

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Strategy Session on Monday, June 4, 2018 at 3:37 p.m. Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Edmund Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, LaWana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Matt Newton, and Greg Phipps.

**ABSENT UNTIL NOTED:** Councilmembers Justin Harlow and Braxton Winston II

\* \* \* \* \*

## **ITEM NO 1: BUDGET DISCUSSION/PRELIMINARY VOTES**

**Mayor Lyles** said we are going to use the same process that we used at our last meeting. This requires six votes to move an idea forward to be included in the operating or capital budget. We went through the operating budget the last time; we had a motion that was approved and adopted by the Council for the Manager to begin to prepare the operating budget as it was from our last meeting. So, today we are going to start with our discussions on the issues that we did not get a chance to cover so that we are certain to make sure that we have covered that. Then, we will come back with that same vote for the capital budget to say, here is our authorization. The Manager also has some minor corrections that he is going to review with us, things that as he got everything, we put these things out one at a time and he will come back and tell us where A did not match B and needs to be adjusted and things like that.

### **CAPITAL BUDGET – ONE-TIME ADJUSTMENTS**

**Marcus Jones, City Manager** said what we will do is we will pick up where we left off last time, and that is we had not begun the discussion on the CIP. I believe that there is a very small packet that deals with the next few slides that I'll present to you this afternoon, so if we go back to the CIP and the one times, there were \$11,250,00 worth of items that received the number of votes that were needed to move them along. So, what I would like to do is just divide these into two categories for you. One is capital, which is related to our bonds. In other words, there were two requests, adjustment 16 and adjustment 20, that related to what I would call the CIP. Then, there were three other adjustments that I am calling one time in nature, and typically what we do with some of those one time in nature items is we go into the pay-go category and hopefully I do not have to say pay-go again, but it is really cash that we have that is not in the operating budget, that is used for one times. For the most part, we do things that are related to our buildings and our infrastructure, and we will talk about that in a bit. If we start out with the capital piece, there were two items, and as we go to the next slide, what was asked of me is that when we came back with the capital adjustments that there would be some items that could be used as offsets, and in no way are these the recommendations from me. It is just a pool of items and the reason why I put this pool of items up. As we relate to the first \$10 million of the \$11.3 million related to the CIP, I thought it would be a good starting point for the Council to know everything that was new in the CIP. So, when you see \$35 million for affordable housing, that means that prior to my proposed budget, what was sitting in that slot was \$15 million, so it is \$35 million additional. Sidewalk and pedestrian safety, what was sitting in that slot was \$15 million. We doubled it. So, this is the additional \$15 million. The SouthPark CNIP, \$5 million was sitting there, and we added another \$5 million. The South Charlotte neighborhood investment program did not exist before the introduced budget; that is \$5 million there. The bicycle safety, which I hope before you adopt the budget we change that title, but the bicycle travel, which is the Bike Plan, that is \$4 million of new money. Transportation Safety Vision Zero is \$2 million, and the Bryant Farm Road extension, there was \$2 million in planning money in the 2018 bond, but the other \$18 million is in the 2020 bond. So, just as a reference, knowing that it would be asked of me where would be some places to go and I started off with the new items. I had started off with the new items, because if you go back to last year, because of the five-year CIP, these items for the most part were already in the budget, just like there are many items that are in the 2020 planned CIP. Having said that, those are the two items that before us; there is more information related to those items, but those are the two items, and those

are some areas that adjustments could be made if ultimately if the goal is, which I hope it is the goal, is to leave the bottom line CIP intact, then you could make movements across these, and it would not impact anything that was introduced related to the CIP.

**Councilmember Egleston** said any adjustments there on the bottom would be predicated on the approval of the things at the top, right?

Mayor Lyles said unless you have another idea, but these are capital budget items that would require funding on a bond referendum, unless we had \$5 million in cash or \$10 million in cash, so I would assume that is why the new bond projects, you would cut from the bond to be able to approve that for the bond.

Mr. Egleston said would the proper specs be to take straw votes on adjustment 16 and adjustment 20, then propose funding mechanisms or would a motion to approve one of those two things have to come with adjustment recommendations as part of the motion?

Ms. Lyles said it does make sense, but what I think I learned from our last session is it is a lot easier if there is a complete balance of it so that it balances out, if you add something to take an equal amount as a recommendation away from something would help us. There was some confusion about bundling all of the changes, and I think it is just a lot clearer if you would say I would like to add this and delete that or take away from that to accomplish it this time. That way we do not get the Clerk confused or the Mayor more confused, and there is a certainty about what we are voting on.

#### **ADJUSTMENT 20- SOUTH CHARLOTTE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT**

**Councilmember Driggs** said on Adjustment 20, my thought there was we had an amount, \$120 or \$130 million that was committed for CNIP. Was that right?

Mr. Jones said yes.

Mr. Driggs said for a couple of years, nothing was in there for District 7, which pays 25% of the residential property tax in Charlotte. We are in a situation right now where congestion and conditions in District 7 are getting worse. The new owners of Ballantyne are complaining that the City appears to be relying overly on them to fund capital projects in other parts of the City are the responsibility of local government, so I do not think this has to be an increase in our bond incurrence. I think that the question of how we are apportioning the CNIP should be revisited. I do not recall the Council ever agreed to a particular allocation of that money; therefore, I was never a party to any conversation talking about where it would be allocated in the City. We were able then to put some money into SouthPark that was not originally contemplated there. I do not think that we should be stuck with the choice of increasing our total debt by \$5 million in order to accommodate adjustment 20. I think that we should be able to accommodate adjustment 20 within our existing CNIP funding availability.

**Councilmember Harlow arrived at 3:47 p.m.**

Mayor Lyles said I cannot respond, because I think that CNIP happened before I was elected. I think that none of us around this table set that policy. I do not know what was included on the bond language or not for those kinds of things. Do we have that history here?

**Councilmember Phipps** said I thought that under the whole CNIP process we had a procedure that we would go through if any adjustments were made to the projects in the CNIP. I thought there was a regular process flow of what would have to happen, because I thought the community was made aware of certain projects and any changes to them would have to be, more or less, we would have to say grace over them or whatever.

Mr. Jones said I will try to do the Reader's Digest version of CNIP, and me not being here at the beginning also, if I am wrong please someone help me out. In the four bond

packages, there were allocations for CNIP. I believe \$30 million, \$30 million, \$40 million, and \$20 million, so we are not going to use South Park's CNIP yet, okay? So, what we did in this budget is actually smooth those four allocations out a bit and did \$30 million, \$30 million, \$30 million, so we left the one \$20 million in place for the original CNIPS. At some point, there was an addition of \$10 million for the South Park CNIP, \$5 million in the 2016 bond and \$5 million in the 2018 bond. We added a program, the South Charlotte Neighborhood Investment Program, to specifically not try to make this a CNIP but to provide \$5 million to District 7, because there had not been anything over the years. If it is more advantageous for this to be part of the CNIP, I am all ears, but we put \$5 million in for the very reasons that Mr. Driggs said earlier.

Mr. Driggs said so, my point is that \$130 million was committed; it was part of the very large bond package and tax increase that occurred a number of years ago. I do not recall, not having been on Council at the time, that included any detail as to where it would be used. It was a general neighborhood improvement concept, and there were all kinds of projects that were considered for it. The thing that troubles me about this again is that at this point, District 7 is being told, hey you have \$5 million dollars, you should be happy. That is a 26<sup>th</sup> of the total CNIP, and even though District 7, granted doesn't have the needs that other parts of the community does, and I would never suggest that it should be on equal terms with the places where the needs are, I think that people in District 7 are getting tired of this treatment. It is where a lot of the tax money comes from. There is a huge amount of development coming on the tax bases growing there. We have a major developer now at Northlake, which is responsible for a lot of what you have seen happen down there, and they are sitting there wondering, how come we are getting this treatment, and they are coming to me and saying what are you doing about it? I do not know what to tell them, because I do not know how these decisions were made in the first place. I am suggesting that it ought to be possible within the scope of CNIP, to find another \$5 million and bring up to a total of 1/13th of the total program, the amount that is actually allocated to District 7, given that the needs there, especially in the last couple of years, are getting more and more acute: sidewalks, congestion, bike paths, all the same things that we are talking about doing in other parts of the City.

Mr. Jones said I am going to set the SouthPark CNIP aside for a second, so five CNIPS that almost from day one divided up this \$120 million, so there are five separate plans that people have been working on since the initial bond that allocates these dollars for a specific project.

Mr. Driggs said and those plans were adopted by Council, specifically discussed by Council?

Mr. Jones said I do not know what happened in 2014, but that is when it all started.

Mr. Driggs said when I talk to people; no one seems to know where they came from.

Mayor Lyles said I think that we need a little bit of clarification. I think that we are being asked if this was a lump sum that has flexibility or were there commitments made based on some plans by the Council or the bonds, just something.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said as Mr. Jones, previous Councils did vote on these CNIPS, but I think that we have an opportunity, because the City has grown very differently. I am going to; as much as I love him, challenge my colleague a little on this idea, which he has been consistent. The whole time that he has been in office, he has been consistent regarding what investments have gone into his area, but if you look at the entire City, the entire City is seeing growth. There is just as much investment that is happening in the Steele Creek area and in South End and other areas of the community that you are seeing coming from south Charlotte, but our CNIP's, from my understanding for the seven years that I have been here, what we voted on, so from 2011, every CNIP that has come up and every other year that we have had a bond package has looked at where we needed investment and needed growth and needed assistance, so for District 3, the Steele Creek area around our road widenings, extensions, because of the massive growth, there is still 900 plus acres of undeveloped

land, but we are seeing congestion like everywhere else. So, I think at the end of the day, I am the pack rat out of most of us withholding these. I can go back to my office right now and pull back our bond package that we approved going back to 2012 to show what has been in every CNIP. So, as a Council, we have approved these. We have moved forward. We have had challenges. We have argued and debated where more money should go, but we still collectively have proved what is going on. I can see requesting additional funds, but I think it is a challenge when an impression is given as if Council wasn't aware that the CNIP's were being identified, what areas were being identified and what was being approved. We did that, and if you have been here, Councilmember Mitchel would be the only one. He took one hiatus, and that was only for a year and a half, so he goes back to the 90's of how we have done this. Council has approved these CNIP's, so I do not want, especially for our new colleagues, you to have the impression that this just pops up out of the air. This is a new process to me, so with Councilmember Bokhari making the recommendation of a match, that is something that we haven't heard before, and the fact that it has made it in, that is great, because you are saying we have people that want to invest, but I want us to not get side tracked and say south Charlotte says they are covering the bulk. South Charlotte pays a good bit in taxes, but we have million dollar homes throughout the City. There are million dollar homes plus over in the Northlake area in District 2, just like there are in District 3. There are million dollar plus homes throughout the City, and within these last five years, there has been a lot more growth that has happened. We do not have any control over the fact that the County hasn't done their reevaluation yet, but I do not want us getting side tracked, and I do not want the Manager thinking that you need to come in and fix something that is 25 plus years old. If we are going to be transparent, I understand wanting more. You have gotten more, but what I am hearing you say is you do not like where the money is coming from, so if you have a specific recommendation where you are saying you want an additional \$5 million or you want more than \$5 million, well heck I want more than \$5 million also for District 3, but at the end of the day, we have a limited amount of money that we are trying to maneuver with, so unless we are having a tax increase and having a real conversation of three cents instead of one cent, then all of the rest of it is just really good for show.

Mayor Lyles said I think that Ms. Campbell was basically nodding as Ms. Mayfield spoke about being able to go upstairs and get the Council approvals, so I think that an answer would be while you may not have been told why it was done and I can provide that information to you if Ms. Campbell can do that as well, send out the approvals or whatever that we were not hear for.

