

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Council Committee Discussions on Monday, February 6, 2023, at 6:03 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Tariq Bokhari, Edmund Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Reneé Johnson, LaWana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Marjorie Molina, Victoria Watlington, Braxton Winston, III.

**ABSENT UNTIL NOTED:** Councilmembers Dimple Ajmera and Danté Anderson.

**Mayor Lyles** said welcome to the City of Charlotte's first meeting to discuss the work that we have done in committees. So, with that, I'd like to call this meeting to order. This is the time that we spend the day working through committee assignments, referrals, discussions, and report out so that we can affirm the things that the committee recommends or have a discussion and then determine if the committee's work is acceptable to the full Council. So, we usually begin with our first committee meeting that's held in the morning, and I would like to ask us to begin with the report out for Transportation, Planning, and Development and the chair is District 7 representative, Ed Driggs.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **ITEM NO. 1: COUNCIL COMMITTEE DISCUSSIONS**

**Councilmember Driggs** said thank you, Mayor. So, we did meet this morning. The committee meeting members are myself, Ms. Anderson as vice chair, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Mitchell, and Mr. Graham. We had one agenda item today. We talked about the CTC (Charlotte Transportation Center) the transportation center and basically received some information from staff about basically the transit aspects of this proposed development of the CTC. So, the conversation revolved around bus service levels, whether they would be maintained or changed as a result of the transition to the new facility and, in particular, the temporary facility that will be created next door to accommodate the buses during the time construction goes on for the new facility. We looked at the financial structure and we also had a conversation about the businesses that are currently in the transportation center and what provision might be made for them to also be able to conduct business at the temporary facility and/or the new facility. At the end of the discussion, the committee voted unanimously to recommend to the full Council that we basically proceed with this project toward an MOU (memorandum of understanding) which would not be binding and would subsequently lead to an actual binding contract that we would be able to consider as a Council after that. So, that's basically my report. I don't know if another Committee member has anything to add.

**Councilmember Graham** said job well done.

Mr. Driggs said we will hear also from Economic Development since it was an agenda item there as well.

**Mayor Lyles** said okay well, I wanted to say that the Metropolitan Transit Group also voted to support it unanimously with the seven voting members including the county and the six towns. I do want to acknowledge the comments that were made in that meeting, particularly around the idea that what people see is this underground, and air quality was something and I'm glad to see that the environmental process is in our next steps to make sure that the climate control is appropriate as well. Then, there's this idea that people of color might be sent to a place, that they're being hidden. I challenged that a little bit in the respect that I think having a safe and reliable system is what we want for everyone in our community, but particularly for those that cannot afford to have a car or have to use bus service for work or grocery shopping. I know we often talk a lot about being seen or that we see people, but I believe that a good design is possible so that people can have a really safe and reliable place where they can take the bus. So, I just wanted to mention, but I wanted you to know that those were the two concerns expressed. I also want you to know the transit advisory riders had a split vote 4/4 the recommendation that we have on the table today and 2 against. So, it was an

interesting thing the staff gave them the same reports that you've seen as a Council, and they had the same opportunity to have that discussion as well.

Mr. Driggs said Mayor, I just wanted to, in response to what you said, mention that we had previously considered in committee the question of the design. So, all of the discussion around the safety issues and the other pros and cons had been addressed. So, I didn't want it to appear that we didn't think about them. That was something that we looked at and decided on to allow that part of process to proceed, and today two committees worked on the remainder of the P3 Project.

Mayor Lyles said well as I said the MTC (Metropolitan Transit Commission) meeting was unanimously to support the design that you are recommending.

**Councilmember Mitchell** said the only thing I'll add to our great discussion this morning was the fact we raised kind of the issue to be sensitive to the business that are there now, and I think Jake was going to give us information who they were that when the new development came back on board that they have the opportunity to move back in. I think people there when it's not good we should definitely give them an opportunity when it's new clientele. It'd be the shiny penny of Charlotte to allow those small businesses to come back and first refusal or whatever but to be sensitive to that.

Mr. Driggs said I don't think we have much of a pipeline. We have a lot of follow-up work to do on the transportation plan as I think was apparent from our retreat. I don't believe we have pending referrals right now. I also think I should mention also during the committee meeting we received a report from Brent Cagle about the agreement that had been reached on a contract with the bus drivers. So, the company that we retained to manage our bus driving system finally, after long months as you know of negotiation, has now completed a new contract. I think that's important because it clears the way for us to make progress on a lot of the other issues facing our buses.

**Councilmember Winston** said as part of that discussion or presentation, Mr. Cagle that there is going to be an RFP (Request For Proposal) out on the street in the coming months, if not weeks, around future contract for the bus management organization and some of the conversations that we've had over the past year, this current and past Council.

**Councilmember Ajmera arrived at 6:11 p.m.**

There were some certain desires to possibly look at what Council's expectations are as it relates to future operation of the bus system. For instance, there was a conversation about whether or not the management organization should come and talk to Council every so often. So, potentially I think, colleagues, we should consider is there a policy question here that we want to deal with as it relates to future selection of and approval of that contract?

Mayor Lyles said I think that one of the things that I would raise is the governmental structure for the MTC and what that means. It would be great, Mr. Baker, if the CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System) attorney could review that document and tell us what's in it, what our roles are, to clarify that so we're all on the same page. That would be very helpful, I think.

Mr. Winston said yes, Mayor, you bring up a good point also this kind of public community dialogues we've been having that structure did come up so how do we not necessarily work in a silo as we're thinking about this, but how do we work with the MTC and the representative towns that are on that to again have a better kind of balance around where our community or regional priorities around those operations.

Mayor Lyles said yes, I think it's always good for us to start off on the same platform so if we can get something from the city attorney that explains what the roles and what the agreements currently say because certainly there are eight voting members representing a number of folks. It's important because one of the issues that we

perhaps have done in the past is not paid enough attention to those groups that work with us to make it possible. So, with that, thank you. Hearing no further discussion on transportation, we will go now to the Budget Governance and Intergovernmental Relations Committee and Ms. Ajmera is here. I hope everything's good.

**Councilmember Ajmera** said thank you, Madam Mayor. So, first I just want to acknowledge our committee members. First, let me start with recognizing our vice chair, Mr. Mitchell, and we have committee members, Ms. Anderson, Mr. Bokhari, and Ms. Mayfield. So, we had three items on our agenda today. So, at your table, you should all have this copy of federal and state legislative agenda. That was adopted by the committee today and you will note, in this one, the only two items that I want to highlight is the committee decided to add two items, one was pretrial services and that was something that was requested by our CMPD (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department) Chief and second is homestead tax exemption. This is in alignment with Mecklenburg County. So, we are working with and collaborating with the county to ensure that we can provide our seniors so that our seniors can continue to age in place. So, those were the two new items that were added to our state legislative agenda. The other item that was the topic of discussion was the mobility. So, on mobility you will see at your table, there is a language there. The only change to that language was a request to authorize under mobility in the first bullet point. Instead of saying, using mobility right after Mecklenburg County, we're asking for that request to authorize the county commission. So, that's the only change. Language that we presented on our January 3<sup>rd</sup> strategy session, was reaffirmed by our committee today. So, there are no other changes to our state and legislative agenda other than the ones I went over. So, any questions, concerns on this topic before I give an update on the second one?

Ms. Ajmera said okay well if not, I just want to give you all a heads-up. The other thing that I do want to highlight was Mr. Bokhari was in support of the committee's process and the protocols, however, he did not recommend the mobility language, as is, that was proposed by the committee.

Mr. Driggs said and same here.

Ms. Ajmera said I'm just talking about the committee. So, I want to give you all a heads-up. So, tonight we would just like to get consensus on our legislative agenda language. The next step is going to be at our February 13<sup>th</sup> business meeting.

**Councilmember Anderson arrived at 6:16 p.m.**

We will have this formal adoption on our agenda. So, committee members feel free to chime in on our state and federal legislative agenda. Yes, ma'am. Mayor, Ms. Johnson has a question.

**Councilmember Johnson** said I just want to ask about our state legislative agenda. One of the things that we talked about in the Great Neighborhoods Committee meeting today is inclusionary zoning. So, I know it might be too late for this legislative agenda or I don't know if it is or not. We were told by Councilmember Bokhari that's kind of a nonstarter from the general legislation, however, since I've been on Council, we know that that could possibly be a solution and we've never broached it as a Council. So, I'd like to discuss it on why we haven't discussed it. Maybe from our attorney, if you could come back with some information about it, I think that would be nice. From what I read; Chapel Hill is doing something like that. Chapel Hill's doing something like that, and I don't know if it's a conservative approach that we are taking. I'm not sure why we're not. This could be an opportunity to begin to build our way out of this crisis. Inclusionary zoning is where part of the development in the city, in which we've had quite an influx, a portion of that would be required to be affordable or at an affordable rate. So, it's something that I think our voters would like to see and they ask about, so I want to know why we're not at least discussing it or advocating for it. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said well I want to talk to our lawyer because if I recall, and I might not recall this as well I need to, but we have some authority for inclusionary zoning now that Anthony Fox, when he was Mayor, they adopted it, but I think the real question is to our

attorney to tell us what that is and what it isn't because I don't know what Chapel Hill has done. I don't recall really what we have done so it would be good to get some information to see what these methods are and even in other places in North Carolina to have a little bit more understanding. So, Mr. Baker, I know we are asking but if you, I think we ought to find out what we currently have and then look and see what Chapel Hill has and if there's anyone else in the state that's been able to get that legislation. Ms. Johnson, would that work for you?

