

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for an Action Review on Monday, November 14, 2022, at 5:12 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Danté Anderson, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, LaWana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Marjorie Molina, Victoria Watlington, Braxton Winston, II.

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmembers Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, and Renee Johnson.

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said this is a meeting that we have in advance of our regular business meeting. We do this to have consideration of items that may be coming up in the future as well as other items that we need to have time to have appropriate consideration. So, I'm going to call the meeting to order, but let's go ahead and deal with our consent agenda.

* * * * *

ACTION REVIEW

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

Mayor Lyles said my understanding is for our consent agenda that we have items number 10 through 32 with the exception of Item No. 18, which is being pulled by the staff. So, with that, is there anyone that would see something on the consent agenda that they would like to see as a separate vote?

Councilmember Anderson said Madam Mayor, I'd like to pull for comment, not a separate vote, 27 through 32.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

ITEM NO. 5: CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 10 THROUGH 32 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 Mayfield and seconded by Councilmember Winston, to approve Consent Agenda items 10 through 32 as presented with the exception of Item No. 18 which was pulled by staff.

Councilmember Anderson said for the consent agenda items 27 through 32, are all within District 1. With the exception of one, all of them have an impact to our tree canopy and shrubs in the area. So, I just want to understand from the perspective of how are we going to address replanting or making whole our canopy based on these several items that we're about to vote on.

Marie Harris, Strategy and Budget said yes ma'am. Thank you, Ms. Anderson. So, this project, this Shamrock Project is one of the newer conceived designs where we're building complete streets. So, for this one we'll have the street and then we'll also have bike lanes and then we'll have planting strips and then the sidewalks. So, it's not fully still in design but we can definitely share those with you when we get the planting strips more completely designed, but there will be trees to offset some of this within the planting strip.

Ms. Anderson said I know the community is looking forward to the project and the increased mobility, but also concerned about the canopy. So, I would like to be updated as we go further. Thank you.

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

The following items were approved:

Item No. 10: Construct Freedom Drive Intelligent Transportation System

Approve a contract in the amount of \$675,544.20 to the lowest responsive bidder, STS Cable Services, Inc., for the Freedom Drive Intelligent Transportation System project.

Summary of Bids

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|
| STS Cable Services, Inc. | \$675,544.20 |
| Hyper Networks, LLC | \$731,050.25 |
| Whiting Construction Co., Inc. | \$945,778.69 |

Item No. 11: Roof Repair Design Services and Building Envelope Consulting

(A) Approve unit price contracts with the following companies for roof repair services and building envelope consulting for an initial term of three years: – REI Engineers, Inc., Wolf Trail Engineering, PLLC (SBE), and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 12: Injection Grouting and Pipe Lining Services

(A) Approve a unit price contract with Nu-Pipe, LLC for grouting and pipe lining services for an initial term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 13. Construct Bonwood Storm Drainage Improvement Project

Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,064,708.28 to the lowest responsive bidder OnSite Development LLC for the Bonwood Storm Drainage Improvement Project.

Summary of Bids

| | |
|---------------------------|----------------|
| OnSite Development LLC | \$2,064,709.28 |
| Sealand Contractors Corp. | \$2,619,625.25 |
| United of Carolinas, Inc. | \$2,997,343.90 |

Item No. 14: Brass Parts and Fittings

(A) Approve a unit price contract with Ferguson Enterprises, Inc. for the purchase of brass parts and fittings for an initial term of one year, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 15: Engineering Services to Support Field Operations System Repairs

(A) Approve a unit price contract with Freese and Nichols, Inc. for engineering services to support Field Operations system repairs, for an initial term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 16: McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Filters and Pump Station Improvements

Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,125,105.00 to the lowest responsive bidder Gilbert Engineering Company, Inc. for the McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements project.

Summary of Bids

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| Gilbert Engineering Company, Inc. | \$1,125,105.00 |
| Garney Companies, Inc. | \$1,290,000.00 |

Item No. 17: Thermal Hydrolysis Process Design

Approve a contract in the amount of \$14,145,000.00 with PC Construction Company for Design-Build design services to construct the McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plan Thermal Hydrolysis Process project.

Item No. 19: Airport Runway Site Development

Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,415,892.84 to the lowest responsive bidder E.S. Wagner Company, LLC for the Fourth Parallel Runway Early Tree Clearing project.

Summary of Bids*

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

Item No. 20: Aviation Biometric Service for International Departure

(A) Approve a contract with PRE, LLC dba Pangiam for Biometric Facial Recognition for International Exit for an initial term of five years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 21: Collection Agency Services

(A) Approve a contract amendment for a total amount not to exceed \$1,320,000 to the contract with FirstPoint Collection Resources, Inc. for Collection Agency Services, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract and this amendment were approved.

Item No. 22: COVID-19 Cost Recovery Support

(A) Approve a contract amendment for a total amount not to exceed \$110,000 to the contract with Hagerty Consulting, Inc. for COVID-19 Cost Recovery Support, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract and this amendment were approved.

Item No. 23: Refund of Property Taxes

Adopt a resolution authorizing the refund of property taxes assessed through clerical or assessment error in the amount of \$17,018.34.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 534-535.

Item No. 24: Set a Public Hearing on Cardinal Creek Area Voluntary Annexation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for December 12, 2022, for the Cardinal Creek Area voluntary annexation petition.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 536-537.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 25: Charlotte Water Property Transactions - N. Tryon Pressure Zone Boundary Change and 960 Zone N-S Transmission Main (WT Harris-Plott Rd. Water Transmission), Parcel #28

Acquisition of 12,483 square feet (0.29 acres) in Permanent Utility Easement and 5,388 square feet (0.12 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 8715 Parkland Circle from KG Commons, LLC for \$83,825.00 for N. Tryon Pressure Zone Boundary Change and 960 Zone N-S Transmission Main (WT Harris-Plott Rd. Water Transmission), Parcel #28.

Item No. 26: Property Transactions - 1615 Burnley Road, Parcel # 6

Acquisition of 384 square feet (0.009 acres) Storm Drainage Easement at Candlewood Drive from any heirs of Edmond Arthur Precourt, Phyllis Precourt, and Mattie Precourt, and their spouses if any for \$450 for 1615 Burnley Road, Parcel # 6.

Item No. 27: Property Transactions - Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 19

Acquisition of 742 square feet (0.017 acres) Fee Simple, 1,102 square feet (0.025 acres) Sanitary Sewer Easement, 517 square feet (0.012 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 1,022 square feet (0.023 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 1723 Shamrock Drive from Bobby J. Raye for \$14,772 for Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 19.

Item No. 28: Property Transactions - Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 48

Acquisition of 1,470 square feet (0.034 acres) Utility Easement, 233 square feet (0.0053 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 100 square feet (0.0023 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 2226 Shamrock Drive from Claire Bowman for \$12,260 for Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 48.

Item No. 29: Property Transactions - Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 59

Acquisition of 1,425 square feet (0.033 acres) Utility Easement and 92 square feet (0.002 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement at 3351 Airlie Street from Gregory S. Jozwiakowski and Kelley Kimball Jozwiakowski for \$14,500 for Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 59.

Item No. 30: Property Transactions - Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 71

Acquisition of 967 square feet (0.022 acres) Utility Easement, 840 square feet (0.019 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 35 square feet (0.0008 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 2409 Shamrock Drive from Harrison B. West and Jessica Grenia for \$14,500 for Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 71.

Item No. 31: Property Transactions - Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 80

Acquisition of 1,385 square feet (0.03 acres) Utility Easement, 421 square feet (0.01 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 34 square feet (0.0008 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 2505 Shamrock Drive from Jessica Lynne Bryant for \$12,200 for Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 80.

Item No. 32: 19034 Property Transactions - Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 81

Acquisition of 625 square feet (0.023 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 1,131 square feet (0.026 acres) Utility Easement, and 33 sq. ft (0.0008 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 2509 Shamrock Drive from Phillip A. Snyder and Peter A. Snyder and spouse if any for \$15,141 for Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 81.

Councilmember Johnson arrived at 5:15 p.m.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: ACTION REVIEW AGENDA OVERVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said thank you Mayor and members of Council. Tonight, we have two updates for you. The first one is the Arts and Culture update, and Priya Sircar will lead that discussion. I see there's some friendly faces in the room that are related to Arts and Culture. One of the things that we're attempting to do is keep Council informed about some of the activities that are happening with the Arts and Culture Advisory Board and the different networks within that. Then we'll have Shawn Heath come back to you tonight for an update on supporting the affordable housing projects. I'll start off with just commending Shawn and the team for working with many of our developers to bring back something for you tonight in terms of updates. So, unless there's some questions for me Mayor, I can turn it over to Priya.

Councilmember Bokhari arrived at 5:16 p.m.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: ACTION REVIEW ITEMS

Priya Sircar, Arts and Culture Officer said yes. Thank you very much. Good evening, everyone. Thanks for having us back to provide an update. I would like to welcome our Vice Chair, Kevin Patterson, who is in the room. A very hardworking vice chair indeed. I'm just looking around to see if we have any other members here. No. Thank you also to my staff colleagues who worked so hard on this work.

So, tonight we are providing an update on the work. You heard a little bit about that in last week's meeting from the Jobs and Economic Development Committee report out, but now we're providing an update to you on where we are with the Arts and Culture planning process. So, briefly before I turn it over to our lead consultant Joy Bailey-Bryant to do the bulk of the presentation on where the team is, I just wanted to share with you this slide which we also shared and discussed with the Jobs and Economic Development Committee last week, which is really a snapshot and a way of thinking about the Arts and Culture ecosystem in Charlotte and in Charlotte Mecklenburg.

