

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Dinner Briefing on Monday, November 13, 2017 at 5:21 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Jennifer Roberts presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Ed Driggs, Carlenia Ivory, Patsy Kinsey, LaWana Mayfield, James Mitchell, and Kenny Smith.

Absent: Councilmember Julie Eiselt

Absent Until Noted: Councilmembers Vi Lyles and Greg Phipps.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 1: MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT QUESTIONS

Councilmember Fallon said Item No. 42: Future Fire Station Land Purchase; why are we putting it there when the density is over by I-77?

Kim Eagle, Assistant City Manager, said I will talk with staff and get you an answer at the conclusion of the Dinner Meeting I will have to do some follow-up.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: AGENDA OVERVIEW

No Agenda Overview was provided.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: DISPARITY STUDY UPDATE

Debra Campbell, Assistant City Manager said we have Randy Harrington and Bob Hagemann, who are going to give you a brief overview and then we have the Consultants who did the Disparity Study to come and make the presentation that they provided to the Economic Development Committee last Thursday.

Randy Harrington, Chief Financial Officer said I turn it over to Councilmember Mitchell just for a second, if there is anything he would like to say about the Committee's work before we start into the presentation.

Councilmember Mitchell said on November 9, 2017, the Economic Development Committee received a presentation from BBC which you are going to see in a few minutes. At that meeting, five members of the Committee unanimously endorsed and accepted the adoption of the study. I just want to make sure that we look at this from the true lenses. This is just Phase I; Phase II is the heavy lifting that would take place in 2018.

Councilmember Phipps arrived at 5:24 p.m.

Mr. Harrington said thank you for the opportunity tonight to share with you the results of the 2017 Disparity Study. Before we get into the results of that work from the Consultant Mr. Hagemann and I would like to share a few comments in terms of trying to help to set the stage and a little bit of framing around what you are going to hear this evening. One of the things I do want to note that over a number of years we have worked really hard to increase our direct discretionary spend with the City Certified Minority Women and Business Enterprises, and in fact we've increased from \$27 million of direct spend in FY15 to close to \$50 million; we are putting some final results on the last fiscal year's work but close to \$50 million of direct spend. We've had some great increases in that, but even with these efforts which you are going to hear tonight are three key points; number one there still remains disparity. Number two when the City sets contracting goals for minority women and small business enterprises, we have greater utilization of minority and women businesses. When we don't set some sub-contracting goals, we have less utilization. Third, based off of the study's findings the City can consider continuing to use race and gender conscious measurers to remedy disparities.

To talk a little about the process, as Mr. Mitchell mentioned last week we were at the Economic Development Committee and received a recommendation out of that, so tonight we want to take this look back and with the disparity study we are going to look back over the last five years and look at what was the availability of firms to be able to contract with the City and then what was the actual utilization of City contracting in terms of use that availability? There is a next phase to this; tonight is not to delve into remedies or potential changes or refinements in the program; tonight's purpose is simply to receive the report and then if Council so chooses on November 27, 2017, we would offer to you an opportunity to formerly adopt and accept the Disparity Study findings. After that in the spring, we will move forward with further review analysis and input and engagement with stakeholders to determine what types of changes should be considered with the Charlotte Business INClusion Program going forward.

Let me also give you just a brief program history. Many of you are familiar with this, but really there has been three key phases with our Minority Women and Small Business Enterprise Program. From 1981 to 2002, we had a race and gender conscious program, and in 2003 we did a disparity study that at that time led to a different program, a Small Business Opportunities Program which the City operated from 2003 through 2013, and that was a race and gender neutral program. We did a disparity study in 2011 and from that resulted in what you currently see today with our Charlotte Business INClusion Program and the associated Council policy that provides the backbone for that. The timeline in March 2016, we issues the request for proposals for the disparity study; in July 2016, we awarded that to BBC Consulting and Research and then over the past year they have been gathering data, serving information, stakeholder input to put together their results. We have a number of slides and just as a suggestion if you would like we would be happy to go through the entire presentation and then open it up for questions, but if we have a clarification on a particular slide we are more than happy to stop and answer that. With that, I will ask Mr. Hagemann our City Attorney to come forward to say a few words about the legal framework.

Bob Hagemann, City Attorney said when government uses race and gender to differentiate between people or groups either in a positive or negative way that action is subject to the application of the Equal Protection Clause in the US Constitution. What the courts have held in seminal case involving MWBE Programs like ours; the City of Richmond versus J. A. Croson case out of 1989 the court repeated the case law that built up in other areas and applied it to these kinds of programs and held that in order to use race conscious means to differentiate in any way under the law or policy based on race, the government must demonstrate that it has a compelling governmental interest in order to justify a race conscious in this case minority business program. That is called strict scrutiny; it is the highest standard under the Equal Protection Clause that the law has developed. Similarly, but a little bit lower, when government uses gender to differentiate the courts require an important governmental interest in what is called intermediate scrutiny. So in the context of MWBE Programs the way that that happens, the way that government demonstrates a compelling governmental interest or an important governmental interest is by due analysis. In this context, that is what is called a disparity study; it is a look back and a comparison is done between availability and utilization as well as some other analysis that you will hear about from our consultants and it is only if the Disparity Study demonstrates statically substantial disparity is government legally under the Equal Protection Clause entitled to differentiate at all based on race or gender. The courts also demand that those studies be done frequently; you can't have an old study and just continue indefinitely. The intent of using race and gender means is to remediate past discrimination and to alleviate disparity. Once the government is successful in doing that it loses the legal justification to continue to use race and gender means. In fact, that is what happened to Charlotte back in 2002 and 2003; we had a very old study. Actually, it had never been adopted by the City Council and the City was sued by a low bid general contractor and it quickly became apparent that we could not successfully defend the program given the age of the disparity study. This disparity study comes five years after the previous one, approximately, and the courts generally require to make sure that your justification is sound, that disparity studies be done about every five years. What that means for us is that the current race and gender conscious components of the CBI Program are set to

expire December 31. If the Council is unwilling or unable to adopt this disparity study we will not have a legal defensible justification after the first of the year to continue with the race and gender conscious programs or portions of our CBI Program. We would be able to continue forward with our small business program, so it is called race and gender neutral if the small business piece doesn't take into consideration the ownership, the race or gender of the owners of businesses seeking to do work with the City. That is why the timing of this is pretty important and why we have this cued up for Dinner Presentation tonight and proposed adoption by Council on November 27, 2017. That would give us a legal justification to continue and then start Phase II, which is the hard and important work of looking at our policies and determining with stakeholder input on whether and how those policies going forward presumably into the next five-years, how they should be tweaked, refined or modified.

Councilmember Lyles arrived at 5:30 p.m.

With that legal framework, I'm going to turn it over to our Consultant, Dr. Sameer Bawa with BBC. We also have with us Keith Whiner, who is an attorney with Holland & Knight, a firm that you are familiar with. Keith is out of the Atlanta Office, and he is an expert in this field in terms of opining legally on the legality of methodologies for doing disparity studies and is prepared to answer your questions about this particular methodology and study.

Dr. Sameer Bawa, BBC Research & Consulting said thank you for having us tonight and giving us the opportunity to speak about the disparity study. In the presentation today I will begin just by talking a bit about the background of disparity studies, what they are and the information that come out of them. I will go over the key results from the 2007 City of Charlotte Disparity Study including the degree to which the City is using minority and women owned businesses in their contracting; the degree to which you might expect minority and women owned businesses to participate in those contracts and any differences in those measurers. Then I will summarize the key results and turn it back over to Randy so we can talk about next steps for the City and the CBI Program. Before I begin, I want to thank our partners at the City of Charlotte, particularly the CBI Office, in which none of this would have gotten accomplished as successfully and as accurately as it did, so thank you for Nancy Rosado and Eric Nelson and Thomas Powers for their contributions to the process in helping us along the way.

What is a disparity study? A disparity study is a collection of both quantitative and qualitative research tasks that assess whether minority and women owned businesses face any barriers as part of an agencies contracting. There are a lot of reasons why an organization might commission the disparity study, but most typically it is first to monitor the degree to which minority and women owned businesses are participating in their contracts. Organizations can also use disparity studies as a way to meaningfully engage with the minority and women owned business community to understand what barriers they might be facing in the market place and also ways they can help to address those barriers. Organizations also use information from a disparity study to help refine measurers that they might be using as part of minority and women owned business programs; programs like the CBI Program that the City of Charlotte implements. All the information in the disparity study is with an eye towards legal compliance or organizations often use that information to insure that it is implementation of minority and women owned business programs, particularly the use of any race or gender conscious measurers are in compliance with federal regulations, state and local regulations and relevant case law.

For the City's disparity study, we analyzed \$1.8 billion of City contracting dollars across a five-year period and that included five relevant industries, construction, architecture and engineering, other professional services, goods and comedies and other services. It includes both prime contracts and sub-contracts that the City awarded during our study period and importantly which I will describe in a couple of minutes, it includes contracts that the City awarded with the use of sub-contracting goals and contracts without the use of those sub-contracting goals; what we call no goals contracts. The key question for the disparity study was, are minority and women owned businesses

receiving an equitable share of those contracting dollars relative to their availability for that work? The first step in answering that question was to assess the participation of minority and women owned businesses in the contracts, prime contracts and sub-contracts that the City awarded during our study period. That process began by looking at data that the City maintains on all the prime contracts and sub-contracts that are awarded during any given time period. We worked with the City to collect information on contracts it awarded in construction, architectural and engineering, professional services, goods and commodities, and other services. We collected information on prime contracts and sub-contracts and all of them that they awarded between the period of July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2016, and it is important to note that this only included City funded contracts so if a particular contract included state funds or federal funds, it was out of the scope of disparity study and that is because the CBI Program is tailored specifically towards City funded contracts. Once we compiled that information we then went out in the field and conducted what we call utilization or participation surveys where we attempt to conduct a survey with each and every business that participated in those prime contracts and sub-contracts to confirm two key pieces of information; their primary lines of work so we can classify each contract appropriately and the race ethnicity and gender of their ownership. We then combined information from those surveys with information that the City maintains and calculated the percentage of total dollars that went to minority and women owned businesses.

So going back to our \$1.8 billion of contracting what our research showed is that during that time period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2016 \$267.6 million of City contract dollars went to minority and women owned businesses and that includes minority and women owned businesses regardless of whether they are actually certified as such through the City or through the State. That represents 14.8% of the City's total contracting spend and off to the right of the screen you will see how that was accounted for my different relevant groups, so white woman owned businesses accounted for 9.1% of that spend which was more than any other group and the majority of the total spend with minority and women owned businesses. Black American owned businesses accounted for 2.9% of those dollars, which was the highest amount among minority groups. Of course knowing the percentage of dollars that an organization spends with minority and women owned businesses is useful on its own, but for the sake of the disparity study and for making policy decisions it becomes even more useful if you can compare it against some benchmark. So having an understanding of how many dollars minority and women owned businesses should receive based on the types of work they do, their existence in the marketplace, the size of contracts they can work on and a variety of other characteristics. That is the primary objective of what we call the availability analysis. They ask the question how many dollars might minority and women owned businesses receive given the degree to which they are ready, willing and able to participate on an organization's contracts.

To assess whether women owned businesses are ready, willing and able and their availability for City work we again started that process with City data so while we are compiling information about all the prime contracts and sub-contracts that the City awarded during the study period we were interested in two key pieces of information; the product markets that are most relevant to City spend and the relevant geographic market area, where our prime contractors and sub-contractors are coming from to actually perform work on City contracts? Through our analysis we identified those product markets within construction ANE professional services, goods and other services and we also identified the relevant geographic market area, which was the Charlotte Mecklenburg combined statistical area. Once we were able to identify those pieces of information we then through a variety of data sources compiled a phone book of businesses who have a location within the Charlotte Mecklenburg combined statistical area and who do work within product markets that are relevant to the City's spend. We then attempted to conduct availability telephone surveys with each and every one of those businesses and our phone book consisted of almost 20,000 businesses and for each one that completed a survey with us we collected information about key characteristics that allowed us to accurately estimate their availability for City prime contracts and sub-contracts. We asked them about their primary lines of work, their role as vendors whether they work as prime contractors, sub-contractors or both,

the year in which they were established, their relative capacity for City work in the form of the highest valued contract they had ever bid on or been awarded in the past, their qualifications and interest in working for the City and the race, ethnicity, and gender of their owners. Once we collected all that information through surveys, we had a representative data base that represented the entire business market place and on a contract by contract basis, we used the matching process so for every prime contract and sub-contract that the City awarded during the study period we were able to determine based on a match between those contracts characteristics and the characteristics of each vendor in our data base which firms could be considered potentially available for each contract piece and then we could aggregate it all together in a dollar weighted way so that had an estimate with a high degree of accuracy the percentage of dollars one could expect minority and women owned businesses to receive on City contracted.