Ms. Johnson said yes, thank you.

Mr. Winston said thank you, I did kind of give a matter-of-fact answer to Ms. Johnson in the housing committee. While this is certainly a topic that comes up for discussion, something I've brought up over the years that I've been on Council, I think I have once or twice introduced it into the legislative agenda process. The matter-of-fact answer is no City Council members put this forward during the legislative agenda process. So, that's why it's not up for consideration right now. Personally, I don't think it's something that we should add at the eleventh hour, but certainly, if there's an interest moving forward, I think we'll probably have to go through another legislative agenda process at the end of the year to perhaps study it and take a look at it then, but it just wasn't brought up, up to this point.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said thank you, Madam, chairs. So, Mr. Baker, while you're looking, we already have a foundation out there. UNC (University of North Carolina) School of Government back in 2010, did a Primer on Inclusionary Zoning where they broke down that there are three general categories of inclusionary zoning in North Carolina, Voluntary, Conditional, and Mandatory. So, if you're going to bring the language back to us of what is being utilized, it will also be helpful to breakdown what is under those three headers, Voluntary, Conditional, and/or Mandatory. Like I said UNC School of Government has already done multiple papers on it and it's being utilized in other communities. I would like for us to be nimble enough to recognize that we have seen very quick shifts in our market and in our community needs. So, as committee has proposed, as I sit on BGIR (Budget, Governance and Intergovernmental Relations), we submitted our proposal to full Council, I believe, and Mr. Baker correct me if I'm wrong, that this is the time whereas a full Council we get to have discussions. So, if there is an addition or a request to get more information not to go back to committee because we've already submitted what we're going to submit but is there room or space to add. We know that for the next five months, I believe, Mr. Fenton shared with us, the committee in Raleigh, they will be meeting, but there will be a fall legislative opportunity as well. So, however we need to get the information back I believe then there might be an opportunity to not stop what we're moving forward, but as an add, not an either/or to get the information back to full Council of the three forms of inclusionary zoning that's already been identified in North Carolina, break those down because it is, we already have the information. We don't need to do a research study. We don't need to identify a group to study it. The information has already been researched and it's out there. It's just a matter of pulling it.

Ms. Ajmera said so, we have two more items that our committee covered today. Second is the budget workshop. So, just a reminder we have our first budget workshop this week. It's on Thursday, at 1:30 p.m. So, our Budget Director, Ryan Bergman gave an overview off our budget workshop and that will be focused around our CIP (Capital Investment Plan). We'll hear more in depth about our capital capacity, what we will need to consider to address some of the pressure points that all cities across the nation are dealing with. The third item that we have, is on governance. On governance, we had requested benchmarking data from staff for cities of comparable size to Charlotte, the Council manager form of government, and this is also going to be plan for discussion at our March Budget Workshop. So, you'll get that data in March, but if you'd like a copy earlier certainly Mr. Bergman can provide that or, Mr. Bergman, if you could just provide a copy of that benchmarking data that was provided to the committee today to the entire Council? I think that would be helpful as we prepare for March's Budget Workshop. With that, I think that with governance, this was the last item on our governance. So, hopefully, this will be the end of it. There will be no more déjà vu. At our February 13<sup>th</sup>

Business Meeting, you will see two items added to our business agenda. Number 1 is four-year staggered terms because that was something full Council gave consensus on and then second one was adding an eighth district, without removing any At-Large seats. So, those two items will be on our February 13<sup>th</sup> Council Business Meeting Agenda. So, stay on the lookout for that, but that's all we had from our committee.

**Councilmember Watlington** said this came up the last time. So, I just wanted to verify with Mr. Jones. It didn't go to committee, but it came up during this discussion. I just wanted to hear an update on the Boards and Commissions piece. I know we're looking forward to coming to a vote on that one. So, I just want to know where that one was sitting. I know it's in the hopper.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, we have that on our agenda next. We have a backlog, but yes that's in our agenda for, at least for our committee. We have that on our agenda for Boards and Commissions.

Mayor Lyles said let me just make sure, is this the one for the virtual attendance? It ought to be on the agenda. We talked about putting it on the agenda. So, with that, do you remember?

**Marcus Jones, City Manager** said yes, I thought, Patrick, there's a term that you will help me with the exception of certain Boards and Commissions.

Mayor Lyles said quasi-judicial.

Mr. Jones said but I thought that quasi-judicial that Council could proceed with a virtual option for everybody else.

**Patrick Baker, City Attorney** said there's some discussions that are going on with the administration and some of those Boards and Commissions to get some feedback from them whether they want to do it or if they have any concerns about how to do it. That's the piece that's going on right now.

Mayor Lyles said that makes sense to ask them what they might want to do.

Mr. Baker said right.

**Councilmember Molina** said I just want to ask a clarifying question around the additional items for, around four-year terms and the additional district seat. When it's on the agenda for the 13<sup>th</sup> is that something, are we having a discussion or is that going to require a vote? I'm just asking for clarification. So, it will be voted?

Ms. Ajmera said yes.

Ms. Molina said we will vote on the item on February 13<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Baker said you'll vote in terms of what you want in front for the public hearing. Then a public hearing takes place and then ultimately once you've heard from the public, you'll have a chance to set specifically what you'd like and how you want to go about doing it whether it's going to be done by Council or by referendum, what have you.

Ms. Molina said okay thank you.

Mr. Baker said it's the first of few steps that need to occur, but there needs to be a public hearing before you actually make the final, final decision. You're going to look on the 13<sup>th</sup> what you have in front of you and what you are going to put forth at the public hearing for comment.

Ms. Ajmera said I just wanted to add Madam Mayor, so when committee approved both of those items, it was contingent upon referendum.

Mr. Baker said right, but you're going to reaffirm that.

Ms. Ajmera said right on February 13<sup>th</sup>.

Mayor Lyles said yes, and I would hope that the agenda item would lay out the process because it's very measured in requirements.

Mr. Baker said yes. It's all spelled out so the public will know in advance of coming to the hearing.

Mr. Graham said so, on the 13<sup>th</sup>, there will be a vote and there'll be a recommendation to Council whether or not we want to move forward or not. Correct?

Mr. Baker said you'll make a decision as to whether or not to set the public hearing. You can choose not to go forward on the 13<sup>th</sup> if you decide that as a Council.

Mr. Graham said yes.

Mr. Baker said but the committee's already done its work.

Mr. Graham said yes.

Mr. Baker said but as a Council, by setting the public hearing, you'll be setting the date of the public hearing, but also.

Mr. Graham said the committee's going to do that?

Mr. Baker said no, the Council's going to do that on the 13<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Graham said, okay, so the Council can vote it up or down?

Mr. Baker said yes.

Mayor Lyles said yes. You'll have a committee. The way I think it will work is that there will be a recommendation from the committee to consider. No, this thing is really prescriptive. So, you'll have a lot to do, and we'll get that prescriptive definition to you.

Mr. Baker said absolutely! Yes.

Ms. Mayfield said the only thing that I will add, as our Madam chair mentioned for our committee, when we're having budget discussion in March, when you look at the benchmarks, by March, you will have a full breakdown of what is the definition of part-time versus fulltime, because if you look at the benchmarks, which is online for those that want to pull it up in today's list of meeting minutes, but we're asking for more clarification. For the simple fact that they use, they benchmark New York. That's the area that they identified, so you'll see some adjusted numbers but all of that will be provided to everyone prior to us getting into the budget meeting that we'll be having in March. Thank you.

Mr. Driggs said so I just wanted to clarify the referral to the committee was to consider the recommendations of the Citizens Task Force. They did not recommend 12 seats. They recommended that we have one fewer At-Large seat and eight districts. So, if the committee wants to propose something else, that's fine, but let's not sort of confuse the issue and proceed as if the Citizens group had recommended 12 seats. They did not. I'm wondering is that also going to be the subject of a vote? Is it proposed that we vote on the district realignment as well?

Mayor Lyles said I believe that you have the option and I think what your question is, Mr. Baker, when the request for Council action is developed, I think it can actually be just those two that we have or you can say, "A will be number of seats. B will be this." So, I think it can be broken down and maybe some guidance from the committee would

be helpful on that, but I think basically it will come as a recommendation from the committee and a separate vote can be taken on any piece or part of it based upon what the Council is doing. So, I was just saying that.

Ms. Mayfield said committee has a response to the question.

