

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Budget Workshop on Wednesday, May 25, 2022, at 1:10 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Council Members present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Matt Newton, Gregg Phipps, and Victoria Watlington.

ABSENT: Councilmember Braxton Winston

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said good afternoon, everyone. Today's meeting of the Charlotte City Council is being held on May 25th and this is one of the most important meetings that we have where we begin to ask the Council if there are amendments to the Manager's recommended budget. We have votes that are considered advisory until the actual meeting where we will adopt the budget, I believe on May 31st. Is that correct Mr. Jones?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said yes.

Mayor Lyles said alright, with that, I want to say welcome to everyone to the workshop. The meeting is being held as a virtual meeting in accordance with the laws that we have to follow especially around electronic meetings statutes. The requirements of notice and access of the minutes are being met per electronic means as well and hopefully, many of you are residents in parts of the community that are impacted by the budget and are viewing this on our Government Channel, our Facebook page, or our YouTube page.

We're also joined by a number of our team from the budget office as well as several of our department heads that are also able to participate today as necessary. Before we go to the virtual folks, I want to just say that I appreciate those of you that are on virtual. If you would just make sure that you speak up because as we go through the process hopefully we'll be able to hear and have you on camera.

Before we begin our meeting, I want to have a few words to say about Ella Scarborough who has served this community in so many ways and so many respects. Her first elected office was as a member of this Council, and she continued to be engaged not just in politics but community building for all of her adult life. We lost Ms. Scarborough yesterday evening and I just wanted to express this board's condolences to her two children Tori and Troy who have been caretakers for her in a way that has shown that great dignity and respect that you have for someone that you love. We know that Ella did many, many things to help pave the way for many of us on this board. She chaired the Blackberry Women's Caucus; she was active in the Black Political Caucus. She served on the County Commission, and she offered herself as a candidate for Mayor as well as for the Senate as our city and county and our state grew.

She was a great leader. She was a woman of faith and promise. She came from a line of exceptional educators, Bethune-Cookman in Florida one of the top HBCUs in Florida, as a part of her family's legacy. So, with that, I just want to recognize that we will miss Ms. Scarborough, but we will not forget her. So, thank you everyone for that moment to think about her legacy in our community.

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said So, with that, we'll now return to our meeting and the purpose that we have here. The meeting today is for the purpose and intent of voting on the amendments or adjustments to the City Manager's Recommended 2023 Budget that was proposed on May 11th. We had the Budget Adjustment Meeting and the Mayor and Council at that time then directed the Manager to prepare for this meeting. So, today we're going to continue to address those. Just a reminder that the adjustments from our May 11th meeting that had received at least five votes were reviewed and analyzed by the staff and that information was sent to the Council I believe on Monday via email and the information was also posted to iLegislate for viewing by the community. In addition

to the adjustments that we voted on, the City Manager has also provided some preliminary clarifying or background information on strategy or any items that we discussed at the May 11th meeting. Today based on the information that we received, we will have further discussions on those proposed amendments and vote to determine if any will be included in the actual adjustment to update the proposed 2023 Budget Ordinance that will be voted on, on May 31st in our Business Meeting.

Before we begin consideration of those items that the Council recommended, I'd like to actually cover several items that were more built around what is our strategy or strategic approach to a subject and whether or not we had sufficient information to go forward. So, with this, what I'd like to do is talk about those items that are in Section 5. I see that's posted here on the screen in our room, but it's also in your materials that was sent out. I wanted to start off with the idea that most of these items really will require the Council to have a discussion around and make some recommendations. So, these items will be referred to the committees as I outline them.

For the Development B Strategy, I'd like to refer this topic for further exploration to the Great Neighborhoods Committee. I believe that what we're trying to do is look at affordability and we're going to have a lot of work being done around that includes the fees. The second item that I'd like to recommend going into committee is auditing the organizations that we provide with funding, and I'd like to refer that to the Budget and Governance Council Committee for their review of what's currently in place and what we might need to do to recommend any reporting or auditing enhancements that may be needed to strengthen our system.

Then I would like to add to the Economic Development Committee a process and discussion to funding the International Business Study that was recommended by our International Cabinet. We would like to do that in a way that we have the opportunity to have the cabinet's fiscal control and participation and procurement, but also we recognize that this is something that we have been discussing that needs a structure for us to do that and I think that that is consistent with the note that we got from the International Cabinet. So, we would refer that, the funding of the study and the procurement of that study, and appropriate outcomes to go to Economic Development.

For the build-out of the Innovation Barn, based on the write-up from Strategy and Budget, I'd like to propose that the project of the barn, completion of the barn be moved into the city's Advanced Planning and Design to work toward developing both the cost and the plan. In reviewing this option, the Manager has indicated that there is already funding within the ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) Advanced Planning Design Program that can be allocated towards this effort. We would have a discussion of this at our next Strategy Session which will be in June.

For the promotional process study, that item is currently already moving through Human Resources and they are planning a contract for an external review of those items. So, we will have that come out and I believe if there is a referral required it will go to the Budget and Governance Committee.

For the two areas that we discussed in the tree canopy, I'd like to refer the review of the city's current plans and any additional actions or components in the Tree Canopy Action Plan, be referred to the Triple E (Environment, Engagement and Equity Council Committee) Council committee under the environmental effort because it's a part of our Strategic Environmental Action Plan. In addition, I'd like to refer the components specific to the assessment of trees on private property to the Great Neighborhoods Committee to explore those options for addressing that need. We know that our city has policies that were built around inequity and the idea that we would have this assessment, will be addressed in a way that we will look at our areas that have the greatest need and to bring them forward for that same kind of quality of life around trees.

So, I hope that you'll agree that this is a strategy that we not lose sight of these items, but we actually define them and have those components ready for actionable items by the Council at our May 11th meeting.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Driggs to adopt all referrals.

Councilmember Eiselt said yes, thank you, Madam Mayor. I just want to get clarification so I don't confuse anyone because I did reach out. Tried to get a hold of everybody about the Innovation Barn and Mr. Newton helped me reach out to some folks as well in the interest of time. I do agree with the idea that we need more information on the funding because I've heard both ends of the spectrum and neither one are entirely correct as to where that number falls so we need to know what that number is to build out our asset, but I have a question. You mentioned here that the design fee of \$200,000 could come from the Advance Planning Fund. So, do we not need to take up that issue of agreeing to do that right now, or will that all take place in the Strategy Session?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said well typically the Advanced Planning Design Fund, we put in the projects that would be in it so having an affirmation from this body that that should be a part and we add to it would be good.

Ms. Eiselt said okay. So, before we vote on this it seems like we need to vote on an affirmation from Council that we should move forward with the intent to do the design and then take a look at where the money could come from should we choose to build it all out.

Mr. Jones said correct.

Motion was made by Councilmember Eiselt and seconded by Councilmember Egleston to have the Innovation Barn moved to the City Advanced Planning and Design and move forward with the \$200,000.

Councilmember Bokhari said I think you need two separate motions.

Ms. Eiselt said I think so, yes.

Mr. Bokhari said so if you need that one to be first for some reason, I will withdraw so you can do that, or you can do it separately.

Ms. Eiselt said just so it's clear that otherwise, I think we're voting on this as written. So, just so that we're clarifying that we all support that.

Mayor Lyles said alright so we will go in terms of I don't think that the motions are in conflict.

Ms. Eiselt said that's fine either way.

Mayor Lyles said so, we'll come back and we'll take the motion that was on the floor followed by the motion of the advance that's on second.

Councilmember Newton said yes, ma'am Madam Mayor, thank you so much. I just wanted to briefly comment on the international values request for funding for the International Business Strategy SWOT Analysis. It's my understanding that there is a broad support amongst Council Members for that. We are looking at referrals from the Economic Development Committee, but I just wanted to underscore that referral by mentioning that we do have money for ARPA dollars, \$16 million as well as an additional \$100,000 just Economic Development Fund that can be allotted towards that. So, it's my hope and expectation that that will be a part of the conversation moving forward. I understand many of the procedural challenges we face in addressing that today in this meeting, but I did want to just mention that the funding is there and it's my understanding that that will be further discussed as well as the security here in the near future. So, thank you so much and I will be the maker of this motion.

Mayor Lyles said alright thank you very much, Mr. Newton. I concur with that intent. So, with that, we'll have the vote on the first motion which is the referral of those policy and strategy items to the various committees as noted.

Councilmember Johnson said I just have a question on the point of order. In the meeting on the 11th when the item of the Innovation Barn was presented, there were not five votes to move this forward, so doing this now, and I guess that we can, but I just want to clarify the point of order. We did not have the agreement to move this forward. We were talking about equity and accountability and really taking a look at this, so to approve this now seems contrary to what we discussed on the 11th and secondly, I believe that there is a consensus among the Council to consider the \$25,000 for the International Committee today instead of moving it forward to the committee. So, I just wanted some clarification on those two items, please. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright, so on the first item I'm going to recognize Ryan Bergman the Budget Director to respond to your request concerning the Innovation Barn.

Ryan Bergman, Strategy and Budget Director said sure. So, Councilmember Johnson, the way that we handled the information from the previous meeting is all of the information that had a vote, we included of course, but we also included almost like a Q&A in the packet for anything where at the end of the discussion the City Manager was going to report back on something. So, some of it probably needs additional information, which is part of what we're talking about here, but the idea was anything where the staff was tasked with responding we did include that in the packet.

Mayor Lyles said and I will say that in these two meetings, the 11th meeting and the meeting today, the whole intent is to prepare for the final action of the Council that will be voted on the 31st. So, I think that we will have other ideas that will be presented today. Today is six so I think that we will continue to have and address other items that may come up today. On the other item, I believe that the process for the \$25,000 is included in Mr. Bokhari's motion. So, that would continue. It would just be referred to the Economic Development Committee. So, does that make sense Ms. Johnson?

Ms. Johnson said so the \$25,000 consideration for the consultant is being referred to the ED (Economic Development), and then the \$200,000 is that being referred to a committee or are we considering that in the meeting?