Here it's just a way of conceptualizing who all the various players are in the ecosystem, so that as we think about the comprehensive Arts and Culture Plan that's being developed and also the city's goals, included for Jobs and Economic Development, where are all the levers for that and what are the different drivers in the ways that we can impact that. So, this is something we have had in mind, the Arts and Culture Advisory Board has had in mind since last spring when we first shared this diagram and started thinking in this way. We are engaging with folks throughout the ecosystem as we go through the community engagement process for the Arts and Culture Plan.

So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Joy Bailey-Bryant who is joining us virtually. She is the president of Lord Cultural Resources U.S. You've heard from her before and she's going to provide the update on our community engagement as well as what you can expect that's forthcoming in the research. So, Joy, welcome and please take it away.

Joy Bailey-Bryant, Lord Cultural Resources, U.S. said thank you Priya and thank you so much City Council Members and Mayor for really being such great leaders as well as collaborators and partners through this work that we are doing. So, let's start without further ado with the first slide which is just a reminder of what the process is and where we are in the process. Time is flying by, and we have come before you a few times just really through this three-phase process getting to the final plan. We have moved through Phase 1 and into Phase 2, public engagement, and today is the closing date of the survey. So, we have really moved through at a really nice pace, but really having an opportunity to blanket Charlotte Mecklenburg with conversations around arts and culture and what it means for and what it can mean for not just the arts and cultural communities but also for residents of Charlotte.

So, you see here that we have both the phase 2 and phase 3. We are in phase 2, this public engagement portion where you see not just public engagement happening, but also a lot of data and analysis and research as well as evaluations and further understanding of the infrastructure analysis and asset mapping. So, a lot going on both qualitative and quantitative wise. We'll have a statement about that later in this presentation.

So, I talked about the overview of the process, but what does it really mean for you? We've been coming to you every few weeks really to make sure that we are in conversation and concert with what you want, and what your needs are. Our remit from day one came from the Ad Hoc Committee that the Mayor created, and we have been moving forward with that scope and growing our knowledge as we have gone forward. Just to point out to you that the pink circles are where we have the City Council touch point. So, here we are today on November 14th where we have the update to Council, and as we showed, we did just have an update to the Economic and Jobs Committee a few weeks back.

So, we did have that opportunity to get some feedback and have conversation. We are moving forward to the preview of the State of Culture Report, which I do want to note

that this draft State of Culture Findings report has been moved from December to allow for more time for analysis and refinement. This is important because that is allowing for us to have more conversations and actually vet the information further and further. So, it is totally refined even when we have this draft that we're able to present to you closer to January, at that preview of the State of Culture Report.

We are looking forward to continuing these regular conversations with you and understanding what's important to you from the state of culture. So, that will help us to then move forward into informing the framework, strategy and implementation of this Arts and Culture Plan. So, basically, we're presenting the draft State of Culture findings, and we are having regular conversations beyond that with you to refine that even further to ensure that we know the true priorities that the city has for arts and culture. So, we'll take that information, and you see that ongoing discussion with council, that kind of shaded time that is between the January and April/May time. So, that's really where you'll see that refinement and moving up to the clear priorities. Essentially the State of Culture identifies emerging opportunities and then things begin to become more clear as fewer and fewer priorities because there's finite time and resources as you all know with all of your plans that we really can focus on and be successful. So, we've built in that timing to continue that refinement, framework building, strategy and implementation.

So, talking a little bit more about this public engagement, and I know from conversations with you all and from presentations in the past, that this is particularly important because we want to make sure that we gain feedback and input from as many Charlotteans as possible and we're really blanketing the area so that we get into pockets. So, what you see here is really a representation of the many different ways, a myriad of possibilities of ways that we have people contributing to the conversation. So, in this slide you see we have conversations happening from as large as community wide events, kind of festivals with over 100 people to smaller drop in conversations and do it yourself community conversations that groups are holding themselves using our DIY conversation guide that is on the website and then sending us the results, the answers to those questions in that do it yourself community conversation toolkit.

So, from the gamut of these large community events that we're coming out to, to these smaller home events and everything in between including several virtual conversations that focus on particular areas, city round tables. So, we're talking to city staff to understand the ways that arts and culture is currently embedded and being used and being collaborated, how it's working and supported throughout the city, but also different opportunities forthcoming. Opportunities that City staff see as possibilities. We've had stakeholder interviews definitely with you all as well as with each one of you City Council Members, but also with funders and with arts and cultural participants with others who are stakeholders in this whole process.

Then finally I do want to note that we have started an ambassador program where after we were able to do this for a little while, we were in the public engagement phase for a while, and we started to see the pockets of communities that we were not really reaching in to. So, we were able to engage with what we are calling ambassadors who are community members who are having conversations within their communities in places that we, because we're keeping the data, were not seeing as much participation.

So, that ambassador program has been going on for a few weeks now and we're pleased to see that we're bearing some results of that as well. So, I talked about the ambassador program because what's really important is all of those myriad of possibilities of ways and the different ways that we are engaging with Charlotteans, one of the things that we do know is, we can have big numbers which is really important, making sure that we get into the different packets with the surveys, making sure that we're throwing our arms as wide as possible for a lot of these big picture events. We also know that we're getting nuggets of information, and we need to get under what that really means, the truth of why we have some of these findings that we're getting, for example in a survey.

So, with that we have these community conversations, we have these smaller drops in conversations that are happening across neighborhoods. That's why the ambassadors who are people who are speaking to other people, it's really important. That's important in spaces that, for example, Spanish speaking communities that we knew we wanted to get a little bit more in depth and we weren't seeing as much quantitative information. We really wanted to get into that quality of what was really happening. There were nuances that we were missing. So, the ecosystem that Priya talked about was not really being complete or we were not really getting to each one of those rungs in order to build higher and higher.

So, this is one of our favorite slides. I will tell you that I'd like to unpack what you are seeing here. When we're talking about public engagement and making our way across the Charlotte Mecklenburg area, we're really proud that in this engagement time, we've engaged over 3,000 individual Charlotte area residents and 75 zip codes have been engaged. So, if you're looking at the right side of your screen, let me tell you what these different colors and bubbles mean. So, of course you know the base is Charlotte and then you see the darker green forms are the zip codes, the five zip codes where we saw the highest participation from the registration of people for our in-person and Zoom events. So, these were our qualitative conversations where we had people to register. They gave us a lot of good information in those conversations. So, these are the top five zip codes that we had of people attending.

Then you see the next level out is the orange dots, a little bit more yellow-gold dot. Those are actually where we see participation in the survey. So, survey participants. People who contributed more, who took the survey, who gave us feedback. Those are these orange dots and based on the size of the dot is where you see real larger participation.

Then finally the purple dots. These are intercept conversations, and these have been going on. Let me change the language a little bit. Intercept is also drop in. So, these are conversations that we're having in local spaces where people are going about their daily life and we're having an opportunity to have more in depth conversation with them around where they are experiencing arts and culture and how they want to experience more. How could it benefit them in any way, shape, or form. This is the way that we really in every city that we're working in, other municipalities that we're working in. People always ask us, "How do I get the opinion of the average person on the street?" The way that you do it is by going to the places that they go to, simply because everyone cannot make the time to show up at 6 pm on a Wednesday night. Everyone has family obligations or other kinds of things. So, we drop into different events. We drop in to kid's events and family events, homecomings or home games and those types of things. So, those drop in events are where we're able to really engage with people who are willing to talk to us about arts and culture.

Then finally, as I said, we updated this earlier today, but the survey does close this evening. We currently have over 1,000 English survey responses and over 100 Spanish respondents. I want you to focus also on the right side of your screen where we have interviewed over 92 individuals. So, those are conversations that we are having with funders, with leaders, community leaders, influencers, with people who are tangentially involved in the arts. Not at all involved in the arts, but they are in some way shape or form especially on the community wide side, on the city-wide side, really do have some kind of impact or could have some kind of impact on this arts and cultural plan. So, we are really excited about the information that we have gained from all of this quantitative and qualitative data because it is really feeding our findings as we develop them further.

So, I preempted myself and I talked just a little bit about the public engagement ambassadors, but you see here just really clearly that the goals of this program are to engage this diverse group of ambassadors. One of the things that I mentioned earlier is that we really wanted to get into the pockets of Charlotte area residents who we were not hearing from. As I said, we keep this data, so we know that we were not hearing from people. So, okay, then I will move on. So, work to date, we're diving more deeply and we're engaging the social media networks.

So, just to give you an outline here of the State of Culture Report, I would like to just point your eyes to number four, the Cultural Asset Map because that is that real asset inventory. The summary of findings is also important obviously. We're bringing this all together, this evaluation of local funding landscape and we're bringing this all together with what does it all mean. So, that is a very important piece.

Ms. Sircar said sorry to interrupt Joy. I was just going to ask Wendy if you could move to the next slide as we're not seeing the State of Culture Report at this moment. Thank you. This is the slide that Joy was just speaking to in terms of what the research is leading to.

Ms. Bailey-Bryant said so, then the very next slide, the last one is what's next. We are essentially the development of the plan's priorities. So, after the State of Culture Report in the first quarter, we're going to have the development of the plan's priorities and the strategy development. As I mentioned earlier at the beginning of this process, we are going to be working through the priorities to assist with that strategy development, then in quarter two, the implementation plan development and the final arts and culture plan. Then finally using the plan to guide the city policy and inform other stakeholder activities. So, I apologize for going over and that is the end of my presentation.

