

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for an Action Review on Monday, July 11, 2022, at 5:02 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Julie Eiselt, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Matt Newton, Gregg Phipps, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston, II.

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmember Larken Egleston

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said this meeting is being held as a virtual meeting in accordance with applicable law governing remote meetings with some Council members participating remotely. The requirements of notice, access and minutes are met as required by law. You can view this on our Government Channel, the City's Facebook Page, or the City's YouTube Page.

* * * * *

ACTION REVIEW

Mayor Lyles said alright, so let's go ahead and call the action review to order. We have this meeting in advance of items that we will eventually have a council to review, question and vote. So, what this gives the city council members is an opportunity to talk about issues that are coming up early in the calendar and to determine if those items are ready or if there are other comments and suggestions and requests for them. So, we will begin our action review of these items letting you know that we are having these meetings in accordance with applicable law governing meetings. I think all our council members will eventually be here. I'm going to start with introductions. With that, as we begin the Action Review, we have two items on our agenda tonight. The first is arts and culture update. Now I'm going to ask the manager to start our session.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: ACTION REVIEW AGENDA OVERVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said thank you Mayor and members of council. You may recall at an earlier council meeting there was a request to have a discussion about the Arts and Culture Advisory Board prior to having any of the FY23 allocations released. So, tonight what we'll attempt to do is give you an update of where we are as well as get feedback from the council. I will start off because I've been familiar with this for the last couple of years, then I'll turn it over to our Arts and Cultural Officer, Priya Sircar as well as the chair of the Arts and Culture Advisory Board, Cyndee Patterson, but I will start off by doing a little bit of a snapshot of presentations that the council has seen over the course of the last couple of years.

So, with that said, if we start off with the February 5, 2020, Budget Workshop, and for some of the council members who were just sworn in that previous December, this became a discussion about where the city would go in terms of arts and culture. In that workshop, what was provided was a snapshot of not just the roughly \$3.2 million that was provided to the ASC (Arts and Science Council) to disseminate grants throughout the community, but also a broader discussion about the city's contributions to arts and culture in general and that's service, or city-owned facilities as well as maintenance on city-owned cultural facilities as well as contributions to public art. If we were even to fast forward to FY23, if you take into account the contribution that is in the infusion fund, this number approaches approximately \$20 million.

So, I think it's important and there's a lot of good information that's going to come out tonight and we're going to hear about city-owned facilities and artists and flex funds, but this all started again back in 2020 with the conversation about these seven city-owned facilities and the debt service and the maintenance that we have in them. So, to the far left you have the Mint Museum Uptown and the Mint Museum Randolph. You have the

Blumenthal Performing Arts, you have the Knight's Theater, the Harvey Gantt Center, Bechtler Museum of Modern Art, and Discovery Place. So, these again seven city facilities as well as other organizations that utilize them such as the symphony, the ballet and the Opera Carolina caused us to think a bit about what's the future of arts and culture. Again, this is prior to COVID-19 that this conversation was happening. Also, what was happening in that workplace giving was drying up.

Councilmember Egleston arrived at 5:08 p.m.

Even when you start to think about the United Way today and what's going on with United Way. Nothing to do with any type of performance from an organization, but workplace giving both individual workplaces giving corporate and foundation giving and individual nonwork place giving. If you start from 2014, the same presentation we had a couple of years ago, to look at 2018 that declined of \$2.6 million was not insignificant.

So, I think this is the key. We have these operating grants that are going to a number of recipients, and this has fluctuated over the years from under 20 organizations to the 38 that we've been discussing over the last couple of years. If you start to take a look at this, you see the peak in these grants was back in 2009, right around the great recession. Then as we were about to approach 2021, that number had gone down to 4.3 million. So, before COVID, this first conversation was around, what happens after this workplace giving continues to dry up? Thirty-eight organizations I think it's important to just put it out there because sometimes people think well they're just the [INAUDIBLE] or what are these organizations? So, I tried to divide them into three categories. One is those thriver organizations which you are familiar with, many of which were on the previous slide. Then we also have starting in 2017 I believe, there was a number of organizations in ALAANA (African, Latinx, Asian, Arab, Native American) organizations also started to get a portion of the funding. I will tell you that if you start to think about what the impact was of the thrive organizations from that peak to that 2021, I'll just call it the valley. That's almost a 67 percent overall cut in the grants that were going to those organizations.

When we start to look at the ALAANA organizations, because they came in later in the process the reductions weren't significant. As a matter of fact, as you start to look at what's happening with the Infusion Fund from 2021 to 2022, those organizations went from approximately \$350,000 to well over a million. So, again if we start to think about what the council was trying to do, what the Infusion Fund is trying to do, trying to get equity, trying to make sure that there's more money in the ecosystem and even building on the ecosystem, these are just three data points I wanted you to have. The remaining organizations, we just put them in alphabetical order, but again it is spread throughout the community. It's not just a bucket of money for the facilities in which we pay debt service on.

So, we fast forward to the annual strategy meeting. January of 2021, we're in the midst of COVID and what the city council did at that annual strategy meeting was look at three key questions. It was, how to service a leader and deploying a comprehensive arts and culture strategy as an economic development tool. How to increase the sustainable public and private support, and then how can we partner with other cultural institutions, artists and stakeholders that were recovering from COVID-19? That led to the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee which had a charge to develop a policy of arts and culture as the economic development strategy for Charlotte. There were meetings in February which the Ad Hoc Committee provided principles. There was a June meeting which there were recommendations to establish this Arts and Cultural Advisory Board and then in October, there was an opportunity for the Ad Hoc Committee to meet with Priya, our new Arts and Cultural Officer.

So, in the budget there was this three-year plan in which a combination of general fund dollars and ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funds would be the public contribution with the concept of having \$12 million a year over a three-year period. I believe the private sector actually 20 million. We have this commitment for the 18 at \$6 million a year over a three-year period. It's also important to note during that time, the Knight

Foundation was able to come in, to provide some additional funds for our ecosystem as well as the county provided a bit more funds as it related to artists and those organizations.

So, this is where I would say we left off and that was as of July of 2021, those 36 organizations had about \$6.3 million in grants. What's going on is as you may recall, we took the higher of the two years from before FY22. So, the higher of '21 and '20, and tried to build some level of stabilization, as well as the council did something for the first time. Having an allocation specifically for artists and creatives much like the county had done as well as \$800,000 for the Arts and Science Council. The remaining 4.4 million which would round up to the 12 million would be allocated at the beginning of the fiscal year. Much of this will be discussed on how this was happening between Priya and Cyndee. I do want to end on one slide before I turn it over to Priya. When we talk about that \$4.4 million, the remaining allocation of this FY2022, we'll call it part two, 3 million of that 4.4 million continue to flow to these 38 organizations for a total of 9.3 million. I think this is just something to think about. I think the good work that's occurring, what the council has done and what the community has done, if you start to think about the peak of funding for these 38 organizations, that would've been in 2009 at 10.7 million even with part one and part two of FY2022, that results in \$9.3 million to the organizations. Some have come in and out over that period of time, but even with that, what I think is a very good infusion, it still doesn't match the peak right around the great recession of 10.7 million.

So, I say that because most of that you've already seen, we've already discussed. It was budget workshops; it was the budget process and now I'll hand off to what has occurred since then to Priya.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: ACTION REVIEW ITEMS

Priya Sircar, Arts and Cultural Officer said thank you Mr. Jones. I'm actually going to invite Cyndee Patterson, our advisory board chair.

Mayor Lyles said we're going to go ahead through the presentation and come back for questions.

Cyndee Patterson, Arts and Culture Advisory Board said so, I'm Cyndee Patterson, I'm co-chair of the Arts and Cultural Advisory Board. I have some board members here with me. My co-chair Kevin Patterson and Reverend Woods is here and why don't you all introduce yourself.

Aisha Dew, Arts Administrator said Aisha Dew.

Ricky Woods, First Baptist Church said Ricky Woods, Senior Minister, First Baptist Church-West.

Carla Aaron-Lopez said Carla Aaron-Lopez, artist and teacher.

Shefalee Patel said Shefalee Patel, artist and dancer.

Nick Tosco, Attorney said Nick Tosco, Attorney.

Ms. Patterson said Nick's an attorney in local government law. So, he's been a great boom to us as has everybody on this organization. You see we have 18 members. We were established in June, but we didn't get all the appointments done. So, our first meeting ended up being in December of 2021. Eighteen members, three were appointed by the mayor, six by city council, eight by the private sector and one by the ASC. You can see just from that brief sample, it's a broad spectrum across the community. We were charged with a couple of things. We had an official charge from the city council that you all had adopted. One was to develop a cultural plan that would

span the next 10 years for Charlotte, and we needed to pick a consultant. That was a lot of work. Guide the development of the plan and then make our final recommendations to you, who will be able to then do whatever you need to do with it, but then adopt it hopefully.

Also, we were to allocate 4.4 million that was left as Mr. Jones has said, from the FY22 funding and we did that. Then we have \$12 million a year to allocate half public sector, half private sector in FY23 and FY24. This is our committee as you can see. You'll see that we have had about five members who've had to resign. As I get through this, you'll begin to understand why in that it's a lot of time and energy and I think folks found it difficult to do. I want to do a little shout out for Irisol Gonzales who was one of the artists on our board. She had been appointed by the mayor and she has a fellowship at Yale. There's a nice ending. We already miss her. Our last meeting was her last meeting. So, we'll be replacing her. One of the first things we did as a board was adopt guiding principles. I wanted to give you all a moment to think about this. We spent a fair amount of time on this because while your charge gave us direction on what, it didn't speak as much to how. As a person who spent years working on group dynamics, that was kind of important to a number of us.

So, you see the first bullet point of our guiding principles that our process would be centered in equity, inclusion and transparency. That on many levels we wanted to have community engagement and the cultural plan selection of the folks we picked to do the cultural plan is heavily weighted because of their expertise in community engagement. So, that's where you're really going to see a lot of it, that we would make data driven decisions. That was not as easy to do with the original 4.4 million that we had about 8 weeks to give away after we were impaneled, but we really worked hard at it this year which I'll talk a little bit more about in our grant panels for the 39 total grants that we've made.

Priya is going to talk more about our innovation and implementation approach because we have something called the Opportunity Fund and many other things, that we would really think about the whole ecosystem. That we would remove barriers that might keep the public from engaging and being involved in the arts, and we would foster sustainability growth etc., Let me say a minute about sustainability. The reason this was on your agenda for the last couple of years that brought you to impaneling this board of advisors, was largely about the sustainability issue. The public and private sector came together to actually breathe air into the sustainability and some opportunity for growth so that we could get to the cultural plan. So, that's what we've been about and of course educate the public. This is not just a small thing because at the end of the day, as we work through the cultural plan, if we don't bring the community along with us so that they understand the value of ongoing funding for the arts and cultural community, then the cultural plan, even if adopted, may not be able to be implemented if that makes sense.

So, there wasn't a good way to do this. So, I'm going to talk a minute about it. So, in getting ready for this, I actually went through my calendar and pulled all my invites from Priya and what I found is there were 14 advisory board meetings. There were 13 to 16 of what we call working group meetings of the board which are smaller segments of the board that worked on things such as how to fund, who to fund, how to write the RFP (Request For Proposal), what would be in the RFP, how to sort the applicants, people that sent in their proposals and how to give away \$400,000 that we gave away in grassroots grants last year. So, those groups met two, three, four, five times each as well. So, what you're seeing on this chart is a series of all of those, knowing that we started December 10th and today is July 11th. We have been meeting seven months, and in that time, we have accomplished everything you see here. The 4.4 million being allocated, the search and request for proposal process and the interviews for the cultural planning consultants that selected the cultural plan, giving away more money through a process that Priya set up and that the board totally participated in. Then now, these grant panels. I want to talk a minute about the grant's panel.

So, we have 39 organizations to look at. The 38 you're seeing plus the Arts and Science Council for this round of FY23 funding. We divided our 18-member board into panels of 6 people each and they each had 13 or 14 grants to review. I didn't survey the entire board, but I would say to you that on average, they spent between 10 and 16 hours reading grant applications, budgets, equity programs for each of the groups etc., scoring those, sending them to staff, then going to a three hour meeting for each panel to actually make the decisions and make recommendations to staff about how we would allocate dollars. So, when I think about the amount of time and why four or five that have had to resign, it's about the time. This group came together with only one in person meeting for the first four or five months of our journey together, which was the first one and then COVID hit again, and we found our footing and we found our culture as a board and how we wanted to work together through our guiding principles, and we did all the things you see on this chart.

So, I would say to you, you have a very dedicated group of people who are work horses and I don't think anybody knew on the front end. I promise you, when the mayor called me she did not tell me how much time this was going to take. They're all what I would call true believers in the value of a strong sustainable arts and cultural system for this community. So, with that, I'll turn it back to Priya.

Ms. Sircar said thank you Cyndee and thank you all board members who are here and who are watching. So, both Mr. Jones and Cyndee talked a bit about how we got here and how we've been doing what we've been doing. I'm going to talk about what we've been doing and why. We spend a lot of time on policy and the what oftentimes, but this is a moment I'd like to take just to reflect on the why. So, we have a great video to share with you from ArtPop Street Gallery.

Kevin Harris, said in high school, my art teacher used to make sure that we went on field trips to the galleries and the museums and one thing that stood out was I didn't see a lot of representation of people of color in those museums. So, that was one of the things when I realized that I had this talent that I wanted to make sure that we strove for.

Unknown said ArtPop has an open call every year and we send out a call to the 13-county region and artist supply for our program. So, our artists are featured for an entire year from January 1st to December 31st and they are all collectively receiving over six and a half million dollars' worth of advertising. Through that, they are seen, they are known and they're no longer a secret.

Unknown said to have unrestricted funds allows us to improve upon our mission, allows us to get more work done, allows us to hire more people to help our mission. So, it's just a win-win all the way around and we could not be happier or more proud than being a recipient of the Infusion Fund grant.

Mr. Harris said to see myself up on that billboard and the opportunities that came of it, I started getting a lot more commissions now. That confidence level that I can absolutely do this set in and here I am. I retired from my company and I'm doing this full time in this building.

Ms. Sircar said Mr. Harris is now a full-time artist living and working in Charlotte in part because of ArtPop whom we funded. His studio is down the street and the VAPA (Visual and Performance Arts) Center which we funded. This is why we're doing what we're doing. If we want Charlotte to be a home for artists, if we want it to be a home for the arts, it has to be a home for artists. So, as the manager described, funding was declining, and arts and culture were hit hard by COVID. The sector was in danger and desperately in need of a shot in the arm. This is that shot in the arm, \$9.7 million in unrestricted funding so that these organizations can pursue their mission instead of having to compete for crumbs. Unrestricted funding is money for whatever these organizations need to do, whether that's programs, payroll or many other things, and it's the hardest funding to get because it requires trust. We trust these partners to know what's best for their situation and that's the kind of funding we needed to give because there is no one size fits all solution to this.

We also created an open call for groups who had yet to receive any kind of Infusion Funding as part of our charge to create more access to funding for more artisan groups. The 51 recipients of this funding through the open call, including ArtPop which has been doing this work for nine years had not received this type of unrestricted funding prior to the Infusion Fund. This open call made that possible. This money is getting us closer to pre-pandemic levels and we're also working to address past inequities to fund ALAANA groups as the manager noted. The ASC had begun to do this, and working with their designations we increased the level of funding for these groups by 100 percent over the previous year.

We've also supported nearly \$1 million to artists and creatives as well as additional organizations through ASC's programs and we supported ASC's ability to do this work. I'm really excited about this one. It's a new approach and exactly the kind of thinking that brought me to Charlotte. The Opportunity Fund gives money to initiatives outside of our grant cycle, because why should these groups be forced into our calendar? Who's serving whom? The Opportunity Fund is as much an opportunity for us as it is for the organizations and artists because it allows us the flexibility to invest in opportunities as they arise. We piloted this with two projects in March. "I Am Queen Charlotte", a multidisciplinary celebration of Black artists, of Black women in Charlotte including our mayor. Artist Hannah Hasan and Scott Gardner organized this impressive collaboration with artists and organizations across the city. They were doing it all without paying themselves. We can't promote economic development and workforce development if artists and creatives are working for free. Free is not sustainable. An Infusion Fund Grant supported their time and hard work at the helm of this program. The Southern Cultural Treasures program is a partnership with regional funder South Arts and Ford Foundation, the second largest national funder of arts and culture.

This program had us coming in as a partner to support One Charlotte organization to receive three years of operating support and capacity building training in an inaugural cohort of BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, People of Color) organizations from around the southeastern U.S. Last week, South Arts announced the selection of JazzArts Charlotte as part of this cohort. This will help them establish greater stability, grow their skills and we expect to open the door to funding from South Arts, Ford and others showing those funders what Charlotte has to offer and hopefully eventually bringing more dollars here. I'll note that Lonnie Davis, CEO of JazzArts has just been named the incoming board president of the world's leading jazz organization. Again, that's the leading organization in the world, Jazz Education Network. So, this is a great opportunity to support one of our gems and to shine a light on Charlotte. That was just the pilot. More on that in a moment. So, a crucial part of the 2022 work has been getting the word out about it. We've created a microsite as a hub for information and use social media and relationships with our partners in community to let people know about opportunity and provide that crucial transparency. This slide is about communication, which is two way. It's about listening to the whole of Charlotte. I've been in community attending meetings, community events learning about the great work taking place here and sharing about what we're doing. Now we're about to take things to the next level without cultural plan which we'll get to in a moment.

So, we've been talking about fiscal year 2022 and now we're going to talk briefly about fiscal year 2023 and for our community members watching at home, that began on July 1st. We've all been working hard as Cyndee referenced to make sure that the money is allocated and ready to go out asap. We did an application and review process as Cyndee talked about and we awarded well above pre-pandemic levels of funding and no organization was awarded less than they received in FY22 unless they requested it. So, this is still part of the infusion, but a shot in the arm can't last forever. This is meant to be a bridge to the future. So, we've assembled a steering group of which the advisory board is the core with community leaders and partners from across Charlotte Mecklenburg to help ensure that the process and the plan are inclusive and implementable. We've engaged global leader, Lord Cultural Resources to work with us and with the community to develop a shared vision and a long-term plan for the future. Lord has an exceptional community engagement practice and a track record of leading a development of plans that are ambitious and also achievable. For example, in

Chicago, 60 percent of that plan was being implemented by the end of the first year and it resulted in the creation of the Chicago Architectural Biennial that attracts half a million people a year. So, it's been a boom for tourism and for the region.

More recently, the Dallas Cultural Plan was adopted in 2018 and among other things, the plan yielded the use of multiple funding sources to support equitable distribution of funding, while also taking care of city-owned facilities and where there was previously not a mechanism for funding artists and creatives, one of those was established. The key to Lord's approach and why we feel they're a good fit for Charlotte is that they're a diverse team that understands our specific needs and because of their ability to engage communities especially those that are typically left out of policy development. At the end of this process, whether you enjoy the ballet or Durag Fest or both, Charlotte will have identified ways to cultivate offerings for all its residents and visitors. Crucially Lord's plan will articulate a roadmap to sustainability. So, what are our next steps?

In the near term, the consultant team will begin stakeholder interviews, including all of you, our council members. They're actually tuning in right now tonight listening as they prepare for these conversations. For the folks watching at home, start thinking about what you'd like to see because you'll soon have opportunities to provide your input. Keep an eye out for announcements on our website and on social media. Following the success of our pilot projects, we are going to be solidifying and rolling out the Opportunity Fund and that will work in synergy with the cultural planning process allowing us to test ideas in real time as they come up from the research. With our partners at the Foundation for the Carolinas, we're ready to cut checks so that these organizations can put Infusion Funding to work. So, hopefully you can feel the enthusiasm and commitment to this work and I want to thank all of our advisory board members again for all of the hard work that you're doing, and my colleagues at the city and at the foundation. With that, I'll turn it over to Cyndee for a final word.

Ms. Patterson said actually I don't have a final word. I think Marcus, Priya and I are happy to take questions. I thank you for listening to us and I really one more time want to thank not just the members that are here from our board, but everybody because they're a pretty amazing group. Priya has done great.

Mayor Lyles said thank you.

Ms. Patterson said we're back on track.

Mayor Lyles said I'm going to turn it back over to Mr. Jones.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said thank you Mayor and members of council. So, we just attempted to provide you some feedback on what's going on. So, now I will take any questions Mayor, that members may have.

Councilmember Winston said just for the public to be aware, it was outlined that there were about 30 meetings had and this is the first update that council has had on those 30 meetings of work. I've learned a lot more in the past couple of weeks since many of us brought up our concerns with the way this policy change is being implemented and I've learned more that I think goes against the intent of council and I think we need to slow down to figure out how to get this train back on the tracks. Ms. Patterson said, "It didn't say how to implement this," because the expectation of council was that the council, staff and the community through the advisory committee would work together to figure out how to go about bridging the short term which was this kind of status quo year, to not pull the rug out from under the arts community, that it was getting public funding, but to create that bridge between the short and the long term. Ms. Sircar said that they went ahead and created that bridge on their own, that's what she just said and there is no mandate for staff or the community or political appointees to create that bridge. That is in the policy that we passed last year. With that said can we pull up to slide 14 please.

I do with agree with what Ms. Sircar said, is that artists can't work for free, but the issue is that we identified where we were trying to make this change, is that more

philanthropic giving is not a scalable solution for creatives to stay in this community, in any community, and ours included.

So, in 2020 when we first had this conversation, a group of us on council said that the way our public arts spending was set up was an insufficient public investment to sustain the creative economies of our city. To put it more plainly, the way we were spending our money we were not able to retain creative people in our community, because again the way we need to invest is very different than giving philanthropic grants out to individual artists or organizations. We need to find out ways to invest in things like affordable housing close to affordable workspaces. How do we understand the needs of industries? Because there are many different types of industries that make up the creative class of folks which I have been part of for crossing over three decades in this community.

So, part of the reason is the overall structures of our city that make it hard to retain talent across industries, but specifically for the arts, is the way we distribute our public funds is that we give grants out to preferred artists and organizations. That was the main intent of the June 2021 change. It wasn't just to create an Arts and Cultural Advisory Board so we can make political appointments to have even less oversight over the way our public dollars are spent. It was to change or approach to invest in identifying and stabilizing and growing sectors of the creative industries and economies through strategic investments. That's what we were supposed to be working on as a council staff through hiring a new cultural officer who is an expert, and the community through working with the advisory committee.

So, that is what needs to be highlighted in June 2021. That is what we all discussed. We all came from different places as an Ad Hoc Committee to figure out the best language that would allow us to go forward and do this, again, without sweeping the rug from under anyone. I may not have liked that we didn't get briefed, even though for some reason many of us on the committee wanted to have this conversation so we were not in this position today. I've heard that the mayor and manager did not want us to meet. That's what I've been told by colleagues. We even had a meeting on the books to correct it, but it disappeared. So, this feels good. I know we have this feel-good presentation about it, but we're basically in the same boat. What was just presented to us was painting the fence and calling it a new fence and that's not what we set up to do and we have to change this.

So, for instance one question I have, what was in the RFP? I've never even seen the RFP for this cultural plan and definitely we have not had the ability to comment or have any input. I don't even know if we can count it as the city's cultural plan because we didn't have any input. It sounds like these political appointment's cultural plan. So, I don't really have any faith in where we're at right now until we've really figured something else out. Again, I don't know why we're not having this conversation in a committee so we can do this work just like we do at every other policy whether it be something as big as the UDO or comp plan, to something small like dealing with airport paint and things like that. So, I don't understand where the disconnect is, but it needs to change and Mr. Manager, I think this really does lie with you. Thank you.