Mr. Driggs said the main point in my argument and if that is true, thank you, is that we go from zero to 1/26<sup>th</sup> of the CNIP money being allocated to a district that does in fact pay 25 percent of the residential property tax of the City. I recognize again that you expect some wealth redistribution to occur; it is normal, and for a while it was kind of okay, because there were not burning issues. You see now that almost every rezoning we almost have a riot on our hands. I am standing at intersections that are backed up for miles, then people say, what is being done about this? The answer I have so far is nothing. I do not want to seem ungrateful that \$5 million has finally made its way into the capital plan for south Charlotte, but frankly, I do not think that it is too much to ask that it be \$10 million. We have in fact the South Charlotte Partners, which is a new association trying to do some work around the same lines as the ULI did. We have a list of needs, sidewalks and all kinds of things that are in some sort of low priority every time I ask I say well, here is a gap in a sidewalk. It is 400 feet long. Can we do something about that? Yeah, you are in line three to four years, and that is the response that I have to take back every time any of my constituents ask me about what is happening down there, and forgive me, but is this really so hard to understand that people in that district wonder why it is that they cannot get a sidewalk? They are big tax payers, and this extends beyond the City. They also get half the spend, because they do not need more, per pupil in schools, and the balance is that they pay these taxes. The City is now spreading across the county line south, and it is just as easy to live nearby and not pay any of these taxes, and I just think that we ought to be more mindful of that.



**Councilmember Egleston** said I think that is a very fair request on behalf of District 7, but I think in this meeting, we have to have a proposal to vote on. My question would be where would you propose that the money come from, because as part of this process, I do not know that rehashing the decisions made in past CNIPS is the proper place for it. If there is a proposal, I think that we vote on it and say I do not disagree that south Charlotte needs more support in those ways, but where does the money come from? Is it a tax increase, do we pull it from somewhere else, or do we rehash all the CNIPS?

Mr. Driggs said it is hard to respond without knowing in greater detail what is in some of those other numbers. I recognize that affordable housing is something of the sacred cow, so I wouldn't even look at that. Sidewalks and pedestrian safety, 10 instead of 15, does that really throw all kinds of plans out of whack that have already been made? It is new money.

Mayor Lyles said I think that we got a list of the sidewalk locations in our Q and A already, so I think that the lowest locations came to us early for sidewalks. I am not sure about the bicycle plan also has it, but I do not know about transportation safety or Bryant Farms Road extension, if we have gotten more details on that. I agree that every part of the City needs to have investment. At some point, District 7 will be 50 or 100 years old, and we do not want to get into a situation that we let a large part of the City get to where it is rehab, so I completely agree that it is a fair thing to say, let's not take something, when we can maintain it, before we have to rebuild it. That is really fair and appropriate. I guess what I am saying is that a number of the CNIP, I was not here, but what I was told about the CNIP program is it was about more than just maintaining before it gets to a place where it had to be completely replaced. It was a lack of improvements in a number of ways. Now, in the life of a city, it can really seem like 10 years is a long time, because that is perhaps how long most of us are willing to sit around this dais, but I think in the life of a city when we are talking about sidewalks and maintenance, we can see some of the needs needed across the City, and the CNIP program was a way to address those major areas of disinvestment that occurred. We have not had that kind of conversation that you are proposing. Where do we start so that we do not get that far behind? That is a different kind of question, so I guess further discussion around that is warranted and should be measured in a way- I would hope that by this time we are seeing some changes in maintaining so that we do not have to repair.

**Councilmember Winston arrived at 4:02 p.m.**

**Councilmember Eiselt** said I just have a question about the CNIP process. It was approved a long time ago. Is there an opportunity to look at the whole CNIP process separate from the budget and rebalance? I do think that without reference to any one area I think we should be looking at where our growth is, and we should be doing that with transportation and with housing and everything else. I think this gets back to the need for a comprehensive plan in our Planning Department. Are we really matching our dollars with where opportunities are and where the high growth is? I do not know. To me saying some of the old Council, no offense James, a previous Council has approved that, we do not even know, sitting around here, what that is. We have to be refreshed to what that is, and does it really match our growth patterns right now? Are we really investing the way that we should be? My question should be, if the answer is we have room for adjustment because it is not really matching that growth pattern, then can you do that outside of the budget process and say you know what, we need a little bit more in District 7. You know, ULI said, and this is what has led to a lot of what is happening in South Park, one of their criticisms were that we are not investing in our revenue producing assets, and that was SouthPark.

Mayor Lyles said I guess that the real question is when we went out and did this bond we did a number of projects, and we had people see those, and they voted for them. They have not been done yet.

Ms. Eiselt said we do them in isolation.

Mayor Lyles said right, I am not disagreeing with that. I am just saying that is what we told the public, so I do not want to be in that position as a city to say we are going to reassess because of growth, what we committed to do in some of these areas where the disinvestment was great because of the lack of maintenance and repair. It is a balance; there is no right answer here. It is a good discussion. It is one that merits our attention and time, but I just do not know that we can dive into, as you said Ms. Eiselt, if we want to talk about what are we trying to accomplish with CNIP, that is a different discussion than we can have right now. We do not have a CNIP for growth. We have a CNIP for lack of investment, catching up. I think that is the premise. There has been documentation and studies to back it up. It is just very difficult to see it all happen. There is no problem acknowledging that we have issues of growth, and we have issues of maintaining our center city neighborhoods, the suburban areas. You know, Charlotte- I am no planner, but I tell you I think that we all know that our capital infrastructure investment lags until it gets to a place that it is beyond lag. So, Mr. Manager, if you have a way to get out of this, maybe we can figure this out, but it is a difficult discussion.

Mr. Jones said again, your budget that you have, the reason why it was proposed this way for many of the questions that are happening right now, there were zero dollars in District 7, so part of the budget was this \$5 million, because I heard around this table that something has to be done, then \$20 million for a road, which I have asked staff do we typically do that out of the bond, the general fund. So, I am not sure if that is typical. The SouthPark CNIP, we doubled it, because the same concept, then probably the most important thing is that- I have been in conversations with Mr. Driggs, and I understand exactly what you are saying when we cannot do a sidewalk. So, one of the reasons why we doubled the sidewalk money is because we want to be able to do that. I think that you drive around the City, and you will see a school, and you will see sidewalks and you go 100 yards and you see nothing. We want to be more intentional about how you use these dollars, including \$300,000, which is not on this page, but it is later on, with this concept of place making, because sometimes we love our Engineers and our Planners, but sometimes you just need creative people who sit around the table and say, why can't we get a speed bump in a neighborhood? That was trying to listing to some of the concerns that came from the Council.

**ADJUSTMENT 16 - MAKE SOUTH PARK CNIP ANOTHER \$5 MILLION  
(CONTINGENT UPON FUNDING MATCH)**

Mr. Bokhari said I think that we can all sit around this table and look at our own Districts or at large and the areas around town and all make a very incredibly valid claim for how additional money and additional capital could be not just put to use well but could catch us up in so many areas that we are struggling. I am not going to try to make that argument. In fact, six months ago when we sat down in District 6 in SouthPark with the community, we decided to jump past all of that. We were not going to sit around and say we are not getting our fair share. We are upset. We contribute a quarter of the property tax basis. We wanted to look forward, and to the Manager's point, we wanted to think creatively, not just for our own District, but how can we think outside of the box to do things that could be recreated in new ways in other areas in other Districts, in Eastland Mall, the affordable housing conversation we just had earlier. So, as we sat down and had six months of incredible work with staff, Fran West, everyone from that group coming up with creative new constructs of play books versus lists of things and ways to activate that, we activated the community in ways where they said okay, what are all the ways that we can build on a foundation that workforce development and some of the other things could sit atop, exactly what we are talking about with relatively small investments. We came up with some pretty incredible things. So, I guess what I would say is that while we have come up with a playbook model that can be utilized in affordable housing like we just talked about in hand or Eastland or other places like that, we have innovated and have a use case there. We have a test case, in my opinion, with this proposed capital adjustment Item 16. While that isn't a great deal of money, I know that we have to reprioritize the budget. This is a model that we could redefine how private matching dollars work in this City. I have over 90% certainty in my mind right now, with the conversations in the private sector that I have been having since we last met on this and since you guys gave me the benefit of running out and seeing with the

straw vote if this was possible, that they will come in; they will match it, and they will match it this year, not five years from now or three years from now, this year with opportunities. I am over 90% certain that I can bring that to the table, and that is not only good for SouthPark and my District. That is the model of the play book and the private sector match that we go show with results and start utilizing with other conversations. So, I would make a motion that my colleagues consider adding adjustment 16 to the bottom of that list included in the proposed budget and the Mayor has asked me and all of us when we come to this table to have proposed cuts or reprioritizations in mind. At a first level, I will request that we give the Manager the ability to go back, not just into just this list but into the other list of existing things and see what is three years plus out that isn't shovel ready today, that the \$5 million could come from one of those things. As we start to think shorter term, small projects than shovel ready, and if that is not possible, I know it is from a different bucket, but it is capital none the less and if I have to recommend something, I know it will not be overly popular with some folks, forgive me Madam Chair, but the \$5 million pilot process that we came up for C level Storm Water projects. We know it is important. We know that is an incredible thing. I would rather go with the first scenario I am laying out to you Manager, but if we have to pick something else that is in this budget somewhere in a different form, we net those out, because we have already said those C's are not critical, not priorities for us, so I would say \$5 million to revolutionize how we do matching of funds with the private sector is critical, and it is now. So, I have hopefully fulfilled your ask of us while also hedging it by saying Manager, I think that you could go find if we could somehow garner the support of another five colleagues here, to go find it in the other list that we are not looking at, not net new but existing that are three years plus out that are not going to be shovel ready in that time. My motion is to approve Adjustment #16 and bring it into the proposed budget.

Mayor Lyles said the question that I have is, on the three years out, would that be from other funded bond projects? All of our bond projects have commitments behind them to the community. It would have to exclude the bond projects if you are looking at this. Does that make sense? The Manager would not be able to take what Council has directed or the community has voted on. Does that make sense?

Mr. Bokhari said it does make sense, but I frame that first one in that manner so the Manager had ultimate flexibility in getting created, so yes.

Mayor Lyles said well, he has gotten his budget on the table, so I do not know. I am trying to figure out. He has recommended his budget, so what would you be asking him to do, fund balances left over from construction? Are you taking out contingencies?

Mr. Bokhari said literally all of the above in that first ask, because they have more staff resources and expertise to figure that out, but yes, all the things that you said. You have made a motion, right?

Mayor Lyles said I am trying to figure out what are- So, if we cannot use bond projects, because those are things that we have committed to on bonds, I am not sure what that is. I am struggling with what that is. Mr. Manager, after bond projects, three years out, if it is three-years out, why wouldn't we wait three years or two years and wait for the next bond cycle for CNIP?

Mr. Bokhari said not my, not these, the match that I am talking about is either going to be matched in the immediate term of it is not, and it isn't a utilization of funds. I am talking about we have other projects that-

Mayor Lyles said but you said three-years out.

Mr. Bokhari said I use that as a stake in the ground for other projects that are not shovel ready to reprioritize these ahead of those. Mr. Manager, do you have any ideas on how to unstick me out of this situation?

Mr. Jones said so, if I understand what you are saying, the only list that is left would be the proposed 2020 bond and projects that are in the proposed 2020 bond. I would go back to this list and reduce something off of something that is new, because the new things are not things that have already been out there for the general public, so my universe would be that.

Mr. Bokhari said I would ask then in the motion to do everything that I said in the beginning then I would just tie a string and say \$5 million if it is not matched within a year, it goes back into if this is possible sidewalk and pedestrian safety, because I feel like there are other places, but I am not at a point to be able to lay those out right now, and I have to say something.

Mayor Lyles said okay, the first motion is to approve amendment 16 and delete \$5 million from sidewalks and pedestrian safety.

Mr. Bokhari said but if it is not matched, it would have the ability to go back to whatever it was, right?

Mayor Lyles said right, okay.

**Councilmember Winston** said I think the Manager answered my question, but I was going to ask are there any projects that are five-years out or further out that perhaps could be reorganized.

Mr. Jones said Councilmember Driggs brought this up in I think the first work session. I am not talking about the certificates of participation, the COPS, or your PAYGO. I am just sticking with the three buckets of bonds, and we do not have anything after 2020. That was one of the reasons of why we wanted to get five-years out, 10-years out, have more stability, but there is nothing in that column dealing with transportation and neighborhoods and housing once you get past the 2020 bond.

Mr. Winston said by pulling the COPS projects out, just for my edification, are you saying that would not be relevant for this conversation?