Ms. Sircar said I would just say that we are looking forward to the team completing the research streams that Joy talked about and then synthesizing all of that to point to what are the implications for the future of our arts and culture. So, we're looking forward to bringing those synthesized findings back to you.

Councilmember Driggs said thank you. Priya, I was just wondering if a report like this is being made to the funders of the other half, the private funders. Are you in touch with them as well while you work through this?

Ms. Sircar said we are not. We do have representatives of the private partners who are on the advisory board. So, of course as you know the advisory board is the core of the steering group that is guiding this process.

Councilmember Bokhari said so, at what point is the Council going to provide our strategic policy framework vision, if you will?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so, I hope I have this correct. So, Priya if you'd go back to slide six, I believe. So, I believe that what will occur Councilmember Bokhari is that somewhere in the December time frame, there will be this preview of the State of Culture Report, but maybe more importantly in January, there will be the State of Culture Report. What I believe would be very important is the council's philosophy about arts and culture should be implemented, at least through the council's lens, the council's vision. I would hope that could occur before that January time frame so that it could be incorporated into whatever this initial report is that comes out. I believe that, that work to some extent is being done by Councilmembers Graham and Driggs and the Mayor Pro Tem.

Mr. Bokhari said so that work can't be done by a subset of Council. That's how we got in this problem in the first place. It has to be done by all of us, and it's a body of work. I don't know what's being done currently right now, but these are fundamental questions as it relates to being stewards of these dollars. Our long-term strategy is for this to get to a self-sustaining model or a model that doesn't require so much subsidy or it's a subsidized model that will ongoing, do X, Y, and Z. The level of work that it's going to take us to do this isn't some kind of side thing where we check a box and it's done. Otherwise, we're going to be at a spot where someone's telling us what we should do with the money, not us measuring what they're doing based on what we've asked a strategic vision. So, it's mid-November right now. This can't be done by one or two people in a back room.

Mr. Driggs said just in response to that, the thought was that the three of us would reach out to members of Council, conduct interviews and try to collect input as a starting point

for a Council statement. Now one thing that I understood was that we would get something in December, like a couple of weeks from now, and it felt to me as if the suggestion was being made, "Well, why don't you wait and look at that before you do that?" I'm not sure if you guys agree, but it sounds as if this is going to take longer before we see anything as if we need to go back to the idea. Then the question was how do we structure those conversations? Like, what are the questions we ask? What kind of feedback we're trying to get? I guess maybe we need to get together and work that out. I've seen a description that Mayor Pro Tem provided in general terms, but I would say you're right. It has to be the whole council, but the question is where do we start? If we all just get into a room and kick it around, the conversation doesn't have much structure and I think that's why three of us thought we would try to bring something that everybody could react to.

Councilmember Winston said to Mr. Driggs' point, you may remember this. We had this conversation at a presentation about a month ago just before Mr. Graham had an absence. We talked as a body to say the same thing, that there needs to be a policy direction, a desired outcome of the Council, but the three of us just have not been able to coordinate at this point in time to have the necessary conversations with Council as a whole so that we could work on something and then have that whole Council conversation.

Councilmember Graham said we were able to receive all of the Council's initial interviews that we got in our package. So, we kind of know from those initial one on one sessions that Priya and Joy had with us at the beginning of the process to kind of use that as a guiding principle in terms of what you told that consultants that were important to you.

Mayor Lyles said I think that I'm really struggling with where we are going and the outcome for this. So, I thought that Mr. Driggs, Mr. Graham, the Mayor Pro Tem would sit down and even if those questions were structured, they would go to every Council member. There would be participation by everyone and at some point, someone does have to collapse this to make sure it's happening. For me, the biggest question is what are we trying to achieve? Mr. Bokhari said we may be trying to determine if there's a way there's a short-term subsidy and then some way to go forward without that or is it going to be a subsidized system. I mean, whatever it is, we need to have these options and choices and I think the only way to get that is by having the Council participation.

So, I want us to when we get to the dot that says ongoing discussion with Council, I think that requires the Council to actually think about what is our philosophy for doing this? What is our own way of wanting to make these decisions or to do this? Three years will go by so very quickly. I mean it's just nothing when you're talking about a number of organizations, the creative groups that want to participate. All of that. I think the public engagement is phenomenal. So, we're really grateful for that. I think it's time to get it down to something that's going to be around policy making which I think includes the private sector as well. If we're not going to do this in a way that Council needs to be able to say, "This is what we're trying to accomplish, and how do we get it done?" So, I think we have to get a giddy up on this one y'all.

Mr. Bokhari said yes, I'll direct this to Mayor Pro Tem and to some extent the manager. It seems like every single major initiative, the same two or three people are the only ones that are asked to do it and the rest of us respond to it for the first time in a meeting. That is such a bad use of our talent, it's such a bad use of time and once again, this is why we're at this point with this. It's Groundhog Day. The same people are behind the scenes asked to do all of the stuff, and we respond to it. If anyone in the community wants to know why we continue to not make progress on so many important topics, that's the root cause. So, I would ask you Mayor Pro Tem as the representative of Council and Mr. Manager as someone who's trying to direct and connect staff to do that, to figure out why that keeps happening when some of us are passionate about it and know how to structure an outcome that can have Council's voice heard.

Mayor Lyles said okay. Alright, is there any further comment or questions? So, what could be the expectation for the next step Mr. Jones? I know it's an economic development, which has five Council members on it. It's not just two. There are three additional members of the Council on this committee. So, if you are on the committee just raise your hand so that everybody is aware that this is something that you're working through.

Councilmember Watlington said I was just going to say in regard to Councilmember Bokhari's comments, how do we structure our information share so that those who want to be involved on the front end can be? Is there something that can be done there in terms of next steps?

Mr. Winston said so, there was kind of a three-part process. We wanted to gather the comments from Lord, from the interviews or sessions that they did with the previous council and summarize those into what we interpreted from those notes because they were given in note form, they weren't synthesized. Then what we were going to do was amongst the three of us, agree to is this what we all agree that we're seeing that's on the paper and then we were going to delegate between the three of us going to two or three council members saying, "Here, this is what the consultants have gotten from previous Council. Does this jive to what you want to see in the policy? If not, what do we need to add?" Aggregate that, come back together and bring all 11 of those feedbacks and try to again put something together, to Mr. Bokhari's point, that we can bring to the whole Council and say, "Hey, this is where we're all at. How do we work from all of this information to create a policy guided document for staff." What is it that five, six, seven of us agree on? One of us, two of us and therefore be able to have that kind of conversation.

Ms. Watlington said so, maybe then it will be something as simple as whatever those notes are so that everybody gets a view to it. That way for people who are interested in engaging more, they are able to do that on the front end.

Mr. Winston said that's the intent. That was pretty much the intent, it just has been logistical that that process has started but not has gotten as far as we would've liked at this point in time.

Mr. Graham said Madam Mayor, with all due respect, we've been at this for months. We just didn't start working on this. We've been at this for months. I want to commend the consultant group and the work they're doing in terms of doing what we asked them to do at our last economic development committee. We went back to the preamble as I call it, which is the white paper that the Manager put forth saying, "This is the direction that we're giving them." They have accomplished that. They have went out and talked to the community in making sure that the community are engaged and informed in a wide variety of ways. The three individuals you're talking about, it's a subset of the ED (Economic Development) Committee. So, it's not preferential treatment other than I stick by the statement you don't reward losers. So, the work is being done and everyone has an opportunity at the appropriate time to call the Manager, call Priya, voice your concerns. Everyone was interviewed.

Mr. Bokhari said the only problem is the losers are the citizens of Charlotte in this scenario.

Mayor Lyles said I think Ms. Watlington's point is a good one. If there's a structure to communicate and acknowledge and understand from each other, I think that's going to take us further. So, I would assume that would go through Priya's office. Nobody in this group is shy, and if you want to have something to say about this and what's working for you and what's not, I think if you sent that in writing to Priya then there's a way to deal with it. It has to go through some kind of council discussion in a way that everyone's weighing in. I think what I see is do you walk away and not comment or do you actually try to engage and how do we do that? So, I would suggest that we have a staff person that could accept that information and acknowledge it and send it out to everybody. That's what we ought to try to do.

Mr. Winston said I can share. To Mr. Bokhari's point, I will work on it. There's information that I can share with the whole Council. It really is I think about how do we best communicate and be able to put that information in one place that everybody can access and have the kind of work conversations that are needed to push it forward.

Mr. Jones said thank you Mayor and Members of Council. So, Shawn Heath will come back to give you an update of where we are with the city supported affordable housing. As you will recall, I think as early as September, we suggested there may be an issue with some of the funding for some of the affordable housing initiatives. Shawn was able to send out, for lack of a better word, an RFP (Request for Proposal) to see where the different developers were in terms of what gaps if any. Since the last time he was with you, the team has worked with some of our partners as well as the developers to give you an update. I can tell you that at a minimum I think we are trending in the right direction. So, with that said, I'll turn it over to Shawn.

Shawn Heath, Director of Housing & Neighborhood Services said thank you Manager Jones. Good evening, everyone. It's a relatively short presentation. We'll start with a very quick recap of the October 24th discussion. Also, a reminder on the evaluation criteria that we've been reliant upon as we receive these new funding requests. Then we'll spend the bulk of the time really focused on what's changed since October 24th when we last met. We'll finish off with a summary of some funding options which will be helpful for me to receive direct feedback from you in order for us to position this hopefully for a vote on November 28th.

