspective. In addition, I think it would help us be good community partners. The developer in question has been making an investment in other areas of our community in Uptown and I think it would make us a reliable partner and more importantly when the swap is done, parcels as I understand is within the I277 loop. So, we're not losing any property because the swap gives us a parcel that we're getting in return for the swap is also in the I277 loop. So, we're not losing an opportunity for development opportunities based on land that the city owns within the loop.

I trust the work of the authority and its board that they have done their due diligence. We've worked with them to kind of help us answer some of the tough questions in terms of tourism and travel and good stewards of the resources that they have under their authority. If they're bringing something to us that I believe they have vetted and requested us to support their recommendations based on my conversation with Tom and other members of their board. I believe this is a transaction that the city should support, and I encourage my colleagues to do that. I will be supporting it. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said it's interesting listening to this conversation. We're all looking at the same thing and seeing something different. So, just by way of clarification there is no 0.3-acre parcel. What we're talking about is 3.2 acres of which 1.9 will be transferred instead of 2.2. So, the residual will be an acre instead of 1.3 acres. To be clear about the 10 years, the change from 10 years to five years reduces a restriction on us. We benefit from that. It means that instead of being locked up by a deed restriction for 10 years, we are tied up for five years. So, whatever you think about that, it is a development that favors us. The land was purchased with hospitality dollars. That means that it was purchased with money that was taken from the hospitality industry pursuant to an authority given to us by the state legislature. That authority was given to us with the intention of allowing the money to be used for certain purposes. So, this property falls within the realm of the CRVA (Charlotte Regional Visitors Authority). It is designated for the use, the promotion of tourism and the mission of the CRVA.

Any hotel deal, if any, would be subject to approval by us. So, if there was a hotel deal subsequently it would come back and we would hear this is the deal, okay or no. We don't have to say yes. So, we are not giving anything away that we have now in terms of control over the hotel deal. I think the right way to look at this is simply in isolation as being an exchange of access on equal terms that we are advised by the professional and the board who run the CRVA, it's beneficial to the mission of the CRVA. I really feel it would be bad for this Council to deny that and particularly because of an impression that this is city owned land that we might be using for housing or for some other purpose. We really just don't have that choice and I hope that we can support the

recommendation of the executives and the Board of the CRVA and let them proceed with the transaction that's beneficial to our CRVA mission. Thank you.

Councilmember Bokhari said yes, I won't belabor the point. We as a city though have a track record of not being good at owning and coordinating city owned property. While some great stuff is starting to go on in Eastland, there's been two decades of us start-stopping because we look at it and we say, "Well we want it to be this, and we want it to be that." The bottom line is none of us around here are commercial real estate experts and it's quite clear after the conversation tonight.

So, the bottom line here is we've got a piece of property that we own that nothing is happening at and there's nobody doing anything. It's constrained by the fact that the hospitality sector in our community on their backs paid for it with the tax that they are now asking us and recommending us to do something as a swap. Which it isn't about property to property, it's about deal term swaps not only as equal from the map they've laid out, but it's what they're asking us to do with the tax that's on their backs at the end of the day. Its proximity to the convention center, it's ability for what's laid out that makes total sense, and there's somebody willing and potentially able to do something there and make something happen rather than just like the mistakes we made in Eastland where we sat on a piece of property, we should've never owned for two decades longer than we should have, we have the ability to get something moving now. So, I think it's a no brainer. I hope we call the question.

Councilmember Ajmera said I won't repeat some of what's been said already by my colleagues. I agree with some of the comments that were made by Mr. Graham, Mr. Driggs. This land is in our tourism bucket. So, there's a restricted fund use as Mr. Driggs shared. So, we can't use it for anything and it's not like we are losing anything, it's a swap. I certainly appreciate the work that the Board has done and Tom you have done to get us to this point and certainly HTA. My phone has been going off today. Mohammad does not give up. I certainly appreciate the work that has been done to get us to this point. I'll be supporting this. Thank you.

Councilmember Winston said it's a good deal and I'll be supporting it.

Ms. Johnson said yes. As a Council member with over 10 years of real estate experience, so don't say that there's no one without any real estate experience, I'd like the public to see the numbers. I've asked for the graph to be posted. I don't know that that's going to happen. This is our land worth \$18 million versus a parcel for \$12 million on the back end of Brooklyn Village I was just told by Councilmember Mitchell.