Mr. Jones said I am not saying that; I guess what I am saying is that we try to focus on the three buckets of bonds that we have, because the CNIP and the South Charlotte Neighborhood Reinvestment program would fall within that category, so we tried to stay similar to similar. If we went into 2020 and let's say for instance if we reduce the CNIP pot, which is \$30 million to \$25 million that would have a ripple effect, because there are communities that have plans to spend all of that CNIP money. If indeed there was going to be something that had the greatest amount of flexibility, it would be the sidewalk and pedestrian safety. I would tell you that sidewalk and pedestrian safety, after our last week, is probably something that would be very difficult to mess with, but with that said, I am understanding- That is why I talked to Bob; what would happen if the money did not come in? I think that what you are saying is that it would go back to sidewalk and pedestrian safety.

Mr. Bokhari said yes, I would clarify one piece, because, as always, my colleague Mr. Egleston helps me actually reign in and say things that make a little more sense. Here is my revised motion: add Adjustment 16 SouthPark CNIP with a match required into the list. Take the \$5 million from sidewalks and pedestrian safety, of which if it does not get matched within the year, it goes back into that bucket, but the vast majority of what that spend will be is sidewalk and pedestrian safety, and I will in effect, be doubling that \$5 million to \$10 million, and it will just be centralized into a certain part of town should that match happen, and if not, it goes back into the bucket.

Mayor Lyles said it would be great to know how much of sidewalks and pedestrian safety was allocated to SouthPark and the area and to do the equal amount so that you are doubling whatever is being allocated out of that \$15 million. I do not know that we have that information, but I understand that principle.



Mr. Winston said with the whole kind of mantra about spending on shovel ready projects, the \$15 million for sidewalks and pedestrian safety, do we think that within this next fiscal year, we will be spending \$15 million on those projects, or is this going to be kind of banked so that we have a fund that is working? Does that make sense?

Mr. Jones said unless Liz tells me something different, we will not spend \$15 million. We will not spend \$30 million next year.

Mr. Winston said do we have a legitimate expectation to how much of that \$15 million will in fact be spend on sidewalks and pedestrian safety over the next fiscal year?

Mr. Jones said Liz; do you have a plan, that would be awesome if you could spend \$30 million in the year, so I guess what I am saying is we are in the process of trying to change the way that we deliver projects, because if you will recall last fall, we asked for an extension, because we were not spending the money in the seven-year timeframe. While I have a great deal of confidence without team, I cannot tell you unequivocally that we are going to spend \$30 million in the next 365 days, and if we will, I will give Liz- You think we will?

**Liz Babson, Transportation Director** said [inaudible].

Mayor Lyles said the motion is to adjust to add \$5 million for a SouthPark CNIP by reducing sidewalks and pedestrian safety by \$5 million, with the idea there would be a match required to get the \$5 million expended first.

Mr. Bokhari said and those \$5 million would need to be spent on sidewalks and pedestrian safety.

Mayor Lyles said your motion did not say that. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. Bokhari said yes.

Mayor Lyles said do you have a calculation of what the sidewalks and pedestrian safety-

Mr. Bokhari said yes.

Mayor Lyles said what is it?

Mr. Bokhari said it is very, very significant. We have an entire list of over 50 projects, which a large majority covered those two areas and the dollar amounts.

Mayor Lyles said from our list, do you remember what?

Mr. Bokhari said within that budget, I do not know that. I am sorry.

**Councilmember Ajmera** said so, just so I understand the motion, so the \$15 million out of that, which is for sidewalks and pedestrian safety, one-third of that is Mr. Bokhari's and Mr. Egleston's motion is to allocate one-third of that to SouthPark CNIP? I would like to understand from our transportation staff, Liz maybe, how much of the sidewalks and pedestrian safety, which is \$15 million, how much of that percentage roughly would be for SouthPark out of the other six districts?

Ms. Babson said I do not have that list in front of me, but we can certainly follow up and get that information for you, because we have developed that list as part of this budget process.

Ms. Ajmera said I guess roughly, we have \$15 million. We have seven districts. I would think it would probably be equitable distribution. Roughly, what is the distribution over all for each District out of \$15 million? You wouldn't be able to give that answer?

Ms. Babson said no, I do not have that information with me, but we can certainly get that for you.

Mr. Jones said it is really \$30 million, so it is \$15 million that is already existing, and we are putting \$15 million on top of it. That is why I am challenging Liz to spend this money.

Mr. Bokhari said and I am matching it.

Mr. Jones said so yeah, think about it if you are thinking about it city wide it would be \$30 million related to sidewalk and pedestrian safety.

Ms. Ajmera said but the motion is for only the additional \$15 million, not the \$15 million that has already been committed. That is why I am only looking for, out of this \$15 million that is not committed, how much is the allocation by District?

Mayor Lyles said we can do two things I think here. I think that some people are looking at well, how much would the \$15 million be less than if we took out District 6 and allocated it for the match, which I would think would be something that would be innovative and different. The question is, we do not have that data, and the question that I may have Mr. Manager is how long would it take to get that data? I know that we do this by Council Districts all of the time, so how long would it take to get that information? If it is a one-to-one swap, would you be willing to do a one-to-one swap? I think that is the real question here.

Mr. Bokhari said whatever would get me the ability to leverage the private sector match, while the list would be helpful, I think that what we have heard the manager say is that they have not figured out how to spend all of that money yet, so there is not a list that accounts for \$30 million.

Mayor Lyles said I thought that there was a list for sidewalks.

Mr. Jones said I think that I am just looking at this a different way. So, I guess that I am wrong, but I am taking it \$30 million. I am taking \$30 million and dividing it by 7, and that is \$4.2 million, but I am not sure that is how this is allocated. I do not think this is the right exercise.

Mayor Lyles said it is. I just think that the benefit would only be if it is that you took it out of one and put it into the other to get the match just because of the problematic aspect of it, but we do not know that number Mr. Manager; we do not know what it includes. I do not know if that is possible.

Mr. Bokhari said if that is helpful, I would certainly be willing to take that and add it into the amendment for more of a one tier perspective. Again, it would be hard without seeing the data, but my assumption based on what he said, a lot of the projects are not thought through, sorry, but for the deployment of the funds, if he is going to challenge her to be able to spend it in that period of time.

Mayor Lyles said I am not sure if I understood that.

Ms. Ajmera said to leverage the private match, which is a great idea, how would we tie that into South Park's incentive, which is already there? Five million dollars, that will get an additional match of \$5 million, while we are still researching what has been allocated for sidewalk safety for south Charlotte.

Mr. Bokhari said my request is for the top level adjustment of 16 for that.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, well I am making the recommendation where we added to the SouthPark CNIP the matching amount.

Mayor Lyles said I think that the district person probably has had more conversations with the private sector about what they will do.

Mr. Driggs said we didn't get to the point of a motion on adjustment 20.

Mayor Lyles said we are just trying to get this one finished up, then we will go right to it.

Driggs said I would point out that it sounds like the way that it is described; we do not need to make any changes. All we are talking about is taking the portion of the sidewalk money that is already intended for SouthPark and putting that up as the object of matching funds. I do not even know why that requires any re-designation. It is money that is already there; it is not new money. It is already there, so if you can get a match for that, great. I will point out again from the District 7 standpoint, the City has got \$50 million in debt capacity that it is able to put towards a goal that we have adopted for affordable housing. It is not programed. We do not even know how we are going to spend it yet, but \$50 million of debt capacity appears to be there; now you are telling us we have a hard stop on debt, that we cannot find \$5 million more in order to come up with a more equitable number for District 7, and those things are not unrelated. People in District 7 look at that and say okay, the City seems to have a lot of money for affordable housing, and it is great that we are doing that, but meanwhile look, we are being told that you should be glad to get \$5 million for infrastructure improvements in your area. This is very basic City stuff. This is what the City does. It provides infrastructure, and it is not doing so, and if you look at the 20 years of history in City investment in District 7, going way back, the number averages out to about \$12 million a year. Check it. This is not even a current phenomenon, because I have done this research in past years.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Driggs, the motion that we are discussing now is on adjustment 16.

Mr. Driggs said well, I am saying that it is not related; if we come back with something that looks like we are stepping up the District 6 CNIP money from \$10 million, which is already in our budget this year, to some hire amount on a contingent basis and we are still stuck at \$5 million for District 7, District 7 is going to say, Gee what do we have to do in order to get similar treatment?

Mayor Lyles said I think that the real question is the motion before us, to take dollar for dollar from sidewalks and safety that are already allocated. So, it is upping, but I expect that south Charlotte or District 7 is getting something out of that as well as bicycle and the road and transportation. Those are all citywide issues. I would hope even affordable housing would be a citywide issue.

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari and seconded by Councilmember Egleston to approve SouthPark CNIP additional \$5 million with a match required, to be added into the 2019 proposed budget by taking and earmarking \$5 million of the Sidewalk and Pedestrian Safety money and specifically aligning it to that, to make it a net neutral move there, then if the funds are not matched, that goes back to the broader Sidewalk and Pedestrian Safety fund. If it is matched, the public dollars of that will need to relate to sidewalk and pedestrian safety.

Mayor Lyles said the point is we do not know what that number is, but it would be a direct correlation of reduction of planned five year, or whatever the \$30 million covers, but that would come out and be allocated to SouthPark CNIP as an increase to that.

Mr. Driggs said that was not the motion Mayor.

Mayor Lyles said well, what was the motion? I thought that he said revenue neutral. Is it \$5 million or project neutral?

Mr. Bokhari said instead of \$15 million, Sidewalk and Pedestrian Safety would read \$10 million and SouthPark CNIP would have an additional \$5 million.

Mayor Lyles said alright, so you have a motion that Sidewalks and Pedestrian Safety become \$10 million, and CNIP be \$10 million.

Mr. Bokhari said right, but \$5 million of that will be a match.

Mayor Lyles said right, understanding that you would have a match.

Mr. Egleston said I seconded with the caveat that the money has to be used for sidewalk and pedestrians.

Mayor Lyles said in District 6.

Mr. Bokhari said if matched, double our money.

A vote was taken on the motion and carried as follows:

**YEAS:** Councilmembers Bokhari, Egleston, and Winston

**NAYS:** Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Eiselt, Harlow, Mayfield, Mitchell, Newton, and Phipps

### **ADJUSTMENT 20 - SOUTH CHARLOTTE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT**

**Councilmember Driggs** said I want us to vote on this just so the people in my district understand very plainly where they stand.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs and seconded by Councilmember Winston to increase the amount in District 7 from \$5 million to \$10 million and fund it with a further increase in the bonds.

Mayor Lyles said I am sorry. Say it again.

Mr. Driggs said on Adjustment 20, that we increase the amount to \$10 million and we not be restricted by the Manager's request and that it in fact be an increase in the total bond issuance, since I do not see any magic about the bond issuance level that we have agreed to now.

A vote was taken on the motion and carried as follows:

**YEAS:** Councilmembers Driggs, Eiselt, and Winston

**NAYS:** Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston, Harlow, Mayfield, Mitchell, Newton, and Phipps

### **OTHER ONE-TIME ADJUSTMENTS**

Mr. Jones said the last three items from the last work session deal with Adjustment 17, 18, and 19, and if I have this correct, Adjustment 17 would set aside a half a million dollars to enhance job creation and training as the discussion with the proposed budget was that there was money set aside for affordable housing, money set aside for neighborhoods, but not that third piece, which is good paying jobs and jobs in general.

Also, Adjustment 18, the FinTech and related workforce development similar to have that type of money set aside for that possibility, then Adjustment 19, Aging in Place. If I understand this correctly, it would take the half of a million that was set aside, increase it by another quarter of a million with the desire to match the increase of a quarter million by another quarter million to get a whole million for aging in place. So, much like with the capital budget, we start off with potential sources. One thing that you will see in the projects that are related to PAYGO is the undesignated balance in each year. In 2019, the undesignated balance was \$213,000, then the same concept is, what were the new projects that we had in that fund in the 2019 budget that did not exist in 2018? The projects were Aging in Place for a half a million; Place making \$300,000; and Tree



Charlotte increasing the contribution \$400,000. So, those are different buckets if you will that could be used, not the recommendation from me or the staff, but giving the Council some options if they indeed want to fund Adjustments 17, 18, and 19.

**ADJUSTMENT 19 - AGING IN PLACE – ADD \$250,000 (CONTINGENT UPON FUNDING MATCH)**

Ms. Mayfield said the question might be for Dr. Harlow. When we were talking about the Aging in Place match, because I do not remember us talking about a match, what was that match?

