

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for Action Review on Monday, May 22, 2023, at 6:10 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Danté Anderson, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Lawana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Marjorie Molina, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston II.

* * * * *

ACTION REVIEW

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

Mayor Lyles said so, let me first start off with the consent agenda. Is there anyone that has a separate vote or a comment to make on the consent agenda?

Councilmember Mayfield said I'm pulling it up, Madam Mayor. You went through that kind of quickly. So, for Item 36.

Mayor Lyles said Item 36, Central Business District Sewer.

Ms. Mayfield said correct. That one, I would like to pull out for questions. Staff did respond. I wanted to have Marie share that with me, because I had a specific question on the Sewer Construction Change Order, because this is their fifth change order. So, Marie, if you can respond to Item 36, please?

Mayor Lyles said alright, why don't do this, Ms. Mayfield, so that we can get this done with attention with everyone. Why don't we go ahead and approve, and then come back to 36, approve the other items.

Ms. Mayfield said all items outside of Item 36?

Mayor Lyles said with the exception of 36.

Ms. Mayfield said and 47 if we are doing that.

Mayor Lyles said 36 and 47.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 34 THROUGH 58 MAY BE CONSIDERED IN ONE MOTION EXCEPT FOR THOSE ITEMS REMOVED BY A COUNCIL MEMBER. ITEMS ARE REMOVED BY NOTIFYING THE CITY CLERK.

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham, seconded by Councilmember Watlington, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda items 34 through 58 as presented with the exception of Item No. 36, and Item No. 47 which were pulled for discussion.
--

The following items were approved:

Item No. 34: Traffic Signal Installation and Maintenance

Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,420,725.00 to the lowest responsive bidder Whiting Construction Company, Inc. for traffic signal installation and maintenance.

Summary of Bids

The City of Charlotte issued an Invitation to Bid twice; only one bid was received both times from Whiting Construction Company, Inc.

Item No. 35: Cooperative Purchasing Contract for Citywide Office Supplies

(A) Approve the purchase of office supplies from a cooperative contract, (B) Approve a unit price contract with American Office Products Distributors, Inc. for the purchase of office supplies for a term of two years under NCPA, an OMNIA Partners Company, contract #11-18, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to extend the contract for additional terms as long as the cooperative contract is in effect, at prices and terms that are the same or more favorable than those offered under the cooperative contract.

Item No. 37: Mallard Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Water System Rehabilitation

Approve a contract in the amount of \$699,772.22 to the lowest responsive bidder BW Service Solutions, LLC (SBE) for the Mallard Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Non-Potable Water and Potable Water System Rehabilitation project.

Summary of Bids

BW Service Solutions, LLC	\$699,772.22
State Utility Contractors Inc.	\$4,964,000.00

The City of Charlotte issued an Invitation to Bid twice, only two bids were received.

Item No. 38: On-Call Professional Engineering Services

(A) Approve contracts with the following firms for a term of three years for on-call professional engineering services: Black & Veatch International Company, Brown & Caldwell, CDM-Smith, Hazen & Sawyer, HDR Engineering of the Carolinas, Southeastern Consulting Engineers (SBE), Sturgill Engineering, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 39: Professional Engineering Services for Surface Water Quality Enhancement Projects

(A) Approve a unit price contract with Armstrong Glen, P.C. for surface water quality enhancement services for an initial term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 40: Sugar Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Alkalinity Storage Replacement

Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,434,793.00 to the lowest responsive bidder Gilbert Engineering Company for the Sugar Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Alkalinity Storage Replacement project.

Summary of Bids*

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

Item No. 41: LYNX Silver Line Equitable Transit-Oriented Development Study

(A) Approve a contract for up to \$506,250 with Community Building Initiative for the LYNX Silver Line Equitable Transit-Oriented Development Study, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 42: Envision My Ride Implementation Study

(A) Approve a contract with Foursquare ITP for professional planning and design services related to the Route Restoration Planning Study, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 43: Airport Arborist Services Contract

(A) Approve a contract with Bartlett Tree Experts to provide Arborist Services, for an initial term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for

up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 44: Airport Landscape Services Contract

(A) Approve contracts with the following companies for landscape services for an initial term of three years: Brightview Landscape Services, Leisure Time Lawn Care, LP (SBE) and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to two, one-year terms and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 45: Airport Paving and Lighting Construction

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$56,030,176.50 to the lowest responsive bidder, Hi-Way Paving, Inc., for the North End-Around Taxiway Project Package 2, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Summary of Bids*

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

Item No. 46: Airport Real Estate Demolition Services

(A) Approve unit price contracts with the following companies for Demolition Services for an initial term of three years: DH Griffin Wrecking Co. Inc., Double D Construction Services Inc. (DBE), WC Black & Sons Inc., and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 48: Airport South Crossfield Taxiway Construction Change Order

Approve change order #1 for \$4,162,113 to Hi-Way Paving, Inc. for the Deicing Pad and South Crossfield Taxiway Project Package 2.

Item No. 49: Workers' Compensation Third Party Administration Services

(A) Approve a contract with PMA Management Corp. for Workers' Compensation Third Party Administration Services for an initial term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 50: Set a Public Hearing on Hamilton Woods Area Voluntary Annexation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 26, 2023, for the Hamilton Woods Area voluntary annexation petition.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 54, at Page(s) 47-48.

Item No. 51: Set a Public Hearing on Northlake Town Center Area Voluntary Annexation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 26, 2023, for Northlake Town Center Area voluntary annexation petition.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 54, at Page(s) 49-50.

Item No. 52: Set a Public Hearing on Oak Lake Area Voluntary Annexation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 26, 2023, for Oak Lake Area voluntary annexation petition.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 54, at Page(s) 51-52.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 53: Property Transactions – 7023 Gilead Road, Parcel # 8

Acquisition of 3,641 square feet (0.083 acres) Permanent Sewer Easement and 1,670 square feet (0.038 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 7101 Gilead Road, Huntersville from Jimmy Rojas and Ma. De Lourdes Alvarez and the heirs of Guillermo Rojas and Arcelia C. Rojas for \$12,000 for 7023 Gilead Road, Parcel # 8.

Item No. 54: Property Transactions – Beatties Ford Sidewalk Phase 1, Parcel # 5

Acquisition of 373 square feet (0.009 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement and 1,065 square feet (0.024 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 1905 Beatties Ford Road from Second Ward High School National Alumni Foundation, Inc. for \$13,000 for Beatties Ford Sidewalk Phase 1, Parcel # 5.

Item No. 55: Property Transactions – Prosperity Church Road (Old Ridge to Benfield), Parcel # 25

Acquisition of 22,110 square feet (0.508 acres) Fee Simple, and 11,316 square feet (0.260 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 6135 Prosperity Church Road, Huntersville from Nisbet Oil Company f/k/a E.P. Nisbet Company for \$125,000 for Prosperity Church Road (Old Ridge to Benfield), Parcel # 25.

Item No. 56: Property Transaction – Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 33

Acquisition of 1,857 square feet (0.043 acres) Fee Simple inside right-of-way and 1,354 square feet (0.031 acres) Fee Simple outside right-of-way, and 4,876 square feet (0.112 acres) Storm Drainage Easement, 1,790 square feet (0.041 acres) Utility Easement, 2,455 square feet (0.056 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement and 2,465 square feet (0.057 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 3244 East Ford Road from Beverly T. Farmer for \$75,000 for Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 33.

Item No. 57: Property Transaction – Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 67

Acquisition of 1,356 square feet (0.031 acres) Fee Simple, and 1,204 square feet (0.028 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 219 square feet (0.005 acres) Utility Easement, 134 square feet (0.003 acres) Storm Drainage Easement, 3,304 square feet (0.076 acres) Temporary Construction Easement and 2,759 square feet (0.063 acres) Post Construction Control Easement at 2601 Palm Avenue from The Yanyan Weiwei Revocable Living Trust for \$79,475 for Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 67.

Item No. 58: Property Transaction – Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 83

Acquisition of 35 square feet (0.001 acres) Fee Simple, and 641 square feet (0.015 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 108 square feet (0.002 acres) Utility Easement and 1,356 square feet (0.031 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 2517 Shamrock Drive from Del Valle Properties, Inc. for \$20,775 for Shamrock Drive Improvements, Parcel # 83.

Mayor Lyles said alright, we'll come back to 36 and 47 after, Ms. Mayfield we'll pull it out.

ITEM NO. 3: ACTION REVIEW AGENDA OVERVIEW

Mayor Lyles said so, we are really tight on time, and what I'd like to do is go ahead and have our presentations and start off with the River District or Project Break Point. I've heard it called different things for a while. So, we'll start with that, and then we'll come back to the NOAH (Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing) Opportunity. We covered the ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) Housing and Resilience Funding opportunity. So, thanks Shawn, for that. So, Ms. Dodson.

ITEM NO. 4: ACTION REVIEW ITEMS

Tracy Dodson, Economic Development said thank you, Mayor. So, you said it right. It's Project Break Point in the River District, so it's both. Many of you have heard about

this project already, but we wanted to take the opportunity tonight to bring it in front of full Council. In an effort to keep things moving quickly, we'll do a quick overview of the River District, and then put the meat of the discussion around Project Break Point, and I'll come back at the end and discuss the public/private partnership.

Many of you sat around this table back in 2017 and may remember when we approved the River District. It set the stage for a long-term public/private partnership, that was contemplated all the needs of a diverse and inclusive and unique community in Charlotte. So, to start, I'd like to bring Brendan Pierce up here to talk about the River District.

Brendan Pierce, Crescent Communities said thank you, everyone. Very excited to talk about Project Break Point and, more importantly, the River District, which Crescent Communities, I'm Brendan Pierce, President of Commercial Development at Crescent, and we've been working on this project for seven years. Frankly, we would not be here today without the public/private partnership we have had with the city. It has made the River District possible, and we are on the precipice of the River District becoming reality.

So, 1,400 acres, in between 485 and the Catawba River, and it is going to be the most dynamic mixed-use development in the city, and what is it, before I turn it over to Break Point? It's a dynamic mixed-use development, but importantly, it is 550 acres of open space, it's 30 parks, and every house is going to be within one block of a greenway or a park. We're going to have a two-acre sustainable working farm there, over 30 miles of biking trails and walking trails, all five minutes from the doorstep of Charlotte Douglas Airport.

It is going to be an incredible development, and we are really excited about the future of this, not only from a mixed-use development standpoint, but all the other things, sustainability and the focus on affordable housing and a variety of housing and making sure that we've got a community that is accessible to everyone in the City. Also, one where when we were building it out, we were thinking about minority, small businesses, women-owned businesses. Right now, 10 percent is our requirement on that and we're already at 12 percent with affordable housing, eight percent is our requirement and we're already at 14 percent, and that is the trend line, and that is what the River District is going to be all about, inclusiveness, sustainability, and a dynamic opportunity, which I want to turn it over, since we're tight on time right now, the Chief Operating Officer of Beemok Capital, Ford Perry to talk about what is going to be a dynamic catalyst for the River District. So, Ford.

Ford Perry, Beemok Capital said thanks, Brendan. Good evening, everyone. I'm Ford Perry, the Chief Operating Officer of Beemok Capital. Nine months ago, we invested several hundred million dollars to acquire the rights to one of the premiere tennis tournaments in the world. I spent more than four decades in North Carolina, including 23 years in Charlotte, before moving to Charleston about three and a half years ago. So, the opportunity to bring this tournament back home to Charlotte is incredibly appealing. However, despite my biases, we are running a process and looking at a number of different cities, including Cincinnati, Ohio, where the tournament is today.

My goal tonight is to highlight three important elements of this project. One, the significance of this tournament. It's considered one of the most prestigious trophies in all of tennis. Two, the benefits that a \$400 million tennis and entertainment campus will have on the west side of Charlotte, and the ability to transform it into a destination for sports and music. Three, the direct impact our investment will have on the community. That last piece, investing in the community, is truly important to our organization. It's something we've done extensively in Charleston and across South Carolina, and we want to be much more than a tennis partner to the City of Charlotte.

We're not exactly sure how that plays out, but we're confident that we'll have opportunities to emulate some of the relationships that we have created in Charleston and around South Carolina, including with the City of Charleston, the Charleston County

School District, and the Medical University of South Carolina. We're very proud of those partnerships and our track record with those organizations. Whether it's four, soon to be five, Title 1 schools serving more than 2,000 students in South Carolina, or the nearly 300 need-based scholarships that we expect to award in July worth more than \$12 million, or the efforts we have working with MUSC (Medical University of South Carolina) to combat the mental health epidemic by creating more innovative treatment protocols.

Those projects are complicated to replicate, but we know at a minimum, the tennis side of this project, will have a direct impact of the lives of hundreds of kids in this community by introducing them to the sport of tennis, which we believe provides an affordable and accessible conduit to teaching crucial life skills. So, let me pivot to the project. I promise I'll flip through this quickly, but there's some important highlights.

As I said, we acquired the Western and Southern Open. It's one of the most prestigious trophies in all of tennis. It is a Masters 1000 event, just below the 4 Grand Slams, which most people are familiar with. Because of that, the best players in the world play this event every year, and because the best players play, you get fans from all over the world. We have fans at the event from all 50 states, from 39 countries. The international appeal of tennis is real, and it provides an incredible opportunity for the City of Charlotte to continue to make itself an internationally profiled City.

In 2025, this tournament's going to expand from one to two weeks, and double in size in terms of the numbers of players that are going to play. So, this is an event that's going to become even more important than it is today. As I mentioned, the opportunity to add Charlotte to an unrivaled class of peer cities, Los Angeles, Miami, Rome, Madrid, Shanghai, Montreal, Toronto, Monte Carlo and Paris. Those are the other cities that host the Masters 1000 Tournaments in the world. So, it's, again, a unique opportunity.

What does that translate to? We look at it in a couple of ways. We look first at what the peer events are in the tennis world. There are two other Masters 1000 events in the U.S., that's in Indian Wells outside Los Angeles, and the Miami Open. They attract between 400 and 500,000 fans each year and have an economic impact between \$390 and \$565 million. We've conducted an economic impact study. We believe this event can easily attract 350,000 fans and have a direct impact from this single event of more than \$275 million. Compare that to something, most of this Committee knows well, which are the golf tournaments played out at Quail Hollow. You have special events, like the Presidents Cup and the PGA (Professional Golfers' Association of America), and also the Wells Fargo Championship.

This tournament, in terms of economic impact and fan draw, will significantly exceed those numbers, is what we believe. In addition to the primary tournament, we expect to have lower-level professional tournaments, collegiate championships, amateur tournaments on weekends, in addition to concerts, festivals, community events, a variety of other things, on this campus. It truly will be a 365-day campus. We expect that to translate into 200-plus event days per year, more than \$300 million of economic impact and drawing in 650,000 attendees at these events. Many, if not the majority of which, will be from out of town.

As I said, beyond tennis, we want to make sure that this campus, and the opportunity we're creating is a partnership well beyond the courts. We want to make, first of all, this facility is built to serve the community, but also accessible to everyone. We want to do that in a few ways. One, making sure that anyone can afford to play, whether that's low rates for court access or thousands of free hours of access for the community based on need. We also anticipate hiring a Director of Community Programming to partner with local community groups to create events, like summer camps, after school programs, and other opportunities for the community to engage. To identify high performing youth, who would qualify to attend our high-performance tennis academy, and provide them scholarships to be able to have that access.

In addition to that, we want the campus to truly be a public park, a space where people can find green space and celebrate what this unique experience will be. We spent a lot of time canvassing the community, thinking about where it could fit best. We ultimately settled on the River District, and we're thrilled with that opportunity. It fits us for a variety of reasons. One, the space that it provided us. We're going to have more than a 50-acre campus in addition to the need for parking nearby to serve a tournament that's going to have 350,000 fans coming to it. Its close proximity to the airport is a truly unique asset and will complement what we're doing, but it also allows us to be able to access all the amenities of Uptown Charlotte, and the rest of the community by being just 15 minutes away, in addition to having great access to roadways.

So, as Brendan said, the River District, the development that's occurring out there, our ability to be a catalyst to what is happening there, and really a magnet for additional growth, is truly exciting. Some of these we've shared before. I won't spend a lot of time on them, but it gives you a good sense of what the campus opportunity is. Four stadiums sort of anchoring the corners of the campus, more than 40 courts, with a blend between clay, hard, indoor pickleball, a wide variety of racket sports. This starts to show what the campus can be beyond tennis. So, examples on the right side, which is taking advantage of the Wetlands, having greenways throughout the campus that connect to the 30-plus miles of trails on the rest of the River District, in addition to things like an amphitheater, where that really doesn't serve a lot of purpose for our tournament, but really can provide a great weekend, an event space for the community, whether it's smaller concerts or plays and special events.

A quick glimpse into the stadium. This is modeled quite a bit off our stadium in Charleston, given the successes and lessons learned there. We believe the largest stadium will seat 14,000, approximately, fans for tennis, but also for concerts. It's important that this venue can serve, again, year-round, not only for tennis but also for music. Tennis stadiums lend themselves really well to music given the intimacy of the venue. The good news is, we have a track record of doing all of this.

So, we have big ideas and big inspirations, but we've, in essence, created a blueprint of this for what we've done in Charleston. We renovated an aging stadium into what is one of the premiere venues in the Southeast for tennis and music. In 2022, our tournament there was awarded the tournament of the year internationally for WTA (Women's Tennis Association) 500s, and we were the number 10 ranked amphitheater worldwide for our concert performances.

In terms of how do we get this done? First of all, we're providing a lot into the project. In addition to taking on responsibility for a minimum of two-thirds of the project, those are new dollars that we'd be investing, we also would expect to oversee all of the day-to-day operations of the facility, to manage all aspects of the design and construction process, to absorb any cost overages and ongoing maintenance, and making a long-term commitment in keeping the tournament here, in addition to the value of the sanction that we're contributing to this project.

What we're looking for from a public perspective is to contribute a third of the total project costs with a cap, in addition to accelerating the permitting and the infrastructure development that will be needed on the River District to get the infrastructure support. Finally, the last piece, which is an important one, is being able to identify land adjacent to the property for parking and the requirements that we'll need out of that, and we've identified a City or Airport owned parcel that will ideally fit that need. So, that's the full scope of it. Again, the quick highlights in terms of the opportunity to add a world class tournament, really create a regional destination for music and sports, and generating significant community impact.

Ms. Dodson said so, I'm going to close this out really quickly. Just to remind you, while this is a different source of funds, I look at this as a business recruitment opportunity, and we look not just at the tournament, but the company as a whole, who Beemok is, and the opportunities that they bring for our community. Like a business recruitment deal, though, it also has County and State participation in it, and so you have all three

entities are looking at this opportunity. For the City, I'm looking at a range of \$60 to \$70 million from hospitality, is where I've started. Now, again, this is all ongoing conversations with other parties to try to figure out where everybody is, as well as working with Ford and team on what the total cost is as we continue to further the discussion.

In addition, separate from Beemok, we would come back to as a CIP (Capital Investment Plan) request for River District, which has always been contemplated. So, that's nothing new, two separate things. Then lastly, as I mentioned, both groups, City Council, State, are all looking at this. We're continuing to talk through permitting efficiencies. Ford mentioned the airport. We're having conversations with the airport about their adjacent land, and we also have launched the website. It's on the City's homepage for anybody to get questions answered or also see presentations on that. With that, I am going to stop so that you can ask questions.

Councilmember Graham said let me take this opportunity to thank the Beemok team for coming and presenting, once again, this, what I believe, is a tremendous opportunity for our State, our region and our City. This is truly a once in a generation opportunity to really bolster our travel and tourism industry and create jobs and economic opportunities for a number of our citizens. As indicated, the economic impact, just a tournament alone, is \$275 million. When you add the other events throughout the course of the year, it can well be somewhere between \$350 to \$400 million a year that helps waiters and busboys and bartenders, event planners, Uber drivers, food trucks, part-time ambassadors, event staff, restaurants, bars, hotels, all benefitting from the event. The event can generate almost 350,000 tourists attending the event every year, which is significant.

It's also an international branding opportunity. One of the things that the Economic Development Committee is doing is meeting with our various committee members or our community members, staffing, organizations that we appoint to, like the International Cabinet. So, having the opportunity to really work with our corporate community from an international perspective in terms of international business recruitment and retention, is really high on my list. It pits up with peer cities like Paris and Rome, Madrid, Monte Carlo, Toronto, Miami, Los Angeles, in terms of that type of media market that we'll be dealing with on a year-to-year basis, bigger than the Presidents Cup and Wells Fargo. This would be an opportunity to host this event every year in late summer, early August, which is tremendously beneficial to all of us.

A number of public benefits, that I spoke with the Beemok team, and let me pause there, and say that I am from Charleston, and I know the Beemok organization in terms of the work they've done in the Charleston community. I talked to the Mayor and other Council members and my own knowledge, this is a first-class organization in reference to creating a relationship and a partnership with. One of the things that we talked about was affordable public access and community engagement around youth programming, grassroot programs, educational programs, scholarships, after-school program. The Vice Chairwoman of the school board has already reached out to me wanting to get involved some way with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools in terms of what they're doing.

We talked about the economic impact, but more importantly, the community impact. We have the opportunity to really engage in community building in the River District in terms of leveraging dollars that we've already spent there, i.e., the \$6 million, that we invested with Laurel Street for the affordable housing units in first phase of what they're doing in the River District.

We talked about minority and women's participation in reference to construction, vendors, professional services, small business, and concessions. They certainly have an understanding of that. Access to walking trails and a park-like setting, and for those who are tennis players, know for sure that in Charlotte and Charlotte-Mecklenburg, there are no public clay courts available. All the clay courts are at the private clubs. So, this would create a public opportunity for older players, like me with bad knees, to play on clay courts, which is a lot better than hard courts. No public indoor courts in Charlotte

as well. This would give us an opportunity to have public indoor courts. Pickle ball is growing in leaps and bounds, more support there.

Lastly, this is a conversation that we've been having with the Beemok team for about five months now. The Council gave us their authorization in January to dig deep, and we started doing that in terms of establishing a relationship with them, and them establishing a relationship with us, to kind of see if it matched.

In late April, we sent a delegation to Charleston to tour the facilities, to tour their Title 1 schools that they're working with, as well as representatives from their initiative relating to mental health, and Danny Morrison with the Charlotte Sports Commission, Tom Murray with Visit Charlotte, Keith Cockrell with the Regional Alliance, Mark Jerrell with Mecklenburg County Commission, the City Manager, Ms. Dodson and I, went there and we really got an opportunity, one, to meet the Principal, Mr. Navarro, but more importantly, get a feel for the organization and the people there. We went back two weeks later with another group, Chairman Dunlap with Mecklenburg County Commission, Lisa Myers who serves on the County Commission ED (Economic Development) Committee, the Vice Chairman, Ed Driggs, James Mitchell with the City of Charlotte, The Mayor Pro Tem.

Again, we went there and saw the stadium being activated during the Charlston tournament. It was extremely impressive. I've been to that tournament a number of years, but even the size of the tournament that we saw there would be four times larger in Charlotte than is in Charleston. So, it's really, really impressive. They also made themselves available to state and local leaders. They had a visit with the Governor. They had a visit with the Speaker Pro Tem of the Senate, as well as representatives of the President's office and the House. So, they've done their due diligence in terms of touching base with the states. We're cautiously optimistic that that will be successful. They've done the same thing with members of the Mecklenburg County Commission, in terms of meeting with the commission and the County Manager, the Chairman of the Board there.