Going back to the \$1.8 billion of City spend and as a reminder minority and women owned businesses actually received 14.8% of those dollars during the study period, our availability now suggest that one could expect them to receive 20.9% of City dollars or \$377.7 million of the \$1.8 billion of contracted. Again, off to the right you can see the different groups that account for that availability so white women owned businesses accounted for 11.4% of that availability which is higher than any other racial, ethnic or gender group and black American owned businesses accounted for 5.4% of those dollars which is the highest availability among minority groups.

Once we had participation and availability calculated a key aspect of the disparity study is to assess whether any differences exists between those measurers. That is the crux of what is called the disparity analysis. The question is are minority and women owned businesses underutilized on City contracts relative to their availability for that work? The calculation for the disparity analysis is relatively straight forward, so for a particular set of contracts for a particular group we take the dollars that minority and women owned businesses actually received and we divided it by the dollars that they would be potentially available for according to our availability analysis. What that results in, that quotient is what we refer to as a disparity index. A disparity index of 100% indicates parity; in other words, utilization or participation is largely in line with availability. A disparity index of less than 100% indicates that that group is being underutilized relative to their availability, and a disparity index of 80% or less is indicative of a substantial underutilization. A substantial underutilization has been taken by the courts as an indication of inference of discrimination against minority and women owned businesses and are often used as justification or support for the use or continued use of relatively strong measurers to address any disparities, things like race and gender conscious means or MWBE contract goals which are a part of the CBI Program currently.

In terms of disparity analysis results, I want to show you results for all contracts considered together first. It is not the whole story, but it gives you a good high level indication of outcomes for minority and women owned businesses. If you look at this top row, this is all minority and women owned businesses considered together, and what this result suggests is that they had a disparity index of 71%, which indicates that they received 71 cents of every dollar you would expect them to receive based on availability and that is considered a substantial underutilization or a substantial disparity. All the rows underneath show results for individual racial ethnic and gender groups that go into this number, so Asian American owned businesses had a disparity index of 102% so they were right a parity. Black American owned businesses showed a disparity index of 53%; Hispanic American owned businesses shows an index of 86%; Native American businesses showed a disparity index of 21% and White women owned businesses showed a disparity index of 80%. There were substantial disparities for Black American owned businesses, Native American owned businesses and White women owned businesses as well all minority and women owned businesses considered together.

I mentioned that this isn't the whole story; one important breakdown of the data has to do with the goals that the City uses or doesn't use when awarding particular contracts. So, as part of the \$1.8 billion of contracting during the study period some of those

contracts the City awarded with the use of sub-contracting goals, so prime contractors in order to be considered responsive had to make sub-contracting commitments to meet a goal either with small business enterprises or if there was an MWBE goal, minority and women owned business enterprises or they had to show good faith efforts in trying to meet the goal but having failed to do so and they had to justify why they failed to do so and the City had to approve those good faith efforts. For other contracts that the City awarded during the study period they didn't use those sub-contracting goals, so they awarded them to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder and we called those no goals contracts. Those no goals contracts turn out to be, from a policy standpoint and a legal standpoint, pretty important because courts want to see what outcomes look like for minority and women owned businesses and what is often referred to as a race and gender neutral environment. Outcomes for those firms when you are awarding contracts without the use of race and gender conscious measurers or other measurers that are specifically designed to encourage participation of minority and women owned businesses, so accordingly we looked at disparity analysis results separately for goals contracts versus no goals contracts, and I will walk you through those results. These darker bars indicate results for goals contracts and the lighter bars indicate results for no goals contracts. Starting with goals contracts, what we see for all minority and women owned businesses considered together is a disparity index of 99% so very close to parity. Again, on contracts the City awarded with the use of minority and women owned and other sub-contracting goals. The only group that shows substantial disparities on goals contracts were Black American owned businesses and Native American owned businesses. All other individual groups were either at parity or above.

You have a very different story when you look at contracts the City awarded without goals. Considering all minority and women owned businesses together, they showed a disparity index of 47% on no goals contracts; in other words they received 47 cents of every dollar one would expect them to receive based on their availability for City work. Those substantial disparities carried through for each every relevant group that we examined, so Asian American owned businesses, Black American owned businesses, Hispanic American owned businesses, Native American owned businesses and White women owned businesses. These sets of results are important for two primary reasons; one is shows that outcomes for minority and women owned businesses are much worse in a race and gender neutral environment. That is when there aren't policies or programs in place to encourage their participation they show substantial underutilization and inferences of discrimination against those groups. On the other hand, when the City awards contracts with the use of goals it addresses barriers in many cases as evidenced by the fact that all minority and women owned businesses considered together and many individual groups showed disparity indexes at or above parity. The only exceptions there were Black American businesses and Native American businesses.

In addition to looking at quantitative disparities for minority and women owned businesses, the study team also examined and collected anecdotal evidence related to businesses experiences working out in the marketplace; any barriers they are facing, any race or gender based discrimination that they might be aware of or have experienced themselves. We collected that anecdotal evidence in a variety of different ways and it is important to note that throughout the entire process the business community and trade association representatives, key stakeholders had a line of communication with the project team and could submit any verbal or written testimony that they wanted to become part of the record. More formerly we conducted them as part of in depth interviews so we sat down with 20 businesses and trade association representatives operating here in the region so that we could have one to two hours conversations about their experiences working the marketplace, that includes both minority and women owned businesses as well as businesses owned by non-Hispanic White men and large prime contractors. We held public meetings at the beginning of the process where participants were invited to share any verbal testimony that they would like about their experience working in the marketplace and were also encouraged to submit written testimony if they didn't feel comfortable submitting verbal testimony and as part of those availability telephone surveys as part of conducting each one of these we gave participants the opportunity to submit any open ended comments they

had about their experiences working in the marketplace and any barriers to success throughout the Charlotte region.

As part of the process of collecting qualitative evidence there were lots of patterns, lots of comments and insights that we received from all different types of businesses, but I want to highlight just a few of the key patterns that emerged through our analysis. One is that most minority and women owned businesses said that they perform small contracts and as a result, contract size can be a barrier when they are trying to work for government agencies. If you are a minority or woman owned firm, whether you work as a sub-contractor or a prime contractor, there is a strong likelihood that you are also a small business, so often they will run into trying to do work within their primary industries with the government agency, but those contracts are simply too big, so the City taking time to think about strategic ways that they can unbundle contracting pieces into smaller pieces may go a long way in encouraging minority and women owned participation. In addition, many businesses said that they don't actually solicit bids from minority and women owned businesses particularly when there aren't goals in place because of relationships that already exists within the marketplace. They know what subs they want to work in different industries; they have a comfort level with them, and so it doesn't occur to them necessarily to spontaneously reach out to a minority, women owned business to solicit them for a quote or a bid as a sub-contractor as a partner. The point here is that minority and women owned businesses have some difficulty it seems and small businesses to break into existing networks throughout the marketplace.

Several minority and women owned businesses indicated that it is difficult for them to get loans or get financing partly because of their size and not a lot attributed specifically to their race, ethnicity, or gender but a few definitely suspected that that played a role in capital markets, finance markets getting loans, getting insurance and of course because a number of them are small businesses, if not most of them, trying to get their hands on financing and capital just to make payroll to have enough cash on hand to start the next project, to buy materials is crucial to any small business so addressing some of those barriers may help minority, women owned businesses be more successful. Most minority, women owned businesses and other businesses reported that slow payment is a substantial issue for them. That is not always just a firm dealing with an agency or an organization but rather that relationship between the prime contract and the sub-contract; anything that the City or other organizations can do to make sure that prime contractors are paying sub-contractors in a timely manner really go a long way in helping small businesses and minority and women owned businesses.

Some businesses expressed concern that the same businesses always seem to win City contracts both at the prime level and at the sub-contracting level. A comment that we heard was that it seems as though even when trying to meet SBE or MWBE goals, that prime contractors tend to use the same small lot of minority and women owned businesses or small businesses to help achieve those goals so having measurers in place that perhaps increase diversity among the firms that are being used may help the minority and women owned business community. Some minority and women owned businesses reported unfavorable work environments due to their race or gender. This is what you more typically think about of racial or gender based discrimination, stereotypical attitudes, unpleasant comments on job sites, things of that nature. A number of businesses said that things like that still go on and of course it is an uncomfortable environment and hard to be productive when those work environments exists.

Finally as I alluded to earlier, several businesses report the existence of business networks or what some people call a good ole boy's network, particularly in construction where there are networks of firms that use each other as partners that win a lot of work, and it is hard for minority and women owned businesses to break into those networks because they tend to be smaller, they tend to be younger, and so it is harder for them to network effectively and get known because a lot of those networks are so baked in. Just to quickly summarize key results from the study and then I will hand it back over to Randy to talk about next steps for the CBI Program, minority, women owned businesses according to our availability analysis were found to be ready, willing and able to perform

20.9% of the City's contracting dollars. The City could take that into consideration when it sets next overall aspirational goal for minority and women owned participation. Overall, minority and women owned businesses are substantially underutilized on City contracts when you consider them together and you look at all City contracts together you see a disparity index of 71%; in other words, they are receiving 71 cents of every dollar you would expect them to receive. Underutilization is much worse on contracts that the City awarded during the study period without the use of sub-contracting goals. When we looked at disparity indexes for those no goals contracts it was 47%, so minority and women owned businesses were receiving less than half the dollars you would expect them to receive based on their availability for that work. In contrast, sub-contracting goals actually seemed very effective in encouraging minority and women owned business participation, so looking at goals contracts the disparity index for minority and women owned businesses were close to parity at 99%.

Minorities, women and minority and women owned businesses face various barriers in capital markets, business ownerships, business success. We detail those our quantitative analysis in those areas as part of the Disparity Study Report and those results are corroborated by the anecdotal evidence we collected through the in depth interviews, the telephone surveys as well as collecting public testimony that many barriers still exist in the marketplace for small businesses and minority and women owned businesses.

Mr. Harrington said for next steps as you heard this evening, there is evidence that disparities exist, and the City can consider continuing its Charlotte Business INClusion Program. As far as committee action, I mentioned a little earlier that last week the ED Committee did recommend unanimously to accept and adopt the report and we plan to bring that before you on November 27, 2017. Any refinements to the CBI Program we will focus on those in the Spring in terms of working with you, other stakeholders and then doing other analysis and review of the disparity study to see where opportunities might be to help us mitigate disparity. That is the overall presentation for this evening and will be happy to answer any questions.

Mayor Roberts said we appreciate that detail, and we know that the Economic Development Committee has heard it as well.

Mr. Harrington said just a little housekeeping item; before you at your table you have a copy of the presentation, and there is also the Executive Summary and a 500 page document that is the full disparity study, and on last Thursday we did e-mail a link to the full Council with that. If anybody would like a hard copy we are more than happy to produce that for you, but that is what you have in front of you tonight.

Councilmember Driggs said I did have a question; the no goal contracts with the 47% utilization, why were those no goal contracts? If that kind of minority participation was possible, twice as much as we actually saw, why weren't those done on a goals basis in the first place?