Mr. Driggs said I'm still asking my question if I may. I had another for the City Attorney. The new district issue, is that something that requires a referendum or anything or is that entirely within our authority?

Mr. Baker said that is within your authority. It's part of the ability to change government structure, which you have specific statutory authority to do that in terms of adding a district.

Mr. Driggs said there is a limit on the number of seats that we're allowed to create.

Mr. Baker said that's correct. You can have up to 12 Councilmembers and a Mayor. So, you would be going to the maximum size that's allowed by North Carolina law.

Mr. Mitchell said so, to add to your point we kind of shared feedback to you earlier in January about that. So, we did. We got a great presentation from the chairperson. She came to our committee about the recommendation, and we deliberated, and we voted against that, and we submitted back a new proposal that you will vote on February 13<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Mayfield said so, in committee what we also recognized that we had an election mid-year, last year and out of that election you had new members that were sworn in as of September who were not a part of the previous conversation. So, those new members who are now part of the committee, when we looked at the recommendation, which it is, it is a recommendation. Community went out, they came back with a recommendation, we then submitted it. We had this conversation with Council months ago. So, when it's time this is our committee's recommendation. We all had the ability just like with any other item that's before us to vote it up or vote it down. Now how it's actually broken out as individual questions that's something that the chair, vice chair going to work with the staff on, but there's no misleading, there's no misinterpreting, there's no miscommunication regarding what committee has submitted to full Council because we had full conversation and a caveat of stating why we are submitting to full Council, what we are submitting.

Mr. Driggs said so I do understand that I'm just saying we convened that citizens' group to talk about our pay increase and some other issues in order to give the public some comfort that we were not making these decisions that affect us by ourselves. When we go outside of the recommendations of that group, that's a different action. So, fine we can do it, I'm not saying we can't, but we should not give the impression that all we're doing is acting on a recommendation from that group if we do something different from what they recommended. Thank you.

**Councilmember Bokhari** said I would just put a piece of food for thought for all of my colleagues out there which is we are in the middle of very complicated and high-stakes strategic planning for transportation and clearly our partners in the general assembly and a referendum is part of that strategy. We just covered at least three topics in the last 15 minutes that are absolutely 100 percent items that they've vehemently disagree with, an extension of terms, inclusionary zoning, and in watering down a republican vote, which let's be quite frank, that was the committee's recommendation. It wasn't get more help and more people around here. It was better level-set through more districts and less At-Large people the ability for the percentage of voters and parties to match at least more potentially the number of representatives here. So, regardless of if you believe in that or not, right or wrong, if there's a majority of votes here or not, I would just ask us to contemplate the fact that the same body that we are going about asking for partnership will not view that in any way other than as a headwind towards our partnership.

Mayor Lyles said I think everyone knows that really, we've gone through and now we're talking about the conversation that you will likely have on the 13<sup>th</sup>. So, just be aware of that, and we'll go to the next item. Is there any other item for this Madam Chair?

Ms. Ajmera said no, that's it.

Mayor Lyles said alright let me make sure. Let's be clear the committee has made a recommendation that will be on the February 13<sup>th</sup> agenda for the Council's full consideration. You do not have to vote for doing it. You can vote to table it. You can ask to send it back. There are all kinds of motions that will be allowable, and they will be voted up and down and so I think this is an important one and there are lots of important issues to consider in this because we have worked a lot to do a lot of major things. This will be one of them for the Council to act on or choose not to. Alright, so is everybody ready to go on to the next item? Okay, the next report is from Jobs and Economic Development.

Mr. Graham said the Jobs and Economic Development Committee met today and vice president, Mr. Driggs, Ms. Ajmera, Ms. Mayfield, Ms. Watlington were all there and accounted for. I will pick up where Mr. Driggs left off relating to the transit update. We too received a transit committee update. We recognize first and foremost that the CTC is a transit project first and foremost giving difference in respect to the end-users, the riders, the bus drivers, and those that will utilize the service. So, we had a robust conversation in transportation. The economic development conversation was more about the economic development spin offs, the Hornets Performance Center, the district opportunity naming rights, and branding. So, our committee meeting went extremely well, where we talked about the potential of the Charlotte Hornets coexisting with the Charlotte Transportation Center. We saw some very, very preliminary sketch and drawings of the facility as it may occur, very, very preliminary for sure. We talked about that being one of two options, there may be yet another option for our practice facility or performance center, Option B. If the facility conversation regarding the CTC doesn't work out and so there's another alternative site option for a practice facility.

Those conversations are in very early stages occurring along with design and all of those types of stuff that has to occur right now to see whether or not that's something that makes sense whether or not that makes sense for both the CTC center and the Charlotte Hornets. So, that's very early conversation, but we did introduce that to the committee today. In addition, we also talked about the district, creating a district. This part of the presentation I'm extremely excited about because it does talk about a lot of economic development opportunities alongside of the investment, we made last year for the renovation of the Spectrum Center itself, the building of a new CTC center, with the possibility of a training facility on top of it as well as the extending up Brevard Street to create a district center. Many cities throughout the country are going to this concept. We got an example of what they're doing in Tennessee. I believe that something of this strategy can work for our local community as well. Couple with what's happening at the Epicentre as well as in the immediate area of vicinity of the Spectrum Center and the CTC.

This creates a unique opportunity of high value assets for our community, so extremely, extremely excited. We did hear from the consultant that we're working with in terms of his perspective on getting the resources necessary to fulfill the financial obligations, again, very, very preliminary numbers. My vice chairman will take care of that for the committee. He's my finance guy. I will focus on the vision in terms of how all of this thing works out. Mr. Driggs and the budget director will look at how we pay for it. So, I think we've got a good team along with other committee members that were really, really engaged in this. Again, we're really, really in early stages of moving forward with preliminary engineering and design and all of those things that you have to do to prepare this project to happening, right. We're very early, but I think everyone left being cautiously optimistic about the financing of it, the vision for it, the community collaboration of our uptown neighbors working in conjunction with center city partners and others to kind of all work together to see how this may work for us.

In addition, I had the opportunity last week to meet with the developers of the new Epicentre and they too are excited as well in terms of how they can blend what they are trying to do to be an extension to what we're trying to do as well. So, very excited about it, a lot of great things are happening specifically related to the district itself and then when you take a look at higher 30,000 feet from the other projects that we're working on that will be complimentary to the district, i.e., maybe the Silver Line, the new transit station that we're building on the other side, near the stadium. Maybe a potential district over there, a lot of economic development opportunities that will be existing for uptown area. So, very preliminary in terms of where we are, a lot of staff work will be going forward in earnest to develop a timeline to be determined. The main thing, and we did not cover this in the transportation report out, is the building of the new temporary facility. Making sure that again, before we talk about economic impact, building a new CTC center, that the ridership and the bus drivers and the public have a temporary facility that meets their standards while this new center's being constructed. So, that was part one of our committee meeting. Part two of the committee meeting was a discussion on our ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funding recommendations. I thought that this portion of the meeting went extremely well as well. There were several recommendations that came forward dealing with workforce development, small business, Corridors of Opportunity, etc., to the tune of \$9.1 million. We did a lot of focusing on workforce development and we paused the meeting to make sure that all minds and hearts were clear in reference to the direction that we were headed to relating to work force development based on the conversations that occurred at our retreat.

I am satisfied that staff has heard some of the comments that were mentioned at the retreat and they have responded to it before and now and related to not only the investment in workforce development activities, but making sure that they've hit on a number of key points that were mentioned relating to targeting industry training and development, apprenticeship, renewed expansion, establishing partnerships with employers investing in innovative, proactive approach for jobs, focused on skills needed and equipping existing workers with more wages, with upscaling opportunities, enabling employees to move into new roles, scale-up and increase salaries. I mean all of those things that were a major concern to many of the members last week, I think was adequately addressed in the presentation given today and so I think we're in good shape there. In addition, we talked a little bit about small business support and developing an ecosystem strategy for that as well with several recommendations to support the utilization of small business with the focus on diverse business as well. Again, a lot of work, and efforts, and resources developed to small businesses as a part of the presentation that they made today. Lastly, I think more importantly, as again the staff and this Council should be proud of the work that we are doing to support our Corridors of Opportunity and there's resources, a million dollars to support grant programs and expand the organizational support for commercial districts and key areas throughout the city, Sugarcreek, West Boulevard, Albemarle, North Tryon, Freedom and Wilkinson Boulevard. Really creating equitable metrics for success within corridors.