Councilmember Bokhari said as a starting point, let me just recap what actually happened and brought us to this point. After the dismal failure of the quarter cents sales tax for arts of which it was a slow-moving train wreck that could've been avoided and wasn't. The voter's spoke and said, "I'm not okay with the status quo anymore," we got to work as an Ad Hoc Committee actually trying to solve the problem. That's indisputable. No one's going to dispute that because that's literally what we did. Now I'm going to speak from my perspective, as I was designing my portion of this plan, certain things we negotiated and found concessions afterwards, but my perspective was very simple. We needed to actually rebuilt the house.

To Mr. Winston's point, not slap a coat of paint on the exact same thing that had been getting slapped some paint on it for the last two decades in a row, but actually rebuild a new structure and strategy that centered around having someone with more money,

public/private, that was czar that the manager would hire. Ultimately while that was going on, in parallel, we would do two things. We'd enable the manager to hire that czar and we would put money ultimately in some kind of areas that they could already get to work that we knew. That was, in your words, the Bigs. We said, "Alright, we have these people, the Bigs," they were inside our buildings. We knew what they needed. So, we said, "We're going to go back to certain amounts of funding." I thin it makes perfect sense to call that funding and going back while we get our ducks in a row for the future, pre-recession funding. The amount of money it took before the world changed around them. Then while that was all underway, we were supposed to be working on our side as a full council. Maybe it was Ad Hoc Committee, maybe it was full committee, we never got to that point, but that was when we were supposed to start our work and say, "What is the council's strategic appetite? What is our policy statement?" What is it to where we want to change the future direction of art and culture in this community at high level mission, vision statement level. Then we would hand that off to the czar and they would then take that and structure the new arts and culture strategic plan to execute on our vision.

So, there was no "Let's figure this out or that out with the other money," or "We're going to do this," it was, "Do exactly what we defined," and we will then on the back end will have something for you to do the next step. Two problems occurred there. One, for some reason we were never convened. We were never brought back together, and we can easily point it at a lot of people. We can also point at ourselves that we didn't force that convening even though it wasn't easy, and we asked for meetings a lot. I think the accountability goes back to the council at this point. We should've forced that. We knew that was the next step. The final point there is we had concessions. So, I told you what I set out to do. There were other views on the Ad Hoc Committee. So, one of those concessions was that I was adamantly opposed to but I ultimately said, "Alright, if it's establishing a board of advisors, I can do that. I can get behind that," because I didn't want to create another ASC. That was the thing that failed in the referendum. We needed something new. So, I said, "Alright, if it's a board of advisors that's just there to basically advise the czar and say, 'well this is what the community thinks of that.'" The czar is the CEO taking our roadmap ultimately and executing on it.

So, that was the problem and where it exists now? What happens? Fast forward the clock and we're at a point where we're reading in press releases and news stories that our money that had nothing to do with people making these decisions and working hard and all these things that were shown to us, was deployed. So, the first thing I'll say is after we've expressed our frustrations for the last almost month on how this arts and culture approach we designed has been botched so severely, if anyone around here things that what we wanted was a marketing pitch about what a group did on their own and against our designs was what we were looking for, I will tell you you've fallen into the same trap that ultimately brought the ASC to failure. So, I agree with Priya on one point. The industry was struggling, and this was a forced opportunity that we had to solve for, but it didn't need a shot in the arm. It needed a heart transplant and that's what we set out to do. Despite all the opportunities we laid out and all the fault to go around, we ultimately went back and allowed a good hardworking board of advisors to come in, potentially be hijacked by a few people and ultimately recreate the ASC under our very noses, when we fought and worked for more than a year to solve for those mistakes that they had created.

So, if you sense frustration here Mr. Manager, I will tell you I could barely sit through that presentation because I've seen it for 20 years on a slow-moving train wreck. So, I hope we can fix this because the future of Charlotte deserves so much better, and we ripped off a painful Band-Aid that was sucking into the ultimate survival mode that we finally got out of that mode. Now they've gotten their way back in and infiltrated a good approach and unfortunately have put us in this position. So, I hope we fix this and fix this quickly.

Councilmember Graham said so, good evening. First let me thank the committee, Mr. and Mrs. Patterson, Vice Chair and Chairman and the committee members for the work they've done over the last several months.

Mayor Lyles said that would be Mr. Patterson and Miss Patterson.

Mr. Graham said I want to thank them for the work they've done. A lot of work has been done since the committee's formation and I think the council should acknowledge the work by thanking you for what you have done. I see two of my appointees over there as well, Ms. Lopez and Ms. Drew. I want to thank them for being dedicated public servants as well in terms of helping us with this charge. I think the manager did a great job in terms of level setting the history. I think that's really important. That's what I had to do since I had the initial phone call with Councilmember Winston just to kind of go back and make sure what we said we were going to do, that we were doing. So, I think it's really important that the manager led off by just really kind of giving us a historical perspective in terms of where we were and where we are today. I think that's really important. Mr. Winston's also right. I took the last two weeks as well to kind of talk to as many people as I could. I acknowledge I'm a member of the Ad Hoc Committee but when I was appointed there, I was also chairing the Great Neighborhoods Committee, I was helping with COVID relief funds distributed to families throughout Charlotte. So, while it was an important topic for me, I was basically in the back seat, not driving the car.

So, I say that my commitment is to get in the front seat and make sure that what we said we wanted to do when I first got here which was to really look at what we were doing as it relates to arts, science and entertainment. We talked about the arena and the number of events that we were having in the arena that was non-basketball related that helped us build a robust and a rich cultural center. That did all those things, right? What was happening at the Spectrum and new artists and how we were able to support those individuals that painted the Black Lives mural. How do we get arts out of Uptown and maybe into NoDa and University City and other parts of our city. So, I supported certainly the direction of kind of taking a look at where we are from the arts and cultural perspective, entertainment and how we can move forward. So, I concur with the charge, and I think it would be probably really important for the council. This is probably a conversation that the council needs to have, other than having it with the Arts and Science Council and/or the committee. I think it's a process issue for the council that we have to figure out. One is to reconfirm the charge we gave to our committee and making sure that everybody around the table is on the same page in terms of what we have instructed them to do and making sure that they're doing it based on the charge that the council has given them. I think that they are, but I think we need to test that. We made an observation early in the year that we were going to hire someone from the outside to come in to lead the process, work in conjunction with the advisory committee and we need to make sure that's happening. Who's on first, who's on second in terms of driving this process. That's something that at least I got the indication from earlier presentations that we were going to do. She's here, she's hired and we're all working hard to accomplish the goals. So, I think we just need to make sure that we dot that I and cross that T too.

Then lastly is the plan itself. That's why we're all here. Where are we going from here? How do we create an environment in our city where our city is just not known for banks and for special sports team, but that we have a thriving, growing, innovative arts, science and entertainment type of community as well. What is it going to take for us to get there? The tools, the means, the resources and who's going to help the council do that? I'm not sure I want to be evaluating grant applications on Saturdays and Sundays. I think we have to find a way. Who's going to help us with the distribution of the resources to the many fine agencies throughout the city who are deserving of it? So, Mr. Manager, again, I think it's a process issue that we need to bring within and just reassess where we are on those three points. One, the charge to the committee. Secondly making sure that our staff members are duly engaged in leading the process. More importantly as we roll out this cultural enrichment plan, that we have robust community engagement throughout the city, that we don't have a predetermined outcome of what that study is going to yield. We don't know what it's going to yield and that we respect all our community partners.

Lastly, the elephant in the room is the Arts and Science Council. I'm very supportive of the Arts and Science Council. I think for a number of years going back to three or four different presidents of the organization, starting with the president of the Foundations for the Carolinas and then the young lady that followed him. So, they've always done a good job, but it is time that we test that too based on what we said earlier about wanting something different, wanting something new, wanting something fresh and that might lead us right back to the Arts and Science Council after a year of studying. It may lead us somewhere else, but I think for this discussion's sake, I think my points one, two and three will get us where I think we need to go. Again, that's more an internal management issue that the council needs to reconfirm what we said we were going to do. If we're doing that, that's fine. I support the work that they did, the decisions that they made after careful consideration of this. I think that we should move forward. I think we're talking about \$100,000 here or there. I can be wrong. I stand to be corrected, but I don't want to be playing the Monday night quarterback with the work of the committee when they've put so much work into it. As we move forward, we just need to make sure that we're all on the same page. Thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said I just want to reinforce what I had said last Monday. I don't want our Arts and Cultural Advisory Board to walk away thinking that we don't appreciate their work or that they didn't follow through on the promises that were made. I think they are doing a tremendous amount of work here. I appreciate all their efforts and time that they are putting into this and I've had conversations with several members of the board on the cultural plan that they are developing that is going to be sustainable and address the concerns that council had last year. Like Mr. Graham said, there are obviously a few things that we do need to figure out to ensure that it is a true collaborative effort with city council and the board, and also ensure that the process and the charge that everyone is on the same page. Also let's not forget that we appointed committee members to serve on this board. So, if you don't trust and faith in their effort, we need to revisit that. There is a reason as a council that every single board member that serves on this committee got at least six of our council member's support to serve on this. So, I don't want us to question the work that they are doing because obviously we were involved in selecting who serves on their board.

So, with that, obviously there is a lot more work that needs to be done here to address the concerns that some of our colleagues have raised. Let's not discount the effort that committee has put forward. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said I'm interested to hear this conversation because obviously our recollection of what happened seems to diverge. I have no recollection of a council consensus along the lines that you're talking about Mr. Winston. You've expressed your views very forcefully. I never heard anybody coming together around that. So, I think the suggestion that we were unanimous along the lines that you were talking about is just a misrepresentation. I'm looking at the report from the Ad Hoc Committee of which I was a member. I just want to express my general recollection. The Arts and Science Council was not able to raise funds. So, we're increasingly relying on public funding. It was clear that we were underfunding the arts and there was a need for a bigger initiative for the arts in Charlotte. So, the city decided that we could increase our funding and we got into a conversation with private sector funders, and we were able to raise a much larger amount of money that hadn't been previously available and there were certain understandings about that. One of our goals was to make sure that we had secure funding for the city-owned facilities. That was a problem. The symphony was on the brink of going broke all the time. So, we wanted to protect those institutions, but because of the increase in funding we were able to offer that security to those in institutions while still leaving a lot of money left over for allocation either to prior recipients from the ASC or for disposition otherwise.

The other conversation was that we did not want the city council to be making these decisions about arts funding. So, the whole plan was that we were to create this board and appoint a director in order for people in the arts community or with an arts context rather than people elected to serve on this body, to make the decisions about where the money would be allocated. This is the way I remember it. The Ad Hoc Committee

issued its findings and with that, the work was done the Ad Hoc Committee was exactly that and the Ad Hoc Committee came back and recommended an increase in funding, recommended the creation of this board and the arts and cultural commissioner. One thing I've called for repeatedly Mr. Manager and have not been able to get, was a written statement from the funders issuing our criteria for the continuing funding from these two sources. The public and the private. I feel that we need to negotiate, state our terms for once and for all clearly and then let this board get on with their work. So, that could include instructions along the lines that were talked about here where the council might say, "Okay, this is the council's position on what the requirements for public funding should be."

The point is I think we need to put that statement out there. Then also achieve the purpose of taking ourselves as a council out of the grant making process, and out of the final conclusions, about where this money is most effectively used. Now the board was created. They're being described as political appointees. This board was created partly by us with the idea that they were people that had an overview of the arts community here and would know better how most effectively to invest these funds, then again, those of us who have been elected to serve on city council. So, it feels to me like we've arrived at a point right now where because of the fact that the cultural plan isn't actually in place yet, we have for 2023 a kind of indeterminacy. We didn't plan for this situation. Nobody talked about where we would be if the interim funding, we provided for FY2022 didn't take us through the completion of cultural plan. So, I believe that we're in a little bit of a continuing resolution mode.

I think that we should take the recommendations and the hard work of these people that we appointed, and to whom we made certain representations about why they were there and go with those. Focus now on the input that we want to provide to the creation of this culture plan as a condition for our continued funding. The council still has the scope to weigh in on that, to work on that, but in this moment as down to the wire as we are in this funding, for us to try to start a process that looks at providing housing or restructuring not painting the fence, it's just not practical. We need to focus on our efforts on this culture plan. We need to provide our input and requirements on a consensus majority vote basis from the council as to what that plan can and can't do. I believe that plan should have in it quite a lot of latitude for allocations by the board beyond certain requirements that we have as a council. Thank you.

Councilmember Newton said I agree with Councilmember Driggs. That was my recollection as well. I also share the sentiments of Councilmember Graham as well as Councilmember Ajmera. I want to thank the board for all of its hard work. Priya for all of your hard work. Not a czar, but as the arts and culture officer that we ourselves via the city manager appointed. That was part of the entire plan as I understood it. Thank you to both Pattersons and once again the entire board for all of your hard work. It's really incredible to think of all you've put into this. For me it shows. I don't recall us ever discussing micromanaging the efforts of the advisory board committee. It was more about us moving away from the model of the ASC and giving more autonomy and authority to the advisory committee. Also doing it because we knew the structure and the history of the ASC was not bringing in the private dollars for our arts sector. It was my understanding that this was a private-public partnership.

Now, I want to be clear. I'm a big supporter of the ASC as well. They have new leadership. I feel like they have taken a new approach, which is a very effective approach, but it was a decision of the council to move away from them as an independent determining body or authority and create this new one. Keep in mind an Ad Hoc Committee is not a permanent committee. So, it was my understanding that the Ad Hoc Committee had completed its job, completed, and fulfilled its purpose and we are moving on from that. So, I just feel as though us engaging in micromanaging here would be a disservice to the board that we ourselves the committee created, the charge we gave that committee. Although maybe we have the authority to review it, I think if we're talking about going back and undoing the work of the committee, I think that sets a very bad precedent.

So, those are my thoughts and once again, thank you all so very much Priya and the entire committee for all of the hard work you've done. You do have support from members of this council.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you Priya and to the committee for all of your hard work. This one is tough for me. I support the committee, I support the committee work, but I also understand what my colleague is saying about process and oversight. Mr. Graham and Mr. Bokhari you've said it this week and said it last week, we as a council struggle with process. So, I want the members of the Ad Hoc Committee and Priya to understand. I don't speak for Mr. Winston, but I believe he's not talking necessarily about this process and your work as an artist. I know he appreciates the work. I think it's more of the process and if we have council take an opportunity to be on the same page with oversight and stewardship, then we could get a lot more done. So, I will be supporting this because you all have done the work, but this is a process issue. So, I don't want the headline to be that Mr. Braxton is against the arts or whatever that would be. I'm not speaking for him. I can speak that we as council get frustrated based on process. So, we need to be consistent. I would just say this is an opportunity for us as council or the next council who's watching that it's an opportunity for us to be consistent in processes and how things are decided. The Ad Hoc Committee, the process is that it goes back to the Council Committee, and it's brought forth to council. So, I just think we need to look at the big picture as council members. Thank you.

Councilmember Phipps said I also appreciate the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. One thing I wanted to get clear on was as far as the committee's charge is concerned. I know we had a lot of meetings that I've been a part of, but have we ever seen or reviewed the policy that you all came up with in terms of the committee's charge. I don't know that I've seen it yet or is it still under development? They said that the committee's work is done. So, did we ever see or review this to make sure we're on the same page as what that policy is, consistent with their committee charge as a council? Did we ever review that as part of any meeting that maybe I'm not aware of?

Mayor Lyles said I think the question is did the council adopt or vote on the Ad Hoc Committee report.

Councilmember Eiselt said it was presented to the full council.

Mr. Driggs said we had an RCA (Request for Council Action) and it was dated June 28, 2021. In that, the actual action request was to approve the Arts and Culture Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation to establish an arts and culture advisory board. The background to that was a description of the Ad Hoc Committee and the work that had been done and a statement of some of the things that we're talking about here. So, in the explanation section of that action item, the Arts and Council Advisory Board will work with the arts and council officer on the following initiatives, developing a comprehensive arts and culture plan. So, essentially the essence of the memo that came out of the Ad Hoc Committee was incorporated into the RCA that approved the creation of the arts advisory board.

Mayor Lyles said so, I don't know who voted, what the vote was but we can get that and get it to you Mr. Phipps as a follow up, but it was voted and approved by the council.

Mr. Phipps said thank you.

Mr. Driggs said it just says approved by city council.

Mayor Lyles said we'll get that.

Mr. Phipps said I'll refresh memory on that. Thank you.

Ms. Eiselt said I too really appreciate the advisory board. I think we put together a really amazing advisory board that is diverse. That is really what we wanted to make sure because we were only appointing half of the team, and the foundations representatives

were appointing the other half. So, that said, I do appreciate the diversity of skillsets, talents, and backgrounds on the advisory board. I just think there was a breakdown after that clearly, as you've heard tonight. The whole council has a different interpretation it sounds like. So, I want to provide a little bit of context because this got started a few years ago. So, it definitely predated this council. I was the city council appointee to the ASC five years ago and that was at a time when the workplace giving was going away, funding was going down. The Arts and Science Council continued to come to the city and the county for an increase in funding. The city had never dropped our funding post-recession. It was at the same level, but that was '08. A long time ago. The county had dropped it, they were building back up. The bottom line is we were losing money per capita on the arts and that in itself was something that bothered all of us. That said, there was a strong feeling on council that we articulated that we didn't want to do the same thing. It was very clear that after the arts referendum failed, that it looked like we were out of options, unless we the council could say, "Look, this really fits into what we do, economic development, tourism industry," and so, we said we were willing to put this effort together if we would work towards restructuring the industry, the sector.

So, I think that to Mr. Winston's point, and to Mr. Bokhari's point, we didn't want to pull a group together to give more money to do the same thing over and over again. That's not sustainable. The private sector made it clear that wasn't sustainable. They agreed to do this for three years. We said we'd do it for three years and match it, but it wasn't just to keep doing the same thing over and over again, because clearly the private money wasn't buying in to that. So, with that said, in having a lot of conversations with advisory board members, with my colleagues, I think the breakdown as it was mentioned, we really wanted to see a different structure. That's what we want to see. We missed that there would be a gap between when the advisory board met, but when the cultural vision plan got going. Not even finished, but got going. What we were hoping from that process was to be able to see that the new approach towards funding would be not to give funders more money. That doesn't mean that there's not a role for the ASC, there is. We've been told repeatedly by the thrive groups who live in our buildings, we don't need you to give that money to the ASC when they take their cut out of it, and then they give it to us. We heard that loud and clear. That money was unrestricted to the Arts and Science Council.

So, the idea really was that we would restructure the sector and that would involve everybody. Carry everybody over to get through the pandemic. I think it took us all by surprise when then the next round of funding was just an increase to basically pretty much the same organizations without that structure coming forward. I think it's truly a timing issue. Going forward as I think at least the members of the Ad Hoc Committee have articulated, we really need better communication of what the council wants to see in this process and with the advisory board. At the end of the day, the private sector has made it clear they're in this for three years, that's one more year of funding. That leaves it to us. We're the only ones that have said we're going to work to find a permanent sustainable source of funding. So, it's not going to end well if the council has a set of ideas, and the board has a different set. That's on us that it wasn't articulated well. Absolutely, and I'm sorry for the angst that that has put the advisory board members and the chair and the vice chair through.

We have to do better going forward. We have to clarify our charge. We also have to make sure that we hear from different organizations. I loved the presentation. Our goal was to help individual artists and small art groups and provide equity, but there was no mention of the symphony or the Blumenthal or some of these other organizations that live in our buildings. I did mention that. Priya and I talked about that a bit through this process. That's really important to hear from them and that's part of what led to this. When I met Nao Tsurumaki who's the new head of the children's theater. I guess he's been here maybe a year or two now. He talked about how when he was in Orlando, that Broward County and the state of Florida did cultural tourism grants. That's awesome. That would fit in to what we want to do as a community with the taxpayer dollars that we are stewards of.

So, I want to make sure that in this process, and I'm saying this because also I understand Lord is on the phone listening in, they have to talk and include the large institutions as well. They have some great ideas. They have institutional knowledge that they bring from really all over the world. Tom Gabbard's in Europe right now in Barcelona and London looking at two different ideas that he'd like to bring here. We can't cut out that whole sector as well. It has to be an ecosystem where I hope when the time comes to approve this new source of sustainable funding, that everybody benefits. That there's more dollars for everybody but that we're also looking at it through a lens of economic development. Equity yes, but also economic development because that is our job. Our job is to get people to come to Charlotte, have great quality of life, enjoy the arts, all types of arts and grow this sector to be deeper, more rich, provide more opportunities for artists to be able to live here and practice here, and also have some great institutions that can open their doors and collaborate as they have done with our local arts groups.

So, with that, I just want to wrap that up and say, as has been said, we the council have to figure out how to do that and how to communicate that to the board more clearly. That's on us to do. Thank you.

Mr. Bokhari said thanks. What Ms. Eiselt just said much calmer than I did I think is spot on. I just want to reiterate I'm staked into this in a way of 20 years from running ASC campaigns at Wachovia to try and fix this over the last 10. I am deep in this. So, I don't want anyone on this board particularly the 90-95 percent of you who are appointed who are just doing good hard work to walk away from this thinking that I'm unappreciative of your work. I am, but we put in a lot of work to get this thing set up and to watch it after a year of brutally deep work in the weeds fall apart, I just want you to know the passion comes from that and what's happened. Not that I think everyone has not been working hard on that board. So, Ms. Eiselt, as always said it calmer and clearer, but that's the point.

Mr. Jones said so, thank you Mayor and members of council. I appreciate the feedback. Clearly there's a process issue that I will own. One of the things that I think, maybe this puts it succinctly, Mr. Winston and I think we had this conversation last week or maybe the week before. A short term, a medium term and a long term. If we could divide it into those three, I think it could help some clarity. The short term is FY2022, and I don't think there's any debate about what council did with that first 6.3 million dollars. I've tried to explain that while it may not be 20 years in, over the last three, the concept of economic development and our facilities and the tenants in our facilities. Then there's the long term. The long term, while we should have been engaging with you about Lord in that study, that long term is we have to make sure that the public is getting input in those big, small, in between or whatever. As Priya said, you're first on the list. So, that long term is going to map out that strategy for the next decade. I think where our issue is that medium. That medium is really FY23 and FY24. If I had to do it all over again, we would've been talking earlier this year, recalibrating or making sure that the conditions of additional future funding were solidified. Even in the conversation tonight, I think we all learned some different things about different people's approaches.

So, what I see is that in this midterm, FY23 and FY24 that FY23 could proceed with whatever amendments or what have you. FY24, as we start to talk about these conditions of additional funding become something that's worked on immediately. That's just something I put on the table in order to advance where we are tonight because absent that, we are in a pattern where the FY23 funds would be held.

Ms. Eiselt said Mr. Manager, I would like to make a motion that we accept the recommendations and I'm not 100 percent with it, but it's been done. I make a motion that we accept the recommendations of the advisory board for FY23 which began July 1st, not to confuse anybody.

Mr. Bokhari said point of order. This is listed as an update, not an action.

Ms. Eiselt said okay, well then I would like to make a motion that we put it on the next agenda unless we can get a unanimous vote today.

Mayor Lyles said we have voted on items. I'm going to ask the attorney because this is on, if the motion is related to this action, is it an appropriate motion.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said yes, so usually when these presentations are made, you take in the presentation and then you take an action at some other subsequent meeting. I'm not sure, I think what the manager is asking for is something has already moved forward for '23 and he would like for that to go on and is looking for consensus from the group which could be done. If the group wants to do something else, then you're going to need to add it to an agenda to make that discussion.

Mayor Lyles said I think the question is, does anyone object to taking the step to start out with the FY23 allocation on the agenda to vote. Or would you like to see it on a future agenda? I think that if I heard correctly that we all agree that there has to be additional communication. That there's a strategy around the consultant's plan and the long-range plan and that the first step of action would be that the council would be interviewed. Then I wonder if we're debating over what we'd like to do for money or if what we're talking about is what we'd like to do for process. I would suggest that what I have been hearing and listening to is more an agreement and a meeting around the idea of council having another session that would define what the next steps would be and expectations. Then that needs to come back to the full council. I would suggest that Ms. Sircar has Lord do this and then come back as a group, but I don't think I've heard any debate over the allocation of the funding. So, I'm going to ask does anyone object to having a motion.