From October 24th, you'll recall that at that point in time we had 17 previously approved Housing Trust Fund projects that had yet to close on financing. We've been referring to these as pending projects. As Manager Jones mentioned, in September we initiated an RFP. We felt like that was the best way to gather information in a consistent fashion and run all of these projects through a formalized process. We received all of the responses by October 5th. There were 11 pending projects that submitted requests and you may recall the aggregate amount of the request, it was discussed on October 24th, was \$32 million. We also discussed the amount of existing Housing Trust Fund resources, which on October 24th was \$6.7 million. That was really sourced from the nine percent LIHTC (Low Income Housing Tax Credit) deals from earlier in the year that did not receive funding from the state.

So, on October 24th what we were really grappling with was the size between the ask of \$32 million and the available resources of \$6.7 million. As Manager Jones also alluded to, that's what we've really been working on over the last few weeks, is to try to close that gap. Just a reminder here. The City is not obligated to provide additional gap funding. This is something that is your choice to do or not do and we agreed on October 24th that we'd come back with revised analysis and recommendations.

In terms of the criteria that we relied upon to review the requests that we received, it really falls into three buckets. First is cost-related factors. As I mentioned before, we looked at what is the amount, what is the magnitude of the change in the total development cost since the prior HTF (Housing Trust Fund) award was granted. We also looked at what are the strategies the developers relied upon to close the gaps on their own before they came to the city seeking additional funding. When the dust settles on those two variables, what you're left with is a revised cost per unit, which is essentially the common measuring stick that we've been accustomed to when we have conversations about Housing Trust Fund investment opportunities.

The second area of emphasis is on construction readiness. In all instances we've asked for the developers that are reflected in the recommendations this evening to confirm that they have a credible path to close their financing by March 31st of 2023. Then finally I would refer to other considerations. These are aspects of the quality of the unit so to speak. So, the AMI (Area Median Income) mix, the affordability period and project location, recognizing that projects in Corridors of Opportunity or near existing or future transit are variables of interest to us.

The last time when we met, there were some questions about how some of the math works related to our analysis on the cost related variables. So, what we've done here is we've just pulled one of the projects. So, this is an illustrative example, I will underscore the word illustrative. Each of the projects will look slightly different if we did the analysis like this, but we wanted to make sure we were being as transparent as possible with you. As we were talking about percentages last time, there were some questions about how do all these things reconcile with one another. So, here we've selected the Fairhaven Glen project and it all really starts with total development costs. So, on the first row, in the original proposal we received for this project in early 2021, the total development costs were estimated at \$26.8 million. In the revised proposal that we received in October of 2022, you can see the estimated development cost of \$35.8 million.

So, that \$9 million gap is clearly what's creating the challenge. That's where all of this really starts. For a market rate development, one of the key levers of course at their disposal would be to make new assumptions around rents in their proformas. That's not an option for these projects. By design, the revenue stream is capped at affordable rates. So, in this example you can see in the far-right column, what are the levers that this particular developer is leaning on in order to close that \$9 million gap. I've highlighted the HTF request just to highlight that all of the projects would be similar in this regard. In no instances are the developers coming to us and asking for us to close the entire gap that they're experiencing. So, in this particular situation it's 13 percent of the gap which is the \$1.2 million divided by \$9 million. Other things that they've done is increased their loan proceeds, the tax credit equity of course relates directly to their LIHTC funding and then they've also increased the amount of the deferred developer fee.

So, once again, this is just illustrative. All of the projects would look slightly different in this regard, but just wanted to give you a sense for what we mean when we say the cost related factors for each of these projects.

Okay, there's a lot to absorb on this slide, but we don't have to absorb it all. What I'd like to do is just quickly highlight what's here and really what hasn't changed and what has changed. So, going from left to right, these are the same 11 projects that were discussed on October 24th. In the second column there have been no changes to the type of projects. In the third column on affordable units, no changes to the affordable units. Previous city award. There's only one change there or modification that's highlighted down midway or so and I will explain that momentarily. When you get into the blue font area, that's really where we'll focus our attention. The new funding request as of October 24th, that's exactly what I shared with you last time, and if you look at the grand total there at the very bottom of \$32 million, that's the number that we were grappling with.

If you look at the next column, based on the discussions we've had with the developers, the work they've done to sharpen their pencils, you can see as of today, the aggregate request across all of these is roughly \$22 million. I won't go through each of these row by row, but I want to highlight a few things because when we talk about some of the recommendations, we may need to refer back to this. So, the boxes that are shaded in green reflect updates or changes since the last time we spoke about this topic. So, using the first project, for example Fairhaven Glen, no change to their funding request but they've increased their affordability commitment from 30 to 40 years. So, in the next one, I've audited Reedy Creek, they reduced their funding request from \$2.295 million to \$2 million and they increased their affordability period from 30 to 40 years.

So, fundamentally the bottom line on this particular slide is there are a number of things that have happened over the last few weeks that create a stronger value proposition for the city, whether it be reductions in the funding request, increases in the affordability period from 30 to 40 years or in one scenario, from 30 to 60 years. Pointing to the River District, which is the one that shows the \$2.5 million previous city award that's crossed out, so in conversations in Laurel Street, they remain committed to this particular project. We remain committed to working with them to find a way to move this forward,

but at this particular time, they've agreed to essentially rescind their new funding request of \$6.1 million and return the \$2.5 million in the previous HTF award. So, what we'll do now in partnership with them is go back to the drawing board over the next few months. They will reassess and retool the project and then we will look forward to receiving a new application from them next year, most likely to determine how to carry this particular project forward.

What that will do as a result is that \$2.5 million would get replenished into the HTF fund and would provide some capacity to move forward some of the projects above that are ready to go now and have reasonable cost per unit figures. I know there may be a lot of questions on this, but rather than me trying to over explain everything, I'm just going to keep moving on. I know we'll go back to this as needed.

Mr. Jones said I'm risking it a little bit by disturbing your flow, but I think it would be beneficial to explain to the Council that there are a couple of additional bites at the apple. Like, I believe the RFP for the 9 percent credits are going to go out I guess in the winter and then we typically have a spring or summer four percent. Could you just explain that to the Council, how that works?

Mr. Heath said yes. For sure. In a normal year we would have two RFPs and the first one would go out in December, and I have a slide at the end here where we'll talk a little bit about next steps. So, that would be generally speaking, city council is looking at recommendations from staff in the April and September-ish time periods. Calendar year 2022 was a little bit different because we had depleted the Housing Trust Fund earlier in the year because there were a lot of great project opportunities to be evaluated. So, I think there are still some questions that we need to grapple with internally about the optimal timing to release the next RFP. On one hand you could say, "Well we haven't done one since early this year, so we don't want to wait too long." On the other hand, we want to make sure that we've briefed you on the Housing Trust Fund tune up. We know the Housing and Job Summit is around the corner. So, there may be things, insights, directions from you that come out of those efforts that would be informative to our RFP.

We also want to find a way to ensure we're signaling to the developers far enough in advance to the extent we're making changes in our RFP, we don't want to surprise them. So, you could make the case that we do the winter RFP on the normal schedule, release it in December and that we really think towards the second RFP in terms of how we might make changes based on the Housing Trust Fund tune up and the Housing and Job Summit. So, that's just one potential way that could play out.

Councilmember Mitchell said that's apples and oranges in a way. I'm trying to focus on ones that we have made a commitment to and we're trying to fund them. I understand the City Manager is saying give us the normal process, but I have to be laser focused on what we have in front of us today. So, that's why I was frowning. We have made a commitment to these developers, and I think we need to concentrate on what's in front of us.

Mr. Heath said yes, and I would just underscore that I have a set of recommendations in here that would reflect move now, but in parallel to that I would say, for any projects that aren't funded today, there would be other opportunities, other bites at the apple going forward as well.

In terms of the status of the Housing Trust Fund itself, where we left off last time was \$6.7 million and I just made reference to the River District replenishment. Here, we're also, from a staff recommendation perspective suggesting that that the South Village Project prior Housing Trust Fund award should be allowed to expire. So, just to go back a slide for a moment. If you look near the bottom, it's the next to the bottom row with the project South Village Apartments. The previous award of \$3 million was in July of 2019. So, all of the other projects were awarded during calendar year 2021, this is the only one that goes back that far.

Our recommendation is to let that original award expire, we bring it back in to the trust fund, repurpose it for some other projects, but I would say on this one that DreamKey remains committed to this project. I believe for various reasons the city of Charlotte should remain committed to finding a way to move this project forward, but we need time to partner together to figure out possibly how to restructure it. It's not the sort of thing that we can sort out over the next two weeks. What we'd like to do is rather than hold that \$3 million in a holding pattern, we'd like to put it to work now knowing that we want to do our best to find a way to move the project forward but needing some more time to do that. So, that's what we're contemplating in terms of the expiration of that prior HTF award.

Ms. Mayfield said while we're on this slide I have a question to follow up on what you just explained. So, we're looking at allowing South Village Apartments to expire even though they were one of the RFPs that we received requesting \$4,705,245, we're saying we want to let that expire for it to potentially come back later. On this slide of what we're looking at right now, what you have highlighted are potentially the five proposals that we're moving forward with. So, let's say Galloway Crossing, initially we awarded \$2,496,000.

Mr. Heath said correct.