Again, a lot of dollars are going that way, but more importantly, as Ms. Watlington has always mentioned making sure that we're measuring what we're doing to make sure that we're getting the impact that we desire. That's a key component of not only the workforce development initiatives that were laid out today to small business, but more importantly also the Corridors of Opportunity, making sure we measure what we're doing. Lastly, and I like this concept that we're doing here with the arts and culture, it's a \$700,000 investment to create permanent workspace for artists and studios, entrepreneurial studio space in these Corridors of Opportunity, which is really, really good. Signs Of The Times, which is a jazz band, who really wanted to do and have space on Beatties Ford Road to create a culture, a theme, a rhythm along the corridors. These are resources to help them do that as well other artisans throughout the city that want to give, blow life into some of these Corridors of Opportunity through art. I think that's really great! Lastly, an investment for a mobile symphony of \$200,000, I think it's good too because we can bring art into some of these communities, arts and entertainment, a traveling road show for a lack of better analogy. In summation, I thought the meeting went extremely well today. I thought we dotted a lot of i's and

crossed some t's and built some consensus within the committee in terms of the direction that we want to go into.

There was a clear acknowledgment that there were some suggestions that Councilmember Watlington made that I suggested that will be embedded in some of these recommendations. We will be looking for them so that they're included. I won't belabor the point of what they are. Staff knows what they are, but, more importantly, Mr. Manager, is that we begin to measure what we're doing and there's some accountability for that within the organization and that we measure the impact so that we can articulate clearly to our constituents in the community the return on the investment for investing in workforce development investing in small business with emphasis on diverse business and then continuing investment in Corridors of Opportunity relating to arts and organizational support that makes a meaningful impact. So, I will pause and allow any members of the committee to jump in if they wish to expand upon other points.

Mayor Lyles said before I recognize Mr. Driggs, Mr. Graham is there any action from your agenda that would be on the Council's agenda for consideration in the next three to four weeks?

Mr. Graham said think that my consensus we encouraged the staff to move forward. There was an action item, taken in the transportation committee that we support and so I think basically we said staff moving ahead that we're moving in the right direction.

Mr. Driggs said Mr. Chair I enjoy being your partner, I'm not just a man with a calculator, I have a vision, too. I think we all do. I admit that's an area of special interest. So, I just wanted to emphasize that as the chairman mentioned we'd two Council meetings today related to CTC and the goal is really to get a message to the staff whether they should proceed along these general lines. Looking at the structure that we'd heard about, we heard about a funding structure, we heard about a practice facility, about naming rights. So, if there was anybody that felt that we should not continue to investigate this, they should speak up because otherwise the presumption is that that work on that will continue. There will be checkpoints along the way. All we're trying to do now is get toward the memorandum of understanding, which is not binding. So, my feeling after both committees today was that at least the people in attendance at those meeting felt we should proceed with that. I just wanted to say for the benefit of the rest of Council, that, that's kind of what I hope that staff was able to take away and if anybody disagrees with that they should speak up.

I did also want to comment that I really appreciated the workforce development, the apprenticeship, that allocation of ARPA dollars. It's been a pet priority of mine. We really need to do more to get people to the point where they can pay their own rent rather than just have programs where we pay it for them or help them pay to it. I particularly liked the Mobile Symphony, \$200,000 is in there for a program that would offer ten concerts, symphony concerts at different locations in a mobile thing. I think that will be really fun in the areas in which they occur. My last comment on the mobility thing was we are using general funds to finance a transit project. So, I think it's okay because it is also an economic development project, but I would like for us to think about refinancing the CIP and the COPS (Certificates of Participation) money when the sales tax is approved from those mobility funds and to restore the availability in our general fund account to other purposes. Otherwise, I'm supportive for now of proceeding with this. Thank you.

Ms. Johnson said I wanted to ask about the workforce development piece. I know when I was on the committee, I was very intentional about lifting up formerly incarcerated individuals and I had asked for information about that, and I thought we were very close to implementing that population into the Hire Charlotte. I've asked Ms. Dodson about it a couple of times and, as I stated during the Summit, society is very intentional about excluding that population. So, we need to be as intentional about programs. So, I wanted to know where we are with that. I've given statistics before and everything, so I know there's information there. So, do we as a Council have the will to ensure that there are programs for that group in any plan that we have in Hire Charlotte? Thank you.

Mr. Jones said okay, so I think there's \$16 million associated with ARPA for I guess this tranche, and I don't think all of it was allocated today. Is that right? Okay. So, I believe what staff did was have some items that are I guess ready to at least be put in front of you, without allocating all of the funds, which would mean there's some opportunities for what I know is going to start to pop up as we go around the table tonight. I do want to also, and Tracy help me out, a little bit of clarity that there is this concept of it comes out of the committee, there's a discussion amongst this group, and then we get it on a docket. So, there will be a vote related to the ARPA recommendations up to this point and I do believe the MOU will come before the Council also for a vote. So, while it isn't on the 13<sup>th</sup> committee discussion, discussion amongst the bigger group with the goal of getting it on a future agenda. Just saying while it isn't here, Ms. Johnson, it does not mean that it can't be a part of this tranche because money is still available.

Ms. Johnson said so I know that city used to have a program. Was it called Promise or something to work with formerly incarcerated? There was some history, there was a person, I remember watching it just as a constituent.

Mayor Lyles said that is true.

Ms. Johnson said right, and I know that person is not at the city anymore. So, it's not really reinventing the wheel, I don't think. I think there's some history there. I'd like more information about that. Thanks.

Mayor Lyles said I think that you are correct, a lot of it was entry-level jobs. Even with that there were issues, because I remember talking to a number of folks about the issues of housing and not having a place to sleep as a result of being incarcerated and some of those things that are real hurdles. The city did have a program and I believe that that program is not a program anymore, it's just became kind of a place that you know you could come and apply in certain jobs and the communication was there. So, I think checking on that would be good, but I do believe that it is something that we have worked with and should continue, alright.

Ms. Mayfield said a couple of questions, one, to follow-up with my colleague, Ms. Johnson. In my first term on Council, we passed Ban the Box. When we passed Ban the Box, there was a commitment then, different city manager, different mayor, where the focus was not only with creating opportunities for employment for those who were formerly incarcerated, because we know that box of if you have ever been incarcerated was a barrier. So, it's honestly disheartening to hear, well, we'll add it in later, because this isn't a new conversation. So, if this is one of those things that keeps getting kicked down the road, then we never address it. So, I definitely hear the concern of why is that not specifically highlighted in here, because while we're talking about ARPA funds and there are 1500 requests out there where organizations have figured out how to spend the few ARPA dollars that we have later, that needs to be clearly identified in what is presented to us in that training. I also have a specific question either for the chair or for the manager, "Who is the organization that is going to manage Hire Charlotte?" Hire Charlotte is a collective of multiple organizations, but who is housing the actual tracking of okay the city has invested \$75,000 per training at Good Will, X at Charlotte Works, X at My Future NC. Who is tracking how much money is going to each individual in training and then tracking them to employment to see okay that \$75,000 investment that we made, but if you're able to identify employment that employment is paying you \$35,000/40,000, who is actually going to, who is managing that, because all of this is cute in a power point, but it doesn't say where the accountability and the responsibility of the report out to Council and to community lies. So, who is that organization, that business, because it should be a for-profit business, not another non-profit? Who is that?

Mr. Jones said I'll start off, Councilmember Mayfield with the end to Councilmember Johnson's point about formerly incarcerated. So, I guess because it's a part of our fabric, we just did it two years ago, three years ago now. We had an apprenticeship program regarding 50 individuals with the whole goal of those individuals being folks that had barriers to employment, many of those formerly incarcerated. So, as a part of

what we do. As an employment center for the city, we have built that into our ecosystem in terms of how hard Charlotte is going to manage up, I will leave that up to the committee. I don't want you guys to walk away today with a thought process that there wouldn't be anything related to formerly incarcerated individuals and if that is a priority of the Council, the majority of the Council, we can set aside some funds for that. We tend to get into these crosshairs sometimes when they're conversations that pop up, but not clear direction, but that's something that we want to allocate a portion of these funds to, absolutely we can do that.

Ms. Mayfield said so, for clarification, if I am hearing you correctly, Mister Manager, so you just said that well we say it's part of our fabric. If it's part of our fabric, then nothing that's in our fabric that's not funded, so that means that previously there were some funds that were allocated if you just mentioned that there were 50 individuals that went through a specialized training. Have all 50 of those individuals been placed in employment that's gainful employment where they're able to still live in our city?

Mr. Jones said they work for us.

Ms. Mayfield said okay so, we're saying the City of Charlotte hired 50 individuals.

Mr. Jones said absolutely.