**Councilmember Harlow** said similar style concept kind of came up right after the SouthPark CNIP thing; we were in conversation with a few different groups. The Knight Foundation seems to be the one leading the way here, so with the same confidence that was indicated earlier, about 90%, those on going conversations have had been had and are still being had. I am not asking for \$5 million, I'm actually asking \$250,000. We know the need for this group that needs some form of help as these property rivals are happening. Somewhere in the \$2.5 million space, \$500,000 is going to run out like this, so trying to create an opportunity here to get closer, knowing that we will not get to the \$2.5 million in this pilot is what is on the table.

Ms. Mayfield said I am concerned at the direction that we are trying to go in here. So, the idea sounds great of saying in a certain area you will reach out to members of the community for them to do a match, but this overall conversation of bargaining for districts and bargaining for funding oppose to what is the role of government, because at the end of the day, the only dollars that we truly have control over are the dollars that we have identified through funding, property tax, investments, and hospitality and tourism, those dollars. So, if community comes to the table, that is great, but I am concerned about us tying any of our dollars to if the community brings to the table. If the community brings to the table, that could be an addition, and that could be great and gives more flexibility in it; there is definitely a need in Aging in Place when we look at our seniors and some things that we can do, there is definitely a need when we talk about what kind of workforce development that we are supporting, and we have a roll in that. I want us to really think about that impact of saying what our dollars are going to be directly attached to if private sector matches, then the money is released, opposed to us identifying what we can do with the money, then if private sector comes to the table, here is additional that we can do with the money. If we can identify the \$250,000 to add to the current funds, then I completely support that idea. I have a concern, because market is very different. The first conversation was a conversation around market. This is a conversation around social, to be perfectly honest. Social issues do not necessarily translate in to the same funding source as market, but if you are talking about Aging in Place, it would be more beneficial to just say, can we identify the \$250,000 to add to it, appose to there being a caveat of a match required for those dollars, because we might put ourselves in a very precarious position by doing that. Mr. Manager, tell me if there are any concerns that staff has around us tying those kinds of dollars, not the previous conversation. Market is market. You can have flexibility in market, but what we are talking about services and social services and the conversation that has been happening in this community as long as this community has been in existence and we are getting ready to celebrate our 250th birthday. I think that it is difficult to try to say that if we get this match, then we do this, oppose to we have identified the funding to do this.

Mr. Jones said that is a tough one.

Ms. Mayfield said before it is addressed by anyone else, I am specifically asking the Manager for clarification of realistically.

Mr. Jones said sure, I think that one thing you will see, not just in this budget but in the last year's budget, the whole concept of trying to get the private sector or the philanthropic community to bring resources to the table. There are different ways of

doing it. This is one way, and we have been consistent with trying to find ways to bring other dollars to the table.

Ms. Mayfield said that is very true; we have been consistent in trying to find, so we have been having this conversation with the market for a long time. We are having a different type of conversation around housing, but I am hoping you are hearing my concern, because it is a great idea, but it is not a new idea, so we have been trying this for many years. I want us to have some reservation for this conversation, specifically for Adjustment 19, to have that match required in there. If we have identified \$250,000, then let's identify \$250,000, and if the community comes along, great, but it should not be contingent on the community coming along, because we have been trying to pull the community to come along with this conversation for more than 50 years.

Mr. Winston said I heard a question from Ms. Mayfield about what our roll is, and I think that citizens have said loud and clear that they expect us to be nimble, innovative, and I see many of my colleagues trying to do that, especially if they have given us the charge, economic inequities, especially related to housing and displacement are specific issues where they want us to act, and they want us to act boldly. I think this program specifically is something that is different, and this idea of a one-time match, we just celebrated last week about this partnership with the private community with the allocation for the first \$5 million to match our bond. This is something that we can and should, should this pass, go right to them and say hey, we need another \$250,000, and this is where it is going to go, so I think that this is right in line where I do not know what has happened over the past 250 years, but in the years going forward, I think that our community definitely expects us to think and act in this kind of a fashion, and it speaks to the strength of these three peak relationships that we so often celebrate. This should be pretty basic lifting right here.

Mr. Egleston said two points I want to make, one would be that it is my understanding that the Aging in Place Program has no district specificity to it, so it is not a pet project for District 2. It is a project for the City of Charlotte, and the dollars would be just as likely to [inaudible] in District 3, 1, or any of the others, just as they would be in District 2, so this is not specific to his geography, but also to echo Mr. Winston's point, I think this is, I am going to support this one and I am going to supported Mr. Bokhari's, because I think the match thing is an innovative approach, and I think that our friends at WFAE right now are doing their pledge drive; they do these inspiration challenges that say Mr. Phipps has said if you donate \$5,000 in the next hour, he will match it. I think that motivates people to come to the table in a way that they would not if they knew the dollars were guaranteed already, so I do think that it is a way for us to leverage public dollars to get more results. That is why I voted for Mr. Bokhari's. That is why I will vote for Dr. Harlow's, because we have got to stretch our dollars further, and I think that this is a way to do it, but in this case, this benefits the entire City.

Mr. Harlow said I was going to make those similar points in kind of a direct response here. This is not tied to any location; this is a citywide program. Anyone benefits within a certain criteria, over the age of 65 or under 60% AMI. This is a win for folks who need it the most. We talk about gentrification. We talk about senior citizens who have concerns about being displaced. This is an opportunity. It might not be a new problem, but it has not been addressed, not in our City budget ever. So, this is something that I believe is something that we need to do now, not just because the community wants to do it. I also believe, and I hope five more folks see it as just the right thing to do. There is an opportunity here. We know with the revals happening right now, tax bills will swell next year. We need this pilot now to get some sense of data, but to Ms. Mayfield's point, I want to just throw something out there to say hey, where do we pull it from? So, let's look at it, and I know the Manager is interested in us just kind of pulling from some of the new things, but I would be curious to know how we can maybe pull from the whole PAYGO schedule and maybe some other things. I like all of the new stuff: Aging in Place, Place Making, Tree Charlotte. My curiosity would be, we have \$9 million in cultural facilities on the PAYGO FY19 schedule, \$250,000 re-shifted from that I think might be a good idea. We have \$655,000 in In Rem Remedy PAYGO scheduled. If people can stay in their homes, we do not need to have the In Rem money as often.

Mayor Lyles said In Rem is for owners to stay in their homes. I cannot be used- Anyway, I get your point.

Mr. Harlow said this is what we are using to demolish homes?

Mayor Lyles said no, it is being used to repair the homes; In Rem is to repair, but I get your point. Just for this point today, you have an undesignated balance of \$200,000, so perhaps if we want to make this simple and easy instead of asking, maybe you just want to make a motion that we adjusting Aging in Place and add \$200,000 to it. That might just be an easy motion to take.

Mr. Harlow said that is fine with me too.

Ms. Mayfield said at the end of the day, if you would listen to what I said with the Aging in Place is do not put the match required. We can identify the \$250,000; let's add that in. If we get a match, that is great. That is above and beyond, but having match required says that this money is not released unless we hit that match. Everything is in language. That is all I was saying. I agree with the idea of it. I was just saying we do not have to have a match required on it. It can have a match on there, and that match will benefit, so add the \$250,000 in.

Mayor Lyles said well, I am saying add \$200,000 of the undesignated balance and be able to move forward. I guess the question that I have, Dr. Harlow, you were saying 60% and below. I did not think that the criteria had been established.

Mr. Harlow said the criteria are not established, but we are- I hear what you guys are saying, and I like the concept of the dialog and the debate of saying, hey, let's make this easy. Let's take it off the undesignated balance and call it a day. For the sake of compromise I will do that. I will say this just on a principal though our private community is looking for us to make real commitments. They like the idea that we are going to have the conversation about it, but until we really make some leaps going forward and be innovative and be a little bit different, we are not here to flip all of the tables over but maybe rearrange them a little bit. I think that, and I know that some folks around this dais share this thought that this is why they have not fully stepped all the way up. It is the concept that private investment truly does follow public investment, when public investment is all in, not just one foot in. So, for me personally, I am actually as I am even saying this in my mind, I just want us to think about that going forward. I am not going to keep the match in place, because I am certain we are going to get the dollars anyway, so let's move forward.

Motion was made by Councilmember Harlow, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell to add \$200,000 from the undesignated balance to Aging in Place.

**Councilmember Phipps** said I guess the details of the plan have not been worked out yet. It looks like these monies would just be exclusively for Charlotte citizens, as appose to the program that is city and county wide right now that the County administers. Is that how that works?

Mayor Lyles said you would supplement that I believe. It is a supplement to that. You would qualify for that, then this would be additional, because of the City only.

Mr. Phipps said would it be possible if they get these city funds would they be eligible for the County's program or not? I do not know that we have really looked into supplementing the County's portion or not.

Mayor Lyles said he is asking would it be allowed to pay not only for the City's tax, the evaluation goes up and the County benefit from that, would this money be used to pay county taxes?

Mr. Harlow said just the City portion, and we have talked to the attorneys about what this would look like already, but basically, what we were trying to do is increase the bucket. The County program right now is a state administered program, \$29,500, \$29,000 a year, over 65. What you are finding is that the utilization is low, and frankly, there are just not a lot of homeowners that make that type of money. So, the City clearly has no program at all, as it sits right now, so this is one, creating a program that doesn't exist period, and two to look at the numbers around how can we increase that income level, because there are just more homeowners who are in that income level?

Ms. Eiselt said I think that it is a moot point at this point. My question was going to be, how did you come up with \$500,000? How did you come up with the additional \$250,000? I like the idea of a matched amount of money, but can't that just be matched to the new \$500,000 increase? I like the concept, but I just struggle sometimes with not knowing where the numbers came from, and if there is data there that shows that, then that would be great to.

Mr. Harlow said the data would suggest that you had the need in the City of Charlotte is about \$2.5 million.

Ms. Eiselt said that is not- Okay, \$2.5 million?

Mr. Harlow said right, so this does not touch it anyway. Not sharing too much, because I do not want the media to pick up on everything. I know from the conversations that I have had from two specific non-profits is, do a little bit more here. We know that this is needed. We like this space, especially around just innovative housing as a whole; \$500,000 is great. It is a small scratch to the surface, about a quarter of the need, so just trying to bump that up, not in any specific area but in Charlotte as a whole.

Ms. Eiselt said that is fine; I just wondered if there was data to show that.

Mr. Winston said I really like keeping a match in there. As Dr. Harlow said, this is a \$2.5 million problem that we are going to throw \$700,000 at. That just speaks to the kind of one microcosm of a bigger problem that we cannot deal with alone. So, if we keep the match there, that gives us something to go and get the buy-in, not just from corporate communities but from non-profits from the faith communities. That is really in line with the Opportunity Task Force report that says we cannot do this alone. This would be a perfect opportunity, and to keep as we do into summer months, to keep people's attention on this and to do it and follow through. I understand the idea of the president just putting the money down there and just saying that is what we are going to do, but I think that it is a good one, and I think that it is the kind of direction that we need to be going on in the city. It is your motion, but I would really suggest that you left that match in there.

Mayor Lyles said nothing prevents the \$700,000 from being a match.

Mr. Winston said I agree with that. Any money can be matched, but we are putting a statement that this is what we expect our community to follow through on. That is a totally different thing.

Mr. Egleston said I make a substitute motion that we leave the match in, because I think that it is all the things that he said, and I will not repeat them, but I think that it is a new way forward for things like this, Kudos for Councilmember Bokhari for bringing it forward and for Dr. Harlow for using it.

Mayor Lyles said how much is the match in your motion?

Mr. Egleston said it is \$250,000 with a \$250,000 match. It is exactly what he originally proposed. That is my substitution.

Mayor Lyles said out of the \$700,000, \$250,000 would require a match. Is that your motion Mr. Egleston?



Mr. Egleston said yes ma'am, and if that fails, we will go back to the other one.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Egleston and seconded by Councilmember Bokhari to allocate an additional \$250,000 to the recommended budget for Aging in Place contingent upon a match from the private or non-profit sector.

Mr. Bokhari said I was not planning on supporting this, but my colleague Councilmember Winston has swayed me in that this is the type of innovative thinking that our community expects of us, and if someone wants to come and bring a heavy lift and an ask with something that the community needs with them, we should be listening to that, so I will be supporting that as well.