Mayor Lyles said that is a separate motion from the motion that's on the floor right now and that will be the next motion that we have a discussion on.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said just so I'm clear. If someone could repeat the motion and also just for my understanding, if something is being referred to a committee it's possible that that committee may decide not to move forward? So, that feels like that's not the same thing. I just want to make sure I understand. If we are saying yes we are agreeing to put in the committee, we're also asking you to agree that it will show up on the other side of the committee?

Mayor Lyles said I think this is around the strategy. These are all strategic items that really need fleshing out. Like what is the intent in how we do it. Right now, we have an idea of it, but we would also ask the committee for their comments and all referrals do come back to the full Council. So, a committee could recommend, they could make some changes or amendments to it, or they may say this isn't something worth doing, but that will still be a Council vote and we would have that reviewed as a part of the committee reports that we have for strategic items. Committees always report out on any referral.

Ms. Watlington said right I understand how the meetings work. What I'm asking is if earmarking is in place of earmarking the money and fleshing out the details later. We're just saying we'll talk about this more even though it's not earmarked.

Mayor Lyles said well I believe that in the case of the international study, the staff has the ability at \$25,000. First, the committee needs to look at the study and determine the right amount. There's two issues that I see as we go through in a very short time period. We first need to make sure that we meet our fiscal control act so that we do the appropriate kind of does this qualify, how does it qualify, and does the city have the ability to do it? The second one we need to go through is our procurement study. So, funding is a part of this, but I will say that all of the items that we're talking about are in a better foundation around the definition of what we're trying to accomplish strategically, and that will come out of committee to a full Council. Does that make sense Ms. Watlington?

Ms. Watlington said it does. What I take that to mean is that the items on this list are essentially not being decided on today. So, that even voting affirmative is not actually saying that yes, we're going to do these things.

Mayor Lyles said alright.Mr. Jones?

Mr. Jones said so Councilmember Watlington, if the question is specifically about the international cabinet request that came in last night. What we'd like to do is utilize the committee structure to put together a plan that's agreeable to this Council whether it comes through an ED bucket, whether it's a collaboration with the CRBA (Charlotte Regional Business Alliance), whether it's a collaboration with ED, it's not saying that this is a place to kill that empty fill. That's not the intent at all. It's just difficult on short notice to give you our best advice as it relates to it. We'd just like to get your input to see how a study can be done. Not in whether or not it will be done but how it will be done.

Ms. Watlington said right. So, basically, this is how we're going to do it. We'll figure out how versus we're going to talk about it and then we'll decide later if we do it. That's all I'm basically trying to understand.

Mr. Jones said correct.

Ms. Watlington said okay.

Councilmember Driggs said again Madam Mayor, I don't entirely agree with the Manager's assessment just now. I think this proposal with the International Business Study came out of nowhere in the last couple of days and therefore I think we need to back right up and think about how we want to approach this and what money we want to spend with no presumption right now. I think we need a committee referral and the subject of whether or not we pursue it is still vital. Otherwise, we need to talk about it more now because as it stands, I'm not in favor of this.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Driggs I think that's what we would do, is dependent on the committee to give us a better definition and as we proceed on this then the funding will be contingent upon the Council agreeing to the definition for the study. So, I don't see it as a separate item from what we're trying to accomplish here.

Mr. Driggs said the Manager just confirmed Ms. Watlington's suggestion that by voting the way we are right now, we are committing to proceed to somehow with the study of the funding or with something and I'm saying that I think we need to be clearer about what it is we want to do. In other words, I think we should refer to the committee the idea of a study and think about our International Business [inaudible] and decide how we want to move ahead, but I don't think there's any presumption based on last-minute \$25,000 funding proposal where we might come out on that. So, I don't want this vote to be construed to mean that we have made a commitment to proceed with anything.

Mayor Lyles said so, when I read what we were referring I said to refer the International Business Study funding and purpose to the Economic Development Committee. That's what I said. Funding and purpose to the Economic Development Committee.

Mr. Driggs said yes, I agree with that. I'm taking exception to the exchange that I just heard between Ms. Watlington and the Manager.

Mayor Lyles said okay.

Mr. Driggs said there's no presumption as a result of this referral about what will happen next.

Ms. Watlington said that's exactly what I was trying to understand. It seems like what we're saying is not what it is.

Mr. Driggs said this is too little too late for us to be making any commitments.

Ms. Watlington said I'm not arguing with the Mayor. I will [inaudible] the vote, but I just want to make sure I understand what I'm voting on.

Mr. Driggs said [inaudible] clarify that. So, we're referring this to the committee. The committee will consider the subject of a study like this or other actions that we might want to take on international business and if the committee comes back with a plan of action that identifies clearly who the players are and how the RFP is going to work and so on, then the Council can consider it, but I just don't think we have enough yet where the Council can be doing anything that binds us anyway. It's a referral, that's all.

Mr. Jones said yes Councilmember Driggs. I don't disagree with you. Where I was going is that this wasn't necessarily something that would end up with an appropriation to the International Cabinet. It was something that was aligned with the city's strategy that the city thought it was important and I think it is, but I'll back way up away off of that. This is clearly an exploration of whether or not it should occur then, that's the Council's prerogative.

Mr. Driggs said I mean I'm open to the idea that that's where we might come out, I'm just saying that based on something that came in a couple of days ago, we should not be lending ourselves right now and I believe the motion that's offered is consistent with that. So, I'm fine with the motion.

Mayor Lyles said well I'm going to say that this is the way that I had referred the International Business Study to Economic Development for both content and funding. That's what we have.

Mr. Driggs said correct.

Councilmember Graham said I too am very supportive of the request but understand the necessity to going back to the committee just to dot I's and cross T's to make sure we know what we're doing, where we're doing it, and why we're doing it. We've had members of the International Cabinet at our last Economic Development Committee so we've already from my perspective established a floor in terms of trying to find ways we can work together. So, I think this fits exactly to what we said that we wanted to do. So, I support it going back to the committee, and hopefully, based on talking to a number of members around the dais on this particular subject, I think there's a need to figure out how we get it done. So, that's my position. I certainly can get it back into the Development Committee and make sure we find a way that is effective and efficient and get the resources, and information that we need and consistent with what the city is trying to accomplish as well as with the cabinet. So, I'm excited to receive and excited to kind of view the report.

Councilmember Phipps said yes thank you, Mayor. I think I guess the Charlotte International Cabinet did come and speak to the Council I think in an open session at a forum as well as Mr. Graham said. They came before the Economic Development Committee as well, but in my conversations with leadership at the committee, I don't think that they're as concerned as much as them personally receiving the funds as much as they would like for a study to be done. Whether it's done as part of the City Manager's Office or whatever, so far as that was the case, I don't think they would have any objections to it. So, I think the request came late but I think the genesis of the request was when the foundation was laid in those presentations before the Council in open session as well as in committee. I would agree that I would primarily support that

the situation would be looked at and studied further. Maybe 25,000 is not, maybe it could be 40,000. I don't know. I think that it's where it needs to be going forward today and I'm [inaudible] to the committee for further study. Thanks.

Councilmember Ajmera said yes, I agree with Mr. Phipps. This request might have come in now, however, the International Cabinet specifically the Madam Chair, Ms. Matthews have already made the obligation when she gave the presentation to the committee. So, this had to come next as part of the presentation's next steps, so I do support this request and I hope my colleagues will do that as well as part of our next steps of the [inaudible] to the meeting. Thank you.

Mr. Newton said to that point I guess what was outlined earlier in the meeting I was of the understanding that we made procedural issues today on the board. The ideas before us today were proposed and vetted over the past two weeks. None of that is brand new to us, at the same time, to Councilmember Driggs' point, it occurred to me that we also needed to have a more specific analysis of the plan. So, I completely understand and appreciate that. I think the overarching question here though is just an assurance that the funds, assuming that plan is adopted, maybe it won't be but assuming it is, just an assurance that the funds will be there. So, we don't have an adopted plan that now is on the budget. So, Mr. City Manager, could you comment on that? Can we feel assured that the funding would be there if and when the Economic Development Committee takes this up and possibly approves the plan?

Ms. Jones said absolutely. Yes.

Mr. Newton said okay. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright. Now for our roll call vote. Would you read Mr. Bokhari's motion so that everybody could hear it? Alright, I'm going to go back and say this. The motion was to approve the referrals to the committee for those strategic items that were discussed in the May 11th meeting to proceed to a committee function and a report out to the City Council as a result of the committee's review. Alright, so that's where we are.

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

Mayor Lyles said we're going to have the second motion which is a motion regarding the Innovation Barn and the concept is that the build-out of the Innovation Barn would be moved to the city's Advanced Planning and Design to work towards developing a plan and its cost which would now be estimated at \$200,000.

Denada Jackson, Constituent Services Division Manager said Ms. Ajmera has her hand raised and I would also like to say, Ms. Ajmera and Mr. Egleston, if you're going to vote, you have to say your name first and then your vote because you are not on camera currently.

Mayor Lyles said [inaudible] would you review the rules about voting if you're not on camera, please.

Ms. Jackson said I believe Mr. Egleston is having technical difficulties but Ms. Ajmera, can you turn your camera on?

Ms. Ajmera said my camera is on.

Ms. Jackson said okay.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. Well for this Innovation Barn build-out, I appreciate the Budget Committee's detailed report on it as part of our Q&A and I noticed that as part of our original agenda items, we actually had approved the entire build-out as part of our original request a couple of years ago. Then the Council had approved another request for additional funding. So, there have been multiple asks for this build-out. So, I'm a little hesitant and I'm concerned about allocating additional dollars to this project when we've already allocated over \$4 million so far on this build. So, I'm not comfortable with putting

any additional dollars towards this Advanced Planning Budget so far and from looking at our detail report, I'm also concerned that a private funding match didn't come anywhere close to what was promised. So, I would like to see what was the private sector fundraising that was done to complete this build-out. We don't have a number for it in our detailed Q and A, so I would like to see that number. I'm uncomfortable with us moving this forward. I will be voting against this.

I also want to put this on the record. I do believe in the circular [inaudible] concept and I do believe in the work that they do, but considering what they have done in the past, I think it needs an explanation as to why we came over budget multiple times and why we've delayed multiple times. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Ajmera, it would be very helpful if you could just jot those down and mail those questions to the Manager so that we have them. I know that it'll be on the record, but if you could just send them quickly to the Manager, we'll be able to respond more quickly.