Lastly, a week ago, we had a joint meeting where they introduced the concept to the public by way of a joint meeting between the City and the County Economic Development Committee. So, I, by working with this group for the last five months, digging deep, understanding the sport, this is an opportunity for us that I don't think we can say no to. Obviously, the devil is in the details. The devil is in the relationship between the three-legged stool, as I call it, City, State and County. Everyone is extremely interested. I think this would be, as I said, an ace for our community, if we have the opportunity to step forward and step front. With this, I believe, this is Malcolm speaking, it's ours to say no to, but obviously I think we should say yes, very loud and very clear. Thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said I certainly agree with some of the comments that my colleague, Councilmember Graham, shared with us. This is a catalyst, not just for the River District, but for our region. It's a great opportunity, but the question that I think we all have been asked is, "What does this mean for the Eastland Yards?" I know I have had this conversation with Ms. Dodson. I know Ms. Dodson has assured me that this does not mean any sort of resources that will be taken away from the Eastland Yards project, not just in terms of financial, but also Staff resources.

I know many residents from the East side have reached out to us and have sent us an email, have called us. I'm sure, Councilmember Molina, is probably getting the most pressure, who represents that District, but I think we do need to have some sort of written assurance. We need to provide that this project does not mean we will stop our commitment to the Eastland Yards. We need to provide some assurance in writing, saying that we are committed with a dollar amount, that this is what it is. We are going to set that aside for the East side project. Certainly, when it comes to this, I don't want to take anything away from this project. I think it's a great opportunity. I think when there was a presentation made, especially about the open house, you had me there. Open house, just the Tree-Save. So, I mean I don't want to add anything else to that, but what

you are doing at the River District is certainly transformational, and we appreciate that. Thank you.

Councilmember Mayfield said I have questions for the petitioners.

Ms. Ajmera said oh, I didn't get a response from Ms. Dodson about Eastland Yards and written assurance?

Ms. Dodson said so, I'm glad you asked the question, Councilmember Ajmera. In no way whatsoever does reviewing this proposal take away anything from Eastland. I was really clear with Ford from day one, that we have other projects in the pipeline, or other projects that are underway, and we have two different staff teams that are working on two different projects. So, we are still working day in and day out on Eastland, as well as looking at this project at the same time. For a written in writing amount to the Eastland project, I'll say right now as we evaluate these proposals, they're different dollar amounts, of which, again, we have the affordability for. We're just trying to make sure that the proposal that we move forward with at Eastland, is the long-term viable project that will lead to the success for the East side. So, we're being very diligent about that in the process, but again, two separate staff teams, as well as not competing money.

Ms. Ajmera said I know we have had this conversation, Ms. Dodson. I think you have assured me, but I think we need to have some sort of assurance to our community. I would like to see some sort of resolution done where it shows our commitment to the Eastland Yards project. So, that's all I have. Thank you.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you, gentlemen, for joining us. I have a couple of questions. You mentioned a number of ways that, in South Carolina, you support the community, one of those being through charter schools. I'm not familiar with your organization and, although I follow some tennis, I'm not going to say I follow all of it to know the difference of whether or not this was in South Carolina or in the Charlotte area. As far as the charter schools, you also noted that scholarships are available. That is helpful, but for me, the breakdown of who has the ownership of the charter schools, as well as not only the graduation rates, the expulsion rates, since they are Title 1 school, because unfortunately, across the nation, we see that a number of Title 1 schools and charter schools have very high expulsion rates, specifically for black and Latino children. So, those numbers would be helpful if that is going to be part of the presentation.

As far as, and this is a question that you can answer, the eight locations that you noted below, are any of those locations either built in or in immediate proximity to residential, because that's what we're getting ready to do? Yes, it's 1,400 acres, but this is going to be a multi-residential and business location. Are any of these that you noted below, are any of them built within immediate proximity to residential, whether it's multi-family or single-family?

Mr. Perry said for the other tournaments? Yes. The one in Paris is right in the middle of the city, the same for Rome. If you go to Indian Wells, there's a massive community built around that complex as well. So, the vast majority are, very few are [INAUDIBLE].

Ms. Mayfield said and staff might be able to help with this, to go back on the slide to show the slide at the beginning that showed the location of where this would be. Where on this map are you looking at or you've identified potentially for the 55 acres?

Mr. Perry said yes, sure. So, this sort of northern quadrant where Dixie River Road intersects with 45. So, you have a 53-acre parcel just in that upper quadrant that is the identified site.

Ms. Mayfield said so that corner would be about how many feet before you start getting into residential? Basically, think about the question I'm asking. If you're trying the egress and regress. So, we have PNC. We also have a lot of residential around PNC. There's a lot of challenges when there is an event. So, I'm trying get an idea for where this is located. At the tip of the development, how far would it be and what access would this

event venue space have separate from the residential and the commercial that's going on in the other part of the development?

Mr. Pierce said so, I'll answer this. Two parts to this. First of all, the area that's being contemplated, this is all considered the commercial part of the River District. It's always been considered that. Then, if you look at the green space to the west of where the commercial area is, it's about 100 acres. So, there's going to be a pretty far divide of where houses are versus where this facility is.

Ms. Mayfield said so, right now we're looking at about 100 acres between where the development is for this project? Again, that is commercial space, but this will be an entity in its own, when I'm thinking about traffic and egress. You noted in here, regarding getting access to parking for [INAUDIBLE]. I believe on the presentation that I sat in on over the phone, this was about 100 acres of airport land that you've identified. Do we have anyone here from the airport that's representing, because it would be helpful, Mr. Manager, outside or from Economic Development, to hear from the airport what the plans may be? Did we have any plans for this potential 100 acres, and what does that look like if we were to move forward with allocating this to a business? So, that would be the information that I will need regarding how we move forward with that. Right now, our Director of Economic Development, Ms. Dodson, noted she's thinking about \$60 to \$70 million of hospitality and tourism funds. What is the current balance that we have in the funds today?

Ms. Dodson said I don't have the exact current balance with me. What I have done is I have worked with Finance to talk through the timing and funding of various projects to make sure that we have appropriate affordability, and they have assured me that we have, but I don't have how much is in a fund on me at this time.

Ms. Mayfield said so, what is the timing and window of this particular proposal?

Ms. Dodson said so, the way that I programmed this particular one out, which was over a series of years, which could be 2024, 2025, 2026/2025, 2026, 2027, just depending on the years of construction and reimbursement.

Ms. Mayfield said so, it was mentioned in the web call that I attended, that there was a goal to try to have an event here by 2026. So, if we know that there's a goal by 2026, it will be helpful to know exactly what is this dollar amount that we have available, in comparison to what this potential ask may be and what window. So, and I see, we do have representation from our airport here. They just walked in. Perfect timing.

So, it would be helpful to know exactly what that dollar amount, where are we financially, because we know that we have a number of financial asks that are out there, including the important ask for Eastland, but we also have other financial commitments that we already have on the books? If we're talking about potentially having this up and running by 2026, it would be helpful to know exactly how much are we going to be potential investing on the front end, just from the City side, since I know there is also a request financially from the County as well as the State.

For our airport, I did have a question regarding that potential 100 acres that is being discussed. As the airport continues to grow, do we see any potential challenges with creating a contract with 100 acres of airport land, when we have needs for industrial and commercial space?

Jack Christine, Charlotte Douglas International Airport said Councilmember Mayfield, in this particular case, this is land that was purchased under our Noise program. It does not have an aeronautical purpose identified in our master plan, so we have some flexibility on how that land will be used.

Ms. Mayfield said that is very helpful. Thank you very much. Again, for the traffic, and this will be the last one for the petitioners. When we look at the egress and regress, do we have an idea what that potentially can look like? Mainly, again thinking about, we

have a facility currently that is very close in proximity to residential, where it is literally a one-way street and you will be stuck in traffic an hour to three hours if there's an event. Has that been taken into consideration when you're speaking with C-DOT (Charlotte Department of Transportation) and looking at how you're going to invest in road infrastructure out here?

Mr. Pierce said I would say, first of all, the River District is zoned for 8 million square feet of commercial space, and majority of it is in this area. So, we have taken into account traffic. The other reason why the location is ideal, is because it's easy access in and off of 485. We initially looked at potentially putting this complex closer to the river and didn't do it for that exact reason. We didn't want to disturb all the residential that's going to be closer to the water.

Ms. Mayfield said and the final question I have, which you partially answered it when I asked, as far as the current facilities being located near residential. The caveat in that that I noted for myself is that residential mixed income where it includes workforce and community? We have a number of events, as you noted, especially in our golfing community. A number of our golfing facilities are private facilities. We have a beautiful facility right off of West Boulevard. The residents don't have access to that. That was governance of things years ago. We have a beautiful facility where we have a major event. The individuals that live in the immediate proximity to that are in a very different socioeconomic demographic than the ideal of what a new diverse community can look like, which is the River District, which is what I worked hard for, not only in multi-family, but in single-family, and making sure that we have access to workforce housing.

So, when I ask if you have facilities that are located residential, are those facilities located near diverse price point residential? Because this could be a very different model, and I want to get an idea of what the impact of that can be, so that we're not setting ourselves up, or future Council members up, with yet another exclusive area that's not accessible by the workers. So, do you have, from current, any idea of what that potentially could look like?

Mr. Pierce said so, I said that this project would be a catalyst. I would say it primarily will be a catalyst for the commercial development of the River District. Our plan, regardless if tennis is here or not, is to keep the original vision of the River District, which is a diverse community, a diverse set of housing across from workforce and beyond. That's not going to change, regardless if tennis comes to this or not. It's very important to us. We have 1,400 acres, all with one developer, Crescent Communities. That's something that we take very seriously, and we've always said from the start, that we wanted a diverse community of price points, of backgrounds. That's what's going to make this a special place, and we don't intend to change that. What we do think, and I'll let you speak to the accessibility of the facility, we think it's going to be something that's really cool for all the neighbors, I'll tell you that. So, do you want to speak to that?

Mr. Perry said yes, I mentioned a little bit in my formal comments, but we fail if this is not accessible to everyone, and we intend to do that in a very formal way, and so I mentioned some of those. One, we run a facility in Charleston that is part of the public park system, and so that is sort of the blueprint for how we would think about doing things here. So, that means a couple of things. One, very affordable access for anyone in the community, but in addition to that, we would expect to provide free access on a need-based evaluation.

So, we want to have someone who's a Director of Community Programming to really make sure we're focused on how do we bring people into this area. Listen, we have to recognize it's going to take many years for this community to sort of fill out. So, how do we bring people from around the community in to take advantage of that? Then, happy to talk more and more about the scholarships within our tennis academy, partnerships with the school district and other community resources.

Ms. Mayfield said it will be helpful if you can follow up with a little more detail on the free as need-base. We have a number of partners in the community that we have supported,

and it is free X number of days. Then, through the partnership, we figure that free on a need-base, the language is a little concerning. So, I would like to flush that out and also having language in place that creates opportunities and clear commitments to minority participation, not only in construction, but also in the day-to-day running of the facility, opportunities will be something that would be interesting to me when we talk about creating partnerships within our local community. Thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said thank you, Madam Mayor. I've got a couple of questions. The first one, kind of piggybacking off of what Councilmember Ajmera was talking about, as you all I'm sure have been briefed, as Ms. Dodson mentioned, we've got a number of other projects going on around the City. So, what's important to me is that we maintain a level of consistency there in our approach. So, in the spirit of that, I've got a few questions. The first one is really a process question for Ms. Dodson, and it's around the economic impact analysis. I'd just like to see that economic impact analysis, so we can get a feel for what the assumptions are associated with it. So, that will be important to me.

The second thing I'd like to understand is, as we talk about the \$60 to \$70 million, can you help me understand how we arrived there relative to the county, given that this is really, I would think, a park and rec type amenity? So, I just want to understand how that breakdown shook out.

Ms. Dodson said so, in this case, I would start with the economic impact, the larger kind of picture of what we're contemplating, but then you look at our dollars and what our dollars can be used for. So, as we started to break down some of the costs of this, I'm looking at the facilities that will house the amateur sports, the regional type tournaments, as well as the tournament itself. That's where my primary focus is.

One of the things that Ford and I have been trying to figure out too is, if we're going to put that kind of money into the project, we own something. What is it that we own? How does that want to work, as it relates to a 54-acre site? So, we're breaking all of that down now, but those are the two primary areas where I look at, because it's the hospitality dollars, it's about heads and beds. It's about that visitor aspect that's going to bring people here and keep generating those types of funds, since that's what we can use them for. Again, as Ford showed in the site plan, there's four stadiums, we're looking at the four stadiums.

I don't want to speak for the County, but if you take the lens of the County, they're going to be more focused on what is the community use? What is the open space and the park use? When we originally contemplated River District, there was a lot of commitment to open space. How does that fit in with some of those previous commitments that weren't really formalized? When we just were starting with the entitlements, we didn't know where the parks were going to go. So, we're kind of piecing the lens that everybody has together to see if we can get to the full picture.

Ms. Watlington said got it. You mentioned something that is of particular interest to me. As we think about some of the other projects, I know that the conversation has been, for this kind of money we expect some level of ownership within the structure, and you just alluded to that. So, I'd love to understand what that looks like, because that's something that's extremely important to me as we consider this.

Ms. Dodson said yes, we'll have to have something to issue the debt on, so we have to own something. Where we'll have to get into it is making sure that we set it up in a way that's mutually advantageous for both parties.

Ms. Watlington said okay. The next thing I wanted to talk about is, as it relates to some of the comments that Councilmember Mayfield made, from an MBE (Minority Business Enterprise) standpoint, again, from a consistency standpoint. In the past, we have required some level of MBE participation, not only for design build, but through the full process. So, I'd like to understand what those current targets are, because if I'm clear,

our current targets at the City level are 20 percent, and I'm wanting to understand what is this project proposing.

Ms. Dodson said well, and we have not gotten to that point yet, but like we do with all of our public investment projects, we will work closely with CBI (Charlotte Business INClusion) in determining what that appropriate percentage is. Then, also work with Beemok, as well as their general contractor, on what we think we can really achieve. If it's higher, or whatever it may be, but really work closely with them on that, and then we would do the same thing with Crescent on any infrastructure as well.

Ms. Watlington said okay, so that's one thing I'd like to see before it comes for decision, what we think is realistic in terms of that, as well as just from a broader process standpoint on these ED projects. I'd like to see what we actually achieved on the back end for these community commitments. So, just as an aside, that's a piece that I would like to see moving forward for the ones that we just came through. The next thing I wanted to talk about, and ask about, is also specific to the community piece, as we think about how important this is going to be, but still a part of a broader master plan.

I know that the last time we spoke, I brought up questions around Workforce Development and Affordable Housing, considering that the jobs that are generally supporting this work, are typically jobs that are getting paid as much as the folks that are maybe on Beemok's radar. So, I just want to understand, how do you envision that working? Because what's important to us is that when we invest dollars, not only for the folks who have ownership stake, but also for the folks who are supporting it every day as employees, we want to make sure that they have a livable wage, and that they're able to live somewhere within commuting distance to this amenity. So, as it relates to a complete community, can you talk about how you all intend to ensure that that's going to occur?

Ms. Dodson said so, let me throw out a couple of comments to what you just said, and then I'll let Brendan and Ford chime in as well. I think you heard Brendan say before that they're looking at this as an inclusive community, and it's always been contemplated with a diversity of price points around the residential. So, that's part of the discussion since day one.

Around workforce and training, I just want to say quickly that from my lens, even separate from this project, we're starting to get to a point where we are a sports city, and you've heard Tom Murray say it before, one in nine employees is in the hospitality industry. So, I've been talking to Tom and to others about how do we solidify a really strong Workforce Development Program around the hospitality industry with our partners that are here, Central Piedmont, JCSU (Johnson C. Smith University), Johnson & Wales, and really build out something that connects to all of these opportunities as well. Instead of pulling students from other parts of the country in for a golf tournament or another tournament, let's build it here. So, we create those opportunities. So, that was just a side note. I don't know if you guys want to add anything.

Mr. Perry said the only thing I'd add is, listen, they'll be a diverse group of employees, as you suggested, in terms of the scope of responsibilities from people who are running the stadium down to our coaches. It's not dissimilar in Charleston, where we run a facility like this today. I would tell you; we compensate our people well. We don't lose people based on compensation. So, translating that to a living wage, I'm happy to have a followup conversation around that, but that's not a concern of mine. I know it's a concern of yours, but just in terms of what the opportunity will be.

Ms. Watlington said for sure, because I have to believe that the vendors that you all are renting out space to, are not your employees, and so I'm wondering how you approach those contracts, and what that ends up looking like for people who are employees, not of your organization, but of the vendors that you do business with. So, yes, I definitely want to follow up on that conversation.

Then, just the last thing I'll say, is really more for Tracy and for the group. More broadly, as we think about tourism and we think about how we continue to become a Thursday to Monday city, if you will, we do have a strong cohort of workers that are in the tourism industry. So, I'm really interested in how we can better support that group. I know, obviously, we live in North Carolina, it's a right-to-work state, but to the extent that we can engage that group as a whole, I think that would be valuable.

Councilmember Driggs said I just wanted to echo, without necessarily repeating, what Mr. Graham said. I think this is a really unique opportunity, and I'm very eager to see if we can make it work. I'm not committed yet, because we haven't seen a lot of the detail around it, and I think we all have questions. In my mind, there is a potential here for a very substantial return on investment to us, in terms of the jobs, the cash proceeds, and the benefits to the City. So, I do want to explore that.

Worth mentioning again to the public, that when we talk about public money, this is not your property tax or your sales tax, not limited to that. I would expect to see a substantial portion payable from hospitality taxes that people pay when they stay in hotels and go to restaurants, and not out of your pocket as a taxpayer. So, don't be confused by the concept of public money. Mr. Perry, we appreciate Beemok's interest in investing in Charlotte. Please convey, also to Ben, that we would welcome him as a member of our family here in Charlotte. Thank you.

Councilmember Mitchell said Tracy, just a couple of questions from the staff perspective, and then Mr. Perry, a couple of questions for you. I want to follow up what Councilmember Watlington, when she was talking about economic analysis. It seemed like we're comfortable between the \$60 and \$70 million from the City. So, is that a fact, or are we still saying that's the range. We won't go below \$60. We won't go higher than \$70 million?

Ms. Dodson said that's the range that I'm looking at right now. Again, it's based on our partners. It's also based on kind of further sharpening our pencils with the Beemok team, making sure that we can move the dollars to where they need to be based on how we're allowed to be able to use the dollars as well.

Mr. Mitchell said okay, and we have here a potential Council vote, May and June. Talk to me about how do you see a potential Council vote in June?

Ms. Dodson said so, we wanted to start here tonight to get your questions, get your comments, and then in talking to the Manager, you've only got two business meetings in June. Then, you have limited meetings in July, I'm looking at the Manager because I don't have the schedule memorized, limited meetings in July.

Mr. Mitchell said yes, one business meeting in July?

Mayor Lyles said I think it's one, yes.

Ms. Dodson said so I think where we are is, we take this one step at a time, but I think what you've also heard Ford say is, they're running two parallel paths right now, at a minimum. Stay in Cincinnati, what that looks like, relocate, with Charlotte being one of those opportunities. So, if they don't get some kind of indication coming soon that there's that support, they need to shift and focus on Cincinnati.

Mr. Mitchell said thank you, Tracy. Mr. Perry, just a couple of questions, and Tracy touched on, your schedule in Cincinnati runs through 2026 or 2024, having the Western tournament there?

Mr. Perry said we actually don't have an end date. We own the sanction. There are a variety of different termination dates, but there's no hard date for us. The 2026 target is a derivative of the fact that this tournament expands in size in 2025. Moving it somewhere and achieving that date is essentially impossible, but we don't want to go well beyond that date in terms of the expanded facilities that we need. So, if we stay in

Cincinnati, we need to start tomorrow to start building those facilities for 2025. If we're going to move, we need to start building that facility tomorrow.

Mr. Mitchell said are there any other cities besides Charlotte you're looking at?

Mr. Perry said we have talked to other cities, yes.

Mr. Mitchell said okay. Last, but not least, the 100 acres you need from the airport. What would be the reason you need an additional 100 acres from the airport?

Mr. Perry said it's for parking.

Mr. Mitchell said oh, it's strictly for parking?

Mr. Perry said yes.

Mr. Mitchell said okay.

Ms. Dodson said can I add one thing on the parking? In the conversations that I've been having with Haley and the team, when we have large events, not just tennis, but it happens with the PGA Tournament and the Presidents Cup, it can also happen with staging of large events like an RNC (Republican National Convention) or a DNC (Democratic National Convention), we struggle depending on what time of the year those events are held in finding adequate parking places. So, the opportunity I'm looking at, is not just parking to serve the tennis opportunity, but also think more holistically about other needs that we have across other sporting events or large tourism events as well.

Councilmember Molina said I don't want to repeat any points. I guess I would be remiss if I didn't take this opportunity to mention the elephant in the room. District 5 here means East Charlotte, and East Charlotte, for all intents and purposes for the people who live on that side of town, the sentiment that I constantly capture is that they feel left behind. If you've lived in Charlotte long enough, you know that that's true. It's very true.

I'm a member of the Economic Development Committee. I'm a Master of Science and Business. So, the business case for this makes absolutely perfect sense, as far as a driver for our amazing City, and so that point is not lost on me. I think what you find yourself caught in when you see some of the series of questioning, is trying to capture a definite answer around what we're going to do for the East Charlotte residents. That leaves me in a really precarious situation, where on the one hand my responsibility is to, one be a member of Economic Development, look at this from a lens of what brings the greatest return on our investment. Then, also, my primary responsibility is to make sure that East Charlotte residents are taken care of.

So, my feeling is, we're going to have to get really specific around some of these answers that are being asked by the constituency, so that we can move forward safely to this wonderful opportunity. Again, I want to be careful in saying that, I don't want to put you, Beemok, in the crossfire of something that's kind of simmering at home here, because you're outside of the scope of what this means. I understand that this is something that could not fit at East Charlotte. So, unfortunately, I wish you would've come a few years ago, because I'm telling you I probably would've been one of the residents sitting there like yeah, that's awesome, but unfortunately this is where we are.

So, I do believe we can walk and chew gum at the same time, but I want to make sure that I do my due diligence in making sure that we, again, answer those questions, because we have to. For ever how long I sit in this job, I would like to leave it knowing that East Charlotte feels restored in hope, that East Charlotte feels like a part of what is happening in the growth of our City. I remember before I got elected, because trust me, election was never on my mind at all. I helped other people get elected. I volunteered in numerous opportunities as a community member, but I remember feeling, as a resident, left out.

So, I don't even empathize with the community that I serve. I sympathize, because I know how it feels. So, again, my primary job is to make sure that we get questions answered. So, I don't know if we do that in this meeting, because I'm a big believer in etiquette. So, maybe it's something we do offline, but I feel like we've got to move in that path in that direction.

Ms. Dodson said and I'm happy to take it offline. The one thing I will say is, if you go back a year, we did have Eastland solved, and it changed. It doesn't change the fact that we are under construction, our commitment is still there, we are more than \$50 million committed to the site. So, I feel like somewhere that's gotten lost along the way. I definitely understand the sentiment of a community. They feel like they've waited a long time, and they have, but our commitment is we've got to get it right. So, I'm happy to have any conversations offline. Like I said, two separate teams, both are working hard independently on looking at this opportunity, as well as finding the right solve for Eastland.

Ms. Molina said okay, and I appreciate that answer, because again, as a member of Economic Development, I've heard it, but again it's harder to translate that specifically to the people that I serve. So, for the representative of Beemok, I want to make sure that I express to you that we are grateful that you're considering our City. We've got a great City overall. We've got areas of opportunity like anybody else, but we've got two planes to land. We can land them both, but we have to be transparent and open about what's happening in both lanes, is what I want to translate to you, as a representative of East Charlotte.

Councilmember Winston said thank you. Something Ms. Watlington and what Ms. Dodson said leads me to make a suggestion. Ms. Dodson is right that we are becoming a sports city, really an entertainment city. As somebody who has earned their living for the past 20 years, working in show business and the entertainment business in Charlotte, sometimes we forget people that we're close to, that not everybody really understands our industry. So, really, to answer Ms. Watlington's questions, the way workers benefit from this and how you can measure it, is by the ability to get more gigs. This is why I was against the Spectrum Center investment last year, because it wasn't clear. Nobody presented how that investment was going to bring more gigs to Charlotte.