Ms. Mayfield said what I'm saying is separate from the City of Charlotte doing the hiring, the language, when we're talking about workforce and workplace, here's the challenge. We have partners out there right now that on paper look really good, but we have individuals that may not be those who need additional education who may just be transitioning work. We've had a lot of layoffs in our city of high-tech jobs and other jobs. These organizations haven't necessarily been the right fit to help some of those individuals be retrained and get connected to another job that's paying them at the salary or close to the salary that they were making before. So, when I ask the question of who is going to actually be the management of this, to me it is not a good response to say well, I'm going to leave that up to the committee. That falls in your wheelhouse as the City Manager because if this is going to be something that Council has expressed that these are our goals and our expectations, it is then the responsibility of your office to help ensure that these goals are met. They cannot be met if we don't have a designated whether it is a for-profit, whether it is a new, specific department head that focuses on this. If there is not a clear financial commitment or contractual commitment to make sure that report out would be available whether it's annually, semiannually, then we risk the chance of having the same question, the same conversation that we're having now regarding those formerly incarcerated, because this is not the first time that that question has been thrown in the middle of table for Council to discuss. It's not the first time that your office has heard it. It's not the first time that you've heard it. We keep going back to it because the language and/or the funding, and/or the support or the combination of all three has not been put in place for clear enforcement. So, that is my question regarding the enforcement not the answer of well if that's what you want to do, then we'll just add a line item. That line item should have been added years ago. So, what I'm asking is for clarification of understanding that if the conversation keeps coming back up, regardless of who the councilmembers are around the table, if this is truly a part of the culture that Charlotte wants to create or wants to give the impression to the community that it has, where is the language and/or the line item so that anyone can go and see that that commitment is not only there, but that commitment is enforceable?

Mr. Jones said so, I guess you've asked two questions. One is how is Charlotte going to be managed and that hasn't run its course in terms of having everything totally built out. So, I think it's premature.

Ms. Mayfield said that's a valid answer but telling me the committee would make that decision was not a valid answer. So, I will accept that answer that we haven't figured that part out yet.

Mr. Jones said yes, and then the second issue with formerly incarcerated individuals I would say to you that clearly there's compassion not just from the administration, but from the Council. We get many items that are thrown out and we'd like to get a little direction at six people would like us to go in that direction. One of the reasons why we didn't allocate all the funds, but if we'd like to have the remaining funds allocated that way and if six Council members said that's what we want, that's exactly what we'll do.

Ms. Mayfield said right, but what I want us to clearly hear that he's saying, this isn't just we'll allocate the money. These are our partners. We can make it very clear, in our language for any contract that our partner brings to us, or anything that we put out that our expectation is to also ensure those who are formerly incarcerated have the same opportunities for these trainings and the same opportunity to actually be in the room. That is not a conversation where we just throw money at it. So, to say well I'll just allocate the balance of the money, we haven't even talked about what is the balance of the money, what are the priorities that we need. This is strictly a conversation that can be supported by multiple Council members saying yes we want to make sure as we're working with these partners, Charlotte Works, Good Will, CELC (Charlotte Executive Leadership Council), whoever these partners are, Central Piedmont, they know that in order to get access to the funds that we are talking about allocating now, that pool of those that come to that table also include our residents and our neighbors who were formerly incarcerated to give them an opportunity to become self-sufficient. It isn't necessarily throwing more money at it. The money that's already allocated should include, not exclude, or to say to help these additional people we need to put more money at it, include them in the part of the conversation from the front end opposed to trying to figure out on the back end and then saying, "Well we spent all the money because if we hadn't done this, then we wouldn't have money for that." No, include them in this conversation on the front end.

Ms. Mayfield said the motion is to support the formerly incarcerated into the Hire Charlotte elevated ecosystem to create job opportunities.

|   |
|---|
| Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield and seconded by Councilmember Watlington to add the formally incarcerated into the Higher Charlotte elevated ecosystem to create job opportunities. |
|---|

Mayor Lyles said okay. So, we first we need to have a motion. I know because this is an item, and this is hard for me because I'm never quite sure when do we want the public to come in and talk and comment and understand we're making something. This has been designed, and actually I'm going to ask Patrick because most of our agendas go out and they're published, so that the public will know what we're talking about. I think sometimes we move to an action item that's not there, but then sometimes we're like, "Well, you can't do it unless you get the public to comment on it." I'm very concerned about how we do this in a way that works. So, Patrick help me out here. On motions that, we've advertised this as a committee discussion.

Mr. Baker said so, you don't have any of these motions on your agenda and how these typically work is that if you're going to add something to the agenda to be discussed and voted on at this meeting, there would need to be unanimous consent to do that. That's typically how that works.

Ms. Watlington said point of order, because I have to believe that if somebody said let's make an adjustment to a committee recommendation, we're not making a Council action to adopt something as policy right now. What I understood of her motion and what I seconded is that we make an adjustment to the recommendation coming out of committee for our consideration as direction to staff to come back with a policy that we would then vote on. So, I have a hard time believing that we can't ever come to any kind of understanding of how people sitting around the dais feel without first putting it on an agenda. I'm not asking for a formal Council action. Councilmember Johnson asked, "Is there a political will?" The purpose of this strategy session is to find out what we have

political will for. So, I don't think that falls under a formal RCA (Request for Council Action).

Mayor Lyles said maybe I misunderstood; I did not hear. I thought it was the motion.

Ms. Watlington said Mayor, we can call it a straw vote or whatever you want to call it. Mayor Lyles said I think we need to be clear on what the motion is first and foremost and then I have a list of people that want to comment about and so that motion, as well as the conversation, I think it's always better to be clear on whether or not what the committee recommendation is versus what a motion would be that's presented as a result of a conversation and if I think what we're saying, I'm going to ask Ms. Mayfield to clarify this motion as well.

Ms. Mayfield said Madam Mayor what my motion was, was to add that additional language to the committee's recommendation. My challenge, of which I have a clarifying question, the way the new structure has been identified for committees to meet and then report out, I'm not seeing where we had the opportunity to do the conversation that we're doing right now. If the expectation is only in committee, may have our discussion and then whatever is brought to full Council, is just this is what the committee recommended without you having any input into it. If that's the expectation of a rubber stamp, where it goes from committee to Council to community that's going to be a challenge because this was the space that I was under the impression where we get to ask the clarifying questions and add additional information.

Mayor Lyles said that is correct.

Ms. Mayfield said when I made my motion, lack of a better word, it was to add this language specifically for those formerly incarcerated in this presentation because if we're talking about ARPA funding, it is about being as inclusive as possible. Because from what I heard and I listened to it, I tuned in online, my colleague in committee made a motion that didn't go anywhere. Now that we're in full body to see if there is support, there is support from a number of us to add this to this discussion for a bigger, a larger conversation. Now, are you saying we have to have unanimous support for us to add?

Mayor Lyles said no, it was a misunderstanding. I thought you said I'm making a motion, and it did not say to the committee wording, and I think that's what Ms. Watlington expressed.

Ms. Mayfield said and my apologies, because my caveat was because of the conversation that we're having right now, it is specifically about committees. When I made the motion, I made the assumption that it was specific to this language, so if I need to clarify that for the sake of the clerk, then I will do that.

Mayor Lyles said I think that it's clarified now. Ms. Watlington has what the motion was that she made in the committee. So, the next speaker that I have, so I don't believe, what I think what we'd be doing is sending this back to the committee for further discussion.

Ms. Mayfield said that's not what I said.

Mayor Lyles said so, you're going to add it to the committee's discussion or to the committee?

Ms. Mayfield said added the recommendations. I'm saying my motion was, my motion was for this to be added to the recommendations, just like we have had other discussion regarding the recommendation.

Mayor Lyles said I understand.

Ms. Mayfield said when we all come together, if we don't get the chance to have these conversations, then again what exactly are we doing or is it an expectation that we're just supposed to rubber stamp it, because if it is, then we all need to do this.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Mayfield, I'm just trying to make sure that I hear you clearly about what the motion is and where it goes, then what I'm trying to figure out that if this was discussed in committee, where would this go back because I think what you're doing is adding to the discussion and then I'm asking Patrick if we would vote on adding it to this, what I think I hear is more discussion from the people that have asked to speak towards that. So, it would be included in the discussion. Patrick, am I?

Mr. Baker said yes, I got clarity as to Ms. Mayfield's, Councilmember Mayfield's question, which is to add, to amend the committee recommendation.

Mayor Lyles said yes.

Mr. Baker said then the full Council will take up the amended committee recommendation as opposed to sending it back to the committee.

Mayor Lyles said let me make sure that I say that correctly. The Council would not be voting the action tonight. It would be on a Council agenda with the full motion that would be included on it. So, that's the next step. If it passes here, it goes on an agenda item, for a Council vote with a committee recommendation or modified to include. I think that we having this discussion, we can move on to now understanding Ms. Mayfield's motion. Ms. Watlington's has spoken, and Ms. Ajmera has left the room. Mayor Pro Tem, you've already spoken.

Mr. Graham said I just want to say this. I get it. Formerly incarcerated individuals in our community should be a top priority for everybody and I would be hard pressed to be corrected if I'm wrong that all of our workforce development partners doesn't have an initiative that focuses on the formerly incarcerated. I would be hard pressed to believe that Charlotte Works doesn't have a pipeline where they're focusing on that we're going to give resources to. Good Will has a focus on formerly incarcerated. CPCC (Central Piedmont Community College) through their program have a dotted line to the formerly incarcerated. So, maybe it's an assumption, that we just assumed that everyone kind of got that. So, it would be little effort at all for the committee to say, "Tag along to all the funding that we'd like to get approved, that there's a special focus and emphasis on the formerly incarcerated with these dollars." I mean that's like a ten second conversation, right?