Dr. Samir said that is not really a question that I can answer; I can answer at a high level. The City has a process in assigning goals to contracts. My understand is and from the results of the study, they assign those goals particularly in construction and also architectural engineering and they make a determination, as they should, on a contract by contract basis whether there is availability of minority and women owned businesses or small businesses on those contracts. I think as part of the implementation phase, the Phase II of this process, one thing that the City will likely look at from what I understand, is how they make that determination and also looking at the possibility perhaps of whether it makes sense to expand the use of those contract goals.

Mr. Driggs said it seems to me that the reason those were no goals contracts was because a determination was made that in fact they weren't particularly suitable in situations like the purchase of Motorola Phones etc., so in a way I'm not surprised that the utilization, and I think when you introduced the word "worse" there you put a discrimination connotation on that that, but I'm not sure is borne out by your research or

the evidence you presented, because we would have to know more about how the choice was made not to do those on a goals basis in the first place in order to reach that. I would make the general observation that in the way you've presented this, and I don't know how this accords with the legal context, and I haven't had a chance to read the 500-page report, but based on what you've told us you are equating underutilization with discrimination. So, you are saying that just because there exist this number of companies who might have done this work, the fact that they weren't used in proportion to their numbers must mean that people are discriminating i.e. that they are avoiding minority as women owned businesses, because they had some enthalpy for them. There is no adjustment in your process for simple issues of performance. We have seen Home Depot close down all kinds of little Mom and Pop stores, and it wasn't because the public had anything against the Mom and Pop stores. It was because those guys could produce, and I think all of us have probably had the experience that we hired an electrician or something, the guy came did a really good job, charged a reasonable price and the next time we needed an electrician we picked up the phone and called him again. We are discriminating against anybody, so I don't think that the report makes the case, particularly when I think of your 99% attainment in the goals based contracting that we did, which is parity. For me, the report doesn't make the case and again it may meet a legal standard and therefore we may be fine going ahead. I realize there is a lot of support for this program on Council, but just as a thought exercise, I really don't think the information you've provided proves that there is discrimination in the sense of the avoidance of using those contractors because of their gender or their ethnicity. What you have said is this is how many of them there are and this is how many of them are using and that doesn't line up right so therefore we must be discriminating against. Small businesses have a tough time competing on a lot of fronts. You mentioned all those barriers as if barriers were necessarily a proof of discrimination. There are a lot of small businesses that can't get loans; it's been tough all around. I think there is another step that would be needed at least from your summary presentation of findings to make the case that we have a discrimination issue. I would not like to think for example that the City in its contracting on those contracts that do not have a goals target in them that the City in its choice of contractors is discrimination to the extent that we were only at 40% compliance. I have a feeling that that result has more to do with other factors on how we chose our contractors. Personally, at this point and I realize there is more work to be done, and we haven't gotten implementation so I'm reserving on that but I'm not really happy that the study does what it really should do. It may do enough for us legally and that may allow us to proceed and if that is the advice of our lawyers fine, but for me personally I don't see the evidence in there.

Mayor Roberts said I don't know if there is really an answer from our study folks, but I would say that to find somebody that is discrimination when you have a goal of being more inclusive, when you have a goal of seeking more ways to include companies in the bidding process and selection process and you are not reaching the goals that you could be. That is where the discrimination comes in, because we have set those goals. I would say that your example of always calling the same plumber when you are consciously trying to be a public entity using public dollars that reflect the amount of companies what they look like in our community, always calling the same person is actually discrimination, because your personal private goal is not a public one. So, if your public goal is to be inclusive to have your public dollars that comes from everybody's tax pockets, minorities and majorities, to have that reflect the community then not having that percentage equal is discrimination. There is not a value judgement about who made that decision or how we did it; it is just the system.

Dr. Samir said that is perfectly fair, and I would just make a quick clarification that nowhere in the report or my presentation today did I say substantial disparity therefore discrimination. What we are trying to do is do lay out the results from our research. The idea that a substantial disparity is indicative of an inference of discrimination comes from federal courts and not from BBC. My use of the word "worse" really applies to the fact that a disparity index of 47% by any measure is worse than the disparity index of 99% and does not again indicate my value judgement on whether is discrimination going on; it is simply comparing the two numbers.

Mr. Driggs said it is less, not worse. You need to interpret that number in context to know if it is worse, and we don't need to debate all of this; I'm just trying to make a point that we are doing this program, because we are allowed under the law to do things against discrimination. Again, if the courts allow this, but I think the way you've stated certain conclusions you have equated disparity with discrimination or at least that is the link we are making, and I don't think that last step is in place. I don't think we proved based on this data that discrimination exists.

Councilmember Ajmera said maybe our Assistant City Manager, can you all just tell us more about what is the scope of this study? Was it just to understand the disparity to help us achieve the goal of MWSBE Program? What was the goal of this study?

Debra Campbell, Assistant City Manager said could we go back to the beginning slides that talks about the purpose of a disparity study, and I think that may help clarify. Also we may ask the City Attorney in terms of the legal interpretations.

Mr. Harrington said on this slide really looking at two core components for us and that is over the past five-years when you look at the City's total spend what has been the availability of MWBE's in the marketplace to use and then what has been the actual utilization of our City contracting dollars. Comparing that then what leads to the analysis on the data that indicates that there is disparity in the marketplace.

Ms. Ajmera said okay and I see that study does that.

Mayor Roberts said we will look forward to seeing this on November 27, 2017.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: CHARLOTTE WALKS: SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION ORDINANCE REVISIONS

Councilmember Lyles said actually I don't know that it is a part of the plan that we've adopted overall, so this I think did not come specifically except as implementation of what we've already adopted.

Scott Curry, Transportation said I am with the Charlotte Department of Transportation and I manage the pedestrian program for the City. I want to thank you for your time tonight as we dive into the implementation of the Charlotte WALKS Pedestrian Plan. As a reminder, Charlotte WALKS is your first comprehensive Pedestrian Plan; you unanimously adopted that plan back in February of this year. Since that time, we are thrilled to report that our State Chapter of the American Planning Association has honored that work with an annual Marvin Collins Outstanding Comprehensive Planning Award. That is a big honor and a great reflection of your work on the plan. The award was presented to City staff at the annual NCAPA Meeting back in September, and we are pleased to present it to you all tonight. I have the Certificate with me, and I will leave it with the Clerk or the City Manager's Office, but it reads, the certificate is awarded to the Charlotte City Council in recognition of the Charlotte WALKS Pedestrian Plan, Comprehensive Planning/Large Community category. I wanted to start by congratulating you all on that good work and let you know that we have been busy implementing the plan since February.

Part of the reason I think you all received that recognition on the plan is because of the public outreach that went into the plan. We talked to over 1,000 residents at 30 different public input events all over the City, and the top two things we heard over and over again were no back of curb sidewalks and fewer sidewalk gaps especially on thoroughfares. As a quick reminder, back of curb sidewalks are sidewalks that are pushed right up against the travel lanes without any sort of buffer between moving traffic and pedestrians on the sidewalk. Tonight during your meeting, you will have a public hearing to consider two Text Amendments that deal with those two issues, first of all

back of curb sidewalks on thoroughfares and second of all an issue that we see that is creating sidewalk gaps in our network.

We have been working on those two issues with the development community and our interdepartmental partners over the past 15 months to put together these amendments for you. Here is a snapshot of what that public outreach looked like; these are pictures from some of our meetings and walk audits. We talked to all kinds of people from all across the City about what walkability means to them and to their families. When we asked people what walkability means to them, these are the kinds of places they describe to us: wide sidewalks with planting strips and street trees that provide a physical separation between pedestrians and moving cars. We also heard a lot about what is preventing our residents from walking more and again the things that kept coming up over and over again are sidewalk gaps and these back of curb sidewalks on thoroughfares. As a follow-up to some of this work, we've conducted a statistically valid survey of Charlotte residents to investigate that back of curb sidewalk issue, and we found that 80% of Charlotteans believe that sidewalks on thoroughfares should be separated from traffic by a grass strip with street trees. There has been a very clear and broad public support for planting strips and separating the sidewalk from the moving traffic.

As a part of the Charlotte WALKS Plan, we identified 13 places in our City Code where we believe improvements can be made. In your adopted plan, two of those are recommended for immediate action. The remaining 11 we've been working with our Planning Department to incorporate into the ongoing UDO work, but these are the two that we really feel a sense of urgency about, because we know we are missing a lot of opportunities right now given our pace of development. For those two high priority items we made a commitment to Council to bring you all some Text Amendments by the end of this year, so that this Council could consider and potentially act on those amendments. That is why we are here tonight honoring that commitment.

First of all, I want to dig into the back of the curb sidewalk issue; Chapter 19 is the Chapter in our City Code that deals with things like sidewalks and driveway connections. It is the place in the City code that dictates how sidewalks are built in developments that don't involve a rezoning or a sub-division of land so these are specifically by right situations. The problem is that Chapter 19 is silent on what to do with sub-standard sidewalks like a narrow back of curb sidewalk. Except for certain zoning categories that already have sidewalk requirements baked in the code is silent on when to construct that sub-standard sidewalk. This is a 32-year old loophole that dates back to when the Chapter 19 standards were last amended. Eventually, the UDO will clarify this, so that our expectations for sidewalks are consistent whether it is a by right development or a rezoning or a sub-division but now that gap in our code means that even a completely regraded and redeveloped site with new sidewalk construction doesn't require that the new sidewalk be set behind the planting strip. I want to show you some images that illustrates how that happens. Here is a development in Midtown on Kings Drive; this is a site along Kings Drive that was cleared and redeveloped back in 2011; it is also a place where we know we have a lot of pedestrians walking in a fairly high density area of town. You can see this is the site right here and that is existing back of curb sidewalk. Then here you can see the site was completely regraded and redeveloped. The problem is after that redevelopment we were left with this sidewalk still at the back of the curb. This is the sidewalk now that we will likely have for decades in a fairly pedestrian heavy area. You can imagine how uncomfortable this might be for residents walking from the new apartments just up the street to the restaurants in the Midtown area. You can also see how this relieves in a matter of available space. It would have been relatively easy at the time of development to just switch the orientation of these street trees and this sidewalk to get the kind of pedestrian environment that our folks are telling us they want.

Here is another example: in 2007 in a little bit larger scale, this is on North Tryon Street. There is the back of curb sidewalk; again, a complete regrade and redevelopment and on one of our heaviest transit corridors we still have a back of curb sidewalk for our transit users and our pedestrians going to that shopping center. Here is another

example: in 2013 on Harris Boulevard, this is a Walmart redevelopment that came in and again completely regraded and redeveloped this site. The existing back of curb sidewalk is here and in this image you can actually see the sidewalk because it is a part of the development. The Walmart ripped up the existing sidewalk but then when they built it they again put it back in at the back of curb in the same place. Again, you can imagine how uncomfortable this is for folks who are using transit on Harris Boulevard trying to navigate these back of curb sidewalks.

Councilmember Mayfield said I'm looking for clarification; I'm trying to understand we are saying we are missing opportunities, but we haven't said why so is this land that was rezoned with that is the right and when it went in because I had a meeting earlier today of a development that yet another development in South End under TOD where they are talking about the exact same thing regarding not doing the setback or the standards that we have today. That is what was recommended to them by one of our team members, so I would love to hear why we've missed so many of these opportunities and what can we do today moving forward to try to mitigate that so we don't have this same conversation in another six months.

Mr. Curry said that is a good question, because it is a fairly narrow loophole that exists right now in the City Code that is resulting in these issues. If the development comes in and it is a rezoning then we are getting that planting strip put in. If the development comes in and it subdivides land then we are getting that planting strip put in. What is happening is, if it is a by right development and there is already sidewalk on that site, but it is at the back of curb our code doesn't have any tools for upgrading that sidewalk. The instances I've showed you are all instances where that back of curb sidewalk existed before the development, because that back of curb sidewalk was already there our code doesn't trigger any sort of reconstruction of that narrow back of curb sidewalk.

Ms. Mayfield said so before you finish this presentation you are going to be making a recommendation on how we close that loophole.