In 2004, I started holding cables for the Charlotte Sting in the Colosseum off Tyvola. This was a kid from New York City. I found more opportunities here in show business, an easier pathway to show business, here in North Carolina in Charlotte, because of the way it was growing and the gigs were growing, and the ability to build those networks and start to work right now. Honestly, based on being a right-to-work state, I would not have had the same opportunities, in let's say, at Madison Square Garden. So, when you have something like this, this is very different than, for instance, the Spectrum Center deal. This is definitely bringing more gigs to a workforce that doesn't have to travel outside. These are thousands of jobs.

So, my suggestion would be that we put in Committee some type of dive into the entertainment business, show business, sports and entertainment business, because I don't think that this is something that we as a Council as a whole really understand. I don't think that this is really something, as a City, that we understand of how to explain to one another how this makes sense.

So, when we look at the way we invest in our economic incentive policies, we have rationale behind there, and I think we're lacking that right now, because if we did, I would imagine that the lens that we put our eyes through, this would make absolute sense. We would be able to explain, I think Ms. Mayfield could attest to this, how many different jobs and many different households will be supported in different ways, because this is creating brand new opportunities really across the economic spectrum from very low to very high, and you rarely get the opportunity to provide that.

So, I would, again, suggest that we put that in Economic Development. Obviously, we probably have to get this done before we complete that, but I think it will be well worth

our while because of the types of events that we're bringing here. I think, even if we invest in this the types of events, we should understand what we're getting ourselves into, because I don't think anybody in this room really understands what we're getting ourselves into with an event like this. The only other question I'll ask on behalf of Ms. Mayfield. The parking, where's the revenue stream going? Is that going to come back to us? Is that going to go back to Beemok? Is that going to go to the airport?

Ms. Dodson said we haven't gotten that far in the deal yet.

Mr. Winston said okay, alright, thank you. That's all.

Councilmember Anderson said thank you, Beemok, for the presentation and your consideration of the Queen City for this event and for this space. I too am an avid sports fan, and I think this would be a jewel in our crown if we can add tennis at this level to our sports portfolio, both professionally and from an amateur standpoint. So, very exciting to see this. Of course, we need to double click on the numbers and understand the sourcing funds, but from a hospitality tax perspective, it seems to make a lot sense, but we can get clarity as we move forward.

I do also agree with some of the comments that have been said about workforce planning. Ms. Dodson, you made a great comment about the talent that we have here in our Universities from Johnson & Wales, JCSU, over to UNCC (University of North Carolina at Charlotte). We are also growing as a culinary destination. So, being able to couple our great culinary students coming out of Johnson & Wales with this hospitality opportunity, from what you're putting forward, Beemok has 200-plus event days out of 365 days a year, is a very high performing space that will, of course, bring additional tax dollars and revenue to the area. So, I'm excited about learning more about this opportunity, but from a macro perspective, I do believe that it would fit very well within the City of Charlotte and would gain support, not only from the state, the region, but pulling international presence as well. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Ajmera, do you have a last comment before we go downstairs? We have got quite a crowd downstairs, and I think if we can get down there pretty orderly, and be able to move forward, we might be in better shape. We've got to respect those folks that've been waiting many, many minutes for us.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you, Madam Mayor. I will keep my remarks very brief. I just want to recognize Fran West here, I know who used to be with the City. Now that we have City staff on the other side, certainly Crescent, you've got one of our best.

* * * * *

The meeting recessed at 7:20 p.m. to move to the Meeting Chamber for the regularly scheduled Business Meeting.

* * * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina reconvened for a Business Meeting on Monday, April 11, 2023, at 7:34 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Council members present were Dimple Ajmera, Danté Anderson, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Lawana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Marjorie Molina, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston II.

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said appreciate that you have been patient, and especially for those ones with the little people up there with them. I understand how difficult that can be to keep

them happy while you're waiting on a number of people, but we really appreciate it. We have had a very long and productive agenda, and we're going to try to continue that.

So, I'm going to call our business meeting to order, and we begin our meeting with some assistance to help us solemnize our decision making. This is all about how we can work with each other and be civil and provide exceptional results for the residents of this community.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Johnson gave the Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by all.

* * * * *

AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

Mayor Lyles said tonight, we have several recognitions that we'd like to make.

ITEM NO. 6: MECKLENBURG DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE WEEK

Councilmember Bokhari read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, on May 19, 1775, Charlotte town's founder, Colonel Thomas Polk, called for a convention of the Mecklenburg County militia leaders to be held in Charlotte. Those 26 men, upon hearing of the battles of Lexington and Concord unanimously adopted resolutions to declare themselves a free and independent people in a document that came to be known as the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence or Meck Dec, and on May 20, 1775, Colonel Polk read the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence to the assembled citizens at the County Courthouse.

WHEREAS, on May 31, 1775, members of the Mecklenburg Committee of Safety adopted 20 additional resolutions, which came to be known as the Mecklenburg Resolves, and

WHEREAS, a local tavern owner, named Captain James Jack, was called upon to deliver the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence and Mecklenburg Resolves to the North Carolina's delegates at the second Continental Congress in Philadelphia, and

WHEREAS, Captain Jack delivered the Meck Dec telling the delegates, "Gentleman, you may debate here about reconciliation and memorialize your king, but bear in mind, Mecklenburg owes no allegiance to, and is separated from, the Crown of Great Britain forever," and

WHEREAS, the state of North Carolina has chosen to recognize the significance of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence by placing the date of its signing, May 20, 1775, upon our state flag and great seal, and

WHEREAS, this May 20, 2023, is the 248th anniversary of the Mecklenburg Declaration.

NOW, THEREFORE, WE, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, and George Dunlap, Chair of the Mecklenburg Board of County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim May 20 through 24, 2023, as

"MECKLENBURG DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE WEEK"

For the recognition and taking of this amazing proclamation, we have former City Councilman from District 7, Warren Cooksey, and two renowned authors on the Meck Dec here locally, Scott Syfert, "The First American Declaration of Independence" is what

he authored, and new author, David Flemming, whose books are now out there and they're amazing. This titled, "Who's Your Founding Father?" Ladies and Gentlemen, the proclamation.

ITEM NO. 6: INTERNAL AUDIT AWARENESS MONTH

Victoria Watlington read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, the City of Charlotte is committed to providing its citizens with the highest quality of services; and

WHEREAS, internal auditors support good organizational governance and oversight, which reinforces trust and builds credibility among the institution stakeholders, including the public; and

WHEREAS, internal auditors play a vital role in helping organizations respond to emerging challenges and opportunities, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, infrastructure projects, environmental, social and governance initiatives, and cyber security risks; and

WHEREAS, the institute of internal auditors has designated the month of May as Internal Audit Awareness Month to promote greater awareness of the value and importance of the internal audit profession.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim May 2023 as

“INTERNAL AUDIT AWARENESS MONTH”

In Charlotte and commend its observance to all citizens.

ITEM NO. 8: MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

Councilmember Johnson read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, there is a proven connection between good mental health and overall personal health; and

WHEREAS, people with mental health conditions recover if given the necessary services and support in their communities. Greater public awareness about mental health can change negative attitudes and behavior toward people with mental health conditions; and

WHEREAS, stigma, shame and fear of discrimination keep many who would benefit from mental health services from seeking help. Mental health doesn't discriminate no matter the background, education, age, race, gender, or finances; and

WHEREAS, good mental health is critical to the well-being of our families, communities, schools and business.

NOW, THEREFORE, WE, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, and Geoge Dunlap, Chair of the Mecklenburg County Board of County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim May 2023 as

“MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH”

In Charlotte and Mecklenburg County and commend its observances to all citizens.

Mayor Lyles said usually Ms. Fonda Bryant would come down and accept this proclamation. I just want to note that she did an excellent job, yesterday I believe, on WSOC TV, talking about this issue and how important is, especially after this pandemic.

So, while we regret that she's not here today, we understand the hard work that she continues to do in this area.

* * * * *

PUBLIC FORUM

Police Oversight

Tim Emery, 11818 Royal Castle Court said good evening. Have you heard the one about the city government that continues to give hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars, a couple of dozen million more each year, to a government agency that resists any efforts of transparency or accountability, all while being inefficient, not keeping us safe, and harming the most marginalized in the community? Unfortunately, so have I.

Since the Council, Manager and Mayor seem unwilling to rein in the bloated CMPD (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department) budget, I come to offer three simple things that can be done to make Charlotte a safer, better, and more equitable city. Number one, demand accountability for the racial disparities in policing by CMPD. According to NC Copwatch, despite Charlotte having a black population of under 35 percent, over 55 percent of motorists pulled over by CMPD last year were black.

According to policescorecard.org, black people are over six times more likely than white people to be arrested for low-level nonviolent offenses by CMPD. This is racist policing in action. Hold hearings, bring in experts, asks tough questions, and most importantly, demand that these disparities disappear, demand that CMPD disband the racist crime reduction unit, a spitting image of the Scorpion Unit in Memphis, that murdered Tyre Nichols and was subsequently disbanded.

Number two, CMPD has no policy on its officers having membership in, wearing tattoos or social media posting of white supremacist organizations. There are explicit white supremacists in CMPD. Despite the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) issuing warnings as far back as 2006 of white supremacist involvement in local policing, CMPD has no policy, nor do they make any effort to monitor their officers, be it Three Percenter tattoos, or decals on cars, membership in Oath Keepers or Proud Boys, are posting white supremacist propaganda on social media and message boards, the City needs to do its part to irradiate explicit white supremacist in CMPD. They haven't even told us how many of their officers went to D.C. for the January 6, 2021, coup attempt. Demand they create a policy to begin identifying and terminating offending officers.

Number three, CMPD pays out significant settlements each and every year when they brutalize, violate the rights of, and sometimes even kill, citizens of our community. However, they come back to the City to write the checks, and nothing ever changes with the patterns of brutality and policies of the department. Going forward, make them pay for their settlements out of their own bloated budget, or in the alternative, deduct it from their budget in the next fiscal year. Thank you for hearing me.

Mayor Lyles said Henry Rozell. Daniel Redford. David Lynn.

Councilmember Bokhari said Madam Mayor, some of those that you just called, they were here, they had to leave. They were with the police department to thank the Council for all the hard work that we've done in the budget cycle. They couldn't stay any longer, but just wanted to let you know.

Mayor Lyles said thank you, Mr. Bokhari.

Attracting Global Talent to Charlotte through Education

David Lynn, 3940 Broken Saddle Lane said thank you. Good evening, Madam Mayor, members of City Council, City Manager Jones, and all who are present. My name is David Lynn and I'm proud to speak this evening on behalf of the Charlotte International

Cabinet. Two weeks ago, I had the opportunity to graduate from UNC (University of North Carolina) Charlotte, alongside Councilmember, Doctor Victoria Watlington, congratulations, and over 1,000 fellow graduate students, of whom over 20 percent were international, having selected our Country, our State, our city to advance their education.

The City of Charlotte benefits from the efforts of public and private K12 schools, colleges and universities that attract global talent. Aligning with our charges, the Charlotte International Cabinet utilized its April meeting to host a community dialogue themed, Attracting Global Talent to Charlotte Through Education. The results were five recommendations for the City of Charlotte that were unanimously approved by Cabinet last week. These include the creation of a central hub of information linking international students of all backgrounds with essential community resources, including government services and insight on ways to engage.

Two, communicating these resources through multilingual publicity, on CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System), at the airport, public libraries, and other strategic locations. Third, celebrate the integral contributions of international students by highlighting their research, intellectual pursuits, and community contributions, including the success stories of those who have graduated, remained in our community, and have helped to further advance Charlotte's thriving workforce.

In the audience, two rows behind me, is Emmanuel Omari. Two years ago, Omari arrived in Charlotte from Accra, Ghana as a rising high school senior. Last year, he earned a Presidential scholarship to Queens University of Charlotte, where earlier this month, he was recognized as Rising Royal of the Year. With many talented international students in Charlotte, like Omari, we also recommend fostering opportunities for Cross Collegian and Cross School partnerships, linking international students with globally-minded peers and community allies.

Finally, we recommend ensuring that the City's budget further addresses funding the target support for the integration and success of these students. Thank you for your time, consideration, and action in pursuing these recommendations. Please reach out to the Charlotte International Cabinet to let us know how we can be of support. We will continue our partnership in promoting the City's International Business Strategy, championing sustainable development goals, and fueling the success of our City's language access policy. Let us ensure that our Queen City continues to build on its global reputation as a thriving community striving to welcome the brightest minds.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much.

General

Jennifer Vollmer, 1515 Noel Place said we decided I need to come regularly, so ya'll get used to seeing me. I'm Jennifer Vollmer. I'm with the Black People's Community Justice Center, and I'm here to talk about the noise ordinances that we have in place. I have some questions. I've been trying to figure this out, and the reason is, I was arrested at Myers Park United Methodist Church, for disrupting their service to talk to them about their participation in court support. I went out Sunday, again, with my megaphone, because I was arrested and banned from the property to the applause of 200 white Christians, eruption of applause. The police told me there's an ordinance specifically protecting places of worship, and I'm trying my best to figure out why that would be.

I understand if there's an empty lot next to the church and somebody wants to play the band, that could be a problem. Myer Park United Methodist owns both sides of the road, so you can't be on the sidewalk, you can't be in the median, you can't be anywhere around there protesting. I would understand if it was, I don't know what I would understand. Besides the band next door, there's no good reason for it, except to protect child predators. That's what we have. I know there's protests being organized against

the catholic church, 14 priests arrested or being charged or involved in child molestation, and I know there's protests being organized against the Jehovah's Witnesses, who have hundreds of child molesters being accused. There needs to be an exception for protests.

The second part of what I want to talk about is, Malcolm Graham, you are my representative, and I can't get a hold of you. I don't see you out there in the streets. I don't see your town hall meetings. I don't see you anywhere. I don't know what you're doing for black people in our District to keep them free. I don't know. I can't figure it out. I've been asking for a pop up for black sex workers in our neighborhood. We need a pop up. We need supply. We need condoms. We need Plan Bs. We need all the stuff. I've been reaching out to you, and I can't get a hold of you. I can't get a response and I'm not going to email you all the time. Like, a number needs to be out there. You need to be accessible. You know what Angela Davis says, is if we make everything accessible to black trans women who are sex workers, everybody else will be able to get there too.

That's not the goal in your District. Basketball courts are great six years, ten years from now. Right now, we have people. Have you been down Wilkinson Boulevard? Right now, we have people sleeping in tents all over our neighborhood. We have sex workers that are unsafe, that are doing unsafe sex work. Where are you? I'm so happy that we have a Council that is mostly black faces now, and I don't like to go in on black representatives, because I know it's different.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Vollmer, thank you. Thank you very much for those of you that have spoken, and we appreciate that you've taken the time to be here.

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM NO. 10: PUBLIC HEARING AND DECISION ON GALLOWAY RIDGE AREA VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Bokhari, and carried unanimously to (A) close the public hearing, and (B) adopt an annexation ordinance with an effective date of May 22, 2023, to extend the corporate limits to include this property and assign it to the nearby City Council District 2.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 66, Page (s) 72-78.

ITEM NO. 11: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE A PORTION OF CLEVELAND AVENUE

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to (A) Close the public hearing, and (B) Adopt a resolution and close a portion of Cleveland Avenue.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 54, Page (s) 35-38.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 12: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Mayor Lyles said we have had a lot of policy discussions earlier today. Mr. Jones, I just wanted to make sure. Are we going to try to address the NOAH today?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said yes, Mayor. So, what I'd like to do is have Shawn, who would have made this presentation in 267, talk a bit about the NOAH investment opportunity. In a perfect world, we would have had an opportunity to talk about the ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) housing recommendation that Shawn made to you earlier for our grassroots nonprofits, as well as the ARPA Community Resilience funding opportunity, \$6.5 million for the housing, \$2.5 million for the Resilience, and we were going to put them all together. So, I'm just saying this for the folks in the audience tonight. You're getting part three of a three-part presentation, but because the NOAH is something that would be before you next month, I need to have this conversation tonight.

Shawn Heath, Housing and Neighborhood Services said thank you Manager Jones. Tonight, we're going to discuss a Naturally Occurable Affordable Housing opportunity in District 1. It's a development by the name of Charlotte Woods, which was constructed in the early 1970s, 266 units, 1 and 2 bedrooms. In 2019, City Council established guidelines for investments in Naturally Occurable Affordable Housing, and those guidelines are helpful for us at the Staff level and they're helpful for the development community, because they provide a good indication of the value proposition that City Council is interested in.

So, as we're pulling up the slides here, I'd cherry pick a few items from the guidelines of particular relevance. One is that the NOAH opportunities are expected to be in a location at risk of conversion to higher rents and the threat of displacement of low-and moderate-income residents. So, that's really at the core of any public investment in Naturally Occurable Affordable Housing. You're only getting a return on that investment if you're putting deed restrictions in place and you're controlling rents over a period of time, in which those rents would otherwise be rising to levels that we not affordable to residents.

A few of the minimum requirements established in the guidelines from 2019. One is affordability period of least 15 years, another is funding must be prioritized for 60 percent AMI (Area Median Income) and below households, and at least 10 percent of the units must be set aside for 30 percent AMI households. All of those attributes are what I would refer to as the minimum requirements established by Council. Staff is always anxious for opportunities that surpass and exceed these goals, and the opportunity that we'll discuss tonight does just that. There also are direct references in the City guidelines related to the cost per unit of up to \$35,000 for NOAH opportunities with a leverage ratio of at least 1:3. So, for every dollar that the City puts in, there's an expectation that other funders are putting in at least \$3 to match.

Since you've established the guidelines in 2019, the City of Charlotte has been very active with NOAHs. You can see here in aggregate about \$28 million of support primarily from the Housing Trust Fund. The Peppertree opportunity last year was funded with ARPA, and you can see a leverage ratio of about 1:6 for those 8 deals that have been closed. In terms of the number of households, over 1,300 units are under deed restriction as a result of these NOAH investments that were made by the City of Charlotte.

So, thousands of Charlotteans are benefiting from these investments, through either avoiding displacement and/or the access to the affordable units. In terms of layered programming, in addition to the units themselves, one of the things that we've had in place for a couple of years now, starting with Lake Mist as the pilot program, is the NOAH Rental Subsidy Program, which is putting new rental subsidies into the marketplace, and it's a City/County collaboration. So, I'll make direct reference to how that fits for this particular opportunity in a subsequent slide. Then, on the supportive

service model, this is something that I know a number of Council members have expressed an interest in seeing us do more of.

So, I think here, Ascent Housing and Atrium are showing great leadership as it relates to these particular housing impact fund opportunities with the focus on economic

mobility. To be very specific, with Lake Mist in particular, I've spent some time out there onsite, because if you'll recall, the first thing that Atrium does with the community health worker model, is they do a resident needs assessment. So, what are the specific supports that a particular community needs, beyond just the access to the affordable housing itself? Generally, you'll see access to affordable childcare, access to affordable transportation, and financial literacy as the types of things that bubble up to the top.

So, we're in conversation at Lake Mist, which is separate and distinct from this opportunity tonight, but it's part of the Ascent Housing portfolio. We're in conversation with them in terms of how to have some of our CATS resources come out to the community and talk about access to affordable transportation. We're in conversation with Childcare Resources, which is a local nonprofit that's focused on access to affordable childcare, for some tools that they can provide to the residents at Lake Mist. Another reason why we're interested in this model is because LendingTree has also shown an interest in working in communities like Lake Mist to put some on-the-ground programming in place to help the residents there.

In terms of public/private partnership, this is a key aspect for these opportunities. The Housing Impact Fund is separate and distinct from the Housing Trust Fund. The Housing Trust Fund, of course, are City dollars. The Housing Impact Fund is the Social Impact Equity Fund that was established here in Charlotte a few years ago. So, keep in mind, the Housing Impact Fund has already programmed in excess of \$50 million in the Charlotte marketplace, in support of Naturally Occurable Affordable Housing projects that the City of Charlotte is invested in. Not only that, but just last week, the Housing Impact Fund closed on their second round of fundraising for in excess of \$60 million to put into Naturally Occurable Affordable Housing in the City of Charlotte. That is a demonstration of the private sector commitment, the philanthropic sector commitment to Naturally Occurable Affordable Housing in Charlotte.

Key investors included in the round two fundraising, include Truist, PNC, Atrium, Honeywell, and The Leon Levine Foundation. Last, I would mention, in terms of co-investments with Mecklenburg County, Peppertree was the first example where Mecklenburg County co-invested in the acquisition and renovation cost of the project, in addition to some things they've done with us the last few deals associated with the NOAH Rental Subsidy Program. So, with the Peppertree project last year, that was \$8 million in City funds and \$4 million in Mecklenburg County funds. You'll see the same representation here once we get to the sources of funds information.

Just to give you more of a line of sight into the specific opportunity with Charlotte Woods, you can see Ascent Housing and Housing Impact Fund are the developers, located in District 1 at Woodlawn and Scaleybark, 266 units as I had mentioned. In terms of current market rents for this location, this was in the mid-April timeframe, you can see for one bedroom roughly \$1,200 to \$1,300, two bedrooms were roughly \$1,500 to \$1,550. So, when you think about going forward, if the City of Charlotte were to choose to invest in this and establish the deed restriction for a 20-year period of time, one key aspect of the value proposition is the rents that would be restricted during that time period.

So, you can see all the way from on the low end, if you're thinking about, for example, a 20 to 30 percent AMI household in bedroom, a tenant contribution for that household would be about \$360. Then, on the "high end," for a two-bedroom household that's at the 80 percent AMI level, there you're talking about \$1,200. So, very attractive proposed rents relative to what's in place today, and certainly relative to where the market is heading in the years ahead.

With Ascent Housing, we have historically seen a very attractive AMI mix, and that's the case for this particular opportunity. At the bottom of the slide, you can see that 80 units of the 266 would be devoted to 30 percent AMI, and that represents 30 percent of the overall number of units, which far exceeds the guidelines in place, which call for 10 percent to be devoted to 30 percent AMI, 50 percent of the units would be devoted to households in the 31 to 60 percent AMI level, and then 20 percent of the units for the 61 to 80 percent level.

Location is, of course, incredibly important for NOAH opportunities, and this is a wonderful location. As I've shared before, the sorts of things that we're interested in would be access to jobs, access to services and amenities and good public schools, and Charlotte Woods checks the box in all of those things. You can see here on the map, that it's located in the Collingwood neighborhood, not too far from the Park Road Shopping Center.

The total cost of the project is around \$44 million. It's primarily the acquisition cost along with about \$6 million in renovations, and you can see the table here that outlines the sources of funds. So, going from top to bottom, the conventional mortgage at \$18 million, the Housing Impact Fund, which I mentioned before, is private sector and philanthropic dollars, puts in the social impact equity at about \$14 million, the proposal here and the Staff recommendation at the \$8 million level, Mecklenburg County at \$4 million.

So, this would be the first investment of round two of the Housing Impact Fund. Unlike everything we talked about earlier, which was ARPA related, this would be a Housing Trust Fund investment of \$8 million. So, in November of 2022, voters, of course, approved the Housing Bond, which replenished the Housing Trust Fund to the tune of \$50 million. With the projects that were approved by Council last month on April 24, 2023, the current balance for the Housing Trust Fund is approximately \$30 million. So, there's \$30 million available to support this \$8 million request. You can see some of the metrics here in the small table in the bottom right. This equates to a cost per unit of about \$30,000, which is well within the guidelines in terms of being under \$35,000 per door, and a leverage ratio of 1:5.

So, as I mentioned before, Lake Mist was really Council's opportunity to explore what was then a pilot program with a NOAH rental subsidy, and then in 2021 Council approved it as a full program. So, I believe we have five of these in place already. So, this would not be new. This would just be an extension of the sort of thing we've done before.