Ms. Ajmera said I did.

Mayor Lyles said so, those questions have come out to the Manager and so Manager Jones, if you could just share that with the Council and recognizing Mr. Jones in response.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so thank you, Councilmember Ajmera. I've just asked Phil Reiger, Director of General Services to come in if you need more details. What you said is precisely why the write-up included the Advanced Planning and Design Fund because prior to that we had our situations with not having good cost estimates before we put something in the budget. By putting the barn, which is our building, in the Advanced Planning and Design Fund, it ensures us that we would have good estimates before we move forward on a project. So, that's why that was at the end of the write-up, but Phil is here if you have some specific questions about the barn.

Ms. Ajmera said yes I do. Thank you, Mr. Jones. So, we had already implemented the advanced planning process when there was a second request that came in front of us. I see Mr. Driggs is nodding his head because I'm pretty sure when the second request came in front of the Council, we wanted to make sure this does not happen again. This is the third time that it's coming. It's already gone through an advanced planning process or at least it should have. So, to Ryan Bergman, when was the advanced planning process implemented? I know it was approved by the Budget Committee and the Council a few years ago. Could you tell us when exactly and then after I could get the second request from our committee to find out if was it before or after, because I'm pretty sure it was after? If you could just help me understand that Mr. Bergman.

Mr. Bergman said yes, it was either FY19 or FY20. I'm actually looking at Phil who was the Budget Director at the time.

Phil Reiger, Director of General Services said yeah, the Advanced Planning Fund was adopted in FY2020.

Mr. Jones said the question is did this go through the Advanced Planning Fund?

Mr. Reiger said the answer to that is no. The original project was funded in FY2019. That's when \$2 million was appropriated specifically for that project and we adopted the Advanced Planning Program in FY2020.

Ms. Ajmera said so, when was the second action plan that was on our agenda approved by the Council? First, you said 2019 but when was the second time?

Mr. Reiger said I'm not aware of a second action the Council took on the Innovation Barn. So, I apologize, you'll have to be a little more specific.

Mr. Driggs said the second action taken on [inaudible].

Ms. Ajmera said [inaudible].

Mr. Driggs said we did an initial funding for this, and I know it was the second funding request to increase our total investment, so we were at I think \$4 million. I don't think there's any dispute about those facts. There were two installments and each time we were told to [inaudible] needed and the status now is that the thing will have to go without [inaudible].

Brent Cagle, Assistant City Manager said Mr. Driggs and Ms. Ajmera, this is Brent Cagle. So, I think they were talking about the same things but maybe saying different things. So, let me try to clarify the timeline. The project was approved at a certain amount in 2019 and that was to do the Innovation Barn. It was never put into Advanced Planning because Advanced Planning did not exist when the project was initially approved.

Subsequently, Advanced Planning was created, and then after the creation of Advanced Planning it became clear to finish the project, that was already started but was not included in Advanced Planning, the city would need additional funds. At that point, because the project is underway, again still no Advanced Planning but because the project's underway and we didn't want to have lost investment, we've already started the project and we needed to finish so that we could have a certificate of authenticity.

The staff then came back and asked for additional funding and that second tranche of funding was asked after the Advanced Planning Fund was created. The initial project itself was created with an incorrect budget; we know that now. With an incorrect budget before the Advanced Planning Fund was created and the Advanced Planning Fund was created, not just for this project but for a few projects that the city had where had we done an advanced planning process in advance, we believe that we would not have found ourselves in the situation where we were halfway into a project and we needed significantly more funding than we had initially discussed with City Council.

Ms. Ajmera said I'm looking at the Q&A and it says that funding allocated was in 2018 and then in 2020. So, 2020 was already after the Advanced Planning Tool was approved by the full Council. So, then my question is why was the Advanced Planning Tool not used after it was already adopted for this project?

Mr. Reiger said Ms. Ajmera by the time the Advanced Planning Process was adopted and funded in the 2020 budget, the Innovation Barn project was already in construction. So, as we work our way through construction, the specific reason for the additional funds needed was simply things that came up as a result of working on a hundred-year-old barn that were unexpected. So, we needed to add additional funding in order to get the project to a point where we could a CO and use it up. So, in other words, the advanced planning process is the initial part of a project where you develop the scope, you do a little bit of design so that you can get a quality cost estimate for budgeting purposes. The Innovation Barn by that time was far beyond that point.

Ms. Ajmera said okay so it was already under construction so you could not use the Advanced Planning Tool, then the second time Council approved additional dollars. Is that correct?

Mr. Reiger said that's correct. The project was far beyond the advanced planning process at that point.

Ms. Ajmera said right. Well now forget about the construction phase, now it's already completed, and do you feel comfortable that us going through this process again through the advanced planning process, there will not be another ask, because this is the third time.

Mr. Reiger said yeah, so we would consider the renovation of the additional 20,000 square feet of space a new project and so our preference would be before we put a budget number on a new project, that we go through that advanced planning process to determine a scope that would support the programming of the building as well as do a

little bit of design. That little bit of design allows us to accurately estimate for budget purposes what it would cost to do the renovation.

Ms. Ajmera said that helps me. This also raises other concerns around the Advanced Planning Budget. So, if you're taking \$200,000 from the Advanced Planning bucket or this project, that will leave less funding for other projects that we might want to do. I'm sure there are so many other facilities that the city has so I just want to make sure the Council is aware of that. It's taking \$200,000 away from other funding requests for any of our other facilities. Thank you.

Mr. Bergman said Councilmember Ajmera, this is Ryan. Let me talk a little bit about how the Advanced Planning Fund works. Like Phil said, it was created in FY20, and it was funded with cash from our Debt Service Program, 20 million to essentially be a revolving fund. So, we would fund a design of a project. If the project goes forward whether it be bonds or COPS (Certificates of Participation), it would pay back the Advanced Planning Fund. So, we have not needed to replenish the fund yet. We do not anticipate needing to replenish it in the upcoming budget.

So, it's a little bit unique. We call it fund but it's more just a Capital Program that replenishes itself so we can do designs like this and Phil [inaudible] can't do it for himself so I'll be a little bit of a cheerleader on this. We feel that they've been pretty successful when things have gone through this program to be pretty accurate, and I think we've seen that with less and less concerns each year when we go through our capital budget process.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you. So, is this \$20 million the balance right now in our advanced planning bucket?

Mr. Bergman said no. \$20 million was the initial investment. We're getting close to that through FY23 but presumably, if the bonds are approved and this budget is approved, there's a couple of things that came from advanced planning that will be able to replenish it, so we feel we can get through FY23 appropriately in this fund.

Ms. Ajmera said could you send us the detailed list of all the projects that will be using advanced planning dollars for our next budget cycle and if there are any additional requests that will come? Maybe not this fiscal year, but maybe next year, I'd like to see those in the pipeline moving forward.

Mr. Bergman said sure. Absolutely, we'll do that. It's a little bit varying in the capital section of the [inaudible] document, but we do list what's in advanced planning and a little bit of an update each year in the budget document in our CIP (Capital Investment Plan). So, that will be on page 313.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you. Thank you so much, Mr. Bergman, you've been very helpful throughout this process. I certainly appreciate it.

Mr. Bergman said thank you.

Mr. Driggs said I think Ms. Ajmera raises some very valid questions. It's my recollection that the history is similar. There was an additional request that was supposed to fund it, then we were told no it's going to take more money to build it out completely and then it wasn't built out completely for that. I think the history of what our expectation was in terms of the mix of funding. My impression was we were putting seed money in the beginning and we thought that private funding once the thing got jump-started, would then make it unnecessary for the City to continue to assess.

So, the history of things have been difficult. The revolving fund is not an issue here. The revolving fund is simply a means through which we develop more fully a process [inaudible] before we had signed [inaudible] for votes and we don't have surprises later on. It's a zero-sum game because we borrowed money from that fund, and we put it back. Mr. Bergman correct me if I'm wrong about that, but I don't think that's the critical issue.

So, as far as this is concerned, we have a city-owned asset that is unutilized right now and I think that is a reason for us to give some thought to how we can make full use of that building and letting bygones be bygones because the way we got to this point is frankly not very satisfactory, but I think our best interest is served at this point by making this \$200,000 investment to decide what we do with this asset that we own that is currently underutilized.

So, I will support that but I just want to be clear that I don't regard supporting this as implying any presumption about a commitment of other money to the lease of the building, and my own view that I expressed to Ms. [inaudible] was that I think we would like to see firmer commitments from private funders in line with the original concept for all of this before we put down millions more to build out the building for its current use. So, I think \$200,000 is probably appropriate, let's understand what it is we're talking about. Let's also get a better feeling for what will happen there so we can make the investment and continue to use the building in its current capacity.

There are some very interesting things going on there. I get that and I think that there is certainly potential for the city to want to be in this place in terms of environmental research and projects, but the thing is just [inaudible]. So, again I say we make this next step [inaudible] ourselves to any commitment. It really is what is the outcome to the analysis until we have more information. Thank you.

Ms. Johnson said thank you, Mayor. I know that I'm not the only person with questions about why the last five items had to go through committee for us to flush out and dot the I's and cross the T's and with this request to say, "Well we'll allot \$200,000 for an ill-defined project, we'll approve it," when we've already spent \$2 million, I'm hearing over the additional budget. We know that the organization, Envision Charlotte that leases the building received a \$500,000 grant and then paying a dollar for rent. So, I think it's up to us as stewards of public dollars to at least send this through the committee. Either the Governance Committee. I would take the Equity Committee because my concern is how some organizations can pay a dollar for rent and we're looking at pouring more money into it. I would want to say if we're going to renovate this space, this 40,000 square foot, and be intentional about leasing the space at the same amount to a grassroots organization. So, I think that's fair and that's equitable. So, I won't be supporting this, but my favorite question is why is this not going through the same process that the other items just before this went through? It needs to go to the committee to define the process, to look at the RFPs (Request for Proposal), and also to dot the I's and cross the T's, to be held to the same standard or higher because we've already spent so much money on this project. We don't want to keep pouring money into it and it's not meeting the expectations that were initially planned for the project. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you, Ms. Johnson.