Mr. Curry said yes and that brings us to the next issue; the second high priority item from the Charlotte WALKS Plan and that is instances where we feel like we are seeing some sidewalk gaps pop up in our network that again we are maybe missing some opportunities. Again this is a Chapter 19 issue in the City Code and the loophole we are seeking to fix here has to do with development, can be phased in a way that precludes sidewalk and drainage facilities from being built. This is called the 50 percent rule; again it is in Chapter 19 of the City Code, and what it says is that if a proposed development occupies less than half of the property it sits on no sidewalks or drainage facilities are required. It is not written as cumulative requirement so that means that incremental phasing of a single site can lead to total site buildout without any sidewalk construction at all. Again, I've got an example to show you what that looks like. This is a site in the Westinghouse employment area on Nations Ford Road; we know there are lots of jobs in this area; there are restaurants and transit stops. In other words, we know there are reasons for people to be walking and the way this development came in was through a series of phases. Here is the development site; this was the first phase, second phase and potentially a third and fourth phase, but because of the way it was phased and because none of those phases individually were greater than 50% of the area of the site, we are left with a ditch along a thoroughfare that carries 7,000 cars per day. This is another issue that we made the commitment to you all to bring some Text Amendments forward to close this loophole as a part of the Charlotte WALKS Plan.

We've been working with our development community over the past 15 months, and we did the same thing we just did with you all when we first talked with them we brought the problem to them instead of bringing a fully-baked solution, because we wanted to hear their input on what makes sense and some triggers to get better sidewalk environments. We met with DSTAC, our Development Services Technical Advisory Committee on four occasions and we've also met with our UDO Advisory Committee to make sure to coordinate this with the ongoing UDO work. It has been a great opportunity for us to check in with the development community as well as the neighborhood advocates and other stakeholders that participate on the UDO Advisory Committee.

A couple other things that we heard from those meetings; the first was a good question and that question is aren't these issues already addressed elsewhere in the City Code potentially through the subdivision ordinance, and we dug into that to verify that no these loopholes aren't closed via the subdivision ordinance Chapter 20; these are problems that we are seeing pop up across the City in places that Chapter 19 applies. Once we got past that, the next couple comments we got were all about incorporating commonsense triggers for when substandard sidewalk would have to be brought up to code. The first was to think about the degree of non-conforming, so if someone has an existing seven-foot planting strip and six-foot sidewalk that seven-foot planting strip is one foot narrower than our current standard, is it really fair to expect somebody to upgrade their sidewalk environment when they are only one-foot off standard? So, that was something that was brought up. We were also asked to think about the scale of development so I shouldn't have to upgrade by entire sidewalk frontage just to upgrade my kitchen. The bottom line in all of this is that we agree; we think there needs to be some commonsense baked into how these triggers apply, and we've tried to do that in our communication with the development community over the past 15 months.

I will bring up some of the proposed triggers that are in the ordinance language that you all have in your handout; it is at the back of the presentation slides. Again, we are talking about thoroughfares only for this back of curb sidewalk issue. We are defining a substandard sidewalk as anything less than four and four, so if you are at a four-foot sidewalk and a four-foot planting strip then we are saying that is good enough for now. It is not ideal but that is a condition that we are willing to accept, because we know a lot of the City was built at that standard and we don't want these requirements to be too onerous. We also have some thresholds about the scale of development and then finally about if you remove existing substandard sidewalk, making sure that it is built back in the correct place.

For the 50% rule, we've got first of all sort of an administrative change; instead of tracking this by developed area we are suggesting that we should track it by built upon area. That is really sort of a staff level thing; it is easier for us to track internally, and it is also consistent with how we measure area elsewhere in City Code so changing developed area to built upon area. Then we are lowering that phasing exemption to 25% to try to catch more of those instances where sidewalks should be built and adding language to clarify that that is a cumulative exemption, so incremental phases less than 25% can get to total site build out without any sort of sidewalk or drainage.

Later on this evening, you will hear comments during the public hearing and then similar to the disparity study we will be back on November 27, 2017 seeking Council action.

Mayor Roberts said just to let Council know, during the Business Meeting we will have speakers come to talk to this. There are nine people signed to speak to these changes. It doesn't say if they are for or against, but we will be hearing from the public.

Councilmember Phipps said you mentioned that a couple of these loopholes would be addressed during the UDO process. How can you be reasonably assured that they will not only be addressed but resolved in as much as that UDO process still has another year or some months to go? So, we will be operating in the same environment as we are now, right; just waiting for that process. How can we be reasonably assured that it is really going to be addressed or if it is something we are just kicking the can down the road?

Mr. Curry said that is a good question, and I think the answer lies in the collaboration between C-DOT and the Planning Department on the UDO process. We've been closely involved with them, and they are aware of the recommendations of the Charlotte WALKS Plan. We've been involved in their UDO Advisory Committee, and we think that these two amendments that we are bringing to you all now will fix a lot of those more urgent issues that we are seeing. Again, that is why these are the two that we are bringing forward because we felt the sense of urgency about those two and the rest of them we are working closely with the Planning Department to fix through the UDO.

Mr. Phipps said the sidewalk gaps part, does that also include those instances where sidewalks need repairing?

Mr. Curry said that is more of a maintenance issue and less of a code issue related to new development. I don't know if that answers your question, but the maintenance issue is not really a part of Chapter 19 ordinance amendments that we are bringing forward to you all at the moment.

Councilmember Fallon said you keep quoting UDO; we never passed UDO and who knows if it will pass, so why are we following rules that were never approved?

Mr. Curry said I don't think we are following any rules that haven't been approved.

Ms. Fallon said you keep quoting UDO.

Mr. Curry said what I'm saying is that our intent is to coordinate the recommendations that come out of Charlotte WALKS, with the UDO process.

Ms. Fallon said we haven't approved the UDO process.

Mr. Curry said exactly, that is why it is an opportunity for us to try to get things right through the UDO.

Ms. Fallon said you are running around in circles, catch 22; you haven't approved it, but you are trying to coordinate with it. The dichotomy should be in your head; it doesn't coordinate.

Ms. Lyles said I was just speaking to the issue; we do have an approved process for the UDO, and that is something that we have started with the Planning Committee of the Planning Commission, and so I think what the staff is doing is trying to determine which of those policy changes can be done in coordination with the idea of building character. I think what we had last month was a conversation about how much awareness we have as a body of what is going on with UDO and that we need to actually do some more work to get more aware. I don't want to put Scott on the spot for something that we are really trying to work to resolve, because it is not just Charlotte WALKS; it is bikes, it is our roads and a number of huge issues, and I would hope that we would quickly move to look at that process, and I think we had a conversation about this two weeks ago that we know this is something that we have got to address.

Ms. Fallon said but maybe not as it stands because I attended the meeting and there is so much push back from the community about the UDO and it will not be as it stands right now.

Ms. Lyles said right, I agree with that. I've heard a lot of push back and not understanding it, so I agree that we don't have the answer to what will be the resolution at all.

Ms. Fallon said that is why I object to us following the rules until we know that some semblance of that is going to be used, and we don't know what will be used right now.

Councilmember Driggs said just for clarification; these changes apply to any rezoning or redevelopment where a rezoning is not required, but any reconstruction on the site. Is that right?

Mr. Curry said it applies in instances where Chapter 19 applies, so that is by right development situations.

Mr. Driggs said so, if it is like I'm rehabbing an existing building does that trigger these requirements?

Mr. Curry said potentially, so let me go back to those triggers. It depends on the scale of that rehab. That is a little bit in the weeds.

Ms. Mayfield said we are talking about the UDO that this Council, this body has not had a full discussion on. Committees may have had conversations, but we have not agreed as a body that yes, here is the model of UDO; this is the direction we want to go in, so every time that is mentioned that according to the UDO that Council has not approved, we are saying to the community we are going down this particular path when the Council has not clearly come to a decision on this particular path. Right now, we have multiple challenges throughout districts and at-large members receive their own set of calls from constituents. I clearly have concerns with our creation of TOD and the impact of it. I clearly have concerns that I've repeated it with every meeting regarding our vested rights, and where does this kick in when you have five to seven-year vested rights on a project today, and we know the world changes within a three-year period? I hear and agree with the question of why do we keep saying based on the UDO looking at the standards of a UDO when we as a full body have not agreed upon what is the model of the UDO that we are all talking about. That is where I'm hearing a disconnect; that constant conversation that we have and that constant question, who leads this direction? Is staff leading Council on the growth and the direction of the City or is Council's role to help direct staff on what our growth and our plan is for the City? If we get push back saying this is the direction we are going in where not all of Council; I'm not saying the individual committee. Transportation may have had this conversation, none of the four committees that I'm sitting on has had this conversation. I hear that question and agree that there is a disconnect, and I do think it will be beneficial, especially since we have a brand new Council that is going to be coming on. I don't want to just lay at their feet, okay this is what we said we've been doing when the people kept saying we need more clarification are no longer around the table.

Ms. Fallon said it is a matter of you can't take a glass slipper and fit everybody's feet into it. We are very diverse communities; some are very rural. Some are very, urban and you can't cut that cloth to fit everybody and use one standard, and that is what UDO does.

Mr. Driggs said Scott, I thought I heard you understand that the UDO as it evolves would incorporate this. My question is were you planning to act on this before the UDO is adopted and then harmonize later? Is that the idea? So, we are not prejudging the UDO at all with this action; we are just looking on a standalone basis that these recommendations which we could adopt; I think the UDO frankly is probably way out there. It took us so long to get the area plan updated, the UDO is a massive undertaking. This thing deserves to be considered on its own merits.

Mr. Curry said that is correct and thank you for helping to clarify that.

Ms. Lyles said I agree with the Driggs; the question that I have is maybe the reverse of it is what you are saying, and I don't know if this is what you were suggesting Mr. Driggs is that we not wait for the UDO to address the other 12 recommendations in Charlotte WALKS, or is it appropriate that we do the things that are in front of us now and try to incorporate them or phase them? I'm not sure which question it is.

Mr. Driggs said I was just saying this should move forward on its own timeline and the UDO process should take on the work whatever comes out of this.

Debra Campbell, Assistant City Manager said just for clarification the UDO is the Unified Development Ordinance, for those of you who aren't familiar with the acronym. Secondly, the Unified Development Ordinance has not been developed; it is in the process of having conversations with staff and with the community. The Unified Development Ordinance will be a combination of a number of different ordinances; the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and a number of others so that we can have a much more user friendly regulatory document for people to refer to. In terms of the Charlotte WALKS recommendations that you are hearing about tonight, there are two that are being proposed to be changed as part of Chapter 19. The reason that the other

changes are concerns that were identified as part of Charlotte WALKS are not being incorporated is because they have a lot to do with dimensional requirements for development and we don't think that we need to take those one off from the Unified Development Ordinance; that we need to look at it more holistically. I just wanted to make that clarification.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: LYNX BLUE LINE EXTENSION UPDATE

Mayor Roberts said I got to ride the test ride on the Blue Line Extension, and it is going to be great.

John Lewis, Executive Director of CATS said I'm kind of biased in that regard because Mayor; I agree with you. I wanted to come back before you to give you an update on what we've termed to be probably the most exciting project we've done in quite some time, certainly in regard to providing mobility options. We all know the extension from uptown out to UNCC has been under construction for quite some time. I'm going to move directly to the video that gives you, for those of you who have not taken a ride, just a snapshot with where we are with the project. A short video plays.

Mr. Lewis said even more work has gone on and in the video you see the 9th Street Station did not have the canopies that are shown in here so work continues on that. All of the work on the actual rail line has been completed; where we are now is finishing touches and stations, the art work and many of the canopies and some of the other minor details at the stations. Our impact of the project in the Noda community has been significant; there were some significant engineering challenges going through that community, but the good news on that is now that the rail construction by Norfolk Southern is close to completion, our focus will turn to the roadway construction and bridge work for 36th Street. The station will open in March of 2018, but the roadway work will not be completed until June of 2018. In regard to Craighead Road, I'm pleased to report that Craighead Road will open in mid-December of this year providing access across into NoDa and eliminating the need for people to travel down to 30th Street or over to Eastway to provide those connections. During this project we've been working with our partners at NCDOT and their contracted work for East Sugar Creek Road Bridge will be completed in February of 2019.

