

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Dinner Briefing on Monday, September 11, 2017 at 5:16 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Jennifer Roberts presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Al Austin, Ed Driggs, Julie Eiselt, Patsy Kinsey, Vi Lyles, and Kenny Smith.

Absent: Councilmember Greg Phipps

Absent Until Noted: Councilmembers Carlenia Ivory, LaWana Mayfield, and James Mitchell

* * * * *

ITEM 1: CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Councilmember Smith, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to go into closed session pursuant to G.S. 143-318.11(a)(3) to consult with attorneys employed by the City in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege and to consider and give instructions concerning the handling of Crystal Eschert v. City of Charlotte – 3:16-CV-295.

Motion was made by Councilmember Smith, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to recuse Councilmember Fallon from the closed session.

The meeting was recessed at 5:17 p.m. to go into closed session.

Councilmember Mayfield arrived at 5:19 p.m.

Councilmembers Ivory and Mitchell arrived at 5:20 p.m.

* * * * *

The closed session concluded at 5:53 p.m. and the Council reconvened for the remainder of the Dinner Briefing in Room 267 at 5:53 p.m.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: AGENDA OVERVIEW

No Agenda Overview was provided.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT AGENDA QUESTIONS

Councilmember Driggs said I wanted to pull Item No. 34, the UNCC LYNX Item for discussion and separate vote.

Councilmember Mayfield said I also pulled Item No. 34.

Mayor Roberts said we have several presentations and in the interest of time we are to move the Tree Canopy Update to our next meeting. It is very important that we discuss it, but we just don't have time in tonight's Dinner Meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: CHARLOTTE CONVENTION CENTER EXPANSION AND UPDATE

Tom Murray, Charlotte Regional Visitors Authority (CRVA) said we are here today to talk to you about the Convention Center Expansion, provide you background before the September 25, 2017 vote on this project. We are going to go over a little bit about

what has been going on with the project, and we are going to do some additional information around the project description and the next steps through the process. As most of you will remember, we've been in front of you on this project on numerous occasions to date. Just as a matter of background the Convention Center is now 22-years old, and the market has evolved and changed on their needs and their demands for what they are looking for from trade shows and more on meetings and breakouts as we've talked about in the past. As you know, we conducted a study recently done by Jones Lang LaSalle to talk about the competitiveness of the Convention Center. It was a pretty in-depth study that took over 18-months. We surveyed 176 meeting planners; had meeting planner focus groups, we did one-on-one meeting planner interviews. We interviewed the CRVA staff, looked at competitive destinations and met with their teams on those sites, and we spent a lot of time on technology to make sure we understood what it would take to be competitive from a technology standpoint. The study as we provided you previously talked about some conclusions that they recommended we move forward with. As part of that process, we are we are proposing to do the Convention Center Expansion to address the top three parts of these conclusions. One was to enhance the meeting experience; two was to increase the amount of breakout space, and three was to create a pedestrian friendly connection between the Convention Center and the Westin Hotel and the new Crescent development at Stonewall Station. That is what the project is working on now. The breakout space was the number two reason why we were not as competitive with cities like Nashville, Austin, Louisville, Tampa, and Indianapolis. The number one reason still had to do with the number of large hotels and the number of hotel rooms, and as you know the market places addressing the number of hotel rooms in a large part as market places will respond, as we are seeing a 30% increase in the inventory in the market as we have today.

The background is that we have now engaged TVS Design to develop the Convention Center improvement design concepts. They happen to be the original architect on the Convention Center, and they are the country's predominant convention center architects. In September of 2016, we updated the Council on the conceptual drawings and designs and estimated the project costs would be in the neighborhood of \$100 million. In 2016, we selected TVS as the design partner by the committee made up of members from Engineering and Property Management and the CRVA. In January of 2017, the Council approved \$1.6 million in funding for the completion of the schematic design. In May 2017, Holder/Edison Foard was selected as Construction Manager by a committee made up of members of the Engineering and Property Management and the CRVA; just recently in July 2017 we completed the schematic designs.

The Convention Center funding for the expansion will come from what was set up as the Convention Center Fund. That Convention Center Fund is made up of the 1% prepared food and beverage tax in Mecklenburg County and the first 3% of the 8% Occupancy Tax on hotels in Mecklenburg County. That fund has specific uses that it is meant for; originally, it was just for the Convention Center maintenance and expansion and marketing for the Convention Center. Earlier, we have had some adjustments to it during the Bank of America Stadium expansion modification and added amateur sports so that fund's uses are just those, but the predominant use for this fund has always been to make sure that we stay competitive in the convention industry and make sure that we can win against cities that we compete with every day.

The current scope and estimates are still in place. We still think we are around \$110 million for the project. We will complete the breakout space along the Stonewall Corridor and Steve Bagwell who is running this project will walk you through some of those drawings to remind you of those and also the pedestrian bid. Management and Financial Services has confirmed the Convention Center Fund can accommodate up to the \$110 million for this expansion. This is Steve Bagwell, our Vice President of Venues and runs all of our Venues, except for the NASCAR Hall of Fame. He has been taking the lead on this project and is going to walk through some of the work that he has been doing.

Steve Bagwell, Charlotte Convention Center said I wanted to expose Council tonight to some of the renderings associated with the project. We are very excited about what this is going to do for the Convention Center. This shot is a picture of the exterior or the outside of the building. Just to orient you, that is Stonewall Street, and that is below the project. To the right side of the picture across Stonewall Street is the Westin Hotel and also the Whole Foods Project, and that is the NASCAR Tower in the background. This is sort of a sleepy side of the Convention Center currently. It is existing roof line, and with this project it will really be transformative for this side of the building with the glass curtain wall that you see there housing the new breakout space and will lend itself very nicely to making this a more vibrant side of the Convention Center connecting it to all of the development that we see going up and down Stonewall Street. This is on the inside of the building looking out, so this is the other side of the glass curtain wall that we just saw. Again, outside of the window you will see the Whole Foods Project and also the Westin again. We are really excited about the amount of pre-function space this will bring to the project. That is something that our planners very much want to have for networking, for attendees to use between sessions, and we are also going to make sure that the new space really blends well with the existing Convention Center. We are going to make sure that the carpet, the window designs and the ceiling designs you see here flow very nicely to the existing space.

Moving on with a little more descriptive of the meeting room space; there will be 26,000 square feet of breakout space in the project, with another 15,000 square feet of pre-function space. This will allow the Convention Center in Charlotte to catch up to what we are seeing in the industry. Where the trend is those smaller breakout spaces are growing in proportion to the larger exhibit spaces and as our meeting planners tell us we need this to continue to be competitive with the cities that Tom mentioned; that is really crucial for us. Most of the 15 rooms that will be added are between 1,800 square feet and 2,600 square feet; we are looking at one here and they can be combined to create spaces as big as 10,000 square feet. Again, our meeting planners tell us that is really the critical size they are looking for in terms of what would make our building more attractive. Here we have a shot of the pedestrian bridge that will connect the Convention Center to the Westin Hotel, and again this is a critical component of what our planners are telling us will make our building better. That connection to the headquarters hotel where it is very convenient to just walk across the bridge to the building, much improved over crossing Stonewall Street right now and walking a block down to the College Street entrance. That is going to be something that attendees are really going to like. We've talked to CATS about the project, and they are very supportive of it and as you can see here how we are going to accomplish the pedestrian connection is by expanding the light rail corridor and putting pedestrian friendly thoroughfares on either side of the tracks.

A closer shot from street level of the pedestrian bridge; again making this connection to the south side of the City, one of the kinds of exciting things about the project, a concept that we are looking at is this picture frame overlook that can be a part of the bridge. One of the things we would like to accomplish is to kind of make the bridge kind of a pedestrian friendly area, where folks can relax between sessions, and this is similar, those of you who have visited New York over the last few years, the high line concept in New York they have a couple of these picture frame overlooks on that system in New York City.

Finally, the last rendering I wanted to talk about was we will now have, with the completion of the project, access to the building from street level; we will walk up one set of steps that will give you access to a lobby like this and then you will take an elevator up or some stairs you can see in the background that will take you into the new meeting room space. That is something we have not had on the Stonewall side of the building and another great advancement to have street level tie into the Convention Center.

Mr. Murry said the next steps for us tonight is the Council Briefing and on September 25, 2017 Council will consider approving an Inter-local Agreement for CRVA to contract for the preconstruction services of up to \$8.5 million and CRVA will then be reimbursed

in 2019 for the funding that we advanced on the project. Over the next 18-months design and development and construction drawings will be completed, and early in FY2019 Council is requested to approve a full construction contract and approve the debt financing. In early 2021, construction is expected to be completed. Construction should start right after the NBA All Star Game in February 2019. That is our presentation and I'm happy to take any questions.

Councilmember Lyles said when you mentioned the survey and the conclusions from it and I think you referenced also exhibition space, so tell me a little bit about how exhibition space actually works, because I've seen that we haven't expanded our exhibition space. Is it time to do that or is it just not planned in the sequence of doing that? I'm just wondering where we are on that idea.

Mr. Murry said I think that is a great question and yes, I think someday we would like the ability to expand the exhibit space but today's conditions after 20-years show that the exhibit space that we built was big enough to handle the clients that we are trying to attract. The challenge is that many times we don't have the breakout space that they need, so we think in the majority of the cases the exhibit hall is big enough for us. As our City grows and we compete at higher levels, we may need to expand. We will have to be thoughtful; that was one of the recommendations out of the study about where we could expand that space.

Ms. Lyles said the plan for the Convention Center expansion that was the fourth conclusion that you had that exhibit space would be a high priority?

Mr. Murry said it may be a priority in the future, but it would really have to be opportunistic. We would have to partner with someone else in an adjacent piece of land that would give us an opportunity to do that. The way that the Convention Center lays out, there are restrictions about where we could go to do that. There are not that many opportunities to do that.

Ms. Lyles said so the constraint is the current design and footprint for exhibition space.

Mr. Murry said yes, I think the exhibit hall when we look at the next 20-years we think that is not the biggest priority and the bigger priority to keep us competitive is actually the breakout space and working on some of the other projects that we talked about, but long-term, we always want to look at long-term on behalf of the community, and we will think about how to preserve abilities to grow in the future.