The vote was taken on the motion to approve action (A) adopt a resolution authorizing the exchange of certain real property rights between the City of Charlotte and 401 S College Street NC, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, and (B) authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to execute any documents necessary to complete this transaction in conformity herewith, and recorded as follows:

The vote was recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers, Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Molina and Winston.

NAYS: Councilmembers Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell and Watlington.

The Resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 540-541.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 14: PROPOSED 2023 CITY COUNCIL MEETING SCHEDULE

Motion was made by Councilmember Winston and seconded by Councilmember Driggs to approve the 2023 City Council Regular and Budget Meeting Schedule.

Councilmember Mitchell said I just want to draw a little caution to the wind. We're looking at the month of January and we do not have a placeholder for our annual. City Manager correct me. We used to call it a retreat. We don't call it retreat anymore. What do we call it?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said annual strategy retreat.

Mr. Mitchell said I would hope we would have an annual strategy meeting prior to us having a February 9, 2024, budget workshop just to do it in order. I think we need to establish our strategies and our priorities before we start talking about money. So, I'm encouraging us to look in January where we can have our strategy session prior to the budget workshop.

Councilmember Anderson said I agree with Mr. Mitchell in that regard. I have the same question as well. I'd also like to lift up, we took to a vote a few weeks back to move the starting time for the zoning meetings for the last two months of this year. When we took that vote, it was under the guise of we would be moving it back to its original time this new calendar year. I see that here as it's laid out, it still starts at a 4 p.m. time ad infinitum for the entire calendar year. I can't support that. I asked repeatedly for staff to come up with creative ways for us to address our backlog as it relates to petitions. I do believe that they've stepped up to the plate somewhat with the consent agenda, but I do think this 4 p.m. start puts pressure on working mothers who are on the Council, people who have 9 to 5 jobs. We say we want to have diverse voices on the Council, but we're not creating space for diverse voices when we're putting a standing meeting that starts earlier in the business workday.

So, I'd like to make an amendment. A substitute motion to amend the calendar and start the zoning meetings at 5 p.m., the original start time that we've had instead of the suggested 4 p.m.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Anderson and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera to start the zoning meetings at 5 p.m. and to add the committee meetings to the schedule.

Councilmember Ajmera said yes. I would like to comment on that. I do support what Ms. Anderson said. When we approved our calendar change a couple of weeks ago, that was only for this year and that was the assumption. I thought that was used not authentically to sort of get the Council to confine into this new schedule of 4 p.m. that really puts pressure on some of us who have other commitments. So, as Ms. Anderson said, this really puts pressure, and we want to help folks who have other commitments outside of the Council. So, I would really like to see that. I know we made exceptions in the past for 2 p.m. meetings, and I just want Mr. Jones to be mindful of that. That we don't make those exceptions moving forward because that means we have to use our PTO (Paid Time Off) or other paid time off to make that happen. Thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said Ms. Ajmera brings us a good point. So, previously I sent the email about the committee meetings. Marie was able to help clarify that what's listed here is the committee discussions, but not the actual committee meetings. I'm good with that. However, I think it's important that if we are going to have committee meetings like we've been having which I think has been working, that it be a part of the schedule here so that people can plan accordingly. So, I would like to see our monthly committee meetings reflected here on this schedule.

Mr. Baker said we're already on a substitute motion. You've already got a schedule of your committee meetings. That's really just a technical merger. You don't need to add a substitute to this conversation.

Ms. Ajmera said we can add to the substitute motion that's been made by Ms. Anderson if that's what Ms. Watlington prefers. I'm okay with seconding that.

Councilmember Driggs said I wish to speak to the substitute motion. In fact, in support thereof. I think our challenge is to improve efficiency in our meetings and not to just make them longer. I wonder if anybody around the dais doesn't feel that other people talk too much.

Mayor Lyles said I think everybody feels that other people talk too much.

Mr. Driggs said I'm not being humorous, but I'm just saying if we had a group commitment to more discipline around some of the conversations that take place. When you've got a quarter of an acre and you hit upon some sort of technicality and we spend a half an hour talking about it, that to me is not in the greater interest of this city. So, if we could somehow kind of be more cost conscious about the time that we spend talking about some of these things, maybe get answers to our questions away from the full Council environment to the extent that they're not necessarily questions that other people need to hear the answers to. I think it's within our grasp to get through a meeting more efficiently. I'll just put it that way. I'm not pointing fingers at anybody, I'm not curtailing anybody's speech, I'm just saying that if everybody would sort of be mindful of the idea of the cost in terms of time of some of the things we talk about, I think we could do better.