A vote was taken on the substitute motion and recorded as:

**YEAS:** Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston, Eiselt, Harlow, Newton, Phipps, and Winston

**NAYS:** Councilmembers Driggs, Mayfield, and Mitchell

Mayor Lyles said the substitute motion is \$700,000 with \$250,000 requiring a match, and that passed with two exceptions, Mr. Driggs and Mr. Mitchell.

Ms. Mayfield said I am a no.

Mayor Lyles said okay, Ms. Mayfield, Mr. Driggs, and Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Jones said can I make sure that I understand? So, in terms of the motion that just passed, is it \$200,000 or \$250,000?

Mayor Lyles said it comes from the undesignated balance. I said it makes it a \$700,000 total; however, the match is \$250,000.

Ms. Mayfield said that is not what Dr. Harlow-

Mayor Lyles said I know it is not what Dr. Harlow, it was a motion that was approved.

Mr. Harlow said I am not sure that you understood the substitute motion either then.

Ms. Eiselt said that was not a substitute motion. He said \$250,000.

Mayor Lyles said he said \$250,000 for the match. He may have meant differently, but he said \$250,000 for the match.

Mr. Egleston said I said back to Dr. Harlow's original proposal, which was \$250,000 and \$250,000.

Mayor Lyles said again, if you voted in favor of it, you are allowed to vote for reconsideration. This is what happened last time, so do I have someone asking to reconsider the motion that was just made that voted in favor of it?

Mr. Egleston said is the \$200,000 number because of the undesignated balance about it?

Mayor Lyles said yes, it was to-

Mr. Harlow said I would like for it to be reconsidered, and here is why: I think that the spirit of his motion or his amendment to my original motion was hey Justin, take your

motion off the table basically, and let's go back to how it is originally placed on here. Is that my understanding, then vote on that?

Mayor Lyles said I just need someone to raise their hand and ask for a reconsideration of the motion that just passed, someone that voted in favor of it can ask for reconsideration.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston and seconded by Councilmember Harlow to reconsider the substitute motion to allocate an additional \$250,000 to the recommended budget contingent upon a match from the private or non-profit sector.

A vote was taken on the motion to reconsider and carried as follows:

**YEAS:** Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston, Eiselt, Harlow, Mayfield, Mitchell, and Winston

**NAYS:** Councilmembers Driggs, Newton, and Phipps

Mayor Lyles said what is the motion regarding this.

Mr. Egleston said my substitute motion is that we revert back to Dr. Harlow's original request of \$250,000 if he gets a private sector match of \$250,000 in addition to what is already in the budget for this.

Mayor Lyles said where would you get the \$250,000?

Mr. Harlow said this was my conversation talking about cultural facilities and the PAYGO schedule and all of the other stuff.

Mayor Lyles said I know. I am just asking you where do you want to take it from.

Mr. Harlow said let's take it from the \$9 million in cultural facilities.

Mayor Lyles said that is in maintenance and repair of all of our cultural facilities that we are required to do under the bond referendum that built them, so the question is, do you want to take it from the cultural facilities? I'm just looking for some head nods so we can kind of get to a place that you can get this money.

Mr. Harlow said we have an innovative housing bucket here; there are tons of things here. My understanding is PAYGO isn't all bonded out.

Mayor Lyles said it is \$38,000.

Mr. Mitchell said Dr. Harlow; we have to be careful taking from the cultural facility, so I will make a suggestion that you take the \$250,000 from the Place Making that is \$300,000 in there.

Mr. Harlow said from the new projects?

Mr. Mitchell said take \$37,000 from the Place Making.

Mr. Harlow said okay, fair enough, in the new projects, okay I got it. Take an undesignated and close the gap with the Place Making and call it a day.

Mayor Lyles said so, we are taking \$213,000. I am going to repeat this motion. The motion is to take \$250,000 and add to the existing recommended \$500,000 for Aging in Place. The \$200,000 comes out of undesignated balance and \$50,000 out of Place Making. Is that your motion Dr. Harlow?

Mr. Harlow said yes ma'am.

Mayor Lyles said it also includes requiring a match for the \$250,000.

Motion was made by Councilmember Harlow and seconded by Mitchell to take \$250,000 and add to the existing recommended \$500,000 for Aging in Place. The \$200,000 comes out of undesignated balance and \$50,000 out of Place Making contingent upon receiving a match of \$250,000 from the private or non-profit sector.

Mr. Phipps said what exactly is the Place Making? What makes that up?

Mr. Jones said Place Making was the concept where we have a number of innovative people who already work for us, and we are going to try to find ways that do projects with this money to much like when we did the better block series, we would have our own in house better block that would be able to do somethings like traffic calming in neighborhoods that we could just go ahead and do it, as appose to study and study and study.

Mayor Lyles said alright, that would be \$50,000 out of that project.

A vote was taken on the motion and carried as follows:

**YEAS:** Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston, Eiselt, Harlow, Mayfield, Mitchell, and Winston

**NAYS:** Councilmembers Driggs, Newton, and Phipps

#### **ADJUSTMENT 18 - FINTECH AND RELATED WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT**

Mayor Lyles said is there any other reconsideration for this area of One Time Adjustments? With that, if I do not hear any further, we need a motion to have the Manager develop the capital budget in line with his recommended and Council adopted changes that were just approved.

Mr. Bokhari said I have no energy left, but the FinTech thing is not happening?

Mayor Lyles said no, I just asked do we have anything else for this Adjustment.

Mr. Bokhari said I make a motion for the FinTech thing. If I cannot get a second then it is not worth another second of our time.

Ms. Mayfield said what is the motion?

Mr. Bokhari said to add FinTech \$500,000, because workforce development is something that we have not really gone heavy into in this budget, but that would be a really good thing if there is a motion to [inaudible].

Ms. Mayfield said where is the \$500,000 coming from?

Mr. Mitchell said would you be in mind for a lesser amount than a half of a million dollars? I mean, we are all looking for a phase two of workforce development, but that is a huge dollar amount.

Mr. Bokhari said I would be, but at the same time, we just spent more than the undesignated balance. I have no idea where to get it from, so I would rather save us time, unless someone had an idea for me of where to get it from. I think that it is important but not to go cannibalize other things that I do not know about this time either.

Ms. Mayfield said Mr. Manager, I see you over there looking through your numbers. Does staff have a recommendation in order for us to basically extend? We already have a commitment on Project PIECE, so do you see the FinTech and related workforce

development outside of project PIECE or as a part of Project PIECE? We already have a financial commitment for that. So, how did you interpret it, FinTech, and as my colleague just asked, how much have we spent than that? I believe we allocated over a multi-year period.

Mr. Jones said Councilmember Mayfield, you are correct in terms of Project PIECE and the million dollars being allocated over multiple years. I think that the question I was getting simultaneously was, how many dollars do we have set aside from our business corridor? As Dr. Harlow pointed out earlier in our community investment plan, as we go through this PAYGO schedule, over the course of a five-year period, there is a million dollars a year allocated to business corridor revitalization. Just like there is between a \$1.2 million to \$1.7 million over a five-year period related to housing and community building. Both of those were new projects that were put in last year and continued throughout the five year PAYGO schedule. So, that is just some pockets that are out there in this innovative space.

Mr. Bokhari said so; we can utilize that without having this conversation here and later. I would move that we ask the Manager to go back and figure out a way and reprioritize existing funds through different means that I think he has at his disposal to increase the police pay step 13 to 6.5%.

Mayor Lyles said I think that he just said that he would recommend that you take \$500,000 from business corridors to fund [inaudible].

Mr. Bokhari said I just now completely changed topics to one last one that we did not bring up today, which was if the Manager believes he could do it within the budget, the motion would be to increase step 13 of Police Officer pay.

Mayor Lyles said no, we are on capital budget right now; we are not on the operating.

Mr. Bokhari said so; we are not in the operating budget?

Mayor Lyles said no, we had a motion that closed out the operating budget. You have a right to bring this up at any time after this, but we have already closed out for this budget session; if you would like to bring that up on the floor of a meeting, then that is appropriate. These are all directions for the Manager to complete, and we gave him directions on the operating. We have a few minutes. We have got to come back. I know that it is after 5:00 now, and we still have this. Let's go back. What are we asking about FinTech?

Ms. Mayfield said the Manager understood my question; he said we have the ability to do it.

#### **ADJUSTMENT 17 – JOB CREATION AND TRAINING**

Mr. Driggs said since I proposed Adjustment 17, I did that because I just wanted to highlight the fact that we are making a huge investment to affordable housing, and by comparison, we have a \$1 million investment over three years in Project PIECE, so I do not have an answer as to how we do this myself; therefore, I am not going to push for it now. I would just like for us all going forward to place more emphasis on enabling people to pay for their own housing, instead of finding ways to pay for it for them, and I hope the Manager in the coming year will explore, for example, the partnership with CMS, CPCC, and Goodwill on training so people will learn how to get into sustaining employment.



**CONSIDERATION OF MOTION DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO PREPARE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS AND RESOLUTIONS FOR THE FY2019 CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THE JUNE 11, 2018 BUDGET ORDINANCE**

Mayor Lyles said so, right now, I am looking for a motion to direct the Manager to prepare the budget based upon his recommendations and the changes that the Council has approved today for the capital improvement program.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchel and seconded by Councilmember Egleston to direct the City Manager to prepare the FY2019 Capital Budget documents for the June 11, 2018 budget ordinance, based upon his recommendations and the changes that the Council has approved today for the Capital Improvement Program.

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

**YEAS:** Councilmember Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston, Eiselt, Harlow, Mayfield, Mitchell, Newton, Phipps, and Winston

**NAYS:** Councilmember Driggs

Mayor Lyles said there are so many good ideas around this space that what we need to do is we tackled a lot of things at our Retreat that have resulted in this budget, and there are many ideas that are coming up. The workforce development is absolutely essential. I hope that LISC have a component of their program around workforce development. FinTech, if we do not prepare for the future, we are going to really get behind. I hope that we will continue to plan on that and particularly on our senior housing and keeping them in their homes and affordability. I would hope that the Intergovernmental Committee would change that, will consider going to the legislature to index that, instead of it being a flat rate, because what happens in Moore County or Nash County is not what is happening in Mecklenburg. It is something that we have really got to figure out. I just think this is the time that we get to focus on some of these things, because we are trying to make scarce resource decisions, but we should not allow those things to fall off the edge of the plate. We ought to be thinking about that.

**CONSIDERATION OF MOTION DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO PREPARE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS AND RESOLUTIONS FOR THE FY2019 ENTERPRISE BUDGETS FOR THE JUNE 11, 2018 BUDGET ORDINANCE**

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to direct the City Manager to prepare the FY2019 enterprise budget documents, for the June 11, 2018 budget ordinance, for the enterprise and other service funds, in accordance to his recommendation.

**OPERATING BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS**

Mayor Lyles said now, we have one more thing to do in terms of the operating adjustment, just like I said, the Manager needs to come back. He did the operating, but there are some things that need some matching up, because we are doing it in this kind of session, he is gone back and looked at it. Mr. Jones, I would like for you to review what the operating adjustments are. This is not to reopen our decisions but to allow him to balance the budget appropriately, as required by law actually.

Mr. Jones said we will go to the next slide; it is a little busy, but I think that the first 2/3rds captures what was sent to Council on Friday in terms of balancing the budget related to the \$1.2 million of adjustments that were made at the last work session. Before I go to the recommended reductions, which I believe you have all seen, I want to talk about one thing that was an oversight from the last time we talked. I said it, but we

never got a vote from Council, and that was the question about a pay parity, and we talked about, in the general fund, and there was this conversational about having our hourly employees, instead of having a three percent salary increase, having a 3.5 percent salary increase, because instead of having that 1.5 percent market adjustment, we went to public safety and had a two percent market adjustment. So, we want to have that corresponding, and I will tell you that if we did that consistent with how we have done in the past, which we are trying to move away from that, that would be February. The cost of that is \$175,000 to move from 1.5 percent to 2 percent. I just did not feel comfortable, even though I said it, we never had that voted on. In the general fund is an undesignated fund balance of \$175,000, and I will tell you, that is both around it. It works out. One is a little bit less than the other, but it works out, so it just didn't miraculously turn out to work.