Mr. Bokhari said I object.

Mayor Lyles said you object? When would you like to see this accomplished Mr. Bokhari?

Mr. Bokhari said when the next council is elected.

Mayor Lyles said well that's another idea.

Ms. Patterson said Mayor, can I ask a question?

Mr. Bokhari said what's happening here?

Mayor Lyles said no you cannot ask a question Ms. Patterson.

Ms. Eiselt said Madam Mayor?

Mayor Lyles said yes?

Ms. Eiselt said I really want to do this in this council. I put a lot of work into it. I'm not going to be on it. I just think that we have to resolve this. It's not fair to leave everybody hanging on the advisory board. I interpret what we approved with the RCA to say that the advisory board was going to allocate the funding. So, it almost needs to be a vote to not do that. In which case, you can put that on in the future.

Unknown said you can just put it on as part of the business meeting. It only takes the majority.

Ms. Eiselt said that's fine.

Mr. Driggs said when is the next opportunity?

Mayor Lyles said August 22nd.

Ms. Eiselt said August 22nd is our next meeting.

Mr. Driggs said we're not going to get unanimity tonight. So, I think we need to put it on for an action on the 22nd where the majority will decide.

Ms. Eiselt said so, I would make a motion that we put that vote on the agenda.

Mr. Driggs said second.

Mayor Lyles said you don't have to make a motion to put it on. I'll go ahead and have it put on the agenda for August 22nd. So, thank you everyone. It's always good to have a solidly focused conversation. I appreciate the board, appreciate the council talking about this. What I'd like to do next is we will not do the American Disabilities Act presentation because it warrants more attention than we have.

* * * * *

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

Mayor Lyles said I would like to ask for adoption of the consent agenda.

Marie Harris said thank you Madam Mayor. Before you had no questions specific to the consent, unless anyone has one now.

Mayor Lyles said is there any item on the consent agenda that you would like to have as a separate vote? Mr. Winston has acknowledged that he would like to have a comment on Item 25. Item 45 has been settled and no longer requires a council action.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston and seconded by Councilmember Driggs and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 26: Cooperative Purchasing Contract for Maintenance, Repair, and Operating Supplies

(A) Approve the purchase of maintenance, repair, and operating supplies from a cooperative contract, (B) Approve a unit price contract with Lowe's Home Centers, LLC for the purchase of maintenance, repair, and operating supplies for a term ending March 31, 2023, under the Omnia Partners, Public Sector, contract number R192006, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to extend the contract for additional terms for as long as the cooperative contract is in effect, at prices and terms that are the same or more favorable than those offered under the cooperative contract.

Item No. 27: Cooperative Purchasing Contracts for Vehicles and Equipment

(A) Approve the purchase of vehicles and equipment from cooperative contracts, (B) Approve unit price contracts with the following vendors for the purchase of vehicles and equipment for a term of one year under the North Carolina Sheriff's Association (NCSA), (C) Approve unit price contracts with the following vendors for the purchase of vehicles and equipment for a term of one year under Sourcewell, (D) Approve a unit price contract with Vehicle Service Group for the purchase of vehicle lift equipment for a term of one year under NASPO ValuePoint contract 05316, (E) Approve a unit price contract with Unruh Fire, Inc. for the purchase of airport firefighting equipment for a term of one year under HGACBuy contract FS12-19, and (F) Authorize the City Manager to extend the contracts for additional terms as long as the cooperative contracts are in effect, at prices and terms that are the same or more favorable than those offered under the cooperative contracts.

Item No. 28: Roadway Construction Services

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,824,872.50 to the lowest responsive bidder United Construction Company, Inc. for the Specialized Roadway Construction Services FY23A project, and (B) Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,880,385.10 to the lowest responsive bidder OnSite Development, LLC for the Specialized Roadway Construction Services FY23B project.

Item No. 29: Construct Storm Drainage Improvement Projects

Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,297,107.75 to the lowest responsive bidder Zoladz Construction Co., Inc. for the Collective Storm Drainage Improvement Projects - Series J.

Item No. 30: Industrial Electrical Maintenance and Repair Services

(A) Approve unit price contracts with the following companies for industrial electrical maintenance and repair services for an initial term of two years: Amteck, LLC, Energy Erectors Inc., Steve Gainey dba Tryon Services, LLC (SBE), and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to three, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 31: Mallard Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements

(A) Approve a guaranteed maximum price of \$7,069,069 to PC-Leeper, A Joint Venture for construction manager at risk services for equipment procurement and preliminary construction of the Mallard Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase 1 Improvements project, and (B) Approve a contract in the amount of \$5,139,608 with Brown and Caldwell for construction administration services required for the Mallard Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase 1 Improvements project.

Item No. 32: Wastewater Treatment Chemicals

(A) Approve unit price contracts for the purchase of wastewater treatment chemicals for six months to the following: JCI Jones Chemicals, Inc., Olin Corporation dba Olin Chlor Alkali Products, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to three, six-month terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 33: Airport Concourse E Renovation Design Services

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,370,536 with The Wilson Group Architects, PA. for Concourse E Public Areas Renovation project, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 34: Airport Environmental Consulting Services

(A) Approve contracts with the following companies for environmental consulting services for an initial term of three years: S&ME Inc., Hart & Hickman, PC, HDR Engineering, Inc., 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. 35: Airport Magnetic Base Stanchions

(A) Approve the purchase of magnetic base stanchions and accessories for the Airport's security checkpoints by the sole source exemption, (B) Approve a contract with Lavi Industries for the purchase of magnetic base stanchions and accessories for the term of three years, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 36: Airport Vehicle Movement Area Transponders

(A) Approve a contract with L3 Harris Technologies, Inc. for the purchase of vehicle transponders and associated monitoring and support services for Aviation's existing vehicle transponder system for an initial term of five years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for additional one-year terms, approve price

adjustments, and amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved for as long as the city uses the system.

Item No. 37: Enterprise Resource Planning Business Process Mapping Services

(A) Approve a contract amendment #1 to the contract with Jabian, LLC to extend the contract by six months for the vendor to provide business process analysis services for all Enterprise Resource Planning process areas, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to extend the contract term for an additional six-months, and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 38: IT Disaster Recovery Planning Services

(A) Approve a contract extension with Risk Solutions International LLC for technology disaster recovery planning services and resources, strategic technology consulting services, and cloud-based planning software BC in the Cloud maintenance services, (B) Authorize the City Manager to approve price adjustments and amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to purchase such additional subscriptions, services, maintenance, and support as required to maintain the system for as long as the City uses the services and the software.

Item No. 39: Amended Bond Issuance Approval for Sugar Creek Apartments

Adopt an amended resolution granting INLIVIAN's request to issue multi-family housing revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed \$28,000,000, to finance the development of an affordable housing development known as Sugar Creek Apartments.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 156-161

Item No. 40: Bond Issuance Approval for Kingspark Commons

Adopt a resolution granting INLIVIAN's request to issue multi-family housing revenue bonds, in an amount not to exceed \$26,500,000, to finance the development of an affordable housing development known as Kingspark Commons.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 162-168

Item No. 41: Set a Public Hearing on Eastfield Station Area Voluntary Annexation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for August 22, 2022, for the Eastfield Station Area voluntary annexation petition.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 169-170

Item No. 42: Resolution of Intent to Abandon a Portion of McAlpine Station Drive

(A) Adopt a Resolution of Intent to abandon a portion of McAlpine Station Drive, and (B) Set a Public Hearing for August 22, 2022.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 171-172

Item No. 43: Resolution of Intent to Abandon a Portion of Unopened Mcaden Street

(A) Adopt a Resolution of Intent to abandon a portion of unopened Mcaden Street, and (B) Set a Public Hearing for August 22, 2022.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 173-174

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 44: In Rem Remedy: 3803 Sharyn Drive

Adopt an ordinance authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at 3803 Sharyn Drive (Neighborhood Profile Area 83).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 65, at Page 104

Item No. 45: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – North Tryon Pressure Zone Boundary Change and 960 Zone N-S Transmission Main (W.T. Harris-Plott Road Water Transmission), Parcel #3

Resolution of Condemnation of 23,261 square feet (0.53 acres) in Permanent Utility Easement at 9809 East W. T. Harris Boulevard from VR Investments, LLC for \$2,175 for North Tryon Pressure Zone Boundary Change and 960 Zone N-S Transmission Main (W. T. Harris-Plott Road Water Transmission), Parcel #3.

Item No. 46: Monroe Road Streetscape, Parcel #13

Resolution of Condemnation of 46,669 square feet (1.07 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement plus 6,904 square feet (0.16 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 4229, 4231 and 4235 Monroe Road from 4229 Monroe Road LLC for \$191,900 for Monroe Road Streetscape, Parcel #13.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page 175

Item No. 47: Monroe Road Streetscape, Parcel #19

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,039 square feet (0.024 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement plus 1,499 square feet (0.034 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 4329 Monroe Road from Context at Oakhurst-Charlotte, LP for \$14,925 for Monroe Road Streetscape, Parcel #19.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page 176

Item No. 48: Monroe Road Streetscape, Parcel #26

Resolution of Condemnation of 720 square feet (0.017 acres) Utility Easement, 966 square feet (0.022 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, plus 373 square feet (0.009 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 4415 Monroe Road from Oakhurst Investments LLC for \$32,700 for Monroe Road Streetscape, Parcel #26.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page 177

Item No. 49: Monroe Road Streetscape, Parcel #27

Resolution of Condemnation of 132 square feet (0.003 acres) Utility Easement, 3,382 square feet (0.078 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, plus 12,930 square feet (0.297 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 4410, 4412, 4414, 4416, 4418 and 4420 Monroe Road from WWD Associates LLC. et al for \$294,625 for Monroe Road Streetscape, Parcel #27.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page 178

Item No. 50: Monroe Road Streetscape, Parcels #40, 41, 42 and 43

Resolution of Condemnation of 3,155 square feet (0.07 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, plus 3,287 square feet (0.08 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 4726, 4732, 0 and 4800 Monroe Road from Monroe Road Investors LLC for \$138,300 for Monroe Road Streetscape, Parcels #40, 41, 42 and 43.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page 179

Item No. 51: Property Transactions – XCLT Orr Road to Rocky River Road, Parcel #7, 8

Acquisition of 14,023 square feet (0.319 acres) Greenway Easement, 983 square feet (0.023 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 13,905 square feet (0.319 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 5801, 5803 and 5807 Orr Road from 5801 Orr Road LLC for \$70,000 for XCLT Orr Road to Rocky River Road Parcel #7, 8.

Item No. 52: Property Transactions – XCLT Tryon to Orr, Parcel #15

Acquisition of 1,180 square feet (0.027 acres) Greenway Easement, 2,642 square feet (0.061 acres) sidewalk Utility Easement, 2,790 square feet (0.064 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 230 Lambeth Drive from Great Escape Properties LLC for \$27,500 for XCLT Tryon to Orr, Parcel #15.

Item No. 53: Property Transactions – XCLT Tryon to Orr Parcel #19

Acquisition of 2,431 square feet (0.056 acres) Greenway Easement, 3,778 square feet (0.087 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 200 West Eastway Drive from Tryon Corridor Realty LLC for \$14,000 for XCLT Tryon to Orr Parcel #19.

Item No. 54: Property Transactions – XCLT Tryon to Orr, Parcel #21

Acquisition of 1,074 square feet (0.025 acres) Utility Easement, 5,885 square feet (0.135 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 231 Northchase Drive from Tryon Corridor Realty LLC for \$17,825 for SCLT Tryon to Orr, Parcel #21.

Item No. 55: Property Transactions – XCLT Tryon to Orr, Parcel #24

Acquisition of 932 square feet (0.021 acres) Greenway Easement, 1,093 square feet (0.025 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 621 Dawn Circle from Mirna Machuca Ramos for \$850 for XCLT Tryon to Orr Parcel #24.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page 180

* * * * *

CONSENT

ITEM NO. 25: CONTINUE FUNDING STAFF IN THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Councilmember Winston said I think this deserves a call out that we fund staff members in the district attorney's office. The district attorney was with us earlier. We try to do a lot to deal with community safety, to deal with the system. We play a part in the system. Something in our report out from our last intergovernmental committee meeting, I mentioned something that Mr. Driggs mentioned in our committee meeting. He asked a question about putting on a legislative agenda a request to better fund our court system because we have in Mecklenburg County the lowest per capita investment in our court system. That means some of the legal options and justice options for our community, while they might be out there, they're not able to be funded and followed through. So, when we don't have the type of state funding, it's up to us as partners in government to find ways to fund and pick up that slack from the state.

I believe we also fund a position in the public defender's office, and you will find in different places where we do this. I would encourage us. Of course, this should pass tonight, but we should look at this. We should look at this from a fiduciary perspective. How can we better invest with our partners intergovernmentally as well as how do we lobby to other intergovernmental organizations, i.e., the North Carolina General Assembly to better fund the offices that we rely on in our local legal justice systems to better do this. Without this type of funding, even though there might be some insufficiencies in the system, it would be even more insufficient if we weren't to do this type of funding. So, again I think it's just really important that we call this out and understand this. I would encourage my council colleagues to get behind Mr. Driggs' question of how we can do a better job of getting our legal system funded here in Mecklenburg County. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you Mr. Winston.

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

We have a full list of people to speak. Before we go downstairs, you have at your place a referral to the Safe Communities Committee to look at social districts. That's been referred. In addition to that, we will have all of the development ordinances speakers have been notified. They have two minutes to speak and we're going to go through all of the public hearings. We will close each one at the appropriate time and try to get through this evening before midnight.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4 CLOSED SESSION

No closed session occurred.

* * * * *

The meeting was recessed at 6:32 to move to the Meeting Chamber for the regularly scheduled Business Meeting.

* * * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Business Meeting on Monday July 11, 2022, at 6:45 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Lyles presiding. Council Members present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Matt Newton, Gregg Phipps, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston, II.

Mayor Lyles said we appreciate every time we can have this room and have people come in and speak to us. It's very important. I know that we have a large number of you here to speak on various topics, but I want to say to you that we really appreciate it. We won't be able to make everybody come down very quickly, but I do want to say to anyone. The stairs are very steep. So, let's be careful out here as you come down to speak. Tonight's city council's meeting is being held in accordance with applicable law governing remote meetings with some Council members participating remotely. The requirements of notice, access and minutes are met as required by law. So, we're glad that you know that. You can watch us on the city's Facebook page, our YouTube channel and the government channel.

We begin our meeting with an Invocation or expression. We do this because we need the help up here. So, it's to solemnize our meeting to make sure that we work in a way that is respectful of each other.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Eiselt gave the Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag by all in attendance.

* * * * *

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Mayor Lyles said thank you. It is also our custom to recognize and honor particular opportunities that we have. Whether it's something that an individual did or some recognition that's national, it's something that we try to keep our pace on.

ITEM NO. 7: AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT AWARENESS DAY PROCLAMATION

Mayor Lyles said today I'd like to read a joint proclamation between the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County because today is Americans with Disabilities Act Awareness Day. I believe that Mr. Ratchford is here to accept this, as well as Mr. Bradley. So, let me begin.

Mayor Lyles read the following proclamation:

pti:mt

WHEREAS, on July 26, 1990 President George H. W. Bush signed into law the Americans with Disabilities Act to ensure civil rights of people with disabilities.

WHEREAS, the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) has expanded opportunities for Americans with disabilities by reducing barriers, changing perceptions and increasing full participation in community life. However, the full promise of the ADA will only be reached if we remain committed to continue our efforts to fully implement the ADA.

WHEREAS, Mecklenburg County and the City of Charlotte celebrate the contributions and achievements of people with disabilities and honor the goals of this landmark legislation.

WHEREAS, on the anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act, Mecklenburg County and the City of Charlotte celebrate and recognize the progress that has been made by affirming the principles of equality and inclusion.

WHEREAS, we celebrate those positive changes in our community so people with disabilities can be free from negative attitudes and architectural barriers.

WHEREAS, we honor those businesses in our community for complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

WHEREAS, we envision a community in which every resident is accepted for who they are and where they are welcomed with respect and given equal opportunities to contribute to the human experience.

NOW, THEREFORE, WE, Mecklenburg County and the City of Charlotte do hereby affirm to continue our work towards full ADA compliance and I, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte and George Dunlap, Chair of the Mecklenburg Board of County Commissions do hereby proclaim July 26th as

“AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT AWARENESS DAY”

In Charlotte and commend its observance to all of our citizens.

* * * * *

PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Lyles said I have one more person to introduce. Mr. Ratchford, if you would help me. Today we have a series of public hearings related to growth and development in our city. It includes a hearing on the second draft of the Unified Development Ordinance, a hearing on our Charlotte Streets Plan and the Tree Ordinance. Each of you should've gotten a call if you are speaking on this and you will have two minutes to speak. The clerk will take your information if it's greater than or needed for that. I just want to make sure that people know that we'll call two people down to each podium for the speakers and we will open each hearing and close it. So, just be prepared. Now it is also our practice to have a public forum on a regular week where citizens can address this council with any concept idea or thought that they would have. Tonight, we have several people signed up. They will have three minutes to speak because we have 10 people to speak.

Animal Care Ordinances

Ellanor Graves, 6121 Woodbridge Road said Mayor Lyles and members of the council. Thank you for this opportunity to lift my voice and seek your attention this evening. The matter that brings me before you pertain to nuisance of animals, Chapter 3 of the code ordinance, section 3.69 statements one and five. For background information, let me give you a brief history. Since October 2021, I have periodically filed complaints regarding the annoyance of roosters in my community. Specifically, there are two residents in my rear that own roosters plus there are more in other sections of

the community. The area in reference is the Lake Forest community and neighboring streets. This area is bordered by Albemarle Road, W. T. Harris Boulevard and Hickory Grove Road. It is across the street from Fire Station number 23 and below the Hickory Grove Police Station.

It is because of lack of response by my district representative and no significant change in conditions that I seek your attention and responsible leadership with action. I cannot peacefully enjoy my deck for reading, meditation, or entertainment because of the disturbing and annoying crowing of the roosters all day. According to code, my experiences are in keeping with the definition of public nuisance.

In addition, the aesthetics are unsightly. In preparation for this presentation, the practices of other North Carolina municipalities have been surveyed. Durham, Greensboro, Raleigh and Winston-Salem, all of these cities do not permit roosters within the city limits. As a governmental unit that subscribes to being a world class city, continuous quality improvement is an inherent practice. I urge you to be deliberate in a review of the ordinance and outlaw roosters within the city limits. Clearly the nuisance ordinance is in need of review in order to improve resident's peaceful living experience.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Graves, thank you.

Ms. Graves said Mayor Lyles and members of the council, this is a shared concern.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Graves, thank you very much for providing this information. Earlier I should have said that for each speaker that's coming including you Ms. Graves, the staff will do a follow up in the next several days or maybe this week so that you will have a response to your request. So, thank you very much for giving us the information. We have your address and things like that to contact for a follow up.

Thank Council

Larry Mackey, 8725 Water Rock Road said good evening. Good evening Mayor Lyles, council members, city manager. I'm going to talk about some old news, but it's never too late to say thank you. I want to thank every one of you all for the budget that you passed. City manager did a great job. He spoke with employees, got information from them, and he put it to action. I wanted to thank him and there's several other people. I want to thank the city manager, Mr. Jones, Ryan, the Budget Manager. Bryan, Assistant Manager. I want to thank Sheila Simpson, HR Manager and definitely the manager from HR, Paula. It is amazing when the employees agree with your pass. Normally you will hear, "Oh this," or "They could've did that," or "They could've did this." They had nothing to say because you dot the I's and cross the T's. Because of the leadership that we have in our council and in our city manager office, we are a great city because of that. From the bottom of my heart, I am very grateful for being a part and an employee of this City of Charlotte. I thank you all.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Mackey, I think we thank you. Your leadership in this organization means a lot.

Budget for Animal Care and Control

Caitlin Martin, 4047 Whipple Place said do you guys want a copy of what I have to read?

Mayor Lyles said you can give that to the city clerk after you speak and just drop off copy and she'll share it with us.

Ms. Martin said Mayor Lyles and city council members. My name is Caitlin Martin. I'm a volunteer at CMPD (Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department) Animal Care and Control, or ACC. I stand here today with the members of the Charlotte community and other volunteers to address the struggles we are facing in animal care and control. To respectfully request that you show your commitment to protecting public safety and

pti:mt

ensuring the humane care of animals by increasing the funding for ACC so it can move operations to an updated large facility or otherwise obtain a second facility for overflow use. ACC current shelter hasn't been update or expanded in nearly 30 years. It opened in 1993 so for context, it's basically the same age as me. Charlotte's population consisted of fewer than half a million people in 1993. It is now closer to 1.1 million as of 2021 per U.S. census data. With over 80 people, including their pets moving here daily from 2020 to 2021, this means there has been an increase of almost three times the population since 1993 when the shelter was built, but zero meaningful additions have been made to add shelter space for the additional animals. How is that possible?

Let's talk about how many animals are currently in ACC. Just last year in 2021 the shelter took in 8,041 animals, 5,041 which were dogs. As of May 2022, year to date, the shelter has taken in 3,302 animals, 2,317 of which were dogs. ACC is open intake which means they cannot turn away the animals even when at full capacity. Unfortunately, the shelter is at and has been at critical capacity for months. This means that although we have a target 90 percent save rate, we have not been meeting that goal. I have provided a reference sheet that sites my data. These statistics break my heart. How can we have that huge of a population increase with no increase in kennel space yet continue to call ourselves a dog friendly city. The animals we shelter now do not have cushy lives. Occasionally kennels are overcrowded. We as volunteers have been informed by shelter staff that the shelter does not meet the Department of Agriculture code in multiple areas. One of these areas being the play yards. When areas like the play yards are not up to code, the animals are unable to use them for daily exercise. They instead spend the vast majority of their days in their kennels.

The shelter is understaffed meaning if volunteers don't walk dogs, they may go days without being out. If you have pet, imagine that pet in a shelter constrained by cement walls and only being able to get out once every three days for 15 minutes and not even being able to run and play in a yard when they do go outside to play. I have provided you with pictures of a few dogs recently that I as a volunteer grew to love and adore, but ultimately, they did not get the ending they deserved. I truly believe if we had the budget and space, these dogs would have gotten the ending they deserved. A long safe healthy life in their forever homes.

The people of Charlotte care about these animals. Just look at social media engagement on the ACC's Facebook page and the number of posts on apps like Next Door that beg ACC staff members, volunteers and fosters to keep doing what they do. I hope you'll show that you care about these animals too, and about protecting public safety by increasing funding for animal care and control. We need a larger and updated facility and/or a second facility for overflow use that can safely and comfortably house more animals to save more lives and meet or even ideally surpass our 90 percent save rate. I'm happy to answer any questions you have. Thank you for your time.

Mayor Lyles said we have heard you and thank you for sharing that information. Thank you all for being volunteers at our shelter. We will follow up with you. So, thank you very much.

Economic Development

Jorge Castaneda, 5249 Central Avenue said first of all, thank you for this opportunity. Good afternoon, everyone. I am speaking here on behalf of myself and also on behalf of the vendors of the Central Market. Mayor Lyles, I am saying this to you and the other members of the chamber. I want to make a petition to reopen the center of a new flea market. Since the fateful day the market was closed to us, we have been in a struggle to get our business and our economy back to normal. Personally, my food business, I have bought more than \$20,000 of merchandise and because they closed the flea market, mostly 90 percent of my merchandise went to the trash. It wasn't fair the way they closed the flea market without giving us at least an opportunity to sell during that week. I want to thank Ms. Ajmera to speak in favor of us, but nothing has been done since that day. I don't only lose my merchandise, I lost opportunity to continue selling

my produce and to bring more income to my family. My debts are getting bigger day by day.