Councilmember Johnson said so, one of the ways we can get out of the meeting, our first item was on our agenda for 15 minutes with a half an hour discussion. The presentation alone was 45 minutes. So, I think that we can have a more realistic agenda and I think it's our responsibility to ask questions and bring things to the forefront for our public. So, I think it's more appropriate that Council be able to have a discussion and maybe shorter presentations. Thank you.

Councilmember Bokhari said I think the problem here is number one, our record stands that we cannot approve a calendar as a body still and that's twice running now. I think the problem here is we can control a start time. We cannot control the commitment around this dais to ask your questions offline and if there's a point you want to make to the community, do it and make it quickly. Until we can do that, we have a commitment not to the big bad developer community, but to the mom and pops who rezone their places and all the people who are in this backlog that the affordable housing crisis is getting worse, to somehow figure out how to jam their stuff into our broken process.

So, I can't support it. I'd love to support it. Trust me. Nobody wants a shorter meeting than me, but until we figure out how to manage the other side, we can control the start time. The stakes are too high otherwise.

Councilmember Winston said so, I agree with a lot of what has been said by everybody, but I can't be in support of the substitute motion. I think everything that we're talking about right here are governance issues and Mr. Manager we really have to figure out a way to have a structural conversation around the way we do business. This is something I literally said at my first business meeting when I got to the dais five years ago. It was the most apparent thing when you walk into here, how you get things done. There was no proper way of getting it done. So, you have to kind of be a pirate at the dais sometimes and take it over. That wasn't why the motion maker made the motion. It was about work, and it was about the ability to change.

Again, I think we should have this conversation about how we go about our business, but to prioritize one type of person's work over the other, I think is quite unfair. There are some people here that don't have the option to even push those things around. If the Council meeting exists, you don't get a check. So, you can't pay the bills. Again, this

is something that I've talked about time and time again. Which again, we should have this conversation, but we have not been willing to. Because for me, I work gigs and a gig doesn't pay you if you're not there. When I first got on Council, I think me and Mr. Bokhari were the only two working parents on this Council when we first got on five years ago, you were not. So, I am certainly sympathetic to these issues.

Mr. Bokhari said that is correct.

Mr. Winston said I've been asking that we need to figure this out for five years and we got it figured out, but we can't just kind of ad hoc prioritize at the dais. I hear what you're saying Ms. Anderson, but we have to have a different type of conversation and I'll be in support of that. Until we do that, we have to figure out a way to do business.

Ms. Anderson said so, Mayor Pro Tem, this is the very first time in a variety of conversations on this topic that you've mentioned that there's a work equity issue. I've not heard that from anyone including yourself at all. So, I certainly don't want to be categorized or depicted as if I'm advocating for worker inequity based on the type of job someone has on this Council. This is the very first time I'm hearing that. These Council meetings, as you guys have set up, have a potential time limit or can go longer. We're not saying cut it shorter, I'm saying take it back to the standing time that it's been for years with the exception of two months. Because I haven't heard that there's a worker inequity issue here, I then in turn question the process of how it got passed a couple of months ago because we had six people who sat around and voted against it. Then it was declined. Then the next morning it was approved.

So, I'm lifting up a tone that I've heard from all of my colleagues and I'm vocalizing that. I've not heard this from you until five minutes ago.

Mr. Winston said we've been having this conversation for five years.

Mayor Lyles said okay, we have a substitute motion on the floor. Madam Clerk will you read the substitute motion please.

Stephanie Kelly, City Clerk said the substitute motion to start the zoning meetings at 5 p.m. and to add the committee meetings to the schedule that was made by Councilmember Anderson and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera.

Mr. Driggs said the motion is to approve the schedule subject to those.

Mayor Lyles said to approve the schedule subject to the two changes that the clerk just stated.

Ms. Kelly said right. The zoning meetings at 5 p.m.

Ms. Ajmera said I just have a comment. I know Ms. Watlington was specifically asking about the virtual option. Is that what you wanted added?

Ms. Watlington said yes. That's the assumption that it will happen exactly like it happens today.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, so you wanted that to be part of the motion?