The other thing that is extremely important that I need to bring before Council, right now with everything in the red, it balances all of the adjustments that \$175,000 to move from 1.5 percent to 2 percent could be taken from the undesignated balance in the proposed budget. A few weeks ago, I talked to you about Pineville. Pineville asked that CMPD continue to police the unincorporated area of Pineville. So, Chief Putney has agreed that we could do that. Very important to take a big step back. When some of the jurisdictions pulled out of the ETJ, it cost us about \$4 million. I think it was \$4.2 million in revenue that came in. We did not cut the police budget by that corresponding \$4.2 million. We did not change Chief Putney's delivery of services, so that have happened, but it didn't make sense given the environment that we were in. The reality is that the way that this agreement is structured that means there is \$561,000 of revenue that is going to come into the City beginning July 1. This will be before you next Monday, and I believe that the County may be talking about it as early as tomorrow. We need to get this all resolved by June 30, 2018, because absent this, we wouldn't have the ability to police Pineville's ETJ. So, \$561,000, we are back to operating; \$561,000 that we did not talk about last time, but now we have the final numbers, thank you Kim for your hard work on that. So, having said that there are a lot of things that can be done with the money that comes from policing. It comes to the general fund. I would highly recommend to this Council that if those funds are utilized they be utilized for police related activities, but that is not what you are completed to do with this money. So, right now, I know the \$561,000 is coming in; it is not a part of this budget balance exercise.

Mayor Lyles said alright, let me put this in context. We didn't cut after we did the services, and now we are picking up a portion of it, because Pineville has requested it. So, this is at the level of service that we would be giving to Pineville, but you have already allocated in the budget, so it is revenue. How much is the Police Department's budget as a total?

Mr. Jones said someone will tell you that number as we are talking. So, it is a small fraction of the Police over-all budget.

Mr. Jones said \$273 million.

Mr. Bokhari said Mr. Manager, if I was to make a motion and our colleagues were to support it to one, considering the fact that when we heard from Councilmember Winston last week on are there other parts of the Police Department's budget we could look to right size? I think that you have done that with the scaling back of take home vehicles. Two, with these additional resources that you have now laid out before us, would you be able to take that money, do everything that the police department needs to do, with the additional responsibilities and then do the final piece that is missing in this budget to be a master piece, which is step 13 and bring them up that equivalent in some way? Would you be able to do that if that had Council support?

Mr. Jones said so, the \$560,000, let's go back to step 13. In the last work session, we got to this place because we brought parity back into the conversation. Anything that I do to that step could impact parity with Fire. If there were a bonus or something that didn't change those numbers between those two steps, in other words, I would hope

that you wouldn't ask me to sacrifice the parity, but there are things that could be used to benefit those individuals who are at the top step.

Mr. Bokhari said and you could figure that out with some model of parity as well? Is that what I am hearing you say?

Mr. Jones said if we were to use those dollars, for the folks who had reached the top step, the first thing is to make sure those folks had been at the top step for more than a year, and outside of that, in 2020 we were going to do a Senior Police Officer Program. The question would be, could you move any portion of that into the FY2019?

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari and seconded by Councilmember Egleston to utilize additional resources to our top step police officers in the way the Manager has just described.

Mr. Egleston said I second it for the sake of discussion. You are saying that you could do something for the top step Police Officers that would not jeopardize the 5 percent parity with Fire, which to me is very important. That would be something Ah la.

Mr. Jones said okay, so the Senior Police Officer Program was something that was in the introduced budget that would not start until FY20. For the most part, it is two pieces. One, you have to create the program, and you also have to make sure that the program is really adding some value to what we have in terms of officer's training, community engagement, what have you. So, it is a \$2 million program, roughly, that would have started sometime in FY2020. If we started the program earlier, let's say towards the end of FY2019, you could probably get a quarter of a year, because of the \$2 million program, you could get a quarter of that year moved into the final quarter of FY19, and because that doesn't adjust to the top step, it would not impact parity.

Mr. Winston said thank you for doing this extra work and finding some more funds. It is always fun when you find a little extra money in there. That is what I see right down there with the policing in Pineville that wasn't part of the budget before. To include that money in this budget, we have to make a motion to replace something in the recommended reductions. Is there something that you could just work with?

Mr. Jones said so, when you have an undesignated fund balance, what would have been \$175,000 could be \$561,000 that is just in an undesignated fund balance to deal with issues as they come up during the year. So, you have flexibility with how you use these dollars.

Mr. Winston said I would personally like to see these additional resources moved up so that we could knock out some of these recommended reductions. I am for increasing our public safety pay plan, but I do not think that it should be done on the expense of our other City workers. That is what I see with the minus \$500,000 that eliminates employee incentive pay program. That is a program that doesn't just help police officers but would help unsworn employees of CMPD, people in Solid Waste, people in Water, and part of my suggestion last week is to take a look deeper into the police budget to see how we can move things around to facilitate that pay plan adjustment. For instance, we always talk about this deficit of 185 officers. That means that there are 185 spots that are allocated that we are not able to fill. Any other department, we see it in this budget, even if it is a number one or number two, if we are not able to fill those, we are moving that money around to make things happen. We know that we are not going to get 185 officers by this time next year. My question is, why should we allocate that money, between today and next year, for that if we can use it to pay the people that we have right now? I would strongly, strongly urge the Manager to use these additional resources to take away the elimination of Employee Incentive Pay Program and perhaps whatever can be left to employees - those other positions that are shown there. I think that it is smart to take away the Police Take Home Vehicle Program for right now. That is an aspirational goal, but as we see it, that is \$478,000 that would affect 11 cars and 11 people. I think that if you look at everything else on the adjustments and the

reductions, those are going to be programs that far and away affect more than 11 people per line. I would very much encourage you and encourage the support of my colleagues to have the Manager use those additional resources to knock some of that right out.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Winston and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell to restore the Employee Incentive Pay Program for \$500,000 for the employees and anything else in the hired positions of the reduction, taking that from the \$735,000.

Mr. Phipps said with respect to the policing Pineville wanting to come back in; do you for see and possibility that that could be delayed in coming into our budget cycle in as much as we have to wait for some decisions by the County? Are you fairly certain that this is something that is going to be happening within this budget?

Mr. Jones said yes.

Ms. Mayfield said I support my colleagues recommendation with the keeping the Employee Incentive Pay Program of \$500,000. Question, how many officers are we talking about for the policing of Pineville's unincorporated? Pineville has Pineville police. They have their own police department, so what unincorporated area or how many officers are we identifying for this \$560,000?

Mr. Jones said I am going to give this my best shot to go into how the policing occurs, and if Chief Putney is in the room, I will try to give him a pass on this unless I totally screw it up. So, we had a long discussion about policing the ETJ and with the various towns, and at some point, the conversation was around calls for service. We tried to change that conversation, because that is not how we police. So, somewhere in here, it is more earth that we are taking our existing resources and policing. So, whether that is three people, four people, five people, it is almost as if what you are saying is you have a limited number of officers, and you spread those officers out across the area that you are policing, and as we get more recruits in and the lateral program works better and we fill some of these vacant positions, it will just change the way that the Chief deploys his resources.

Ms. Mayfield said so basically we do not have a number of officers to coincide with this dollar amount, but are you comfortable with the recommendation of either the total additional, if we move forward, because there are two separate questions that you are asking us. One, if we are going to approve the policing of Pineville, and if so that is how much can be generated from that. Two, are you comfortable with us saying out of that \$735,000 it is really only going to be \$235,000, because we are asking you to put the \$500,000 back into the Incentive Pay Program, so it is not to hurt all of our other employees.

Mr. Jones said I am comfortable, if I understand you, with making any budget decision you have today, based on those additional resources.

Mr. Bokhari said if we vote yea, the other motion is gone, so I just want to make one last statement, which is I do not want to take anything away. You, staff, everyone has done an incredible job, the whole budget for officers as well. I went to the one group of officers, the 1/3 we have talked about for the last couple of weeks that are in that topped out pay plan. I went to the roll call at South Division, and I talked to them, and they were all in this step. They passionately explained to me why they are feeling left behind and not just from their own perspective and how they are the role models to all these other younger officers that were asking to do much. They said the data that you looked at, and you saw I think it was steps five and nine and how you used a database approach to say this is where we are having our biggest retention problem. This is where they are falling off. They gave me some context that made me understand that data a little differently, which is those ranges, especially in that six/seven but the five where you see it most, we are losing them not because how much we are paying them at that moment,



because it is the last moment of round about that they have to make the decision to transition into FBI or some other broader form. That is that age where they start aging out, and they look at how we treat our topped out officers as they are making that decision, not how much money they received at that moment to keep them there. So, while your data may have shown you that retention in the step five or six area is it, the context I got from these guys when they made the decision in the contract that they have with them how they look up to that topped out level, and I am just saying, you have done excellent work, and I am so pleased with everything. This is the last piece to the master piece, and there is so much reason why that money there could make the difference. If we vote yea on this now, that will in effect be a no vote to that level, and again, everyone has done amazing things for all the rest of the officers. I do not want that to go over looked, but this is the last chance to make it a masterpiece.

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

**YEAS:** Councilmember Ajmera, Egleston, Harlow, Mayfield, Mitchell, Newton, and Winston

**NAYS:** Councilmember Bokhari, Driggs, Eiselt, and Phipps

### **ADJUSTMENT 3 – PAY PARITY FOR ALL GENERAL EMPLOYEES**

Motion was made by Councilmember Phipps, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to adjust the hourly employee match increase from 1.5% percent to 2% using the undesignated balance of \$175,000.

**Mayor Lyles** said the manager mentioned at his last report, fund the additional recommendation to adjust hourly market rate increase from the undesignated amount, which is now \$235,896.

### **MAYOR LYLES REQUESTED CITY COUNCIL INDICATE APPROVAL TO DIRECT THE MANAGER TO APPROVE THE BUDGET AS ADJUSTED TODAY**

**YEAS:** Councilmembers Ajmera, Egleston, Eiselt, Harlow, Mayfield, Mitchell, Newton, Phipps, and Winston

**NAYS:** Councilmembers Bokhari and Driggs

Mayor Lyles said so that leaves us a designated balance of practically zero. That is all the corrections and the adjustments; you now have all the new money, all of the corrections to be made.

\* \* \* \* \*

The meeting was recessed at 5:31 p.m. for dinner. The meeting reconvened at 5:44 p.m. in Room 267.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **ITEM NO. 2: MEMORIAL STADIUM RENOVATION PARTNERSHIP**

**Randy Harrington, Chief Financial Officer** said I think this sets up perfectly with some of the conversation earlier, talking about leveraging and partnerships with many of the programs that we do and tonight you are going to hear about partnerships and leveraging with three particular projects. One is around the Memorial Stadium partnership with Mecklenburg County, and Mr. Ron Kimble will be doing that portion of the presentation, then we will transition into the Bojangles-Ovens Connector Facility, which you have heard about before, but we want to give you an update on that particular project, and Tom Murray and Steve Bagwell, with the Charlotte Regional Visitor's Authority will be giving that presentation, then we will round out with I-277 ped bridge, a unique opportunity that has a number of partnerships with it to advance that

mobility here in our community. With that, Dan Gallagher will be giving that presentation with Ron Kimble.

**Ron Kimble, City Manager's Office** said it is exciting to be here tonight with a lot of enthusiasm and information to share with you. It is interesting that I think at the Economic Development Committee meeting, when Memorial Stadium was there, I think there were nine Councilmembers there that day, so this may be a repeat for many of you, and there were just a couple that were not in attendance that day, Mr. Driggs as Vice Chair, but I met in follow-up with Mr. Driggs, because he was out of town during that day, but I think we had a great conversation that day, and it is a committee recommendation. It was a vote of three-to-one by the committee to recommend this to City Council. So, tonight, we are going to review that presentation again. It is the City-County Partnership Proposal for Memorial Stadium. It also involves the Charlotte Independence and other many events that we could put in a renovated Memorial Stadium. I am going to outline the partnership proposal for you, then the future Council action is intended to be put on your June 11, 2018 meeting, next Monday night, if you are ready for consideration of Memorial Stadium next Monday night.