I want to show to you guys two statements from my credit card. This is for my business. I am late on payments on my credit cards and if this inflation keeps going the same way, I am not going to be able to pay my truck payment. I'm going to lose it and I use it for my business. I want you guys to put this situation on your hearts and help us solve it. We are struggling with this situation. This is the proof. This is my name; this is my business. I'm losing it. Everybody who sells at this flea market on the Central Avenue is losing it. Please do something to reopen or give us opportunity to buy the land. We can create a nonpublic organization. We don't want anything free, but we want to work with the City of Charlotte the right way to put our small business in the City of Charlotte the way it was. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much.

Business Opportunities

Norma Almada, 6028 McDaniel Lane said good afternoon. My name is Norma Almada. I'm here to address you because you are the people of authority who have the ability to help our families, those of which used to have a stable job at the Central Flea Market. Seven months ago, you guys promised our families help finding a new place to work at. So far till this day, we have received none of what was promised. All of this is slowly starting to affect me. I am a student who wishes that someday she will have the ability to sit in the chair that you are sitting in today. Unfortunately, with what you guys have done to me and my family in these past seven months, my mom has lost her main job, and thanks to not having the opportunity to reopen the flea market we once had, many of us and many of our families don't have the opportunity to go to school. Many falls into debt. Me and my mom aren't asking for much but for the opportunity to work. In your hands is the future of many of us kids, not only that, but our dreams and debt is something many of us don't want to fall in to. We are asking that you reopen the flea market. A place where many hard-working people once fed their families from. We the people of the Central Flea Market, my mom, me and everyone sitting in this room today, we all ask that you reopen our place of work. We are all here because we want to work. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much.

Charlotte Open Air Market

Astrid Jimenez, 328 Forest Hollow Drive, Statesville said good evening, Mayor Lyles, city council members. My name is Astrid, and I am a vendor of the Charlotte Open Air Market. I own a food truck that helps provide for my family along with my mom and my sister. I'm here as a reminder of a pending promise of finding a relocation site for our market as the last two people have spoken. It has been approximately six to seven months since we last heard you promise to us that you would help us find a relocation site. We are on the cusp of a recession with vendors struggling to make ends meet as Jorge mentioned with his debt. Again, it's been six months and we have yet to hear back. Please put yourself in the shoes of the mothers and fathers of this market who only seek the opportunity to provide for their kids. Our vendors have been tirelessly looking for a location but have had no luck. We have been out of business for six to seven months. We're not willing to be pushed aside. We are small businesses bringing a huge revenue to the City of Charlotte. What raised solutions do you guys have for us? That's the only thing we're asking.

To remind you, we are gathered together to urge you to honor your commitment and forming a partnership with the City of Charlotte to help the Central Avenue Market vendors find a permanent location. We ask that you deeply consider our requests and help the people of our community find a safe and family friendly location for our business. Thank you again for your time and we hope we can find a resolution together.

Mayor Lyles said I understand we'll continue to look for properties that you find acceptable. So, you'll hear back from us in the next several weeks or several days. Thank you very much.

Councilmember Ajmera said Mr. Jones, can you provide an update to council on this?

Mayor Lyles said we still have Mr. Vaca to go. She asked when, and so we will get back. Thank you.

Hector Vaca, 5116 Banfshire Road said good afternoon. My name is Hector Vaca. I am the Immigrant Justice Director for Action NC, but I also have the privilege of being on the board for the Central Flea Market. They've elected me to be on the board. I'm here today in support of the Central Flea Market vendors. Several months ago the City of Charlotte agreed that the circumstances that led to the ejection of these vendors were less than ideal. It was also agreed that the vendors were not at fault for staying on the property as they were not adequately informed of their need to vacate. As a result of these unfortunate circumstances, the Charlotte City Council and the City of Charlotte made a commitment to assist these vendors in finding a new location to establish their market. The city also agreed to help finance this new location for a period of time. Sadly, up to this moment the City of Charlotte has not delivered on its promise to find a location for the collective family businesses to work and thrive. The manner in which many of these vendors were ejected by CMPD can only be described as a raid by an occupying force as property was willfully damaged.

Adding insult to injury, the city staff members that led the raid were observed to have knocked elbows with smiles on their faces as if they were saying to each other, "Good job." This has yet to be addressed by the city. Between the property damage caused by CMPD, the loss of thousands of dollars in perishables, loss of customers and cost of temporary relocation. Many of these family businesses are in debt. In many cases tens of thousands of dollars. The forced closing of the Central Flea Market is a symptom of a much larger problem. At the moment, many of our affordable communities are being gentrified as this city council has allowed developers to price people out of their neighborhoods, causing many to move further away and spend more on gas and public transportation just to get to work, doctor's visits, shopping and school. The Center Flea Market provided many of the goods and services that many of these families depended on at affordable prices. As many economists are predicting, we will fall into a recession. The city's lack of follow through on its commitments is unacceptable, especially during a time when many of you are up for reelection.

This city council has yet to show its leadership in protecting our neighborhoods from developers. It has yet to show a true commitment to small businesses as it cowers to the will of corporate landlords and developers. During this election season, we the community challenge the city council to step up and truly lead showing us why you deserve to be reelected. You can start by honoring your commitment and promises. Defend the bullied instead of the bullies. Support the Central Flea Market vendors. Help these working families to get back to work.

Mayor Lyles said it's painful to hear that kind of comment about the work that we are doing. So, I'm asking Assistant City Manager Cagle to actually give us an update on what has happened and what is going on. Especially because so many of you are here tonight and we want to make sure that we leave you with what our perspective is on this issue. Mr. Cagle?

Brent Cagle, Assistant City Manager said yes Madam Mayor, members of council. I'm happy to provide an update. So, Mr. Rios and I have been working on this for several months now since the situation at Eastland occurred. We have found some sites but none of them are ideal. Most of the sites or all of the sites that we found so far are too small to accommodate the number of vendors in one location like Eastland did. So, we continue to work on it. We have also had continuing conversations with private site owners, with nonprofits in the area. Again, we continue to work on it, but one of the major problems that we continue to run in to is site size. Quite frankly that has been a

challenge for us, finding a site that is large enough to accommodate all of the vendors in one location with all of the infrastructure. Parking, and those kinds of things.

Mayor Lyles said so, who are you working with in the community as you evaluate the sites? Who is commenting on that evaluation of those sites?

Mr. Cagle said so, Mr. Rios has been working directly with Hector, Mr. Vaca. So, Mr. Rios has been in contact with Mr. Vaca and others of the newly formed cooperative or group of vendors and some others as well. So, again there have been several site tours or several conversations but none of those conversations and tours have yielded results for a site adequate to accommodate all the vendors.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Cagle I know this is all about the sites and I understand you've had multiple sites, but what is the size of the site in case anyone is watching us. The size of the site that's necessary to meet the requirements that the community is asking for. What is the size?

Mr. Cagle said so, it is tough to give an exact size, but I would say we're talking about at least an acre. Once you start factoring in parking and other things, it is a very large site. If you think about Eastland, it was 80 acres of pavement but completely open. So, once you start to factor in parking and space for the vendors and all of the goods and other things to be set up, we're talking about a fairly substantial sized site, although it may be possible to deal with a slightly smaller space.

Mayor Lyles said so, the acre is for the vendors, but the parking adds additional need for property and storage, I guess. I remember being at the site and it was a large site. So, is there anything else that you would like to say to this group tonight as we continue to work through this?

Mr. Cagle said absolutely. I guess what I would say is we will continue working on this. Mr. Rios and I have been working on this and we will continue working on it. We remain committed to try to find a site and to work with the vendors if financially the vendors need support or assistance from the city reestablishing their business. We understand that and we remain committed to that.

Mayor Lyles said alright. Thank you very much. We're going to end our public session and Mr. Jones is going to provide a report that's in more detail tonight.

Ms. Ajmera said can we ask questions? I have followed up questions for Mr. Cagle.

Mayor Lyles said could you provide those questions to the city manager?

Ms. Ajmera said no, I would like the public to hear from us directly the questions that we have. I think we haven't been given [INAUDIBLE].

Councilmember Egleston said well that was the thing I was wanting to get at, the media is obviously going to be covering this tonight. They're a lot of people out in the community who might have sites that are vacant or unused or they might have sites that don't have development plans for 5 or 10 years that might say, "My site can be that solution for a year or 2 years or 5 years." So, just wanting to give the media and the public who are watching as much information as possible about what that site looks like. I assume there is a desire for it to be somewhat proximate to the former site. If that was a successful site, I assume there is a desire to be in east Charlotte or somewhere there about. So, just anything we might want to be on that sort of ad that goes out via the media tonight about what is being looked for. So, I don't know if there's anything that you want to add to that, what you've already said.

Mr. Cagle said thus far what we have been looking for is a site that is on the east side, possibly on the west side. Again, that was part of the conversations that Mr. Rios and I have had with Mr. Vaca. One of the largest issues here is trying to find a site that is going to accommodate the traffic, folks coming to the market and provide ample space

for the vendors to set up and be able to conduct business. That has been a difficult thing. Some sites might be large enough, but they don't have the infrastructure. They don't have the parking or they're just fields or even sites that formerly were other things that are paved but they may be in poor condition and would create hazardous conditions for folks walking around and others. So, I would love to speak to anyone in the community who has ideas around possible sites because that's where we are at right now. Trying to find that site, and thus far it has been very difficult to find.

Councilmember Winston said thank you and thank you Mr. Cagle. We've been at least touching base since this first came to our attention and in knowing that there have been many different folks as you said in the community that have reached out that we tried to make work that just hasn't worked out yet. I see Mr. Vaca holding up a sign that says a minimum of five acres is needed to accommodate the space. If that wants to go out, that's helpful. One question I have of a potential partner to help us figure this out. Have we reached out to the county? I ask that because food deserts for one, this is a goal in the Comp 2040 plan. As many vendors have said, they provide food, food stuff especially food items that can't be found in some traditional stores that are important to the community over there. The county really does have more resources than us as a system set up to think about distribution and think about how to look at these things from yes, an economic development perspective that we do, but also from the health and human services perspective.

Wondering if there are ways to maybe interconnect. I just think of for instance McAlpine Park over there or something like that. Obviously, I don't want to put any words in their mouth, but this is something to think of and they have systems in place. Have we, and if we haven't, can we?

Mr. Cagle said so, yes sir this has come up as part of the conversation. So, one question was would the county be willing to make some park space available because there are parks available. The county does have a process to allow for festivals, different activities at parks but that is a permitted process. It is not for free. There are charges associated with it and the other problem with it is it's difficult to have certainty. To be able to lock in one specific location for six months, 12 months, 18 months for any certain amount of time. What the county allows for is groups. If they want to have a festival or some kind of event, to permit that or ask for a permit on that on an event-by-event basis and it makes it very difficult. So, number one there's the economic considerations, but it also makes it very difficult to create certainty with a specific location. So, I have had that conversation with the county parks and rec folks and that was where they are on [INAUDIBLE].

Mr. Winston said how about from a public health component and the access to fresh foods and vegetables to neighbors and neighborhoods that would otherwise be in a food desert?

Mr. Cagle said certainly willing to reach out to the county and have that conversation.

Mr. Winston said try that angle. Thank you.

Ms. Ajmera said I appreciate this opportunity. I know we were considering several sites, especially Simmons Y which is just a few blocks from where the current site is located. We were also considering Aldersgate. Could you please tell us why those options didn't work?

Mr. Cagle said Simmons Y is too small, however there may be some options with Simmons Y. The Simmons Y, they are still willing to talk about options. Their specific site is too small. It probably would require cooperation from CMS (Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools).

Mr. Cagle said The Simmons Y is adjacent to a school. So, in theory if the three, the Y, CMS and the vendors could work something out for a joint use, that is a possibility but again, the Simmons Y site, the part that they own was deemed too small. There were

some onsite tours and walk throughs. The Y is interested. Aldersgate, their board chose not to move forward with it. Not because they weren't interested, it was because the site that they have which is sufficiently large enough, they do have development plans and they could not say for certain how quickly those development plans will be moving forward. It could be any time in the next three to eight months. So, they weren't comfortable moving forward with this knowing that they may have to stop the market within a short period of time for their own Aldersgate development.

Ms. Ajmera said alright, so the Aldersgate option is no longer an option. So, really the only option that you were all exploring was the one with Simmons Y and CMS collaboration? Have we facilitated that conversation with this group?

Mr. Cagle said so, with the group of vendors?

Ms. Ajmera said yes.

Mr. Cagle said yes ma'am. Again, we have had the conversation, they have done the walk through, but it was not a site that was large enough. We still need to see if CMS is willing to partner on this, but even then, there may be some space constraints on that site. This CMS parking lot could assist, but it would be a space constrained site, especially in context of a desire to have a five-acre site. That will be difficult.

Ms. Ajmera said alright. So, I'm trying to figure out. Was there a meeting between CMS, Simmons Y and vendors and the city?

Mr. Cagle said no ma'am. There was a meeting with Mr. Rios, with the Simmons Y and the vendors. At that point, it was determined that the Y site was not feasible. So, I am saying that I do not know that the Y site can be feasible, but we could reengage the Y and try to engage CMS to see if there's an option. At this point, the Y site was deemed infeasible due to size.

Ms. Ajmera said I'm disappointed in this. I have expressed my frustration with Mr. Jones and my colleagues that we have failed our open-air vendors. We've always figured out the way to do big things. How about we start doing small things, especially support these vendors. Their livelihood depends on this site. They have brought traction to this Eastland site. I have gone there many times to buy produce and they really bring not just a unique nature, culture, but also workforce development opportunities. I think we just need to find a way to do this. We have found a way to do big projects. Blue line, we found ways to do Spectrum's Arena renovation, all the big projects. Why can't we figure out a way to do this. We have to give them the same level of respect that we provide to large entities, businesses and corporations. So, can we get next steps on this? What will be the next steps?

Mr. Cagle said I will be happy to provide you an update on next steps. I will discuss next steps with Mr. Rios, and we will be reaching out to the vendors as well. At this point, next steps will be to continue to try to find a site that is suitable.

Ms. Ajmera said I would also like to see if we can add this to our agenda. So, if we have a public discussion on this so that community can directly hear the efforts that we are actually making to find space for them. Thank you.

Councilmember Newton said so, Brent and I suppose Federico is probably not here tonight. I do appreciate your efforts. I likewise appreciate the efforts of the collaborative, Hector as well who is here tonight and gave a very impassioned speech. I think what you've heard is that much like this is a priority for the community it's a priority for many of us here on council. So, I want you as you continue to work and try to find a site that is suitable in size to the needs of the collaborative, and my hope, much like Councilmember Egleston had said a moment ago, my hope is that maybe someone watching tonight might have a site that's suitable. Alternatively, maybe if we work with the county as Councilmember Winston was saying. We can come to some sort of arrangement and find a solution to this. I still feel like in the interim, we need to continue

to find solutions as well. If we have multiple sites that are available, understanding that there are vendors whose businesses are very much in need, their families are very much in need, maybe we can work and find ways in which we can accommodate those vendors in the meantime. You had mentioned, and I know that this has been a part of this process, part of the conversation has been helping fund the vendors if and when we find that larger site.

Maybe we can start some of those measures in the interim as well. So, a couple of additional options I think that are worth considering as we move forward and continue to work on this finding one of those larger sites that can accommodate everyone. I am also in agreement with my colleagues in as much as continued updates or concerns. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said I would like to piggyback off what Councilmember Newton said as far as looking at interim solutions. I wanted to ask how much space did the vendors take up before?

Mr. Cagle said so, I struggled to answer that because Eastland was not space constrained. It is a massive site that is literally 80 acres of parking lot and there were no space constraints. The space needed was available because it was open. So, I said an acre. Mr. Vaca clearly believes five acres. Somewhere we need to find a site between one and five acres. The city does not own a site like that. That has been our struggle, to find a site like that, that is privately held or held by a nonprofit that would be available for this.

Mayor Lyles said we're asking once again.

Mr. Cagle said it's a very difficult ask. It has been very difficult.

Ms. Johnson said my question was, and maybe we can ask Mr. Vaca, how much space the vendors took up before of Eastland Mall? You all took up 10 acres?

Mr. Vaca said the vendors are telling me right now that it was somewhere between six and 10 that they were actually physically using when they were at the Eastland Mall.

Ms. Johnson said okay. I know that that space has been sold, but there's not activity on all of the space there currently. Is there? If it's not under construction, is there a section of that space that we can allow them to use because when you're a small business owner, six days is a long time without income, let alone six months. So, I know we as council were in discussion about some of the land. So, if there's some land that's an opportunity for them to use in the meantime, I think that's an alternative. Also, if we don't have room for all of them, they can coordinate. If some of the vendors can work two weeks out of the month or something and offer them space for them to solve. A percentage of something is better than a hundred percent of nothing. So, if there's an alternative, if we have the ability to allow them to use some of the space in Eastland until we actually need that space, I think that that's a solution. We know there's the parking, they know the location and I just think that we need to look at interim solutions sooner than later. Immediately, for their livelihood.

Mayor Lyles said thank you Ms. Johnson.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said I just have a couple of questions Mr. Cagle, a little bit along the lines of what Councilmember Johnson was just talking about. I really just feel like this is an opportunity. We talk about food deserts; we talk about corridors of opportunity. Inasmuch as we can create an opportunity for the businesses to have somewhere to conduct businesses and also create a cultural experience and create a physical health experience for members of the community who wouldn't otherwise get it. I just think this could be great. So, to that end I just wanted to ask about what you all have done or what the status may be of a couple of different items. Firstly, the state

regional farmers' market. What conversation has there been in regards to working with them?

Mr. Cagle said so, we have not had conversations with any of the regional farmers markets.

Ms. Watlington said was that an opportunity or was there something that prohibited that?

Mr. Cagle said it probably depends. I would suspect that some vendors it may be an opportunity for and some vendors not. We would need to reach out to understand that, but clearly as we've been talking to Mr. Vaca and the vendors, we have said any site that they believe is viable to bring that to us. Let's talk about that and thus far none of the farmers markets have risen as possible sites.

Ms. Watlington said okay, if we could just add that to the list of places to investigate. The next thing. I love this idea really of smaller multiple markets. I think about we do Cabinet Comments now in South End. So, you all know what Cabinet Comments is, where we set aside space where there is a public street and vendors are able to come out. I don't see any reason why we couldn't adopt a similar model for the open-air market. Even in a smaller capacity, there may be particular things where certain vendors can sign up for certain areas across the city. I know that that would require us to scale up our open streets program, but I certainly think this could be a worthy cause to do so. So, I'd love to see that.

I also think about some of our other event space. I know that as we talk about this performance center next to the basketball center, that this is exactly the kinds of things that we would want to create a space for there. So, insomuch as we could utilize our vacant lots that are over there right now. As we have these conversations, that could be an additional draw to Uptown. I think that could be a win-win. Bojangles Coliseum, whatever other event places that we have, why not put this on as a particular event. So, those are the kinds of things that I'm thinking about. So, I'd love to see the results of those investigations. Thanks.

Mr. Cagle said so, I will say one of the options that we looked at, but again there were issues, we did have conversations with Park Expo. So, Park Expo is a little bit different. Size was not the issue there. It was cost and the consistency with which Park Expo could provide because they have shows coming in. So, it's difficult when three weekends, sure, but the next weekend no and two weekends after that. That became the problem especially with Park Expo. One, the cost but also really with the other events and consistency making the site available consistently for the open-air market.

Ms. Watlington said understood. The last thing I was going to say is I absolutely can understand the difficulties of trying to get consistency. I would offer that given the current circumstance, two out of four is better than zero out of four. So, just food for thought.

Mayor Lyles said so, you can hear the understanding of the council, the commitment of the council as well as the staff to continue to work on this. So, we appreciate all of you and understand that this is something that is about how do we actually develop and work with small businesses in our community. So, thank you very much.

Councilmember Graham said I think Councilmember Watlington kind of wrapped it up for me. Other than to say that, listen, we hear you, we understand the plight, but we also understand the reality of trying to find 6 to 10 acres in east Charlotte that's unoccupied that can be leased for 18 to 24 months. I think Councilmember Watlington suggested something smaller may be better than nothing. So, I think both parties especially the vendors and my family was vendors as well. My grandmother sold flowers in the market in Charleston. So, I get it, I understand that that supports a family.

So, I get it, but I think you have to understand some of the restrictions that we have in trying to meet the requirements that's necessary for an environment that is safe. An environment that is clean, an environment that is consistent, that you can depend on for 18, 24 months, something that you can rely on. So, I don't want to leave the impression that the council is ignoring the problem. I think we've heard tonight that staff has been engaging the leadership of the organization to try identify possible solutions, but the reality is this is a tough problem. So, I hope that the committee, the group will give the council the grace to work with your leadership to find a permanent solution. It's not as easy as finding six acres in east Charlotte near the current site that's unoccupied and available.

Councilmember Bokhari said I think the problem that I've heard loud and clear is that Jorge who came and spoke and held up his bills can't wait anymore. There's no more time for waiting. What we have to do here is very easily recognize one thing. There's a difference between all of us when you show up in force and us talking here to you and paying you lip service and telling you, "Oh we care," and then staff is left on their own to try to figure out things. There's a big difference between that and us saying, "I'm going to take personal notice of this and go solve the problem alongside staff." That is the problem right now. You guys don't need more lip service, you need action, and it isn't going to happen around this dais. So, what we have to do is very simple. I'm not going to sit here and do the same thing and feed you the lip service. I've been communicating with my team right up there; Charlie and David are going to take point and we're going to spend the next 60 days solving this. We're going to figure it out and work alongside everybody and make it happen. So, I'll see you guys on the streets for that.

Unknown said you shouldn't write checks you can't cash.

Mr. Bokhari said I just took a big risk making that commitment, but we're going to follow through.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Vaca and Mr. Bokhari will meet and we will continue to appeal to people that are watching us to see if there is an opportunity to resolve this. So, Mr. Vaca be sure to contact Mr. Bokhari.

Ms. Johnson said one last question. This is for Brent. How much of the land does the city still own at that Eastland Mall site?

Mr. Cagle said at the Eastland Site? The city owns 100 percent of it.

Ms. Johnson said okay. The city owns 100 percent. So, then I'd like to make a motion that we allow the vendors to continue to use this space, perhaps on a month-to-month basis. Well, I would like to make the motion to allow them to use the space until it is absolutely needed. It's been sitting there waiting on construction. I understand we're moving forward, we're developing it, we get that, but if it's not needed or if it hasn't sold at this time, if we still own the land, they could've been using it for the past six months it sounds like. So, that's my motion. I'd like to make that motion Mayor. Hopefully I have a second.

Mayor Lyles said you have to have unanimous support to put it on the agenda.

Unknown said second.

Mayor Lyles said so, we have to have motion to put [INAUDIBLE]. It's not on the agenda. I think you could ask the city staff to tell you if that feasible and bring it back quickly.

Ms. Johnson said well can you find out if we have unanimous consent?

Mayor Lyles said we certainly can. I have a motion to add this to the agenda. Raise your hand if you'd like to see that motion on the agenda. You want to discuss the motion Mr. Driggs?

pti:mt

Councilmember Driggs said yes. I don't think we should do this hastily tonight because there's a whole sequence of events related to our development at Eastland and our plans for Eastland which are large scale where there are lead times. The site had to be cleared if I understand correctly because of site development and other work that's intended to take place there. So, I would like to see us at least get the benefit of a little more input from the staff and have an orderly vote on the agenda at a future meeting and not tonight.

Ms. Johnson said can I respond to that?

Mayor Lyles said no. You've made a motion. He has commented on the motion. Further discussion on the motion.

Ms. Johnson said okay, this is further discussion.

Unknown said it doesn't matter now because it's not unanimous.