Councilmember Mayfield said Mr. Murry, I was listening and flipping through this and maybe I missed it. What if any of the cost sharing is being done by the Westin, since they also are going to benefit significantly off of this link?

Mr. Murry said the Westin is not doing any cost sharing on the bridge link at this time.

Ms. Mayfield said I'm trying to understand why we would have a presentation where the hospitality and tourism fund because it is going to benefit this independent private business by one, their customers not having to leave out, depending on what the weather is and connect, and that is also going to be a major selling point for people to stay in that hotel versus others that may be coming around because of the link. Were there negotiations; were there any conversations and they chose not to be a part of it?

Mr. Murry said one thing the Westin Hotel is the largest contributor of hotel tax in our community.

Ms. Mayfield said today because we've got new ones coming.

Mr. Murry said they still individually would be the largest hotel for anything that has been announced individual hotel contributor to the tax and when you take their parent company Marriott their large inventory of hotels in the market place that are funding that the hotel industry feels that fund for the Convention Center is being contributed to on

behalf of the hotel industry to make sure that we keep the Convention Center competitive.

Mr. Mayfield said so, we did have the conversation but because of the parent company of the Westin and the Westin, they feel like they are already contributing to the construction of this expansion.

Mr. Murry said it is the hotel industry belief in general that that is why the Convention Center Fund is there.

Councilmember Driggs said I would just say further to that point; all the hotels contribute; does anybody else object to the fact that this one is getting that special advantage?

Mr. Murry said I think quite frankly the advantage is a recommendation from the study that the Convention Center is less competitive, because a lot of meeting planners require as kind of part of their check list that you need to have a hotel that is connected to your Convention Center; a Convention Center Hotel and we don't get a lot of groups because we don't make that check list. It is actually to the convention industry and our competitiveness position that this is something that we highly desire. Will it benefit them? Yes. Will they be able to charge more money because of it? I don't think that is the connection, but we may be more successful as a Convention Center and industry because of the connectivity. The other nice thing about what the meeting planner industry is saying to us is visitors want to authentically feel our City when they arrive here, and they want these kinds of connectivity to the City and other cities like Austin and Nashville have started to make that connectivity where we fail in comparison.

Mr. Driggs said that actually wasn't my question, so if I may ask, I recognize that we need to make a big investment in the Convention Center, and I support that, so really my only concern here is how do we determine that this \$110 million is sort of the sweet spot for the most productive solution? I respect the work you've done; I think it looks great but why not \$90 million or \$150 million. Is there any way to kind of answer that question in terms of how we project revenues from the Convention Center and what benefit we expect to see from Convention Center revenues as a result of this investment or payback period type analysis? I'm just trying to find a context financially for this.

Mr. Murry said yes sir, we looked at that as part of the study and the third party, JLL recommended that they thought that this would bring us enough additional new revenues to have a payback actually within three-years but certainly within five-years of the investment, additional revenues to do that. We do think that is the case. We had other options and recommendations from this group. We picked these as the highest priorities that gave us the most return on our investment as you suggest, and we think that these are the highest priorities from staying competitive.

Mr. Driggs said it is a good project, thanks.

Councilmember Fallon said Tom, my favorite thing that I need a golf cart for. What are you going to do with that entrance, that long hall?

Mr. Murry said as part of this study they talked about changing the way that the customer experiences the Convention Center and so that there is a lot more opportunity for small meetings and that may be two to five people in settings and so when we do this project we are looking to refurbish the seating areas and adding technology ports and those kinds of things to improve connectivity, actually mini meeting spaces so that folks can meet and that will enhance the way you feel. We have other drawings that show that but it will enhance the way you feel as you enter, and I think may make that way when you walk in you feel differently. We certainly have heard your point on this in other times, and we've been thoughtful about making sure that it felt –

Ms. Fallon said no retail, no boutiques, no little restaurants?

Mr. Murry said retail, we are doing some changing in the retail. We are upgrading the way that we deal with it and with the business center side of it and the welcome centers but for the most part there is not space for sufficient retail in that area.

Councilmember Ajmera said with regards to slide #6, Project Background; I would like to understand how this was approved. You are asking for \$8.5 million construction services on September 25, 2017, and I'm looking at the Project Background slide #6. Walk me through that, because I'm trying to understand this \$8.5 million ask, was that discussed earlier?

Mr. Murry said as part of the whole \$110 million project that we did discuss earlier there are phases where we will continue to come to you. This is a component of the larger \$100 million plus project, and it was always contemplated that we would come to you in stages as we progress through this process. We are just now at the next stage of that, and in keeping with a project this size the staff felt it was appropriate that we keep coming back to you to tell you where we are on these projects. That is why we are here today to talk about the next phase which is the funding of this next set of building design drawings.

Ms. Ajmera said so this \$100 million plus project cost, was that part of the estimate that was presented to us for overall funding that we have left in tourism dollars? I think that might be a question for Finance staff.

Mr. Murry said I think I can answer that; yes, that was the amount that we had reserved in the funding model for this project.

Ms. Ajmera said are you saying this \$8.5 million is the same as what was approved earlier?

Mr. Murry said yes ma'am; it is inside the \$110 million project.

Councilmember Mitchell said as we talk about the different phases, hopefully by September 25, 2017, staff will have the breakdown how much MWBE participation we will have on each phase. Has there been discussion with staff already?

Mr. Murry said yes we've discussed the MWBE participation with staff and are making our efforts in that direction.

Mr. Mitchell said so by September 25, 2017, we will have that as part of the action item for Council?

Mr. Murry said we will revisit the issue.

Mr. Driggs said I just want to clarify, did we actually vote to approve \$110 million for this? I remember we had a conversation and the \$1.6 million was being discussed, and I don't know whether there is a decision in place that we are committing these funds. It is just a technical –

Mr. Murry said we haven't voted on the whole \$110 million for the project. We voted in stages to advance to the next stage of the project.

Mr. Driggs said at what point would you expect to be able to put an amount certain in front us for which you would be accountable?

Randy Harrington, Chief Financial Officer said as a practical matter, if Council decides to move forward this administratively, we will go ahead and hold the \$110 million of capacity aside so that we don't allocate that for any other projects. The full financing would come essentially in the fall of 2018.

Mr. Driggs said I just want it clarified, there will be a point in time at which we will commit to an amount and then that is an accountable number above which we are in an overrun situation, right? We don't have a firm estimate for the project yet.

Mr. Harrington said we told CRVA \$110 million and that is the project budget at this point, but we don't anticipate that moving right now, unless something really in material and unique would come forward.

Councilmember Smith said in a similar vein of Mr. Driggs, we are in for \$1.6 million, and we are in for \$8.5 million, if you come back to us and tell us it actually cost \$125 million or \$130 million, what allowances do we have?

Mr. Murry said our intent is to adopt the project scope to end up at that \$110 million if we have to and we will have to reduce parts from what we call Phase One of the project to a future phase is where we would end up having to be. Today, we are still on line but as you know construction prices move constantly, and they are always a battle, so we have some flexibility.

Mr. Smith said I get it and they are going through the roof right now. My larger concern is that we get so far as a body with a certain amount of hard dollars that we are beyond the point of return, because we've already spent \$10 to \$15 million or whatever it is and then we have a project that is larger in scope than we originally anticipated.

Mr. Driggs said we have a personal guarantee from Mr. Harrington at this point.

Mr. Murry said not to leave him out there; I'm standing by his side.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: CAMP NORTH END INFRASTRUCTURE REIMBURSEMENT

Councilmember Mitchell said thank you ED Committee for looking at this item and I'm thankful we have Councilmembers Kinsey and Ivory already on board. Thank you District Reps.

Pat Mumford, Economic Development Director said we have two projects we want to discuss very similar so use of Capital Investment money and one of them has an additional component to that of a Tax Increment Grant.

Let me just talk generally about the ability of capital dollars to support development to support leveraging of private sector money. What you are going to hear about tonight is two great examples of how your capital program is doing just that. It is allowing projects to come forward and infrastructure to become developed more quickly and aligned more closely with private development. That is exactly what you all have set up from the very beginning with this program. The bottom line is it is working in that regard.

There are two projects and the first one I'm going to discuss is in the Applied Innovation Corridor and it is Camp North End. Most if not all of you have had an opportunity to go out to the site to take a look at the buildings; we've discussed this a good bit in the Committee and also generally. I'm going to walk through the objectives of the project in the CIP, talk about some of the details and get to what the ask will be in two week. Tonight is to explain the terms of the agreements and on the 25th you will be asked to give the City Manager the authority to negotiate a contract based on the terms that we will be discussing this evening. A lot of complexity in both of these projects, but generally it is about the developers building infrastructure that we would have otherwise built in the future and then we will reimburse for that.

So to orient people, the Applied Innovation Corridor as we look at it from a capital planning standpoint runs up I-77 along I-85, back down a little bit north of Atando Avenue and then just a little bit east of North Davidson Street. It is a large area and when this geography was put into place, it was supported by a planning effort, various

different plans came forward through the Center City Partners 2020 Vision Plan. The idea was that this area, which is highly industrial, was going to be redeveloped. We saw that the pressures from downtown were heading out that way. How might we do that very strategically? We knew that infrastructure was really critical in that area, so we've built upon that; a ULI Study came in and recommended that infrastructure be placed in this area to unlock the potential, so the CIP was charged with identifying and prioritizing where to use the money most to leverage. There were not specific developers on board at the time and so the idea was to look at streets that needed to be improved; connectivity which is very important in that area and then along came ATCO. ATCO is a development firm that purchased the 72-acres which used to be most recently the Rite Aid Distribution Center, so we recalibrated a little bit of the capital dollars so that we can leverage it to support both our long-term public needs and this development. Some of the goals that are highlighted here include the ability to create a sense of place and if you have been out to the ATCO site you will see that there is that already underway. Some of the space has been leased; there is activity on Friday Evenings; there is becoming a real sense of what this could be out there. It is still about 1.1 million square feet of space to be addressed but it is changing.