Again, we have reviewed the history with this project. In the summer of 2016, there was a proposal that was starting to be heard and worked through the community. It was a proposal that city/county staff and some city/county elected officials and the Independence brought forward. It was to invest \$25 million in renovating Memorial Stadium. The original idea was a 1/3 share by each of the participating parties, the County, City, and Charlotte Independence. The request of the City was \$8.33 million. It would come from City tourism funding to help with the renovation and reconstruction of Memorial Stadium, but in the summer of 2016, as that was starting to come forward, two events occurred that sidelined and put that out of the mix at that point and time. One was the officer involved shooting in September, and the other was a proposal that was being advanced for major league soccer in this community. As a result of those two, there was no forward movement what-so-ever on the proposal for minor league soccer in Memorial Stadium. It was put on hold; it was put on abeyance, and it was in early 2018. It was December 2017/January 2018 that the County picked the ball back up again in conversations with the Charlotte Independence, and the County Commissioners were presented with a proposal, and they actually approved \$31.7 million dollars for a reconstruction plan for Memorial Stadium. Their plan also included a partnership opportunity of a lesser amount than the original \$8.33 million. It was for the City using tourism funds, which are reserved for such things as stadiums and amateur sports, to come to the table with a lesser amount, and it turned out to be an amount up to \$3 million to look at a synthetic turf field for Memorial Stadium. The \$31.7 million investment by the County would have used a grass field, and the rest time that is required for a grass field is much longer than it is for a synthetic turf field, and the tourism funds are illegible uses for such things that create additional visitor spending in our community, so the revised funding proposal became a \$34.7 million total proposal; \$31.7 million by the County, then the County would have an agreement with the Charlotte Independence for how they would act as a major tenant in the County owned facility, then up to \$3 million would come from City tourism funding. The Memorial Stadium reconstruction concept would be that the field that exists there today is too small in respects for some sports that need to be played there. It is too small for a soccer field to have the proper dimensions and boundaries on the sidelines, especially in the corners. So, there is a need to expand the playing surface to a large dimension than the current stadium accommodates. The current stadium also is aged; it is old. It needs reconstruction. It needs a lot of help, as you have seen over the last eight to 10 years the facility has sat more idle than it has active, and the whole idea here is to activate and rejuvenate and create a destination and asset for the community that has lots of event day scheduling it.

The summary of the planned county investments would put the capacity at about 12,450. It would reserve the historic attributes and landmarks of this facility. It would preserve the historic stone wall in a different fashion than what it has placed on the field, but it would be reconstructed and reused in the new facility. It would also preserve the Veteran's Memorial that has the naming right now on Memorial Stadium, and it would

be an enlarged playing field for all sports. We have categorized the summary of the expenses here, totaling \$31.7 million of new investment in the facility, with site work design fees; new construction; FF&E, which is furniture, fixtures, and equipment and video board; and all of the soft costs and the contingencies that go along with the project.

The idea and the proposal that has surfaced and worked its way through the Economic Development Committee, with a three to one vote and a recommendation to this Council was for the City to make a one-time capital payment of up to \$3 million for the preparation, acquisition, and installation of a new playing field. It would be a partnership with the County; they would invest the \$31.7 million. They would have to document the costs so that we would then reimburse for the costs of the playing surface. It would be a new field, a synthetic surface that would be FIFA two compliant, and that is a very great field, the greatest in synthetic surfaces. I would note that each year, synthetic surfaces get even better than they were the year before. So, if we are in agreement to move forward with this proposal, synthetic fields will get even better, and by the time that the field will need to go in, in late 2020, they could be even better than they are today, in terms of their synthetic playing surface. Our payment would be last money into the project, because they would reconstruct the stadium, do all of the other things to the stadium, and the field would be one of the last additions to the project. In return for putting tourism money in this particular proposal, the City and CRVA would receive five rent free use days each year for 15 years, so five times 15 would be 75 rent free use days over the 15-year period. The promotor would pay those out-of-pocket expenses, as is the case in many of our other proposals and agreements in other stadiums in the City, and the source of the City investment would be tourism funds, and they are restricted for purposes such as this.

The example of the synthetic turf field is shown here. They are very durable, but they are also becoming safer on the knees, back, and legs of people who play on them each and every year. It insures the highest level of field accessibility and the widest variety of stadium community use options, and the beauty of the synthetic field is that it doesn't require much recovery down time associated with natural grass fields, which need to rest due to the playing that is conducted on them and also weather conditions can really hold up, play on those fields for days at a time. This can also support new visitor spending in the community by virtue of the dollars that we are putting in, so it will support growth in the tourism economy, and there is also an economic return for the tourism fund, which justifies this level of investment. When we were presenting this to the Economic Development Committee, there was a question asked about how can we justify an economic return? Can you showcase an economic return? We took Battle of the Bands from last year that was conducted in Memorial Stadium. Heath Dillard, who is the Economist on staff for the Charlotte Regional Visitor's Authority did a direct contact to the event promotor, got all the information from ticket and ticketing and survey information from the attendees at that event and did the down load and breakdown of people that came from outside Mecklenburg County to come to Charlotte Mecklenburg for the Battle of the Bands. We use that as one example. We ran through all of the direct visitor spending. It is about \$1.7 million for that one event. It resulted in \$84,000 of new increase taxes to the City and the County by virtue of that one event, so we can show that one event in one year's time brought new visitor spending from outside of Mecklenburg County of \$84,000 net new dollars to us, City and County, and if you had five of those, five times \$84,000 is \$420,000 each year, just for the five event days, and if we have 15 years of five rent free use days, 15 times \$420,000 is over \$6 million. That is only related to City events that would be booked in Memorial Stadium by the five rent free use days. We also discussed at the committee that it is likely that when you have a synthetic turf field in Memorial Stadium, the County has run the calendar for a 12-month cycle and has noted that there are 319 possible event days use of Memorial Stadium, not only for out of town new events but for community events that could be held, concerts, other types of activities in Memorial Stadium. The estimate of a grass field, because of the rest time and because a lot of the booking dates are in the spring, summer, and fall, and we have a lot of rain in the summer period which washes out some of the available dates in your strongest booking period, the estimate of the number of days that you could use for events is around 150 with a grass field. So, you

can get just a little bit more than two times the number of event days with a synthetic field than you can get with a grass field. Now, those are event day's availability. It doesn't mean that we are going to book events in every one of those days. We will try. The County will try to do that, but those are event day's availability with a synthetic field versus a natural grass field.

We feel that this is a great use of tourism monies in a partnership fashion with Charlotte Independence and the County. The County has an agreement with the Charlotte Independence; The Independence pays an annual rent for the stadium. They pay a per game fee for use of the stadium, and they are also sharing the profits in concessions and other types of sales inside the stadium, so the County has negotiated the proposal agreement with the Charlotte Independence. The City through an interlocal agreement with the County would flow the up to \$3 million for the field to the County.

So, the next steps, if you are so inclined, is City Council consideration on June 11, 2018 of the Economic Development's recommendation to authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute an interlocal agreement with Mecklenburg County regarding Memorial Stadium improvements in accordance with the key terms outlined on slide seven. Those key terms are the five terms that I went over in the middle part of the presentation.

**Councilmember Eiselt** said first of all, I am really happy to see a plan come together to make Memorial Stadium a community asset. I think that it is great. I think that it is exciting. I will be supportive of this, but I do have a question about the five rent-free days. If a bluegrass festival comes and says we would like to rent out Memorial Stadium, who do they go to, to schedule that; therefore, who's project does it become?

Mr. Kimble said if it is a rent free use day, they would go through the Charlotte Regional Visitor's Authority, who will then go to the County and make sure that they can book that event in the facility, and they will look at the calendar and work with the promoter to make sure that event can then be held in the stadium.

Ms. Eiselt said so, are the rent-free days set days and you say well; look at August 20th was the City's day. So, what I am saying is, who gets to determine if that is their revenue day or not? Is it a project that we have to bring forward?

Mr. Kimble said we will encourage any of you if you have an idea, to route it through the CRVA, because this is a partnership between the City and the CRVA to book these additional five, rent-free use days. The County is the owner of the facility. They operate the facility. The Independence is a major tenant, and CRVA will work with the County on those available days and try to book those five rent-free uses into the calendar. It would be nice if we know in advance, so when the calendar is being set, we can provide for that availability, but it is again a back and forth to determine when those days are available, what kind of events we can hold to go out and recruit, then make sure we can put those into Memorial Stadium with a capacity of 12,450 seats. This is a great venue for a smaller event, other than the events that we hold at Bank of America Stadium, because there are many, many events that can use a 12,450 seat stadium facility like this. The County is going to be booking other events too, because they are going to be wanting to fill the calendar. They want their bottom line to be enhanced, so they will be booking lots of events themselves, more community events, but they will work with the CRVA to recruit events that bring visitors to this community. The reason why you want to bring visitors with our five, rent per use days is we are using tourism monies for the up to \$3 million, and really you need to bring additional visitors to support the use of those funds for that particular purpose.

**Councilmember Winston** said I sat in on the Economic Development Committee when this was proposed, and I am still kind of where I am at, especially given the process we just kind of finished up or are about to finish completing with the budget process. \$3 million might not sound like a lot, but we know that it can be impactful. I am not convinced of the need for this type of perf and the capacity. I know that we said it could go from 105 days use to 210, but I still stand by. Soccer season is about 17 home



games. The lacrosse season is probably about eight. Summer months in an uncovered field where there is no shade, I do not see a whole lot of events happening there, but I say whether or not we decide to spend this money, I also am kind of aware that combined with all of these free days that we have, whether it be a Memorial Stadium potentially at BB&T field, the arena, at Bank of America Stadium, that we already do not use all of our days. So, we are not completely leveraging the use of these facilities. So, if we are so compelled that we find it that we should add more of these rent-free days, we should use them as a Council, and we should have a master plan going forward or committee or somebody that is making sure that every one of these days is used in generating revenue.

**Councilmember Mitchell** said I just wanted to reiterate to Council some discussion that we had in ED. One point was that our contribution would be the last money, and it would not come out until 2020.

Mr. Kimble said the end of calendar 2020.

Mr. Mitchell said secondly, we had a lot of discussion about it, would this contribution impact other projects, and the answer was no. Thirdly, the all American from Davidson, we will touch on some of the turf, some of the issues about the turf. Last but not least, the Councilmember from District 1 told us that we had to support it.

Mayor Lyles said can I ask a follow-up to the last money in; it is in there \$30 some million, so if they have savings of \$3 million, will we still be putting- Is last money in just this the last finishing piece to the stadium or is it that if they need it, we will pay it? I do not know what last money means.

Mr. Kimble said we have agreed in this proposal that we would fund the field. So, it is up to \$3 million for the field. We have not discussed what happens if they do not spend \$31.7 million on the rest of the stadium; my guess is they are going to spend at least \$31.7 million with the cost escalation.

Mayor Lyles said I just do not know what project last money in meant, whether or not that meant if needed or was just the last item for the completion of the project.

Mr. Kimble said thanks for the clarification; ours is only for the field, nothing to do with the stadium, and it is up to \$3 million for the field.

**Councilmember Bokhari** said this is five days of free rent for the City; what does rent normally cost if we did not use free rent?

Mr. Kimble said I do not know if they have established it yet, but they have a pro forma that they are working on.

**Mark Foster, Assistant County Manager** said we have not established it yet. In terms of rounding numbers, probably about \$12,000 a game.

Mayor Lyles said \$12,000 a game for what? What game?

Mr. Bokhari said for renting, whatever you want to do with it I guess.

Mayor Lyles said that doesn't make sense.

Mr. Bokhari said if you want to rent it out for your birthday party next year, it will cost you \$12,000.

Mayor Lyles said but they do not do that. No facility is ever just the same amount for every- I have never seen a facility that was an event space that charged- What are you going to do to price?

Mr. Foster said the way that we charge Memorial Stadium and our other public venues now, we have a cost sheet which starts with the base rent, and the base rent for this facility, for that day, would be approximately \$12,000. In addition to that, you also have ancillary expenses, depending upon what services you want to have for your event.

Mr. Bokhari said great, perfect, so my second question, let's use the Battle of the Bands which was the baseline for the other numbers we got. We are still responsible, as whoever else is throwing the event, for the out of pocket expenses. Is there a high-level rule of thumb for what the City is responsible for? I am assuming one thing out-of-pocket would be our police support of the event, things that we would have to cover, not necessarily someone throwing a concert or a birthday party.

Mr. Foster said typically, the big ticket items would be security, ticket sales, and obviously vending. As you are working with a beverage or food vendor, obviously you would have contributions towards that service.