Ms. Mayfield said they're asking for an additional \$1.5 million. You all had conversations, got that to \$1 million making it \$3 million. How much of the \$2,496,000 has been spent? That's what I'm trying to get an idea of because I'm concerned that some of these requests that are coming, we're already seeing a shift in the market. We're seeing a shift regarding the cost of materials, access to materials, cost of labor, and honestly, the slowing down of mortgages and rentals. So, all of that has a play. I'm wondering if these numbers that we're looking at are numbers based off earlier this year when we were still at the height, or are these numbers more recent based on the market and the higher interest rates and the challenges that's causing? How much of the current award has already been spent before we're having real conversations about adding to that dollar amount?

Mr. Heath said thank you for the questions. I understand what you're getting at. First I would say that it's based on the most recent information we have, which is the RFP itself. So, this was submitted on October 5th. In some instances, a few days prior to that. So, I think it's fresh. I think it reflects the extraordinary market conditions that we're in now in terms of the prices that have been rising related to construction costs and then also the pressure on interest rates. So, this is based on recent information.

Then your second question in terms of how much of it has been spent. So, none of the previous city award funding has been released. So, in all instances we wait for these developments to move through their financing process and close on their financing and then we will structure an agreement where generally speaking the funds are drawn down during the construction period. So, you could look at the prior city awards and just think of all of those dollars in a bullpen. They're waiting on the project to close and once it closes then construction commences and we're 12 to 15 months away from having units brought online. So, what we're trying to do through these discussions with our development partners is move as many of these projects as we can towards affordability in terms of cost per unit from a city taxpayer perspective in order to get as many of these units online in the next 12 to 15 months as we possibly can.

Ms. Mayfield said so, I like the analogy of all of these funds sitting in the bullpen waiting to be released. It would be helpful to have the opportunity to review their additional funding. So, it may seem like it's not a lot of money that they're asking for from us, it would still be helpful to know how much is coming from other sources because my colleague said it perfectly a week or so ago. The city is not a bank. That's not our role. We have a role in this conversation, but we need to know that they were able to go out and to the best of their ability, secure the funds in other ways outside of giving me just the total number given that breakdown on these projects.

Full transparency, I am not a fan of the idea of committing current dollars on future projects. I'm really interested in the projects that are ready to come out the ground immediately, not in '24, not potentially in '25 because we have some very real needs that we're having to address, and we have to have some real conversations around our thoughts and plans for a recession. We don't know what it's going to look like but we know it's going to come and at the same time, we're having a mass foreclosure crisis happening across the nation. There are a lot of mitigating factors that are happening all around us that we also have to be prepared for because it is going to impact our residents having access to quality housing. So, I don't want to have us commit to projects that are much further down the line versus those that we can see almost immediate.

So, as the example we have here, Evoke Living at Morris Field, that project started a number of years ago. Those units are almost done. That's something where a little assistance, if decided upon, could get people into those units immediately versus a project that hasn't even broke ground or has much further to go. We have some projects out there that are much further along and that can have immediate connection to the community. So, it would just be helpful I think and it may be helpful for my colleagues as well to see that financial breakdown of how are you working towards achieving the balance of the funds so that you don't come back again and say, "Well this project is not going to happen, but for," because that's what I heard and that might not have been what you were really saying. What I heard with that bullpen example is but for government gives us this additional, this is not going to happen. Well Evoke Living is pretty much completed on where you are now. So, it was twofold when I asked about how much has been spent versus we do release it during certain phases. Some of these are in the phases where money has released. Thank you.

Mr. Heath said if I could just make two clarifications because I may have misspoken before. One is in all instances we have evaluated the sources and uses of funds reflected in the new funding proposals. So, this for Fairhaven Glen Apartments as I mentioned is an example where you can see the incremental HTF request of \$1.2 million represents 13 percent of the gap that's experienced as a result of the increase in total development cost. So, that was part of the analysis that we've done for all of the projects. I would say that there are not other multi-family projects that we have in front of us at this moment that could bring units online quicker than these particular projects. That's an important point. It's not like there are other projects that we could fund instead of these that would be ready to move through the entire development process and leapfrog these and have units online in calendar year 2023.

So, these are our best hope to bring units online as quick as possible. It's just a question of have we been successful enough in our negotiations over the last few weeks to get the cost per unit to a level that you're comfortable with.

Mayor Lyles said [INAUDIBLE].

Councilmember Anderson said thank you Madam Mayor. Thank you.

Mr. Mitchell said thanks Mayor. So, this is what happens when you've been around as long as dirt, you have a lot of history. Shawn, what I would ask is after this meeting if we can just share with all council the history around South Village Project. I think Tracy maybe City Manager and the Mayor maybe LaWana. So, South Village Project is a project we first gave to Peter Pappas. Peter Pappas tried to develop, did not have success. The city bought it back. Then we entered a partnership with the Charlotte Housing Partnership at the time which is now DreamKey. I say that to Council for three reasons. Number one, we asked for development along a light rail, and this is at the Scaleybark Station. Number two, we wanted a mixed-use affordable housing. So, in the South Village Project, it has 30 percent, 50 percent, 60 percent, and 80 percent and to Councilmember Johnson's point, it has 20 Section 8 vouchers for that project.

I just want Council to know the history so when he comes back November the 28th we can be clear if we do not support South Village Project. I don't want to send the

pti:mt

message to the affordable housing developer that we asked you to go out and do it, then we don't support you. This one is very unique from the sense that it's old, 2019, and it's going to be hard to develop affordable housing at a transit stop which we all agreed is very important to have mobility options for our citizens. So, I just want Council if you can, Shawn, for everybody to have the information so they know the history of it. This is a good project and I just want to make sure we're educated before we move forward to have that to expire. Okay? Thank you.

Ms. Anderson said Shawn, thank you for the presentation. I was looking forward to you walking through the three options that you laid out on slide nine. Can you provide some added dimension to those?

Mr. Heath said so, these are the three funding options. We thought it would be helpful to have options rather than walk in and say, "Here's what we think the answer is, and once again, seeking feedback from you on where is your comfort level across this continuum and these aren't the only three options. These are ones that we felt were logical. So, the way that this is structured is option one would basically be the lowest cost option, it's the lowest investment requirement, but it also sustains or preserves the lowest number of affordable units. So, you can see here that basically the vantage point for this option is if you wanted to essentially stick with your prior Housing Trust Fund guidelines. So, for example historically an RFP for multi-family rental we will allow for a cost per unit of up to \$32,000. There are only two projects, Fairhaven Glen and Avada at Reedy Creek that would meet that criteria. Bishop Madison is a homeownership scenario and the cost per unit for that particular project is lower than the cost per unit for a project that you last approved related to homeownership. So, we felt like it would be reasonable to put that in option one.

The total funding requirement would be \$3.4 million and there are 227 units associated with that. This may be a little bit easier to digest as a visual. This is basically the same slide that we were just looking at but we've narrowed it down to if you went with option one, these are the three projects that would be funded because they meet your historical guidelines.

If you wanted to do something that was a little more of an investment, kind of a middle of the road option here, and you based it on funding all projects with a cost per unit under \$63,000 and a closing date by March 31, 2023, that would allow you to pull in a few more projects. It would have an investment of \$8.9 million and there would be 409 units. So, basically the way this is working with option two, you're working your way through the stack. So, you're not accommodating two more projects. You can see in the revised cost per unit which is the second column from the right. It adheres to that criteria that I mentioned of things that are under \$63,000 a unit. Then if you wanted to go all the way to option three shown on here, which would be fund all projects with a cost per unit under \$70,000 and a closing date by March 31, 2023, under that scenario you get two additional projects. Ballantyne Seniors and Evoke Living. For this, the funding equation would need to look a little bit different because you would use up the \$12.2 million of HTF keeping in mind to Councilmember Mitchell's point. Part of that \$12.2 million is in an assumption that we are returning \$3 million from the South Village Scaleybark Project into the Housing Trust Fund now and working with them and expecting that they would reappear in the future.

There would also be a need to tap in to either some of the recently approved housing bond, the \$50 million approved last week by voters and/or ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act), but at a very modest amount of \$3.6 million. So, in exchange for that investment in either the new HTF or ARPA of \$3.6 million, the value proposition for this option is the number of units is increasing substantially from option two to option three. So, that's from 409 units to 623 units.

Then these two particular projects each have compelling value propositions. So, Ballantyne Seniors is in District 7. We've been working hard for a long time, much longer than I've been here working for the city, to get affordable housing in District 7 and we have an opportunity to do just that with Ballantyne Senior and it also has an

attractive AMI mix. Evoke Living is very compelling because it's squarely located within a Corridor of Opportunity, the Freedom/Wilkins Corridor where we're always looking for opportunities to layer investments. It's also 0.5 miles away from a planned transit stop for the west segment of the silver line. We've talked about the importance of trying to think ahead as it relates to investments and affordable housing, recognizing what will happen as we build out the silver line over time. Evoke Living also has a very attractive AMI mix as well. So, for that incremental investment, I think there's some incremental value that's received as well.

If you went to option three, this is what the funding would look like. You're stacking up everything except for the projects that are not in green. So, maybe it's easier to focus on what's not included in option three. River District, as we discussed with Laurel Street. They're voluntarily rescinding that request. We will work with them in the months ahead to reevaluate that. Lakewood Apartments, I should've mentioned that earlier. The reason we've taken that off the table for this conversation is we feel like there's a very viable federal funding source for that particular project. We'd rather put that into the federal funding source category, keep this conversation focused just on projects that would require a local funding source. South Village Apartments we've talked about. As Councilmember Mitchell said, there are a lot of reasons why we'd be attracted to finding a way to make this work in the future, one of which is the fact that it's contemplated to be on city owned land.