Just to kind of step back for a second on 30 percent AMI households. I think the City of Charlotte has demonstrated a real commitment to 30 percent AMI households. Number one, you have a number of policy provisions that require 30 percent units be placed in City supported developments, whether it's new multi-family construction where you require at least 20 percent of the units, or whether it's Naturally Occurable Affordable Housing where you're requiring at least 10 percent of the units, and as I said, this proposal far exceeds that. A lot of jurisdictions don't have those types of policies in place. So, many units have been brought into this community because of those types of policy decisions.

Last year, you passed the Source of Income Policy Protection, in support of City-supported housing to help ensure that individuals with vouchers that are seeking housing in City-supported developments are treated fairly. We've talked in Committee about the Home For All initiative. Among other things, one of the areas of emphasis there is, how do you grow the number of landlords, and like the portfolio of landlords that are willing to accept voucher holders through incentives and things like that? So, I think that's something we will hear more of as we go through the year. Then, this particular program I think is important, because here once again, because of this program, it's introducing vouchers into the marketplace, and we know this is a challenging market for 30 percent AMI households. There's a long wait list for rental subsidies.

So, fundamentally, the way this works is, half of the units that are devoted to the 30 percent AMI household, are eligible to participate in this program. So, for this development, 80 units were at 30 percent AMI. So, that means, you can see in this table on the bottom right, that up to 40 units could participate in this program. It's devoted to

30 percent AMI households and below. As has been the case in all of these, there's always a direct reference to the City property tax associated with this site. The City property tax is not waived, there's not a tax reimbursement, but we establish a ceiling on the amount of the rental subsidy based on the annual City portion of the property tax associated with the site. That's how we ensure we live within our means during the 20-year period when these rental subsidies are in place.

So, as we've talked about recently, with really any form of rental subsidy, you're going to have the tenant contribution, which here is based on the household's ability to pay, to ensure they avoid being cost burdened. Then, with this collaborative model, you have the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County, both providing a portion of the rental subsidy. So, we work with Housing Collaborative as the third-party to administer to the program. Once again, it's a feature that we think makes these particular opportunities really distinctive relative to really what you find anywhere across the county. In terms of the financial impact, the City property tax for this location in 2022 was \$112,000. As I said before, this is a rental subsidy that would be put in place for 20 years. It's kind of like a project-based subsidy. It would not follow the household if they left the community.

In the interest of transparency, we also wanted to show what a present value would look like if you grow that subsidy over time based on reasonable assumptions associated with property tax growth, make some assumptions around utilization of the subsidy program itself, and then discount it back to present day. So, with all of that in mind, it would equate to a present value over the 20-year period of about \$1.8 million.

So, kind of wrapping up once again, 266 units would not be the largest NOAH in the City of Charlotte that you invested in, but it would be among the largest. Clearly, this is an area in Charlotte that's been experiencing substantial rent growth. This opportunity meets or beats, and in some cases, far surpasses the guidelines that were put in place in 2019. We love that this is a further demonstration of collaboration with Mecklenburg County in a very meaningful way. Then, this really checks the boxes on a number of city-related priorities, most of these which I've already spoken, but I'll jump down to the last two.

You'll recall with Ascent Housing, that this is a commitment they've made on previous deals as well, that for the renovation piece of the overall investment, that over 90 percent of that work will be minority led. Once again, with the supportive services aspect of it, this project will include the community health worker model onsite, where Atrium has an individual onsite multiple days per week. Ascent Housing, within the last few months, actually hired somebody to work on a full-time basis supporting Mark Ethridge, focused exclusively on economic mobility and supportive services, in order to not just provide the housing to these individuals, but look for opportunities to support them in other ways as well.

In terms of next steps, as the City Manager had mentioned, this would be on the business agenda for June 12, 2023, based on feedback and discussion this evening. The Board of County Commissioners is expected to consider this opportunity in early June. Typically, their cadence is, they'll have a discussion and a vote in the same night for an opportunity like this. Then, I wanted to close out on just a little bit of a pivot. Anytime we do a presentation like this, I think it can raise questions in the community, "Well, what about me? Where can I, if I'm a community partner that does this sort of work, have an opportunity to pursue City funds for these sorts of projects?"

So, one of the things we've talked extensively with the Housing Safety and Community about, over the last few months through the Housing Trust Fund tune-up process, is the idea of having a "rolling RFP (Request for Proposal)" for Naturally Occurable Affordable

Housing. What makes it rolling is, it opens, but it never really closes. So, it's open to the extent we have funds available to support compelling opportunities. So, for any community partners that are working on or dreaming of exciting Naturally Occurable Affordable Housing projects, we opened up the rolling RFP on Friday of last week, and as I said, there's no close date.

So, we'll be excited to hear from community partners. We know some of them have been asking questions about what's the most appropriate funding pathway for them to put good ideas in front of us. This is it, right here. So, we're excited that that launched on Friday. What we will do is, we will batch up opportunities as they come our way and we see things interesting that look worthy of funding, we will bring those into Council for conversation and a vote. So, that is the end of the prepared remarks. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Johnson said I just had a couple questions for Shawn about the programming. The Housing Impact Fund, you mentioned some private investors or partners. Are there any public dollars included in that fund?

Mr. Heath said no. Well, speaking for the City of Charlotte, the City of Charlotte has no investments in The Housing Impact Fund whatsoever.

Ms. Johnson said do you know the current numbers, the deficit of 30 percent AMI units in the County right now?

Mr. Heath said \$23,000, is the number I have floating around in my head, but something north of \$20,000, yes.

Ms. Johnson said okay. You mentioned the rolling RFP for developers that might want to develop NOAHs. Can you define NOAH?

Mr. Heath said yes, and it's interesting you asked that question, because I was looking for a definition the other night. There's not a universal definition necessarily of NOAH, but the one that we have in our guidelines from 2019, I think, is a pretty good one. I'm not seeing it off hand, I know it's buried in here, but fundamentally NOAHs in their simplest form are basically unsubsidized affordable rental housing. That's essentially the definition that you'll see at the local level. The Charlotte definition, the Mecklenburg County definition, the State of North Carolina nationally. So, unsubsidized existing rental housing at affordable levels, which is at risk of rising rents over time, which will make it unaffordable to current residents.

Ms. Johnson said, so do they have to be a certain age?

Mr. Heath said no.

Ms. Johnson said okay. What programs or incentives do we have for developers or landlords who might want to provide affordable housing, specifically 30 percent AMI, the lowest of low income, truly affordable housing? What incentives do we have for those landlords who may want to come to the City for help?

Mr. Heath said it really depends on the nature of the project. If you think about new multi-family construction, new single-family construction, Naturally Occurable Affordable Housing, and you go across the continuum of what are the different types of affordable housing that any marketplace is interested in. Between the rolling NOAH RFP, which we just rolled out, the conventional RFP that we do for the Housing Trust Fund, generally twice a year. Then, I believe in the very near future, the program that I mentioned earlier tonight, around the \$6.5 million of ARPA funds, where we're looking for creative ideas for local partners. Depending on the nature of the project, I'm confident that there are pathways for our partners to pursue. It really depends on the very specific nature of what they're proposing.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you, and I just want to clarify, the rolling RFP is for existing units, but there's no requirement that they be a certain age?

Mr. Heath said no. In the NOAH guidelines, we require that the units be 15 years or older, which is fairly common across the country. You'll see either 15 or 20 years as the norm.

Ms. Johnson said okay, alright, thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said Mr. Heath, I appreciate your leadership in really addressing affordable housing crisis through NOAHs. We have seen, over last five to six years, hedge funds acquiring these apartment buildings and renovating it, and then raising rents to 200 percent in certain instances. So, this will definitely help us keep people housed, and this will help us address affordable housing crisis, where we don't have to wait two, three, four years for apartment construction to be complete. This is absolutely a great model.

I recently read an email from Mark Ethridge that talked about how NOAHs can help address affordable housing crisis now, not two to three years from today, and some of the work they are doing around Social Impact Fund, and they've raised over \$65 million. How do you see our Housing Trust Fund dollars, with their private match, address some of our affordable housing crisis, especially NOAH? Do you think we have enough capacity, because of just a massive amount that they have raised?

Mr. Heath said right, and if you think back to the January Housing and Job Summit, where one Council member, I don't recall which one, asked Mark Etheridge that specific question and what he felt his pipeline looked like. I think the answer in the room was something to the effect of, that they could potentially put opportunities in front of the City that would equate to about half of the housing bond on an annual basis, so potentially \$12.5, \$20 million kind of range. On one hand, it's easy to think, well, "Gosh, we don't have the capacity to do that," but I think that's a good problem to have, and we're going to have that challenge, to be frank, over the next 12 months.

There will be many more opportunities, whether it be new construction, NOAH construction, homeownership, you run across the board. There will be more opportunities than there are funding available, which is yet, again, another reason why I really like the idea of having the RFP like the rolling RFP. It's the only way that staff can be in a perspective where, when we're standing here in front of you, that we're confident that we're putting the best project opportunities in front of you as if we're having them compete against each other.

Ms. Ajmera said absolutely. What they are doing is certainly massive. I mean \$65 million that they have raised for Social Impact Fund. I mean we're talking about more than 1,000 units that could help us address. So, applaud your leadership and what they are doing with NOAHs, and I look forward to seeing more NOAHs brought to us. Certainly, it helps us to tackle affordable housing crisis with sense of urgency. So, thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said thank you, Shawn, for the presentation. I've got a couple of things. I'm happy to see increased interest around NOAH opportunities. I'm particularly interested to see what we get, to your point, when it comes to competition. I know that the NOAH RFP has just gone out. As we look at some of our other Housing Trust Fund projects, we've seen affordability go out to 40 years and beyond. I understand that NOAHs are a different animal, but I really want to make sure that we continue to shift our focus toward long-term affordability. So, as we consider these NOAHs, I just want to balance that against what are the other opportunities to really, truly invest in mobility for our residents over time, because when I look at the average cost here, if we were to extrapolate that to the balance of our HTF (Housing Trust Fund), it's less than 2,000 units. Even if we talk about that \$20 million every two years, we're not going to build our way out of this.

So, I think what I would like to see us shift our focus to, in an increasing way, is how do we help people grow through, and part of that is homeownership. We know that. I'm very excited to see the wraparound services here, and I think that as we think about this project, it's got to not only consider the subsidy associated with the housing, but the value that that enables in terms of the mobility piece, because I think that's where the real investment is here for us, because as I look at this, I'm looking at \$8 million in up-front investment. There's going to be some level of voucher holders, and then we've got this additional subsidy that's got the NPV (Net Present Value) of \$1.8 million. That feels like a lot, for even this being one of the largest NOAH projects that has come before us.

So, I'm interested to continue the conversation with this. It certainly, in its lane, is extremely innovative, and so I do want to acknowledge that. I just want us to continue to broaden our focus of how do we deliver tools that are going to be meaningful for the long term and provide affordability in perpetuity?

So, that being said, I'm going to be very interested to see what comes out of this first few weeks of this NOAH, because I don't want to lean too far in on one project without seeing what competition can provide for us in that space. So, I'll be interested to see that. As we think about NOAHs, and I know you and I had this conversation earlier, certainly it appears that it's structured around the rental. So, I would like to see us have the conversation in terms of how does our policy support Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing as it relates to homeownership as well, and that is a piece that I think that we can add. So, please respond.

Mr. Heath said if I could just maybe pull a thread on the last one, because I'm looking forward to the upcoming committee meetings for a number of reasons. One of which, we're really going to start diving into the work around the anti-displacement strategy. The recommendations coming out of the NEST (Neighborhood Equity and Stabilization) Commission, Deputy Director Hefner, has been leading this work with the NEST Co-Chairs. I think we will see some recommendations emerge from that work that are very aligned with some of the points you're making. For example, the acquisition, rehab, and resell program that was established by Council a couple of years ago. It would be a great opportunity for us to flex that, scale that a bit, as a way to scoop up some affordable homes in the community and convert them into long-term affordable homeownership.

Ms. Watlington said thank you.

Councilmember Winston said when I met with staff and sent this, there are a few things that really popped out about this deal that make a lot of sense to me. It really is an outcome of years of policy work that this Council has had a high fidelity to, and it really does underscore the need for this body to be a deliberative body and work from these policy perspectives, and not simply look at the deal.

So, how is this our policy at work? When you look at our locational policy, where this place sits. I don't know if this is a function of redistricting, but I thought this was in District 6, but it is in District 1, but it's a short walk away from Park Road Shopping Center. It's a longer walk, maybe a bike ride, to the light rail, surrounded by many different bus lines. So, on top of the affordability of rent, you don't necessarily have to have the cost of owning a vehicle to have all your quality of life needs for folks that need to live here. That was something that we had to adjust our policy to look at many years ago, or to re-weight the way we score our affordable housing projects.

We look at this idea of a NOAH policy. Many years ago, we were presented with an idea that sounded like a very good idea, but we realized that we did not have a policy lens to deliberate this to, "How did it actually match the data? How do we align this to the priorities that we set year to year?" So, we and the County, I see County Commissioner Leake in the building. Good evening, Ms. Leake. We each went on our independent policy paths, so that we were able to, again, take a deal in front of us and deliberate and make a decision.

We continue to learn, as Mr. Heath said, it's the fifth deal or something like that. That these NOAHs can be a powerful tool to prevent displacement, but we certainly need to adjust how we're looking at NOAHs, because they're not a panacea of do good. You see that in terms of the adjustments that we're suggesting tonight, where you have the rolling RFP or the presentation that was made upstairs about how we might continue to look at housing more people, utilizing different partnerships for people that we find difficult to fit in existing policies to house.

Then, we look at the 30 percent goals. Many years ago, we saw a Housing Trust Fund and we saw that we were doing really good from the 60, 80 to 100, but we were having little impact, if any impact, at the 30 percent. So, when you see this deal, you're actually not just sustaining rents where there're at, this investment is lowering rents. These rents are going to be lower than they are right now with the status quo. So, when you look at that, you see just three different policies that we've been working on over time. So, that's how I'm getting behind this, why the numbers make sense to me, but even more important, why this fits the policy direction and the policy discussions and the policy work. Again, I begged us upstairs on a different subject. I would beg this Council to continue to operate on the level that we work best in, and that is high level, giving our Staff the right policy guidance so they can come back to us with the best plans to execute on our stated priorities. Thank you.

Councilmember Anderson said Shawn, you and I have spoken about this deal, and actually Mayor Pro Tem, just hit a lot of the really great points around this. I'd like to say just overarchingly that District 1 has a high concentration of NOAHs, and several of them sort of about Ms. Molina's District. I love the idea of what NOAHs bring to the table, and certainly a sense of great partner and thinking holistically from a 360 perspective, how to benefit communities that they invest in.

So, one of the most important points you hit on, Shawn, is really and truly this location. This is a fantastic location. It is 100 percent at high-risk of being converted to higher rent, and hello Commissioner Leake. If we were not partnering with the County to come up with a creative way to protect and invest in these 266 units, you could see rents doubling very easily in this location. So, that is great that we are protecting rents, and to Mayor Pro Tem's point, lowering them in such a great location. Again, the location, not only to everyday needs, but there are multiple schools right down the streets where our kids can actually walk to schools, Myers Park and Selwyn and Alexander Graham. So, it's right in the middle in the nucleus of so many grocery stores, so many amenities, walkability to school, and everything you need there.

I also really like how Ascent utilizes and leverages the community healthcare workers, and I just want to call them out on their innovation around that, because community healthcare workers are not purely just wraparound services. These guys are trained. They have certifications, they have to update their certifications, and they really serve a multifaceted role in the community. So, I love that, to Ms. Watlington's point, there will be community healthcare worker access here that will help with upward mobility and how to navigate systems to ensure that families are getting the best that they can. I also think the \$30K per door is a good metric well below what our threshold is, and the rolling RFP is a great way to instill competition in the marketplace year-round. So, we can ensure that it's not just fortuitous from a timing perspective, but you're actually inviting competition to truly bring the best deal forward.

Lastly, Shawn, I would just say, I love that you're introducing the net present value here, because we get some sense of the true value of money, and how it impacts on a go-forward basis. So, I'm definitely in support of this project. I think District 1 has always been in support of NOAHs, but this is a great location, and it has so many marks for it that underscore and support our policy, and that's such a critical point, that it supports the policy that Council has stood up. I'm looking forward to having conversations and moving forward with approval of this project.

Councilmember Mayfield said Mr. Heath, thank you for the information that you shared. We've talked for years regarding my colleague's comment, regarding how do

we get access to more homeownership, because that is where you build wealth and where you have opportunities. I want to get an idea. When we're talking about the rolling RFP, and I want to also acknowledge and thank you, as well as Mr. Wooten, because we've had some very different conversations with some developers in the community.

So, we've identified a few single-family developers that aren't mass developers, and where we've had real conversations is, in that challenge of funding is in that land. So, if that land costs a million plus, of course that cost is going to be transferred to the purchaser. What I do support with this project is the fact that you broke down the surrounding area and knowing that you had the average home values that were close to \$600,000 and potentially is going to grow, having accessible multi-family available is going to be a great opportunity.

I also want to make sure that we're not completely reliant on subsidy. If we're already putting government dollars in, whether those dollars are coming from the City, whether those dollars are coming from the County, and then you're adding a subsidy on top of that, that somewhat creates a challenge for me, because we also have a number of individuals who are on limited incomes. That their income may be \$1,000 a month, but they cannot find access to housing, and they don't even have an opportunity to get in the door, because we have an unwritten rule of relationship regarding our subsidies.

So, I also have a challenge when you think about no one should be paying more than 30 percent. So, whether you're in 30 percent and below, 60 to 80, up to 120, in a world where there was some type of equality, you shouldn't be paying more than 30 percent of your income towards rent, regardless. The challenge I have is, if we're not opening that space for those who have an income, but that income without subsidy, because that's a set up long-term when you're receiving these government dollars, you can only get access if you have these government dollars.

So, it will be helpful for me to get an idea in our language, as we're pushing this out and creating these opportunities. How do we create real opportunities for everyone to be able to at least have access that we're not necessarily seeing today? That would be helpful for when I'm going out, and having conversations with the community, of which you and I have had, again, lots of conversations for many years about this, so this isn't new. I want us to think about, it has to more than, with this subsidy, this is what you can get access to, because everyone doesn't have a subsidy, and everyone shouldn't have to be dependent on a subsidy in order to get access.

So, it would just be helpful to get an idea of, when we're talking about this large dollar amount, \$8 million is a lot. We're going to hit some goals here that we're not going to hit in other areas, but what are the other opportunities when we're talking about bringing a smaller, and Mr. Manager, I had a chance to have you pop in just to say hello to a developer that's built 10 to 20, 30 single-family homes, and can build them and get them. Yes, you really can't build a house in a hundred days or less as a quality home that doesn't have as many of the obstacles, especially if we are talking about our land, or land that we have access to or through our land trust, that can help reduce those costs on the front end. Do you see opportunities in there, Mr. Heath?

Mr. Heath said yes. If I could just make one point. If you think about our overall portfolio of projects that we support, and this question actually just came up a couple weeks ago, a lot of the LIHTC (Low Income Housing Tax Credit) deals that we support. So, I reached out to the developers just to get a better sense for, "How do you really manage these 30 percent AMI units?" I may have mentioned in a previous meeting that the feedback I got was that when an income eligible household shows up with these LIHTC deals that they may or may not have a voucher. If they don't have a voucher, then their rent is just the tenant contribution. If they do have a voucher, it's the tenant contribution plus the Section 8 voucher layered on top of that.

I feel comfortable that when you look across our whole portfolio for the City of Charlotte, that we are being responsive to households that do have vouchers, because we know how many voucher holders will say their waiting for the callbacks, or the phones aren't answered. I'm comfortable that when you look across our whole portfolio, that we are working to provide opportunities to the people that don't have vouchers as well.

Ms. Mayfield said and I know that we cannot do it legally. Yet, according to our legal team in language of mandate, but I think there is value in looking at residents who have been here three years or more, who have been on wait lists for a number of years, to be able to have some type of access if they can't have priorities, since we can't use certain words, have access to these developments when you have a NOAH that's 90 percent at capacity. Okay, so for that 10 percent, how do we get those individuals in quicker? Even though it is happening on some level, I also want to make sure that we're not setting it up where one partner has a leg up over all the others that may be coming to the table, so we can be as diverse as possible, so that we don't look back after two decades and we have a created a conglomerate of multi-family, where one partner has received access to all of that. That is something else that I want us to really think about long term in order to make sure that we do have an equitable city. Thank you.

Councilmember Driggs said I want to offer a slightly different perspective here. I appreciate the creativity and the private investments that are going into this structure. For that reason, given that we have committed money to the Housing Trust Fund, I think this is probably a good way to invest it. The concern I have here is that, if you look at the number of units compared to the need that we just talked about, the effect of what we're doing is that, for every person who actually receives this kind of assistance, there are probably 19 or 20 or more who are just as deserving and just as needy who don't. I think as a matter of honesty to the community as a whole, we need to be up front about our limits here and we need to be clear. We will continue to strive to ease the need and to identify the people for whom this is the most critical, but we're not going to buy our way out of this.

So, I just don't want us to create the impression that because of these efforts by us, and thanks to this novel structure. This translates into about \$50,000 a unit, and if you multiple that out times of the number of units we think it would take to accommodate all the people who have a need, it's a billion or a billion and a half. So, I hope we will continue to pursue policies, that we will leverage our resources everywhere we can. We do also just need to be up front. I don't want the day to come where we're sitting in this chamber, and a lot of people are out there going, "Where is my affordable housing? You keep talking about affordable housing, and I can't get any, why not?" So, maybe it's just a question of messaging, and again, I do appreciate the creativity that went into this transaction.

I just look forward to next year to our budget process. We talked about it already. We are incurring deficits in certain areas in the conduct of City business, and we are making these investments. In my mind, it's not an ideological thing. In my mind, I'm looking at the success we're able to achieve with these investments versus the cost we're incurring in terms of other things the City needs to be doing. I think next year, we're going to find ourselves with a tough decision about either reducing our social investment or increasing taxes or getting deeper into a hole on basic City obligations.

So, I don't want to spoil the party here, but guys, maybe I'm a numbers guy, but that doesn't mean they don't matter. I would like us, again, in our messaging and in our prioritization, to remember all the other things that we're responsible for. Thank you.

Councilmember Mitchell said Shawn and Council, I want to take us back. I think we had this conversation in January, and we all agree that we can't build our way to solve affordable housing, but our summit was called Jobs and Housing Summit. So, I think sometimes we forget about the upward mobility and creating skills part, so people can be able to afford their own based on their skill level. So, I do know the housing impact. The Board of Advisor has some very committed people to workforce development. So,

can you talk about, or have they shared, some of the results from some of their projects they have created workforce development components of their construction projects?

Mr. Heath said Councilmember Mitchell, I think I would have to take that as a homework assignment. That's not something I'm really prepared to speak to directly.

Mr. Mitchell said because I know they're passionate about changing the community, but they're also passionate about upward mobility and providing skills for the residents that they're building quality of housing for them. So, thank you. If you can just give a report back to us that would be great.

Mayor Lyles said I think that there's been a lot said about this, but I remember our first NOAH, and it was to prevent displacement. So, whatever we're doing to keep people in their housing is really important. The idea of how we do increase the ability for people to have homeownership or to pay their own way, is related completely to how we begin to work and collaborate on our workforce development programs.

We have a lot of opportunities to talk about affordable housing, but at some point, I do believe we have to figure out how to talk about building out the ability for people to live somewhere and get to work without spending money for a car. That we would actually take that income that's actually disposable, but not right now. It's essential to be able to have a bus system and a train system that works for everyone to get to work. Our investments do not necessarily have to be always in the housing part of it. If we would invest in our community college, I thank Commissioner Leake and all of the Commissioners for the support that they give to Central Piedmont Community College and all of its opportunities that it creates, but we have the issue around how do we get people to have the ability to support themselves, as Mr. Mitchell said.