Councilmember Eiselt said I was out there the other day, and I love what they are doing out there and how they are activating it. Can you speak at all to the limitations, because I understand they have just found out that they are not able to use the big distribution center now for pop-up activity? The County had said they are not permitted to do that.

Mr. Mumford said there is a challenge with taking an almost 100-year old, 200,000 square foot space and turning it into active uses, so we are working through and helping the developer work through bathrooms and fire exits and temporary uses. Yes, they have been told by the County that there are some challenges on the books with what the regulatory environment suggest and what they are wanting to do. The challenge we are facing is this 72-acre site and this amount of old building space was not really in the thought process when those regulations were put into place, so we are working through. Life safety is critically important, and we need to make sure that is taking into account as they activate spaces in a temporary use. What you have referenced is how can they utilize these buildings temporarily to gain some more attraction to the development. Ultimately, there will be a permanent use and the buildings will be permanently rehabbed, but today it is a little bit of a challenge for them.

Ms. Eiselt said that worries me, because I don't understand how much of a challenge it is. I sort of sense that it was an obstacle that they couldn't overcome, that code restriction and the vibe, if you will, of Camp North End right now is really critical to activating this. So, as we look at putting millions of dollars into the vision out there; if they have to tear it down to rebuild because of existing codes and that is a whole different project. If they can't use the building as it is that concerns me.

Mr. Mumford said the use right now that is a challenge is that temporary or interim uses for this space; the long-term vision is to have a permanent revitalized building, especially the Ford Plant, which is what you are referencing for a permanent use. The challenge isn't that permanent solution; it is the interim solution to activate the space and we continue to work with the developer, the state and the county to see if there is a way to do that.

Two other items that are critically important here: improving the streetscapes so a sense of feel and a sense of place. Right now if you were to walk Graham Street or ride your bike on Graham Street, it is tight. The physical environment, the buildings that have been built over the last century are right up on the street sometimes and makes for a tight sidewalk, so we are taking in account the built environment but also knowing we need to enhance that in order to improve esthetics and then connectivity. We don't have a lot of opportunity today to connect from Graham Street to Statesville Avenue and this project allows that with some of the reimbursed infrastructure I'm going to describe but also some of the internal network the developer is paying for themselves.

Also objectives that you've seen with the CIP, the Letter to the Community and Ten Traits of a Winning City are addressed with this project. This is clearly an urban infill project, and it is a wonderful opportunity to on the ground speak to these things that you've all said are important to this community. This slide show, in red, the initial CIP list of projects and this was back before ATCO was here. This was when the team was looking at how we can enhance this space, and we are continuing to work on those projects. In the interim we are going to use \$10 million that is unallocated for these projects today and set that aside we are proposing for ATCO and then in 2018 with the bond package reserve \$5 million of that \$13.8 million to move forward with the rest of the ATCO project. It is not an either/or proposition here; it is an 'and'. We are continuing to work through the design process of those other projects while we are working with the one that we know will enhance that area and leverage a large amount of private funds.

This shows the Innovation Corridor and shown in purple is the Camp North End site. You all have seen some of this already through the rezoning petition, and the rezoning comes to you next week for approval. Existing is a little over 1.2 million square feet of space and the first ten-years; this is a long-term project before it will be built out, but the first ten-years you can see the complimentary uses and the size of uses that are being proposed and that represents about a \$350 million investment by the developer. It is suggested that on site through these improvements there could be facilities that would support 4,500 people working there on a permanent basis. It is a huge impact just a mile and a half from the center of downtown.

I will quickly run through the streets that we are proposing the developer will build and we will reimburse through the CIP. The first is Graham Street and I mentioned to you that Graham Street is a tough street right now, a lot of traffic; it is a state street. We will probably have to make most of these improvements to the developer's side, because there is not a lot of room to move on the other side. So, enhancements will be accessing into the site, turn lanes, sidewalks, streetscape, really beautifying and enhancing it for the pedestrian, the cyclist and for vehicles. The green line up there is Woodward which connects today Graham Street over to Statesville Avenue and ends up at Statesville Avenue right at the new Mecklenburg Aquatic Center, and if you have driven there you know that it is still a very industrial feel, and this will allow this to open up and be more pedestrian focused. Statesville Avenue to the north of this slide; Statesville Avenue went on what we call the road diet. This is a state street today, and we are talking with the state about how we can continue that to be more in the vein of sidewalks, pedestrians and allow for this mix of uses in this street cross section that we know is more of a complete street design. The final connection point here is Sylvania Avenue. Now Sylvania Avenue exists on the other side of Graham Street does not exist as a public street today. This would be built and give a very nice connection point between the two streets. Right now, it is only up there at Woodward and then all the way down to this intersection of Statesville Avenue and Graham Street. This project allows for and this investment allows for a great deal of connectivity.

Three other components here are these railroad crossings. Norfolk Southern has a rail line right now that is inactive, and the developer is actually working with Norfolk Southern to see how to allow for what is technically a railroad crossing because the rail line is still there. The middle one does not exist today and was never active; the other two were active rail crossings. The middle one will allow for development to have a street to come through there and on up to Woodward and allow for a lot of connectivity and hopefully those negotiations are going well with the railroad and ATCO. I think that can be a huge game changer for this project and frankly for the public side of that corridor.

The benefits we talked about enhancing the opportunity to leverage private sector dollars to take a look at how this brings forward the planning that has been done in the past so we are not just coming up with this today; this is building on efforts that have gone on for years. As we mentioned ATCO is already activating this site so there is interest in this site; they are continuing to talk to large scale tenants and small scale tenants so this is a real project, money has been invested and continues to be invested.

The proposal here is up to \$15 million of CIP money, and that leverages the \$350 million in private investment, of that, \$23 million will be on site for infrastructure so comparable connectivity in streets and sidewalks on the interior that bring public benefit that the City does not pay for, then ultimately that generates a place for 4,500 people to work and an annual City property tax revenue of \$1.7 million once it is fully built out and phased, that first ten-year phase.

Now to the key terms and again, it is the key terms that we are asking you to support and then we will work through all the details in that context. We will reimburse up to the \$15 million; \$10 million of that has been already approved from 2014/2016 bonds. The other \$5 million is from 2018, so clearly is subject to the approval of the voters of that bond package. The roads will be constructed to our standards and our specifications; all rights-of-way, and this is important, because most of the rights-of-way to do this work land on the developer's side because of the tightness of those streets, and that is coming to us. It is about a \$1.2 million value that if we went to build those roads through the straight CIP program, we would have to buy that from the land owner. All costs overruns beyond the \$15 million will be for the developer to pick up. If you think about it we wanted to do this level of work in this area; we wanted to leverage money. We have a developer. We've now capped our dollar risks, and we are buying the road in today's dollars and as Mr. Smith mentioned construction costs are going up exorbitantly, so we are locking in those dollars early. It comes to market more quickly which unlocks the value in that property more quickly.

I also want to talk a little bit about the equitable economic development. This developer is already engaged in conversations with the community about workforce. You've done a great job with that; they are very supportive of figuring out how the project P.I.E.C.E. program can play out on this site, so we are going to continue to work with them in that vein, as well as the MWSBE utilization commitment. We don't know the exact design today, nor do we know the opportunity that exists for that particular type of work, but they have committed to at least 10% utilization for that infrastructure. If you think about it today on a minority side, our average is around 6%. On small business, the high side we've had on this type of project with the City has been 19%, so if you blend that rate it gets to the 10% to 12% range, so they are comfortable with at least 10%, and I know they will work diligently to maximize that.

The rezoning decision as I mentioned to you is coming up next week, and then this will be brought forward for action for the Council to support not only the \$15 million of CIP but also to authorize the City Manager to execute the agreements based on this context.

Councilmember Lyles said Mr. Mumford said if we can go to slide #14, I want to just address if we can look at this in a whole and think about what that community was like before it became an opportunity for redevelopment, and you think about we've redone Fairview Homes. We've done Greenville 25 to 30 years ago, and this is an opportunity for us to actually put what I think some of our history investment in, so I really appreciate the project. I think it is a great project, but I am very uncomfortable with the Equitable Economic Development goal. It says that we have at least 10% utilization for public infrastructure improvement, and we've been having some conversations in the community about both jobs and economic opportunity. I really appreciate the continual prioritization, but to me what gets measured gets done, and I'm not quite sure that I understand what continued prioritizing means when we talk about the opportunities for MWSBE here. I look at this and even with our job levels when we talk about the 4,500 jobs, they are jobs, but we don't know what type of jobs they are likely to be, what income level they are and this community has always been a community that has sought opportunity. I'm concerns that we don't have a measurement of what that opportunity will be like here and when we talk about our public dollars coming in we are helping to create economic wellbeing but for whom and along that corridor how? Already, we've got situations where there is concern in Druid Hills about how people are being pushed out of their homes, and we are trying to hold on to that, but look at that corridor and what it is going to do, and Camp North End is great but I don't see us creating economic opportunities here and I don't see a strong enough presence in terms

of really defining what the minority business participation is and what the jobs will be there. Perhaps you can help me understand how that works and what it means to say continue prioritizing.

Mr. Mumford said when I mentioned 4,500 jobs, those are jobs for tenants that come into that development. I don't know and the developer doesn't know what those are today. That is going to be market driven by who wants to locate, so I can't speak to that. As a CIP funded project, we were looking that it is very comparable to if we did the project, and that would be the infrastructure road building work itself. We do have some control and opportunity to really drive that. Beyond that, it really is about partnering with this developer which has shown great faith in helping Project P.I.E.C.E, reaching out to Druid Hills understanding the issues on the ground in our community. They understand Equitable Economic Development; they understand we are pushing for that, but we don't know enough about this project yet to clearly identify a goal and codify that in a contract. The world just isn't that clear to us moving forward, but with the infrastructure it is.

Ms. Lyles said I understand that, and I understand that what we've got as the requested action is approve the \$15 million for the infrastructure and improvements and then authorize the Manager to negotiate and execute agreements consistent with the negotiated terms. That to me is not a term; continue prioritizing is not a term. That is sufficient enough to say what are we negotiating from or where are we going. I really believe that if we are going to actually encourage this kind of infill development in the neighborhoods and with the community surrounding it, if we can't point to benefits that we are going to do that will actually impact the communities, I think we are missing something here. I'm just not comfortable that we have an understanding of what opportunities are going to be there for minority and small business and women owned businesses and how that works to help that community retain the character that it has, increase its ability to make sure that Greenville and all of those places along that corridor are going to be able to remain with those 4,500 jobs there, people not coming in and squeezing poor people out that have been there forever. I'm just very concerned about that.