Mayor Lyles said it's not going to be unanimous. He is opposed to it. So, it's not going to be on the agenda. Thank you very much for the time and attention. I think you do have an action step. So, please look forward to the conversation with Mr. Bokhari and Mr. Vaca. The staff will continue to do the work that council has acknowledged or attempted to present as an alternative. So, that is the end of our public forum. Thank you very much everyone. We are now on our next agenda item which is our next public hearing. Again, this is a series of public hearings that we're having as underdevelopment. We'll begin with a public hearing on the City of Charlotte's Unified Development Ordinance. I would like to recognize the chair of the Transportation and Planning Committee, Ms. Eiselt.

Ms. Johnson said Mayor before we proceed. I have a point of order on the last issue. We didn't have unanimous consent, but don't we just need six to put it on a future agenda?

Councilmember Eiselt said you wanted to vote on it tonight.

Mayor Lyles said you made the motion for tonight. So, talk to the city attorney and you guys get it straightened out and then we can figure it out. Let's go with the next item. Thank you very much for your attendance. It's really appreciated.

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM NO. 8: PUBLIC HEARING ON THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Councilmember Eiselt said in a moment, we're going to hear from Alyson Craig, our Interim Planning Director for a brief overview on where we are in the process of developing the Unified Development Ordinance, or as many of you know, that it's called the UDO. I would just want to say for those that aren't as familiar with the UDO, we estimate it at least seven years in the making. I recall that far back. Mr. Driggs probably does and those of us who have been on council that long. So, this isn't something that was developed overnight. It's been developed with the engagement of two groups of citizens that's made up of professionals and residents that met for a couple of years even pre COVID. It's basically a course correction of all of the comprehensive ordinances that have been overlaid for decades and that we knew conflicted with each other in many cases. So, it's hard to do something to correct something that's been done for decades, but the UDO is this attempt to set the groundwork in a document in order to move forward with planned development for a community. Something that we have been desperately needing because for anybody who tunes into our zoning

meetings, we go through seven hours on a Monday hearing planning proposals on a transactional basis. This is part of moving forward with a plan for planned growth.

We know that there's differences of opinions on topics. We're going to hear from speakers tonight on both sides of the issue and I think that's really important because this is a living document. We know that once it's voted on, if we get to vote on it, that there will be changes to the ordinance. So, for anybody who's not completely happy and I don't know, maybe we'll hear from some speakers who love the entire thing tonight, but I think you'll see a difference of opinion on both sides. Know that this is anticipated. There can be edits to this ordinance after it's been approved at any time and we anticipate it will because the city's growing and we will see changes to the city that we didn't anticipate. So, with that I'd like to invite up our Interim Planning Director, Alyson Craig. Thank you.

Alyson Craig, Interim Planning Director said good evening mayor, manager, council and members of the public. I wanted to take a few moments to highlight the history of the work on the UDO and where we are today and next steps. As Mayor Pro Tem mentioned as well as the mayor, there's been a great deal of work and many years have gone in to developing the city's first Unified Development Ordinance. I would like to thank Laura Harmon, the UDO Project Manager for her leadership and all the efforts by the UDO team, our consultants Camiros, and all the city and county departments who have collaborated on this.

Also, very involved in the development of the UDO as the Mayor Pro Tem mentioned is the Ordinance Advisory Committee (OAC). This was formed in late 2016 to begin talking through updates to ordinances written at different times over the last 30 years to reduce inter-ordinance conflicts and modernize our regulations. The OAC is made up of neighborhood representatives, community members, development industry and advocacy groups. In 2018 the city made the decision to complete a comprehensive plan to set a citywide comprehensive vision. The full UDO rewrite was paused but we completed some quick wins with text amendments to particularly challenging parts of the ordinance and completed a total rewrite of the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) regulations which were passed by council in 2019.

The UDO team has worked closely over the last few years with the comprehensive plan team and released the first draft of the UDO in fall of 2021. Since the first draft was released, we have had many, many meetings with the community, stakeholder groups, planning commission, and council including several UDO workshops with council members. We believe the UDO represents the balance of all the feedback that we have received. I wanted to highlight a few topics that have been discussed a lot over the last year. First, starting about trees. We've had a lot of conversations about heritage trees. Heritage tree requirements are a big step forward for Charlotte as these trees are not regulated or protected today. Allowing removal where demonstrated conflicts exists is the best place to begin these regulations for Charlotte as it will allow us to track and better understand the location and the impact that heritage trees have for residents and for Charlotte's tree canopy, and better understand how regulations should be modified in the future.

What we haven't talked about are some of the other tree regulation highlights. The UDO contains stronger preservation requirements than we have in the ordinance today. We've removed all trees save exemptions, increased tree save area and have also increased the cap for tree save payment in lieu. We have new frontage planting requirements for residential, single lot and full development that will provide important tree-lined sidewalks in our community, and finally funding programs from fees collected in the UDO will bring thousands of new trees into our city and provide residents help in managing their large trees.

For parking, the draft as written creates a balance between limiting parking in an area where there are other transportation alternatives while recognizing that some of our city still requires cars and parking. As we continue to advance our transportation goals, including those recently passed by council with the Strategic Mobility Plan, we will

update parking requirements. We are working with CDOT (Charlotte Department of Transportation) who is currently conducting a parking study and will use this information to guide changes in the future.

Building heights. We've heard from council and the community that greater transitions are needed between neighborhoods and higher density. We made that adjustment in the second draft and have balanced that with increased heights in districts where additional density should be prioritized like centers.

Finally, affordable housing. The residential density bonus and today's ordinance has never been used. The height bonus program and TOD however has been successful and has committed more than \$5 million to the Housing Trust Fund. The UDO will expand this to more districts, potentially four times the land area of TOD, and finally we've worked closely with housing and neighborhood services, and we propose a menu of new incentives that will effectively add more affordable units and homes to Charlotte. We're proposing an UDO effective date of June 1, 2023. This allows us time to update our processes and educate the public on the changes. You've heard Mayor Pro Tem mention this as a living document, and you've heard me mention several times about updating the UDO. We view it as a living document and will continue to bring text amendments forward as we learn from implementation as well as recommendations for updates that come from the community, from council and council committees and commissions.

Tonight, we'll be hearing on three connected items. The UDO, the Streets Manual and Map and an amendment to the tree ordinance. The Streets Manual and Map is an important complement to the UDO as there are standards in the UDO that depend on the type of street. Further the comprehensive transportation review that provides additional multimodal requirements and updates to traffic impact studies for rezoning and by-right projects depends on the type of zoning district outlined in the UDO. Tonight, finally, there's also a hearing on the tree ordinance. This is partially procedural as it aligns the development related tree regulations into the Unified Development Ordinance and the nondevelopment regulations into the tree ordinance. After tonight, the next step in the process will be to go before the Planning Committee of the planning commission who is responsible for providing a recommendation to council in advance of the council vote on August 22nd.

The Planning Committee and Commission Chairperson Keba Samuel is here alongside other committee and commission members. They meet on July 19th at 5:30 pm. At that meeting, Planning Committee will discuss and make recommendations on the UDO and the tree ordinance that have public hearings tonight. Prior to that meeting, you're welcome to contact them to provide input. You can find their contact information on the city's website. In advance of the Planning Committee meeting, we will issue a summary of recommended changes to the UDO on July the 14th for Planning Committee's consideration and for public view. These changes are based on feedback we received since the second draft was released including comments made this evening. To clearly identify all recommended additions and deletions, the summary will be redlined and highlighted to clearly distinguish staff recommendations since the second draft release.

Any additional recommendations or changes determined by the Planning Committee at their July 19th meeting will be incorporated into a third draft called the adoption draft that will be released on August 15th in advance of the city council vote on August 22nd. Finally, I look forward to hearing comments from the community and from council. I'll turn it back over to you mayor. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright, now we will hear from our speakers. I'm going to call four people down at a time. I also want to recognize that we have the Planning Committee in attendance with us tonight for the public hearing. So, thank you very much. Each speaker will have two minutes.

Lorena Castillo-Ritz, 6706 Alexander Hall Drive said thank you Madam Mayor. Good evening. It's Lorena Castillo-Ritz. I stand here before you for the third time addressing

the same issue, the UDO. It's not all bad. Some of it has some good parts, specifically the abolishment of single-family housing. It feels like it fell upon some deaf ears. Some of the council members are trying to pull a fast one on the citizens of Charlotte by getting rid of single-family housing during the lame duck session. That is very disappointing. As stated before, this plan hurts the very communities most of the council say they're trying to help. It wasn't planned but a perfect example. I'm 100 percent Hispanic. My parents immigrated from El Salvador. That Hispanic community was moved out by developers. There's no ifs, ands or buts. You had six months to help them. Extreme measures such as abolishing single-family homes very rarely works. This part of the UDO makes it harder for young families of meeting and come to eventually buy a single-family home where their children can play outside in their own yards. A place to call their own. All of the young families I have spoken to, 100 percent of them about the UDO are unaware of the abolishment of single-family houses and are not interested in living in close quarters in multi-family units.

The people who are really going to reap from this are the developers. I think it was a developer who moved out my Hispanic community out of that part of town. This will make the cost of single-family home dwellings sky high which will make it impossible for young families to buy a home. This is like an alternative reality for me, where Mr. Potter of It's a Wonderful Life or Biff, of Back to the Future Part II takes over and ruins their beautiful community.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Ritz, thank you for your comments. If you have additional remarks and you'd like to leave them with the clerk for the record, we will have a copy of those.

Eric Zaverl, 828 East 36th Street said good evening, Mayor, city council members and staff. My name is Eric Zaverl, I am sharing Sustain Charlotte's feedback on the current UDO draft. Since 2017, I have served on the Ordinance Advisory Committee first working on the TOD ordinance update and then on the UDO itself. We have submitted over two dozen comments on the UDO since last year. Most of the comments dealt with supporting the tree heritage protections, reducing parking requirements and the general improvements of zoning using smart growth principles. City council attempted to incorporate some of our recommendations regarding parking in to the second draft, but given the negative feedback and general hesitation from your work sessions, they never made it. We are disappointed to see Charlotte move backwards by requiring more parking in this draft than we currently require in our most recent TOD ordinance adopted in 2019. We're especially saddened to see this around our transit stations.

Therefore, we urge you to support the changes to the parking regulations staff first proposed in this draft. Additionally, we're also asking for you to keep protections for heritage trees including safeguards to prevent loopholes and to restore some of the building design standards that were removed from the first draft. I don't have time to cover all the items that we support in the latest draft, but our other fellow members and neighbors from more neighbor's coalition are here tonight and they will cover the items we shared together. If our recommended changes to the parking requirements are incorporated in this final draft, we will support it and encourage you to do the same. Strong leadership is needed from you to tackle the necessary work to seriously move us beyond our car dependence that we have today. Perfect this document is not, but it is a step in the right direction towards achieving our climate, affordable housing, economic mobility and equity goals. Thank you for this opportunity. We hope you to continue to work with us in making Charlotte more livable.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much Eric. We appreciate your remarks.

Steve Yaffe, 1638 Emerywood Drive said thank you. I appreciate the opportunity as a new resident of Charlotte to testify regarding the draft UDO. Adoption of a revised UDO is of course not an end in itself. The UDO will have to interact with the Charlotte Comprehensive Plan as well as the Strategic Mobility Plan in governing land use. It will also have to interact with health policies and other aspects of local government to do this properly. The common objective of course is a city that enables all of its citizens to fully engage in learning, earning and peacefully participating in community life. So, I'm

here tonight to emphasize both collaboration aspects and the needs of people with disabilities. Thank you for that excellent resolution on Disability Awareness Day, very relevant.

Consistently, surveys of people with disabilities highlights two impediments to living a productive life. The lack of affordable accessible housing and transportation which is my field. People with disabilities are twice as likely not to have dependable transportation which of course makes it difficult to find and keep their jobs, take care of health needs, build friendships, relationships and family connections, and take part in community activities in the local economy. By enabling people with disabilities to live near transit hubs, especially in transit oriented developments, more can connect with jobs, shopping and services. I want to thank the Charlotte Planning Design and Development staff for defining pedestrian in Article 2.3 of the draft UDO as anyone who travels on foot as well as those with disabilities who require assistive devices. I also appreciate the emphasis on affordable housing in section 16.1 and 16.4, but let's make a connection. Affordable housing should be accessible, incorporating the principles of universal design and a new construction. That's not a significant added cost. Certainly, can be more than made up with reduced parking minimums.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much. If you want to send those to us, we get your emails.

Julie Porter, 4601 Charlotte Park Drive, Suite 350 said good evening, Mayor and council members. I'm Julie Porter, President of DreamKey Partners. DreamKey Partners is a nonprofit organization with over 30 years of community development work in Charlotte. DreamKey is also a founding member of Neighbors for More Neighbors Charlotte and represents their interests. We support current UDO and urge you to support it as well. This plan removes the historical zoning regulations that so often have forced affordable housing out of high opportunity areas. It replaces those zoning codes with meaningful and thoughtful development regulations that we believe will enable us to build in more locations by right. The UDO will also lead to more density and units of housing. Charlotte is desperately short of overall housing inventory which has driven prices up and out of reach for many renters as well as first time home buyers who might qualify for House Charlotte.

There's been speculation on whether this plan will help affordable housing development. One thing I would point out is that the zoning codes we have now has not stopped development of high-end homes. Our current neighborhoods are gentrifying day-by-day with a new house replacing an older one on just about every block of the northwest side of our city. To not have a plan means the same contentious rezonings for affordable rental housing and the same unequal outcomes. This plan also provides bonuses for affordable housing development that allows us to increase density which is desperately needed if we are to build projects that work financially. We do have some concerns that the UDO may increase development cost, however we trust that city council and staff will work with us to find solutions to cover new gaps in financing.

We want to thank and commend city staff, especially Alyson Craig and Laura Harmon for their proactive engagement to seek feedback and insight on the plan from all sectors. This plan gained support and input from thousands of community stakeholders. It has built in guardrails; it respects the character of existing neighborhoods and describes next steps to safeguard them. We can't delay the rapid growth of Charlotte and we shouldn't delay this UDO. DreamKey Partners believes it will improve the prospect of affordable housing in high opportunity areas.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much Ms. Porter.

Laura Belcher, 3815 Latrobe Drive said good evening, Mayor Lyles and council members. Thank you for your time tonight. I'm Laura Belcher, I'm the president and CEO of Habitat for Humanity of the Charlotte region and a member of Neighbors for More Neighbors. Working in collaboration with other organizations committed to affordable housing and the livability of our community has allowed us to focus on how to

unify development ordinance, would better support Habitat's ability to build more units and remove barriers to homeownership. We believe the work of the UDO has been comprehensive and inclusive and the time has come to support its adoption. Within the current draft, we believe there are many things that are beneficial, but I want to highlight three in particular that are in the UDO draft that are essential in executing our mission effectively.

One is the inclusion of the UDO's second draft, the affordable housing development allowance. This allows Habitat to install many of the same amenities such as widened sidewalks and things that other for-profit developers in their communities do without driving the cost for Habitat homeowners. This begins to address public equity in public places for these developments, allowing teachers, office workers, retail clerks and other hard-working families and opportunity to purchase affordable housing that is attractive and safe for their communities.

Two, the geographic expansion of density bonuses for affordable housing will be especially beneficial as we seek to expand affordable homeownership throughout the city.

Three, the UDO encourages the development of duplexes, triplexes and quads, expanding the opportunities to better utilize parcels and increasing the housing stock while controlling for the largest driver of costs, land value. This flexibility in housing types can lead to more mixed income developments and address gentrification that is happening in many of our city neighborhoods right now. In addition, the elimination of the requirement in the first draft that lots containing duplexes, triplexes and a quads have only one curb cut per street frontage will be cost effective for construction and ensures viability of increased density on smaller sized lots.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much. Please send the remainder of the remarks to the clerk's office.

Sam Smith, Jr., 7008 Palatine Lane said good evening, Mr. Manager, Madam Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem, city council. My name is Sam Smith, Jr. I'm here today on behalf of Neighbors for More Neighbors Coalition, which I have the pleasure to lead. The Neighbors for More Neighbors Coalition is an organized group that was formed in 2020 that consists of nonprofit, corporate partners, neighborhood organizations and individuals that support the concept of smart growth imbedded in the 2040 Comp Plan and the UDO. For us, smart growth means comprehensive citizen engaged approach to land planning as well as equitable economic and community development focused on slowing and reversing worsening environmental conditions, encouraging mixed building types, promoting more transportation choices and less congested traffic patterns. Supporting the development of diverse housing options, including affordable housing, protection of heritage trees, including safeguards to prevent loopholes and restore some design standards and more comprehensible regulations.

Additionally, we support the inclusion of more housing types like duplexes, triplexes in neighborhood one, and new affordable housing development allowances in section 16.4. The increase building heights and standards districts, and lastly the added ability to use tier three parking standards in any district except neighborhood one within half mile of existing transit stations. I want to thank city staff such as Alyson Craig, Laura Harmon and Alysia Osborne which have worked very closely with us and made themselves available to provide us with information to inform our decision as a coalition to support the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. In conclusion, the UDO is clear. The current zoning laws are outdated and will not keep up with the growth rate in Charlotte in the future. They do not conform to strategic growth mapping that will sustain Charlotte neighborhoods and equitable prosperity for families. The status quo has given Charlotte hyper segregation by race and income inequality doled out amenities and benefits for disinvested working class families. So I ask that you please support the UDO. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you.

pti:mt

Tony Lathrop, 2714 Belvedere Avenue said good evening folks. I'm Tony Lathrop. Not wearing my DOT (Department of Transportation) hat, but here as chair of the Ordinance Advisory Committee. I've been the chair of that committee since its inception. There have been at least 68 people who have given their time on their own behalf as representatives of important stakeholders and stakeholder groups in this city, including neighborhoods and on down the line, and have met over 50 times since the inception of the OAC in 2016. I served with many of you who are still on the council on the planning commission from 2011 to '17 and chaired it for three years and so have been with this since the inception.

There's been a lot of comments about the substance, but I want to talk about the process. I've said since the beginning, we have a process that's been very inclusive, very transparent and very rigorous. That kind of thing leads to good outcomes and sound outcomes. Here we have had a very, very inclusive and rigorous process. I want to thank the staff Alyson, Laura, Allen and their team and many others about that. Thank the OAC members and all the stakeholders who've been involved in this. We've had many, many community meetings, there's online portals, thousands of comments to which the staff has responded. Drafts circulated, office hours, comments on all sides of it and they've been addressed. It's been a fantastic process and an important part. We're close to the goal line and tonight's public hearing is part of that process. So, this process is an example in which Charlotte can be proud for the whole country. I thank you all, and I speak in favor of this ordinance. So, thank you very much.

Mayor Lyles said thank you Mr. Lathrop.

Sara Reidy-Jones, 2716 Olympus Drive said good evening council members. My name is Sara Reidy-Jones and I recently had the opportunity to witness my assistant's glee when she discovered she qualified for a mortgage to purchase her first home. I personally watched as that initial excitement has turned to disappointment and frustration as she's realizing the opportunity to purchase a starter home in Charlotte isn't remotely feasible. We are watching starter homes and starter neighborhoods phase out and the passing of the UDO will only expediate this drought of a affordable housing. During my daily commute, I drive through neighborhood after neighborhood that is going through gentrification, and I can see the homeowners that can no longer afford to live in their homes of often decades. Through Berkshire Boulevard to Wesley Heights to Enderly Park to LoSo, I see the struggle daily as small homes are being paved for Starbucks and skyscrapers.

We're hurting those that the plan 2040 claims to help the most. To those saying gentrification is already here, how about we actually offer real solutions instead of Band-aids like we always do with the City of Charlotte. Even in my own neighborhood, due to skyrocketing home costs, I can no longer afford to purchase a single home in the very neighborhood that I moved to five years ago. Add the disastrous effects we know that will happen should this ordinance pass. When I'm even agreeing with WFAE when they report that abolishing single family home zonings in cities like Minneapolis is a failure in both affordability and segregation. This is a bipartisan cry to our city council to say no to the UDO and go back to the drawing board on how to realistically provide smart growth and affordable housing with the parts that do work of the UDO. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you. Ms. Wright.

Jasmine Wright, 1817 Central Avenue said good evening. Thank you all for allowing me this opportunity to speak. Before I do so, I definitely would like to make note or even a suggestion to the council, when signing up for this and asking where we stood in favor, there wasn't an unsure option. So, for future reference, I think that would be idea. My name is Jasmine Wright. I am a community organizer, leader, activists. I do a lot of things here in Charlotte. Right now, I'm currently organizing with Redress Movement. We're working to redress racial segregation right here in Charlotte. So, we're talking about building out Charlotte's future, but I don't think we've done much to address what happened to Charlotte in the past and I'm particularly talking about the Brooklyn community. In 1950s, 1960s, we saw the Charlotte's Chamber of Commerce and

Charlotte realtors as well as some Charlotte city leaders pretty much decide to vote or displace thousands of Black residents and businesses all in the name of urban renewal.

As we're building out or planning Charlotte's future, I don't think that not mentioning Brooklyn should go unheard of. Right now as it stands, the UDO definitely isn't perfect. They're a lot of things that could be done to address some of the issues that we are making reference to, however, I do believe that we can see some of what we need in terms of making this push for redress when it comes to the Community Benefits Taskforce that's in that Charlotte 2040 plan. We're seeing how a lot of decisions are being made behind closed doors, a lot of the funding is not getting to where it needs to go. So, as a member of the City of Charlotte, I definitely want to ask you all to not only support or push for it with the 2040 plan.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Wright, thank you very much for your time. If you'll give the remainder of your questions to the city clerk, we will get back. Okay, thank you.

Anne Marie Peacock, 2210 Summer Green Avenue said thank you Mayor Lyles and council members. I am Anne Marie Peacock and a Republican candidate for the NC State House and a Charlotte citizen. The current UDO reflects poorly on the judgment of this city council and its ability to put its citizens first. Instead of dealing with rising crime, a spiraling cost of living and a crumbling infrastructure, the council would rather pander to social engineers that allow politically connected developers to destroy the character of Charlotte's single-family neighborhoods. If adopted, the UDO will lead to more concrete high rises, more traffic that already burdens our roads and more flooding from storm water systems unable to handle the runoff already from miles and miles of concrete. Charlotte's quality of life will suffer under the insanely high population density that forces ordinance citizens into cramped housing that provides no privacy or freedom.

That alone shows Charlotte is in desperate need of a total change in council membership. This council has been more concerned with squeezing more tax revenue out of every overbuilt plot of land than making Charlotte a prosperous, safe and pleasant place to live for all. Even if the council does put the interest of wealthy donors and connected developers over the ordinary Charlottetians, there are leaders here tonight including myself who are ready to go to Raleigh and use the power of the state to stop this council from overreach. The UDO is an overly aggressive approach that will limit housing development and actually impede the city's own goal of creating more affordable housing. I'm praying this month's mayoral and city council elections will give us a clean slate of Republicans that will represent its citizens and small businesses. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you Ms. Peacock.

John Comer, 1817 Central Avenue said good evening. My name is John Comer. I am the National Field Director for the Redress Movement. Redress is about making right. My colleague Jasmine spoke on it earlier. The Redress Movement was inspired by the book The Color of Law. If you haven't read it, I suggest you read it. The Color of Law did a great job in connecting the dots as how government sponsored segregation, and I know you sit in the chambers consistently talking about crime and things of that nature, which can be traced back to segregation, under funded neighborhoods, under funded schools and things of that nature. The Redress Movement believes in multifamily housing. The Redress Movement believes in mixed income housing because that allows more opportunity for people to thrive in this society. I want to ask you to lean into this and as my colleague said, the Brooklyn people as well as the generations that followed behind them are still reeling from their communities being bulldozed. From my understanding the second ward has land and there's money available for affordable housing. So, let's not be complicit in a second wave of segregation or a third wave of segregation. Let's address this the right way or redress, which is to make right and to bring just to the folks of Charlotte as we continue to work nationwide. I'm here in Charlotte today. Redress Charlotte.