So, I believe in our collaboration, to try to hold this down and hold it together, but we all have to begin to invest and what are we going to do in changing our methodology, so that people have the opportunity to make choices for where they want to live. So, thank you for all of the time that was spent on this project. We'll probably have to have some stop gaps like this for a while, \$22,000, \$25,000. I actually think that it's time for us to do a little bit of work around our demographics. We need to know how many people we have that are seniors that are not going to want to live in a home or have a homeownership. What are we doing?

I think there's some opportunities to get additional information, to fine tune where we are, and to have some precision around what we can accomplish. So, we can talk about that later, but I certainly hope that we continue to remember that people have to have a safe place to live, and that's very, very important in a community. It's what makes a community work. So, thank you everyone. I believe that that is the end of your report on housing at least. Do you have others?

Mr. Jones said Mayor, what I'd like to do is, and while there are other items I'd like to defer those. The one thing I would like to do is, on the 30-day memo, I think it's a great segway for the last four of you who spoke. The concept is, on the same day that you vote on the budget, that we have an update on where we are with the priorities from the Annual Strategy Meeting, as well as an update from the Jobs and Housing Summit. We've worked with Resilient Cities. They provided some feedback since those meetings, and we'd like to begin to share that with the Council, even to the point where we can start to look at scorecards and things of that nature. Mayor, I know there are a bunch of individuals who have some items on the agenda they'd like to speak to. So, I would like to get off the Manager's message.

Mayor Lyles said alright. So, thank you, Mr. Jones, for that, and thank you Mr. Heath.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE DISCUSSION ON INFILL REDEVELOPMENT WITH TRIPLEXES AND DUPLEXES

Mayor Lyles said this item is a discussion on the Unified Development Ordinance, specific to infill redevelopment. I think Ms. Craig has a presentation.

Alyson Craig, Planning, Design and Development said thank you. In the May 15, 2023 City Council Zoning meeting, Council requested that I come before you on the May 22, 2023 to provide a presentation and a discussion of information related to the implementation of the UDO, (Unified Development Ordinance) specific to infill development as related to triplexes and duplexes. So, what I want to talk about tonight are really in two parts. The first thing I want to cover is, why it's important to expand our housing supply by providing missing middle housing, and then I want to talk a little bit about how the UDO supports increasing our housing supply and development through the infrastructure requirements that are new in the UDO.

Before I move to the next slide, I want to call out, I have two words or phrases underlined here. I wanted to take a minute to define these, so that as we're having this conversation, we're using the same words and on the same page about what these concepts are. So, the first is missing middle housing. So, this is really the type of housing that's between a typical single-family home, as well as an apartment building. So, it's different types of housing options, like fourplexes and duplexes, cottage courts, townhomes. So, it's different types of housing, because not everyone wants to live in a single-family home or an apartment, and we need to have options for different places and ways in which we want to live.

I've been asked a few times over the last week about what is infill, particularly since it was brought up last Monday night? So, for the purposes of this conversation, I'm defining residential infill development as developing vacant, underutilized or redeveloping parcels that are within existing neighborhood areas that are already largely developed. So, Charlotte's future, we have talked about this a number of times that, over the next 20 years, we're expecting more than 400,000 new residents, 200,000 additional jobs, and we really need to take the time to modernize our policy and our regulatory tools to make development and planning more easily understood and to make it more predictable. Really, but even more so, it's not just planning for the people that are coming here tomorrow, it's also supporting the people that are here today and making sure the people that are here today can thrive tomorrow as well.

So, you mentioned the Housing and Job Summit a couple times this evening already, which is great, because I'm bringing back a slide from Dr. Chu's presentation. So, Dr. Chu from UNC Charlotte. One of the things he talked about was this price to income ratio, and how it's really an indicator of affordability in our area. So, if you look, third from the left is Charlotte. So, what he talked about in January before you all, is that Charlotte for the first time reached a price to income ratio of four, which is really a very strong signal that our affordability issues are going the wrong direction, and we need to do something.

He also talked about middle income affordability is becoming a significant challenge for our region, and that all in all, one of the most important things that we can do as a community, is to increase our housing supply. So, there's a nonprofit in D.C. that does housing research. Nationwide reached out to me recently, as they've been doing research about missing middle housing in Charlotte, and in all kinds of metro areas across the United States. So, I've got a couple slides here tonight, because the research that they've done is very recent. It's been done in the last few weeks to months.

So, there's a lot on this slide. I'll take a minute to walk you through it, and I'd like to start first at the bottom part of the graph. So, the far-left block really is talking about rents in two-to-four-unit buildings. So, we're talking about in our duplex, triplex, quadraplex type of structures. You move over to the 15-to-19-unit buildings, those are really your more like midsize apartment buildings, smaller scale. The 20-plus unit buildings, we're really starting to get into your typical apartment style project. Then, finally, the single-family homes, which we all understand what that is.

For each one of those housing types, there are four different bar graphs that talk about pricing per decade. So, for each of those sections, you look at it's from 1990 or earlier, 1990 to 1999, the 2000s, and then 2010s. The point I really wanted to make from this particular slide is, if you compare single-family homes to the two to four unit building blocks, you can see that the price increase over the decades has increased dramatically for both single-family homes, as well as for apartment buildings. Then, when you look at the two-to-four-unit buildings, so your plex units, you've really seen very little price increase, and they are generally are naturally more affordable than your apartment buildings and single-family homes types of development.

It's a little hard to read on the screen, but what I wanted to convey here is that, we have really built very little missing middle housing in the last few decades. So, I think we have, I think it's around it would be 4,000 units citywide, but over the last 20 years, we have really built only 400 or so plex units citywide. So, we have vastly underproduced in this particular housing type. Given all the importance of how they are affordable and the housing options that they provide, is something that we aim to do something about through the comprehensive plan and the UDO.

So, of course, we have our vision that we adopted in 2021, the Comprehensive Plan, and then recently adopted the UDO last August, which goes into effect on June 1, 2023. NEICE (National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise) worked together, from a vision and a regulatory standpoint, to really implement the City and the community's vision for what they want in their communities. So, what's in the 2040 plan? So, there is a policy, I think we're all quite aware of, that allows single-family, duplex and triplex housing units for single-family housing is allowed, and there are site development standards specified within the UDO, in terms of lot size, setbacks, etc., and other dimensional standards. So, that's in the policy in the comprehensive plan.

In the UDO, it states that duplexes and triplexes are allowed in all residential zoning districts, and that lot standards remain the same for single-family, duplexes and triplexes, except for height and driveway widths. So, I want to call your attention to a couple pictures on the slide. So, at the top, in West End and in Dilworth, these are duplexes that exist today in our communities, and particularly in our inner ring neighborhoods, you see a lot of these throughout our community that have been around for some time.

The bottom slide is something, a duplex that was recently constructed, and it's an example of what we're not allowing in the UDO. So, there's two pieces of that that relate to height and driveway width. So, to the left of the duplex structure, is a single-family home. That would not be allowed under the UDO because of the sidewall height requirements that limit heights so that the new structure is in character and scale of what is in the neighborhood today. We also have driveway width restrictions to ensure that we're maintaining treeline streets, treeline sidewalks, and not creating excessive and pervious surface in our communities.

So, also from the Housing Center, they have done some research projecting how many plex units or how many duplex or triplex units and quadraplexes could be built in the City of Charlotte. I'll mention this, we did some work similar to this a couple years ago with a consultant, EPS (Environmental Process Solutions) systems, and so this data is fairly comparable to what Matt found a couple years ago. So, the conversions that this data is showing is that, if you were to convert all of the properties that could be developed as a duplex that are economically feasible, over a 10 year-period, we would expect about 8,000 units. If we did just triplexes, it would be about 17,000 units.

So, the reality of the development pattern would be that you would have some mix of these, and so that number might be somewhere between 8,000 and 18,000, is the number duplex, triplex or quadraplex units that we would expect under the UDO requirements of today. As you can see, talking again about price and AMI and price to income ratio, as you add these additional units, that price element is reduced and becomes more affordable. So, I wanted to mention too that what these estimates do not

factor in are any limitations that are imposed by Homeowners Association or other restrictive covenants that do exist today.

I pulled a slide from some work that the City did in 2019 and 2020. So, this is directly from a presentation that you all received a few years back. Just to understand how prevalent Homeowners Associations were within our community, and what they estimated in 2019 was that anywhere from 50 to 67 percent of single-family lots are impacted by some type of Homeowners Association, and that of the ones that they pulled and, of course, you have to keep in mind that there are thousands and thousands of different restrictive covenants out there that have been put in place in different times over decades. Just the sampling that they pulled, they were estimated that many of them, almost all of them, have some type of prohibition for the different types of units, like duplexes and triplexes in those particular communities.

So, when we're talking about the number of units that we're expecting here, they are not a lot. Those are not a lot of units that I stated in the previous slide, and that they're even further limited by restrictive covenants that may be put in place for private associations. The last sort of map that I have too from this data source starts to put these in a map, and so you can see really a heat map. So, the darker the color is, the more net units you might expect, and these are really starting to put in a map where we might expect duplexes and triplexes to occur within our community. So, I think, having a map like this, even if it doesn't really reflect maybe some restrictive covenants that are in place, what it does is it provides an opportunity for us to connect the dots between work that's going on in other departments.

So, you're aware that Housing and Neighborhood Services are working on an anti-displacement strategy, and that's really responding to development pressure in general. It's not necessarily related to just duplexes and triplexes, but it presents an opportunity for us to add that sort of the toolbox and the inputs that we're using as we start to make recommendations in the anti-displacement strategy that we are working on. So, I want to spend a couple minutes just talking about, as we're talking about growth, as we're talking about the importance of housing supply, I want to make sure that Council and the community are aware of the infrastructure that's now going to be required in the UDO that we have not had before.

So, I think we're doing a lot in the mobility place. So, we hear a lot in the rezoning meetings, there's a 2,500-trip threshold for TIS (Traffic Impact Study). Why is that so high? We are reducing that in the post June 1, 2023, world and requiring a Traffic Impact Study for our projects with lower thresholds. We are also requiring a comprehensive transportation review, and this is for projects that are not just going through the rezoning process, this is also for projects by right. So, really trying to start to build that infrastructure through private development that occurs both by-right and through the rezoning process. This, of course, is focused on being multi-modal. This is not just about moving cars. It's about moving people.

There's other requirements too. We're eliminating an exemption for single building sites to not have to provide for streets, and also we have requirements in there for bus stops and bus stop amenities. We talk a lot about stormwater infrastructure, and I know there's been a number of articles in the news about subdivisions or individual lots that are experiencing some drainage challenges. We currently today review projects, commercial, multi-family and subdivisions for stormwater, and now come June 1, 2023, we will begin reviewing infill development, single lots, additions, modifications to structures, land disturbance, really trying to make sure that we're protecting our residents from any potential negative impacts to flooding and drainage.

Then, lastly, wanted to talk a little bit about trees and open space. So, we have not updated the payment in lieu fee that is capped at property tax value since about 2012. So, we have right-sized that to current property tax values of today. There's new increased onsite preservation area for subdivisions. We're protecting heritage trees on all types of sites. There's new street tree planning on private streets, as well as for residential infill. So, really getting at that, again, the treeline sidewalks, the treeline

streets, and we have exemptions today for Tree Save in our current ordinance. So, TOD (Transit Oriented Development), and in some cases, MUD (Mixed-Use Development) and UMUD (Uptown Mixed-Use District), do not have to provide that. So, those exemptions will go away June 1, 2023.

Then, with open space, open space has to be usable. It can be sort of a fragment of a site today, but now it has to be quality open space. Then, we also have a great partnership with Mecklenburg County really providing opportunities for private development to be able to contribute to building out our park and our greenway infrastructure. So, appreciate the partnership with Mecklenburg on that. With that, I'm happy to answer and entertain any questions.

Mayor Lyles said well, before we have questions, let's hear from our two speakers. Reverend Boyd.

Reverend Jordan Boyd said thank you, Mayor Lyles. The other speaker, Dr. Lewis, was not able to be here this evening. So, I'll be the only one speaking tonight.

Mayor Lyles said alright. It's good to see you.

Mr. Boyd said thank you, good to see you. Good to see you, City Manager, and to our representative, Renee Johnson. I stand here before you today as a member of the Lexington resident community, along with those who have come to stand with me. There's only a few of us tonight. We were a packed house on last Monday, because we didn't get, until late, that this was actually going to be on the agenda.

So, our reason for being here tonight is to bring your attention to the fact that, and I won't bring up the petition, it's already been mentioned on last Monday, that there's a development proposed next to our community. We've gotten into, and are starting to learn, about what you all very astute about tonight. One of the things that we want you to be aware of, is what the general public is not aware of, is that the UDO is going to take in effect a unified zoning ordinance by-right, which is I understand, not only citywide but nationwide from an R-3 to an N1-A, which means from three units per acre to seven and a half units per acre, three units per 10,000 square feet to seven and a half units for 10,000 square feet.

Now, I heard the Planning Director's presentation tonight, and what is missing is the quality of life and the accelerated displacement that is happening. Infrastructure is behind. Infrastructure in terms of the building, in terms of police, emergency, fire, in this push to gain housing. I heard from one Council member that this is the way to reduce the pricing of housing. While the proposal for our builder is on a 15-acre lot, 186 units at \$400,000 per unit for 1,800 square feet. June 1, 2023, they'll only be able to put in 116 units, and as they've said to us, "Either take this proposal or you'll get no concessions, no easements, no amenities, and all of the things that could come from this."

So, what we're saying is, is that we're asking the Council to revisit this proposal of N1-A, that will allow for additional housing in this way, because it will in effect change the character, even with the NCO (Neighborhood Conservation Overlay), it will change the character our existing neighborhoods, and accelerate displacement of folks whose property values are changing. Thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said so I've got a couple of things, and I do have a motion I'd like to propose, but I can wait until further discussion goes, because I think there's going to be a couple tonight. Reverend Boyd, thank you once again, for speaking on behalf of your residents, not only in your neighborhood, but across the community. What you are saying is absolutely correct as it relates to the impact that may be unseen.

As you know, there was a long and drawn-out dialogue over several years as it related to this UDO. So, I won't belabor those points or reopen that discussion here, but I will point out a few things, because as I look at the presentation, and thank you, Alyson, for bringing this forward. One of the things that we asked for during this whole discussion

with the 2040 plan, was more data. We wanted to understand if we're talking about, in this case, 400,000 residents coming to Charlotte, how many lots were really going to be impacted and how many units could we conceivably get? We have those numbers, at least, a preliminary set of them in this PowerPoint, and that were presented tonight. As was anticipated, it is abundantly clear to me, and probably those of you that are sitting here, that we cannot fit 400,000 people into even 18,000 units. So, we understand that this is not a strategy that's going to deliver what we hoped it would deliver.

When you hear what the price points are for these multi-family units or for these attached units, we're not talking about increasing affordability. We're still looking at \$400,000 homes for a smaller square foot. So, by and large, I would say if the intent is to increase affordability, we can see very clearly by the numbers that this is not the strategy for that. I would offer that a regional approach has got to be the only way we can address this. I think that ties into our transit and mobility, because we're not going to fit all these people in the city limits. So, what does that mean for what we are doing?

Well, if you go look at the maps, and if 18,000 is the number of units that we could potentially get without HOA (Homeowners Association), and you look at Slide 11 and you see that 67 percent of these lots are impacted by HOA, well what that tells us is that some people may not be affected, and there's going to be several people who are disproportionately affected. Unfortunately, those are the neighborhoods that are also already vulnerable to displacement.

So, what we're doing here is instituting a strategy we know is not going to work at the cost of those who are going to be the most vulnerable, and that was what we talked about last year, and unfortunately here we are. That said, I do believe that there are some things that we can try to do, and what I would like to do with the appropriate time, is introduce a motion.

Motion was made by Councilmember Watlington and seconded by Councilmember Mayfield to initiate our Neighborhood Character Overlay process on these neighborhoods that have already been identified by the City as vulnerable to displacement.

I think that that will at least begin a process to provide some protections for these neighborhoods that are vulnerable, who also happen to be neighborhoods that don't have HOAs. So, we can revisit that later on in the discussion, but again, thank you for your comments.

Councilmember Mitchell said first, let me say, Alyson and staff, thank you so much for this presentation. I think it was from our meeting last week that we made the motion to have Staff to make this presentation to us. So, there's a couple things that go through my mind. I think the first one, what is very clear is, we've got a lot of homework ahead of us as June 1, 2023, rollout, getting people very accountable with this UDO. I'd like to back Alyson, first time since I've been on Council, we're really talking about the infrastructure support that the UDO is going to create. I give Councilmember Johnson credit, I call her Ms. Infrastructure, because you remember back in December she was beating the drums, we need to have a conversation about the infrastructure.

Secondly, and I have to apologize to my colleagues, when I made the motion, I think I used the word infill, but as Alyson and My Chair corrected me on Saturday, Mr. Driggs, infill is about a small parcel within a community. I think when we heard last week, I think the bigger issues out there that are going to be facing our community, is when you have large parcels, almost the size of a new subdivision that can change the character of the community.

So, I would like to ask Council if we could, tailor made, but to look at how we can approach subdivisions and the impact the triplexes and duplexes will have as we roll out June 1, 2023. So, with the help of the City Attorney, and with the help of the Planning Department, Madam Mayor, I'd like to make a motion, if I can.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell and seconded by Councilmember Driggs to at the June Transportation, Planning and Development Committee meeting, ask staff to recommend alternative options, including a schedule for potential changes to the UDO for allowing duplexes and triplexes and larger projects developing by-right in residential subdivisions.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Craig.

Ms. Watlington said he's saying make changes to the UDO that allows [INAUDIBLE].

Councilmember Winston said we've got to get this thing in front of us to consider a motion like this.

Councilmember Johnson said two questions. Yes, the duplexes and triplexes on any single-family lot is something that we were opposed to, and we'd want to see that reviewed. Also, this issue is kind of bigger than the duplexes and triplexes, specifically what Lexington was presenting. Those weren't duplexes and triplexes. Those were what's going to be allowed by right in the UDO. So, what we'd also like to take a look at, is the proximity of any multi-family near or in a subdivision or abutting that subdivision. This policy change would not solve that issue that was presented on Monday.

So, it's the by-right, because like we said last week, the developer is proposing 186 units, and when he first presented it, it was on the Lexington approach. If you all know where Lexington is, these houses are over \$600,000 some of them, and they were proposing 186 rental multi-family right there. So, while there's some talk with the developer, prior to the UDO, they would have only been able to build 45 single-family units, but with the UDO and our by-right to policy, the developers basically said okay, and they show this comparison slide. If we don't get this approved, we're going to build 116 vinyl for rent units, and what our residents believe is that Council has "thrown them under the bus," because there's no protection for them by-right. So, if we're going to look at the UDO, these duplexes and triplexes, we also need to look at what's allowed by right in the N1-A areas or residential area period.

Ms. Craig said I just want to make a quick point of clarification. I may need Mr. Baker. We've closed the public hearing for that zoning petition, so it's not something that I think we are able to talk about this evening, correct?

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said yes. The more we talk and specify that public hearing that was already held, the potential is for whatever decision you make to be potentially challenged for having a second unadvertised public hearing.

Ms. Johnson said okay. So, this is not about any specific petition. It's about the policy and the by-right being allowed in subdivisions. So, when we talk about duplexes and triplexes, we need to say duplexes, triplexes and multi-family development. So, I would say, and multi-family development and larger projects. That would be a substitute motion. Did you already make the motion?

Councilmember Driggs said and seconded by Ed.

Ms. Johnson said okay. Can we make a substitute motion to include multi-family in that motion?

Mr. Baker said so, if I could recommend, if the maker and the second would take a friendly amendment, it'd be easier to do it that way than a whole substitute motion.

Mayor Lyles said we have to hear it. Could you read again what you're recommending.

Ms. Johnson said if we want to wait, so everyone can see it.

Mayor Lyles said well, that would be ideal. Yeah, that would be the best thing.

Ms. Craig said I just want to clarify, though, that in our N1-A areas, we only allow single-family, duplexes and triplexes. There's not multi-family in those areas that's allowed by right.

Ms. Johnson said okay. Then, I'll just remove that specificity. So, I'll say residential.

Mayor Lyles said so, it's back to the original motion from Mr. Mitchell?

Ms. Johnson said no. I don't want everybody to get confused. Let's just wait. So, what we'll do is, when we can see it, we'll add multi-family to the motion, because again, that doesn't address all of the residents' concerns, or all the citizens' concerns. It's not just duplexes and triplexes, and we can't pretend that it is.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Craig.

Ms. Craig said multi-family is not allowed in that particular place type or zoning district. So, we already don't allow it. It would only be able to come in through a rezoning, which Council would have purview over.

Councilmember Molina said point of clarification. I want to make sure that I'm clear in making sure that I understand, because now it seems like we're discussing a previous petition. We can't do that. So, was that an answer to a question about the previous petition?

Mayor Lyles said I think Ms. Craig was explaining the definition of multi-family as it is allowed or not allowed in the N-1, and I think that Ms. Craig is saying that that would be an inappropriate reference, because it's already not allowed. I think that there is a disagreement or I'm not sure.

Ms. Molina said I just want to make sure that I understand, and before we accept as a Council this substitute motion, I think we need to see and make sure we're clear on what we're actually voting for and on. I don't know if we're going to be able to do that before that actually takes place.

Mayor Lyles said well, we're not going to take any action until we get the wording from Mr. Mitchell, and if there is a substitute motion, a second wording would be allowed.

Ms. Watlington said point of order. Suggestion, because I see that they've put up a graphic related to my motion, I'm wondering if while we wait for that, is it possible to work on the other motion while we wait for them to get Mr. Mitchell's motion written? Just offering a suggestion to keep us moving.

Mayor Lyles said I think we probably ought to clear up one motion at a time, Ms. Watlington. It might take a little bit of time, but I think it's better.

Councilmember Mayfield said while we're waiting for that to come up, I want to say thank you for the way that you wrote this down based off of our conversation last week, with understanding, okay, what will the UDO approve versus what it wouldn't? So, the slide number nine, of showing where we have some current development that has happened that looks like this, this will say moving forward, this is what will not be allowed. When we're thinking about this conversation of duplex, triplex, we have a number of HOA communities. Some of those HOAs are more active than others, because during that time, you've also had a number of rentals that are in the communities. Some HOAs have 10 percent or less, some can't get to that because they don't have the participation. Does the UDO take into account that situation, now as we finally got the language to come up? Does it take into consideration if you have an HOA, but it's not necessarily an active HOA?

Ms. Craig said so, the HOAs, like any of those restrictive covenants, supersede any of our zoning regulations. I do want to point out too that Housing and Neighborhood Services has a lot of training materials about what is an HOA? Why is an HOA helpful?

Some other information about maybe organizing for one. So, there's a lot of stuff on their website about that particular topic.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright, the Council members now have before you on the screen a motion that was made by Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Mitchell, just confirming, this is your motion?

Mr. Mitchell said yes, and I apologize, in not meaning for this to stop the meeting. Yes, this is the motion.

Ms. Johnson said so, my concern is that we are addressing multi-families, as well as duplexes and triplexes. So, and maybe I'll ask you Alyson, what language would that require for multi-families to be considered, not just duplexes and triplexes specifically?

Ms. Craig said that's where they aren't allowed in any of our six N-1 zoning districts. They're already not allowed. So, in fact, there's not a lot of N-2, which does have multi-family in there. There's not a lot of that even really in our community, but those are things if, as we are making refinements to the policy map, we can make adjustments to where we're wanting our future vision for multi-family to be, and we can certainly also talk about that as we get into alignment rezoning. So, which zoning districts are aligned to within that particular place type, we can have that conversation, but multi-family is not allowed in N-1 period.