Mr. Mumford said we will have continued conversations between now and the 25th and see if we can put some more words with clarity around that.

Councilmember Mayfield said mine is directly related to Ms. Lyles' comments. Ms. Lyles if I am hearing you correctly, Mr. Mumford I think the question additionally on the same line that I have is regarding that minority participation on the front end and being a part of the decision making not as a - okay we decided what we are going to do and now we are going to reach out, because we've already reached out. We know Junior Achievement is coming in, a good possibility; we know some groups are coming to the table, but what I'm hearing is if we put the plan together then we already identified minority participation. I think what I'm hearing from Ms. Lyles or maybe it is just what I want to hear since we tend to hear what we want to hear is that, we have minority business owners already here. We have those that are developers and major business owners that are already here. They need to be a part of this conversation at this level of the conversation, not a now that we've decided what we are going to do, what do you think you can bring to fit into the conversation. This really isn't directed to you Mr. Mumford; it is directed directly to our City Manager as far as when the report out to staff, as far as how we move forward should go, because if we talk about we want to do something different then that means being at the table at the front end when decisions are being made, not you coming to tell me this is what we have created now figure out how to fit in where you can get in.

Councilmember Smith said here is what this project does, if you go along Graham Street or along North Tryon Street and Statesville Avenue you have a lot of commercial property that is just drastically underutilized. We showed a building recently. It is a 2,000 square foot small building, and it is not in good shape, and that area is ripe for people to come in and open up small businesses and parlay off this larger investment. I think that corridor is ripe to have some of these buildings get brought up to a more

equitable standard to the private sector. We put \$15 million in there I'm telling you the excitement along Graham Street and some of these small strip centers in some of these small areas that need revitalization, it isn't going to happen, the ATCO project is going to anchor that. This project is going the rest of the private sector the belief and faith that will come into develop some of these other properties. The neighbors, that is something we have to figure out, and I think that is one long term as a community with the gentrification we've got to come to some sort of policy on, but regarding the commercial sector over there this \$15 million is going to unleash areas for people to have small businesses and safer neighborhoods.

Councilmember Driggs said I hear the arguments about leveraging the investment, but I just want to remind everybody we committed to invest this money in infrastructure years ago and at the same time we committed to invest \$800 million in other projects. We haven't applied these tests to every single one of those. What this is doing is it is allowing the developer to pay for some streets, finance the construction of streets that we wanted to build anyway, and we will pay him back. I think we need to continue to pursue the goals that you are talking about, but I don't want to see these transactions get sort of clouded by a false understanding of what this represents. We are investing in City streets that we intended to pay for anyway, and we are getting \$1.7 million in tax receipts out of the project, a huge amount of private investment, and I don't think we should overload it with other requirements.

Ms. Eiselt said from the conversation that Ms. Lyles started I'm hearing something different so I hear you saying there is a floor of 10% in MWSBE participation, so that to me is fixed. It is 10% but could go higher, because this is very preliminary. I think where that conversation went though is a very different conversation and already there are some businesses over there in development and they are not businesses that are normally seen on Statesville Road, so that is a very different conversation. This is going to open it up, but is it going to boot out the people that have been living there forever, and that is a separate conversation that we have to have and how we do something about that I don't it is the same conversation of how do you build streets and how do you get the infrastructure in there so you can attract the development. The development that it attracts is the conversation we have to have and the neighbors have been so engaged. When there are community meetings there are 200 plus people, and let's make sure that we are also going the long haul with them as to how they can stay in the area. They can open up businesses there, and to me that is two different things.

Councilmember Ivory said basically, what I want to say is what Ms. Lyles and Ms. Mayfield is saying is very correct, because in selling this and in talking with the residents in that area, the hope is that they have the opportunity to have some of these jobs. They have the opportunity to continue to live there. They are very excited about this, and like I said before worked in that area for almost 20-years, and it was probably the most drug infested area and with the exception of Bright Walk and the new Aquatic Center there was nothing so they are very excited, but to hear that there is a possibility, they want to grow this area, but they might be put out of the area or it might hurt them. That is not what they are looking for, so I would hope that we do have that conversation, because that is a needed conversation. You engaged them to endorse this; we need to make sure they have a clear understanding of what is going to happen, because this is in close proximity to downtown, and if we are not careful it will affect the people who endorsed this project.

Mayor Roberts said I think the view of Council is pretty clear on the need for including the neighborhoods and making sure that we are working very hard for that opportunity.

Ms. Lyles said I just want to say that I've been pretty consistent; I've attended the ED Committee meetings, and I said that when we talk about these public/private infrastructure grants that it is something that we went through with a project that was a major project, and I said okay I understand, but we needed to have a policy decision before we start bringing these forward, especially those that are in neighborhoods that haven't had an opportunity to participate, and we can see how that is. Ms. Eiselt, I agree the 10% is on the advancement of our capital investment, and that is a floor for

the governmental use of funding. There is nothing in here that talks about how except continuing to prioritize. That to me is not a sufficient enough agreement for me to say that the Manager can execute an agreement without some certainty for these neighborhoods and for the people that participate there.

Mayor Roberts said it looks like we have some work today before the 25th.

Councilmember Kinsey said Druid Hills is in District 1 and they have been very involved with this. I stay very close to them, and I don't think they are worried; they welcome this. I don't think they are overly worried about the area being gentrified. The Housing Partnership is working in the area, and I have had long conversations with Pam Wideman. We have to get out in front of the gentrification, and I think that is what we are trying to do. I see this as two different things; obviously, we want to do what we need to do with our money that we are spending on the ATCO property, but I think Druid Hills; I can only speak for Druid Hills, because that is the only neighborhood, well Lockwood and Graham Heights, but Druid Hills is the main one I think everyone is thinking about. It is just two different things, and I know I'm working very closely with Druid Hills, Lockwood, and Graham Heights for that matter. Let's just keep these separate in our minds, because whether or not at code was there, we would have to be careful about gentrification in those neighborhoods.

Mayor Roberts said so we will have some of those questions answered by the 25th.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said yes.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 6: RIVER DISTRICT INFRASTRUCTURE REIMBURSEMENT

Pat Mumford, Economic Development Director said River District has been multiple times through the Committee; the request on the 25th will be similar to the last project, That is the use of \$16.2 million of CIP funds for road infrastructure. This has an addition which the last one did not, which is \$15 million that would go towards additional road infrastructure that would be funded through a Tax Increment Grant. Most of you are familiar; this is the site west of I-485, west of the Airport, and we are talking about Phase I. You all approved a rezoning on this about a year ago, and Phase I is the focus of both of these grants. It is a large amount of development in Phase I; Phase II and III are for another day.

The same thing as the last this is touching on goals of CIP, Community Letter and Traits of a Winning City. This slide shows that the work that we are proposing around the large major road network the City is supporting through reimbursement is about half of the total road network in that Phase I. The private sector is putting in \$30 million worth of connectivity in roads that will be publicly accessible roads, and so it is about a 50/50 split in that Phase I. The blue line that just came up is West Boulevard Extension and a little bit north/south there of Garrison Road. That is what the CIP money is proposed to reimbursement the developer who would construct that. The green shows through the Tax Increment Grant what could be built, and that is the northwest, the continuation of Garrison Road and then Dixie River Road, and if there is enough funding available after that you see the dash green line that is a continuation of the West Boulevard Extension.

Councilmember Mitchell said so, it is CIP is \$16.2 million, TIG \$15 million; the developer is not asking for \$30 million. I just want to make sure we are clear; the only ask is the CIP and TIG, correct?

Mr. Mumford said that is correct; private developer investment is \$30 million and then there is the community investment with the CIP and Tax Increment to reimburse and that equals \$31.2 million.

Mr. Mitchell said I would just say for clarification so this gets out to the media if you want to add private investment, because that slide shows the ask, and I don't want people to

interpret it that the private developer is asking for \$30 million. Let's make sure it is conveyed properly to the public; that is all I'm asking, because right now people will look at that and say they are giving \$16 million of CIP. They are getting TIG \$15 million and they are giving the private \$30 million, and that is not. To your point, that is the private investment they are making in the project.

Mr. Mumford said correct.

Mr. Mitchell said Council and Mayor you with me.

Mayor Roberts said absolutely, thank you James.

Mr. Mumford said so the Community Investment Plan same long range goals as the other; we are looking at the \$16.2 million in the bonds. These were approved in 2016 at Dixie Berryhill and then further and subsequently identified specifically for West Boulevard Extension. That is part of a \$44.7 million bond package, so the goals are similar to the other, creating infrastructure, catalyzing, leveraging private sector dollars. I do want to point out the asterisk toward the bottom; there is a separate body of work going on with Charlotte Water for utility infrastructure. We don't have all the details of that yet; it makes sense to coordinate this work though with the road construction since the water mains will be going in the road. That would be a separate item that you may see coming forward later, \$1 million to \$2 million. We are not sure how much, so what I didn't want you to do is confuse with gosh, we just approved \$31.2 million worth of work and now all of a sudden a month later we have more River District activity. This is a separate item, but we are thinking about it comprehensively.

We would propose to reimburse up to the \$16.2 million from CIP; the roads will be constructed as the last project was to our standards. This one is a little bit unique and this area is outside of our jurisdiction, the City limits, so voluntary annexation will be required before the reimbursement, and what is really important, understand that if this were developed site by site, parcel by parcel it would take forever to get developed in a way that annexation that could ever occur. We can build a road, but it has to be in our jurisdiction to maintain the road and we want to be able to maintain, so annexation is a critical component. Having two developers control all of this property allows for that to be under a voluntary basis, really important point. The easements and rights-of-way would also be dedicated, and the developer is responsible for any cost overruns beyond the combined \$31.2 million.