The next steps for us in this project as contractor testing continues to be ongoing; we are working towards alignment turnover where the contractor will actually turn over the alignment to CATS which is a major goal for us moving forward that will allow us to begin our testing. The contractor has been successfully performing testing over the last couple weeks, and as Mayor Roberts mentioned many of you have been participants in that testing where we've gone through and been able to operate the trains in simulated service along the alignment.

What is next for CATS? Once the alignment is turned over to us we begin our simulated schedule revenue service and that is the point where we run trains just like we will be running them once the alignment opens for revenue service, so to insure that not only we double check the testing that the contractor has done but we are able to meet the schedules that we are going to put out for the public to be able to utilize the service. I just wanted to take a moment to go over the Council actions that we will be bringing to you at the November 27, 2017 meeting. We still have several consultant management support contracts that we will have to continue until revenue service date that will support CATS, as we continue our testing and moving towards opening of the service. I will reiterate that it is funded within the current contingency and the project remains under budget.

Last, just a quick presentation of the parking decks at University City Boulevard and J. W. Clay, kind of Charlottesque of how we light up our buildings. We wanted to make sure that it reflects the culture and image of Charlotte at those locations. We will be moving towards opening in March, and I am very confident of that opening in line with the theme of March.

Councilmember Mitchell said Mr. Lewis go back to the color scheme. I noticed green, red and blue and blue, no purple and gold. Do you have something against purple and gold in the lighting?

Mr. Lewis said I do not; we have blue for Charlotte for the Panthers; we have green for our partners at UNCC. There aren't too many colors that we can't program in there.

Councilmember Driggs said I should probably know this, but what is the status of the platform expansion on the old part of the line?

Mr. Lewis said on the Blue Line Extension, all of the platforms are constructed to accommodate future three-car trains. On the current Blue Line, we have our four most heavily utilized locations that are being expanded, and we've pretty much finished that contract, but our day to day service does not have us at a point where we will need to have three-car trains probably for the next several years, so we do have those stations, the heavy utilized ones for special events like Panther Football Games or other events that will be held in uptown so that those targeted stations for heavy use can be utilized. We will look to do the rest of the locations as we get closer to that point where they are needed for day to day service.

Mr. Driggs said the targeted ones are pretty much done?

Mr. Lewis said yes.

Councilmember Fallon said John, I want to compliment you; the art work is the nicest I've seen in Charlotte. In addition, I love that leaf bridge; I got stuck for 15 minutes on J. W. Clay the other day, because they were finishing plantings, which should just make it just lovely, a lovely, lovely place, and it is conducive to want to ride it.

Mr. Lewis said thank you; staff has done a fantastic job on that, and we have entertained groups from other transit agencies and other cities have come to take a look at our art work, but this was an intentional part of the design of our contract, not just to provide mobility options, but also to be added value to the community. It is easier to just up a blank wall there, but it is something that is entirely different.

Councilmember Smith said it looks awesome on that video, and it is so cool to see the life up at University area and stuff that are activating on that side. There are a lot of rumors that has been going on about this project, and there is one I want to see if you can help me dispel. I heard you let Greg Phipps actually drive the train. Did that really happen, or is that a rumor?

Mr. Lewis said are my safety and security people here?

Mr. Smith said it really does, and I'm looking forward to it opening. You go through NoDa and you go up to the University area, and so much life is now happening along that line. It is going to be a real good day for the City when it does open, and I'm glad you didn't let Greg drive it.

Mayor Roberts said all the former Councilmembers who were there and voted on these things will be invited.

Ms. Fallon said it was worth it to take the heat to get the tax originally, because we did take the heat on it.

Mr. Lewis said you are going to get to reap the benefits of that decision.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 6: ANSWERS TO MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS

Kim Eagle, Assistant City Manager said I have a response to Ms. Fallon's question, concerning the location site selection for the Fire Station. There were a combination of reasons that this particular parcel was selected. First of all, the patterns for residential growth in the area dictated that this was prime location for response times. The second point I should say is related to the fact that we had a willing seller; we got a very good price and there is no condemnation required. It was response times and then it was a good deal.

Councilmember Fallon said I'm not going to pull it, but I think it should be closer to I-77, because that is really [inaudible] and I-485 where it meets, that is getting so heavily dense especially Mallard Creek on this side.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Smith, and carried unanimously to go into Closed Session pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 143-318.11(a)(3) to consult with attorneys employed or retained by the City in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege and to consider and give instructions to the attorneys concerning the handling or settlement of a claim and the case of Timothy Scott Bridges v. City of Charlotte 3:16-CV-546.

The meeting was recessed at 6:53 p.m. to go into Closed Session in Room 267. The closed session recessed at 7:27 p.m. to move to the Meeting Chamber for the regularly scheduled Business Meeting.

* * * * *

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina reconvened on Monday, November 13, 2017 at 7:38 p.m. in the Meeting Chambers of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Jennifer Roberts presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Ed Driggs, Claire Fallon, Carlenia Ivory, Patsy Kinsey, Vi Lyles, LaWana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Greg Phipps and Kenny Smith.

ABSENT: Councilmember Julie Eiselt

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Mayor Roberts explained the protocol for the invocation. Councilmember Driggs led the invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to The Flag.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 7: CONSENT AGENDA

Motion was made by Councilmember Kinsey and seconded by Councilmember Driggs to approve the Consent Agenda as presented with the exception of Item Nos. 51 and 52, which were pulled by staff and will be brought back at the November 27, 2017 Business Meeting.

Mayor Roberts said Item No. 39, which is the CATS Bus Service Agreement with the City of Concord, I just wanted to note that our neighboring counties are also very excited that the Blue Line Extension will be opening in March, and we are working on an agreement for the City of Concord to have express shuttle bus service to the parking

deck at the end of the Blue Line. They are working with us; we are cost sharing, and it has been a great partnership and Item No. 39 is to approve that agreement. We look forward to continuing to work with our neighboring counties to connect to our transit system and hopefully one day to expand that transit system beyond our county borders. I just want to raise attention to that and say Good Job CATS and keep on going and thank you City of Concord for working with us.

Councilmember Phipps said did you say that they enter into an agreement to have express buses at the end of the Blue Line?

Mayor Roberts said not the stop on UNCC Campus but the parking deck on North Tryon Street, not the very, very end.

Councilmember Ajmera said what was the question?

Mayor Roberts said where the buses were going; they are going to the parking deck that is on Tryon Street, not just the stop that is on UNCC Campus.

Mr. Phipps said the J. W. Clay right.

Mayor Roberts said you are right.

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

The following items were approved:

Item No. 22: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department Strategic Planning and Consulting Services Contract Amendment

(A) Approve contract amendment #1 to extend the strategic planning consulting and software services contract with MC Planning dba OnStrategy for an additional one-year term, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 23: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department Communications Recording System Maintenance Agreement

(A) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute a contract for a term of five years with Carolina Recording Systems, LLC for maintenance and support services on the recording equipment system utilized by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department's 911 center, (B) Authorize the City Manager to purchase maintenance and support for as long as the City uses the system, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to purchase such additional software licenses, services, and hardware as needed from time to time to optimize the City's use of the system.

Item No. 24: Resolution of Intent to Abandon a Portion of North Brevard Street

(A) Adopt a resolution of Intent to abandon a portion of North Brevard Street, and (B) Set a public hearing date for December 11, 2017.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Pages 499-501.

Item No. 25: Private Developer Funds for Traffic Signal Installation and Improvements

(A) Approve a Developer Agreement with Northwood Development LLC, Faison-Seventh Street, LLC, Mecklenburg County and Atherton Mill (E&A), LLC, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9208-X appropriating \$425,103 in private developer funds for traffic signal installations and improvements.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 140 at Page 150.

Item No. 26: Pedestrian Safety Improvements Contract for Fiscal Year 2018

Award a contract in the amount of \$1,953,402 to the lowest responsive bidder Zoladz Construction Company, Inc. for pedestrian safety projects.

Summary of Bids

Zoladz Construction Company, Inc.	\$1,953,402.00
Blythe Development Company	\$2,939,043.80

Item No. 27: Master Planning Services for Discovery Place Science Museum

Approve a contract in the amount of \$700,000 with Jenkins-Peer Architects, PA for master planning services for Discovery Place Science Museum.

Item No. 28: Charlotte Vehicle Operations Center Architectural and Engineering Design Services

Approve a contract in the amount of \$266,420 with ALR Architecture, PC for architectural and engineering design services for the Charlotte Vehicle Operations Center, Phase 2.

Item No. 29: Site and Civil Engineering Design Services

Approve unit price contract with the following firms for site and civil engineering design services for a three-year period: The Isaacs Group, P.C., Merrick and Company, Cole Jenest & Stone, PA, and Gavel & Dorn Engineering, PLLC.

Item No. 30: Misty Wood Drive Storm Drainage Improvements

Award a contract in the amount of \$1,101,296.35 to the lowest responsive bidder Hall Contracting Corporation for the Misty Wood Drive Storm Drainage Improvement project.

Summary of Bids

Hall Contracting Corporation	\$1,101,296.35
Sealand Contractors Corp.	\$1,147,379.15
Zoladz Construction Company, Inc.	\$1,173,000.00
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$1,234,552.60
Onsite Development, LLC	\$1,268,913.45

Item No. 31: Storm Water Rain and Stream Gauges Maintenance Agreement

Approve a five-year agreement with the United States Geological Survey (USGS) for an amount up to \$2,247,100 for maintenance of storm water rain and stream gauges.

Item No. 32: Sugar Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant HVAC Produce

Award a contract in the amount of \$511,000 to the lowest responsive bidder, Southeastern Plumbing and Heating, Inc. for the Sugar Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant HVAC Project.

Summary of Bids

Southeastern Plumbing & Heating	\$511,000.00
Climate Systems	\$515,000.00
Colonial Webb	\$568,011.00

Item No. 33: Water Master Plan Program Management Services

Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,755,818 with Brown and Caldwell for program management services for the water Master Plan Program.

Item No. 34: Sonic Financial Corporation Hanger License

(A) Approve a five-year license with Sonic Financial Corporation for hangar space at Wilson Air Center, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the license for one additional, five-year term and to amend the license consistent with the purpose for which the license was approved.

Item No. 35: Matheson Flight Extenders Lease

(A) Approve a five-year lease with Matheson Flight Extenders for cargo facility space and, (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the license for three additional, one-year renewal terms consistent with the purpose for which the license was approved.

Item No. 36: Airport Checked Baggage In-Line System Conveyor Parts

(A) Approve the purchase of checked baggage in-line system conveyor belting and parts, as authorized by the sole source exemption of G.S. 143-129(e)(6). (B) Approve a unit price contract with FORBO Siegling LLC, for the purchase of conveyor belting and parts for a term of five years, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for us to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the City's business needs and the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 37: Bus Maintenance Parts Contract

(A) Approve the purchase of bus maintenance parts, as authorized by the sole source exemption of G.S. 143.129 (e)(6), (B) Approve a unit price contract with Arkay Acquisition LLC (Gillig, Inc.) for the purchase of bus maintenance parts for the term of three 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. 38: LYNX Blue Line Extension – Landscape Services Contract Amendment

Approve contract amendment #2 for an amount up to \$420,000 to Champion Landscapes Inc. for landscape services for the Blue Line Extension Project.

Item No. 39: CATS Bus Service Agreement with the City of Concord

(A) Adopt a resolution ratifying the Interlocal Agreement with the City of Concord for bus service operated by the Concord Kannapolis Transit System for one year that will connect the City of Concord to the LYNX Blue Line, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the agreement for up to four additional, one-year terms and to amend the agreement consistent with the purposes for which the agreement was approved.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Pages 502-515.

Item No. 40: Refund of Property Taxes

Adopt a resolution authorizing the refund of property taxes assessed through clerical ore assessment error in the amount of \$14,411.80.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Pages 516-519.