Ms. Johnson said so, I don't want to list a specific place type. I'm talking about the bottom line, the outcome. What do we need to say, because the concern from our residents is that multi-family developments are being developed in what used to be single-family zoning types?

Ms. Craig said so multi-family would, as we are developing and as we have a policy map that is guiding our growth, that helps inform what can be built there. So, if there needs to be a refinement of that, we are looking at that through the area planning process, as to where those would be located.

Ms. Johnson said so, I would like a motion to refine that. So, I know that you worked with Councilmember Mitchell for this one. This motion, according to the public, does not address the entire issue. So, I'm looking for, since we are revisiting the UDO, a change in language that addresses the residents' concerns, specifically, the residents that are here today, and Pastor Boyd just spoke.

Mayor Lyles said so, we have a motion on the floor now.

Councilmember Graham said I think it's important, before we get into voting for motions or seconds, the motions, that some of the discomfort you probably saw, rightly so, is the public hearing was closed last Monday night. So, we're mixing apples and oranges, which is really inappropriate for this Council to do, and I think we cleared that up. So, these comments aren't to talk about what happened last Monday, because I'm not going to do that, but to talk about the UDO itself, and the kind of level set for the public and Council. So, whatever we do that we spring forward and not go backwards.

We spent three years working on this comp plan. Three years. We did two of those years during the height of COVID-19. Two years' worth of work with developers, with neighborhood associations, trying our best to get public input, public feedback, to change a document that we had governed how our City developed and was growing for 40 years. We changed that document. Just recently, just this weekend, I read that Charlotte grew by some 17,000 residents last year. Our city is growing in leaps and bounds.

I do believe that, from an infrastructure perspective, someone who lives in the University City area, Mallard Grove, I drive those highways every day, 29, 49, Prosperity Church Road, Mallard Creek Church Road, going to Mallard Creek High School, and a number

of people I know and respect live in Lexington. So, I know that community extremely well. The grid system over there, the housing patterns over there, even Citywide I believe that, from an infrastructure perspective, we're good. We can be better for certain. We will never be able to fill the requirement, as we talked about earlier today, about 36,000 units of affordable housing that we need, but every day we work towards accomplishing that, and I'll get to my point in a minute.

We've adopted the 2040 plan, we adopted the UDO, and we all said, and I know I said it, the 600 pages of it, it's not a perfect document, in that we would have to educate the public, educate the Council. I think even staff had admitted that they too needed to go through an education process to ensure that we were all on the same page, knowing that there'll be some pain along the way, and that there'll be some learning curves along the way, and that there will be unintended consequences along the way, but we made a commitment to fix it when we identify it. So, I don't want to do anything that opens up a door that we've said we were going to walk through June 1, 2023.

Now, unintended consequences, yes. We'll fix things as well acknowledge them, as we get feedback from the public. I'll study the motions. I'm reading the motion, but I'm hearing the language around the dais. So, the language around the dais is different than some of the written motion. So, I just hope that we're not revisiting three years' worth of work, and confusing residents and neighborhood associations, the development community, the public, and the Council. I'm just being honest and acknowledging where we are as a community in reference to our growth.

I'm not talking about the petition last Monday. I'm talking about where we are through our planning process, and what steps we are willing to take, and I'm willing to step backwards. Councilmember Watlington, I heard exactly what you said. Your motion looks a little different than what we're seeing now. So, this is different. Again, sometimes it's hard. I know a lot of people in the audience that say, "Hey, this may not be the right course of action for the City as a whole." So, I'll rest and I'll wait to hear more of the discussion, but I just think it's really important that we kind of level set and we kind of make sure we're doing what we want to do for the City.

Mr. Driggs said so, Mr. Graham, I agree with you. Having seconded the motion, I agree with you. My take on this is that we passed, amidst controversy, a UDO. When we did that, that became the adopted policy of the Council. So, we're not here to relitigate any of what we discussed before. I'm not here as a former opponent of the plan. I'm on board. It's adopted. At the same time, the UDO was a massive high-level undertaking and we knew that we hadn't gotten to the bottom of all of the details, the possible contradictions and unintended consequences, and therefore, we have been describing this as a living document.

So, my intention, in seconding the motion, is that this is an occasion where we think about whether or not we've got something going on that we didn't really intend. Without alluding to any particular petition, I'm a little uneasy about some of the things that can happen that I don't believe we intended. So, we are not reversing anything. We're not backtracking. We're not undoing. We are simply going another step-in terms of making sure that the UDO accomplishes what we want. I will say that one of the toughest things, that in my mind was not resolved when we adopted it and that we're coming up against, is the inherent conflict between, for example, infrastructure development and density. So, we had a big emphasis on density when we adopted it under this sort of mantra of more housing means less expensive housing, and I'm not sure we finished the conversation we needed to have.

So, you've seen, for example, in our meetings that the subject of infrastructure comes up when we see some of these petitions, and wow, the traffic, and yet, the petitioners are telling us, "Well, it's your policy, that's what you said." So, my goal here is to make sure that what they interpret us to have said, is what we meant. So, big emphasis, we are not reopening the UDO. We are not backtracking or contradicting or reversing, but we have more work to do.

So, Mr. Mitchell, I'm with you to the extent that we should ask the staff, and I did discuss this with you and with our Planning Director, just to make sure that what you talked about is not happening, because I had the same concern. I do think that we have to have a willingness when we see situations where the thing is going in a direction that was not in the original document. Never mind what anybody else [INAUDIBLE]. Not relitigating it, but if something is happening that wasn't our intention, we have to give ourselves the latitude to take a look at that. Thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said I agree with some of the points that Mr. Driggs shared, that we have to be willing to look at what UDO is doing, and able to analyze and look at the data, so that we are not increasing congestion and traffic issues throughout the City, because every rezoning comes, I hear that there is more traffic and congestion, and it is a living and breathing document that we have. So, the intent of this UDO is to make changes as we see unintended consequences. However, with that, I don't know what will be the implications of this motion, what would be the changes, and I don't feel comfortable modifying policies from the dais. I don't think anyone should, where we don't know the implications, or we're trying to govern and legislate from here without understanding what that would entail.

So, I'm open to having text amendments like we had on Monday, where we actually take a closer look at data, where we analyze it, we have facts in front of us. Without any of that, I don't feel comfortable making a decision on the spot right now, because this is the first time I'm seeing the motion. So, that's the reason I will not be supporting it. However, we do need to look at the changes that our community members who are here, who have waited, I guess, almost four hours sitting here. Their concerns are valid, and we need to address them. We do not need to add to our infrastructure problems that we already have throughout the City. So, I would like to suggest that staff come back to us with text amendments as to what we can do to make the quality of life better for all our residents and address some valid concerns that we are seeing as part of the UDO. That's all I have. Thank you.

Mr. Winston said so, I would disagree with what Mr. Driggs said. This is clearly an attempt to relitigate the comp plan and the UDO from the dais. If you look at this motion, what this does is guide staff on a wild goose chase. This language is not specific. It says at the June Transportation, Planning and Development Committee, ask staff to recommend alternative options, including a schedule for potential changes to the UDO for allowing duplexes and triplexes and larger projects developing by right in residential subdivisions. It's ambiguous as to what that means.

Now, I assure you, if staff comes back with alterations to allow more, and a more dense, building in places, there will be high holy hell being yelled from this dais. This is an attempt to limit the place where you can build more and different types of housing. This is an attempt to try to reimplement exclusionary zoning to the UDO. It is an attempt to preserve the number one tool that, not just here in Charlotte but in North Carolina and all over this country, has been used to segregate communities, to make us one of the most segregated cities in the nation. Because you can go back, roll back the tape to this conversation when people on this dais who said, "Yeah, I want to use this tool for my liking, because I think I can use it better for communities that look like me." I do not want to use the tools of the oppressor. I want to use the equity lens. Look at the data, that again, some people who are making these motions, when they requested a Housing and Job Summit, that told us data, some of which is included in this presentation, that housing will never be affordable. People will continue to be displaced if you do not allow for more building to happen in more parts of your City.

It is a simple supply and demand issue. You reduce the supply of housing, and the demand increases, price increases. So, if demand continues to increase, you have to increase supply. You also heard it from the dais earlier tonight. There are \$600,000 homes. "We don't want those other types of homes that are a hundred something thousand and different types of people can live here and live next to me." That is not something that this Council, I think, should be entertaining. I'll say that this is what I've had conversations with my colleagues about. Yes, we want to preserve the nature of

our communities. Well, what does that mean? “Well, we don’t want duplexes and triplexes that don’t look like the homes that are in our neighborhoods.”

Well, do you know that there are other regulations in the UDO that make sure that if you build something in a neighborhood, it looks like those other things in the neighborhood. “So, you don’t want those people living in your neighborhood?” “Correct.” I don’t care if District 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7, the same thing happens everywhere. Everybody’s, “Oh, I’m not against housing affordability, but just don’t put it near me, put it over there.” “It’s not that we don’t like those people, I just don’t want them near me.” It is ridiculous, ridiculous that this motion was made. You guys should be ashamed of yourselves if you vote this in. So, I’m going to make a substitute motion.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Winston, and seconded by Councilmember Graham to let the UDO come online as is, and study it, in six months, and if there is any type of report back, we can consider new text amendments.

It would be embarrassing, embarrassing to sit on a body that is going to blatantly, blatantly champion segregation. Please entertain my motion.

Ms. Watlington said so I’m going to tell you, unashamed and unabashed, I call BS on everything that Mr. Winston just said. Can you please put Slide 11 back up on this screen? You’re not going to tell me that this is an equity lens when the only people that are affected live in the most vulnerable neighborhoods. This is not about nimbyism. The people who don’t want you in their neighborhood have HOAs. This is not going to affect them. Their neighborhoods don’t change. We know the numbers are right here in our faces. We cannot build our way out of an affordable housing crisis. We’re not getting there. The numbers don’t make sense. We know the tool won’t work. So, for you to sit here in my face and tell me that your ashamed because I’m voting against something that I think is disproportionately impacting black people negatively, too bad, because I’m not stupid. I read the UDO when it came out the first time. That’s how I knew it didn’t make any sense. We’ve studied this. We don’t need another six months to tell us what we knew two years ago, what we can see right here in the data that staff gave us.

Supply and demand doesn’t work when you haven’t reached a point of saturation. It’s not basic economics 101. That’s why people can still charge \$400,000 for an 1,800 square duet, because there will never be enough room to put all the people that want to live in the City in it. This is not the answer. What is? Regionalism. Figuring out how to work with our partners in our surrounding communities. So, you’re not going to tell me to buy something that hasn’t worked for black people in the beginning, and now tell me it’s a solution. Wrong answer. I can read, and I’m not going to sit here and allow the work of this Council to be mischaracterized as if we’re working against equity. That’s crazy. I’ll be voting against this secondary motion, and proudly supporting the next one.

Mayor Lyles said alright, we have rules here, and I’m pretty sure that we have a new motion, and that allows people to speak to the new motion.

Ms. Johnson said yes, I also want to just make sure I speak out against the statement that we’re blatantly segregating. That’s not what this is. Again, if you look, only 33 percent of the neighborhoods don’t have the HOAs and won’t be protected. I’m glad I could send you this map, so it could be included in this presentation. These were the arguments that we spoke about the last time, and I definitely stand up. I’m a homeless, reentry housing provider. I’m an affordable housing advocate. I’m going to be fighting. I hope the same level of passion on item number 15, when I’m fighting for the 30 percent housing. So, let’s see how we all feel about that then. Anyway, on this one, this is not blatant racism. There is a place for single-family subdivisions, period. You can have strategic development, and that’s what we’re asking for. There are places, there are urban areas, where duplexes and triplexes are appropriate, but implanted in single-family subdivisions is not appropriate. We cannot just plop down development and pray that it works.

We are asking for some type of order to development in the City. I fought for the infrastructure and we're still asking for that. We're understaffed with our police department, our sidewalks, our schools. We're not even counting the impact on schools with all of our development. So, we are simply asking for some responsible development, and I think that us tweaking the UDO is appropriate. Well, we'll go back to the other motion, and I'm opposed and offended to be called a racist because we're asking for strategy in our development in the City. Thank you.

Mr. Driggs said Mr. Winston, you're entitled to your opinion, and I respect your passion. I don't believe you have the right to speak in derogatory terms about two people who don't agree with you, alright? It's a basic courtesy. Go ahead and advocate, leave us alone. Everybody make your case and may the best man win. In my mind, what we're talking about here is trying to get to a place where the policy achieves the things that we intended for it, and I don't think we need to kind of go back and relitigate. I think we should absolutely not go back and relitigate, but I think it needs more work. I think what we're talking about right now is an instance in which we should take a closer look. Again, I mentioned before, we've got issues about congestion. If you take the HOAs in there and you take the neighborhood character, you could shrink to a relatively small area the places where any of this stuff can happen. Is that what we intend? We're going to get the findings of the NEST Committee, and we're going want to be able to see how that overlays with what we did, but let's just try to be practical here, and certainly not go back and redo everything that we did for several years, as Mr. Graham pointed out. Thank you.

Councilmember Bokhari said I'm just going to say real quick, because I'm confused. So, there's a lot of different angles here. I'll just say that there are parts that I've heard from both groups here that I kind of agree with, and parts I disagree with on both. So, the parts that we all fought for three years against, I think they're very valid. I'm not prepared at this moment, behind the dais, to redo or theoretically position a change in one evening that took three years. There's going to be another group and another group and another group that are going to come up with the same issues, and it's not going to be exactly the same each time, but those are the inherent flaws we fought against, and the five of us that were all against the UDO at that time. So, while I passionately believe that, I don't think we're going to figure that out right now, and I'm scared that we do that. I kind of like a couple of the things Mr. Winston said, where we need to reflect and do it all at one time. So, I don't know what else to do other than just vote no on everything, and we'll see what happens.

Mayor Lyles said so, I want to take a stab at this. I believe that yes, there are some people that just really don't want to have triplexes and duplexes in their neighborhood. I get that part of it. It's what we're accustomed to. We're all creatures of where we came from and how we see things, and I think that that's an easy thing to understand. I also think that Mr. Driggs made a point to say that the question would be, not whether or not we ought to change, but whether or not this works for change for us. I think that we have framed this in a way that the Planning and Development Committee should have an opportunity to look at this, but I think it has to have some informed information.

June is what, two weeks away now? We have got a Planning Director, a planning group that's worked really hard on this. They know the 600 pages way better than we do. I'm wondering if this Council would be willing to have the Planning Director actually look at this, not necessarily by June to come back, but to actually say, "What has happened?" We're not the only city that's had a UDO, and we have the opportunity to go and say some things that are very specific. I think one of the things that Mr. Mitchell said was really important. It was about larger projects. We cannot litigate or go back and change some of the things that are just not appropriate or that really helps us get to a place where we can have more housing choices. I think, when we talk about this raw land and lots of it, and a larger project, I don't know what a larger project is, but I think it is a valid question to ask. I think by pushing it, that I would actually ask our Planning staff to develop a white paper, but I wonder if this Council would be willing to have the staff invest some time to do something that actually gives us some clarity about what

problem we're trying to solve and how is that being done in many different places, and to give that to the Committee, but not to push it as like, "Let's do it right now."

So, Mr. Mitchell, I would ask if you would be willing to ask the Planning Director to review this, explain the question, put together a really thoughtful paper. I don't care if you use it from UNC (University of North Carolina). I don't care where we go to get it, but there are answers out there. We're not that special ya'll. I hate to say it. I know we're really special, but we're not that special that we can't come up with solutions to questions like this and really focus on the larger projects, development, and what it means for us. So, I can't make that motion.

Mr. Driggs said we have a substitute motion pending, Mayor.

Mayor Lyles said we have a substitute motion being pending. I can't make a motion, but what I'm saying is that, right now I feel that we're probably in a position where we can agree on something, and it may not be everybody's agreement, but I think if we actually thought about this in a way that we are asking the Planning staff to give us a review.

What are the questions, what are the options, where are we going, and how are other people doing it, that we might be in a better position to have a conversation like this.

Mr. Driggs said are you asking that the substitute motion and the motion be withdrawn, Mayor?

Mayor Lyles said yes, that would be great. Yes, I am asking that. Can I ask that, Mr. Baker?

Mr. Baker said sure.

Mayor Lyles said alright, I'm asking for that motion to be withdrawn.

Mr. Winston said I'm not withdrawing my motion. You have the opportunity as the Mayor to refer things to Committee. So, you can always do that on your own.

Mayor Lyles said well, I don't want to do it on my own. I wanted to do it in a way that works for all of us, but I understand that that may not be the case right now.

Ms Ajmera said so, I did comment on the first motion that was made by Mr. Mitchell. For the same reason, I believe what Mayor just said. We need to be very careful, where we take a look at the facts, the data, but I would like to have our Planning staff bring back whatever text amendments that are necessary to address quality of life concerns for our residents, and you heard that loud and clear from our residents. So, there would be a scenario where it might take two months or three months or four months or maybe even two days. So, I don't want to sort of put you all in a box where it's six months. So, that's why I will not be supporting it. Again, I don't believe in legislating from the dais, where we are making decisions and modifying policies at the last minute, where we have not even had an opportunity to take a look at the language. So, I will not be supporting any of those motions. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said okay. So, we call for the question on the motion that the Mayor Pro Tem made, okay? Did everybody get that? Again, let's read it one more time, Ms. Billie.

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

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

NAYS: Councilmember Winston

Mayor Lyles said alright, thank you. The prevailing motion is Mr. Mitchell's. You have it, would you support a friendly amendment?

pti:pk

Mr. Mitchell said yes, I will.

Mayor Lyles said that we would have the staff examine, recommend and review. It's more than just recommend alternative options, because you have to figure out where they are and all of that. So, would it be appropriate to ask the staff to develop a paper on the potential changes to the UDO that address large parcel development by right?

Mr. Driggs said so, we are modifying the motion, is that right? Because it's different now, right? There's no Committee, etc. We're just talking about having the staff provide a research document, a paper.

Mayor Lyles said I think that would be step one.

Mr. Driggs said I'm just clarifying the modification that we're making to a standing and existing motion. So, would you say what you would like the motion to be, instead of what you offered?

Mayor Lyles said I guess what I'm saying is, to get everybody on the same page.

Mr. Mitchell said this was the whole goal of the motion, Mayor and Council. It wasn't to change anything here at the dais. It was to refer it to the TAP (Transportation Action Plan) Committee for study and get staff input, that's it.

Mayor Lyles said okay, so, I think that we can have the referral to the Transportation, but it said June, and I wanted to give staff time to actually do real work to address it.

Mr. Mitchell said can I just clarify, reason why we say June, Council, there's no committee meetings in July, and so it had to be June or it's August. So, that's the only reason why, and staff and I had this conversation, we said June 5, 2023, because we're not meeting in July, and we didn't want to delay this to August. So, that's why the June 5, 2023, committee date came about.

Mayor Lyles said I think the question would be, if we can do this and get a foundation for it, and staff can present an outline of what would be done as work. We're not going to have an answer on June 5, 2023.

Mr. Mitchell said and we decided to get it referred to the committee, to the TAP Committee.

Mayor Lyles said we'll, see, I think the committee referral is fine. I just think that given the staff.

Mr. Driggs said it's not an action item on that day. It's not an action item, right? We get this information from the staff pursuant to your referral. The committee talks about that, but the goal is not to be in a position at the end of that meeting to pass something.

Mr. Mitchell said correct, if this was referral until June 5, 2023. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright, so we have this motion. I think we've had it on the floor before. Substitute failed. This is the original motion. It is not an amendment to his original motion.

Mr. Baker said so, at this stage, we're going back to the original motion as is.

Mayor Lyles said alright, the original motion. At the June Transportation, Planning and Development Committee meeting, ask staff to recommend alternative options, including a schedule for potential changes to the UDO allowing duplexes and triplexes and larger projects develop by-right in residential subdivisions. Alright, did everybody hear the motion? Everyone has spoken to the motion.

Ms. Watlington said then I'd like to make a substitute motion.

Unknown said you can't, there's already been one.

Ms. Watlington said point of order then. Are we just talking about duplexes and triplexes, or are we talking about multi-family and townhomes also?

Mayor Lyles said duplexes and triplexes. Mr. Baker, if there is a question for clarification, since everyone has spoken except Ms. Anderson, I think, would that be appropriate?

Mr. Baker said I think the question has been called.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Anderson, Driggs, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, and Watlington

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Graham, Molina, and Winston

Mayor Lyles said wait a minute, I don't know if that can happen. Alright, Mr. Baker.

Mr. Baker said I don't know what the count was.

Ms. Watlington said point of order. If Mayfield didn't vote, is she recorded as a yes?

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Mayfield, it is six since you did not vote.

Ms. Mayfield said did you vote yea or nay? I'm a yes already. I already know how the rules go without raising my hand or not. It is an automatic yes. I'm asking the Clerk, because I asked the Mayor for clarification prior to, because there was a conversation that was brought to the table and the Mayor asked, "Will you submit that as a friendly amendment regarding the multi-family?" That was a whole conversation and then it turned to a different conversation. So, I was looking to the Clerk to try to see if I get clarification on that, because the Mayor asked for what Ms. Johnson submitted as a friendly amendment, and somewhere that conversation got lost.

Mayor Lyles said I believe it didn't get lost. I think that Ms. Craig said that multi-family is already not allowed. It wasn't that it was stopped or not discussed. It's not applicable.

Ms. Johnson said but I also said I didn't want the specificity. I want to look at the outcome that multi-family, townhomes, whatever it is, but we're being specific.

Mayor Lyles said I understand, but the motion has passed. Madam Clerk, we have Ms. Mayfield as a yes. Ms. Johnson, because she voted against, she is now a yes. Then, there were four, so that makes six people to accept the motion that Mr. Mitchell made. I just want to make sure that that's okay Mr. Baker.

Mr. Baker said it's fine. So, Ms. Johnson is a yes?

Ms. Johnson said yes.

Mayor Lyles said and Ms. Mayfield is a yes.

Ms. Watlington said Madam Mayor, I had a motion as well out of this [INAUDIBLE].

Mayor Lyles said alright, you'd like to present a motion as well?

Ms. Watlington said yes, please.

Motion was made by Councilmember Watlington, and seconded by Councilmember Johnson, to, per UDO, Article 14, Section 3, on June 1, 2023, its effective date, initiate by majority Council vote, the Neighborhood Character Overlay process for all of the

neighborhoods identified as of June 1, 2023, vulnerable to displacement, per city anti-displacement guidelines.

Ms. Watlington said if you'll please show the map just so Council is aware of which neighborhoods we're talking about. So, these are the neighborhoods. So, if you remember Slide 11 from the previous one and you take a look at this map versus the map that's on this screen, the neighborhoods that do not have HOAs, we're talking neighborhoods along West Boulevard, Wilkinson Boulevard, Freedom Drive, Beatties Ford Road, are the very same neighborhoods that you see here that are vulnerable to displacement. What this means is without some kind of overlay or some kind of intervention, those neighborhoods are vulnerable to converting homeownership opportunities for residents into likely rental properties with duplexes and triplexes.

This is the need for a Neighborhood Character Overlay in these districts, so that that provides an opportunity to work with the residents to define what that neighborhood character and how that needs to be preserved. It doesn't necessarily prevent duplexes and triplexes, but what it does do is create guidelines based on the neighborhood residents' desires as to how that looks in their neighborhood. So, this is part of the

UDO, so it would not go into effect until June 1, 2023, which is why you see that there. We do have neighborhood character overlays as part of the NEST Commission strategy. So, you will see that on the June 1, 2023, Housing, Safety and Community Committee meeting. This motion is intended to put that process in place. If we do not do this, it will be left to, the only other option to get a Neighborhood Character Overlay, which is to have 25 percent of residents sign a petition to bring it forward.