Mayor Lyles said thank you Mr. Comer.

David Merrill, 153 South Bruns Avenue said I'd like to begin by using some of my time to help Mr. Vaca who I believe is outside speaking with his group. There are two good locations which he can use and this can be resolved tonight. The first one is at West Tryon at the intersection of North Bruns Avenue. The second on Monroe Road across from Village Lake at McAlpine Station. That is a very large plot of land. It's been used for things in the past. I used to live in that community. I think it would be a phenomenal location.

To get to the UDO. How to address a 650-page document in three minutes. That's the Charlotte way and now it's two minutes. This is a complete farce. While I believe in the intention of trying to help people of Charlotte being smart in our community, this is the wrong approach. There are too many things in this document that will eliminate single family housing. That will accelerate gentrification. Mr. Graham, I live in your community. I'm just a few blocks away from where Five Points Plaza was opened and many of you were there for the ribbon cutting. This is going to accelerate gentrification in my neighborhood where there are people that are part of the fabric of this community that are going to be displaced from their homes. We are rushing through this and doing this for all the right reasons in the exact wrong way. We need to pause this, take more time for input, look at better development plans to keep single family housing intact and instead of trying to have a global plan that allows you to manage the far east neighborhoods like your area Ms. Ajmera, to your area, to all the different parts of town. You can't manage these areas the same way. You can't develop them the same way. You need to leave this to be neighborhood specific and allow people to keep the charm and the character of their communities.

As far as the rest of this goes, as I mentioned during the press conference outside, I've seen many of your campaign finance reports. I've seen which of you have had substantial donations from the local developers, from the realtor commissions, from the real estate associations. This does not look good, especially coming in to election, rushing this through between the election and when people are sworn in.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much Mr. Merrill.

Bill Fountain, 20524 Deep Cove Court said good evening. I'm Bill Fountain. As you know, the eighth commandment says, "Thou shall not steal." This means that God gave us the right to private property. While your council, Democrats, advertised this Unified Development Ordinance is for the common good, I see that it is stealing small businesses and homeowners' property rights. What is it with you Democrats that make you want to control our lives. You screwed up your overreach on the shutdown and masks and let's look at some of the specifics that you're doing now. First you have new rules that are going to rob homeowners of their rights to remove trees from their backyards and throw in maybe \$1,000 permit.

Second, the additional foot on the foot plain requirement is going to prohibit some people from making renovations to their property. Third, you have a new requirement for the small business owners that could put them on the hook for putting in a curb, gutters, sidewalks and plant trees just for changing the focus of their business. Fourth, your parking regulations on charging facilities for electric vehicles are guesses and will be wrong. Let the market make this decision. Fifth, the second draft of the height requirements still encroach on the small density housing. What are you trying to do? To run homeowners out of their houses. Lastly, this ordinance will make Charlotte a more expensive place to live and work. I hope the Charlotte citizens recognize that this city council isn't serving you well. We need council members who strive to keep this city safe and not steal our property rights. Thank you.

Philip Gussman, 2008 Winter Street said hello Mayor, city council. I'm here to address you just as a neighbor. Just as a neighbor of 34 years active in our community, active around the city, trying to do everything we can to make this city better. I love Charlotte. Approval of the UDO is the correct step forward for our city. It will give our city the tools

to preserve, grow and adapt like we have never had. Simpler and clearer ways to help meet the needs of our community instead of relying on negotiating rezonings that seldom bring the promised benefits to our community. The ability and tools needed in order for communities to organize, participate and the developments surrounding them. More trees protected and replaced. More protection for those communities that can't or haven't been able to organize in the past, and most importantly the encouragement of more diversity of housing that can lead to more diverse communities and neighbors who can stay in our city instead of having to move to meet their housing needs. The UDO is the answer right now for Charlotte. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you.

David Capper, 8932 Nottoway Drive said thank you members of the council. Charlotte does need a plan for orderly city growth if it protects citizens, their property rights, the city's natural resources and beauty. The proposed UDO will only further divide our city, undermine the ability of any neighborhood to defend its unique character and diminish the quality of life for all. All because someone wants to cram more population into our city with no regard for the consequences. The worst part of the UDO is the allowance for duplexes, triplexes and even higher density housing to be built in single-family home neighborhoods, section four, page one. This provision exposes the UDO's true goals. More population at a higher density and more tax revenue for politicians to spend as they see fit. The zoning proposed will only intensify density related problems Charlotte already faces. Multifamily zoning necessarily entails more intensive use of land as well as an increased strain on the surrounding infrastructure and thus a heightened need for more revenue. Which unsurprisingly will only give rise to claims that more high-density housing is needed. The attempt to destroy single family neighborhoods is not the only problem with the UDO. Its provisions allowing voluntary mixed income high density housing to be built in any single-family neighborhood, as long as some units are set aside as affordable housing is another.

I do wonder who exactly volunteers under that provision? The current residents of the neighborhood or a politically correct connected corporation driven by some social engineering ideology, or even just plain greed. The UDO as it stands is not wise policy. Adopting it will only harm Charlotte.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much Mr. Capper.

Mary Barnett, 6025 Pleasant Grove Road said good evening, Mayor Lyles and councilmen. My name is Mary Lineberger Barnett and I am running for a seat on this council for District 2. One of the reasons I decided to run was the hasty passage of the 2040 plan and the removal of single-family housing from that plan. It is hostile to a lifestyle that many Americans of all different backgrounds value and will speed up gentrification. Note that 70 percent of the land area in Charlotte is currently zoned single family. The potential impact of the change in zoning is huge. The transition to duplexes and triplexes will be limited by the existence of HOA deed restrictions in many neighborhoods were single family homes, but the net effect is that the low-income neighborhoods who do not have the protection of HOAs and deed restrictions will be probable targets first. That will result in accelerated gentrification and rising housing prices. Mayor Lyles was quoted in June 2021 by the Charlotte Observer that the passing of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan disrupts the status quo and ensures equitable growth over the next two decades. Can someone please define equitable growth as it pertains to this UDO?

It will not be equitable to me. There is a two-acre piece of land next to my home and I do not live in a neighborhood that has HOA and deed restrictions. We are an area of single-family homes. If the owner chooses to sell it, I will not be able to prevent a duplex development from being built and the value of my home will go down. This will affect me personally as well as the undeserved low-income citizens of my district, District 2. I am against the passage of the current version of the UDO and as a city council woman, I will fight to keep the integrity of our neighborhoods intact for continued generational wealth. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you.

Jimmy Vasiliou, 3001 Shallowood Lane said hello Mayor Lyles, members of city council, staff and residents of Charlotte. My name is Jimmy Vasiliou. I'm speaking tonight in regard to the Unified Development Ordinance or the UDO as a member of the Housing Justice Coalition and the Charlotte Community Benefits Coalition. Throughout the 2040 plan process, the two organizations of which I'm a part have been deeply engaged in the plan, policy map and UDO. As a result, we presented a number of policy suggestions within the UDO in order to [INAUDIBLE] rampant speculation leading to gentrification. We have also provided policy alternatives to provide solutions to disinvestment and working-class communities by ensuring community benefits are secured from large transformational development projects that would benefit the residents of these communities rather than displace them.

While the city has created the Equitable Development Commission, the Charlotte's Nest Commission and formerly recognize the Charlotte Community Benefits Coalition in the 2040 plan, these were not the city's [INAUDIBLE]. These were due to the efforts of the residents and members of each of the aforementioned organizations in which I am a part who have spent months organizing and pushing for the city to live up to the words of equity that it espouses in policy documents and grand press conferences. The second draft of the UDO includes bonuses to developers for affordable housing despite the fact that this attempt at bonuses has been performed in the past along the blue line north extension. Very few developers took advantage of these bonuses and that's what we see along the north end of the blue line as a repeat of the displacement and gentrification seen all along South Boulevard, South Tryon.

We ask that the city look for solutions that are driven by community who want investment in their communities without displacement. We ask that the staff incorporate some of the work being performed in the Community Benefit Taskforce within the UDO. The overwhelming response of the taskforce, which includes residents from neighborhoods across Charlotte such as Clanton Park, Eastway/Sheffield Park and South Park have been to ensure that any public dollars or public incentives used on the [INAUDIBLE] are steered by the communities in which they will affect. It's these kind of policies with communities helping to decide the use of public funds.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much. Your time is up. If you will continue to send your remarks to the city clerk. We'll get those by email. Thank you very much.

Gillie Soratt, 2601 Hampton Avenue said I'm Gillie Soratt. I'd like to start by thanking you for your service. All of you work tirelessly and put a lot of thought and efforts into your decisions and I realize it's a sacrifice for many of you if not all of you. I'm here tonight on a matter that's not probably as important as many of the others tonight, but it's important to me. I'm concerned about a proposed change to the accessory structures set back to the side of residences. Not behind residences but beside residences. What is an accessory structure? It can mean a pool house, tool shed, all kinds of things. Under the current code, the required side yard minimum setback for accessory structures next to a residence is six feet for R3 and five feet for R4,5, 6 and 8. UDO page 17.1. Accessory structures beside a residence will have to have a minimum setback of just three feet from the side property line. I would submit to you that a three-foot minimum side setback is not good policy for a number of reasons.

It reduces the green space between the sides of neighboring structures, whether they're houses or duplexes or whatever. It encourages larger obtrusive accessory structures beside residences. It adversely affects enjoyment and potentially the value of the neighboring property holder. Before the hearing tonight, Officer Hough was nice enough to give the clerk, Ms. Kelly a photograph that I had. You have them in front of you.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Soratt, your time is up for this but we do have the photograph, and I'm sure that if you will give the clerk the remainder of your information.

Mr. Soratt said can I take 10 seconds? It was the most important part.

pti:mt

Mayor Lyles said I'm sorry Mr. Soratt, we have to follow the rules for everyone. So, thank you.

Mr. Soratt said thank you.

Charlie Mulligan, 12328 Sandringham Place said good evening, I'm Charlie Mulligan and I am a YIMBY which means Yes In My Backyard. I'm a millennial and I'm a candidate for Charlotte City Council, but I'm going to disagree with some of the other speakers. I don't believe that this UDO issue a partisan issue. I think it's an issue that affects every community in this city. I'm going to agree with some of our earlier speakers who used the example of the Brooklyn community and I think you then expanded to the Cherry community as well. Many times, we begin with very well-intentioned policy that unfortunately leaves those with the least amount of resources to protect themselves in terrible positions. I came to my position to not support the UDO based off of my conversations with folks in the neighborhoods that would be most impacted by these changes on the west side and the north side and the east side of Charlotte.

The issue I have with the way that this has been presented is that it's been sold as although it'll just be a couple more duplexes in your neighborhood, it's no big deal, but we know that we have a housing crisis in this city. We are short tens of thousands of units. Where is the new development going to go? It is going to go into the areas where land is the cheapest and this is the single-family exclusive zoning as one of the few things that protect people in those neighborhoods. So, my question really is is this is a policy that is so well supported by the public, that is so popular in the city, why are we having the vote? Why has it been delayed and why are we having the vote in the lame duck session after the election in August. If it's so popular, why not let the voters provide their support for this program? So, that's why I'm challenging the current council. Be transparent about what you're doing because ultimately many people are going to be facing massive changes due to this. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much Mr. Mulligan.

Kimberly Helms, 2230 Verde Creek Road said good evening mayor and council. My name is Kimberly Helms and I'm on the HOA Board of the Rapids at Belmeade. The Charlotte Roads Plan, the 2040 plan, whatever you want to call it, says just that. Charlotte Roads Plan. Those of us that live outside the SC limits and the extra territorial jurisdiction, or ETJ zone are not part of Charlotte. We're not allowed to vote for the city council, yet the city council are allowed to make development decisions that will have negative effects on our quality of life and our property values. As of 2018 the population of the Mecklenburg County ETJ was 60,911 citizens. A recent Charlotte Observer article referred to residents of the ETJ zone as disenfranchised. We have no representation, so I am. I'm asking the city council to revisit the UDO and the Roads' Plan or whatever and not connect Verde Creek Road to either the Whitewater Parkway or Ryan Road. We would love a second entrance for the two neighborhoods of the Rapids at Belmeade and Belmeade Crossing which was jammed behind us with over 350 homes and one access out of the neighborhood. Someone on the Planning and Development Committee apparently doesn't know how to do that.

So, connecting the main streets in our family neighborhood to the road that comes out of the Whitewater Center and then running up to the other end to a road that runs parallel to 485, connects exits 12 and 14 will invite every car and truck stuck on 485 or 85 traffic through our neighborhood full of kids to get to the Mount Holly Huntersville Road to cross the river into Mount Holly to continue their drive. Our neighborhood has bare minimum width of streets with street parking. There have been issues with emergency services' vehicles not being able to get down our streets because they are so narrow. This is a residential subdivision. It was never intended for more than our neighborhood traffic. When we chose a rural home in the rural area of Mecklenburg County, it was so my daughter could stay at Northwest after our home in Westerly Hills burned down. We wanted to be in driving distance of Charlotte but we didn't want the crowded housing, the traffic, the noise pollution, the light pollution. We can walk outside

and see the stars where we live. We wanted to be in a suburban area, but the ETJ area is just what we have.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much Ms. Helms.

Carrie Olinski, 4103 Carmel Acres Drive said my name is Carrie Olinski and I'm running for city council At-Large. Thank you for allowing me to speak before you. I get that you all are trying to promote more housing, which we all know is needed in Charlotte, but the UDO can negatively affect the city and its people. The changes and in particular rolling out single-family zoning will have negative impacts on housing markets, traffic congestion, quality of life and more. We should look at historical patterns of displacement and it shows that gentrification will likely occur with the UDO as it stands. You will be hurting the very people you are trying to help. I saw in an article today in a journal called Cities that was based in February of 2020 and it actually was titled Gentrification in the US New South: Evidence From Two Types of African-American Communities in Charlotte.

I would like to just read a blurb from that. "To the end, Charlotte, North Carolina is used as a case study to reveal how two types of African-American neighborhoods near new growth centers, [INAUDIBLE] villages and street car suburbs become gentrified. Our research reveals that while dynamics of economic change restructure neighborhoods in Charlotte, they also destabilize infrastructure that supports economically and socially struggling African-American communities. As midsize US new south cities continue to grow, our viewpoint argues that more thorough and geographically sensitive studies are needed to address localized impacts of gentrification on minority neighborhoods to form site specific anti-gentrification strategies."

We need to refocus our attention in workforce development and individualizing our efforts in people. We need more information and studies before we race to push the UDO through, and ultimately, we need a UDO that will be closer to an 11-0 vote, not a 6-5 vote. Thank you for your time.

Karen Henning, 6203 Knightsgate Court said hello I am Karen Henning. My family moved here in 1981. When we moved to this warm charming inviting city, it was a beautiful place to buy a home, work, play, own our own business and raise our family in a safe environment. It was our American dream. Implementing this progressive ordinance is a perfect example of how out of touch this city council is. I rise before you in opposition to the Unified Development Ordinance. There are currently 42 pages of public comments that the staff recently addressed. The staff has recommended changes to 50 of the comments, while recommending no changes to the other 206 comments. This indicates that this is not only a hard plan to understand, which the staff has admitted, but the people still have several concerns and are not in support of it. A plan of this magnitude creates financial burdens on homeowners and will destroy the current infrastructure of many of our residential communities.

It is especially harmful to our older communities that are not protected by HOAs and to our underserved communities which you all swore to protect. Every aspect of this plan is to take control of private property. Can you imagine looking out your door and seeing your neighbor's homes demolished and replaced with duplexes, triplexes? Neighborhoods are created for the sense of community.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 9: PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE CHARLOTTE STREETS MAP AND CHARLOTTE STREETS MANUAL

Mayor Lyles declares the hearing open.

Eric Zaverl, 828 East 36th Street said thank you Mayor. It's good to talk to you again tonight, city council, staff. My name is Eric Zaverl in case you forgot. I'm speaking on behalf of Sustain Charlotte in support of the Streets Map and the manual. We fully support goal five of the Charlotte future 2040 Comprehensive Plan where Charlotte will provide safe and equitable mobility options for all travelers regardless of age, income, ability, race and where they live, or how they choose to travel. This goal is critical for reaching a more sustainable future, having a tremendous land use plan is pointless without the equally strong mobility plan. The Streets Map and the manual are great starting points for this mobility plan. Effective implementation of the Streets Map and the manual will determine how Charlotte's success in implementing the goals of the recently adopted Strategic Mobility Plan, including the ambitious yet achievable goal of reducing drive alone car trips by 50 percent by 2040.

To make our streets truly safe and inviting for everyone, we need the right planning tools to guide Charlotte's investment and development. The street cross sections that are included in the Streets Map are appropriate space for people to walk, ride bikes, ride public transit and create equitable streets. We applaud the forward thinking and planning of this space that is being used in the Streets Map, an improvement over what we have today which is nothing. We believe this tool can even get better in the future and include our future projects that we have planned and our planned priority networks as well. It could be used to expand the different street types that we have moving away, even further from the car centric designed streets that we have. The Comprehensive Transportation Review will also be key to getting safer streets and more multimodal elements that we need as Charlotte develops.

Mayor Lyles said thank you. Your time is up. Thank you very much.

David Hannes, 13441 Woody Point Road said David Hannes. The second draft of the Charlotte Streets Map has a serious flaw in it. I don't believe the mayor and city council can ignore this situation. I was even told at the UDO open house that public comments from residents of Woody Point Road would not be given consideration and that Woody Point Road Street classification would not be changed again. Thirteen residents of Woody Point Road left public comments regarding their disapproval of the city changing Woody Point Road back to a collector's street on the Charlotte Streets Map. There are more comments on Woody Point Road on the Charlotte Streets Map than any other street in the city. On October 18th of 2021, the first draft of the Charlotte Streets Map was released. Woody Point Road was correctly classified as a local street on this map. On June 3rd of 2022 the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Map was released. City officials admitted to me that they changed Woody Point Road's classification back to a collector's street on the new map because of my interference in city affairs. I never realized I was such a threat to the city.

The city also published a list of all changes to the Charlotte Streets Map. This list details the following information: 42 streets were changed from collector to local streets on the second draft of the Charlotte Streets Map. Only three streets were changed from local to collector streets. Woody Point Road was singled out by the city and was the only street changed to a collector's street that should've been left a local street. It's impossible to find any logic or reason in the handling of Woody Point Road Street classification by the city. I respectfully request that city council take up this issue immediately regarding correcting Woody Point Road's classification from a collector's street to a local street. It is of the utmost urgency since the city is completing the review process of the fire department's plans to build a station on Woody Point Road. You must act now. You have the responsibility, and you have the authority to fix this mistake.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Hannes, thank you. We'll continue to work with you. So, you'll have someone contact you.

Kimberly Helms, 2230 Verde Creek Road said so, have you all ever gone to the Whitewater Center at a big event? Lots of traffic, right? How would you like to have all of

those cars drive through your neighborhood that's a nine-foot-long crossroad with your kids and your pets right there next to all of that traffic? Why would anyone think that connecting Whitewater Parkway to a residential neighborhood street would be a good idea? It just shows me that no one gives a crap about the neighborhoods, especially in the ETJ zone. Why would anyone think that was a good idea? Then we were told that, "Well we need a second entrance or exit out of the neighborhood," because it is dangerous, but no one wanted to negotiate with the CSX to make sure that a road was built over the railroad. So, we're crammed in there. When we moved in there were woods. All of a sudden someone buys the woods and builds 100 more homes behind our 250 in our neighborhood. So you have 350 houses, one entrance on to Belmeade Road, two lane road, Whitewater Center is half a mile away.

We knew that when we moved out there. We moved out there to not have to deal with this city mess. I grew up in Charlotte. I grew up in Westerly Hills. I didn't want my daughter in that mess. I wanted to be out more suburban where we can like I said look up at the stars, hear the crickets outside. Now you're saying the city has to have a second entrance. Okay, connect to Belmeade Road so that we're not the entranceway. Whenever 485 or 85 breaks down, Waze is going to tell those people if you connect on Verde Creek Road, to Ryan Road, they're going to say get off on exit 12 or 14, you can go through that neighborhood, get on Belmeade, go to Mount Holly Road and you can cross the river in Mount Holly because there's only three ways to keep going south when those roads go down. Wilkinson, 85 are the bridge over at Mount Holly, which it's all neighborhoods. We're all neighborhoods. One little house, one little yard at a time and we don't have the infrastructure. Being in the ETJ zone, no one represents us. Ms. Watlington has been helping us, but no one represents us. We didn't vote for you all, we didn't vote for this 2040 thing, but we're stuck with it.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much Ms. Helms. We hear you and we'll see as much as we can do and continue to follow up.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 10: PUBLIC HEARING ON THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE TREE ORDINANCE

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs and carried unanimously to close the public hearing on a text amendment to the City of Charlotte Tree Ordinance.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 11: PUBLIC HEARING ON GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND REFERENDUM

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

David Hannes said I wanted to let the council members know that [INAUDIBLE] statement from me [INAUDIBLE].

Mayor Lyles said yes, we have it. Thank you.

Mr. Hannes said [INAUDIBLE].

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much.

Janet Labar, 330 South Tryon Street said good evening, Mayor, council and Manager Jones. Thanks for this opportunity to be with you tonight. Thanks for all that you do for the City of Charlotte. On behalf of the business community, we applaud the council's leadership in overseeing the community investment plan. The city's long term capital plan funded in large part by the issuance of bonds approved by local voters. These investments help sustain the hard work and forward thinking that has helped to make Charlotte such a dynamic and great place to live and work. Likewise, we appreciate the effective fiscal policy and smart stewardship of taxpayer's dollars that bond funding represents. Charlotte's AAA (American Automobile Association) credit rating, the highest possible grade a municipality may have is a validation of this approach.

They city's debt capacity and sound budgeting have meant that issuing bonds has not resulted in tax increases which is the case with this year's bonds leading to encouraging support for and approval among voters. The regional businesses that the alliance represents are keenly aware of and appreciate the importance of investing in our streets, our neighborhoods and affordable housing. Well maintained infrastructure is vital to the quality of life here which attracts and retains our workforce as well as new and existing businesses. That's a big reason why every two years the Charlotte Regional Business Alliance and our predecessor, the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce rolls up its sleeves and works to convince voters why a vote yes for bonds is in everyone's best interest. The alliance is a committed partner with the city and the vital civic imperative to address municipal infrastructure and improvement needs over the long term. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much Ms. Labar.

Alison Summerville, 601 South Tryon Street said good evening I'm Ali Summerville, Business Administration Executive at Ally Financial and I'm also pleased to serve among the Charlotte Alliance's senior leadership. As you just heard, the Charlotte Alliance supports the \$226 million bond package that council has approved. At Ally, one of our larger city's employers we do too, and I'd like to stress the importance for the investment in public infrastructure that the bonds represent because of the many benefits to our employees, customers and the community at large. On behalf of both organizations, I thank you for putting the bonds on the November ballot. In particular, the \$146.2 million transportation bond will help make commuting easier and safer for Charlotte residents and enhance their access to residential, commercial and retail areas citywide.

These bonds will fund improved intersections, continued development of the city's growing and popular bike path system, upgrades to our traffic control system, congestion mitigation, measures to improve driver and pedestrian safety, street resurfacing and repairs and construction of bridges and sidewalks. The streets package includes projects across the city from the northeast corridor to Rea Road in the south. Many residents will experience the benefits firsthand as they travel from work, school, stores and other important parts for their daily lives. These benefits will be achieved without a property tax increase. We must continue to invest in our transportation infrastructure to keep the city's economy humming and strong for whatever we face in the future. I'm excited and honored to be on the Charlotte Alliance leadership team and on behalf of the business community, I will do my part to make sure we earn voter approval for all three bond measures in the November ballot. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much Ms. Summerville.