Ms. Watlington said I just want it to be documented as such.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. So, I guess then the motion would need to be amended to include that committee will have a virtual option.

Mayor Lyles said the committees already have a virtual option.

Ms. Ajmera said I know, but I guess that's what she wanted to make sure.

Ms. Watlington said she's right in that the assumption is that it's going to be exactly like it is today. We've got the option we previously voted on. So, I think what Ajmera is asking is to make sure that that's reflected on the schedule which I think is how it has been when there was a virtual option it, it was [INAUDIBLE].

Mayor Lyles said committees have the option. It's already there. So, I don't know if you'd have to add that to a motion because it's already in effect for virtual meetings of committee members and how they handle that. So, the motion is to add the committee meetings on Monday to the formal Council adopted agenda, as well as to start the zoning meetings at 5 p.m. So, that is the motion on the floor.

Mr. Driggs said and to approve the agenda with those modifications.

Mayor Lyles said yes. To adopt the 2023 Council regular and budget meeting schedule with the two amendments. Zoning meeting start at 5 p.m. and committee meeting shall be posted as a part of the regular Council schedule.

The vote was taken on the substitute motion and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Watlington.

NAYS: Councilmembers Bokhari and Winston.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 15: CITY CLERK COMPENSATION

Mayor Lyles said do I have a motion to approve the FY 2022 and FY 2023 compensation adjustment for the City Clerk with the following information that must be included in the record? For the City Clerk, a base salary of \$136,918.08 effective July 2021, a 4 percent increase which results in a new base salary of \$142,394.80. Rounded, that number comes to \$142,395. Effective July 1, 2022, a 7 percent increase which results in a new base salary of \$152,362.44 rounded to \$152,362.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari and seconded by Councilmember Mayfield and carried unanimously to approve a Fiscal Year 2022 and a Fiscal Year 2023 compensation adjustment for the City Clerk.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: CITY MANAGER COMPENSATION

Mayor Lyles said alright. Do I have a motion to approve the FY 2022 and FY 2023 compensation for the City Manager? Current base salary is \$379,586. Effective July 1st, an 8 percent increase which results in a new base salary of \$409,953 rounded off to \$409,954 effective July 1, 2022, a 6 percent increase which results in a new base of \$434,550 rounded to \$434,551.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari and seconded by Councilmember Molina to approve a Fiscal Year 2022 and a Fiscal Year 2023 compensation adjustment for the City Manager.

Councilmember Mayfield said Mayor, I am not going to be able to support this particular motion. This particular amount is very difficult with all of the challenges that we have heard from the community for specifically these last few months. I think Council is showing a level of being tone deaf to the issues that we have. Yes, our Manager does a great job. Yes, I have conversations with him, but yes, he is doing his job. Because unfortunately previous Council did not have a review last year, we're now, for both of

these conversations, not only having to do an increase that's going to have to be retro back for a year, but we're adding on top of that a new amount.

So, to go from the current 2021 rate of \$379,586 to jump for \$434,551, almost half a million dollars for a City Manager which this is government work. Your Council just got through having long conversations regarding the limited times and some of them work full-time and/or have families. The amount of concerns that come from the community that we have to attempt to try to address and at times having to feel like we are not having partners in city staff with some of the projects that come before us. It is a concern to be able to say that we're saying we're willing to allocate this much money for an individual. Yes, he does a great job. For a city our size, this is truly a level of not really hearing what is going on in our community to even have the conversation of going from 8 percent to 10 percent, opposed to a 4 and 6 or 4 and 7. \$434,551 when it's all said and done just to turn around and next year do another increase, is very difficult to sign off on. Whether my colleagues move forward with it or not, I will not be able to support this although I do think we have a great City Manager and he and I have talked. It is a challenge to be able to sign off on this amount of funding.

Councilmember Bokhari said call to question.

Mayor Lyles said thank you. Alright, we have a call to question. Do we have a motion on the table?

Unknown said yes. You have a motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington, and Mayor Lyles.

NAYS: Councilmembers Johnson, Mayfield, and Winston.

Ms. Mayfield said point of action for the City Attorney.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Mayfield the motion is over.

Ms. Mayfield said since the community doesn't see you get to vote often. You only get to vote when it's a tie breaker. So, if this is the first time that people are seeing that you as the mayor has a chance to vote, that's why I'm asking the city attorney for clarification on why the mayor gets to vote since this is [INAUDIBLE].