Well, we know, if you live in a neighborhood, like the neighborhoods I'm describing as I do, that that may not always be the easiest thing to be able to do. So, rather than leave it to the residents to come and ask for these kinds of protections, it is incumbent upon us as their representatives to initiate it. So, that's what this motion does, and I would ask for ya'll support.

Ms. Johnson said do you have a list of those neighborhoods?

Ms. Watlington said I don't believe there is a list. I'll refer to Ms. Hefner, because she answered that question for me earlier.

Rebecca Hefner, Housing and Neighborhood Services said good evening. I thought I was going to get to talk to you about something really exciting earlier, but here I am on this one. So, we don't have a list of neighborhood names that accompany the neighborhoods that are identified as vulnerable to displacement risk. These are neighborhood profile areas. So, there are a variety of named neighborhoods that would intersect with these neighborhood profile areas, but we don't have that list for you tonight.

Ms. Watlington said I can tell you from District 3, I see Westover Hills, I see Revolution Park, Clayton Park, I see Reid Park, I see all of the areas around Ponderosa, I see Westerly Hills, I see Historic Camp Greene and Ashley Park. As you go on up, I see Enderly Park. So, as you move along those Corridors of Opportunity, essentially these are those neighborhoods.

Ms. Johnson said can we get a list of neighborhoods?

Ms. Hefner said yes, we can overlay these NPAs (Neighborhood Profile Areas) with our next-door neighborhood names and provide a list.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you.

Mr. Winston said how does this interact with the community area planning process, and how was this supposed to interact with the community area planning process, and how

does this disrupt, interact, or have no effect on, the community area process? What is the effect?

Ms. Craig said so I think, as we're all aware, all of our neighborhoods and communities are different, and there's different strategies needed for the different community needs. Rebecca and Shawn are doing a great job with the anti-displacement strategy. That's a lot of different tools in a toolbox to be able to help residents in areas of change. In the UDO, there are several different types of overlays. So, neighborhood character is not the only one. There's other streetside, residential infill, and some of those are better suited for different neighborhoods.

So, what we had planned to do, and what we've been talking about doing, is maybe piloting a couple of neighborhoods along with the Corridors work, because we've already started the conversations, and have identified a tool that is what the community is asking for. Really, what we would do then in the area planning process, is talk with residents about, "These are the different ways that you can help manage and mitigate change in your communities." So, it's really in the next year or so that we would be meeting with the communities and talking about how they can get organized, how they can understand what's the best tool for them, and then help them in that process.

Mr. Winston said what are the potential unintended consequences of taking a step like this?

Ms. Craig said so, there's a lot of questions out there. You have to define what the boundaries are, what's the geographic area. This is actually an overlay that is an amendment to a map, and so it then puts in place different requirements that the people that live there should be aware of. So, there's a lot of engagement that's involved in this. We are, again, wanting to pilot this in the Corridors work, and then really try to work with the communities in area planning to make sure they're aware of the tools that will help them in their communities.

Mr. Winston said so, would I be hearing you correctly in saying, a step like this will remove the opportunity for neighborhoods to interact with the planning of their neighborhood?

Ms. Craig said I would just say that it's not giving us the opportunity to sit down and explain to them what this is or what their options are, and then how this intersects with the anti-displacement strategy work.

Mr. Winston said thank you.

Mr. Driggs said so, the Neighborhood Character Overlay was included in the UDO to give us the opportunity in certain circumstances to circumscribe. I believe that a large scale like this, particularly without detailed analysis of the consequences, the affected neighborhoods and so on, represents kind of a modification to the plan, rather than a refinement of the type we were talking about before. So, I would like to consider the use of the Neighborhood Character Overlay. I don't believe a wholesale approach like this, and particularly without the benefit of that prior analysis, is the best way to go about it. So, I can't support it, I'm afraid.

Ms. Ajmera said I agree with some of my colleagues. We don't know what the unintended consequences would be. We do not know how community feels about it. We have not done any community engagement. Again, we are trying to legislate from the dais, which I can't support. So, I will not be supporting it.

Ms. Mayfield said so, already been said that what we're looking at is the opportunity to fix it as a challenge is identified. I'm not understanding why there is a challenge with us applying the NCO, because previous Council came up with a collective effort around looking through an equity lens. We also have the NEST Commission that was sanctioned by you, who is going to be making recommendations. This direction that we're going through right now, to a certain extent, is superseding some of that work. No

one anticipated what 2020 was going to do. We also didn't anticipate 2008. So, challenges grow, retraction will grow, things happen. If we know that some projects have been approved that has created a complete change of character in some neighborhoods, I don't understand why there will be pushback to try to at least meet what was done three years ago, because a number of the people who were in support of what was originally created, aren't sitting around this space right now. So, yes, we've got 600 pages. Staff has done amazing work, but the reality on the ground is, it was always said that we will be able to address certain needs, certain changes, as needed.

So, to look at the overlay, I'm not understanding why that would be a challenge to at least make sure that, to the best of our ability, we are mitigating the unintended consequences, because we have already seen the rollout of where we thought we had a good idea in different areas of the City, and we made investments, and now those areas have been completely transformed. Even in here, we have the example of what can't happen. That example came from what we allowed to happen. We allowed certain developments to happen, and now we're trying to fix it from previous mistakes. If we just have the overlay added on to it, when we look at the map that's provided, and we see where we have HOAs versus areas where we don't have HOAs, it might help us to make sure that what we're creating aligns more with what we as a Council have told the community we're interested in trying to support based off of what they've asked from us.

Mayor Lyles said I guess I hear that, Ms. Mayfield, but there are a lot of HOAs that are not active aren't even aware, and I wonder how we would do and take an action like this when the people don't know and the planning process hasn't given them an opportunity to comment on it. I think that probably one of most difficult things, and I don't know, probably Mr. Mitchell if he were here, I can say this, but I remember when we were doing some of this work around Third Ward and Fourth Ward, and Malachi Greene said to me, he said, "You know, property is really something that can have a family really change their trajectory," and they were able to actually make decisions about their own property. I think what we'd be doing tonight is making that decision for them, and that is a real concern for me.

Ms. Mayfield said I see [inaudible].

Mayor Lyles said well, I understand. I just want you to know that's the perspective that I have, and I don't know that we have HOAs that have the ability or have had the interest, but I think more importantly, if anything, is to have the ability to have someone come out to you, and I can say this because you guys know I'm trying to get into McCrorey Heights, but the idea of coming into something and not knowing and not having a choice about it, would be particularly, I think difficult, because there might be parcels in here that people don't even live in our City. They might be heirs property or all kinds, and I think that this is protecting people in a way that doesn't include them in the decision making. So, I would just say that that's one of the factors that I would consider.

Mr. Graham said I stand on the comments I made earlier, again, trying to protect the work. At the same time acknowledging, as I said earlier, that we're going to have to make changes along the way. I have no problem with doing that. I have a problem doing it from the dais. I'm just seeing it for the first time. I don't have any data in from of me. The UDO is supposed go into effect in two weeks. We're sending a mixed message, certainly to the community, neighborhoods, and as I said, the development community, I mean everybody, and staff.

So, I just think that there's a better way to process the work of an important document that we have in front of us. There has to be a better way to process the work based on what I'm seeing here tonight. My personal opinion, I think changes, amendments, resolutions, all those things are fine, but there has to be a process that we follow that everybody kind of understands where we're headed. Some members saw this motion before tonight, others are just seeing it for the first time. I see my folks from Lexington are still here. We had these conversations last year. We voted on it last year. We had an election based on it last year. We got the results last year based on those elections, and now it's time for us to move forward, and not move forward blindly, but move

forward understanding that the NEST Commission is doing its work. I don't want to get in front of their recommendation. They haven't made a recommendation to us, although, they had a really good meeting, I heard. I heard some of the feedback from my neighborhood residents, and so I don't want to get in front of the work. So, not that I'm saying no. I'm just saying no to the process of what we're doing here tonight. That's just not how we should do business.

Ms. Watlington said yes, I would like to address a few things that were said, and I will be honest, just listening to some of the comments around the dais would lead me to believe that either folks did not read the UDO when it was before us for a vote, or they have not been following along with any other work in the housing space. This is part of the UDO. This is the UDO that some of ya'll raised your hand to accept. This is not a new tool. It's not an amendment. I am proposing that we use the tool that we said we wanted to use. When it went into the UDO, it was fine. Now that we want to use it, we're talking about people not having had a chance to discuss it.

Again, that's an indicator that folks are too far away from the Corridors of Opportunity work. This is one of the things that showed up in the playbook. People want to preserve their neighborhoods. They want to make sure that they will have some autonomy and some assurance that, as they have purchased in their neighborhood and invested there, that it will not be overrun as we have seen over and over again. That's how it got in the

UDO in the first place. So, to say that this is something that the neighbors had not already engaged in, absolutely false. To say that this takes away their choice, absolutely false. If you've read anything about the Neighborhood Character Overlay, you know that it requires a community engagement process. So, it's not we vote today, and it's over. We're voting to initiate the process.

So, I've got to correct the record on some of the things that people are saying who, it appears, are not familiar with the tool. We know that June 1st comes. We keep talking about unintended consequences. June 1, 2023, is coming. We know, we've got all of the data that we need to tell us who's sitting ducks. We know it. Our residents have been telling us for the last three years. This is not new information. So, to say that we put a tool in a document, and then turn around and say, "We don't want to use it, because they haven't been engaged," completely and totally untrue.

If you've been following anything the NEST Commission has been reporting on over the last six months, you would know this is one of the leading tools that they've asked for. Once again, NEST Commission met, had a great workshop, like you said. The number one tool that people put at the top of their priority list, I know that I'm looking at District Reps who are clear about what their residents want. So, we've got to stop saying that our residents haven't been engaged. If we did the work we said we did, they've engaged along the way this entire time. This is not new. It's in the UDO. It is well within the toolkit that we said we wanted to use.

So, I respect if you don't want to do it today, but I just have to push back against this idea that we don't have data. It's sitting in our face. The anti-displacement dashboard has been live for over a year. We have the data. At some point, we do have to legislate from this dais, because that's what we're elected to do. We can't keep throwing it back to staff to come back and tell us the answer. At some point, staff's done their work. They provided a 600-page document. We, in that document, voted, or some of us voted, to approve that document, and it very clearly says, "By majority vote of Council, we can initiate the process."

So, we have a responsibility to be what we say we're about. We cannot say that we're about equity. We cannot say that we're about protecting the vulnerable. I appreciate process. This process has led us to this decision. We've got to not only protect process, we've got to protect people, and to sit here and pass by an opportunity to do that in a proactive way, I think is a failure of representation. So, again, I would ask that you use the tool that you voted to support.

Ms. Johnson said I do have a question, Mayor, I'm sorry. I'll be supporting this, obviously, but I want to ensure that we have the opportunity, because there are going to be other neighborhoods that would want to apply for the NCO. So, I want to make sure that the process is very clear on how that's done. Can you describe that process on what a neighborhood would do if they wanted to apply for the Neighborhood Character Overlay?

Ms. Craig said sure. So, I think really the first part is talking to the neighborhood about what it is that this tool does. So, it is an overlay that puts additional restrictions on your property that is developed by the community. So, they decide, these are the elements that I want to preserve within my community or ensure remain the same, and as I was saying in the beginning, those character elements are not going to be the same across all different neighborhoods. So, that's why we believe that it is better to do this as part of the area planning process, so we can go in and talk to residents about, "These are the tools that we have to help you manage and change and empower you to protect your neighborhood in ways that are important to you," and those conversations may be different from neighborhood to neighborhood.

Once we begin those, we start to talk about these are things that you can put within a Neighborhood Character Plan. In order to actually put that overlay in place, you have to go and get the Neighborhood Character Plan adopted, and then you actually go and get the overlay, because this is a map amendment, then adopted by Council. So, there's a

two-step process with Council. There is another option. There's also Residential Infill Overlay that relates to height and setbacks. It's a lot easier to get to a point in which you're getting something adopted. That's why my recommendation is to allow time in the communities to understand what it is they want and help them connect that with the best tool for them to accomplish what is important to them.

Ms. Watlington said I just want to add to what she just said, because Alyson and I talked about this. When we initiate this NCO, and when we get to the community engagement, if they choose that this RIO (Residential Infill Overlay) is the better tool, they have the flexibility to shift to that. So, I want to be very clear that this vote is to initiate a process.

Mayor Lyles said so, I have a question. If you have an overlay process and it is done, what's your saying is, I wondered if there was a way that it could be undone? If we move forward and say we're going to do the overlay.

Ms. Watlington said we're going to initiate the process. That's the difference. We're not saying today there's an overlay. We're initiating the process today.

Mayor Lyles said we're initiating the process for how many neighborhoods?

Ms. Watlington said all of the neighborhoods that are identified. She says she doesn't have a list, but if you count them up, it's about 20.

Mayor Lyles said 20.

Ms. Craig said those are, I believe, neighborhood profile areas or census tracts. There's probably hundreds of neighborhoods in those areas.

Ms. Watlington said so, if you live in Enderly Park, you might go from one street where you're in Enderly Park specific, and then the next street it's another name. It's the same Neighborhood Association. So, when we talk about hundreds of neighborhoods, it isn't hundreds of neighborhoods. So, I just want to make sure that we bring this back to the people. Like, we can jump through hoops and create all kinds of barriers and bureaucracy, but at the end of the day, this is about helping folks preserve their neighborhoods. So, it's important to me that the work that we do delivers outcomes that provide for a better quality of life. So, as we talk about processes and we talk about how to get the work done and things of that nature, I want to make sure that that's not more important than ultimately what it delivers.

Mayor Lyles said I guess my concern is that if you don't have a process that everybody can be consistent with, that it might be good for some, but it might not be, and you're not giving that person a voice.

Ms. Watlington said that's not true. Again, that's false. That's absolutely opposite of how the process worked, and it's outlined in the UDO. She just said that the nature of process is to reach the community.

Mayor Lyles said it'd be through the planning process?

Ms. Watlington said it can be in conjunction with that. I think that's a good idea, but let's talk facts.

Mayor Lyles said so, is it the June 1, 2023, that makes it go into place for this?

Ms. Watlington said it initiates the process.

Mayor Lyles said why wouldn't it be just the initiation of the process, because it would be then consistent with the UDO on June 1, 2023.

Ms. Watlington said no, because it can't go into effect until June 1, 2023, because the UDO won't go into effect until June 1, 2023. It's a UDO tool. So, that's why the June 1, 2023, is there.

Mayor Lyles said right, but it's the neighborhoods identified as of June 1, 2023. So, we're identifying the neighborhoods.

Ms. Watlington said well, they're already identified. The only reason I said, as of June 1, 2023, is because they're updating the tool, and so there's a possibility that there may be some neighborhoods that are added to the list, because they are now based on our criteria.

Mayor Lyles said is there a possibility that a neighborhood is in it that does not want to be in it, or some part of the neighborhoods that don't want to be in it?

Ms. Watlington said if they don't want to be in the Neighborhood Character Overlay, that will come out as part of the community engagement process. When they start talking about, what do we want to preserve. If they say, "We don't want to preserve anything." Well, then they'll never get to the next step in the process, because there will be no Neighborhood Character Plan to adopt.

Mayor Lyles said so, why do we have to do it as of June 1, 2023?

Ms. Watlington said because we can't do it now, because the UDO comes online June 1, 2023. Alternatively, June 1, 2023, comes, no process is initiated. There's only two ways to initiate the process, either 25 percent of homeowners who, to your point, some may not even live here, homeowners have to petition for it, or Council can initiate the process. So, rather than, again back to these unintended consequences, but not unforeseen, we know that these are the neighborhoods that are going to see the most development. This is not even a tool that stops development necessarily. It simply preserves the character of the neighborhood. So, doing it June 1, 2023, versus doing it December 1, 2022, all we did is waste six months in my opinion, because we know that this is going to happen. That's why we put the tool in the UDO.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Anderson, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, and Watlington

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Molina, and Winston

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 14: UPDATED PROCESS FOR APPOINTED STAFF PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

Councilmember Ajmera said I'll keep it very brief. So, our Budget and Governance Committee reviewed staff performance evaluation process. So, thank you Mayor for sending that referral. As you recall, Ms. Simpson reviewed the current evaluation process a couple of months ago and reviewed best practices. So, Committee members, Mr. Mitchell, Ms. Mayfield, Mr. Bokhari and Ms. Anderson, provided feedback in Committee's discussion at our last Committee meeting, and we did provide an update to the full Council.

So, here are some of the changes. Our process improvements. First is, we will have the current year-end evaluation process. So, we'll complete that in July. Second change is, we will reestablish the Annual Performance Evaluation process with each appointee, and that will be based on the fiscal year. Also, we will have a goal-setting process for each appointee within three to six months of the close of the strategy session, and that's based on Committee and HR (Human Resources) recommendations.

Then, Committee decided that we will have a formal mid-year performance process, and that will be end of the year. So, it would be in November/December timeframe, and that was based on Ms. Anderson's feedback. We have a mid-year evaluation included as part of the overall evaluation process. Last, we will have HR conduct training at our new Council member orientation process, so that everyone is familiar with what the evaluation process will look like. So, based on Council's feedback and based on everyone's availability, performance review dates for this year are going to be July 10, 2023, we'll have City Attorney July 17, 2023, City Manager and City Clerk will be decided based on when she returns from medical leave. So, these were the process enhancements that Committee had worked diligently and have provided you all a review. So, this should not be a surprise.

Motion was made by Councilmember Anderson, and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera to approve the Budget, Governance, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee recommendation to implement process enhancements for the performance evaluations for appointed staff.

Councilmember Johnson said I just have a question about position descriptions. I think last year we learned that not all of the positions had position descriptions, and there was going to be some work on the Clerk. So, I wanted to just ask if you know if all of the positions have position descriptions, and if not, we need to make sure that we have those.

Ms. Ajmera said we'll share that with Ms. Simpson.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you.

Ms. Ajmera said Ms. Simpson, is she here?

Sheila Simpson, Human Resources said I'm here.

Ms. Ajmera said oh, okay. Thank you for all the work with data. I know there was a lot of questions, and you all provided us with a lot of data. We really appreciate it.

Councilmember Mayfield said so for clarification, what came out of Committee was that we were voting to move forward with closing out this fiscal year. If our fiscal year closes in June, it runs from July to June 30th, but we're not having the reviews until July, this language in the action of Approve the Budget Governance and Intergovernmental Relations recommendation to implement process enhancements, the recommendation I thought was to complete the FY (Fiscal Year) 2023 current cycle performance evaluations for the appointed staff, and begin the FY2024 process, for January 2023 with the added mid-year reviews starting for 2024. At some point in the conversation, one of the Committee members made a recommendation that, instead of us closing out

this fiscal year in June, they wanted to do a review during that time. So, I need to make sure that what we're saying is the same thing, because that did not get approved. What got approved was the language of closing out FY2023, and then starting 2024, and 2024 would have a mid-year review that will be sometime around December.

Mayor Lyles said right. This is our first time with the recommendations, and we have to get Council member's schedules together. So, the idea was that it would still relate to the 2023 year, but the new materials would all start at the beginning FY2024.

Ms. Mayfield said so, we're having their reviews in July.

Mayor Lyles said we're going to have to have it. If we would be able to put it on the calendar that we adopt in December, but because we didn't have that calendar for this year, so it'll roll out in the new calendar year to allow for this to be scheduled.

Ms. Mayfield said so, we're going to continue to move forward with our calendar year, but we're going to have their reviews in July, thankfully not in December, so that it'll be within the month.

Mayor Lyles said yes, we will be.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

Mayor Lyles said and that's as close as we can get.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 36: CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT SANITARY SEWER CONSTRUCTION CHANGE ORDER

Motion was made by Councilmember Winston and seconded by Councilmember Bokhari to approve change order #2 to Sanders Utility Construction Co., Inc. for the Little Sugar Creek Tributary to Central Business District Sanitary Sewer project.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington, and Winston

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 47: AIRPORT ROADWAY RELOCATION CONSTRUCTION CHANGE ORDER

Councilmember Mayfield said this is also one where we're on the fifth amendment on this. So, since we didn't get to talk about it in the room, I ask for staff to give us the list of where the other bids came in, because with this being the fifth amendment on this, I want to see how close it was to the next responsive bid. The challenge being, because of the way this project was done, we're moving forward, but there was a something.

Marie Harris, Strategy and Budget said yes ma'am, and if I may. Yes, to your point, there were original bids, but since that bid, there's been five change orders. The first one was \$30,000 for different traffic control patterns that were needed. The second one was no charge for the change order, but it was to move the milestone dates within the contract. The third one was \$10,000 to modify security gates that the security at the airport had recommended. The fourth one was, there's two different types of valves, water valves that they changed to be in compliance with the Buy America, so they had

to do a change order and those did actually cost more. Then, this one that's before you tonight, is for Norfolk Southern. We had a contract with them to do some flagging, and they informed us that they're no longer going to perform that service. So, we're descoping it from our contract with Norfolk Southern and adding it to this contract.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

Councilmember Mitchell said Marie, related to Councilmember Mayfield's point, though, Crowder was awarded because they were the lowest responsive bidder.

Ms. Harris said correct.

Mr. Mitchell said and so, with five change orders.

Ms. Harris said they were still under the second lowest, but also with the change orders would've happened with this. If we would have went with the second, say if Crowder hadn't bid, anybody else would've had these type change orders as well.

Mr. Mitchell said okay, you said universe in, okay, you answered my question. Thank you.

Motion was made by Councilmember Winston, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to approve change order #5 for \$532,500 to Crowder Construction Company for the North End-Around Taxiway Old Dowd Road construction project.

* * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 15: AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT REQUEST

Motion was made by Councilmember Johnson and seconded by Councilmember Watlington to (A) Approve a \$1,700,000 Housing Trust Fund allocation for the Sycamore Station Apartments multi-family affordable housing development, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to execute, amend, and renew any documents necessary to complete the transaction.

Kenny Robinson, 1635 Waybridge Lane said my name is Kenny Robinson. I'm the Executive Director and founder of Freedom Fighting Missionaries. Although ya'll tried to wear me out tonight, I stayed here. I have missed dinner with my children tonight in exercise of our constitutional rights to be able to come up here and say something. So, I am here in support of the Sycamore project for one reason, and that reason is because these are the kind of messages that I receive from the citizens when we make decisions like buying hotels without a real plan for those who are going to be displaced for them. We are the ones who get the messages, those of us in the grassroot communities. So, this is one right here through Facebook messenger. "I currently live at the Economy Inn off of Reagan in the C building. If I could, I would love to speak with you about my situation, and we have a few other tenants here as well. I was working here. I have three children, one year old, two years old, four years old. It has been hard since the City bought the building. It's currently under new management. Who are talking to us about demolishing? My number is. I'm available any time. I really appreciate it."

Yesterday, the same single mother of three who had been displaced, said, "Could you help, please? I need to pay my phone bill, because I'm starting a job tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. and I need my phone in order to start the job." So, I'm here in support of the Sycamore project, because I spoke to Mr. Greg over at Lumen. He said, "Kenny, I've got 34 units reserved at 30 percent AMIs. I've already went to the City and went through the housing trust policy process. They said I'm out of line, I'm out of policy, I'm out of process." We have lost people in the City of Charlotte. They have perished, because of

checks and balances and processes, waiting on procedures, waiting on 2040s, waiting on UDOs. People have perished because of that. So, I'm only here in support of that project, that is going to provide 34 units tomorrow, immediately.

The average cost for a homeless person in the City of Charlotte, what it costs you and I, is about \$30,000. The average cost to incarcerate a person in the State of North Carolina is about \$34,000. If you multiple 34 times 30, you get right around \$1 million. So, we know what can be done and what can't be done. If we can get the support of the City Council, I know that Marcus Jones can make the numbers work. I know that he can do some maneuvering around. He is good at that, that's why you hired him, because he's good at that. Give him an opportunity to do what you hired him to do. He'll move the numbers around. I knew that when I came here, that this agenda item was DOA, that means dead on arrival, because your minds are already made up. We know who's the three that's going and who's not going. So, please support this project.