Ms. Watlington said I actually agree with everything Ms. Johnson just said.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Watlington, and seconded by Councilmember Johnson to route it to the committee for a further review consistent with the motion that was previously made for the other five items.

Mayor Lyles said we have a motion and a second to a substitute motion. So, we'll continue this discussion.

Mr. Bokhari said I really wasn't going to say anything, but I feel like if the public is watching this they're probably incredibly confused. So, let me just kind of recap where we are. We had a disaster on our hands from the last 10 or 15 years of administration for capital projects that were coining things like the big ITF and things like that. Mr. Jones and the staff all came together and created this concept of an Advanced Planning Fund. As you've heard tonight, it existed at a point in time, and it couldn't be used before that because it didn't exist. So, the first round of this and what we were talking about was very much like every other project that existed before that where someone

squinted one eye and put a thumb up and said, "This is a great idea. Let's go down it," and it almost always ended in cost overages and disasters.

So, now we're in a spot where we fund an asset that is an organization doing great work that's important and now we need to finish something out whether it's with that organization looking at other opportunities and the Advanced Planning Fund, and this process is the way that we'll ultimately get it. Not just see what it's going to actually cost this time but figure out strategies by which we get public/private sponsorship and partnership and matching where we have all these things where they're going to then come back and make a full proposal for us to look at and then we'll lay out. So, if we sent this to the committee, that's fine if that's the will, but the committee is going to be able to do nothing other than send this to the advanced planning process because otherwise, we'll be repeating all of the mistakes of the past.

While those mistakes are very real and I've been hyper-critical of them, just because the Cross Charlotte Trail was a debacle beyond all others, doesn't mean that we should hate greenways now. The same thing applies with the great work that's happening. Just because it went over budget because we didn't have a real process and discipline doesn't mean that we should hate the environment now. So, I'm a strong advocate of going through this process not because I have a predisposed notion of what the end answer is going to be, but because we're just burning cycles until we get into that process and we can have some real things. If we do anything other than send it, we should do nothing or send it to the advanced planning process because sending it to the committee is either wasting time or it's in danger of repeating the mistakes before we had the Advanced Planning Fund.

Ms. Eiselt said thank you. So, what Mr. Bokhari just said I absolutely concur with. We should not follow through with the crusher of the trail, but this is our feeling. Let's be honest with ourselves. If we had really questioned that process, and we didn't know what was going to implode with Cross Charlotte Trail at the time. If we had stopped to think about it, \$50 a square foot wasn't going to build anything out there. I want to emphasize, that Envision Charlotte didn't build this building, we did. Envision Charlotte did not come up with those estimates, we did. Okay, we're past that, we understand it. The Manager and teams have upped the Advanced Planning Fund, that's exactly the right way to do it. The city needs to go through this process and make sure it's not done again. I want to also mention, I think my colleagues who have voiced their opposition to this, have any of you been out there in the past year? Ms. Ajmera told me she hasn't been there in four years. I ask you to go out there. There are nine small businesses operating out of that space. So, when you say give it to a nonprofit, give it to a small business, go out there and see what's going on. There are nine businesses that are working on the goals that we set as a Council, that we support in our Strategic Energy Action Plan.

There are at least two out there, three possibly that are helping us with the fact that in 2028 we have an opportunity to renegotiate our interlocal agreement on recycling for which we are paying for all sorts of recycling that goes straight to landfills, and we're paying for that. So, it's not just what this costs, it's what money we can save because we have the opportunity to pull the glass and most of the plastics out of this trash cycle. Every time I talk to somebody about what's actually recyclable, people are shocked. Most of what you put in your recycling bin is going to landfill if not all of it because it's dirty.

So, I encourage you to go out there before you pass judgment on what's actually going on out there. The rent, people brought up the rent, that's being passed on to those nine businesses of which some are minority-owned businesses, women-owned businesses. So, again, they're getting the benefit of being able to scale up before they have to pay the market rent or any rent. They're paying a dollar. I would also emphasize that a lot of the cost that went into the first phase already took care of in the second phase. All of the windows have been replaced. A lot of the roofing had to be replaced, lighting is already installed so it's not going to be \$300 a square foot, but it's not \$50 a square foot. Let's be clear about that. With regards to private funding, again, go out there, take a tour, and talk to the entrepreneurs that are based out there. The organization Envision

Charlotte runs on a budget of \$600,000 a year. We don't pay for that. The private companies who are in partnership pay for that. Electrolux has set up an entire teaching kitchen out there, that was equipment that they brought in. Lowe's has put a lot of money into this organization. Go out there and see what's there before you pass judgment is what I'm asking.

Lastly, this is our building as it was pointed out. No private company is going to come in and put our roof on when then we can say goodbye, thank you very much. So, yes absolutely the private funding has got to come from the private sector. That's on them to raise that money. We're not doing that. The grant that Ms. Johnson referred to was for architectural fees and for Metabolic and was a separate consulting company that was brought in. They are one of the world's premier leaders in this work, and lastly, we are the only city doing this in the country. We can put more money into things that we all want and need but if we want to leave a legacy for what makes Charlotte different, then let's do it in the form of sustainability and upcycling. This is a workforce development opportunity. If you just go into that unfinished part of the barn and see the stacks and stacks of plastic containers that have been used that people are volunteering bringing back over there to be recycled, you'll be shocked because that is just a small portion of what ends up in our landfill and our future generations are going to have to deal with.

So, let's not throw the whole thing out just because we don't like what happened four years ago. That was on us. So, with that, I hope that my colleagues will support this going to the Advanced Planning Committee and coming back to the Council. Doesn't need to go to the committee because this is an existing project. We know what's going on out there but we're all going to take a look. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said thank you.

Ms. Ajmera said yes. Thank you, Madam Mayor. I agree with what Mayor Pro Tem said about the great work that Envision Charlotte is doing, helping so many other small businesses. I supported the project, and I supported the other two requests that came in FY2018 and FY2020 because of that vision. I'm uncomfortable because of the past fiasco we have had with the budget and with the timeline. I just need to get more comfortable and that's not on Envision Charlotte, that's on us trying to figure out how do we make sure we don't come back to this point again another two or three years down the road. With Cross Charlotte Trail, the City Manager and the entire Budget Committee spent so much time ensuring that we were comfortable with the additional funding. When it comes to the Innovation Barn all the discussion, we have had is just for this budget cycle. We haven't had a specific separate discussion on the Innovation Barn and the next steps moving forward on how do we fix this. So, I think for me, it's just about getting to that comfort level. It's not about the concept, it's not about the work that I think Charlotte is doing. So, I just want to make sure that this is being reflected in the meeting minutes. Thank you.

Ms. Eiselt said again, please go visit Ms. Ajmera. I think you would be incredibly impressed.

Ms. Ajmera said oh yes, I remember the Mayor and I were at the Sustainable Fashion Show a couple of years ago.

Ms. Eiselt said yes, four years.

Ms. Ajmera said I look forward to visiting that space again to see what they all have done with the \$4 million that was helping. Thank you.

Ms. Johnson said thank you, Mayor. I was just going to ask the Manager to clarify how many organizations that the city is renting this space to.

Mr. Jones said Councilmember Johnson, I don't have that at my fingertips, but I could get that information for you. I know that there are [inaudible]. So, I guess it's one thing I'd like to [inaudible].

Ms. Johnson said I'm sorry and I mean that we are leasing to, not that's being subleased from the lease. I want to know who our relationship is with. That is, I'm presuming one organization and then they sublease to other entrepreneurs. The issue for me is equity. If we're going to spend any more money in that building when we should open up the opportunity to other organizations. What happens is in the city the reason there's a challenge with upward mobility is because the same people get the same dollars. The rich get richer meanwhile small organizations are supposed to be satisfied with being sublessors or satisfied with the crumbs left over from the table.

Ms. Eiselt said for a dollar a year. Their rent is the same. Go out there and see them.

Ms. Johnson said so, once again this is about equity and accountability. If we send the other five items to the committees so that we can define them and cross the T's and dot the I's then we should do the same with this one. This is \$200,000. We just had a whole debate over \$25,000. So, we need to be consistent, and we need to be equitable as a Council and it's not based on any history. We weren't even here for the Cross Trail. This is the right thing to do for public dollars. I'll be supporting the substitute motion. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright we have the substitute motion on the floor. I'm going to say this. It would be great to not suppose any information and have facts instead of just numbers or comments. So, Mr. Jones, it may not be today, but this narrative that we have needs to be correct, so we need to have something as a follow-up either from communications Envision Charlotte whatever, to get this information at a place that we're all being consistent and having the same thing that is being documented. That's my first point.

The second point is it's not exactly just one decision on this because there are two functions here. There's first the function of the City Manager which is to produce the kind of documentation to implement policy and plans. Council committees are to recommend policies and plans. So, I don't see that this is something that is in conflict with each other. I actually think that they're closely intertwined that we can't make policy without knowing what the numbers are and we can't have numbers without knowing what the policy is. So, in my opinion, I think it will be fine to send this and in fact, it might even be helpful considering the narrative that we had to do this idea of sending it to a committee, but also the Manager's job is that revolving fund. It is not a cost; it is a revolving fund to get our asset to a place for how do we use it best and how to do that.

So, I know that this has become we/they situation or a singular focus, but I'm willing to refer to the committee but I think that it's really important to get some numbers that are realistic for anything that we own, instead of having the asset fall apart. We would never let a roof cave in, we would never do something that we did not know the cost since we've had this experience in the past. I think it's fiscally correct to have that estimate done.

Mr. Bokhari said Mayor, can I just make one quick point on that?

Mayor Lyles said yes.

Mr. Bokhari said I would just say given the contentiousness that surprises me on this, I would respectfully disagree. I don't think that it makes sense to send it to the committee whatsoever. I think we as a group, there will be nothing that is gained out of that, but we have the intelligence at this point, the data to be able to make. So, I think we need to vote down the substitute motion and then simply go back to the original motion. If the will of the Council is to not move forward, then let's vote down the first one, and if it is to move forward there's only one option, which is and the Manager with the early planning fund can come back and say, "Look we own as an asset where the roof needs to be fixed," so at a minimum, we have to do; he can bring us back options. There's no point in wasting any time discussing this if the will to do the initial analysis doesn't exist.