I think we need to factcheck that, Ms. Dodson, for sure. I would be hard pressed to believe that they didn't. Now, if you're saying the City of Charlotte should have its own initiative program related to formerly incarcerated, I would probably say that would be redundant because there're people in the community doing a lot better than we probably could, a lot more effective, a lot more efficient. Then if we want to fund those organizations, I think we can do that. So, I think we're just having a circular argument here that I'm not sure that we could never get off. Secondly, in reference to the management of the Hire Charlotte, it's being managed by economic development now, right. So, if we want score cards or we want performances, I mean that's where it's being managed at today and I stand to be corrected, I think there's an individual that's working specifically related to those initiatives that can report to the Council anytime we want them to report out. So, I'm just missing the boat. I just don't understand what we're doing.

Ms. Ajmera said I know we were having conversation to the point that Ms. Johnson had raised. I think the purpose of this meeting is to really see where consensus is. So, Mr. Jones, what do you need from us? Like do you need a show of hands? Do you need head nods? What exactly do you need in order for you to include that as part of the proposal because I think we've done that with other items in the past, whether it's state and federal legislative items or transportation items. We kind of sort of give you consensus where Council is leaning towards.

Mr. Jones said no, thank you Councilmember Ajmera. I don't disagree with what was mentioned earlier about the purpose of this meeting. So, it isn't rubber stamping it, it is having these concepts and ideas come out. So, let's just use a very different thing. It's relevant. So, there have been times when a Council member of two may have thrown something on the table for a good discussion, but at the end of it, there's not the majority of Council that wants to do it. So, whether it's a head nod or whatever the right thing is, it would be great to have that type of consensus from Council to say that we'd like this to be priority as we start to think about workforce development going forward.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I think that, so this topic needs to be revisited so that you have clear message from the majority of the Council as to where they are leaning. So, that's one item and we can do that. I just want to comment on a separate item, and I've shared that with Ms. Dodson earlier today and a couple of times before as well as Chairman Graham. When we released our first tranche of ARPA dollars, there were concerns around equity, especially when it came to business partners support program. I had highlighted that at our last committee meeting, and I think in doing our one-on-one meeting where we needed to ensure that the minority chambers were included in that distribution and that distribution was done in a way that aligns with our Equity in Governance framework and it's an equitable process. A lot of the minority chambers were left out of that funding. So, I know that we still have some ARPA dollars left and I would like us to prioritize some of these minority chambers who have worked tremendously and these are all volunteer run organizations that have supported businesses whether it's Latin American Chamber of Commerce, Asian American Chamber of Commerce, Black Chamber of Commerce, and so on is to ensure that with this distribution that they are getting their fair share and the whole process is equitable and we are using equity lens. If we can get some sort of feedback on that. I know Ms. Eskridge was working on it with Ms. Dodson, but it's been a while, and we haven't received any update on that. Thank you.

Mr. Winston said before I talk about the Arts and Culture slide, I'll just continue my comment on this section of the conversation. This is something I said during, I'll probably bring up during the next section, the next committee presentation. I think the difficulty with our retreat last Monday and Tuesday is that we weren't able to give clear affirmation to what our priorities met. I thank Mr. Bokhari for making the motion so that we can kind of get past that, but I don't think we were ever able to have an effective conversation as a Council, to give staff some of that clear guidance, right. I think what Mr. Graham said in his assumption, I think Ms. Mayfield is correct that we shouldn't operate under assumptions, we have to be clear. I think we need to figure out as a Council how to have a structured conversation where we do that very simply, right. Year after year we are expected to affirm, where do we want staff to focus our workforce development efforts so that it is a common thread through the entire DNA of the way they're looking at recommendations through the year. So, I would like to personally prioritize formerly incarcerated people. I've said that over the years. I've worked on that, but also would like to get it to a clear kind of guidance to staff of not only for formerly incarcerated folks, but where do our kind of top three, top five kind of priorities lie? I think this is something that we did well for instance during the pandemic when we first got that CARES ACT money, where we said we wanted to focus on restaurant or hospitality workers getting them retooled. We wanted to focus on people whose industries were kind of wiped out because of the pandemic to get them retooled. We have to give staff that type of guidance so that we are not acting under assumptions, but our values are being represented in our policies.

I think if we find a way to do that, I think that is a committee question to define since we weren't able to do it at our retreat this year, but I think that's going to be common thread through our many different policy areas. So, I don't think it's something that we should just do for one group, or we should kind of define that somehow, somehow. With that said, I did want to just kind of call out slide 16 of the presentation on these ARPA dollars. I brought this up during committee meeting, but this is kind of what I meant as it relates to looking at arts investment from the public sector through economic development lens. We're looking at investing in infrastructure stages as well as finding

ways to support workspaces so folks can work and build businesses. While it doesn't have a dollar amount, we're looking at how that we can integrate artists and art within, again, our policy development lenses throughout the city. So, I would just like to point out that while this is an important kind of conclusion we need to come to, as it relates to, again, guidance to our priorities for staff, as it relates to arts and culture. While this is an economic development thing, it should be a City Council priority.

I mean this conversation about supporting formerly justice involved individuals is important because this is ARPA dollars. This is one-time dollars, but the intent is to get this year to year and to create some kind of framework where future councils can reprioritize how we want that money to be focused so that they can work throughout the year on making effective recommendations that fit our expected outcome expectations. Frankly this is the way City Council is supposed to work. So, I think we all have to or should take a step back and figure out how we really refocus our energies in these last few months to be effective policy making boards and work through those policies and by those policies. Thank you.

Ms. Molina said while we've covered a lot, I just want to go back to the discussions that we had in committee because I specifically remember Councilmember Watlington bringing up, she actually said as a takeaway, and I think we all agreed with her. I know that now we're in front of the full Council, but I just want to ensure to my colleagues that that was actually a piece of the discussion that we had today. Councilwoman Watlington, she injected that into the conversation, and she also added single mothers because there's a large amount of quantitative data in our particular city that speaks to poverty being sexist, right? So, we have an overwhelmingly large percentage of women who are affected by need in our population. So, adjacent to our formerly incarcerated community, she also injected into the conversation single mothers as well. So, I wrote down some of the takeaways, that as the committee we provided to the staff, which was pipeline development, which would also include some of what we are talking about. What would the pipeline look like with Hire Charlotte? What methods of connection would we use? How do we do it? Because we're still like our chairman said today, we're still talking about the how. So, I don't know at what point we will have injection from the full Council, but we did mention that the how is still being hashed out and that was one of the takeaways that a few of the Council members actually mentioned. The impact on economic mobility, our target audience, we even actually said, "Do you remember that chairman and vice chairman?"

We were actually talking about, I think we do have areas of opportunity to decide what the target audience will be for Hire, and I don't disagree with my colleagues in saying that our formerly incarcerated, I want to iterate that and be clear. I'm not saying that I am disagreeing, I'm really just kind of providing context to what we actually talked about in committee and assuring you that those were things that were brought up and we talked about success models, what they look like. Because I feel like a lot of what we would do with something like this, is look at what's been successful and then hopefully build on that so that we can be more inclusive as the project goes along and one thing that I was encouraged by was that Tracy, our economic development head, she actually said was that Hire was designed too scalable. So, in order to create a project and make it scalable, you first have to find out what works and what doesn't. So, we have a scalable model where we can actually create different workstreams and different ways to impact our community. So, I feel encouraged by the workforce development piece, and I want to speak personally.

As a person who changed careers in my thirties and retooled and tried to get work, I had a hard time. I was trained and I have a lot of education and so I do realize personally that we've had areas of opportunity with connection and employment and things of that nature. So, I think a lot of us bring a lot of informed experience and passion and things of that nature that we're going to add to and take away from. That's why I kept kind of saying I remember that Councilwoman Watlington injected that into the conversation, so I want to ensure my colleague because I could feel her passion from across the room that we did mention it in committee, and it was actually a piece of the discussion. Actually, when the chairman and the vice chairman were saying, like we

were saying we were giving staff the okay to go forward with it and continue with the work, Councilwoman Watlington actually injected, she was like, "I'm okay with it as long as we consider what I've said as a takeaway." So, I felt encouraged by that because she did, she brought that up specifically in the meeting. So, I just wanted to provide that as a piece of feedback and assure you that I don't know what the will of the body is to do anything additional right now, but we did discuss it in committee.

Mr. Bokhari said I'll just say quickly, I think that when we have topics that are deep, that have a lot of moving parts and pieces to them it would behoove anyone who cares about how they want to be shaped, to get into the weeds of how they work first. We can't sit around here at a high strategic level and think we can navigate to outcomes when we don't understand how the cake is baked. So, two points for this conversation just so you guys are aware. There are two parts to Hire in this capacity. On the one side, there's the training programs, all the parties you've seen before. I will absolutely guarantee you not only do they all have a focus and care about single mothers, about formerly incarcerated, aside from that as a priority. It doesn't matter. It's not like there's a different kind of program to teach them to code or ultimately a trade skill if you're formerly incarcerated or not, it's a program to upscale you. So, there's nowhere you go spend your money to make that program different. Then on the other side of the coin, what really matters is the workforce partners, the hiring companies who are providing the jobs, the most important thing to those folks.