Item No. 41: Meeting Minutes

Approve the titles, motions, and votes reflected in the Clerk's record as the minutes of October 09, 2017 Business Meeting and October 16, 2017 Zoning Meeting.

Item No. 42: Future Fire station Land Purpose

Approve the purchase of 6.56 acres (parcel identification number 037-411-23) located at the corner of Miranda Road and Beatties Ford Road for the amount of \$350,000.

Item No. 43: In Rem Remedy 5000 Lakeview Road

Adopt Ordinance No. 9206-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at 5000 Lakeview Road, (Neighborhood Profile Area 260).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 61, at Pages 141-145.

Item No. 44: Property Transactions – 25th Street Connection, Parcel #9

Acquisition of 3,738 square feet (.086 acre) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement, plus 3,839 square feet (.088 acre) in Waterline Easement, plus 605 square feet (.014 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 2,747 square feet (.063 acre) in Utility

Easement at 2121 North Davidson Street from Dora Ann Hood for \$155,100 for 25th Street Connection, Parcel #9.

Item No. 45: Property Transactions – 25th Street Connection, Parcel #10

Acquisition of 293 square feet (.007 acre) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement, plus 323 square feet (.007 acre) in Waterline Easement, plus 77 square feet (.002 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 286 square feet (.007 acre) in Utility Easement at East 25th Street from BGH Holdings, LLC for \$14,575 for 25th Street Connection, Parcel #10.

Item No. 46: Property Transactions – Low Pressure Sanitary Sewer to Serve NC 73, Henry Lane, and Beatties Ford Road, Parcel #3

Acquisition of 1,436 square feet (.033 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 2,183 square feet (.05 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 14910 North Carolina 73 Highway from MDHB Properties, LLC for \$13,700 for Low Pressure Sanitary Sewer to Serve NC 73, Henry Lane and Beatties Ford Road, Parcel #3.

Item No. 47: Property Transactions – North Wendover Road 6” Water Main, Parcel #1, 2 and 3.

Acquisition of 2,507 square feet (.058 acre) in Waterline Easement, plus 8,757 square feet (.201 acre) in Temporary construction Easement at 617 North Wendover Road from Wendover Green, LLC for \$28,250 for North Wendover Road 6” water Main, Parcels #1, 2 and 3.

Item No. 48: Property Transactions – 24” Water Main – South Street Davidson - Phase II, Parcel #2

Approve resolution of condemnation of 17,773.48 square feet (.408 acre) in Waterline Easement, plus 8,627.46 square feet (.198 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement on Zion Avenue from Antiquity, LLC for \$29,450 for 24” Water Main – South Street Davidson – Phase II, Parcel #2.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page 520.

Item No. 49: Property Transactions – 24” Water Main – South Street Davidson, Phase II, Parcel #5

Approve resolution of condemnation of 4,903.69 square feet (.113 acre) in Waterline Easement, plus 2,189.24 square feet (.05 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement on Catawba Avenue from Antiquity, LLC for \$32,175 for 24” Water Main – South Street Davidson – Phase II, Parcel #5.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page 521.

Item No. 50: Property Transactions – Gum Branch Sanitary Sewer, Parcel #14, 19 and 25.

Approve resolution of condemnation of 5,555 square feet (.128 acre) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 4,093 square feet (.94 acre) in Temporary Construction Easement at 511 Gum Branch Road from McClure Real Estate & Investment, Inc. for \$750 for Gum Branch Sanitary Sewer, Parcel #14, 19 and 25.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 48, at Page 522.

* * * * *

AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

ITEM NO. 8: #GIVING TUESDAY CLT PROCLAMATION

Mayor Roberts read the following Proclamation:

WHEREAS, need in our community is real, affecting children, adults, seniors, families, military, animals, and the environment; and

WHEREAS, local nonprofits work every day to help alleviate these needs; and

WHEREAS, SHARE Charlotte, a one-stop shop that brings together local non-profits making it easier for community members to learn about the organizations and become engaged, is uniting more than 230 nonprofits and the community to showcase Charlotte's philanthropic spirit and to raise \$10 million for the 2017 campaign; and

WHEREAS, by putting all non-profits on an equal playing field, SHARE Charlotte aims to heighten awareness of the critical nonprofit work being done in Charlotte and the importance of community involvement on #GivingTuesdayCLT; and

WHEREAS, #GivingTuesday is a global movement dedicated to giving back; #GivingTuesdayCLT celebrates and promotes community members giving the gift of time, treasure, and talent that has direct impact on Charlotte; and

WHEREAS, presented by Wells Fargo, #GivingTuesdayCLT powered by SHARE Charlotte is a rally cry to engage the hearts of Charlotteans by providing Charlotte with easy access to get involved and give back, and the collective effort will strengthen the community for tomorrow:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Jennifer Watson Roberts, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim November 28, 2017 as

**“#GIVINGTUESDAYCLT POWERED BY
SHARE CHARLOTTE”**

Mayor Roberts said if I remember correctly last year when we had this event Charlotte had the biggest amount raised of any City in the US for the GivingTuesday, so that was great. The Executive Director of Share is here this evening, Kelly Brooks, and we appreciate all that you do with Share Charlotte.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 9: JIM PROSSER DAY PROCLAMATION

Mayor Roberts said our next proclamation is for recognition of somebody who has been a tremendous public service who is with us tonight; Jim Prosser who has worked on Centralina Council of Governments.

Councilmember Kinsey said Mr. Prosser has done a great deal for our community as the Executive Director of the Centralina Council of Governments. Jim announced his retirement in late spring or early summer of this year, but he promised us he would not leave until we had someone to take his place. Now, nobody can really take Jim's place and I am chairing the Search Committee, and I'll admit I've been sort of slow about it, not wanting him to leave us. He has a long career of both the public and private sector before coming to what we call COG. He had more than 25-years in City management in several mid-western cities serving as City Manager in Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Richfield, Minnesota, and Hazel Crest, Illinois. Under his leadership Centralina GOG has worked for five local governments with the creation of strategies to launch solar initiatives in the region. Favorable renewal energy policies and incentives have helped the Charlotte Metropolitan area become a national leader in solar energy. One of his accomplishments and there are many, and some of you probably have heard about this and maybe participated in stakeholders meetings as the connect project. The COG was very fortunate with the help of many municipalities including our own in getting a HUD grant to do this three year study and just to let you know a little bit more about Connect, it was a three-year study, communities and the private sector partners in the nine-county Centralina Council of Governments region has been building a regional growth framework with a focus on growing jobs and the economy, controlling the cost of government and improving the quality of life known as Connect our Future. This project engaged more than 8,000 respondents in the region through hundreds of public/private

governmental and stakeholder forums. The study an initiative of central Carolina Council of Governments in collaboration with Catawba and South Carolina Regional Council was guided by an extensive 100 plus member public/private consortium. The Connect project is the first comprehensive regional growth plan ever assimilated for the Greater Charlotte Area. We got really nice compliments from HUD when we closed out the grant, and in one of their paragraphs they state “we commend your staff and the partnering organizations that contributed to your success. The quality of products, process and participation through your planning effort put you amongst the excellent company nationally with regards to innovative approaches, to engage communities in resolving their local issues. Your efforts moved the Greater Charlotte Region from being the largest metropolitan area without a long-range comprehensive plan to a national model for sustainable development. This project was a well-conceived concept and its proof will be revealed in the months and years to come”. Indeed it is continuing to do just that, and I have been pleased to be able to serve on the Executive Board and actually Chair it this year so it has been a pleasure to work with Jim. Ms. Kinsey read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, Jim Prosser has served as Executive Director of Centralina Council of Governments (CCOG) since December 2010; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Prosser has been instrumental in advancing CCOG’s mission of helping local communities grow jobs and the economy, control the cost of government, and improve quality of life; and

WHEREAS, under Mr. Prosser’s direction, CCOG has continued its commitment to finding innovative solutions that meet the needs of local governments in the areas of aging, community and economic development, regional planning, and workforce development; and

WHEREAS, during Mr. Prosser’s tenure, CCOG has completed development of the region’s first regional growth framework, “CONNECT Our Future,” developed the Prosperity for Greater Charlotte Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, and held the Creative Solutions for Thriving Communities annual conference to promote national best practices; and

WHEREAS, with Mr. Prosser’s leadership and strategic vision, CCOG has earned respect within the region, around the state, and across the country as one of the leading Councils of Government in the nation:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Jennifer Watson Roberts, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim November 13, 2017 as

“JIM PROSSER DAY”

in Charlotte and commend its observance to all citizens.

Jim Prosser said despite my reputation, I will keep it brief. First of all, I appreciate this acknowledgement, but most of all I appreciate the opportunity to keep the company of the dedicated elected and appointed officials within all local government, but especially City of Charlotte. Without the commitment that you make every day to make sure not only Charlotte, but the Charlotte region is a better place for not only the people that live here now but our children and grandchildren, this never would happen. One of the most important things for people to remember is that there is a special place in Heaven for people who work and are elected to local government, because the work that you do, this is your third, fourth or fifth job and your commitment to quality of life, to making sure that there are quality jobs for people and our strong economy that will support quality of life this wouldn’t happen. It has been an honor to work with you and your staff; Charlotte is well regarded as one of the best cities and continues to improve and continues to strive to make this a better place for residents now and in the future. Thanks very much, I appreciate this.

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM NO. 10: PUBLIC COMMENT ON CHARLOTTE WALKS: SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION ORDINANCE REVISIONS

Mayor Roberts said Council heard an update on what these amendments will entail at our Dinner Meeting and now we are here to hear public input on these amendments.

Linda Park-Leach, 704 Louise Avenue said I wanted to talk with you for a few minutes about what it is like to be visually impaired and walk out of a neighborhood beside a thoroughfare to get to a destination. First of all, you are going to have to walk in the street and as you do that you are trying to walk as close as you can to the edge, but it might not be that easy for you to tell where the edge is if there is not a curb. Then you are going to be trying to avoid the parked cars and you are worried about damaging the car with your cane; you are worried about going around the vehicle, maybe a truck that has a mirror that is sticking out, so you may be edge a little bit closer to the traffic than is wise to do. If you get out onto the thoroughfare, and you are not going to be in the street at that point you are going to be walking along grass, maybe weeds and you are going to be trying to have an edge to follow, so you are going to be walking very closely to the edge of the street trying to move your cane across in front of you and down the curb into the thoroughfare. That is a very dangerous place to be. With sidewalks in place, the experience is much different because there is a defined path. It is easy to count the driveways or the walkways to determine which house is which. It is easier to find the corner and not accidentally walk into the perpendicular street. When sidewalks have a planting strip rather than being designed as back of curb it creates an additional sense of security for all our citizens for especially for our disabled. People with a vision loss don't have to be concerned about accidentally stepping off the parallel street as they are walking down if there is a grass line between them and that curb. Planting strips are also critical for those using wheelchairs; they provide space for driveways and sidewalk ramps to slope down to the level of the street. Without planting strips, back of curb sidewalks often don't have sufficient room to meet ADA standards or provide bus shelters. Metrolina Association for the Blind, of which I am an employee, supports the amendments to the Charlotte WALKS pedestrian plan which would require developers to create sidewalks throughout their building projects, not at the conclusion of their phased development. We also believe that Charlotte should require the highest standard on sidewalk design. Research clearly indicates that planting strips should be our standard to create safe barriers in our walkable streets and neighborhoods. Whether you want to exercise, walk to work, walk to a social opportunity or public transit a safe and ADA compliance sidewalk is a Charlotte standard.