Mayor Lyles said that is true. Thank you.

Mr. Phipps said thank you, Mayor. I agree with Mr. Bokhari and also I'm wondering are we really losing focus on the original purpose of this whole project. I realize that you all notice these and start this thing and we grasp on to it to advance our sustainability goals. I can't get over the fact that I recycle all the time and for me to recycle and to know that 95 percent of the stuff that I think is being recycled is just being thrown away in the landfill. I really do think if the community was really aware of that, a lot of people would be upset. All these bins rolling out every week thinking they're doing something and all they're doing is paying to have recyclables go into the landfill. So, I think the only committee that this thing needs to go through is the Advanced Planning Committee. Either we're going to finish the thing, do it to try to meet our goals or we're not going to do it. So, I'm surprised at the depth of this discussion too as well that we're spending this much time on this. So, Advanced Planning Committee for me, so thanks.

Mayor Lyles said alright, thank you, Mr. Phipps.

Mr. Driggs said I think the conversation we're having today is basically an asset management decision. It's a resource that the city owns. It is underutilized and we should explore how to get the full value out of that without prejudice to our relationship with the current tenant. The lease exists for a couple of years there, so we will have more time to talk about how we move forward. I don't believe the improvements that are being proposed are specific to the needs of the tenant. I think they're just invented to make the building useful and that's why I'm concerned we could approve the \$200,000 and the committee referral today, and maybe that's the answer because we need to do more work before we give any thought to millions that might be needed to carry out all the work that is identified by the 200,000, but we are basically not making any progress any time unless we authorize the use of this initial money. So, I hope we can do that today and then think about what our best steps are for what comes after that. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright. I think everyone has spoken. I'm going to go ahead and move a roll call vote on the substitute motion, which is to refer to this item, I guess the use of the Innovation Barn to the committee. Alright, so with that we'll start the roll call.

Unknown said this is the use of the Innovation Barn or is taking it to the Advanced Planning Fund that you're referring to the committee?

Mayor Lyles said okay, so I'm going to make sure that Ms. Watlington has made the motion so I'm making sure that it's correctly stated. Ms. Watlington?

Ms. Watlington said yeah, so the motion is about referring this Innovation Barn discussion to the committee. Councilmember Driggs explained it very well. It's not necessarily an either/or because the question becomes what would we do as part of our overall sustainability piece with this asset. Our other option I think is beyond just the are we going to do this or we're not going to do this because if we don't do it, we have the option to do something else. So, if you're going to do any kind of best buy-in option analysis, you should probably look at more than just one option. So, this is particular motion is about referring this to the committee, not the advanced planning.

Mayor Lyles said so, it would be to refer the use of the Innovation Barn to the committee. Alright, so let's begin. Ms. Watlington?

Mr. Driggs said the Mayor. This is a substitute motion.

Mayor Lyles said it is.

Mr. Driggs said would we have defeated the original motion or is that still [inaudible] to propose the \$200,000 investment and the referral?

Mr. Baker said it will defeat the original motion.

Unknown said it will defeat the original motion.

Ms. Eiselt said which is to go to advanced planning directly.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Johnson, and Watlington.

NAYS: Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Newton, and Phipps.

Mayor Lyles said the substitute motion is defeated. Now, we'll now go to the original motion which is to refer this project to the Advanced Planning Design Group for [inaudible].

Mr. Bokhari said we can go directly to the question, Mayor?

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

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

NAYS: Councilmember Johnson.

Mayor Lyles said alright, the motion passes so it will go to the Manager's Operational Committee on cost estimates and for the Advanced Planning Design. Okay, so we've covered at least two topics already so let's go to the next follow-up item.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: CONSIDERATION OF ADJUSTMENTS FROM THE MAY 11, 2022, CITY COUNCIL BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS MEETING

Mayor Lyles said we're going to go to where the Council has recommended on May 11th, a city Council budget adjustment. So, with that, I believe Mr. Bokhari sent the Council a memo earlier today at about 11:30 a.m. and presented several options that he talked about when we were here on the 11th. He said, "I will be able to go in and find some of these costs and other uses." So, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Bokhari.

Councilmember Bokhari said thank you. I assume you're addressing the 1.5 percent market adjustment for police salary to January 7th to July 2nd, correct?

Mayor Lyles said I didn't assume that, so you tell me what we're doing specifically.

Mr. Bokhari said yes, just making sure. So, we're on that agenda item. So, as we've seen in the Manager and budget staff's breakout, the dollar amount for that would equate to an additional \$1,279,900 million but as we've seen the source of adjustment there was an initial amount included as an initial recommendation to the General Fund. So, this adjustment would require at least \$849,644. They had given some initial thoughts in there, but the memo that I sent to Ryan Bergman today was a follow-up per the process for what was asked of me two weeks ago to go through, and rather than just come up with one option, I actually brought forth three in the hopes that this very important topic could have the possibility of passing here today. I have spoken and heard from a number of officers who heard about this and were very very much appreciative. It isn't just about the money although we know the money is incredibly important to them, it's also an indication in a time of morale, retention, and recruitment crisis. A tip of the hat of saying we understand, and we are doing our part as best as we can. So, the first option you can see exceeds the amount.

Financial Partners all proposed 2023 amounts come to 1.164 million. Option two, my personal favorite, removal of the Mayor and Council salaries and expenses 989,000. Option three is something that is meant to be a little more pragmatic. Again, I'm more of a fan of giving what we want as a Council and the adjustments to the Manager and the budget staff and allowing them to come up with what they think is best, but I am certainly happy and encourage all of my colleagues to go through a budget-cutting exercise on their own because it's very enlightening. So, I came up with a laundry list of

\$1.74 million of items that one could make a definite claim more important. Nothing makes the budget that doesn't have some level of importance, but when we're talking about prioritization between one of our most important functions as a municipal government and the level of crisis that's going on there, the prioritization of what I'm proposing, in my opinion, outweighs all of these no matter their individual merits.

I will tell you each of those have line items and the dollar amounts, and I will leave that. Any one of those, again, we did take a third of any of those. My recommendation for today's discussion would be for us to start cherry-picking ourselves in any of those but rather say which of the options if indeed are palatable to then hand the Manager and budget staff so they can go about their process because we could all sit her and definitely debate the finer points of each. I think it would be more constructive and quick for us to say all three aren't acceptable and we're not going to do it or one, two, or three of them are and we'll hand them to the Manager and staff with some high-level guidance to then go follow up because I certainly do not want this to turn into an all-day exercise amongst us.

Mayor Lyles said I really appreciate that Mr. Bokhari because I do think that it is pretty simple. Ordinarily, we would have six people move this forward, and instead of going through everyone, we've heard Mr. Bokhari state the idea to have all three options given to the Manager. Now I always feel like that's a particular difficult spot because you've already gotten the Manager's recommendation, so it would be a directive and I think at some point we'd have to have some prioritization beyond what the Manager wants. Many of these things have been approved or are included in the budget that nobody suggested a change, so I know that we [inaudible].

Mr. Bokhari said Mayor, if I'm just a little more specific to streamline it, I think the way I structured it, we could say option one Mr. Manager go ahead or option one is off the table. Option two go ahead or option two is off the table or option three of which if we decide on option three, we could give guidance to them around which ones that we would prefer to be deprioritized or funded in other ways. However, if the answer is simply that it's a no and there aren't six votes, then let's just get to that quickly.

Mayor Lyles said well I think you're right about that too. I think when we were doing the UDO earlier this week, you said, "Here's my idea on parking," and I said, "You need five more." So, why don't we do this informally? If I could have the screen come up, I'm just going to go option one, option two so that people have the opportunity to formally raise their hand in support of this. If we don't get to six then we're okay. Alright, so on option one being offered, the 2023 Financial Partners Agreement, this isn't a formal vote, we'll come back and take a formal vote. I'm going to consider this an informal discussion. So, raise your hand if you would support the option one Mr. Bokhari, which is 1.1 million almost 1.2 million to eliminate the Financial Partner appropriations. So, I have Mr. Bokhari. Anyone else with a hand up?

Councilmember Egleston said Egleston, no.

Mayor Lyles said thank you for that Mr. Egleston, that's really helpful.

Mr. Bokhari said thank you, Mr. Egleston.

Mayor Lyles said so you have one on that. Option two. Raise your hand if you see the Mayor and Council's salaries and expenses being eliminated. Is anybody's hand up? Okay. No. Alright on option three, there's approximately 1.4 million, I hope all of you have the list, but is there any support for the list of 1.4 million? Alright, one. Okay, so Mr. Bokhari we did not meet the threshold, so we'll go on.

Mr. Bokhari said so just for a point of process because this is the incredibly important item to the Police Department, just because my three options were turned down, there was still enough desire to move forward to have a conversation. Is that dead now because mine were turned down or is there still appetite to find another way to make this work?

Councilmember Eiselt said I just have a question about that because I think we all would love to see our police officers get what they deserve but I have a question about the way the one and half percent and the one and a half percent was getting implemented. The note said that that would actually be more so is the second one and a half on top of salary plus one and a half so it's cumulative?

Ryan Bergman, Strategy & Budget Director said yes so the way that we structured the salary increases this year for Police, Fire, and for hourly is it's split between July and January so that's the case with the hourly with the four and four and then with Fire and police with one and a half, one and a half. So, the second one and a half would be off of a higher number. The other thing I say is one of the reasons we designed it this way is because we basically designed the budget towards much more simple compensation as we could. One of the reasons we were comfortable doing it this way after discussion was because of the retention bonus that they are getting in July and September of two percent which in our minds helped to make up that gap a little bit.

Ms. Eiselt said okay so yes thank you for bringing that up. So, there is the retention bonus but I think what I missed the first time so I went back and reread the note, is if you're making a hundred dollars and you go one and a half percent above, now you're making \$101.50, and that new 1.5 percent is off of \$101.50 so you're going to make more ultimately.