On the Tax Increment side the terms are up to \$15 million, and as you call Tax Increment Grants require enough investment on the ground to return revenue to the City that then could go back a portion of the grant to the developer. We do this typically; there is an interest costs to carry the funds that is calculated in addition to the \$15 million. Any remaining funds of this \$15 million so if the work came in less than \$15 million the developer can use that money to cover any overruns of the \$16.2 million or use that money to go for that dash green-line segment of West Boulevard. We don't pay anything beyond \$15 million, so if they exceed the \$15 million those cost overruns are on them. This is a 45% Tax Increment structure; 45% of those funds that come into us would get paid back out in the form of a grant over a 10-year terms, all of these volunteer annexations the same and roads developed and designed to our standards.

This came up in the rezoning petition as your heard the hearing; there is land preservation for Police, Fire and CATS facilities. Don't know exactly where those will be today; we are continuing to work with the development team on the terms of that, as far as setting the price but they are in agreement to set aside those properties. We just talked about this in the last one, equitable economic development; this development team has already met with general contractors. They have been engaging and helping people understand the scope of work, the amount of work to tee that up, and we see that as very positive and they too are committing to at least a 10% utilization rate. The request will come forward on the 25th, two separate components here \$16.2 million from CIP \$15 million from Tax Increment Grant and an authorizing the Manager to negotiate based on those terms.

Councilmember Ajmera said when this discussed in Committee meeting, I specifically asked for an MWSBE plan for the private sector, and I know it was somewhere around 10%, so has that been finalized yet?

Mr. Mumford said there was a request to understand over the last couple years, City projects what the average has been. That was when I mentioned the 6% for minority contractors and 19% is the high for small business and we blend those, so it is around 10% right now is the average, and that is the floor here. We expect that to hopefully be larger. Did that answer your question?

Ms. Ajmera said yes it does; will we have that number before the 25th?

Mr. Mumford said no ma'am, we won't have an exact number because we don't have the roads designed, and we have to align opportunity with design and the scope of the project, so by the time we come with signing the contract we will have that number for sure but not for the 25th. This is a term that we will meet.

Ms. Ajmera said I see that we have 10% for public infrastructure improvements.

Mr. Mumford said correct, that is for the reimbursed infrastructure, our public roads we are paying for that through these funding sources, and they are committing to at least 10% utilization for that infrastructure work.

Ms. Ajmera said so if we have that scope I guess I'm not clear why do we not have better clarification on the private infrastructure? We have the MWSBE 10% utilization for public infrastructure improvements. I'm looking at slide #12, and it says at least 10% for public infrastructure, but we don't have a plan for private infrastructure.

Mr. Mumford said no ma'am, our money is not going into the private infrastructure, so we have an ability here to negotiate this, because the public funding going toward these projects so we are working with the developer to commit utilization with those projects that are using public dollars. On the private side we don't have any authority to participate; we continue to talk to the developers though about how can we engage contractors and small businesses, but we don't have a contractual relationship with the private component of their development.

Ms. Ajmera said I think this is an opportunity that we have to get some clarification on what type of commitment we are looking at for MWSBE, and I think this was something I had asked even at the Committee meeting and I know that was in discussion and from what I understood we were going to have some sort of a number even from the private infrastructure. I know that Crescent has already engaged minority and women owned businesses; they have been very active in trying to figure out some sort of specific percentage, so when it comes to approval we have some clarity on what we are approving even if this is not a public investment we still have some understanding of what we are looking at.

Mr. Mumford said we will continue to talk with the developer about that.

Councilmember Smith said Mr. Hagemann can I ask you a question? What legal standing do we have with a group we are not contractually bound with?

Bob Hagemann, City Attorney said I'm not sure I understand the context.

Mr. Smith said I'm just trying to figure out if we are trying to put MWBE on the private sector portion of the development, is that something we can legally do?

Mayor Roberts said we need to negotiate that into a contract.

Mr. Smith said if they are developing their property, the City can tell them they have to have a certain amount of minority business participation.

Mr. Hagemann said we have done that before.

Councilmember Lyles said this is the same question; the idea that we are going to create an opportunity using city dollars to move forward, something that is a major development. We've got an economic opportunity study that talks about how difficult it is for people to rise out of poverty, and we have the opportunity to say can you help us in this community with our infrastructure program and investment. What can you do to help us, and I think it is one of those things that once this measure gets done, and the creation and engaging, I really love those words. They are some of my favorite words as a facilitator, but it is not enough to get us to a place that we know that we've been successful. For me again, the same question that I asked on the other project; I really appreciate it, but really do we have an idea? At the committee meeting, I think we did talk about this, and you said we were talking with the developer and that there would be some idea about what would be done and this is coming up on the 25th. That is where I am.

Councilmember Fallon said does this impact the lowest bids? Does this impact the thing that we have to pick the lowest bids when we deal with people?

Mr. Hagemann said I'm not sure I'm following.

Ms. Fallon said it is incumbent upon us to accept the lowest bids when we do a project. If we are going to ask to have something written into the contract does this impact the lowest bid?

Mr. Hagemann said I think it could be a factor in the setting of bids by the bidders. Any requirements that you impose on contractors, they have to determine what it is going to cost them to comply with the requirement and that does become a factor in their bid amount, yes.

Ms. Fallon said so, we might not get the lowest bid; do we have to accept it then or can we ameliorate the problem by saying we don't have to take the lowest bid, and does that impact what we are responsible for to the law? Do you understand what I'm saying?

Mr. Hagemann said not exactly.

Ms. Fallon said can we put in a clause that we want so many percentages? It takes the lowest bid up.

Mr. Hagemann said it would take all the bids up.

Ms. Fallon said right and in that case if someone can't meet that how does it impact the contract?

Mr. Hagemann said if you are awarding the contract you still have to award to the lowest responsible bidder.

Ms. Fallon said that is what I was asking.

Mr. Mumford said a point of clarification, the developer would be contracting for the roads; they would follow the public bidding process. They would not have to award to the lowest bid, but they would choose the most, for whatever the characteristics are, they would choose the contractor to move forward. We would be managing from our standpoint process of the project; I'm sure we would know who the contractor is, but it is not the City that is contracting for the work. The developer is contracting for the work, and we contract with the developer to support the utilization rate, so they know whoever they choose must at least meet that minimum and hopefully exceed it.

Ms. Fallon said what happens in the case where they can't meet that bid?

Mr. Mumford said they are not going to use that contractor.

Ms. Fallon said no, I'm saying no one can meet it.

Mr. Mumford said we would address that when we get to it. We have chosen a number as the floor that we have met in this community for the last couple of years.

Ms. Fallon said so, we would have an idea of what we want to do?

Mr. Mumford said yes ma'am.

Councilmember Driggs said I just want to say in response to that question there have been instances where we did not take the lowest bid, because we are also required that the goal be met that we have established. That is part of the terms of the deal, so we are able to do that, but I also wanted to get back to Mr. Smith's point which is are we empowered statutorily to impose on private investors a certain requirement across the board, regardless of whether they are in partnership with us or does our authority over them stem from the fact that we are not going to sign our contract unless they agree with our terms? I think that is an important distinction; we can make it a condition of what we want to do in the partnership for their part due and then they could figure out whether that is something they want to do but it is not a statutory authority to require all private investors to adopt a program like this.

Ms. Ajmera said to follow up to the City Attorney, he said we have done this in the past where we had worked with the developer to meet specific MWSBE limits for private infrastructure. What are some examples?

Mr. Hagemann said the Wells Fargo Cultural Facility Project. We paid for construction of the [inaudible] facilities of that project. They also put in place MWBE goals for the private tower.

Mayor Roberts said good example.

Ms. Ajmera said to that point, I think this is an opportunity for us to do something that is going to serve as a model for other investment that we make, whether it is infrastructure or when we have a private/public partnership. I'm a strong proponent of actually that incorporated into an agreement to insure that we continue to work together with private sector to address economic mobility.

Councilmember Mayfield said so that my colloquies are all on the same page, the same questions I asked regarding Camp North End are the conversations we've had from the very beginning regarding this, because we all read the Opportunity Task Force Report. We all know what the study came out saying and upward mobility is not just a job and trying to create a job. It is also having your own business, so we have already worked closely together. I personally am comfortable with the commitments that have already been made. Yes, there are going to be commitments that are made in writing because in this day verbal commitment is just that. I'm not going to sit in this role for 20-years to watch this thing develop; by that time I hope I should be retired somewhere. By the time this come out of the ground, this is a 20-year plus project but they've committed to putting some language in place, and they've already started the process with bringing groups together, not only in the contracting world but also in the business world to have a conversation of new opportunities, because you are going to have a hotel. You are going to have restaurants; you are going to have entertainment. You are going to have so many different opportunities, retail that is out there, so yes I want to make sure as the representative of one of the many votes around this table that we are creating true diverse opportunity with ownership, not only a job that may or may not be at whatever wage, because we don't get to determine that. I am supportive of this development, because these particular developers have come together in this partnership, we have worked together previously and we have already done this. We've already seen it in the Steele Creek area; we see how well they can work. We saw with the Outlet, and we saw it with the other developments, so I am very comfortable with

that floor being at 10%, but I truly believe when it is all said and done what you are going to see is something transformational, not just in contracting of construction, but actually who owns some of the businesses that are out there and that representation being the diversity of our City. Just so you know, I don't just throw it out saying what is Camp North End going to do; I'm asking the exact same question for any developer that wants to come in to District 3. I don't want a business, because I'm too lazy for that because this job is all consuming, but if I did have a business, I would want to know that if new development is coming in my area do I have an opportunity to be at the table? So, more often than not when I'm having these conversations it is from that lens that I'm asking the questions that I ask.

Mayor Roberts said I just want to say thank you to Council for helping us all remember our private sector partners and friends who are in the room that we absolutely have an obligation and a commitment with that Task Force Report that shows we have real disparities, that we don't always look for opportunities to bring people along who have been left out historically by things that were conscious public decisions years ago that did leave people out and separate them and destroy wealth. We are all part of helping move forward when it comes to that, and this is an opportunity, and North End Smart District is an opportunity as well, and I would just ask the private sector partners to think of creative ways to work together with us to help make sure that we are looking beyond the usual suspects, and we are looking for subcontracting and looking at small business that we are looking around seeing who is not at the table, because that is what that report is all about. I know this community, as a whole, is working very hard to change that narrative. I appreciate all of Council's comments.