Diana Cook, 12737 Windyedge Road, Huntersville said I appreciate the opportunity to offer comments on the Charlotte WALKS Chapter 19 Amendments. I am a volunteer with the American Heart Association and a member of the State Advocacy Committee for the Cure. We support plans that make it safer and easier for people to bike and walk in their communities, especially for those who use public transit, biking or walking to get to and from work, school, and the grocery store. Integrating health considerations within communities can create more active neighborhoods and increase transportation options for healthier living. Without safe places to walk, it is very difficult for Charlotteans to get the regular physical activity they need to stay healthy and live heart healthy lifestyle. Charlotte is doing a great job of building a vision of a healthy, vibrant, community for all, that includes all members of the community can safely walk in their neighborhoods. We need you to continue this work by closing the problematic loopholes in the city code. The first loophole allows development to be built in phases without any sidewalks. This decreases pedestrian's ability to walk because of inconsistent sidewalk space and it is very dangerous. The second loophole allows development to completely demolish, regrade and rebuild a site without installing a planting strip or small area of grass between the sidewalk and moving traffic. If pedestrians don't feel safe walking along a busy road, they are much less likely to use the sidewalks. We urge the Council to close these loopholes in the City Code creating consistency with the vision of a safe,

walkable community. The American Heart Association supports your efforts to build a healthier Charlotte.

Kate Cavazza, 2151 Hawkins Street said I am the Bicycle Program Manager at Sustain Charlotte. Sustain Charlotte is a land use and transportation advocacy organization and our mission is to inspire choices that lead to a healthy, equitable, and vibrant community for generations to come. I'm speaking tonight in support of the two proposed amendments to the City Code, as identified by the Charlotte WALKS five-year pedestrian plan. These two amendments would close loopholes that currently allow developers to forego construction of safe sidewalks with new phased development. Specifically, Charlotte WALKS addresses Chapter 19 of the City Code that currently allows development to be built in phases without any sidewalks. It also defines the standards of construction that allow developers to build sub-standard back of curb sidewalks without planting strips. According to the visions via our street design standards sidewalks are an integral element to eliminate all traffic deaths and serious injuries. This policy framework, adopted by City Council in May of this year, recommends sidewalks to offer no less than eight-feet of unobstructed width in order to encourage walking and reduce speeds. Charlotte WALKS further explains that pedestrians are the most vulnerable users of our roadways. It says that Charlotte is committed to providing a safe pedestrian environment; it is the foundation of any walkable place. The economic, environmental, and health benefits of walkable neighborhoods are well documented. Numerous studies from the Land Institute show that sidewalks increase property values as safe pedestrian networks connect people to businesses and jobs all over Charlotte. Right now, the average transportation cost in Charlotte is over \$12,000 per year; that is 6% higher than the national standard. Making our City more walkable can help reduce this cost. By allowing developers to shift this responsibility to phase construction and giving them options to build sub-standard and dangerous sidewalks, we are denying Charlotteans the social and economic benefits of a walkable City. We have to ask ourselves, what kind of City do we want to be? Will we continue to prioritize cars or work to protect the most vulnerable users of our roadways by giving our citizens safe sidewalks so they can walk to work, schools, businesses without having to dodge traffic around new development? Sustain Charlotte urges City Council to adopt these new amendments to the City Code and support the five-year pedestrian plan Charlotte WALKS.

Katrina Pitts, 1900 Selwyn Avenue said I am a student at Queens University of Charlotte. The decision you will be making today is more than fixing the sidewalk loophole; this is a choice of saving lives. A study done by the Governance Highway Safety Association showed that the number of pedestrians killed increased by 11% last year in Charlotte in comparison to 2015. Would a few more sidewalks decrease that percentage? I'm sure it would, but would a City that values its pedestrians put the lives of its citizens first decrease that percentage? Absolutely. For a City that is growing as fast as Charlotte, we can't become the dynamic and vibrant City that I assure you we all want to be if our residents and if our tourists do not feel safe in our City. We cannot wait until more innocent people are killed. The cost of building a sidewalk may feel like a nuisance to some but to a student who chose this City as its home for four years, it is a necessity.

Amanda Morales, 1900 Selwyn Avenue said according to data from NCDOT's Watch for me NC Pedestrian Cyclist Safety Program, vehicles in North Carolina hit more than 3,000 pedestrians and 850 bicyclists every year. This makes North Carolina one of the least safe states for walking and cycling. Even more alarming is a fatality rate for these crashes; approximately 160 pedestrians and 25 cyclist die in state wide traffic crashes each year. If there are no sidewalks in an area it becomes harder for pedestrians to move about safely. This poses a risk for walkers and drivers. Insuring that developers are required to include sidewalks could help lower the rates of which pedestrians and biker related accidents and fatalities occur in our City. Including sidewalks, new development also allows for Charlotteans to be more active in a safe way. Without sidewalks, going for a walk or a jog can become dangerous, or as noted earlier, even fatal. This is why I believe for health purposes in addition to safety that the Charlotte WALKS Chapter 19 amendments are so important. I would like to close by saying I

have the privilege of living and working in Myers Park at Queens University of Charlotte. For those of you not familiar with the area, almost the entire neighborhood has tree-lined wide sidewalks on either side of the street. Residents and our students are able to safely use the sidewalks to exercise, walk their dogs and just hang out. On any given day you can drive through the neighborhood and see the sidewalks filled with pedestrians enjoying these nice sidewalks and doing so in a safe manner. I grew up in a place without sidewalks and little to no room to walk on the side of the road, a place where you walked facing traffic to be safe so you could see the cars and trucks coming at you. This is a reality for so many Charlotteans. There is also something about moving forward with new development you all have the opportunity to change. I hope you all consider the benefits of these amendments and vote in favor of this measure.

Natane Deruytter, 1900 Selwyn Avenue said I am also a student at Queens University of Charlotte. I'm going to start by drawing somewhat of a small comparison here, so Sidewalk Saved my Life. I'm opening with a quote from a relatively recent song by the The Weekend. While this may seem a bit informal, it actually proves rather symbolic. The logic behind the symbolism simply stated is, as times change individuals should adapt to meet them. Recently, in one of my classes at Queens University at Charlotte I read The Jew and The Lotus by Rodger Kamenetz. He explains the divide in the Jewish religion between those who adapt to modern times and those who live in the past. Ultimately, he advocates for these alterations to contemporary times. Similarly, Charlotte's road systems are constructed around the times of major automobile growth. The excitement surrounding these cars cause engineers to neglect the needs of pedestrians, little regard for sidewalks were taken into consideration; however, now as Charlotte is growing, as you know it is the second largest growing City in America, there is a greater need for safety of the growing population of pedestrians. Additionally, the movement towards healthy and sustainable living is also growing. Every day, we see people walking, running or biking; however, they face many potential dangers as many of the roads in Charlotte do not have proper sidewalks. I can directly relate to this; I'm a cross-country runner at Queens University of Charlotte, and while running through the Myers Park area we have sufficient sidewalks but going three miles out there are sidewalks overgrown by brush or non-existent ones at that. In fact, I have had many a team mate actually get hit by a car due to inefficient sidewalks. More or less, the City of Charlotte needs to evolve to meets the needs of its growing population.

Joe Padilla, 1201 Greenwood Cliff said I am the Executive Director of the Real Estate and Building Coalition and on behalf of the hundreds of commercial and residential developers that we represent in the City of Charlotte. First off, I want to comment your staff for working with us and incorporating some of the feedback we gave them in this proposal through both the UDO process and the Development Standards, Technical Advisory Committee, but I want to express some lingering concerns we do have. No one is questioning the need for sidewalks and pedestrian safety, but what we are asking is that it is important for you to recognize and understand the costs and trade-offs associated with these new requirements, as well as how they affect other public policy priorities identified by this Council. These amendments require property owners to replace all sections of sub-standard back of curb sidewalk on their site when their development meets a specified threshold. The new sidewalk has to be six-foot wide and buffered from the street by an eight-foot planting strip for a total right-of-way dedication of 14 feet. Keep in mind, the amendment and our biggest concern with it is when the developer is required to tear out existing sidewalk and reinstall it to the higher standard regardless of whether they are seeking a rezoning on their property. That represents significant amount of additional costs in grading and clearing, all of which is going to fall on the tenant or purchaser of the new building or multi-family project being constructed. Now for the past year we've all talked about the critical need to address Charlotte's growing lack of affordable and workforce housing and while we've made progress in a number of key metrics, and I think we take a small step backward whenever we pass any regulation like this one which adds to the cost of new housing. It is also important to remember that this new requirement involves more than just the dedication of additional right-of-way on the development site. Depending on the topography and grade, additional linear feet may be lost beyond the 14-feet called for in the amendment. That additional grading could call for the removal of additional trees on the site making it

difficult for us to retain our 50% tree canopy. Again, we all want Charlotte to be a more walkable City but the consequence of this policy needs to be measured against the detrimental impact they may have on other policies we've agreed are priorities for our City. What we are asking simply is that as you look at the policy and as you consider adopting it you also include at the very least a hardship exemption for affordable-housing development to allow projects that are going to have topographical or other site constraints but are trying to provide that affordable housing to have a way around this policy if that situation should arise.

Martin Zimmerman, 1616 Bonnie Lane said it is a pleasure to speak with you again. As many of you know I've been very active for a couple decades now, first with the UNC-Charlotte as records facilities planning during the 1990's under Chancellor Woodward, later with the Charlotte Area Bicycle Alliance and recently resigned from the Bicycle Advisory Committee. I resigned, as I told Councilmember Phipps, a few weeks ago, because I think the Bicycle Advisory Committee is on great footing; we passed the Bicycle Plan. We've got a great bicycle program manager for the City, Ben Miller. They are moving forward very well, a very capable group, and I thought I would mention that to you. As far as the matter of concern this evening, the timing is excellent, because I did want to speak about the testimony that was just given. Almost 20-years ago when I was with the Charlotte Area Bicycle Alliance and we were trying to get the Bicycle Plan passed, I got a call from Pat Mumford at 7:30 in the morning the day of the vote. We had been working closely together to get the Bike Plan passed and he cautioned us that if we didn't get enough people on the petition that the real estate interest might cause some issues. It turned out that we had enough on the petition to make an impact on City Council and there was quite a lengthy discussion. John Lassiter, who was later run against Anthony Foxx for Mayor, spent quite a bit of time at that meeting, picking apart the Bike Plan. I don't think we need to pick apart the ordinance changes that are before you tonight and my goal is sit back and relax and see if you can pass this in under three minutes, the time it has taken me to speak right now.

Juan Euvin, 1330 Green Oaks Lane said I am a long distance runner; I've done my second marathon this year; I did the Charlotte Marathon. I wish this was a joke but running in Charlotte is almost a contact sport. I can give you two examples where I was almost hit by a car in the past 30-days. I would ask you to pass the ordinance and in addition to that I would ask you invest in education i.e. driver's education. I've seen examples of drivers texting, not paying attention, and even when I have the right-of-way they gun, because we have right on right they gun it to the corner instead of stopping at the cross-way. What they do is they gun it all the way to the end and then see if anybody is coming but if somebody is crossing then it is too late.

Mayor Roberts said Ms. Campbell, we are not voting on this tonight, is that correct?

Ms. Campbell said that is correct, November 27, 2017.

Mayor Roberts said we got the public comments this evening; we had a good discussion at the Dinner Meeting and we will have the formal vote on November 27, 2017 two weeks from tonight for the Council to accept these amendments to increase our sidewalks. We appreciate everyone being here this evening and I think our dinner discussion was pretty favorable to these changes.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 11: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Debra Campbell, Assistant City Manager said the City Manager requested that I highlight two items for his report tonight; the Neighborhood Exchange and Leadership Awards and the National League of Cities City Summit Update. I believe we have a video, but before we see that I would like to make some brief comments. The Neighborhood Exchange and Leadership Awards took place on Saturday, September

23, 2017, at the Charlotte Contention Center. The program highlighted a presentation from Krista Nightengale of the Better Block Foundation followed by a series of brainstorming and networking sessions on a variety of topics. Quite frankly, the highlight of this event are the awards, and that is given a part of the luncheon and at this particular luncheon there were 39 neighborhoods, non-profit and businesses recognized by the City for making a positive impact on our neighborhoods. You know how they say a picture is worth a thousand words, so we will see the video, and then I would like for the recipients of awards and the participants in the program to stand afterwards so that we can recognize them in a much more formal and fitting way.

Ms. Campbell said the second item the National League of Cities City Summit Update and I will ask Randy Harrington if he would come up do the honor.