Now, I'll promise you two things right now, every company in this town of any magnitude has a D&I (Diversity and Inclusion) officer and a D&I officer focuses on every day far more than what you're thinking about right now. So, those are the folks that ultimately are going and saying, "Can we push the envelope on more female hires or single mother hires or all those things?" Trust me they are measured every day to meeting those goals. There are certain things like formerly incarcerated, where for example if you are any of the banks here, it's out of your control. The regulators are at a federal level right now do not allow you to hire certain people with certain things on their record and that's the way it works. Again, I appreciate the passion for the items, but if you learn what is actually happening in the programs, you'll realize very quickly, this is a completely irrelevant conversation we're having. It does not matter because you wouldn't change the things that you train people to or the jobs that are there, that are being provided. Again, you got to ramp up on the program.

Mayor Lyles said okay, let me tell you what I have so far. Wait, I just want to say that what we're talking about is the committee's work that's going to come back to you on a future agenda and then what I have is first in our programs to be sure that any program that includes chambers, includes the minority chambers. I have that we would have a policy about those that have been in the justice system, as we contract or work with groups that are doing this work for us that they would be including those that were formerly in the justice system, but we would also ask them to describe how they do it now. Then we would also include single mothers, that we would look at, the committee has talked about some of the administrative things that Ms. Molina said. There's still a pipeline to be developed, there's still connections on how to get people into the space that they can have for the training, and then the metrics of beginning to actually measure what the targets are for people to be successful as we move through this. Then the final thing that I had is the Workforce Development Programs that was submitting their programs that they would use to address single mothers and those that have been in the justice system. So, with that, I know that the committee has given their overall report. By the Roberts' Rules, everyone has spoken that wanted to be recognized except Mr. Mitchell. So, I'm just making sure we know what we're including right now. So, those would be the things that you can have in the request for Council action, address these issues specifically as the staff returns the information for the Council.

Ms. Johnson said point of order, Mayor, is there a motion on the table?

Mayor Lyles said there is a motion on the table. I'm just clarifying the motion is to include the formerly justice system clients to be included in the policies on the contracts

that we are talking about today that will be on a Council agenda. Does that answer your question?

Ms. Johnson said there's just a lot of discussion outside of the motion that usually is not allowed to happen.

Mayor Lyles said that's why I am trying to outline the points that would be included when Council comes back to vote on these items.

Ms. Johnson said we didn't talk about; single parents wasn't in the motion. The motion was very, very specific about formerly incarcerated.

Mayor Lyles said I think that what I was saying is the that staff would give information on the single parents. They could just say, "The committee did not discuss, or the committee can discuss." It's just getting every item that was raised as an issue addressed before we have the actual vote on the programs, and the motion. Okay. I understand, I'm just clarifying. Alright, so the last thing that I had is that Ms. Johnson has raised the question of single mothers, and that can be addressed. So, the staff would have the ability to say that. So, now Mr. Mitchell has not spoken. I will now recognize Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Mitchell said I'm going to try to be brief. So, let me do a follow-up to Councilmember Watlington when she said, "How do we measure what programs are successful?" So, could I get some information because Hire Charlotte is new to me. So, it would be helpful if you could share the results of Hire Charlotte particularly how many have, we placed, who's our target audience, and what level, what salary are those jobs were they able to attain. So, Councilmember Bokhari, I will say I have a different perspective in workforce development. So, let me share you mine. I work for two construction companies. Our primary focus were those who either were incarcerated, or those who never had a job before and lived in some of our challenged communities. So, we took about 70 through a training program with the companies in construction. They trained them skills, then put them on the convention center and the airport. For me, in my earlier conversation, I mentioned that at the Annual Strategy Meeting is the Chetty report. So, my vision of a workforce development, it's nothing against Hire Charlotte, but it's a different audience we need to reach, we need to train, and we need to put on the payroll, as Councilmember Driggs articulated. So, for me that is the market, or the citizens that we have yet to spend time with. So let me give you an example, Councilmember Molina and I are working on a project, so I let her talk more about it, but it's really about workforce development. We're going into a community with partners, with appliance and construction companies to give the 18 to 24-year-olds who are flunking out high school, skills in construction and HVAC (Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning) so they can be productive citizens in our community. I don't think that's an audience for Hire Charlotte. So, I've always said there's an and possibility not an or. I do think Mayor and Council, this conversation I think we all got the right intentions. We're trying to employ people in Charlotte. I think the difference for me has always been Hire Charlotte is about the jobs that are out there that need to be filled. My definition of workforce development is the person in Charlotte that I need to give job skills so they can get an entry level job. So, when you think about those two different dynamics, you've got different people who are going to play in the Hire Charlotte space, which is great, the fen-techs, the computers, the financial analysts. Then you get those who Danté and I grew up in, in Brookhill and Southside.

It's all about how can train me to have the right attitude, get the right skills so I can get an entry-level job in the City of Charlotte. I think those are two different dynamics and I want us to be inclusive for all of us. So, I can talk about really from construction, we have been very friendly to those who have been incarcerated. We give them a second chance in life. You mentioned to your point, if you've been incarcerated, you can't get a job as a financial planner or deal with finances in a bank, correct? All of our citizens who want to work and say give me a chance, give me an opportunity, we should have a program to encourage them and give them a skill set. So, that's the only difference I see when we talk about, in my mind, really workforce development. Go where our normal

company Fortune 500 don't go. Go, where the construction company says, I'll take that young man. He may not make it at Garinger High School, but I'll tell you if I can teach him a trade, he can start working making \$18/hour at the airport in construction. Mayor Lyles okay thank you. I think that we've covered it. I have six to seven points here that the manager has also been inscribing. This will come back to Council with the information as requested, addressing the issues that Council requested and also including the recommendation for the motion that Ms. Mayfield made.

Ms. Mayfield said so, are we addressing the motion right now or are you trying to lump all of that?

Mayor Lyles said no, I'm not trying to lump it right now. I want to get that added if it's to be added to the recommendation.

Ms. Mayfield said just for clarification, Mayor, you captured a lot which is great. I just want to make sure that what we recognize is separate conversation. There was a motion, there was a second on that motion. My motion was only to add the language of formerly incarcerated into this. That's it.

Mayor Lyles said yes, that's what I had adding the incarcerated policy into our contracts.

Ms. Johnson said she made a motion to what I had discussed. I said Hire Charlotte. The biggest concern for me is this was already in Hire Charlotte, when I was on the committee. When I changed committees for the new term, I asked Councilmember Watlington to make sure you keep this lifted. I'm trying to look for previous presentations where we addressed this. So, that's the bigger issue, the governance, that like Councilmember Mayfield said, "Ban the Box." We've got to keep this lifted, and I also want to address a text that I had received from Kenny Robinson about the partners in the community that are not addressing specifically formerly incarcerated. My point is, in all due respect, I've been a single parent. There's no one that will legally discriminate against someone because they're a single parent, but if you're formerly incarcerated the employer can say, "I'm in the banking arena, we can't hire you." So, as intentional, as people exclude them, there needs to be policies to be intentional about including them.

The vote was taken on the motion to add the formally incarcerated into the Higher Charlotte elevated ecosystem to create job opportunities and recorded as unanimous.

Ms. Johnson said just for clarification it's added to the agenda or we're asking for that population to be included in the Hire Charlotte Program?

Mayor Lyles said to be included in the Hire Charlotte Program.

Ms. Ajmera said I would like to make a motion. I know I talked to some of you about using equity in governance framework and ensuring that minority chambers do get their fair distribution from the ARPA dollars. So, I would like to make sure in the ARPA distribution, they're included. There is a specific bucket just for minority chambers to apply to. So, I would like to add that to, I'd like to make a motion to add that.

Mr. Jones said I think you just call for the vote.

Mr. Driggs said accepting it to the agenda, is that the motion?

Mayor Lyles said no, what we're doing is giving direction on the setting aside for the minority chambers an amount of any ARPA funding.

Mr. Bokhari said isn't this a budget a conversation?

Mayor Lyles well, it is a motion.

Mr. Bokhari said we're talking about appropriating dollars, right now.

Ms. Ajmera said we are discussing how ARPA dollars. Committee just did a report out on ARPA dollars from the committee. So, I'm just adding. This was not included as part of the recommendation, which I've been advocating for a while and now I would like to just make a formal motion.

Mayor Lyes said the motion would be, if it's ARPA money funded it would be allocated among the minority chambers and they would have a separate allocation.

Ms. Ajmera said yes.

Mr. Bokhari said for how much?