Mr. Bergman said yeah, I don't want to oversell that piece. It's a little intangible. It's 3.08 percent I believe compared to three when you compound it.

Ms. Eiselt said okay, but it is compounded?

Mr. Bergman said yes.

Ms. Eiselt said okay. I just think that's an interesting point to bring up to everybody because it does get them a little bit more.

Mr. Bokhari said one final point Madam Mayor if I could, just making a last case of this. There's 1.4 million in that option three. All we need to come up with is \$849,000 to make this happen and there are items in here that you can see. We don't have to go through all of them but, two FTEs to support the NDO (Non-discrimination Ordinance) there have been nine total complaints of which only three are created from the new NDO we put in place, actually two in the entire year and this still leaves them with 13 FTEs to do all that work. One additional from the year before. Two FTEs for the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) program support and there's already again 13 other FTEs in that department. A new FTE for the historic district review process, 167,000 for CRBA support, there's a lot of things in here that I would say could easily meet the number we're looking for and go a long way to help the morale, retention, and recruitment in the Police Department which is in crisis state. I have to say that and I would hope that we wouldn't just jump over this stack quickly. I want to jump over it quickly but in a good way for our officers. So, there's a lot of things in there that don't warrant budget funding right now over this.

Mayor Lyles said I think for the process that we had, it was that you needed to have five votes to bring it forward and today we need six. I've tried to follow that and unless there's someone that says, "Well I have five plus your vote," I think we've pretty much decided. To your point about what's in here, I think that those are questions that you have for the Manager, why that number of allocations are being made or how is the work distributed? I think that we can have the Budget Office take a look and do a workforce analysis and come back and if there's something, we will have the results of that. I do believe that when we have these recommendations there has been research and work done around them and it's a question if there's something that's different that it's more people than necessary, I think the Budget Office can come back and tell us that. At the same time, these are implementing policies that the Council has agreed to do.

Mr. Bokhari said I just want to make sure process-wise going forward. Everyone else, the new model is just going to be we vote up or down on the Council Member who

brought their alternative idea, not the thing. So, we're not going to do a vote up or down on should we do this pay increase for the officers. We're only going to vote on my ideas.

Mayor Lyles said right.

Mr. Bokhari said so that's going to happen for everybody else going forward. Their ideas are what we're voting on to replace it.

Mayor Lyles said on the 11th you asked that you be able to bring that.

Mr. Bokhari said I just want us to vote for it up or down, but you asked me to go back and come up with alternatives.

Mayor Lyles said I thought you agreed, but if I misstated it I apologize for misstating it because I have not gotten a request from anyone else to say I want an option beyond what we discussed on the 11th.

Mr. Bokhari said I didn't want to go do this. I wanted to vote to have the Manager and budget team. If we voted yes, they'll figure it out. Can we just have a vote on the item?

Mayor Lyles said I think we just did. There were not sufficient numbers of people to come in and do this. We're going to vote on the police pay. I mean that's one of the things that we have. We have a recommendation for the Manager on police pay, so we will vote on that as part of the budget.

Mr. Bokhari said my budget adjustment was to ask for that pay to be moved up six months. So, can we just vote on that? All we voted on is my idea to who doesn't have a Budget staff to change if people don't like it.

Mayor Lyles said okay.

Mr. Bokhari said I had five votes last week. I'll save us time and just move on, but I do hope that we don't vote up or down anyone's desire that they asked for again, for the rest of this meeting from two weeks ago. We vote on what they brought back as an alternative.

Councilmember Watlington said point of order.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Watlington I just want to make sure that I got the City Attorney with us because my understanding from our budget procedures is that we have a list that was carried forward and in working with the City Attorney, I have to check to say this is what we would do. If you had six votes to move something then we would move it but not having that, then votes that are presented today from the five would come forward today. Am I saying that right Mr. Baker?

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said yeah, I think that I understand it. I think Mr. Bokhari's question though is the list. Is there going to be an expectation that Council Members will have a specific way of getting to that number per the cost adjustment or not? I think I understand what Mr. Bokhari is saying. He's offered three versions and there's no support for those three versions so then the question then becomes is there support for the process at all? I think what he's asking is if they're going to go with the other adjustments, are you going to go line by line expecting a Council person to have a plan to make that adjustment? I think that's what's being asked. My understanding is that you're going to go through the entire list and make a determination whether there's six votes going forward with particular [inaudible].

Mayor Lyles said the difference is that the Manager did make recommendations for all these. There was no support to do the \$1.2 million.

Mr. Bokhari said the example would be, just to make this simpler. If the increased Planning Commission stipend of \$45,200, we won't vote on that. We'll vote on Mr. Egleston's, where he found \$45,200 to go take away.

Mayor Lyles said that's what I'm trying to say. That is not what I had as an expectation. When we did this, and Mr. Baker we talked about this, and some of these were turned over but I think you had said that you would bring options forward. If anyone else wanted to bring an option forward, the 1.2 million, they would also need to have six votes to do that. That's where I was thinking and if no one has brought that number of people, but Ryan, you're better at this and Mr. Jones, I want to make sure we're consistent.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I think I understand what Mr. Bokhari is saying. So, what we did was, and this was atypical, doesn't mean it was right or wrong. It's atypical in the sense that normally what we have is a pile of resources that is enough to potentially cover the ask that resonated to this [inaudible]. That's what we intend to do on one level and what we did is we started off with the undesignated Fund Balance and we've also had a suggestion for about \$220,000 more that we have to deal with maintenance. So, we had \$430,000 roughly that could be applied to anything that was on the list. I will say that the police salaries that went up was complicated, so what we did do on page seven of the write-up is we reflected basically Mr. Bokhari's option one where one of the things that we heard during that meeting was, "What about your financial partners?" Then what we did in the second table is just basically said all of the enhancements, if I have this right Ryan, that weren't tied to revenue, we put out in front of you much like Mr. Bokhari did in his option three.

So, it is my suggestion that we're saying please don't do these, but if there were a place to go first, we didn't want to impact all of the other salary adjustments they endorse. Salary employees, hourly employees, public safety, all of those kinds of things because we thought we had put together a pretty decent packet. So, Mr. Bokhari, I think what's interesting is at some point, there will be a discussion I guess about page seven and is there any appetite for the things that aren't a Bokhari option.

Mr. Bokhari said okay, so we voted my ideas down. You and the staff have brought back the idea to use \$430,000 and then find the balance that's left out of this bucket here and we just need to vote up or down based on your ideas and what you guys want to do.

Mayor Lyles said that's what my understanding was. The Manager was asked to make a recommendation, so we go through those and vote the Manager's [inaudible].

Mr. Bokhari said so can we go to the Manager's recommendation?

Mayor Lyles said yes.

Mr. Bokhari said perfect. Then that will appease me.

Mr. Jones said get [inaudible] clarification.

Mayor Lyles said alright, clarifications.

Mr. Jones said you vote for what the Manager provided as options.

Mayor Lyles said right. Alright, so is everybody ready?

Councilmember Johnson said I just wanted to ask about firefighters' pay.

Mayor Lyles said do we have anything that was recommended from the group for firefighters' pay? I don't think that's on our list today.

Ms. Johnson said okay, so this is just for the police officers and not for firefighters correct? What we're discussing is giving them their raise upfront instead of splitting the three percent twice a year like for all of the other employees, correct?

Mr. Baker said correct.

Ms. Johnson said firefighters are not included. Alright, thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright, so the first one, is our General Fund Non-Personnel Adjustments. You can see the page numbers. Do we need to go through these? Hi, Mr. Egleston. We can see you. Thanks for joining us virtually.

Mr. Bokhari said [inaudible]

Mayor Lyles said we are [inaudible] plans. I'm just saying how many of these we vote at one time because it's like one through five. You know when you look at this, they had 10, seven, eight, 10 votes and there's a recommendation.

Mr. Bokhari said I'm sorry, my item. We didn't finish the Manager's options.

Mayor Lyles said I thought the Manager's report on your options was further back.

Mr. Bokhari said okay if you're going to [inaudible], that's fine. I thought we were just closing that out.

Mayor Lyles said let's go through the page numbers as they are here. The General Fund Non-Personnel Adjustments. I don't have another [inaudible].

Mr. Jones said the Mayor and members of the Council. I think what's happening here is that because Councilmember Bokhari's ask is pretty significant, that if you go through some of the other asks first you take away the resources that potentially address it.

Mayor Lyles said okay so we should do the largest amount first which is on page seven. Okay, is everyone looking at page seven on the handout that was given? I'm going to ask the Manager to address the categories here but there is 1.1 and 1.2.

Mr. Jones said so Mayor and members of the Council, so again what we intended to do to address the movement of the police compensation up by six months is to again take what was laid out a couple of weeks ago which was the Financial Partners which is pretty close to Mr. Bokhari's option one. Then what we did is we took all of the enhancements within the budget that aren't tied to revenue, and we just displayed them in front of you. So, the concept would be, once again, if you were to take all of these enhancements or if you were to take \$430,000 plus roughly another \$800,000 for use in enhancements there would be enough resources to take care of this salary increase. However, you would not generate enough resources to have your first category taken care of, the non-personnel adjustments.

Mayor Lyles said alright, does anyone have any questions about this? The staff has put together the adjustments based upon the order in which they are listed. Is that correct when we start off?

Mr. Bokhari said yes.

Marie Harris, Strategy and Budget said so you're saying we would vote on the Financial Partners option first? Is that what you were saying?

Mayor Lyles said yes, that's what I'm saying.

Ms. Watlington said I don't know if my question can be answered right at this moment. I've listened to what you said Mr. Manager in terms of how you got here. It still feels like it's a little bit of a disconnect between the Financial Partner's piece and looking at personnel across the board in every department. I see down here at the bottom, that it's 1.2, so they're actually the same. So, it's not that one is going to cancel out the other.

Mr. Jones said correct. The first one actually was provided as an option during your last budget meeting. So, we just produced that because it was brought up. Then we thought that from a management standpoint if you at least continued to do everything you did the previous year, and if you left all the compensation the way that it was, that the next

logical step would be you go to any new positions. Not saying that we believe these are great ideas. As I look at Patrick, I'm not sure Patrick would like to lose the assistant attorney to [inaudible] Human Resources support, but just logic was to deal with the new stuff first.