So, we want to find a way to make it work. We just don't believe that right now with this particular proposal, this is the time to move forward with the funding recommendation. You can see the cost per unit is \$94,000ish. Easter Home is a permanent supportive housing project that at this point we would just like to keep it in a holding pattern. We'd like to work more the DreamKey over the next few months to sort that one out. The prior award for that one was \$630,000 and we do not recommend at this point that we return that back to the Housing Trust Fund. We would just like more time to work on that one.

So, those are three funding options. I know I went through those pretty quickly. One last slide and then I'll open up for any additional questions. What we're asking for tonight is more direct feedback on the funding options themselves. As an additional next step, we do need to evaluate what's the appropriate timing for the next traditional HTF RFP given some of the variables that I mentioned in the conversation earlier. So, with that I will pause for any other questions and feedback.

Ms. Anderson said thank you Shawn.

Mr. Jones said so, thank you Mayor, thank you Shawn. One of the things that I'd like to do, and it's in part to address your comment Mr. Mitchell, is that if we go to option three that recommendation's option, there could probably be an option four if you did them all. So, I would say the starting point is that once you start to cross over to this option three and beyond would be a beginning of going into ARPA or into the next Housing Trust Fund, the \$50 million. We can talk about how that would work. So, \$3.6 million is where we started, if we did what was formerly known as Scaleybark you would just add \$3 million to that and that would be \$6.6 million. I think Shawn that one of the things, and maybe this door has closed, you had a couple of these that received CHOIF (Charlotte Housing Opportunity Investment Fund) funding and did you get any movement on the CHOIF for those projects? Are we still holding out some hope there?

Mr. Heath said I've had conversations with LISC (Local Initiatives Support Corporation) and they've been very proactive in trying to work through some potential snares, but I don't have anything to share tonight in terms of a commitment for particular incremental funds that they could bring to the table.

Ms. Watlington said thank you. I have a few questions and I think this one was already addressed but just so I'm clear. Whenever we give money, it's ahead of the financing. So, none of these projects are in progress at the time of award for Housing Trust Fund?

Mr. Heath said that's right. None of these projects have closed financing yet.

pti:mt

Ms. Watlington said okay.

Mr. Heath said so, certainly they have not started construction.

Ms. Watlington said okay. The next question I have is can you go back to any of the slides that show the overview of the projects? Yes, I'd like to understand a little bit more about the rationale or what drives this affordability commitment because I would think that there would some kind of linear relationship between the revised city cost per unit and the number of years with the exception of the homeownership which I would imagine maybe is done through a deed restriction or something of that nature. Can you explain what would drive for instance a \$62,000 cost per unit at 60 years and then look at a \$65,000 cost per unit at 40 years?

Mr. Heath said yes. It's a hard question to answer only because each one of these is going to have a different profile underneath of it, in terms of the sources and uses of funds and on the affordability commitments. A lot of the changes, maybe all of the changes, are really driven by the revised financing that they're relying on in order to find other solutions to close their gaps. So, that's just a longwinded way of saying that the revised affordability commitments here are more attractive than what we typically see because it's usually going to be 30 years. The flip side of the coin is it's really a byproduct of some of the things they've had to do to close their gap. So, for example, some of them have pursued what's called a (d)(4) loan through HUD (Housing and Urban Development) and under that kind of a scenario, it's a 40-year amortization period which then puts them in a position to commit to a 40-year affordability period as opposed to what would've traditionally been 30 years.

I'm not giving you a direct answer only because each one of them has a different profile in terms of land acquisition costs, construction costs, financing costs, other soft costs that are associated with the deal itself. There's not always going to be a direct correlation between cost per unit across the board. It's kind of a blunt instrument in terms of comparison, but typically the best one that we have to compare across deals.

Ms. Watlington said okay. That would be something I'd be interested to see if there's an opportunity to increase some of those years for some of the more expensive projects to us.

Mr. Heath said I don't think we can go beyond. I feel like we've pushed on that as far as we can. I don't envision there's anything we can do between now and the end of the month that would change those numbers on the affordability commitments.

Ms. Watlington said so, you've already explicitly asked them to extend?

Mr. Heath said yes, all of those were 30 years before. So, I think that's a material change to me in a beneficial direction to go from 30 to 40, or in the case of DreamKey from 30 to 60.

Ms. Watlington said okay. Then my next question is right now we're talking about voting on the 28th. In the event that doesn't happen, for the projects that have suspension dates prior to year-end, can you tell us which ones those are?

Mr. Heath said so, we've asked that all of the projects affirm that they can close their financing by March 31st of 2023. Some of them have expressed the ability to close as soon as possible, like very quickly if there's a favorable outcome on November 28th. I don't have a list in front of me that shows what the soonest potential closing date is for each one of these. I just know the latest closing date across the board is March 31st of 2023.

Ms. Watlington said okay, the reason I asked is because I know there's at least one project that will be impacted in terms of having to go and readjust all of their finances because their interest rates will change if they don't close by the end of the year. So, I just want to make sure that as we're having these conversations, we have all the

information so that if something does get delayed or the council chooses to make an option that pushes out past the 28th that we can make sure the ones that need to be closed sooner are taken care of.

Mr. Heath said yes. You know, I won't try to predict the future, but I know that based on the last six months in the informal conversations we had and then in the formal conversations which then translated into the formal RFP process, we've continued to see things kind of eroding in the wrong direction with construction costs and with interest rates. That's the gamble we take, right? If some of these were pushed into next year, we can really only speculate what would happen, but it wouldn't be unreasonable to think that the gaps would only get bigger.

Ms. Watlington said right. I just wanted to know if there's anything that needs to be addressed, yes or no before the 28th, that we know those very clearly. The next thing I have is if you could go to the options overview. Here. So, I want to make sure I'm interpreting this correctly. I see 623 units that are affordable for \$16 million. That's the same 623 that we were expecting before this exercise began? Okay.

Mr. Heath said yes, those aren't new units per se, it's just they're units that require gap funding in order to make them real.

Ms. Watlington said so, essentially if we chose option two instead of option three for instance, we basically save \$7 million and we are net negative 200 units?

Mr. Heath said yes.

Ms. Watlington said okay. Then my last question, because we've had these conversations about certain options taking us into ARPA or potentially the new Housing Trust Fund dollars, I would much prefer that we use ARPA dollars to do this because I do have some concern that we continue down the path that we're on with Housing Trust Fund. I would like to see us leverage our dollars to acquire more land and even work with developers on long term leases or something. Something that allows us to retain some level of ownership and also that we are able to, to Councilmember Mayfield's point, see the value immediately with the dollars that are committed. So, that's it for me.

Mayor Lyles said so, as a follow up, I just wanted to make sure that I understood. Are there any other of these developments that are going to be built on City owned property?

Mr. Heath said not that I'm aware of. I know the team will text me if I've misspoke.

Mayor Lyles said okay, I say that because I do think that is an important issue. I should've said it the other way. Are all of these projects that we are talking about under any of the options, they have control of the land.

Mr. Heath said yes.

Mayor Lyles said that's probably the way that I should've framed it. I also wonder, some of the developers have used additional money from other sources and they've captured everything that they can whether it's through the federal home loan banks and all of the other opportunities, CHOIF, all of those and this is where they are.

Mr. Heath said yes, that was a big reason for doing the RFP and Zelleka Biermann and Warren Wooten on the housing team have spent the last few weeks, really over the last month evaluating each of the proposals to ensure we feel comfortable that these developers have made a good faith attempt to exhaust other options to the fullest extent.

Ms. Johnson said thank you Mayor. I just wanted some clarification. So, South Village is on City owned land right?

Mr. Heath said correct.

Ms. Johnson said okay. South Village is that the only one that's being developed by a traditional affordable housing developer?

Mr. Heath said could you clarify the question Ms. Johnson?

Ms. Johnson said so, who's the developer for South Village?

Mr. Heath said DreamKey.

Ms. Johnson said right. So, DreamKey, when I think of affordable housing, I think of DreamKey.

Mr. Heath said yes.

Ms. Johnson said so, are any of the other projects being developed by an affordable housing developer?

Mr. Heath said yes. Yes, a lot of these projects are being developed by local partners you'd be familiar with. Laurel Street, Crosland. Then there's some other ones that you may be less familiar with but we're very familiar with on the housing team. They're very seasoned affordable housing developers, including SGC, Woda, Commonwealth to name a few.

Ms. Johnson said the reason I ask is I've called DreamKey numerous times and they're a solution in the community. They step up. they've been there for very low-income residents as far as the hotels and the motels. They've just been a partner throughout this crisis. I would want to consider that as we're considering the decision. If this is on city owned land, this is a developer who's been in the affordable housing game for a long time and will continue and provides the solution with or without housing tax credit dollars, this is what they do. So, I believe that if we committed to them specifically and we want to really consider that some way because they are truly a solution in our community. Laurel Street does a great job, Crosland, they all do, but I know throughout the COVID crisis, I can call DreamKey right now if there's someone that's in need. I think we need to really consider; I would want to consider that. Is South Village Apartments considered? So, I'd like to see an option where it would be considered.

When I'm looking at the option criteria, the construction readiness, they've all committed to closing by March of 2023. So, that's the same for all of them. The AMI mix, do any of them that you recommended have a greater AMI mix or a greater commitment to the lower AMI or anything unique?