Julie Porter, 4601 Charlotte Park Drive, Suite 350 said hello again Mayor and city council members. I'm speaking to you a second time this evening in favor of the \$50 million bond for affordable housing. This council is well-versed in our city's drive to increase the availability of affordable housing. Once again, you've demonstrated that commitment by including a \$50 million bond for affordable housing on the ballot for voter approval. The simple fact is an affordable home is vital to quality of life and economic well-being, but finding an affordable home in Charlotte is more difficult every day. Low to moderate income individuals and families make up a large percentage of

our workforce. Police and EMTs (Emergency Medical Technicians), nurses, and hospitality workers, teachers and bus drivers. If they can't find an affordable home in Charlotte, we will all feel the impact. The public/private partnership among the city, county, Foundation for the Carolinas and many businesses and nonprofits has made great strides in addressing a critical shortage of affordable housing for our most vulnerable residents due, in part, to passing the bond referendum, but there's still work to do. Recently we witnessed the mass eviction of the Sterling neighborhood. With city funding, DreamKey assisted with rent, moving expenses and deposits for displaced individuals and families, but the real challenge was finding new rental homes and apartments that were affordable for these families. A yes vote on the affordable housing bond will help replenish dollars in the Charlotte Housing Trust Fund used to increase and supply affordable housing. Issuance of the bonds will be covered under the city's existing debt service capacity meaning approval will not result in a tax increase. I look forward to working with you council members, city staff and other constituencies to make the case for the voters and win approval for these vitally important housing bonds. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you Ms. Porter.

David Howard, 9610 Steele Meadow Road said I'm David Howard and it is great to be back in the chamber with the council tonight. To many Charlotte residents the neighborhood improvement bonds may be the most important issue on the entire \$226 million package. The \$29.8 million bond will help to keep our neighborhoods as the brightest jewels in Charlotte's crown without imposing a tax increase. There is funding for infrastructure for things such as sidewalks, greenways, bike lanes, streetscapes, curb and gutter, storm drains, landscaping and pedestrian lighting in established and emerging high growth areas. All are items that citizens across the city value and appreciate. If Charlotte continues to grow, this bond package will help to grow and help design and protect and improve older as well as emerging neighborhoods and create connectivity for residents to employment, shopping and entertainment opportunities. For 20 years across many election cycles, voters have signaled their faith in Charlotte's potential by approving over \$4 billion worth of bonds for our streets, our neighborhoods, our schools, our parks and other civic infrastructure.

This vision made it possible for us to have the great city that we have today. This November we must follow their lead and keep Charlotte strong for current and future generations. So, Mayor Lyles and council, you can count on me to do everything that I can to get as many yes votes out for all three bond packages. I'll end by saying please remember you guys are doing God's work. Thank you for what you do.

Mayor Lyles said thank you Mr. Howard.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Winston II to close the public hearing on the bond orders which would be authorized at the General Obligation Bond Referendum to be set for November 8, 2022, adopt Bond Orders introduced for \$146,200,000 of Street Bonds, \$29,800,000 of Neighborhood Improvement Bonds, and \$50,000,000 of Housing Bonds, and adopt a resolution setting the General Obligation Bond Referendum for November 8, 2022.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston

NAYS: Councilmember Bokhari

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 12: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE A PORTION OF THE ALLEYWAY BETWEEN SYLVANIA AVENUE AND DUNLOE STREET

pti:mt

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleson, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt and carried unanimously to close the public hearing to close a portion of the alleyway between Sylvania Avenue and Dunloe Street, and adopt a resolution to close a portion of the alleyway between Sylvania Avenue and Dunloe Street.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 112-115.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE A PORTION OF THE ALLEYWAY OFF SOUTH POPLAR STREET BETWEEN SOUTH POPLAR STREET AND 4TH STREET

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleson, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt and carried unanimously to close the public hearing to close a portion of the alleyway off South Poplar Street between South Poplar Street and 4th Street, and adopt a resolution and close a portion of the alleyway off South Poplar Street between South Poplar Street and 3rd Street.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 116-120.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 14: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE A PORTION OF THE UNOPENED PEGRAM STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleson, seconded by Councilmember Driggs to close the public hearing to close a portion of the unopened Pegram Street Right-of-Way, and adopt a resolution and close a portion of the unopened Pegram Street Right-of-Way.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 121-124.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 15: CITY MANAGER’S REPORT

Marcus Jones, City Manager said thank you Mayor and members of the council. There’s an announcement I’d like to make with some changes in staffing. I know I sent this out to council last week, but I wanted to publicly acknowledge some of the good news that we have in the administration. We’re very proud of the team that we’ve built, and we have some homegrown folks that will talk a little bit about tonight with some promotional opportunities. So, we’ve had an opportunity to round out our assistant city manager position. We have Tracy Dodson and Brent Cagle who have done exceptional work. We did a national search and we stayed right here at home with the promotion of Liz Babson and Reenie Askew.

So, it wasn’t enough that Reenie is trying to implement an ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning), we said let’s bring you up to the manager’s office also. Liz, as you know, has just done a wonderful job being here the last couple of decades and being promoted from deputy director to the director and now to ACM, so we’re very proud. So, that

leaves a bit of a void in CDOT. So, that was almost too easy because as we started to talk, you're very familiar with Debbie Smith who's the new CDOT director, working for the city for over 23 years and a lot of times when you think about Vision Zero and how Vision Zero has grown over the past few years, a lot of that is due to Debbie and her hard work. Again, thanks Liz for having built a strong bench that we're able to promote Debbie. Then lastly, I hope he hasn't left the building, Shawn Heath now will be the permanent director of Housing and Neighborhood Services. He's done a great job over the last six months. He'll be behind the lectern often tonight for the rest of evening. So, we're very proud to have Shawn. As you know, he has worked in the community for a long, especially at Duke Energy when he was the vice president of community affairs. So, it's been a while since we made announcements like this and it's just something we're very proud of. Very proud of the team. So, thank you for this moment.

Mayor Lyles said alright. Thank you for that report. It's great to have those introductions and it's so glad to see you joining our team.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: SOURCE OF INCOME PROTECTIONS IN CITY SUPPORTED HOUSING

Councilmember Watlington said so, first of all, it's been a long time coming. I want to say thank you to Councilmember Graham, our former chair and current vice chair for the work that you started with Ms. Pam Wideman, the work of the Ad Hoc Committee who's been working for several years now. Thank you to our community members and our Housing Justice Coalition and our other housing advocates, Inlivian and all of the many many partners, DreamKey, who have put this on the table and made sure that we're taking action. I want to thank my council colleagues and fellow committee members who have been a part of the work as well. While we understand that while this is an exciting time, we know that this is only one step in the puzzle to make sure that we can preserve affordability for all residents in our community.

What I'd like to do is talk a little bit about how we've looked at source of income discrimination and then I'd ask Mr. Heath, our interim housing director to come and explain a little bit about the path forward. I've had a chance to speak with most of my colleagues if not all here recently and I was very pleasantly surprised at the support that everybody has for our community and to make sure that we are using public dollars for public good as former Councilmember James Mithcell would say. I know that there are some things that we still have to figure out in terms of enforcement and what that looks like for third party activities, but we do know that our intent is to increase affordable housing in our developments and anything that has city funded dollars.

So, what I'd like to do then is have Mr. Heath just explain the basis of what we're going to do here tonight and what the next steps are going forward.

Shawn Heath, Director of Housing and Neighborhood Services said thank you Councilmember Watlington. Shawn Heath, Housing and Neighborhood Services. Just picking up from where we left off, I think one of the words that I used last time when we were together was transparency, and when I said that I meant it. What's become very clear to me over the last couple weeks through conversations with staff and various council members and various advocates in the community is there's been some different interpretations of how to apply the recommended source of income policy that was discussed at the last action review. I take accountability to the extent any of this has become a little bit wrapped around the axle over the last two weeks, but if there's a silver lining in that, I believe that there's more clarity today at the staff level in terms of council's expectations and I hope we've done something over the last few days to clarify some of the rationale behind our original recommendation.

So, maybe I can just highlight one of the specific scenarios contemplated in source of income and see Councilmember Watlington if you want to direct me in a different direction after that. One of the core questions that came up was how would the source

of income protection apply in a public partnership scenario like a tax increment grant? You'll recall that Todd DeLong from the Economic Development Department here two weeks ago had a slide. Just a reminder, right now for the Housing Trust Fund investments that we make, we already have source of income protection built into those investments. LIHTC (Low Income Housing Tax Credit) investments also have a source of income component as well.

So, this was the scenario that we really focused on and Councilmember Johnson thank you for pushing me on this. I think it helps us get to a better answer. So, with TIGs (Tax Increment Grants) think of a master developer and in a scenario where the master developer chooses to bid out certain pieces of the project. So, for the purpose of this particular illustration imagine that the master developer bids out a market rate housing component to the project. Keep in mind with TIGs, they're not required to have housing. Since 2005, there have been I believe 11 TIGs that have had a housing component, 10 of which the Economic Development Department has been able to successfully negotiate having affordable housing built into those agreements. So, imagine the master developer bids out the market rate housing component and you essentially in that instance have a third party doing the market rate housing. What staff had contemplated was that the master developer which is the entity we have the partnership agreement with, the master developer, which is the entity that received the incentive, the tax increment grant based on the infrastructure investments that they have made would be the entity that the source of income protection is applicable to. Not to the third parties. That's where the conversations over the last couple of weeks I think have been helpful to clarify that having this protection apply to the third parties is where we left off with the source of income Ad Hoc Committee.

The only missing link for staff at this point then would be to evaluate how to develop a proportionate enforcement mechanism for those scenarios where a third-party developer is doing market rate housing under a TIG as opposed to the master developer. If I had the visual hopefully that would've been a little more clearer. I apologize if that was a little bit murky. Let me just pause there for second. It might be easier if I just answered just direct questions rather than ramble on.

Councilmember Driggs said I have a question.

Ms. Watlington said one moment Mr. Driggs if I may just so that it is here for discussion. What I can do is read the specific language in terms of the applicability. So, under applicability and market rate housing any market rate housing developed, and this is the piece that has been added, by a master developer or third-party developers as part of a development receiving city infrastructure reimbursement incentives such as tax increment grants and capital funded partnerships for infrastructure improvements. So, the key change here from what you have on your paper is that we've added "or third-party developers" because the intent was to include housing that came as a part of the TIG. What Shawn is explaining is that if you have a master developer that only does commercial, well then they don't have any housing to apply it to. If you have a master developer that then works with another developer who does residential, we want to make sure that that housing is included under the source of income because it is indirectly receiving benefit of a TIG because it's part of a project that public dollars went in to.

So, if you had DreamKey, and I'm just making that up. DreamKey, if they also did commercial and residential, right now the way that it's worded here without this bold, they would be subject to the source of income discrimination ordinance or policy. What would happen though if we don't have this "or third parties developer" language, is that there's ambiguity that any third party developer who came in would not be subject to source of income protections. Is everybody clear about what we're saying here?

Mayor Lyles said yes.

Councilmember Eiselt said so, I just want to be really clear. I'm not great at these things at the last minute at the dais. What if the third-party developer has come in at a

pti:mt

later point and they've decided to add housing that wasn't part of the original deal that got the TIG, because I think we just identified one project, at least in my seven years that was a TIG that had housing. Mostly this is commercial. So, what happens if a developer comes in later and is sold some of that land by the first party who received the TIG and the developer is arguing, "I didn't have any benefit from that TIG."?

Ms. Watlington said right. So, that is the part that what we're saying tonight. In order to hash out those particular details because the intent was always to include housing in this if you got a TIG, but as we got into the details of enforcement, that's the piece that needs to be shaken out for those scenarios. What we can agree on or what we know is that from a policy standpoint, we want to include third parties, at least subject to this council vote. So, what the motion will likely look like is to approve the over arching policy to include third party developers and then request Housing and Neighborhood Services and economic development to come back on August 22nd with an analysis for approving the enforcement or the regulatory component of it. So, similar to Comp 2040 Plan, we approved a policy a year ago, and now we're trying to approve the ordinance or the teeth to it. That's what we're proposing, to separate it. Approve the policy, give ED (Economic Development) staff time to work with Housing and Neighborhood Services and come back with appropriate proportional enforcement depending on how the third party is involved.

Ms. Eiselt said what if they say, "We didn't have anything to do with it."? Shouldn't at that point council have the right to determine whether or not it should be included?

Ms. Watlington said that question is a great question. It's part of what we want to hash out in the enforcement component of it.

Ms. Eiselt said how do we vote on that now when we don't know that?

Ms. Watlington said we won't vote on the enforcement component. We would only vote on the policy which is that we want source of income protection for publicly funded projects. So, that's where you see the "or third part developers." That's the policy component. That's the intent of the direction we want to go as council, and then we'd like staff to come back to approve the enforcement.

Unknown said this is the new language?

Ms. Watlington said yes, this is the new language. Truth be told, the original language already would allow us to do this, but we found out that there was ambiguity. Some folks were interpreting it differently than the original intent of the initial language.

Unknown said this is the substitute motion?

Ms. Watlington said yes.

Unknown said okay.

Ms. Eiselt said just from the staff point, is there any other perspective we're not taking into account here that makes it problematic?

Mr. Heath said I think that to me TIGs are a different animal and there are many nuances and that's what we've been trying to tease out over the last couple of weeks is what are the various hypothetical scenarios. What if the master developer initiates market rate housing on their own, but then subsequently sells that to another developer? Is the source of income protection policy applicable? I believe the answer would be yes so long as it was within the term of the incentive agreement. Then the other scenario as we've tried to illustrate here is, what if at the outset of the project, the master developer bids out that market rate housing to a third-party developer? Should that third party developer be required to adhere to the source of income protection? I believe there the answer is yes so long as it's during the incentive period. What we haven't, I believe, married up here yet appropriately is what the enforcement

pti:mt

mechanisms should look like in those scenarios and what the failure to comply should look like. For example, in that scenario, let's say a master developer receives a TIG incentive valued at \$40 million over a 20-year time period and they bid out the market rate housing to a third-party developer who is then subsequently found to be in violation of the source of income policy. In that instance, after the third such violation, then the City of Charlotte would go to the master developer requesting the refund of all TIG payments made to date.

So, we're just trying to ensure that this is a policy with real teeth, but that it has a proportionate enforcement mechanism that's appropriate in light of the unique dynamics of a TIG in terms of the different parties that are involved.

Ms. Watlington said so, that is an example of one thing to hash out, but that clearly sits in the enforcement piece. The policy piece though is clear.

Ms. Eiselt said staff thinks that's okay to do? You guys have been working on this. We haven't. We're just hearing this tonight.

Councilmember Bokhari said staff endorses this?

Mr. Heath said let me say I am comfortable if we defer the enforcement component of the policy and the failure to comply component of the policy in order for us to ensure that those features feel proportionate to potential source of income violations.

Mr. Bokhari said wouldn't it make more sense for us to do all that at one time so that if it's unenforceable we understand that. If it seems harsh or it doesn't make sense, why would we piece mill it like this?

Ms. Watlington said so, for me, the intent between the two is very similar again to Comp 2040 and the UDO. As a council, based on my conversations with our colleagues, the position is clear. So, inasmuch as we can confirm the position and then confirm the appropriate enforcement of said position, I'm absolutely fine with doing it separately.

Councilmember Ajmera said is that what the committee recommends?

Councilmember Driggs said so, I talked to a number of people today who are affected by this or involved in this, and I don't believe they were aware of this proposed change. I think the stakeholders ought to be able to provide their response before we move ahead with a change like this. I don't know whether this was notified to the Apartment Association to re-dig and to other parties, but it's just hard to appreciate how it could play out or what the implications are, what kind of measures we take. We offer TIGs for a variety of reasons and I understand the goal of making sure that we get value in terms of this source of income discrimination, but there are constellations where it could have unintended effect. I think we ought to be more careful about it. So, I don't know what the answer is. Can't we pass the thing as was originally agreed? Then if it is the will of council to amend it or if we find that we can make that change and we have thought through exactly how it would be enforced, we just make that change? I don't know why that has to go in tonight without the benefit of what I would consider to be due process.

Motion was made by Councilmember Watlington and seconded by Councilmember Newton to (A) Approve any market rate housing developed by a Master Developer or third-part Developer(s), as part of a development receiving City Infrastructure reimbursement incentives, such as Tax Increment Grants and capital-funded partnerships for infrastructure improvements, and (B) add enforcement of this policy to the August 22, 2022, agenda.

Ms. Ajmera said so this language right here on the screen, that doesn't apply here right, to your motion?

Unknown said this is the motion.

Mayor Lyles said this is the motion. Ms. Watlington would you restate your motion that includes this slide from the deck?

Ms. Watlington said sure, and I'm happy to do this as a substitute or a primary motion.

Mayor Lyles said you already have a motion on the floor. You already have a motion and a second.

Ms. Watlington said I understand. Right now the motion on the floor is to accept what you seen on the screen as the policy.

Ms. Ajmera said then work on the enforcement piece later on?

Ms. Watlington said for August 22nd.

Ms. Ajmera said got it. Okay. I'm good.

Councilmember Newton said I think what this is coming down to, and this is due to some conversations that have occurred, and we talked about this in committee today and some conversations as Shawn was alluding to over the past two weeks. The prevention or enforcement mechanism within this policy isn't what we would want because it doesn't really fulfill the full extent of the goals particularly when we look at it in a much more comprehensive sense including all of the types of activities that we as a city engage in and want to promote within the city at large. So, having said that I am completely on board with this moving forward with the policy piece as Councilmember Watlington was saying and us taking a deeper dive into that enforcement piece which will only take what, maybe another month tops. We're talking about coming back with this August 22nd, is that what you were saying Shawn?

Mr. Heath said that is the next business meeting, yes.

Mr. Newton said so, before this council, some of the council members here leave, so it stays here. There's that continuity here in as much as notice to other folks to have another hearing is concerned. We're not changing anything that wasn't already originally contemplated. So, what we're talking about right now is adopting the portions. So, that policy piece is already what was contemplated in the first place and delivered to the community for its feedback. This enforcement piece, maybe not. Maybe it will require a little more conversation, but inasmuch as what we're talking about adopting right now, public comment has already occurred on that, and that piece is what was originally contemplated in the first place and subject to community engagement and a public hearing. So, I just wanted to make that point clear.

Mayor Lyles said maybe I have a question. So, are we going to pass the policy of the source of income but we're not going to pass the enforcement for any part of it until the enforcement is done? Is that what you're saying?

Ms. Watlington said that's correct.

Mayor Lyles said okay, alright.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you. So, if a primary developer is granted a TIG and then they sell to a third party, is the third party responsible to comply with the zoning approval and the site application?

Mr. Heath said I can't comment directly on the zoning piece. I think in that scenario of source of income, yes, during the incentive period.

Ms. Johnson said so, the answer is yes. So, the primary developer is responsible if that third party developer does not comply with what's been approved. The zoning type, the site requirements and all of that. So, they're responsible for third parties and that's contractual. This can be very easily awesome. I'd also like to say for the record, the Ad

Hoc Committee recommended this language. The Great Neighborhoods Committee recommended this language. It's been to public comments. The changes, when staff intentionally changed the language based on their consideration. Mr. Heath you've said that earlier in a meeting today, right? So, this was a staff policy, and we had this conversation in the Great Neighborhoods Committee that the Great Neighborhoods Committee approved the language. This language is different that the staff carved out. So, the intent was that the third party would be included. So, I think we just need to be careful.

I also just want to say earlier in our meeting we had some discussion, and I wrote down some quotes. This is some of the things that council said when we were talking about processes. This is a process we should be concerned about. Painting the fence and calling it a new fence to do exactly as we as council defined and we instructed. We talked about processes, oversight and accountability and this is one of those examples. The Ad Hoc Committee has spoken, the Great Neighborhoods Committee has spoken, so any change was made by staff, and I just think we want to be very cognizant and conscious about that. So, the original motion was that the funding with the land and that's what this motion does. So, I'll be supporting it.

Councilmember Winston said thank you. So, I think a bit of level setting is important for this conversation because I saw some things out in the media. This is a good thing, this is something I'm going to support but I really hope that this community and the next council and future councils don't just put this to bed. This is not going to all of a sudden makes source of income discrimination illegal in Charlotte. So, citizens shouldn't believe if their voucher isn't accepted at an apartment community that they should call 311. That's not the case. We have put a lot of effort into doing something I think what council saw kind of closing a circle that's saying any city investment should accept vouchers. We identified this one as one that didn't. So, basically what we're saying, and the people of Charlotte are saying is that we don't want to fund our own discrimination with our own tax dollars. I think that is a good thing, right, but it's also not a scalable option. It's not a scalable option so we need to keep working to fund a scalable solution. This is not a problem that exist all across North Carolina. This is a problem that exists all across the country but only in certain cities that have certain situations that are similar to ours.

For instance, high growth, or very high occupancy rates where housing is very difficult. For instance, we're in the same league with cities like New York City right now. I grew up in New York City. It was a point in time where if you had a Section 8 voucher, it was good. That's not the case anymore. They have similar numbers to us that you can't find a place that accepts these vouchers. So, we need to find ways that we can build coalitions with different cities around our country that are experiencing similar conditions to us and find solutions that way. I want to also level set the fear factor that might be put into this conversation. "Well if we put this on TIGs, then TIGs will never be accepted." I'm not buying that. One, we know that TIGs very rarely produce housing, but the acceptance of vouchers doesn't ensure that a person will be able to get housing. It just means that that voucher can be counted towards the income that is needed for that potential housing.

So, right now the problem is that when you say you have to prove that you have \$2,000 of income a month, people are not able to count that money. So, people are literally walking around with money in their pocket that they can't spend on housing and if somebody doesn't want to take tax money because they don't even want to consider that cash, well if we don't have that regulation on them, we're pushing and pulling on the same rope. That doesn't make sense. I think this is a lot of squeeze for a little bit of juice, but it's a necessary one and I hope it's one that keeps the train going down the track. I agree with Ms. Watlington's suggestion on how to go with this. It's the way we do a lot of things. We get the policy in place and then we figure out the best path forward for enforcement. This certainly sets a standard. It says something to our community members. This isn't just Housing Choice vouchers. This is veteran benefits, these are all types of vouchers that landlords are basically saying we are not even going

to count it, so don't even apply here. That's not right and we have to do everything that we can to at least give folks a fighting chance. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said so, I am entirely in support of the goals that we established here and what it was I thought we were going to vote on tonight. I would like to clarify that if you have a rezoning and somebody sells a portion of the property, the seller of that property is not liable. The buyer of that property is bound to use the property in accordance with the zoning that's been assigned to it or apply for a rezoning. Now what can happen is that the seller of the property offers it with the condition that its terms under the TIG will be met by the buyer and that would be the burden on the seller of the property to ensure that they remained in compliance with their TIG agreement when they sell the property to somebody else.

The other difficulty I have though is that when we talk about this is just policy, it's not enforcement, we're talking about whether or not any enforcement applies. We're talking about whether something should be put in place that will be subject to penalties or enforcement or not. So, it's not the same thing. This is a step that implies that there will be enforcement and then there's a question about if we don't take this step, there is no enforcement. So, I think there's two separate questions. I think the question of whether or not we want to try to attach liability to a third party is a basic question and then if we decide we do, the enforcement question comes in to play. Really, I think the best way is for us to rely on the master developer to be bound by the terms of the TIG and to ensure that any subsequent transactions they enter into conform to the terms of the TIG and not try to somehow pin something on unnamed and unknown third-party developers who may come along.

We can get the enforcement we want. The TIG will get continue to have the effect of requiring that housing and that effect will pass from the master developer to anybody else. I think we should be able to rely on the fact that the master developer knows that they won't get the benefit of the TIG unless they ensure that the terms are met, including in the context of any transaction they enter with third parties.

Ms. Watlington said that is exactly the intent of the wording.

Ms. Eiselt said so, that's what that says right?

Ms. Watlington said that's the intent of this wording.