Ms. Watlington said I see, so there really is another option. Go through and tell me where we are in terms of eliminating waste in our existing positions as well.

Mr. Jones said we've been saying that over the course of the last three years, we've streamlined about \$13.5 million, and we took about 5 million out of this budget also. So, before we started to even come to you to ask for the new positions, we tried to identify savings first. So, I would just say the next step already took place prior to asking for any new positions and prior to asking for any type of property tax increase or revenue increase.

Ms. Watlington said okay, thanks.

Mayor Lyles said alright so the adjustments that we're looking at are the ones listed on page seven on your General Fund discretionary partners with the idea that this would be a tradeoff for increasing police salaries at the total amount instead of over two pay periods of one in six months to immediately at the beginning of the fiscal year. Alright.

Ms. Watlington said I was going to try to follow up before we moved to the next person. I do have a question. Can you just go back up to the Financial Partners? Is it possible that these financial partners can be funded through other avenues? I see some of them that could potentially be grant recipients of other dollars that we may have available through other channels. Can you speak to that a little bit Mr. Manager?

Mayor Lyles said I think we're going to ask Mr. Bergman to speak to that Ms. Watlington and Mr. Jones will follow if necessary.

Mr. Bergman said I think there were a couple that were moved over to discretionary a couple of years ago. When you speak of other sources, we're not aware of any grants that are available right now that we could do something like this and I guess you'd have to make a process decision on do you want the support to be ongoing or one-time because if you shift them to anything that's one time in nature, we're going to have a difficult budget process next year if the expectation to continues.

Ms. Watlington said right. I'm just thinking for instance My Brother's Keeper. One could make a case that they could apply for funds related to our Charlotte grants for instance because that is absolutely in need of violence reduction through community mentors for youth.

Mr. Jones said I'll try to piggyback a little bit on what Ryan said.

Ms. Watlington said I get the whole idea of [inaudible] and you want to make sure you that your [inaudible] balance versus your own voting cause. I'm just wondering if ongoing if there are other buckets that we have like [inaudible] organizations who could potentially apply for funding through.

Mr. Jones said yes that's a great question. I think the thing is right now the uncertainty in whether or not these organizations would even be able or fulfill any types of requirements and that's not [inaudible].

Ms. Watlington said okay, thank you.

Mayor Lyles said okay, Ms. Johnson?

Ms. Johnson said thank you, Mayor. I just want to be clear on what we're doing. So, if we take this \$1.2 million to give the police their increase up front, does that mean we're deferring some funding for six months? Because we're still going to do it, we're just

moving it forward, so the money is there. So, does that mean that we would fund these other organizations in January?

Mr. Jones said no we wouldn't fund them anymore. You would have to find another funding source if that funding source is one-time in nature, we would start next year's budget with a dollar-for-dollar type of setting.

Ms. Johnson said okay so we plan to give a three percent raise to the police. If we did this twice a year then we would still be able to fund these other expenses, right?

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Bergman, can you go through the process or the recommendation for funding police? I want to make sure the percents are right.

Mr. Bergman said so, three percent is the market adjustment for police so that's currently spread where you get one and a half in July, one and a half in January. So, because the second one is a little bit later, there's less cost this fiscal year. So, Councilmember Bokhari is proposing doing it all in July which would add \$1.3 million that we would have to account for in this fiscal year budget. One clarification I do want to make though. The three percent increase for police is just the market adjustment. Other than those at the top of the pay scale, they'll also get a Step, so the majority of the police officers with the Step and the market adjustment will get eight percent plus the two percent bonus. That's the same as [inaudible]. Although [inaudible] some Steps that are two and a half, but all police officers would get that except the ones that are at the top of the scale.

Ms. Johnson said so, the initial proposal was to give the three percent increase to the police and public employees, and you would also be able to fund all of these financial partners and increase the staffing in these areas below. Right?

Mr. Bergman said correct. Everything on those lists is included in the proposed budget. So, this would be taken [inaudible].

Ms. Johnson said so, but if we give the raise six months early, then we would have to exclude these financial partners and the full-time staff and just to [inaudible] staffing?

Mr. Bergman said no. From these lists, you would need to come up with at least \$880,000 and that assumes that the sources that we did have for the other adjustments, that would assume that nothing else went forward. So, if other things went forward, that 890,000 would grow by whatever else was approved today.

Ms. Johnson said okay. The police budget is pretty substantial in our funding. Is there anywhere else in the police budget specifically that that \$890,000 could be drawn from?

Mr. Bergman said so, I've talked about this at a few committees. The police budget is very, very heavy on personnel and the reason for that is just to have one person in a spot at all times in the city, you need about five FTEs. So, I think with insurance and benefits and personnel, it's close to 88 percent of the police budget. So, it's really heavy on the personnel needed for that and that's nothing to do with training or anything. That's just the cost of them being there.

Ms. Johnson said okay so if we don't agree to move the pay raise up front and we agree to it because they're still getting it, it turns out to be .8 more and we're able to fund the other items that are recommended, it does not mean that we're not supporting the police. We're supporting the raise but we're also supporting the balanced budget that's recommended. I just want to say that for the record in case we're not able, because of these small organizations, this dollar amount means a lot to their organization. It could be the difference between keeping the doors open and these positions have been vetted and they're important to the city, so I just want to be able to consider these positions and consider this funding without the Mayor thinking that we're not supporting the police. We want to see the raise but we have a finite amount of resources that we're working on. So, thank you.

Mr. Bokhari said I surrender. Let's call the question.

Mayor Lyles said alright, is there anyone else that would like to comment? So, with that, Mayor Pro Tem?

Motion was made by Councilmember Eiselt, seconded by Councilmember Driggs to accept the police fund budget as proposed by the Manager.

The vote was taken and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Johnson, Newton, and Phipps.

NAYS: Councilmembers Bokhari and Watlington.

NO VOTE: Councilmember Ajmera

Councilmember Graham left the meeting at 3:08 p.m.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Jones, what is our next item?

Mr. Jones said so, Mayor and Council as I mentioned earlier there were two levels of sources that I guess Maureen has on the screen right now that totals 430,256. One was \$201,000 that was in the undesignated Fund Balance and then there's another \$228,000 roughly that we had placed in General Services for inflationary cost and building management. Because we were able to add some additional funds outside of the operating budget, we felt like this was a reasonable item to put out. So, roughly you have \$430,000 in resources and you're down to sections one and four on the information on the first page that would require some level of resources for everything to be approved. I pulled out the section three which is the on-street parking adjustment because that's just a reduction in revenue which would be offset by less paving for the city.

So, I would like to move forward, but my suggestion is to give the General Fund Non-Personnel Adjustments that all had some level of a straw vote at your last meeting and how are you going to pursue. That would be the recommendation moving forward.

Mayor Lyles said alright so you see the increases that were requested for the General Fund Non-Personnel Adjustments and is there a motion to accept and approve these to be included in the 2023 budget?

Mr. Egleston said this is for section one?

Mayor Lyles said this is for section one and you can certainly take out anyone for exception.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston and seconded by Councilmember Newton, included in FY2023 budget; section 1, approve items (1) Increase Planning Commission Stipend, (2) Enhance Housing and Neighborhood Services' Community Engagement Program, (3) Provide Support for Workforce Development Initiatives, (4) Provide Funds for Charlotte-Mecklenburg Historic Landmark Commission, and (5) Increase TreesCharlotte Funding and source of funding would be the adjustment in the next sections.

Councilmember Driggs said I just want to clarify with the Manager, you're taking out the inflationary increase in maintenance expenses I believe as part of your funding for this. Wasn't that there for [inaudible] for a reason? How is it that we cannot [inaudible] without it?

Mr. Jones said sure. Councilmember Driggs, we have another source, but I'll let Ryan go through that.

Mr. Bergman said Councilmember Driggs, that was something we like to do so that we have consistent inflationary increases but at the same time due to some of the capacity that we had in COPS in our Capital Investments Fund, we were able to do a couple million dollars more on building maintenance from COPS than we were able to do last year. So, due to that, we were comfortable this year being able to back off on that one with still additional sources beyond what we typically have.

Mr. Driggs said great. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright so I just want to make sure. We have the motion to approve items one through five on the General Fund Non-Personnel Adjustments, and the revenue source for doing that would be on page two of our document, tends to a non-personnel expenditure increase coming from that adjustment. Do I have that correct Mr. Jones? Am I doing that right Ryan?

Mr. Bergman said yes. So, it would be coming from General Fund expenditure sources on the right there, would cover the five items.

Mayor Lyles said on page two.

Ms. Eiselt said the first dark blue bar, not the second dark blue bar?

Mayor Lyles said yes the first.

Ms. Eiselt said okay.

Mr. Phipps said so what we're basically is one through five we're voting on as a group that that funding has been secured. So, in the case of number one, we're approving the 200 percent increase in that stipend. Is that correct?

Mayor Lyles said that is there unless you'd like to pull it out as an exception to that.

Mr. Phipps said to me I could go with a hundred percent but 200 percent? I used to be on the Planning Commission, and we hadn't had an increase from 125 in years, but to go from 125 to 375 or whatever. I don't know.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Phipps, do you have a substitute motion?

Mr. Phipps said number one, I could support a 100 percent increase but not a 200 percent increase, but if we're going to go and vote with the whole thing together, then it leaves me no option.

Mayor Lyles said I just thought it would be easier, but if you would like to make a substitute motion for Items 2 through 5 and change number one, that's fine. So, you tell me what you'd like to do.

Mr. Phipps said I don't know. My colleagues, would it go down in flames? I don't want to put [inaudible].

Mr. Egleston said please tell me [inaudible].

Mr. Phipps said will it go down in flames?

Mr. Egleston said yes.

Mr. Phipps said Okay, I'll just go with the flow.

Mayor Lyles said okay, thank you, Mr. Phipps. So, the motion on the table stands for adoption of Items 1 through 5, the cost of adjustment from page 2.

Ms. Eiselt said I just had a question. So, what are we talking about a total of?

Mr. Baker said 367,000.