Mr. Heath said yes. As I transition into answering that question, I did also want to say that Grounds for Change, which is a DreamKey project and it's shown here maybe five down, is included in both recommendation two and funding recommendation three for an incremental funding amount of \$4.5 million.

Ms. Johnson said okay.

Mr. Heath said I just wanted to acknowledge that. To your question, yes each of the projects has its own AMI mix. All of the projects would adhere to your requirement that at least 20 percent of the units be devoted to 30 percent AMI or below. South Village does have an attractive AMI mix. Grounds for Change has an exceptionally strong AMI mix. I think South Village, once again, from staff's perspective, it was really the cost implications of that project with it being close to \$94,000 a unit that made it an outlier for us. Which is the only reason it was not included in the recommendation set this evening.

Ms. Johnson said I understand. So, there's a specific AMI mix that's required to even apply for housing tax credit, the 20 percent at 30 percent AMI. We know that. So, what I'm asking, and you might've given this to us before, but if we can see it or point me to

the document that shows the AMI mix. Because again, the city is not a bank. The city is in the business of taking care of the public if you will. You know, public dollars are for public good. So, I think that we should look at the AMI mix and make that one of the considerations. Who is providing solutions for our hardest to house? I think that should be a very strong solution, the AMI mix, if there's an exceptional AMI mix. Yes, I think that's one thing we should look at. Again, I really think we should consider those affordable housing providers because again, they're providing this housing when no one else is. They don't just rely on the tax credit. So, I think we really need to consider who the developer is. Thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera arrived at 6:37 p.m.

Mr. Jones said okay so, Shawn, just a little clarification for me also. So, the River District, I forget the term that you used, but the one that's off the table. To some extent, I think you said earlier that all the closing dates were in March. That one is actually I thought in October or is that now March?

Mr. Heath said no. Thank you. That one is in November of '23.

Mr. Jones said okay, and then it seems like the conversation that's happening now is that if South Village Apartments were added to option four now, then it may be an option five, and option six. You would take the \$4.7 million and add it to the \$3.6 million?

Mr. Heath said if we add South Village, we would have to add the full \$7.7.

Mr. Jones said okay.

Mr. Heath said because option three assumes that the \$3 million prior award is returned. Yes.

Mr. Jones said so that would be all of the projects that are I guess ready to go by March and I think you said the Easter Homes, we're working through that one?

Mr. Heath said yes. That one does have a closing date targeted before March 31st. It's just that we wanted more time to work through the opportunity given the cost per unit at \$122,000.

Mr. Jones said so, Ms. Mayor, and I'll stop. I think at least what I've heard from a few Council members is having at least one more option, an option four that includes South Village Apartments.

Mr. Winston said thank you. So, the crux of why staff is not recommending South Village Apartments and Easter Homes be part of the options right now is because the price per unit is too expensive.

Mr. Heath said yes, that's the main consideration for sure.

Mr. Winston said you mentioned that Easter Homes, you're not recommending putting that \$630,000 back into the pot to pay for something else because you think that could be reworked?

Mr. Heath said yes. A couple of reasons there. First the HTF award itself, the expiration date isn't until December 31st of this calendar year. So, we couldn't bring it back before then even if that was our desire to do so. Second, if we return that \$630,000 it's going to complicate the financing that DreamKey is putting in place for that project in a way that we didn't think was wise.

Mr. Winston said okay. So, it could come back to us in the future.

Mr. Heath said that would be our hope.

Mr. Winston said with South Village Apartments, the price per unit is too high, but you are recommending putting that money back into the Housing Trust Fund. You're saying that especially since our land is involved in this, at this point in time it might not be the right investment from staff's recommendation, but the idea is that this could come back as well in the future?

Mr. Heath said yes. We would like to return the \$3 million and sit down and have an all options on the table conversation about that particular location. Is there a way to rework the proposal? Could the existing proposal be made better in some fashion? We would like to have time to really work through that with DreamKey. Let's say we went through that process, and we became comfortable that everything under the sun has been done to get this project as close to the affordability that you're accustomed to, then I'd be happy to come back in and provide a strong recommendation that we move forward with it as is. I believe we need more time to go through that analysis based on the size of the request, but we didn't want to hold up everything else while that work is ongoing.

Mr. Winston said basically if we take the Housing Trust Fund dollars from that South Village Apartments Project right now, our land is still committed. This was a complicated deal when it initially happened, when it changed and when it changed again. Our city land would still be committed. We're not removing the commitment to developing an affordable housing at that site, but staff is telling council this is not the right situation right now, but we think we can get to a place where affordable housing will be developed at this very desirable site, but at a lower cost per unit in the future.

Mr. Heath said I think that's a fair summation, yes.

Mr. Winston said thank you. The only other comment that I would ask is Ms. Watlington added it. I would like to see us fill the gap with as much Housing Trust Fund dollars as possible. I think that's what it's there for and our ARPA dollars are more dynamic in use and I'd like to see those things balanced. Thank you.

Mr. Driggs said so, South Village, were you talking about this Mr. Mitchell? Is that the old Scaleybark?

Mr. Mitchell said there you go sir.

Mr. Driggs said with Ms. Campbell I remember. We went through several rounds there. They were applying for 9 percent LIHTC and not getting it and that's one of the reasons we couldn't move ahead. So, are we now assuming 4 percent or 9 percent there? I guess it says four percent.

Ms. Mitchell said 4 percent and it's a tax credit.

Mr. Driggs said is the city land being donated in addition to this funding request?

Mr. Heath said yes. I haven't looked at the specifics of the planned conveyance, but that's generally our practice when we use city owned land for affordable housing. It's done at a discount.

Mr. Driggs said we need to know that though Shawn.

Mayor Lyles said didn't we buy it?

Mr. Driggs said if that's a City cost as well as these dollars, that needs to be clear.

Mayor Lyles said we bought that land Mr. Driggs.

Mr. Mitchell said yes, we bought it back from Pappas. The Mayor is right.

Mr. Driggs said yes, I know, but now we're talking about contributing that land and not having that development pay for it. So, that's another cost of that development which should be clear.

Mr. Heath said I think the only point I would make is the only thing that's changed on South Village is the incremental gap translating to an incremental request for \$4.7 million. Everything that a previous Council became comfortable with related to City owned land and the use of Housing Trust Fund resources up to \$3 million was already approved by Council.

Mr. Driggs said I know, but you're talking \$93,000 a door without taking into account the fact that we're donating land as well. I think that needs to be in the calculation.

Mayor Lyles said I'm going to go downstairs and start our meeting because we have some that last time we didn't get to the proclamation, and they were very hurt by that. So, Mayor Pro Tem can do this. Let's hope that we can get through this topic. I think this is our last one and remember, we have four closed sessions to do after this. Okay? Thank you.

Ms. Anderson said I just have a very quick question for you Shawn. The next time, can you provide for the three options on slide eight? Would it be possible for you to provide the AMI mix for each one of those three items?

Mr. Heath said sure. Oh yes.

Ms. Anderson said okay, thank you.

Mr. Heath said on a per project basis?

Ms. Anderson said yes.

Mr. Heath said yes. Oh yes.

Ms. Anderson said thank you.

Ms. Molina said first of all, I'm looking at the original ask. I think the original ask based on this information was substantially higher. First of all I just want to commend you for your work because this is a substantial difference and we're talking about a difference of about 130 units. So, your team really went to work on this and I see some gaps. I realize that you may even be dealing with time constraints for these projects. We're dealing with the budget portion. The only thing I would ask is, I'm just asking for clarification. The seven that you chose from the 11, are they shovel ready projects? So, these are projects that are ready to go? Is that what the rationale is behind and then the other three are contingencies because they're not ready to go for some reason or another? Is that what the rationale is?

Mr. Heath said so, all of the seven we believe are ready to move forward and ready to close no later than March 31st of 2023.

Ms. Anderson said okay. So, then my subsequent question to add to that would be if we're ready, are the additional funding for the other projects, would they be ready? How would you deal with that contingency if they weren't?

Mr. Heath said for the seven projects that we're recommending?

Ms. Anderson said absolutely.

Mr. Heath said yes, that's been part of the analysis to ensure that they have a credible path forward to close on the financing by that point in time, with our gap funding obviously being a critical piece in that puzzle in order for that to work out.

Ms. Anderson said okay.

Mr. Heath said we're comfortable with the seven that we've put forward and depending on council's movement on this going forward, we would likely put a requirement in there that they do close by March 31st or the incremental funding would not be available beyond that date. Because otherwise we get stuck in these scenarios where the HTF dollars are kept captive.

Ms. Anderson said absolutely.

Mr. Heath said yes.

Councilmember Ajmera said okay. Thank you. If you could go to slide number five where you have an example for Fairhaven. So, a developer fee in the revised proposal column, \$600,000. We were told when you did this presentation last time that developer fees were not increased.

Mr. Heath said that's correct, yes.

Ms. Ajmera said so, what happened here?

Mr. Heath said so, it's the distinction between the aggregate amount of the developer fee versus when they will receive that fee. So, in any scenarios where the deferred developer fee is growing as it is here, from a cash flow perspective that enables them to close their gap. So, the increase from \$300,000 to \$600,000 is beneficial to us because it's \$300,000 that otherwise they would've requested we close through the Housing Trust Fund. That increase from \$300,000 to \$600,000 does not mean that their aggregate developer fee is changing. It just means that the timing of when they will receive it has been changed.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, so the way I understand this. The longer it takes for a project to complete, the developer fee will increase?