Randy Harrington, Chief Financial Officer said I am really pleased to announce to you that this week we are excited and ready to host the National League of Cities City Summit here in Charlotte. I can tell you that we have over 200 volunteers who are ready and will be at the Convention Center and our hotels and other venues across the City this week to help insure that those who visit our City have a wonderful experience and they have someone who they can rely on and go to for any help or needs they may have during the conference. As I mentioned, we have approximately 4,000 elected officials from across the United States who will converge on Charlotte to learn about emerging local trends and discuss innovate approaches to solving and addressing the needs in our local communities. The attendees have begun arriving already for pre-conference meetings and other trainings and also to partake in spouse tours and mobile workshops that start before the conference officially gets underway on Thursday afternoon.

This week some of the key highlights that are in store, first off, on Wednesday evening the National League of Cities Board of Directors will have a special event on the NASCAR Hall of Fame. On Thursday, it kicks off with key note speakers former Congress Woman Gabby Gifford, as well as Mark Kelly, former astronaut with NASA. The City Summit Conference concludes with a really amazing key note address from the one and only Ervin "Magic" Johnson. Some great speakers will be at the event, a lot of great attendees and what I would like to do is share with you a brief video that will share what attendees can expect to see and do and hear and feel in Charlotte.

Mr. Harrington said I want to thank the Mayor and the three Councilmembers who were so willing and gracious to lend their hand in the video so thank you very much for that and for your leadership in terms of bringing this wonderful event to Charlotte and our region. Let me ask Councilmember Mitchell if he would like add a few additional words.

Councilmember Mitchell said let me just say thank you staff; Randy, I think you took over this when Ann got her promotion back in August, and you just rolled up your sleeves and really got behind this conference. I'm so excited that it starts tomorrow. Thank you Patsy, President; I will mention LaWana, NBC Leo, and Mayor After School Time Out Youth Program, because I really think that what people are really excited about that this entire City and City Council really embraces the National League of Cities so thank you so much. There is one thing; 18 local businesses have signed up for their unique wares in exhibit hall, and I think the first time ever NLC has created this type of atmosphere, so for those businesses, thank you so much and let's show them a good time, and I know we will. Thank you staff I really appreciate it.

Ms. Campbell said that concludes the City Manager's Report.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 12: CEMETERIES ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

Councilmember Kinsey said I think a lot of people don't realize that Charlotte owns seven cemeteries and operates seven cemeteries. It is a common function for many municipalities. This service proves an affordable alternative for residents and respectful

burial for indigent persons. An operational analysis was completed in 2015 by the UNC-Charlotte Master of Public Administration Program; the adopted 2018 budget includes \$225,000 for completion of a Cemeteries Master Plan. The cemeteries ordinance was last updated in 1985; the goals of the revised cemetery ordinance are to update obsolete duplicate or unclear language and better reflect current operations. On October 23, 2017, the Environment Committee approved a revised cemeteries ordinance and recommends adoption by the full Council. Just in case you are wondering what those cemeteries are; Old Settler's Cemetery is right behind First Presbyterian Church uptown, and you have Elmwood, Pinewood Cemetery, North Pinewood and West Pinewood, Oaklawn and Evergreen out on Central Avenue.

Motion was made by Councilmember Kinsey and seconded by Councilmember Driggs, to adopt Ordinance No. 9107 amending Chapter 7 - Cemeteries of the City Code, as recommended by the Environment Committee.

Councilmember Lyles said I just want to thank the Committee, because a lot of this work was done by our University and anytime that we can use people out of that program at UNC-Charlotte, it is the Foxx Masters of Public Administration, and I want to recognize them and know that we are grateful for the work and the opportunity to work with the University on this type of research.

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

The Ordinance is recorded full in Ordinance Book 61, at Pages 146-149.

* * * * *

Mayor Roberts recognized County Commissioner Velma Leake who is in the audience, as well as incoming Councilmembers Tariq Bokhari and Justin Harlow.

* * * * *

BUSINESS

SCALEYBARK DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS AMENDMENT FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Mayor Roberts said this was not on the agenda so it didn't have a number.

Motion was made by Councilmember Fallon and seconded by Councilmember Driggs, to approve a 90-day extension to the General Development Agreements with Scaleybark Partners LLC to extend the development completion obligations to March 30, 2018.

Councilmember Kinsey said this thing has been hanging around for how long; I'm going to support this but I certainly hope we can move forward with this particular project because it has been around since 2007, and I just urge the developers go ahead and complete it.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: NOMINATIONS TO THE BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term beginning July 29, 2017 and ending December 31, 2019 and two appointments for full terms beginning January 1, 2018 and ending December 31, 2020:

Jack Cameron nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Fallon, and Mitchell
Robert Carter nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Fallon, Ivory, Kinsey, Mayfield, Phipps, and Smith
Nadine Ford nominated by Councilmembers Ivory, Kinsey, and Mayfield.
Brian Geathers nominated by Councilmembers Lyles and Mitchell
Tarik Hameed nominated by Councilmember Ajmera
Milton Irizarry Jr., nominated by Councilmember Driggs, Fallon, Ivory, Mayfield, Mitchell, Phipps, and Smith
Ryan Phipps nominated by Councilmember Kinsey
Cherie Readus nominated by Councilmember Phipps
Carlos Webb nominated by Councilmember Lyles

Motion was made by Councilmember Smith, seconded by Councilmember Lyles, and carried unanimously to appoint Robert Carter and Milton Irizarry, Jr. by acclamation.

Mr. Carter and Mr. Irizarry Jr. were appointed.

The remaining appointment will be brought back for consideration at the next business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 14: NOMINATIONS TO BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following nominations were for one recommendation by the Carolinas Asian American Chamber of Commerce for a partial term beginning immediately and ending April 28, 2020:

Deepika Jalla nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Fallon, Ivory, Kinsey Lyles, Mayfield, Mitchell, and Phipps.

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Deepika Jalla by acclamation.

Ms. Jalla was appointed.

Two recommendations by the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce for partial terms beginning immediately and ending April 28, 2018, then continuing for full three year terms until April 27, 2021.

Charles McShane nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Ivory, Kinsey, Lyles, Mayfield, Mitchell, and Phipps
Sterling Scott nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Fallon, Ivory, Kinsey, Lyles, Mayfield, Mitchell and Phipps.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Smith, and carried unanimously to appoint Charles McShane and Sterling Scott by acclamation.

Mr. McShane and Mr. Scott were appointed.

The following recommendation was made for the Hispanic Contractors Association for a partial term beginning immediately and ending April 28, 2020:

Baldwin Mercedes nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Ivory, Kinsey, Lyles, Mayfield, Mitchell, and Phipps.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to appoint Baldwin Mercedes by acclamation.

Mr. Mercedes was appointed.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a full term in the At-Large category beginning immediately and ending April 28, 2018, and then continuing for a full three year term from April 29, 2018 until April 28, 2021:

Damiko Faulkner nominated by Councilmember Ajmera and Phipps
Elizabeth Frere nominated by Councilmember Kinsey
Rachel N. Geathers nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Ivory, Mayfield and Mitchell
Thomas Rothrock nominated by Councilmembers Fallon and Lyles

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 15 NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD

The following nominations were made for a full three year term beginning December 18, 2017 and ending December 17, 2020:

Diane English nominated by Councilmember Fallon
Sheila Jones nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Ivory, Kinsey, Lyles, and Mayfield
Allyson Siegel nominated by Councilmember Ajmera
Carlenia Ivory Nominated by Councilmembers Mitchell and Phipps

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE TREE ADVISORY

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term beginning December 14, 2017 and ending December 13, 2020:

Jesse Boyd nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera and Mitchell
Jeffrey Wells nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Fallon, Ivory, Kinsey, Lyles, Mayfield, and Phipps

Motion was made by Councilmember Lyles, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to reappoint Jeffrey Wells by acclamation.

Mr. Wells was reappointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: NOMINATIONS TO THE CIVIL SERVICE BOARD

The following nominations were made for a partial term beginning immediately and ending May 15, 2020 and one appointment for a partial term beginning immediately and ending May 15, 2018:

Harvey Katowilz nominated by Councilmembers Fallon and Smith
Karen Labovitz nominated by Councilmember Kinsey
Ryan McGill nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Fallon, Ivory, Mayfield, Mitchell, Phipps, and Smith
Carolyn Millen nominated by Councilmember Ajmera and Kinsey

Marlos Uzzell nominated by Councilmember Phipps
Victoria Watlington, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs, Ivory, Mayfield, and Mitchell

Motion was made by Councilmember Fallon, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to appoint Ryan McGill by acclamation.

Mr. McGill was appointed.

The remaining appointment will be brought back for consideration at the next business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 18: NOMINATIONS TO THE HOUSING APPEALS BOARD

The following nominations were made for one appointment in the Housing Industry Representative category for a full three year term beginning January 1, 2018 and ending December 31, 2020:

Timothy O'Neil, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Fallon, Ivory, Kinsey, Lyles, Mayfield, Mitchell, and Phipps

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to reappointment Timothy O'Neil by acclamation.

Mr. O'Neil was appointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: NOMINATIONS TO THE MINT MUSEUM BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term beginning immediately and ending July 31, 2019:

Bernaddette Flavors nominated by Councilmember Lyles
Roxanne Trenkelbach nominated by Councilmembers Fallon, Ivory, Kinsey, and Mayfield
Nalan Karakaya Mulder nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, and Mitchell
Linda Webb nominated by Councilmember Phipps

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 20: MAYOR AND COUNCIL TOPICS

Councilmember Ivory said since I don't have any tickets to the game I have about ten announcements. I want to say thank you to all our Veterans for their service, and two, on November 15, 2017 the YMCA will be having their Better Together Program, and I know that prior to coming on Council I ask you guys to support giving them \$50,000 for summer youth opportunity and you did that, and they want to say thank you. If you could stop by the Knight Theatre on the 15th between 7:00 and 8:00 and let them say thank you and they have a very special announcement. Last, I want to thank the public for their support for the CMS Schools Bonds. Several districts benefited but District 2 really benefited, and I want to personally say thank you to Commissioner Leake, who was able to add West Charlotte and Bruns; they are over 50 years old and they need to be replaced badly and I want to say a special thanks to her and all of the citizens who overwhelmingly supported the schools bonds. I will save the others until next time.

Councilmember Driggs said I had the pleasure on Saturday of attending the 100th birthday party for Maggie Bell Moore and reading a proclamation from you Mayor; I got to the party and there was a large room full of people, and I was informed that every one of them was part of her greater family; six generations. I just wanted to say Ms. Moore Happy Birthday to you; it was fun attending your party.

Councilmember Kinsey said I have another Happy Birthday, Sugar Creek Wastewater Treatment Plants 90th birthday and Irwin is the same. I went to the party on Thursday morning and it was cold and damp, but those ladies are still going strong at 90 and still taking care of us.

Mayor Roberts said I will just echo some of the comments; thank you veterans, great Veteran's weekend with a lot of celebrations. I went to the Carolinas Freedom Breakfast, and that was amazing. So many people have sacrificed for this great country and we really appreciate that so thank you to all who participated in Veteran's Day activities. Looking forward to the NLC; we want to put our best foot forward and show all those city officials from around the country all the great things that are going on in Charlotte and the best practices that we are a role model for other cities in putting forward. We look forward to sharing what we are doing here and making everybody else jealous.

Councilmember Lyles said I want to thank all the veterans that have served us in the past and those that are continuing to serve us today.

Councilmember Smith said I salute our veterans and congratulate the Mayor-elect.

Councilmember Mayfield said I want to welcome everyone who will be coming into town for the National League of Cities, but I want to send out a special welcome to our President of the National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials, Hanifa Shabazz, who arrived earlier today to get started since meeting for the Board will be starting tomorrow evening. She is the President Pro-Tem in Wilmington, Delaware, so welcome Ma'am President and I look forward to the community celebrating with us with National League of Cities in town.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.



Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk, MMC, NCCMC

Length of meeting: 3 Hours, 9 Minutes
Minutes Completed: November 20, 2017