Ms. Eiselt said okay, so they're certainly not there, but we included section number four because that's the only one that has an increase. Is there still enough there? I'm just looking overall.

Mr. Jones said so the last item would be revolving around the conversation about planning and zoning and staffing. So, we did work with Alyson and Ryan did a great job and, on the right, you'll see there's a series of things that are related to the staff as well as the process. We believe that for \$78,000 more we could resolve all of this. If we use all of it, I think there's a \$15,000 gap, a worst-case scenario to move forward, Ryan to figure it out with two budgets, 15,000, but that's it.

Mr. Egleston said Mr. Bergman if you can give me that actual number, I will fix it right now.

Mr. Bergman said the actual number is 15,646.

Mr. Egleston said I will amend my motion to take my proposal, number four, and make it \$84,000.

Mayor Lyles said great.

Mr. Bergman said you're leaving me \$350 undesignated. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said so what I hear is we approve all of the items as recommended?

Motion was made by Councilmember Eiselt, seconded by Councilmember Driggs to approve 1 through 5 and section 4 as recommended and the excess that we need based on the total adjustment of General Fund expenditure sources would come from Item number 4, the Charlotte Mecklenburg Historic Landmark Commission.

The vote was taken and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Johnson, Newton, Phipps

NAYS: Councilmember Bokhari

NO VOTE: Councilmember Watlington

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO PREPARE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS AND RESOLUTIONS FOR THE FY2023 BUDGET ORDINANCE

Mayor Lyles said section three. Eliminate adjustments to on-street parking fees.

Councilmember Egleston said, Madam Mayor. I'm just trying to make a motion to retain the original recommendation of the Manager's budget as it relates to on-street parking fees.

Mr. Bokhari said are we accepting motions to the opposite of what we voted on last time we were all together?

Mayor Lyles said we did that. The Mayor Pro Tem said to accept the Manager's recommendation. I think Mr. Egleston [inaudible].

Mr. Egleston said I'm fine with [inaudible] motion as it's written [inaudible].

Mr. Bokhari said yeah, let's just vote it as it was written, and they can vote it down or out. So, move to get rid of the changes to parking.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Egleston, tell me your motion.

Mr. Egleston said I'm satisfied with Mr. Bokhari's [inaudible] to keep moving here. It's fine with just having an up/down vote on removing the adjustments that were proposed in the original Manager's budget.

Mayor Lyles said okay.

Mr. Egleston said is what he [inaudible] forward.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari and seconded by Councilmember Driggs to adjust/amend the Managers recommendations budget to remove parking fees.

Councilmember Eiselt said the motion is to accept it as written right here, right? To eliminate adjustments to on-street parking.

Councilmember Bokhari said we're not going to start charging on the weekends.

Ms. Eiselt said that's what the motion [inaudible].

Mr. Bokhari said we're also not going to add the charge.

Ms. Eiselt said the \$0.50.

Councilmember Watlington said I had to step out. Everything will stay the same. We're essentially saying no change to our current on-street parking fees.

Mayor Lyles said correct.

Ms. Watlington said alright, yes.

Councilmember Newton said I'm not sure that was right. We're voting right now not to increase parking fees. I just want to make sure we are all good.

Mayor Lyles said yes, that's correct.

Mr. Bokhari said against tax increases, yes.

Mr. Newton said [inaudible] parking fees, vote yes.

Mayor Lyles said okay. This is to vote to change the Manager's recommendation and not increase parking fees for the \$0.50 in the meters or the free parking on the weekends over the three-day period and any of those other recommendations.

Mr. Egleston said just some clarifications so nobody's confused. There's no proposal or a scenario where we are charging for parking on Sundays. That is free and in any scenario.

Mayor Lyles said that's true. Okay.

Councilmember Johnson said Madam Mayor, I have a clarification question please. Just in case anyone didn't watch the last budget meeting, can the Manager just give a recap on the reason that he was proposing an increase in parking fees?

Mayor Lyles said yes ma'am.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said thank you, Councilmember Johnson. So, I guess it's a few reasons. One is that since we instituted the on-street parking we have not increased the fee and if we were to just apply inflation, it would be less than this \$0.50.

The other thing that's important is that this is two-hour parking so actually what's happening, instead of paying a dollar for an hour for the two-hour parking, you would be paying \$1.50 an hour for the two-hour parking which is a dollar increase. The other piece to it is that we would add Saturdays and that's roughly \$650/\$660,000. As you may recall, we had a gap as it relates to the street resurfacing, and as the Council identified in the last meeting, this is a small amount. It goes towards the street resurfacing. Again, the concept was as we compared ourselves to other North Carolina cities and that we hadn't raised on-street parking since the onset of the program, we just thought that this would be a good time to do it, as well as on the weekend needing those spaces to turn over.

Mayor Lyles said let me make sure that everybody's understanding, and I want to make sure that the people that made the motion are in agreement. On page eight, the Manager says, "If we decrease the parking revenue, that he would decrease the General Fund supplement to street resurfacing. Is that the motion?"

Mr. Bokhari said that is correct.

Mayor Lyles said that is Mr. Bokhari. Who made the second? Mr. Driggs?

Mr. Driggs said yes.

Mayor Lyles said it's on page eight. Alright.

Ms. Eiselt said Ryan maybe you can clarify. I understand that this reduction would come from our Street Resurfacing Program, but aren't we adding a significant portion of the 37 million to our Street Resurfacing Program?

Ryan Bergman, Strategy & Budget said we are. So, we used additional bond funds to replace the state power bill reduction. So, that's handled in our CIP. So, that bond money essentially got us back to where we were a couple of years ago, and then beyond that, through pay-as-you-go, a couple of shifts that we did, and then this program, we put in the proposed budget of \$3.4 million beyond previous levels to try to get this street resurfacing cycle down. So, just apples and oranges because we do have Ms. Babson here as we need, but 650,000 is about five to seven miles, equivalent to about one year in the cycle.

Ms. Eiselt said but aren't we making up for that with the extra funds that we have this year?

Mr. Bergman said if this passes, there will still be more resources than last year and the year before in street resurfacing.

Mayor Lyles said it's just bumping 655,000 toward the fund. We are increasing it but it's bumping it up.

Mr. Bergman said so an easy way to look at it, two scenarios. Scenario one is it stays as is. We would need plus 3.4 million to account for the cost of resurfacing and things like that. If you approve this motion, we would reduce that supplement by the amount of revenue and we would be plus 2.7 million.

Ms. Eiselt said okay.

Mayor Lyles said alright, is everybody clear? Alright, so Ms. Watlington I wanted to make sure we knew the offset of the change. I wanted to just give you an opportunity to begin your vote again.

The vote was taken on the motion to amend the Manager's recommendations budget to remove parking fees and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Newton, and Watlington.

NAYS: Councilmembers Egleston, Eiselt, Johnson, and Phipps.

YEA: Mayor Lyles vote yes to break tie.

Mayor Lyles said okay, so we have a tie.

Ms. Watlington said a yes vote, in this case, means we preserve the existing cost of parking and the existing days correct?

Mayor Lyles said correct.

Ms. Watlington said okay.

Mayor Lyles said honestly this is going to be in the budget. I can break the tie. I support the parking fees. I think that'll be done if that's what's necessary, but I know that this will be on the Agenda and I expect you'll have more people there. Right now, we're missing Ms. Ajmera, we're missing Mr. Winston, we are missing Mr. Graham. So, we have three people out but if we're going to move it forward, I'm going to vote to support the Manager's recommendation for the increase in parking fees. So, we have this appropriate procedure. Alright, is there anything else that we have to address on this list now? That's it. Are there any questions? Mr. Bergman, do you need anything else?

Mr. Bergman said no.

Ms. Johnson said I have some questions, Mayor.

Mayor Lyles said yes, Ms. Johnson?

Ms. Johnson said thank you. This is for the firefighters, just for clarification. Can you clarify Mr. Bergman if firefighters are included in the city's \$20 per hour minimum wage based on their 52-hour work week?

Mr. Bergman said no, we do it based on the Department of Labor's standards for what constitutes overtime and so they work a 52-hour schedule. So, they get more funds in total than a 40-hour person working 20 hours per week, but the intention with what we did was our 40-hour employees would move to \$20 an hour.

Councilmember Bokhari left at 3:26 p.m.

Ms. Johnson said what about part-time employees? Are they getting \$20 an hour?

Mr. Bergman said yes, our regular part-time employees which we don't have a lot of, which work similar positions would get \$20 an hour as well.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and are firefighters and non-emergency operations personnel excluded from shift differential pay while working those regularly scheduled hours?

Mr. Bergman said yes. So, when we talked to the Public Safety Paid Committee about this as well, in our comparisons it was extremely common for police officers to be in this. It was uncommon for firefighters because, for operations, we only have one shift, so there's not a shift differential.

Ms. Johnson said okay. CFD (Charlotte Fire Department) employees are eligible for five percent or 10 percent at the [inaudible] incentive. It looks like in your budget request to us, they asked for the CFD employees to be treated the same. Will firefighters be eligible for a five percent or 10 percent educational incentive?

Mr. Bergman said yes, firefighters already get that in the Public Safety Plan for Firefighters 1, Firefighters 2, and fire engineers. Nothing changes with that. There's one adjustment we did for police that will also be done for fire around eligibility. So, nothing happened on the education incentive that fire is excluded from.

Ms. Johnson said okay. My last question. I know the employees, the FTE, we're adding an employee to assist with public records requests, and this might be a question for Mr. Jones, will that full-time employee be able to assist with emails and all the public record requests Mr. Jones?

Mr. Jones said, Ryan.

Mr. Bergman said yes, one full-time position in the City Clerk's Office. That's a very small staff so there's not really any ability to absorb work amongst the staff and then we added technology support in the Innovation and Technology Budget. As far as how the public records requests will work with the additional position, we were fulfilling the clerk's office request, but I think that would be a later discussion for the exact details and we can certainly get you that.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

ITEM NO. 4: REVIEW OF NEXT STEPS

The next steps were not addressed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:34 p.m.


Billie Tynes, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 2 Hours, 24 Minutes.
Minutes Completed: August 27, 2023