Mr. Heath said no. There's nothing in any of these scenarios where the developer fees are growing. The aggregate amount of the developer fee over the life of the project is remaining constant. What is changing is many of the developers, in order to help close their gaps are agreeing to defer their fee which is less advantageous to them. So, they're taking steps which make the project more attractive in terms of the HTF request but it's less advantageous to them.

Ms. Ajmera said got it. As my colleague mentioned earlier, I certainly appreciate the work that has gone into this, especially looking at the per unit cost. I know that was one of my concerns last time when we were looking at all of these deals where we have \$122,000 per unit. That takes up resources from other affordable housing projects. So, I'm glad to see what's being presented right now. Thank you.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you. Shawn, one thank you for your grace because Evoke is all over the place and I kept mixing up Evoke off of Arrowood and Evoke that's coming off of Morris Field. You were gracious enough not to say, "Councilmember Mayfield, two different locations." I appreciate that, but we need it right for the record.

Mr. Heath said okay.

Ms. Mayfield said here's the question that I have, along with the fact that I support my colleague Councilmember Watlington, on the fact that I am not interested in hitting new HTF funds that we just approved. We can utilize those ARPA funds that we have available, but when we look at this breakdown that you showed us on funding option number two in comparison to the gap funding request for pending projects. The five that you identify on this page, Ovata, Galloway, Bishop, Grounds for Change, Evoke Living at Morris Field, when you go to funding option two that has five, you have Fairhaven Glen, Ovata, Galloway, Bishop Madison and Grounds for Change. So, I don't know

where that changed. We don't have to go into that tonight, but if you can bring that back because you gave us five initially of which all of us asked about, are these the five that's recommended. Then when we go into the funding options of one, two and three, on two which lists five, it's not the same five that we originally identified on this page.

So, I don't know if that maybe was just a transposition error or what. I know we're running late on time. So, you can get that back to us, but I want to make sure that we're actually looking at what is being proposed because these five are not the five that you have in option two. For option three, if we were to go look at it, I really would have concern about allocating any new HTF funds. Thank you.

Mr. Jones said clarification. Shawn, so I believe that what happened the last time you presented it before council, there was a number of cost per unit, but because folks brought some of their costs down, one or two of these leap frogged others. So, that's why you saw a difference in the list because some of them became cheaper per unit.

Ms. Mayfield said then it should be reflected on this page. It would be helpful if this is the most recent information that we're getting, on this page the five that are highlighted, it would make more sense if these were the five that were noted in option one, two or three.

Mr. Bokhari said yes just for you guy's takeaway. One, making sure that we have a view of the total cost as was just said of every bit of city value going in into the ultimate dollar amount. Two, I think Mr. Driggs had a really good point that he just said a second ago. I would really like to see when you look at all in, the end product of all of this which is somebody goes into an affordable housing unit that will be available to them at X dollars a month for the next X years. How much are we paying for that reduction? Because at the end of the day, if we're paying, to Mr. Driggs' point he just made a second ago, \$800 to get a \$400 reduction, there's probably other ways we could do that. I think we need to see that across the board, especially with these numbers jumping up. I don't know that I've seen that view. I think that's really important. So, I didn't want that to leave without being asked for.

Mr. Mitchell said to go back to Mr. Driggs's point. Mr. Driggs, on South Village the city will own the land and DreamKey will lease it. Secondly, I think we all see big numbers and one thing Councilmember Johnson reminded me, maybe we can engage CBI (Charlotte Business INClusion). What will be the minority participation we want to set. This is a lot of city dollars we're spending and so we need to make sure that we set our aspiration goals for minority participation on all this construction. We can really make a difference for our CBI firms, those who are registered certified to work on these projects. Thank you.

Ms. Johnson said thank you. I agree. This is a carrot. These are public dollars and again, we're not a bank. I can't say that too much. So, these projects should meet our priorities. When you look at \$93,000 for South Village, they've committed that 48 percent of their units are going to be under 60 percent AMI. So, that does cost. If you look at Easter Home, that's supportive housing. Councilmember Bokhari, you've talked about workforce housing and having supportive services. So, that's another project that meets the needs. So, I would like to see the AMI breakdown, again what the impact is on the community because I think that's how we should measure these dollars.

I said it last week, I'd like to see which one of the developers is going to commit to banning the box. This is an opportunity to use our funds to really leverage and get what we want. So, again, if we could have the AMI breakdown. I just read about South Village. Almost half the units to be under 60 percent. That's the kind of impact that we need in our community. Again, I say supportive housing. That's the only supportive housing. The homeownership. Those are the things that we should look at. We should look at impact analysis in order to consider. So, that's just my thought. Thank you.

Mayor Pro Tem Winston said thank you all for the discussion. We'll continue to the business meeting downstairs.

* * * * *

The meeting was recessed at 6:57 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 14, 2022, at 7:03 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Danté Anderson, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Reneé Johnson, LaWana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Marjorie Molina, Victoria Watlington, Braxton Winston, II.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

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

* * * * *

AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

Mayor Lyles said so our next recognition is a joint proclamation between the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County. I would like to invite Mr. Randall Hite to come downstairs to receive this proclamation. Thank you. Alright, you stand right there, I'll come to you okay, this is a joint proclamation between the city and the county.

ITEM NO. 6: HOMELESSNESS AWARENESS MONTH

Mayor Lyles read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, the month of November welcomes in both a time of thanksgiving and a season for sharing our resources, our freedoms to worship, work and live interdependently as possible.

WHEREAS, some members of our community cannot find adequate employment or a place to live for a variety of reasons, both simple and complex.

WHEREAS, there are efforts to bring homeless children and adults out of the shadows of our abundance, to address the diverse needs among them as well as to correct systematic conditions that have led to poverty and homelessness.

WHEREAS, our current economic challenges call for greater awareness and guidance to address the needs among all our neighbors.

WHEREAS, the Homeless Services Network of Charlotte Mecklenburg, its member organizations and public partners in the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County desire to dispel myths and overcome stereotypes of homelessness and to provide opportunities for all our citizens to learn about the plight, the hopes and the achievements of homeless neighbors our community and to welcome them. We commit to work together to overcome systematic causes of homelessness.

NOW, THEREFORE, we, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte and George Dunlap, Chair of Mecklenburg County Board of Commissioners do hereby proclaim the month of November 2022 as

“HOMELESSNESS AWARENESS MONTH”

in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County and urge all of our citizens to do more than just honor this observance. We ask them to actually do something about it.

Thank you very much. Mr. Hite, I'm going to give this proclamation to you as a part of your work and commitment that you have for us all.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 7: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I do not have a report tonight, Mayor.

* * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 8: JUNETEENTH HOLIDAY

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera and carried unanimously to adopt a resolution to establish Juneteenth Independence Day as an annually recognized city holiday in which city offices will be closed.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 532-533.

Mayor Lyles said this is very significant. While we acknowledge that many of us can look at this today and say, “Well it’s been needed and necessary,” I think that we also have to remember that at a time, there were people that didn’t know about this and they suffered much, much longer than necessary. Even today when we talk about how we’re dealing with equity in our community, I think this is a recognition in a way to say that we’re very serious about this kind of action and the policies that we put together. So, thank you for the agenda.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 9: LAND ACQUISITION FOR EXPANSION AND UPDATE OF CHARLOTTE FIRE STATION #21

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham, seconded by Councilmember Driggs and carried unanimously to (A) Approve the purchase of 0.44 acres, located at 1017 Little Rock Road, for the expansion and update of Charlotte Fire Station #21, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute any documents necessary to complete this transaction.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you. I just wanted to go back to the Manager’s report. I know he didn’t have one, but I’m wondering if we can get some update or some information on the delay in the 911 calls?

Mayor Lyles said oh yes.

Ms. Johnson said I sent an email to you. There’s been a couple emails this week about a delay, individuals being placed on hold when they’re calling 911. Is there any update about that?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said yes. I believe we sent something to Council twice, but what I'll do is talk to Jason and see how we can address some of the questions you have.

Councilmember Mayfield said those would be right for manager support?

Mayor Lyles said alright.

Councilmember Ajmera said yes, that was from communication, right?

Mr. Jones said exactly.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, those are talking points for the media. We really need to understand and get to the bottom of this as to why there is just so much delay in response time. At least that's what we have been told by constituents.

Mr. Jones said yes. So, we will convert that from me to you, but I do believe that that correspondence indicator there isn't a delay in response times that was reported. We'll make sure we get that report to you.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, if we could get a briefing on that at one of our dinner briefings because we have received multiple emails from constituents directly that they had to wait for more than two minutes just to get emergency services.

Mr. Jones said okay. Will do.

Mayor Lyles said alright. Now I'd like to recognize our City Attorney for a motion to go into closed session. I know that we have several items.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said yes. I'm going to call for it all on one.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: CLOSED SESSION

| |
|--|
| <p>Motion was made by Councilmember Winston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to go into closed session pursuant to G.S. 143-318.11 (a)(3), to consult with City Attorney in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege between the Attorney and the City Council in the following matters: Bonner versus City of Charlotte, Wright et al. versus City of Charlotte, Smith Pfeiffer et al. versus City of Charlotte and pursuant to G.S. 143-318.11 (a)(4), to discuss matters relating to the location of industries or businesses within the City of Charlotte, including potential economic development incentives that may be offered in negotiations.</p> |
|--|

The meeting was recessed at 7:20 p.m. for a closed session in Room 267.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m. at the conclusion of the closed session.


Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk MMC, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 2 Hours, 2 Minutes
Minutes completed: February 13, 2024