Mayor Lyles said thank you, Mr. Robinson.

Kenn Shrader, 420 East 15th Street said my name is Kenn Shrader. I'm the other Kenny. I appreciate y'all's opportunity to come speak to ya'll tonight. I represent the Reentry Housing Alliance. I'm also speaking in favor of the Sycamore Station Apartments. With HTC (Housing Tax Credit) funding, the Sycamore Station Apartments will be able to provide a home for 34 families that need the most help. This includes wage earning citizens making \$7.25 an hour, minimum wage, if they can even hold down the equivalent of a 40-hour a week job. That's only about \$15,000 annually. If you double that up to \$15 an hour, as has been discussed recently here, that's still close to the 30 percent AMI, about \$30,000 a year. So, it's all very similar.

Elderly neighbors living on social security also will benefit from this. Even someone who has had a good career, and they're depending mostly on social security for income, will be earning about the same amount of money annually as their wage-earning neighbors. Our neighbors with criminal records, which overlap with both of these groups, they have the additional burden of not being allowed to let the past go. The past follows them wherever they go. Recently, for example, two families requesting housing assistance from Reentry Housing Alliance, the group that I represent, in the last four months were initially approved by the landlords, only to be denied when a second corporate background check was conducted.

Another family, rental application was lost, and they were denied housing the day they went to go pick up the keys for their new unit. Another RHA (Reentry Housing Alliance) applicant with severe health issues, is living in a hospital literally week-to-week, because area nursing homes and apartments will not accept him due to his criminal background. Since the Sycamore Station Apartments Property Manager has agreed to postpone criminal background checks until after the applicant has been otherwise qualified, because the Property Management will accept INLIVIAN and other similar voucher applicants, and since the Property Management will set aside apartment units for applicants for special needs, HTC funding will help the most vulnerable of our neighbors, not in a month, not in a year, but right now.

I remind you of the Council's declaration of a commitment to the Reentry Partners of Mecklenburg and to Hope Marshall adopted last month. I also remind you of the 86,000 metro area citizens with felony convictions that that same commitment covers. Ultimately, the numbers represent people, and each housing placement represents creating a home. This additional funding will help to establish these families as contributing neighbors by rebuilding their credit and establishing a history. Reentry Housing Alliance hopes that you will pass this motion.

Mayor Lyles said thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said as you might recall, this is Sycamore Apartments. We talked about this. I think the challenge some of our colleagues had was that it was already in construction phase. Well, we don't have a policy right now that actually says

that we cannot fund Affordable Housing if they are in construction phase. So, it's not against our current policy. If that's the policy direction that Council wants to go, I think we need to make a policy decision and not make a decision based on a proposal by proposal. I personally think this is a very good proposal. It's one of the lowest costs per unit. As one of the speakers said, I think it was brother Kenny said, that this will be available immediately, which means we would be able to house residents that are at 30 percent AMI or below right now, rather than waiting one month, two years or three years.

Yes, you are right, brother Kenny, and I can attest to that, that our Manager Jones is very good at numbers. As the Budget Committee Chair, I can say that, and he can make numbers work. If there is an Affordable Housing proposal that would come where we may not have funds, I'm sure Manager Jones will do his magic and will come up with funding. I highly recommend that we support this, and I hope my colleagues will support this. We can house families that need housing tomorrow. So, please support this. Thank you.

Councilmember Molina said I want to make sure that I'm clear to the ones of you who have stayed so long to speak to us. Thank you for taking your time to get your point across and make sure that we understood the passion behind this. I think what you're up against right now is, most people here have some story, something that is going to connect them to need, the understanding that there is an immense need in our community. Make no mistake, actually sometimes I cringe when there is a sounding that is absolutely disingenuous, that we've got money to get us out of this, with \$50 million. If we did it ourselves at \$200,000 a door, we could only deliver the City of Charlotte 250 houses, that's it. This project, in particular, steps way outside of our current precedent. We're talking six buildings, five are already built. We've never done that before, and we're a policy making body. So, in order to entertain this as a possibility, the right thing for us to do is to have a policy discussion about it.

Look, I preface my statement in saying that, in order to be creative with how we need to entertain our crisis of affordability, we do need to start thinking outside of the box. I think as a governing body, we have to have those types of conversations to decide how far and in what context that we want to think outside of the box. If this is done on a case-by-case basis, then that's not governance. So, in order for us to do this, we have to have a governance conversation. Now, I don't know when we do that, I don't know in what timeframe we do that, and I don't think anybody who says no tonight is saying no to this in particular. What I would suggest to my colleagues here in this body, if we were to so entertain this, that we have a governance discussion on some level to decide how we want to diversify our opportunities to help our residents who need affordable housing, because right now in this context, we've never done something that was 90 percent finished that I'm aware of. Shawn, can you help me? Is that something that we've done? Can I Madam Chair, if you would allow me to?

Mayor Lyles said please, go ahead.

Ms. Molina said with Madam Chair's permission, I would like to have our Director of Housing, can you give me some guidance on what we've done, and how far inside, outside context, the possibility that this actually is?

Shawn Heath, Housing Director said so, of course, this first came up on April 10, 2023, during the Action Review when we were presenting recommendations coming out of the Housing Trust Fund, RFP from the January time period, and then it was discussed on the 24th, and then in Committee meeting as well. I ask staff to look back at the Housing Trust Fund award since 2002 when the Housing Trust Fund was initiated, and we're only aware of one other scenario where a project that has already commenced construction has received a Housing Trust Fund award. In that particular case, the project was far into the development phase when it was annexed into the City of Charlotte. So, very unique circumstance, whereby the time they were eligible for HTF funding, they were on the cusp of construction. So, as it worked through the process, it

was under construction when the HTF award was made. So, there is 1 out of about 150 awards since 2002.

Ms. Molina said and that was only when it was actually outside? It was in an ETJ (Extraterritorial Jurisdiction), and then it became a part of the City. Okay, so that would be something that I would deem absolutely unique. So, my subsequent piece of questioning is, how far along is this project?

Mr. Heath said so, there are 7 buildings that are 99 percent done with construction. Here are some pictures from today. Five of the seven buildings are 100 percent complete with occupants that have leased units, not all of the units. Two of the units are at approximately 98 percent complete with construction. So, overall, 99 percent complete with over 50 percent of the units occupied as of a few weeks ago.

Ms. Molina said so, would this actually be a housing project, or would it be something that we're looking at from a different angle? Would it go to a different Committee? I'm just trying to think of options here, because this is something that has gotten some momentum, but now we've actually crossed over what we need to have as far as a policy decision is made, and I'm at a loss.

Mr. Heath said I would agree. The preferred sequencing would have been if we could've had the policy conversation and settled the policy conversation first, because the thing we're grappling with here would've been answered through that policy conversation by and large. That wasn't the way that it transpired, so this is where we're at. It's a very unusual circumstance. Fundamentally, I think the question that is being posed to Council through the vote tonight is, but for the \$1.7 million, what would happen? If Council chooses to fund this project with \$1.7 million, there will be 34 units at this location that are devoted to 30 percent AMI households and below. If Council were to choose not to fund this project, those units will stay at 60 percent AMI, which is the way the project was contemplated before the most recent request was made for Housing Trust Fund resources.

Ms. Molina said so, just to be clear, because that's a great point for our understanding. Right now, even if we don't invest, there'll be a 60 percent AMI level met, and we would pay how much?

Mr. Heath said so, the current request is \$1.7 million, and that would enable 34 units to be at the 30 percent AMI level instead of the 60 percent AMI level.

Ms. Molina said but we still would be meeting a need for affordability, just not particularly at the 30 percent AMI, and not going outside of the precedent of decision.

Mr. Heath said that's correct, that's correct.

Ms. Molina said so, I feel comfortable with us having a policy discussion around this type of precedent. I think if we're going to take this type of step, something unique, because what we say to not only our community, but the building development in particular, because what we have to worry about when we make a decision, is not only how we effect what we're trying to decision, but the other opportunities that may come behind it to say, "We want to do that, and you gave that to them, and we're 99 percent, and if you do this, we could go from 35 to 30." Maybe the index of price is different, but again, that's what we are here to do. We are a policy making body.

Shawn, addressing you directly and my body of colleagues, I feel comfortable, and I won't be supporting this tonight. I would be willing to, because I do sit on the Housing Committee, to have a conversation around how we would like to diversify the opportunity to help our residents in need, is what I would be willing to do.

Councilmember Anderson said I just have a question as a part of my weekend activity of entertaining phone calls. I also went back and looked at our April 10, 2023, meeting for this portion of the meeting, and Shawn's presentation then on April 10, 2023. Then, I

also went back and reviewed the April 27, 2023, portion of the meeting where we took a voting action on this of this particular project. Shawn, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but in both cases, there were comments from Council members and City Manager and others that said, "Let's take this back to the Committee to have a policy discussion around how we would handle projects like this," because I could foresee projects like this occurring in the future. It's occurred now. It's an outsider. It's an anomaly. It's an outlier. However, this could happen potentially in the future, and if we feel like our 20-year precedent of our policy has not supported us taking an action like this at all, then perhaps we need to revisit the policy. That was an ask that we sent back to the Committee. So, I just want to ask the Committee members, this is not a Committee I'm a member of, was there a policy discussion relative to the tenants of this proposal?

Councilmember Winston said we haven't had the Committee discussion yet.

Ms. Anderson said we did, yes we did. It was an ask in the April 10, 2023, meeting, and we asked the Committee to think about, propose policy changes, etc., and then there was a vote. We took action on April 27, 2023, where we did not vote for this project, and

again, there was an ask directed to the Committee, to have a policy discussion and come back with some recommendations, and there has been a Committee meeting since that time. To my understanding, and I just want to verify with the Committee members because I'm not a member, and I did not go back and look at this this weekend, that meeting, but this showed up on the agenda as a voting item and not a policy discussion proposal item. So, I'm just asking, was there any discussion in the Committee as it relates to policy to the tenants of this proposal and the like?

Mr. Winston said no there wasn't.

Ms. Anderson said and you're a member of that Committee?

Mr. Winston said yes.

Mr. Heath said if I may, it was on the agenda to have a two-part conversation. One was to talk specifically about this project, and the second piece was to have the broader policy conversation, but there were time constraints, so the policy conversation didn't happen.

Ms. Anderson said understood.

Councilmember Mayfield said but it was attempted.

Ms. Anderson said okay.

Mr. Winston said yes. So, I'm going to explain why I'm voting against this, and part of this has been brought up. We need to have this policy discussion, and we can do this swiftly. This was a situation that we dealt with when our first NOAHs were brought to us. We realized that this sounded real good, but we really had no way to gauge this. My suggestion would be to do just that. Let's get this back into Committee, and let's figure this out, because what this says is something new. The Housing Trust Fund, since its existence, has been used as gap funding to fund projects that, but for, our gap funding would not come out of the ground.

This is something different. This is something that is used more, honestly, like a bank, where we're saying, "Hey, at the end of this, the developer has figured out how to build to this, the economics are right." They say, "We can give you something that you want, invest in us, and we'll give it to you." Now, that sounds kind of good, but if you just do it from a deal-making perspective and don't have a policy that guides, where you say, "Hey, these are my priorities. I want this amount of 30 percent. I want this amount of vouchers to be accepted."

I don't see why, tomorrow, The View doesn't come down here and say, "City Council, if you give me a million dollars, I'll let you buy three condos uptown." That might sound good. I don't know how to gauge this. I don't know why a developer in District 6 or District 7 doesn't say, "Oh, City Council, I've heard that you guys really want affordable housing in District 6 and District 7. I've got these apartments that are almost done. I could afford to build them without your help but give me \$5 million and I'll give a certain amount." There's no way for us to guide it, and if you do that repeatedly, over time, over time, if it doesn't make sense, then we are not being the best stewards of taxpayer dollars, and that is our number one responsibility.

So, this something that, what I hear Council saying, and this is what we said at the vote in full Council, is that we're not saying no to Sycamore. This isn't a no. We want to go back, have a policy lens, so we can make an informed decision. If this developer is able to provide those units, because they're not cost constraint. Those units are not going away in six weeks, when we can have this policy discussion and figure out what makes sense. That this can come back to the table, and that's what I think a bit of frustration was. We didn't want to be forced into the situation to vote it up or down, when we could potentially have another tool in our toolbox that can deal with the 23,000 units that exist. Just kind of putting it forward to say, "Here, here's a cake that we know you like." That's a real dangerous situation to be in. So, Mr. Manager, Madam Mayor, is this policy item actually still in Committee?

Mayor Lyles said yes.

Mr. Winston said so, yes it is, because there's two pieces to it. There was never an action taken on the second piece. So, we need to give staff the guidance to say, let's go. Let's get this done. Let's have a lens that we can view this, and potentially future deals for last in, if that's the prerogative of Council, so we make an informed decision and be the best steward of taxpayer dollars. So, I'm going to vote no on this, but that doesn't mean that this should die on the vine, because it's certainly an opportunity in the next coming weeks for us to have a good and informed decision.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you so much, thank you. One bedroom, \$403 per month. Two bedrooms, \$484. Three bedrooms, \$559. That's 30 percent rent. When we talk about 30 percent AMI, that's very ambiguous. These are the actual rent amounts that this developer is proposing. They're also proposing, as Kenn Shrader with the Reentry Housing Alliance said, they're committed to banning the box regarding criminal screening. They're committed to having a preference for applicants who've been on an INLIVIAN or similar waitlist for more than year. So, when we talk about waitlist preferences, they're checking that box also.

They're committed to having 17 units, that are set aside for special needs residents, as determined by the North Carolina Department of Health and Services. At the beginning of the meeting, I read this beautiful proclamation. This is all nice for individuals who are vulnerable or disabled, but this is an opportunity to put our votes where our mouths are. There's 34 units that's willing to ban the box, give individuals second chances. I had a call at 7:30 a.m. in July of 2022 from a gentleman, Mr. Harris. His sister was on disability making \$900 a month. Her rent was going up. She wanted to know what to do. I told her to apply at different organizations, and she went on the waitlist. That was July 2022. He called me again today. The rent's going up again. She is still on the waitlist. I referred her to my colleagues, because I certainly don't have the answer.

So, we have people out here that are hurting individuals. Our current policy landed a whole tent city. Many of those individuals were working and in the 30 percent AMI. We are the policymakers. We have the ability to set policy. I would like tonight to put people over policy actually. So, Shawn, you mentioned different funds. You mentioned the Housing Impact Fund. You mentioned rolling RFP. The rolling RFP is a policy, something we're doing that's new we're starting. Again, we have the ability to create a policy for new construction. It doesn't have to be NOAHs. So, we could do this. As Councilmember Ajmera, she talked about earlier, the policy is open that we could do this.

So, I don't understand. This developer also talked about, he's willing to bring in nonprofit organizations to provide supportive services and wraparound services for the individuals. He's not your typical Ascent or the larger developer. It's a smaller developer. We need tools for developers who come to the table and say that, "I want to provide 30 percent AMI housing." We have a 23,000-to-33,000-unit deficit. We know we're not going to build our way out, but when we have someone handing us 34 units for \$403 to \$559, for us to turn away from that, I just think is a failure to represent our constituents.

I wanted to also ask you, I asked you earlier, were there any tools for developers who want to provide subsidized units, and we talked about different tools. Is there a tool for smaller developers who bring us units or who want to provide supportive housing? Do we have anything like that currently in our toolbox that would fit this project?

Mr. Heath said for this project really, frankly, the tool would be the Housing Trust Fund. That would be the funding source if Council chooses to move forward with this.

Ms. Johnson said and you said we've done it once before for a unit that was already complete, right?

Mr. Heath said well, not complete, but in construction.

Ms. Johnson said okay, in construction. Another thing about this complex. They're providing 34 units at 30 percent AMI. That's more than all of the other five projects that we approved, except for one. Is that correct?

Mr. Heath said yes, and that's really a byproduct of the size of the project itself, and I generally focus more on the percent of units at the 30 percent AMI level for an apples-to-apples comparison.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you. Then, lastly, I just want to lift up the names Liz Clasen-Kelly, Ray McKinnon, Kenny Robinson, Kenn Shrader, all low-income housing advocates, and myself, I'll say myself as well, who actually are on the front line with individuals, working with homeless individuals. We recognize what a great project this, and I implore Council members to approve this. We can develop a policy. You talk about setting a precedent. This is a good precedent to set. If we have a developer that says, "Hey, I'll bring you some 30 percent units and the maximum will be 60 percent, if you give me subsidy," then we should welcome that. We should figure out a way to say yes. We have homeless individuals on the street. We're approving hotels to be developed monthly. We know we had one hotel, and the gentlemen, he worked with DreamKey and all these other partners, and all they said is, "We need more inventory." That was the outcome. Here's more inventory. We had a City employee who lived in a hotel who needed additional housing. Here's an opportunity. We talk to people all the time. To vote this down because of a process, because we've never done it before, I think our voters elect us to do things that have not been done before to solve problems. So, that's all I have. Thank you.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Johnson, and Watlington

NAYS: Councilmembers Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Winston

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT FOR THE DEARMON ROAD COMPLETE STREET PROJECT

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to

May 22, 2023
Business Meeting
Minute Book 157C, Page 362

execute a Municipal Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation to accept Surface Transportation Block Grant funds in the amount of \$5,486,000 for the DeArmon Road Complete Street project, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 544-X appropriating \$5,486,000 in Surface Transportation Block Grant funds from NCDOT for construction to be used on the DeArmon Road Complete Street project.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 66, at Page(s) 79.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 54, at Page(s) 39.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT FOR THE I-85 NORTH BRIDGE PROJECT

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute a Supplemental Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation to accept Surface Transportation Block Grant funds in the amount of \$4,752,000 for the I-85 North Bridge project, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 545-X appropriating \$4,752,000 in Surface Transportation Block Grant funds from NCDOT for construction to be used on the I-85 North Bridge project.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 66, at Page(s) 80.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 54, at Page(s) 40.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 18: CHARLOTTE WATER ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM GRANT APPLICATION

Motion was made by Councilmember Winston, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager, or his designee, to apply for a grant in an amount of up to \$2,871,388.66 with the U.S. Department of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration for the Charlotte Water Electrification program, (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to accept a grant in an amount of up to \$2,871,388.66 from the U.S. Department of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration for the Charlotte Water Electrification program, and (C) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 546-X appropriating \$2,871,388.66 from the U.S. Department of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration to the Charlotte Water Capital Projects Fund contingent upon being named a successful grant recipient.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 66, at Page(s) 81.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 54, at Page(s) 41-42.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: GOOSE CREEK SANITARY SEWER EXTENSION REIMBURSABLE

Motion was made by Councilmember Winston, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to (A) Approve a five-year reimbursable agreement with Classic Neighborhood Development, LLC for construction of a portion of the Goose Creek Sanitary Sewer Extension to Cresthill Drive project, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance on appropriating \$2,400,000.00 from Classic Neighborhood Development, LLC to the Charlotte Water Capital Projects Fund.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 66, at Page(s) 82.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 20: LEASE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY AT JW CLAY PARKING DECK

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution to approve a lease agreement with ArKay Beauty Supply LLC, with a 61-month term for retail space in the JW Clay Parking Deck, (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the lease for up to one, 60-month term, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute all documents necessary to complete the transaction.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 54, at Page(s) 43.

Councilmember Mitchell said not wanting discussion, recognition, the owner's here. Congratulations. We wish you the best of luck.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: TELECOMMUNICATION LICENSE AGREEMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Winston, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to (A) Authorize the City Manager to execute a telecommunication license agreement with Crown Castle South LLC to license two shelter pads totaling approximately 215 square feet and to mount wireless equipment on a tower owned by Crown Castle South LLC for a term of 10 years, (B) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute all documents necessary to complete the transaction, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to renew the agreement for up to four, 60-month terms and to approve such other amendments as are consistent with the original intent of the agreement.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 22: UPSET BID PROCESS FOR CITY-OWNED PROPERTY ON FRENCH STREET

Motion was made by Councilmember Winston, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution to accept an offer and authorize the upset bid process for a portion of city-owned property (parcel identification number 078-212-01) located at 600 French Street for construction of a planned townhome development, and (B) Authorize the City Clerk to publish a notice of the proposed sale, which notice shall provide the description of the property, amount of the offer, and terms under which the offer may be upset.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 54, at Page(s) 44-46.

* * * * *

NOMINATIONS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

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

ITEM NO. 23: NOMINATIONS TO THE ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term for a Community Representative beginning July 1, 2023, and ending June 30, 2026.

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

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

May 22, 2023

Business Meeting

Minute Book 157C, Page 364

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term for a Real Estate Development Industry Representative beginning July 1, 2023, and ending June 30, 2026.

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

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 24: NOMINATIONS TO THE BECHTLER ARTS FOUNDATION

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2023, and ending June 30, 2026.

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

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 25: NOMINATIONS TO THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Asian-American Chamber of Commerce beginning April 29, 2023, and ending April 28, 2026.

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

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

The following nominations were made for two appointments for a three-year term recommended by the Charlotte Regional Business Alliance beginning April 29, 2023, and ending April 28, 2026.

- Catherine Morrison, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington, and Winston
- Robert Rolle, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington, and Winston

These appointments will be considered at the next Business meeting.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Metrolina Native American Association beginning April 29, 2023, and ending April 28, 2026.

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

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the National Association of Women Business Owners beginning April 29, 2023, and ending April 28, 2026.

- Marise Fernandes Kumar, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington, and Winston

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term beginning April 29, 2023, and ending April 28, 2026.

- Shenequa Thomas, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington, and Winston

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 26: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE BUSINESS INCLUSION ADVISORY

There were no nominations.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 27: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE INTERNATIONAL CABINET

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term for an Airport Staff Member category representative beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2024.

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

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2023, and ending June 30, 2026.

- Joseph Hoff, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Winston

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 28: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE MECKLENBURG PUBLIC ACCESS CORPORATION

The following nominations were made for two appointments for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2023, and ending June 30, 2026.

- Jakob Gattinger, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington, and Winston
- Pamela McCarter, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, Watlington, and Winston

These appointments will be considered at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 29: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE NEIGHBORHOOD EQUITY AND STABILIZATION COMMISSION

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a Market Rate Housing Developer for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending August 31, 2024.

- Eric Lemieux, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Bokhari, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Molina, and Winston

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2025.

- Faye Barnette-Shell, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera and Mitchell
- Frank Sutton, nominated by Councilmembers Anderson, Driggs and Graham

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 30: NOMINATIONS TO THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2023, and ending June 30, 2026.

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

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 31: NOMINATIONS TO THE PASSENGER VEHICLE FOR HIRE BOARD

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term for a Representative of Persons with Disabilities beginning July 1, 2023, and ending June 30, 2026.

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

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 32: NOMINATIONS TO THE STORM WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

There were no nominations.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 33: NOMINATIONS TO THE TRANSIT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

There were no nominations.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: CLOSED SESSION (AS NEEDED)


Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to (A) Discuss matters relating to the location or expansion of industries or other businesses in the area served by the public body, pursuant to NC General Statute § 143.318.11(a)(4), (B) Establish or instruct City staff concerning the positions to be taken on behalf of the City in negotiating the price and other material terms of a proposed contract for the acquisition of real property, pursuant to NC General Statute § 143.318.11(a)(5), and (C) Allow Council to view a recording has been ordered to be released, pursuant to General Statute § 132.1.4(a), pursuant to NC General Statute § 143.318.11(a)(10).

The meeting was recessed at 11:20 p.m. to move to CH-14 for a closed session.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:35 a.m. at the conclusion of the closed session.


Billie Tynes, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 4 Hours, 56 Minutes
Minutes completed: July 1, 2024