* * * * *

UPDATE ON HURRICANE IRMA

Mayor Roberts said with Harvey and Irma and the things that we see, we are more aware and grateful than ever for our first responders. I just wanted to say that; we appreciate the Police, Fire, and Medic seeing the readiness, the shelter and all that you all have been doing and all the equipment, I just want to say on behalf of the Mayor and Council thank you.

Rich Granger, Deputy Fire Chief said I have to share that that commitment goes way beyond those three; just about every department you have in this City and County has touched at some point over the last week. Thank you for the opportunity to update you. Early last week, we were scheduled to have a direct hit from this hurricane so we got very busy with our storm team and all of our department preparing for that. I'm happy to report that as she moves west, our area gets better and better. Not to wish it on anybody else but we are down into the two inch range of rain for the next 24-hours, which we handle that extremely well. Our biggest risk will be wind, 25 to 30 mph, gust 35 to 40 mph between midnight and 7:00 a.m. tomorrow. Loose soils, trees, down powerlines is probably our biggest risks. I will say the impact to our community will be minimal, because this is a great time of year; we are 65 to 70 degrees, not 95 or cold, so we will be able to weather the power outages and any effects to our community very well. You have additional staff in many different departments tonight; I will be able to handle the additional call load, and we want to be able to handle our everyday call as well as the addition from the storm and as this storm moves out sometime after tomorrow afternoon we are going to reassess and be able to downshift or upgrade as necessary. That was very brief and quick, and I will take a quick question or two if you need it.

Mayor Roberts said you are absolutely right; every department of the City, Stormwater, C-DOT, CATS, Solid Waste, everybody has been preparing, and I just want to say how grateful and thankful we are.

Deputy Chief Granger said the shelter is working extremely well; currently, we are housing 29 people in the shelter in the north with two pets and we expect for that to maintain to at least the end of the week.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 7: TREE CANOPY UPDATE

This agenda item will be presented at a future meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 8: ANSWERS TO MAY AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS

There were no Consent item questions.

* * * * *

The Dinner Briefing was recessed at 7:24 p.m. to move to the Meeting Chambers for the regularly scheduled Business Meeting.

* * * * *

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina reconvened for a Business Meeting on Monday, September 11, 2017 at 7:38 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Jennifer Roberts Presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Ed Driggs, Julie Eiselt, Claire Fallon, Patsy Kinsey, Carlenia Ivory, Vi Lyles, LaWana Mayfield, James Mitchell, and Kenny Smith.

ABSENT: Councilmember Greg Phipps

Mayor Roberts welcomed everyone to the September 11, 2017 Meeting of the Charlotte City Council and said September 11th is an important date for many of us for many reasons, and we will hear about that in a minute. I hope folks are safe in this region, out of the way of the wind and rain and are checking on pets and neighbors. We are very fortunate that the main thrust of the hurricane missed us, but we have many friends and relatives and families who are in the middle of harms of way, and our thoughts go out to them this evening.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Mitchell gave the invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

* * * * *

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Mayor Roberts said we don't have proclamations this evening, but part of it was the remembrance of 9/11, and I think Councilmember Mitchell did that really well. I just want to add one aspect of gratitude for our first responders, our Police, Fire, Medic, Emergency Personal, our National Guard, who are on standby, and serving those who went to Texas and those who are here helping our neighbors, those who are operating the shelter, the Red Cross operating the shelter up in Huntersville and have 29 folks staying there this evening as well as all the City Departments who have been prepared; Stormwater clearing our storm drains, C-DOT ready for down trees and all the folks who are helping out, Solid Waste ready for things that happen. I just want to give a shout out to everyone in remembrance of 9/11 and of hurricane season. We are so grateful, and that is the only proclamation for this evening.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion was made by Councilmember Kinsey and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera to approve the Consent Agenda as presented with the exception of Item Nos. 34, which was pulled for separate vote and Item Nos. 41, 48, 51, and 52 which have been pulled by staff.

Councilmember Ajmera said Item No. 24 is for infrastructure investment in District 5 to create a safer environment for our residents at Idlewild Road, Rama Road, and Monroe Road Intersection and this is going to add left and right turns for motor vehicles, and it is also going to create a safer environment for pedestrian crossing and for bike riders. It is a total of \$9.5 million, and this project is in collaboration with NC-DOT and the City. I wanted to recognize that and thanks to our staff for collaborating with NC-DOT to make this successful.

Councilmember Mayfield said Item Nos. 47, 48, 49, and 50, which are all together, and I just wanted to acknowledge the Steele Creek Residents Association does a really good job of keeping the community aware through social media and through the website, but we have been having discussions about the sidewalk and road widening along the area, so those four items really include Wright's Ferry Road, Old Steele Creek Road, Steeecroft Parkway for the road widening. I did have a question for staff but I can ask that one off line, but just to give them a heads up I'm wondering if the Rendozes' Gridiron, which is the last item on that side, if we are having negotiations to also include them, but I really wanted the community to know that this is a sidewalk project that the Steele Creek area has been looking for a while and the road widening along Tryon Street. I wanted to let you know that that is on the books for this evening that my colleagues are looking to pass.

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

The following items were approved:

Item No. 20: Governor's Highway Safety Program Grant for Traffic Safety

Adopt a resolution authorizing the Charlotte-Mecklenburg police Department to accept the grant award of \$43,000 from the Governor's Highway Safety Program.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Pages 431-432.

Item No. 21: Governor's Highway Safety Program Grant for Driving While Impaired Task Force

Adopt a resolution authorizing the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department to accept the fifth year grant award for \$187,479 from the Governor's Highway safety Program for a Driving While Impaired Task Force.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Pages 433-434.

Item No. 22: Voluntary Annexation Public Hearing Date

(A) Adopt resolutions setting public hearings for October 9, 2017 for the following voluntary annexation petitions: Rocky River MPV, Berewick Commons, Winget Park/Nature Preserve, and Reedy Creek Nature Preserve, (B) Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for October 9, 2017 for annexation of the City-owned Byrum/NC160 property.

The resolutions are recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Pages 435-452 and Pages 461-465.

Item No. 23: Intelligent Transportation System Project Grant

(A) Approve a resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute a municipal agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation accepting a Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Grant for Intelligent Transportation System in the

amount of \$1,580,000 and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9152-X appropriating \$1,580,000 to the General Community Investment Plan.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page 453.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 61, at Page 23.

Item No. 24: Idlewild Road/Rama Road and Monroe Road Municipal Agreement

(A) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Municipal Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation for construction of various improvements at the intersection of Idlewild Road/Rama and Monroe Road, (B) Adopt a resolution accepting funds from the North Carolina Department of Transportation to the City of Charlotte for the project in the amount of \$3,400,000 and (C) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9153-X appropriating \$3,400,000 in North Carolina Department of Transportation Funds.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page 454.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 61, at Page 24.

Item No. 25: Beatties Ford Road Widening

Award a contract in the amount of \$10,281,606.23 to the lowest responsive bidder, J. T. Russell and Sons, Inc. for the Beatties Ford Road Widening Project.

Summary of Bids

J. T. Russell and Sons, Inc. *	\$10,281,606.26
Blythe Development Company	\$10,472,006.85
Sealand Contractors Corp.	\$10,552,294.58
Blythe Construction, Inc.	\$11,911,279.05
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$11,994,131.79

* The contingency was reduced by \$0.03.

Item No. 26: Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning Maintenance and Repair Services

Approve unit price contracts with the following companies for heating, ventilation and air conditioning maintenance and repair services for a three-year term: Armstrong Mechanical Services, Inc., Redblue, Inc., and Southern Comfort of Charlotte, Inc.

Item No. 27: Charlotte Fire Logistics Pavement Repair

Award a contract in the amount of \$474,935.22 to the lowest responsive bidder Carolina Site Concepts, Inc. for the Charlotte Fire Department Logistics Pavement Repair project.

Summary of Bids

Carolina Site Concepts, Inc.*	\$474,935.22
-------------------------------	--------------

* Only one bid was received.

Item No. 28: Landscape Installation Services

Approve one-year contracts with the following companies for landscape installation services: The Metrolina Landscape Company, \$150,000; Roundtree Companies, LLC, \$225,000; Carolina Outdoor Maintenance, Inc. \$75,000; Leisure Time Lawn Care, LP, \$75,000; Southern Shade Tree Co., Inc. \$75,000 and New Beginning Landscape, LLC \$100,000.

Item No. 29: Cross-Charlotte Trail Design Services

Approve contract Amendment #3 in the amount of \$352,439 for the Cross Charlotte Trail with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. for additional design services.

Item No. 30: Seneca Place and Wedgewood Drive Intersection and Storm Drainage Improvements

Award a contract in the amount of \$915,200 to the lowest responsive bidder Zoladz Construction Company, Inc. for the Seneca Place and Wedgewood Drive Intersection and Storm Drainage Improvements project.

Summary of Bids

Zoladz Construction Co., Inc.	\$ 915,200.00
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$ 954,825.87
Sealand Contractors Corp.	\$ 992,943.33
Blythe Development Company	\$1,111,661.10

Item No. 31: Long Creek Stream Restoration

Award a contract in the amount of \$1,045,969.18 to the lowest responsive bidder North State Environmental, Inc. for the Long Creek Stream Restoration project.

Summary of Bids

North State Environmental, Inc.	\$1,045,969.18
Riverworks	\$1,051,784.25
Carolina Environmental	\$1,293,989.40
Eaglewood	\$1,496,578.47
Sanders	\$3,252,480.00

Item No. 32: Professional Services for Charlotte Water Relocations and Improvements

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,500,000 with Hinde Engineering, Inc. for general engineering services for Charlotte Water Infrastructure, and (B) Approve a contract in the amount of \$500,000 with STV Engineers, Inc. for general engineering services for Charlotte Water Infrastructure.

Item No. 33: CATS Passenger Information Display System Upgrade

(A) Approve contract amendment #5 in the amount of \$138,200 to Signature Technologies, Inc. d/b/a/ Com-Net Software for an upgrade of the CATS Passenger Information Display System (PIDS) and one year of annual maintenance and support, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to approve the purchase of maintenance and support for as long as the City uses the system.