Mr. Driggs said okay, but that's not exactly what it says because the way I'm describing it is if there is an enforcement, it is always against the master developer.

Ms. Eiselt said say that again.

Mr. Driggs said if there is an enforcement action, it is always against the master developer who is the party with us to the TIG. So, what I'm saying is that we should not be targeting any unnamed and unknown third-party developer, because if there is a violation in the terms of our TIG agreement, it is always the master developer who's responsible to us. That is covered by the original language.

Ms. Eiselt said Madam Mayor can I make a comment on Mr. Driggs? So, couldn't we just tweak that language and put the word third party developers lower down saying, "including third party developers?"

Ms. Watlington said I'll accept that.

Ms. Eiselt said I think we're saying the same thing here, but I understand your caution. I think that's what you're saying. So, why not just say, "market rate housing developed by a master developer as part of a development receiving city infrastructure incentives," blah, blah, blah, this also applies to any parties that were brought in to the transaction.

Mr. Driggs said I think the way I would've put it is the master developer remains responsible for the terms of the TIG regardless of any subsequent third-party transactions. That's the way I would put it.

Ms. Eiselt said right.

Ms. Watlington said I think that that is absolutely what you described as the intent. I like what you said Mayor Pro Tem. I would even suggest, "By a master developer including third party developer." Just change "or" to "including," but that is the intent. I think how we has that out is a part of the enforcement component.

Ms. Eiselt said putting other parties to the development.

Ms. Watlington said correct and I'm happy to amend the motion to reflect that because I think it maintains the integrity of the intent.

Mr. Driggs said what would that wording be then?

Mayor Lyles said I actually think that that is one of the things that the staff will have to do working through this, to figure out what the right language is. So, what's legally possible. I don't know. You have to go through all of this. So, I think all of us are kind of saying the same thing, but your intent is to make sure that the public dollars from the city at least are not discriminated against. So, have you talked to the real estate people and the attorney's office and all of that?

Mr. Heath said this all evolved very quickly. So, no not today.

Ms. Watlington said I communicated with Patrick, and I know that he and Anna communicated on the legality of this particular wording and confirmed that it is permissible. I don't want to speak for you.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said keep in mind, I don't know if this helps or not, but what we're looking for from a staff perspective is what is the policy of the council? What are you generally trying to do? I'm not saying that words don't matter but once we have a sense of what you're looking for, keep in mind that we then have to go out and put together a contract and it's really going to be the contractual language that's going to be the real key to tie the public funds into making sure that it goes in the direction that's consistent with your policy. I hope that makes sense.

Mayor Lyles said I guess I was just saying that we not wordsmith because I think we need some expertise in wordsmithing it, but we know the intent. So, that was it.

Mr. Bokhari said so, he just left and I agree with Mr. Winston and some of the things he said where one, the angle of our approach in innovation in affordable housing is fatally flawed. We've discussed that at great length. Vouchers in concept provide an amazing opportunity for us to change the paradigm, not build all the time and basically think that we have to create a new project in building to solve every component of this problem, but more nimbly do it. That requires us to step back and really look at this entire paradigm, innovate and attack the problem at its core. This is does not even remotely do that. It does not even start pushing us in the right direction because it's such a rounding error on the edges of what we're actually going to do, that it's inconsequential. It is very similar to the 2040 Comp Plan and the UDO in that in single family zoning, people got to champion and say, "Look what I did, I abolished it," but when the rubber meets the road which is enforcement, and the tactical implications that it creates on your community. Well, that's where everyone is left shaking their heads after everyone had their ribbon cutting and their moment where they're like, "Well wait a minute. What did this do to our viability around using one of the few tools we have, TIGs to do anything?"

We have a big business investment grant, a TIG, CIP (Capital Investment Plan), and then two or three others. That's literally all the tools we have to do anything we want to

do around here. What we're saying is that you think that a developer who we're coming and we're trying to negotiate a complex deal is going to listen to what we just said? Say, "TIG, sign me up. That sounds great. Oh and I get to manage all and be accountable for enforcing all the third party stuff?" All it does is give people a win and makes people walk out of here thinking, "They did it, great." It won't have any relevance or impact on the broader thing and it will in doing so completely water down and add bureaucracy to a tool that's one of the few things we have in our toolkit. So, I just hate the fact that we would do that and ruin one of the few tools we have just so some folks could feel like progress was made when in reality no progress was made whatsoever. So, I hope that people really weigh that in when they think about, "Oh there is no unintended consequences." There will be an unintended consequence of this and for those of you who aren't in the weeds of negotiating deals in recruiting companies in using TIGs, I promise you that will have a ramification. Developers will not want to take on that exposure and figure out how to manage third parties and all off these things, let alone how it will enforce our part.

Ms. Eiselt said then don't take public money.

Mr. Bokhari said well if they do that, then you don't get any houses and no one gets anything. So, all we're doing is patting each other on the back and saying congratulations we did it.

Ms. Watlington said or perhaps we create new tools that actually deliver what we say in important to our community.

Mr. Bokhari said exactly, and where is that work being done?

Councilmember Graham said so, here's the deal. We've been talking about this source of income for about a year and a half now and certainly out there people out there are looking for any tools, any resources, any policy that the council can do to give them some relief in this effort. I want to thank the council woman for picking up the baton and getting this issue to the dais tonight. A journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step, and this is a small step. This makes no doubt about it, but it's a step in the right direction acknowledging that there are some individuals in this community that will forever reason, not accept these vouchers and we're saying plainly and specifically that if you want to do business with the city that you should have to on our projects. I support that.

I also support the way the council woman has laid it out in terms of we can approve the policy tonight and then by our August 22nd meeting begin to have more meetings with staff. Certainly, I think the Economic Development Committee and Tracy Dodson and others along with Shawn and Victoria need to work out the devil in the detail in reference to the third-party developers. We need to make sure that we get that right. I think we have the capacity to kind of figure it out between now and then, get the language correct Madam Mayor to ensure that we dot our I's and crossing T's and that we know where we're going. Councilmember Winston, I agree with you. It's a national problem but it's also statewide. We can't do what the folks in Raleigh won't allow us to do. There are a number of things we can do in reference to this policy if we had the type of support needed from our legislatures in Raleigh to make not only vouchers a lot more user friendly locally, but other tools too to increase the affordability of housing in our community if we had a general assembly that would work with us, not against us.

So, I'm willing to support the motion as stated Councilmember Watlington, and hopefully between now and the end of August that the wordsmith things and the consultation between economic development and the Great Neighborhoods Committee and both of the assistant managers and attorney can figure out making sure that we're moving in the right direction.

Mayor Lyles said I think that's an excellent idea, that if we can have the two committees meet and with the staff as well.

Councilmember Phipps said yes, Mr. Heath I understood you to say at our Great Neighborhoods Committee meeting today that the degree of granularity to which we discussed this particular topic was not something that was communicated during earlier meetings. Is that true?

Mr. Heath said I sat in all of the source of income advisory committee meetings last year. There were in depth policy discussions in all of those meetings clearly, but I think in the last few weeks what's been quite helpful is to interpret that policy in specific scenarios because TIGs are nuanced. So, we did not have those types of nuanced TIG conversations in the source of Ad Hoc Advisory Committee to the extent we've had in the last couple of weeks. So, that was the point that I was trying to make.

Mr. Phipps said so, I think this approach that the chairwoman has made will be helpful in getting those things ironed out somehow. I'm a supporter as well.

Mayor Lyles said alright, I think everyone has spoken. We have a motion on the table which is we're not going to change any of the wording of what's on the slide. We're going to wait for the professionals to give us the process for the enforcement while we adopt the source of income discrimination as a policy that we would like to prevent that and that we would continue to work on how we would enforce it.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston

NAYS: Councilmembers Bokhari and Driggs

Ms. Eiselt said I don't understand what we're voting on. Maybe the Ad Hoc chairwoman can clarify for me. The language in our business meeting agenda did not include what we just saw on the screen. So, are we voting on what's on the agenda or are we voting on this piece and not voting on the agenda?

Mayor Lyles said maybe I misunderstood. I thought we were voting on the agenda, the item that was recommended and that we were going to have staff and we're supportive of the staff.

Unknown said no it changed. The motion is the screen.

Mayor Lyles said only the screen is the motion?

Unknown said correct.

Mayor Lyles said not the item that was submitted for the nondiscrimination.

Ms. Watlington said it passed right? So, what's on the agenda is the full policy. It includes a section that says applicability. It also has an enforcement section. That's what in the agenda. What the motion on the floor is, is to adjust the applicability section at the top, add this "or third-party developers" language to get it more clear on what our position is and to bring the enforcement section back August 22nd. So, the intent to Attorney Baker's point is not so much that we have to get this exactly right, but the reason we added this language, third party developer, is because there was some ambiguity between what some folks understood it to be versus what it is. What I'm moving to approve is the policy that is in the agenda with this adjustment in the applicability section.

Mr. Driggs said plus that on the screen. That's the question.

Ms. Watlington said not plus. This is a section that is currently in the item on the agreement.

Mr. Driggs said what's your motion?

Mayor Lyles said I believe that the policy is in the agenda under tab 16 and it starts on page one, agenda packet 160 and it says, "Market rate housing. Any market rate housing developed as a part of a development receiving city infrastructure reimbursement incentives such as tax increment grants and capital funding for infrastructure improvements." So, the market rate section is in the document. The issue is, is that enforceable? We have no enforceable mechanisms until we come back with a legal opinion as well as one that I would assume the committee would also discuss with ED (Education Development) as well as have community engagement. We can't pick and choose. So, we have to have the community engagement on both of this and what I understand is that we just approve the policy, but we do not have any enforcement until a result of coming back on the market rate housing section.

Mayor Lyles said is that your understanding Mr. Heath.

Mr. Heath said my understanding is that the market rate housing paragraph in the policy would be replaced with the wording on the screen and that the enforcement and failure to comply paragraphs would be tabled until next month.

Ms. Watlington said correct.

Ms. Eiselt said what bullet point is that in the policy?

Ms. Watlington said it's under the heading enforcement. Are you talking about what's on the screen?

Ms. Eiselt said I'm looking at the actual language.

Mayor Lyles said no, not the action item, it's the actual write up.

Ms. Eiselt said oh alright. Okay, that's why because the action that we were asked to vote on doesn't say anything about it. So, to me that's why I was saying shouldn't we be adding that as a substitute motion because what we're voting is actions to approve the recommendation to adopt blah, blah, blah and it has a description in there. So, wouldn't you just add that in as a substitute motion?

Mayor Lyles said let me see if I can try this one more time. You have a policy that's in front of you.

Ms. Watlington said point of order. Didn't it pass?

Mayor Lyles said it did pass but what I think we're saying is that you can have a policy like this written and it could pass, but if you don't have any enforcement, it's just a statement of interest. What you're trying to get to is whether or not there is an enforceable way and I don't know that we have one of those yet. Until we get some advice from legal counsel as well as whomever else needs to weigh in. All I'm suggesting is we ought to have the community engagement portion where we take this out so that we have ED Committee, Great Neighborhoods Committee and a community engagement, but this could be in here as a policy and have no enforced unless this gets done and adopted. So, this would come back to the council and that's what Ms. Watlington said at the very beginning. That this would come back with a staff recommendation.

Ms. Johnson said the enforcement piece. This is the policy and that just passed. This is policy. Our intent is that any developer who receives public dollars not just TIGs, BIGs (Business Investment Grants) and all the other ones and anything we name in the future.

Ms. Eiselt said talk to us, we're the ones that vote on it.

Ms. Johnson said I'm making sure that Shawn knows. That's the intent. Any public dollars that are received by a developer, that was the committee recommendation. That was the Ad Hoc recommendation. The change came when staff tweaked our language. So, the intent from council was that any developer who received public dollars would honor or accept vouchers.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Johnson it's passed.

Ms. Johnson said right.

Mayor Lyles said what I'm clarifying is that we have no enforceable way of dealing with it. So, we have a policy that needs enforcement and that has to come back to council.

Ms. Johnson said did you say that it has to go to committee? It's not going to committee or anything right?

Mayor Lyles said the two chairs asked it to come to the committee.

Ms. Johnson said go through committee again?

Mayor Lyles said the enforcement would go to the committee. I thought I heard Ms. Watlington and Mr. Graham agree on that. So, I'm putting it in committee for the enforcement and then come back to us. Alright, so that item is concluded.

* * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO 17: ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY ON 1541 WEST BOULEVARD

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt to (A) Approve the purchase of a parcel located at 1541 West Boulevard (parcel identification number 119-033-42) for \$480,000 from RRWB, LLC, and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all documents necessary to complete this transaction.

Councilmember Watlington said I just wanted to say that I was happy to see this as a continuation of the West Boulevard neighborhood playbook and another opportunity to determine the residents for themselves what they see on this corridor. So, I look forward to doing more of this. We've had a lot of interest throughout the district and other parts of the city about how we can do more of this. I think it's a very tangible way to execute the strategies of the community. So, thank you for the work on this Mr. Manager, Tracy and all who were involved. I look forward to doing more. Thanks.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 18: AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT REQUEST

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston and seconded by Councilmember Graham to (A) Approve a total revised funding allocation of \$3,000,000 to support the development of The Barton multi-family affordable housing development, and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate, execute, amend, and renew any documents necessary to complete this transaction.

Councilmember Winston said I had a question that was asked about this and I don't really think I got an answer. So, the Housing Trust Fund request as well as CHOIF (Charlotte Housing Opportunity Investment Fund) request. I understand why the project cost increased, but from what I got in the breakdown, we are the party that is paying more but the CHOIF isn't paying more. How is that balanced? I don't understand.

Shawn Heath, Director of Housing and Neighborhood Services said so, for this particular project it was approved for \$2,000,000 in Housing Trust Fund in April of 2021 and to your point, they've experienced cost pressure. It's a four percent deal over the last year and we've been working with a developer for the last four months to try to find a creative solution. We wouldn't put this in front of you except for it meets three conditions in our mind. I'm going to give a direct answer to your question after I mention the three conditions. One is we have to be confident that the developer has exhausted available options. So, Zellica Biermann, Miles Vaughn, Warran Wooten, myself, Rebecca Hefner, we've all been involved in a number of conversations with the developer to really get comfortable that they've done everything they can to close their gap.

Two, the opportunities still need to look attractive in the revised structure and I have a slide if you want to look at one that will be reminiscent of the Housing Trust Fund kind of materials that we look at. Then three, we need to have available funding obviously. So, the answer for all three of those questions from a staff perspective was yes. The size of the gap associated with this particular development at this point is \$4 million approximately. So, we would be making a contribution towards closing that gap. The developer has also agreed to increase the amount of the deferred developer fees. So, of course the developer fee is not something they pay, but it's something that they receive. So, they've modeled that as an additional 1.3 million dollars in deferred development fee to help close the gap and they've also made some assumptions around LIHTC tax equity financing as a result of the cost pressure that they faced.

So, there would be a combination of funding sources to close to the 4 million. What we're recommending here is that we play our part to help preserve this particular project with \$1 million in incremental funding. So, it's a shared effort. CHOIF is staying at 3 million. So, this would put us at three and CHOIF would be at three. It's not uncommon for us to have some parity with what CHOIF does on previous deals.

Mr. Winston said that's the crux of my question that still hasn't gotten answered. We're now going to be paying more to get less. We're reducing our leverage and it's not a two to three public to private investment amount, it's a one to one. Why did the private sector decide to stay [INAUDIBLE] and why did they not kind of go hand in hand with us to share the increase of cost on this investment understanding that again these are taxpayer dollars, right?

Mr. Heath said right.

Mr. Winston said they're making an investment that is going to come back to them. So, why are they not taking more risks, but taxpayers are?

Mr. Heath said so, it's my understanding that CHOIF is essentially in between rounds and that CHOIF one has been depleted. They're in the process of recapitalizing for CHOIF two. That's why in our most recent HTF (Housing Trust Fund) round it was a city alone kind of a scenario without CHOIF by our side. The metrics for this still look good. The cost per unit is lower than the average cost per unit for the six four percent deals that were approved in the last calendar year. Leverage ratios look good. The AMI (Area Median Income) mix looks very attractive. So, we definitely have taken a hard look at the revised proposal to ensure that it's still attractive.

Mr. Winston said I hear you and you're right that it is still attractive. It's less attractive than it was and again, I know we talked about this a couple months ago on another question. The answer was I think the same thing, that we're in between. It feels like a dupe when we're saying that we're going to get something and then it comes back around and say, "Actually we need more," and we're going to get less. That's what we specifically wanted to avoid. That's why we started the processes like we started many years ago to avoid this. It's like time after time after time after time. It's not a great look and Mr. Manager, I don't know how we avoid this moving forward, but again the taxpayers are picking up the slack where our partners are honestly this point in time have kind of fallen off. It's kind of demoralizing.

Mayor Lyles said I think that one of the things that we have to look at is what the per unit cost is and I know that they are reducing their costs, but for what we're having to see and pay for, for these units, it's certainly less than our cost by a large amount. I understand your point. Your point is this that this is a structured deal. If I recall you said deferred fee, and this was also part of the list work that was done to make it happen. So, I completely understand it.

Mr. Winston said it's just we're going out and especially now we just had the go bonds which Housing Trust Fund is engaged in it and we have said that we have this public/private partnership, but it doesn't seem to be sustainable. So, if it's not sustainable right now, how can we assure that it's sustainable moving forward? It should always be. The taxpayers with far less resources are making sure that one we can hold up our end of the bargain. Then too, we even have contingencies to go above and beyond. Our partners should be doing that too. It should not be acceptable that we're in between funding. That's their one job. We have many, many different jobs in the services that we provide.

Mayor Lyles said I don't know that they would agree Mr. Winston that they have one job.

Mr. Winston said the CHOIF? The CHOIF is to fund it.

Mayor Lyles said it is to fund it, but it's not just one job to have the money. You have to raise it.

Mr. Winston said that's the job of our partner, to ensure that that exists.

Councilmember Ajmera said I agree with Mr. Winston that we do have our per unit cost that has increase, but I also want us to recognize that development fee of almost 1.3 million was deferred in this case. Is that correct? In the follow up report I read that.

Mr. Heath said that's correct.

Ms. Ajmera said so, the developer did let go of those dollars. So, they contributed towards some of this increase in construction costs which could have been a lot higher. So, I hear what you're saying Mr. Winston, but I think the developer is doing what they could in this case to see this process successful.

Mr. Winston said not the developer.

Ms. Ajmera said I understand. You were talking about CHOIF.

Mr. Winston said yes.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: AMEND RESOLUTION FOR SALE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTIES ON ISENHOUR STREET

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Graham and carried unanimously to (A) Approve an amendment to the resolution approving the sale of three vacant City-owned parcels located at 3221 Isenhour Street, 1005 Patch Avenue, and Wainwright Avenue (parcel identification numbers 077-192-12, 077-192-13, and 077-192-21) to JCB Urban Company, to modify the scope of permissible development to include a single-family residence and two townhome units, and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all documents necessary to complete this transaction.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 124A-124B.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 20: RESERVE CENTRAL AVENUE CAPITAL PROJECT FUNDS

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Winston to (A) Direct the City Manager to transfer \$5,000,564.34 from the I&T Consolidation Building project to the Budget Capital Control Account, and (B) Adopt a budget ordinance reappropriating \$5,000,564.34 from the I&T Consolidation Building Project to the Budget Capital Control Account.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Newton, Phipps, and Winston.

NAYS: Councilmembers Johnson and Watlington.

Motion was made by Councilmember Eiselt, and seconded by Councilmember Driggs to add lease extension on Innovation Barn that is related to this item the August 22nd agenda.

Councilmember Ajmera said so I know this was a discussion at last council meeting. So, manager, you had said that you would bring that up on August 22nd?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so, that's what we're attempting to do. We have Phil Reiger who's working with Envision Charlotte and our legal department. We believe we're going to have that to Envision Charlotte this week and then it's just up to Envision Charlotte to get it back to us so that we can get it on the agenda for the 22nd.

Ms. Ajmera said yes. So, do we need a motion? It's already planned. From what I hear you telling me, I think it's already planned for the 22nd.

Councilmember Eiselt said it's been spoken but it has not been stated that we will vote on it on or before August 22nd. In other words, it could get delayed or deferred if staff chose to. From our conversation before I believe it was the intent of council that we would vote on it on or before the August 22nd.

Mayor Lyles said we have a motion on the floor to do put it on the 22nd.

Ms. Eiselt said on or before.

Mayor Lyles said well it would be August 22nd unless we do a special meeting. So, with that, a discussion?

Councilmember Johnson said we mentioned a 30-day notice. What is the 30-day notice and the 30-discussion period. I don't know if it goes to public hearing or what's the process for approving a lease?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said my understanding is the 30-day notice would go out well in advance of the time period it needs to be out before the 22nd of August. The 30-day notice will not be an issue.

Ms. Johnson said okay.

Mayor Lyles said alright, any other questions?

Ms. Johnson said this is for the extension, not the execution of the current lease right? The current lease is not executed right? Isn't that correct.

Mr. Jones said so, I'm trying to save Phil from a trip. So, I believe what we have worked on is to clean up the original lease to have it much like any other commercial lease we would have and with that we would have an extension that would be related to the same as if it started with a certificate of occupancy. It would be locked into the first 18,000 square feet and I'll call this the Driggs amendment. On the second half of the facility, if the council does want to move forward to invest funds in the second half of the facility, it isn't 100 percent certain that it would be for Envision. It could be for a use that the council decides at that time, but the lease step one which is August 22nd would be to extend that lease so that it would be five years related to the certificate of occupancy. I got a thumbs up. So, that's what it should do.

Ms. Johnson said okay. So, then the second part after the current lease, that's not what we're talking about discussing in August, right? We're just talking about validating the terms of the lease that were illegally extended right?

Mr. Jones said I would say that it's a clean-up, but absolutely it would be a lease that would be five years from the day.

Ms. Johnson said okay, so it's the current lease. Okay.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston

NAYS: Councilmember Johnson

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: EXCHANGE OF REAL PROPERTY WITH MILL DISTRICT PARTNERS, LLC

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Graham and carried as unanimous to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the exchange of certain real property rights between the City of Charlotte and Mill District Partners, LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company ("Mill District"); and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all documents necessary to complete this transaction.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 22: WATER SEWER REVENUE BONDS AND REVENUE BOND ANTICIPATION NOTES

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt and carried as unanimous to (A) Adopt bond orders and resolutions that makes certain Statements of Fact concerning the refunding of Water Sewer Revenue Bonds and Revenue Bond Anticipation Notes, (B) Provide for the issuance of Water Sewer Revenue Bonds in an amount not to exceed \$535 million, (C) Provide for the issuance of Water Sewer Revenue Bond Anticipation Notes in an amount not to exceed \$500 million, (D) Authorize City Officials to take necessary actions to complete the financing, including making the application to the Local Government Commission, and (E) Adopt a budget ordinance appropriating \$415 million in bond proceeds to the Charlotte Water Revenue Bond Debt Service Fund.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 127-144.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 65, at Page(s) 103.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 23: LEASE OF CITY-OWNED LAND TO MECKLENBURG COUNTY FOR GREENWAY

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Newton and carried as unanimous to (A) Adopt a resolution approving a five-year lease agreement with Mecklenburg County for a greenway on City property; and (B) Authorize the City Manager or his designee, to execute any necessary documents to complete this transaction and to amend the lease agreement consistent with the intent of the agreement.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 145.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 24: INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR THE LONG CREEK WATER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Newton and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute an interlocal agreement with Mecklenburg County for construction of the Long Creek Water Quality Enhancement Project, and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to amend the interlocal agreement consistent with the purpose for which the agreement was approved.

The resolution was recorded in full in Resolution Book 53, at Page(s) 146-155.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 p.m.

Marquita Moss, Assistant City Clerk/Minutes

Length of Meeting: 5 Hours, 4 Minutes
Minutes Completed: October 12, 2023