Mayor Lyles said it would be, as the Manager's going to be bringing these back, we'll know that because you're giving him policy guidance now.

|   |
|---|
| Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, and seconded by Councilmember Johnson to Approve Using equity and governance framework ensuring minority chambers get their fair distribution from ARPA dollars. |
|---|

The vote was recorded as follows:

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

NAYS: Councilmembers Bokhari and Driggs.

Mayor Lyles said okay. Our next one, our next agenda item is from the Housing Committee.

Ms. Watlington said today, in the Housing, Safety and Community Committee meeting, we had a rousing discussion about developer fees and staff brought a recommendation back based on the last feedback from the committee in regards to what we can do to reimburse or offset some costs for developers in an effort to try and reduce the upfront cost of housing in the hopes that it would then obviously create some new pathways for additional affordable housing. That was voted out of committee today. So, definitely would like to hear feedback from the committee.

Mayor Lyles said okay, so this is on development fees that were addressed and discussed this afternoon.

Ms. Watlington said yes. Alright, so when you're talking about developer fees, there were some things that we had asked to be done and so it's really a reimbursement pilot program. Staff had actually reached out to not only Council members in the committee, but also to developers in the community and they received a list of ideas and recommendations that came from the developers as far as what help would look like. So, some of it was funding related, a new property tax incentive tool for mixed-income type multifamily projects and also funding for subordinate debt or bridge lending whenever they are private or philanthropic partnership opportunities. So, that was one bucket.

The second bucket was about process and time gaps, and we want to try and improve the process as it relates to getting through permitting. So, offer concierge service to all projects that include affordable units, so essentially creating a preferred tier for dedicated rezoning and queue prioritization for projects that include affordable units because we know that oftentimes because of our long queue in rezoning, there's increased and significant carrying cost for developers which then impacts the projects financials and limits the ability to provide more affordable units. Add capacity for rezoning cases each month to try to get that reduced, eliminating that queue. More clarity and predictability around the process and on for sale products, for nonfinancial

tools brought at the definition of affordable to match how Charlotte parameters so that, that will match with the UDO (Unified Development Ordinance) development incentives.

Then thirdly, there are some things that we will need for state level advocacy for so that we can get the permissions necessary to do these things and there are four under this heading. It's amend the definition of affordable housing and state law, because right now it's 20-60 percent and that they feel is too restricted because they are not meeting the qualifications for providing affordable housing outside of those parameters. Expand eligibility for the Homestead Act, which we know is something that we all have taken up. Establish state low-income housing tax credit program, and address challenges with the state building code from commercial to residential conversion, because there are some inconsistencies there. Obviously, with the commercial being a little more stringent, when you're going from one to the other, they'd like to improve that process.

So, when it comes to the program recommendation essentially from staff, we're talking about allocating up to \$1.5 million of the ARPA funds for this pilot program. There was some discussion around whether or not that was the right number, if that was enough. We estimate that out of that \$1.5 million we could do three to four of these projects at that funding level and that was based on staff's assessment of what has been done for these target projects. We would provide periodic updates to City Council. Obviously, we'd received them at the committee levels, see how the pilot program's going, and we'd bring that back to the full Council for review. Then evaluate after one year or at time of full allocation of pilot funding whichever is earlier. So, the intent here is exactly like we've been discussing. It's measurement and metrics and performance management, so we can see did this move the needle? Did we get the three to four projects? What did we learn, and do we need to make any adjustments here?

So, that was the recommendation that came from staff, and it was approved in the committee 4:1. So, that was the developer fees. I did want to mention that we had one minority opinion that they'd like to see us do something a little bit more strategic that is not subsidy-based, if you will. So, certainly we're always open to understanding how we can provide other tools. There're two more items. So, the Housing and Job Summit, as you all know, we did. So, we just talked about some of the follow-up that comes from that and so we covered our key areas of focus in 2023 and there are eleven. Housing Trust Fund tune-up, cost of regulation and its impact on affordable housing, economic mobility for residents in city supported housing. I felt like that went nicely with the \$600,000 pilot that the ED (Economic Development) Committee discussed today about how do we put together jobs and housing. Landlord acceptance of rental subsidies and expanding that, corporate buyers and landlords, providing an education program from the city not necessarily an advocacy program, but an education tool kit if you will to HOA (Homeowner Association) so that they can understand what their potential opportunities are and what other HOAs in North Carolina are already doing.

As I understand it, there is already significant, about 40 or so HOAs that have signed up for that workshop for this week. Innovative, public, private sector funding models, like team force housing, affordable housing incentives that do not require upfront capital investments. Home ownership opportunities. We all saw last week the announcement that we had some updates to our downpayment assistance program, a couple of others. Leveraged city owned land for affordable housing, we've talked about that for quite some time. Anti-displacement strategies, NEST (Nuisance Enforcement Strategy) is still working. We look forward to those recommendations coming back, ahead of the UDO affective date, and then finally supporting the United Way led A Home for All Program as well. We also talked about Brookhill that has still been in contact and in conversation with the development team over there. So, we know they have asked for a little bit of assistance, because, unfortunately, they were not able to get the housing choice voucher approval and so they are trying to work on that.

So, to the extent that we as individual Council members can help support, support for that, they would absolutely appreciate that, but we're still looking to see, they have not made a specific ask yet, but we're waiting to see what they may need. Finally, we did talk about the Three Sisters Market, who has made tremendous strides in their work in

terms of their getting their full board on, getting their business plan updated, and they've been able to secure funding to hire their market manager, which will be their full-time staffer. So, we have \$1.5 million earmarked right now and so staff is feeling confident that, in the near future, they will come back with a couple of, what I call pointless items or follow-up items, that will put us in a position to then vote on whether or not we can release that earmark. So, feeling pretty good about it.

Mr. Winston said again part of the discussion when it came to how we look at the Housing Trust Fund moving forward. I think Council as a whole, and maybe through the work of the committee, can really be helpful to staff, maybe not for this RFP (Request For Proposal) that's going to be due in February but for moving forward. If we do have any changes in priorities about what are the outcomes that we want to see with our Housing Trust Fund dollars, I would remind Council for those that were present, when we went from \$15 to \$50 million that we went through a policy exercise where we really didn't have a priority kind of outlook before that. We were challenged by the community, and we challenged ourselves to do that and we have created a framework where we were able to add, for instance, when we added the NOAH (Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing) Policy to it, when we retooled it, I think it was June of last year, we're heading into the midst of different economic environment.

We may want to give staff, again, some pretty clear guidance of what our expectations are and our priorities are. I personally think it's more than a retool, because of how different the environment is, but I think that should be something that we decide as a Council through working with the committee. Thank you.

Ms. Mayfield said one of the things that I brought up to staff in the meeting that I want to just share with all of my colleagues, is when we're looking at our Housing Trust Fund tune-up, I wanted staff to have the flexibility to think about ecovillages and/or co-housing, which is a model that is not new, but they are happening across not only North Carolina, but across the nation where you're looking at utilizing and capitalizing on SEAP (Strategic Energy Action Plan) and green building and development. That's housing that's built with a very different sustainable model that has both rental as well as ownership ability into it. So, wanted to make sure that North Carolina doesn't have any language that opposes and/or necessarily supports. So, it's still for some a new environment, but they're at least six communities across North Carolina that have effectively been able to create an ecovillage/co-housing successfully through local policy language and zoning. So, I wanted to just put that out there in this space so that we all at least have it on our radar that we might have the opportunity to have a very different type of affordable housing development in [INAUDIBLE]. I can send the information, but there is a community that actually used their trust fund dollars to help use some of their local government dollars to help with the development of a green ecovillage and there's a report. It's been out there for a while. Planet Green is one of the developers. So, I just wanted to put that out there for us to start thinking about how we can look at supporting our environmental goals also through our housing goals. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

Ms. Johnson said I just wanted to share what Shawn Heath told us about an event tomorrow. There is a Homeowner's Association Awareness Training or something. I don't have the time. I don't have the details, but I did want to say that it started back in July. Shawn met with a small group of folks, primarily from District 4. It was Tony Mingo, Claudia Charles, Dr. Johnson at UNCC (University of North Carolina Charlotte), and George Doyle, who's a real estate attorney. He lives in another district. We talked about how the city could help combat the corporate buying and what can be done. One of the things that's come out of that, and we only met twice, and Shawn got right on it. So, Marcus, thank you so much. He does a great job. Anyway, there's going to be an education about homeowner associations can strengthen their bylaws and maybe limit corporate buyers or maybe add some language to limit the rentals in the neighborhoods. So, there's going to be some training tomorrow and, I apologize, I don't have the details. I don't know if anybody here does. He said it's going to be on the city's website. So, look out for that, but it's going to be recorded and so folks can watch it on

demand. So, I'm excited about that and that's one of the things that was mentioned in the committee meeting today. Thanks.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM NO. 2: CLOSED SESSION (AS NECESSARY)**

No closed session occurred.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Billy Tynes, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 2 Hours, 5 Minutes  
Minutes completed: March 28, 2024