Item No. 35: Transportation Management and City Strategic Planning Consulting Services

(A) Approve a contract in the amount not to exceed \$203,000 with TransPro Consulting LLC for transportation management consulting services, (B) Approve a contract in the amount not to exceed \$68,200 with TransPro Consulting LLC for City strategic planning consulting services, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 36: Aviation Passenger Boarding Bridge and Baggage Conveyor System Parts

(A) Approve the purchase of passenger boarding bridge and baggage conveyor system parts, as authorized by the sole source exemption of G.S. 143-129(e)(6), (B) Approve a unit price contract with ThyssenKrupp Airport Systems for the purchase of passenger boarding bridge and baggage conveyor systems parts for the term of five years, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two additional, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 37: Airport Enclosed Regional Boarding Ramps

(A) Approve the purchase of regional boarding ramps, as authorized by the sole source exemption of G. S. 143-129(e)(6), (B) Approve a contract in the amount of \$775,420 with East Island Aviation Services, Inc. for the purchase and the installation of enclosed regional boarding ramps, and (C) Adopt Budget Ordinance No.9154-X appropriating

\$665,420 from the Aviation Discretionary Fund to the Aviation Community Investment Plan Fund.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 61, at Page 25.

Item No. 38: Airport Federal Aviation Administration Grant Acceptance

(A) Adopt a resolution accepting a grant in the amount of \$14,610,809 from the Federal Aviation Administration for Airport projects, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9155-X appropriating \$14,610,809 in grant funds from the Federal Aviation Administration and \$2,870,270 in local share from the Aviation Discretionary Fund to the Aviation Community Investment Plan Fund.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page 455.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 61, at Page 26.

Item No. 39: Refund of Property Taxes

Adopt a resolution authorizing the refund of property taxes assessed through clerical or assessment error in the amount of \$7,732.15.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Pages 456-457.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 40: In Rem Remedy 619 Sheryl Circle

Adopt Ordinance No. 9156-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at 619 Sheryl Circle (Neighborhood Profile Area 54).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 61 at Pages 27-31.

Item No. 42: Aviation Property Transaction – 8200/8210 Tuckaseegee Road

Acquisition of 11.34 acres at 8200/8210 Tuckaseegee Road from William Ladd Shaw, Jr. and Kimberly Shaw Quisenberry for \$900,000 for Airport Master Plan Land.

Item No. 43: Aviation Property Transaction – Corner of N Josh Birmingham Parkway and Wilkinson Boulevard

Acquisition of 5.03 acres at the corner of N. Josh Birmingham Parkwood and Wilkinson Boulevard from Fuller Family Limited Partnership and John and Irene Blackmon for \$4,820,000 for Airport Area Master Plan (Project AMP).

Item No. 44: Property Transactions – 25th Street Connection, Parcel #3.1

Acquisition of 588 square feet (.013 acre) in Utility Easement, plus 555 square feet (.013 acre in Gas Line Easement at 413 East 25th Street from William Caldwell and Pamela Caldwell for \$22,825 for 25th Street Connection, Parcel #3.1.

Item No. 45: Property Transactions – Clems Branch Pump Station Improvements, Parcel #1

Acquisition of 305,676 square feet (7.017 acre) in Fee Simple at 16790 Lancaster Highway from Jared James and Janna James for \$180,000 for Clems Branch Pump Station Improvements, Parcel #1.

Item No. 46: Property Transactions – Goose Creek Pump Station, Parcel #12

Acquisition of 19,848 square feet (.456 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 35,837 square feet (.823 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 13700 Lawyers Road from Peter J. Jugis, Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Charlotte, NC for \$18,950 for Goose Creek Pump Station, Parcel #12.

Item No. 47: Property Transactions – South Tryon Sidewalk Improvement Project Phase II, Parcel #11

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,244 square feet (.029 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 13721 South Tryon Street from Elbert Wayne Collins and Lunette Pace Collins for \$1,525 for South Tryon Sidewalk Improvement Project Phase II, Parcel #11.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page 458.

Item No. 49: Property Transactions – South Tryon Sidewalk Improvement Project Phase II, Parcel #21

Resolution of Condemnation of 67 square feet (.002 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 13121 South Tryon Street from Danita A. Brigantino, Kitra J. Leach, Jaquelyn F. Brigantino, Cathy J. Brigantino, and Gloris J. Brigantino for \$100 for South Tryon Street Sidewalk Improvement Project Phase II, Parcel #11.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Pages 459.

Item No. 50: Property Transactions – South Tryon Street Sidewalk Improvement Project Phase II, Parcel #22

Resolution of Condemnation of 143 square feet (.003 acre) in Storm Drainage Easement, plus 569 square feet (.013 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 13105 South Tryon Street from Sicilian, LLC for \$1,525 for South Tryon Sidewalk Improvement Project, Phase II, Parcel #22.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page 460.

Item No. 53: Property Transactions – North Tryon Business Corridor, Parcel #64 and #66.

Acquisition of 6,193 square feet (.142 acre) in Fee Simple plus 6,137 square feet (.038 acre) in Storm Drainage Easement, plus 4,095 square feet (.094 acre) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement, plus 12,870 square feet (.295) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 146 square feet (.003 acre) in Utility Easement at 114 West 28th Street from Lonnie C. Hanna, Sr. and Kathy Hanna for \$41,500 for North Tryon Business Corridor, Parcel #64 and #66.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 34: LYNX BLUE LINE EXTENSION SERVICE AGREEMENTS WITH UNC CHARLOTTE

Councilmember Mayfield said my question is specifically for Part A – Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute a five-year agreement with UNC Charlotte for an all-access pass to use CATS services. We had a brief discussion but I wanted to give opportunity to share. Is this something that is also available, or are we having conversations with all of our higher education institutions, Central Piedmont, Johnson C. Smith, and Queens so that when other students who may be working their way to UNC or may choose one of our other institutions, do they have this opportunity as well?

John Lewis, Transit Director said thank you for the inquiry Ms. Mayfield. To answer your question we have been in discussions with both Johnson C. Smith and other institutions as we be continue expand our premium rail service to other corridors. This will serve as a model for other institutions to follow suit. As we are working currently to expand Phase II of the Streetcar up to Johnson C. Smith, we've already started those conversations with them. This will serve as a model for us to bring in other institutions of higher education; these kinds of passes to those institutions.

Ms. Mayfield said the LYNX Gold Line?

Mr. Lewis said yes.

Councilmember Driggs said I had a related question and that was, I looked at this and it is \$1 million per year; it was based on unlimited ridership for anybody holding an ID

card from the University, and I just wondered whether the methodology was such that we could create similar agreements with other schools on similar terms. I will say that I did have a conversation with Betty Doster and briefly with Danny Pleasant and reached a level of comfort that the analysis of the likely ridership was detailed and in-depth and that the pricing of the thing was such that we came back with a reasonable return to the City at the terms stated which was \$50 per member of the participant pool and proceeds to be paid to the City. I assume if you do this with other schools you will do a new calculation on what the ridership for that population looks like and you will come up with a different set of numbers representing what they should pay and how much the City should get. Is that right?

Mr. Lewis said that is true Mr. Driggs. What we are looking at is to make sure that the return that we get from these kinds of negotiations with those institutions will bring us around the same return on investment as we do our average fare. We want to keep that in line with the average fare that all the rest of our passengers pay for our service so that would depend on the size of the institution, how many potential riders we get, but our goal is to make sure that at the end of that deal that what the City gets and CATS gets in return is in line with all of our other customers that make use of our system.

Mr. Driggs said thank you and I really just wanted to clarify the fairness issue to the City and to other schools. We have a wonderful relationship with UNC-C which we value highly; we've worked well with the University in this transportation environment.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs and seconded by Councilmember Smith, to (A) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute a five-year agreement with UNC Charlotte for an all-access pass to use CATS services, (B) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute a five-year agreement with UNC Charlotte for addressing safety and security issues within the CATS light rail easement and adjacent areas, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute a five-year agreement with UNC Charlotte for landscaping and maintenance services within the CATS light rail easement including the UNC Charlotte Main Station.

Councilmember Ajmera said this reminds me of my collage days when I used to take the bus, and I had a free bus pass, and I think it was pretty much all college students got free bus passes. Do we have any kind of program in place that gives bus passes or discounted bus passes to college students or folks attending high school?

Mr. Lewis said not for college students but currently anyone from K-12 who makes use of our transit service gets a 50% discount on all of our services.

Councilmember Eiselt said along those lines I wanted to say if we could keep an eye towards eventually doing this with our high schools. I know there are legal issues, liability issues that CMS would have to negotiate but to allow our high school students in particular to have an all access pass so they could have access to other magnate schools or other technical vocational training type programs in different high schools. I think it would be a fantastic collaboration with our high schools.

Mr. Lewis said as I mentioned earlier this would serve as a model. I think would really help us to move this issue forward with UNC-Charlotte is the security of their ID card, so that gives us a level of security that we know exactly who is riding, when they are riding, and we are able to track that. I think as we begin to have these other conversations with other institutions we can use this as a model moving forward.

Councilmember Smith said from a practical standpoint this goes right and terminates on campus at UNC-Charlotte, so we know that these students will be able to take advantage of this if they want to live elsewhere in the City to get up UNC-Charlotte which will be a win/win, and I think as Mr. Driggs said UNC-Charlotte does a very good job with us on some right-of-way issues and some other issues as we were trying to

finalize the Blue Line. I think this is a good partnership, and I think this would be a good deal for everybody.

Mayor Roberts said I just want to take a second and thank the folks in the audience for UNC-Charlotte. We do have two stops on campus, and they worked very hard to make sure those worked and were in the right place and worked with CATS very closely, and I know there will be lots of students using it when it opens.

Mr. Lewis said I agree, and I would venture to say that this project probably would not have happened if not for the partnership that we have with the University.

Councilmember Kinsey said I think it is okay if I say this, but I had the opportunity to ride CATS week before last now all the way up to the University. Most of it is in my District, so they let me ride, and I can hardly wait until it is open, and I think it is going to be wonderful for the UNC-Charlotte students. I'm really pleased and proud of what we are doing with that line.