Unknown said point of order. We're not in that conversation right now.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said yes, it would be helpful for me to have that conversation with you all maybe in the budget process or the governance group because there's a long history for those of you who have been here a while. I know my predecessors have given an opinion that the mayor does not have a vote in this particular matter. The Mayor and the charter speak to the Mayor having a vote in the consideration of the employment or dismissal of the three Council employees. So, this has been a discussion for a long period of time. I'd like to pull some of that information that's been provided to previous Councils and provide it to this Council going forward.

* * * * *

NOMINATIONS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor Lyles explained the rules and procedures of the appointment process.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: NOMINATIONS TO THE ARTS AND CULTURE ADVISORY BOARD

pti:mt

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending September 30, 2024.

- Martina Ackridge, nominated by Councilmember Ajmera.
- Destiny Crawford, nominated by Councilmembers Graham, Mayfield and Watlington.
- Melody Gross, nominated by Councilmembers Anderson, Johnson, Mitchell, Molina and Winston.
- Alvin Jacobs, nominated by Councilmember Driggs.

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 18: NOMINATIONS TO THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a partial term recommended by the Certified SBE-Hispanic Contractors Association beginning upon appointment and ending April 28, 2023, followed by a three-year term beginning April 29, 2023, and ending April 28, 2026.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a partial term recommended by the Charlotte Regional Business Alliance beginning upon appointment and ending April 28, 2023, followed by a three-year term beginning April 29, 2023, and ending April 28, 2026.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Charlotte Regional Business Alliance beginning upon appointment and ending April 28, 2024.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Charlotte Regional Business Alliance beginning April 29, 2022, and ending April 28, 2025.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE BUSINESS INCLUSION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term recommended by the National Association of Women Business Owners beginning upon appointment and ending February 28, 2023, followed by a two-year term beginning March 1, 2023, and ending February 28, 2025.

- Rochelle Stewart, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Rochelle Stewart by acclamation.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a two-year term recommended by the Hispanic Contractors Association of the Carolinas beginning March 1, 2022, and ending February 28, 2024.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term recommended by the Latin American Chamber of Commerce beginning upon appointment and ending February 28, 2024.

- Pacino Mancillas, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Pacino Mancillas by acclamation.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a Prime Construction Company category representative for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending February 28, 2023, followed by a two-year term beginning March 1, 2023, and ending February 28, 2025.

- Jason Deans, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Jason Deans by acclamation.

ITEM NO. 20: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE INTERNATIONAL CABINET

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a Cultural/Ethnic category representative for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2024.

- Jeffrey Baldwin, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Jeffrey Baldwin by acclamation.

ITEM NO. 21: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE TREE ADVISORY COMMISSION

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a Housing Finance category representative for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending August 31, 2024.

- Nate Negrin, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.
- Elliott Voreis, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to reappoint Nate Negrin and Elliott Voreis by acclamation.

ITEM NO. 22: NOMINATIONS TO THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending March 9, 2025.

- Latesha Graham, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Latesha Graham by acclamation.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 23: NOMINATIONS TO THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a Business Operator of Dilworth representative for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2022, and ending June 30, 2025.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a partial term for a Resident Owner of Hermitage Court beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2024.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 24: NOMINATIONS TO INLIVIAN

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term beginning December 18, 2022, and ending December 17, 2025.

- Linda Ashendorf, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to reappoint Linda Ashendorf by acclamation.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 25: NOMINATIONS TO THE KEEP CHARLOTTE BEAUTIFUL COMMITTEE

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2023.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2024.

- Grace Few, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.
- Dale Stoller, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Grace Few and Dale Stoller by acclamation.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 26: NOMINATIONS TO THE PASSENGER VEHICLE FOR HIRE BOARD

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a Hospitality/Tourism Industry category representative for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2021, and ending June 30, 2024.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a representative of Persons with Disabilities category representative for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending July 1, 2023.

- Joe Gentry, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Joe Gentry by acclamation.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 27: NOMINATIONS TO THE STORM WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a General Contractor category representative for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2022, and ending June 30, 2025.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 28: NOMINATIONS TO THE TRANSIT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a Vanpool Rider category representative for a three-year term beginning February 1, 2022, and ending January 31, 2025.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m.


Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk MMC, NCCMD

Length of Meeting: 4 Hours, 20 Minutes
Minutes completed: February 26, 2024