Councilmember Fallon said John; can you arrange that we all get to ride?

Mr. Lewis said I think there may be some difficulties in that, but as we continue to test, we will certainly love to have every member of Council join us for our test; you will have to wear a hard hat but, we would love to have you on it.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 12: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I just have one item this evening and that is related to the Keyo Park West Development or the tiny houses. There was a meeting August 31st and I would like to thank Ed McKinney for doing such a good job in that community meeting. We had a number of elected officials that were also in attendance and based on the information that we have and based on the lot sizes and the regulations in zoning, we believe the proper place for this to be referred to would be the Council's Transportation and Planning Committee. Tonight, I would like to refer that issue to that Committee.

Mayor Roberts said do you have a date for that?

Mr. Jones said it would be taken up the next the Committee comes together.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: SOLID WASTE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

Councilmember Kinsey said I am confident that you have read every word in the draft and memorized it, so I'm not going to go over it, but I will mention, just to touch a few things. This ordinance would simplify the structure to create a standalone ordinance each for Solid Waste Services and Code Enforcement, modernize the language, doing some housekeeping and the draft also provides discretionary powers and additional authority to the Solid Waste Serviced Department Head and looks at some of the violations and the costs. I don't know if you need a presentation or not but that hits the highlights, and I'm quite sure you have read this draft word for word.

Motion was made by Councilmember Kinsey and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell to approve the Environmental Committee's recommendation to adopt Ordinance No. 9151 amending Chapter 10 – Health and Sanitation of the City Code, with an effective date of January 1 2018.
--

Councilmember Lyles said I really think this is a great step and it is really good to have it updated and something that someone could read and understand is a big achievement. I just wanted to mention one thing; there is a section that we have that I would like for us to figure out. We are approving a lot of communities that are allowing on-street parking, and I had the opportunity to go ride along to pick up the garbage, and when you have cars parked on both sides of the streets and the guys aren't allowed to go and knock on people's doors, so they are out in the truck blowing the horn to see who will come outside first. I would really like to have some discussion at the appropriate time and place; how do we connect those two things? Our desire to slow traffic down, have great neighborhoods but also how do other communities handle that practice of on-street parking when we have to go out and these trucks are like computers on the inside; you don't just drive in and out of them. You really have to be very careful to drive and to handle all of the equipment on the inside. If we could at some point talk about the connection that would be helpful I think.

Ms. Kinsey said may I respond to that because I have on my street; we park on both sides, and what we've done just among us is decide we will stagger our parking or in some cases some people will go ahead and put both cars in the driveway the night before. It is difficult, and I hear that horn every now and then, but we are very aware of that situation. I think maybe the neighborhoods just need to be made aware. The other issue that we are starting to have is we put bicycle lanes in, which I certain support. That does create a little bit of a problem also and actually a safety problem with bicycles going down the bike lane and the truck trying to wiggle in to get the garage. I don't know how to do it, but you are right it needs to be talked about, and I think individual communities or blocks actually need to handle that.

Councilmember Smith said a multi-family development of 12 or more units, are townhomes included in that?

Thomas Powers, Senior Assistant City Attorney said yes.

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

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 61, at Pages 1-22.

* * * * *

NOMINATIONS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

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

ITEM NO. 14: NOMINATIONS TO CHARLOTTE COMMUNITY CAPITAL LOAN FUND

The following nominees were considered for one appointment for a three-year term beginning October 2, 2017 and ending September 30, 2020:

- Corey Busker, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Eiselt, Ivory, Mayfield, and Smith
- Kimberly Edmonds, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera and Mitchell
- Daniel Herrera, nominated by Councilmember Fallon
- Jason Lackey, nominated by Councilmember Kinsey

This appointment will be brought back for Council consideration at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 15: NOMINATIONS TO THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ADVISORY BOARD

The following nominees were considered to one appointment for a three-year term beginning September 23, 2017 and ending September 22, 2010 and one appointment for a partial term beginning immediately and ending September 21, 2018:

- Gabrielle Alsop, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Eiselt, and Fallon
- Takiyah Amin, nominated by Councilmember Kinsey
- Rita Brown, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Eiselt, and Fallon
- Linda Carr, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera and Mitchell
- Monique Cleckley, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera and Mitchell
- Pamela Johnson, nominated by Councilmembers Ivory and Mayfield
- Ellen McCoy, nominated by Councilmember Kinsey
- Tiffani Newbold, nominated by Councilmembers Ivory and Mayfield
- Adam Pasiak, nominated by Councilmember Smith

This appointment will be brought back for Council consideration at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: NOMINATIONS TO THE HOUSING APPEALS BOARDS

The following nominees were considered for one appointment in the At-Large category for a partial term beginning immediately and ending December 31, 2018:

- Trici Davis, nominated by Councilmember Fallon
- Gregory Pizarro, Jr., nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Kinsey and Mitchell
- Cherie Readus, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs and Smith
- Tyjuana Wilson, nominated by Councilmembers Ivory and Mayfield

This appointment will be brought back for Council consideration at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: NOMINATIONS TO KEEP CHARLOTTE BEAUTIFUL

The following nominees were considered for one appointment for a partial term beginning immediately and ending June 30, 2018; one appointment for a partial term beginning immediately and ending June 30, 2019 and one appointment for a partial term beginning immediately and ending June 30, 2019:

- Jeff Beaver, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs and Smith
- Jesse Boyd, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Fallon and Mitchell
- Marika Christie, nominated by Councilmember Mayfield
- Tonya Clarkston, nominated by Councilmembers Kinsey and Lyles
- Sue DuChanois, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Eiselt, Lyles, and Mitchell
- Myra Foster, nominated by Councilmembers Ivory and Mayfield
- Krystle Hornsby, nominated by Councilmember Kinsey
- Taelor Logan, nominated by Councilmember Lyles
- Jordan McGee, nominated by Councilmembers Ivory and Mayfield
- Gita Patel, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera and Mitchell
- Ian Patrick, nominated by Councilmember Fallon
- Margaret Pendergrass, nominated by Councilmember Fallon
- Kevin Thomas, nominated by Councilmember Kinsey

This appointment will be brought back for Council consideration at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 18: NOMINATIONS TO THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS

The following nominees were considered for one appointment for a partial term beginning immediately and ending January 31, 2019 and one appointment for a partial term beginning immediately and ending June 30, 2020:

- Terry Brown, nominated by Councilmember Ajmera and Mitchell
- Scott Campagna, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Eiselt, Ivory, Mayfield and Smith
- Scott Carlisle, nominated by Councilmember Fallon
- Shawntae Crews, nominated by Councilmember Mayfield
- Susan Pfahl, nominated by Councilmember Kinsey
- Gregory Pizarro, Jr. nominated by Councilmember Ajmera
- Teadra Pugh, nominated by Councilmember Kinsey
- Thomas Rothrock, nominated by Councilmembers Fallon and Lyles
- Lissette Torres, nominated by Councilmember Mitchell
- Marshall Williamson, nominated by Councilmember Driggs, Eiselt, Lyles, and Smith

This appointment will be brought back for Council consideration at the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL TOPICS

Councilmember Mayfield said I wish for everyone to stay safe; we are expecting high winds and some rain tomorrow. Yes, it is Election Day, so if you haven't had a chance to go vote, go make your voice heard, but please be safe. Take note to my colleagues I wish us all a safe and wonderful week because I will not be with you next Monday, because I will be celebrating my one-year anniversary. I don't know where I'm going; thanks to Irma, but I will be going somewhere.

Councilmember Mitchell said I would like to thank Alicia Dasch working out of the Budget Office on NLC with Randy Harrington and the whole group. They have just done a [inaudible] of job; there is a lot of excitement about the Conference, so Alicia, thank you for your hard work.

Councilmember Lyles said everyone be safe in this weather, and be careful tomorrow as buses are running on our roads and our kids are going to school in the morning and go vote.

Mayor Roberts said I just want to add to be safe; watch out for down trees and powerlines. We hope that our trees stay steady, but we know they tend to drop limbs. Thanks to all the crews who are out there, including Duke Energy, who are ready to take care of the damage might be coming. Be safe and vote.

Councilmember Eiselt said I just want to beat that drum for getting out to vote. Be safe if not soggy tomorrow; there are 535,000 registered voters in Charlotte who have not gone to the polls. There are so many important things, and we need you to get out and vote, so please get out tomorrow and vote in the municipal elections.

Councilmember Fallon said I would like to congratulate Pete Key as the Interim Fire Chief. I would like to ask for an audit of that department to go to the right Committee, because we did it when we had the Airport, and it is only fair to someone taking over to have an audit.

Mayor Roberts said that goes to the Governance and Accountability Committee.

Councilmember Smith said we can handle it.

Councilmember Kinsey said it all been said, but it hasn't been said by me; please do go vote tomorrow. It is really important that everybody go and exercise that responsibility really. Do be safe; we are going to have some weather. Just take care of each other.

Councilmember Driggs said I just wanted to pick up on the 9/11 comments that were made earlier. I lived in New York, and I worked in one of the buildings that were destroyed for six years; luckily, I was not there. Friends of mine were in my new office and looking out the window of what went on. The lasting image was first responders rushing in while everybody else rushed out. I think it is ironic that we now see the same thing happening in Florida and Houston, a reminder of the dedication, and I just hope, particularly as it pertains to the Police, when you think of some of the controversy surrounding the Police, let us remember those images of them rushing in while others rush out. It is very important to value the service of our Police Department to the community.

Councilmember Ajmera said everyone has already said stay safe, stay dry, and thanks to all City staff, our first responders for always keeping us safe. Thank you for all that you do.

Councilmember Ivory said I just want to iterate what everyone has said; please be, but do not let that stop you from going to vote. We have fought hard for that right and you need to vote, and if you don't feel safe then you find someone and have them take you to the polls. Someone is willing to do that, but please take advantage of the opportunity that we've fought so hard for and that is please vote.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Lyles, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.



Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk, MMC, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 2 Hours, 54 Minutes
Minutes Completed: September 15, 2017