Mr. Bokhari said so, the promotor or whoever was doing it would probably handle most of those, but I am assuming security is something- Well, I guess that they would have to be offset, so all of that would probably not be City spend, unless we negotiate with that. It will be the person who is doing it, right?

Mr. Foster said the person who is doing it.

Mr. Bokhari said okay, was Battle of the Bands a normal benchmark or high or low in your mind for typical usage?

Mr. Foster said we have booked the Battle of the Bands every year for the last few years, and expect that we will continue to do in the near future.

Mr. Kimble said we use Battle of the Bands we think as a very good example of we could be bigger than that on some other and a little bit shy on that, but that is a great bench mark.

Mr. Bokhari said \$1.7 million in direct visitor spending, that was for one event, Battle of the Bands, right?

Mr. Foster said yes.

Mr. Bokhari said so, on average in the model that we build here for ourselves, we can say \$1.7 million is the soft factor of economic impact.

Mr. Kimble said the report is for outside Mecklenburg County visitor spending \$1.7 million.

Mr. Bokhari said my final, more strategic question is, obviously this is not a decision for us to make on should it be done or not, because that decision has already been made by the County. So, this is a question of do the hard factors of the pro forma and five days and things make sense, and do the soft factors of partnering with them make sense. So, I guess that the final question is how do you feel, given that you have been working with all of these parties, the County views the City in the importance of us being on board, especially given the fact that I am assuming we need to build up cross body capital and things that we will not need them for in the future.

Mr. Kimble said we have had great partnerships in the past with the County, a lot of them on tax increment grants for private development on the Levine Center of the Arts. We have had great partnerships, and we are going to have great partnerships in the future. Gateway station would be a prime example. The library and Discovery Place, there are cross collateral partnerships on land that involved in each one of those. I think there is going to be strong partnerships on many fronts, and this is another one where we can leverage each other's funding, and we can do it in a way that is a smaller dollar amount for a great purpose using tourism funds that are restricted for these kinds of things.

**Councilmember Driggs** said I am wondering how many examples there are of something like this. Basically, you have the county that owns the facility, controls it, is in relationships with the team, and we are being asked to sort of chip in \$3 million. How many instances are therein other projects where the County has done something like that for us?

Mr. Kimble said Levine Center for the Arts; they have a \$2.9 million annual payment for 25 years to help fund arts and cultural facilities that they never funded prior to that day and time. We have \$1.6 million of guaranteed annual payment. They are paying \$2.9 million of the \$4.5 million of the annual guaranteed tax increment payment.

Mr. Driggs said we own that and we get all of the proceeds that are from it?

Mr. Kimble said we do.

Mr. Driggs said the only thing that concerns me about this is the history on the stadium in particular, given the ride that we went on with soccer and their subsequent offer that we just take the whole thing off of their hands. I just wonder if that lays the ground work for the kind of construction cooperation that you are trying to promote here, and I think of a couple of other instances too where frankly, the cooperation with the County hasn't been that wonderful, so I would love to make an investment in the hope that it contributes to a spirit of cooperation, but it needs to come from both sides, and I am not completely satisfied that has been our recent experience.

Mayor Lyles said a couple of things, it is probably not so much about the project or whatever, but I just really want to say that I think when you say we receive the revenue from the arts, that revenue actually goes to the organizations and not to the City, so I do not- You mean this is the money for the debt service. That is different. I was not sure about that, but when you say we receive I want to make sure that we know what we are doing, and I want to say that I am not sure that Battle of the Bands should be the average event that you should price around this. I guess looking at it longer term and even when it was in its hay day, I have already gotten calls, can you get the Shrine Bowl back or can the HBCU's have their college football games there? That to me is a more typical event. Battle of the Bands, you could not get across Independence and Elizabeth for the line waiting to go in there. Now, that is great, but that is not your typical attendance in my experience when Memorial Stadium was really operating and doing well. I just do not want to get a lot of hyperbole here in terms of what the expectations are when the stadium was being used frequently it was great, but it is not going to be the Battle of the Bands as a bench mark, in my opinion. I do want to ask about collage games. Will they be treated with the same revenue base for our local schools and high schools? Are the five-free days sufficient enough for us to go after events like the Shrine Bowl that we know can bring people in? I just wondered, five-free days and we are putting in this money from tourism dollars; wouldn't we want to be able to have a road map but also to calculate something that would give us that same kind of 10-year return of more on those kind of days? I just wonder what is the five-free days and what are the events that we would recruit for those five-free days. Can we go after the Shrine Bowl? Can we decide to do HBCU games there?

Mr. Kimble said those are the kinds of events that we believe are the right events for the five rent-free use days, but I believe the County, beyond out five rent-free use days is going to go after large events too that are for the community as well. So, I think that our joint goal is to fill that stadium with usage as frequently as we can of the 319 available days for play, but our events, because we are putting tourism dollars as the origin, need to be directed towards large scale events that bring visitors to the community. So, I am not so sure that Battle of the Bands- It might be a little bit unusual, but we want the kind of events that you are talking about for those five rent-free days, but we have to work with the County on the community events to be used in Memorial Stadium.

Mayor Lyles said I would like for us to actually have some understanding, besides five rent free days, that is a little bit more specific. I think this is all good, but I think that

Memorial Stadium has always been a community venue that has supported other efforts. So, if we are trying to invest in keeping some of our colleges strong, invest in bringing some of our traditional- I just wonder if we would have a better arrangement with more specificity than five rent-free days that we would be able to manage.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said the five free-rent days doesn't have as much value to me, because of the fact that we have multiple free-rent days with our other venues. I also have a concern with the fact that we know we are going to be having a conversation pretty soon regarding our current investment, and that is Bank of America Stadium, of which we originally started that conversation in 2013. The County was a part of it, as well as the state, and we could have had a 15-year tether instead of a seven year, and the County and the State backed out of that deal, which caused us some challenges, and it is going to cause some challenges now as we are having future conversations. The \$3 million, even though it was said that we do not see how that would hurt, I have a challenge when we are saying there are no other items currently that we are already committed to or we know commitments that are coming down the pike where that \$3 million can be invested, oppose to this, and reality is our summers are brutal. So, 80 to 100 plus degree heat, you are not- I remember it was probably a good number of years since the last festival was held out there, and you cannot be out there with an umbrella, because then you would be blocking everyone else from seeing, so you cannot take umbrellas in, and you are sitting out in direct heat. The chances of that realistically are very slim as far as who is going to have access to use this facility. If they were talking about some other investments with covering, that might be a different conversation, but also I have challenges with the fact that this property has gone so many years disinvested. It was under leadership, a number of the individuals that identified this funding sat there without investment, and now again we are having a conversation of throwing millions into a project that investments could have been made along the way. I just think that we have other ways to support \$3 million in current requests: bridges; a new hotel, which I am trying to figure out why we are paying for; but a bigger conversation, Bank of America and what is going to happen. I am not going to be supporting this, because I have challenges, but it will be helpful to come back with something other than the five free-rent days, because I specifically remember asking a comparison of how many free rent days have we used on our other facilities, and that information has not been brought back yet, because that would give Council a better idea of are we using? The other side of that is, there are a lot of other costs associated with turning the lights on in Bank of America, whereas with this being an outdoor facility, maybe it might not have as many costs as Bojangles or some of our other facilities. So, having that information I think will be helpful for people to make a better informed decision.

Mr. Bokhari said aside from the intangibles, right now the kind of in the back of a napkin view of this with direct net new kind of ROI coming in, you can say \$420,000 a year in new taxes, giving the assumptions that you have made in the model, then knowing that it is \$12,000 per day for rent, it would be about \$60,000 in deferred rent that we would have in the deal. That is just under a seven-year payback period for the type of capital that we are talking about here. Is there an option to go back and negotiate to say 10 days? That would bring it more to the three-year payback period, something that I am more use to seeing in investments that we make in the private sector. Is that possible?

Mr. Kimble said I do not know. We negotiated to the five. There were lots of conversations about how many. It is kind of bench marked against what we felt we could get for the value of this investment compared to other investments we could make with this money, and we negotiated hard. We asked for more days. We didn't get more days. We feel five is a reasonable amount. I think that it is always subject to somebodies interpretation as to whether or not five is the right number. That is what we were able to negotiate with the County.

Mr. Bokhari said I would just recommend that if we are looking for ways to- We are all going to try to be maximizing out more days in this thing with venues, giving the fact that it is turf and not grass, which is a constraint that existed before. I think it is kind of like



sleeves off of your vest at this point for five or 10. If there is a way to do 10, it would certainly make me get closer to a comfortable level for the intangibles with an ROI.

**Councilmember Egleston** said I am someone who would definitely not want to be out in the middle of this field at noon in July, but I will remind my colleagues that this stadium has lights, that I will assume will continue to be there, so there is the option of going after the sun goes down to do an event, which would be much more enjoyable. Even still, I can tell you as someone who attended one of them, they use to have beer festivals in the middle of the day in the middle of summer, and it did not hurt attendance that it was 90 degrees out there. It lowered my enjoyment of the event, but it didn't stop people from going. You just drink more beer. People will still attend events; people will still hold events, and they will be well attended in the summer, but we have lights out there. We can do it at night. That is an option. Also, I have had heartburn too about the fact that we have not used some of our dates at like the Panther's Stadium, but at Councilmember Mayfield just alluded to a moment ago, the hard cost of opening the doors there are so much higher. These dates are going to be far more useable because there are so many more promoters and events that can absorb the cost of opening the doors of Memorial Stadium than they are at the arena or Panther's Stadium or wherever, so I do not think that is an apples-to-apples comparison, given the absorbent cost of the Bank of America Stadium.

Mr. Kimble said I do want to address the number of days that we have used. Remember that in the first five years of the agreement with the Panthers, we were out of the business of booking events from the end of the season through July 15th because of the construction that was going on in the stadium for each of the first five years. We have booked either two, three, or four additional events with the Belk Bowl every year, even when we only had a booking window from July 15 until Labor Day, for all practical purposes. So, it is a hard thing. It cost a lot to open the doors, and our booking window was very small giving the improvements that were going on in that stadium. I believe there is a new day coming for all of us, with a new owner of the Panthers as well, because I think there will be much more frequent use of Bank of America Stadium in the future by other events than there has been in the past. BB&T Ballpark, we have booked most of the 15 dates. Look at the number of college baseball games that were booked into BB&T Ballpark this year. I think it was either seven or eight, and it might have been nine, and we have 15 dates per year, and we are using it for a lot of community events at BB&T Ballpark. So, there is good return on your investment for the tourism money in these facilities.

Mr. Mitchell said I think that the conversation has been great around our free days and Mayor and Council, what I challenge us to do is to spend some time to really monitor it but then decide what free dates and activities do we want to pursue? CRVA is our marketing arm, but I think that sometimes they need some direction from us, Mayor to your point, is the Shrine Bowl is one of the five? Is big Friday high school one of the five? Is graduation one of the five? Is it a country festival one of the five? Here is what happens at the end of the day Council, the citizens look at us and ask us the question, what have you put in there as one of your free dates? A lot of us, we go blank. We say, well we have the soccer event coming in. So, I think that if we are serious, to Braxton's point, let's be very intentional for what we want to use for our five free-rent days at Memorial Stadium. How many do we have at Bank of America?

Mr. Kimble said the Belk Bowl plus four, we have five total.

Mr. Mitchell said so; we have a total of nine days, so let's think about what are some of the events that we would like to go there.

Mr. Winston said and BB&T and the arena.

Mr. Mitchell said and BB&T, I will be the first one to tell you, I did not know about the 15 days at BB&T.

Mr. Winston said the arena, do we have events?

Mr. Kimble said it is directly tied to the traffic control costs that the CRVA is bearing for the BB&T Ballpark.

Mr. Bokhari said Mr. Chair, maybe that is something that we could have a reoccurring update, as necessary, in the ED Committee or something where- because 15, I am just learning about that now. I am not saying that we want to micromanage, but just to know what is there, I know my colleague and I are working on a music initiative with CRVA and others right now that we would love to know what is available, things like that, and I will be holding my fantasy football draft somewhere this year, and I do not have a location.

Mr. Kimble said I would like to introduce Tom Murray and Steve Bagwell who are going to cover the Bojangles/Ovens Connector Building.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **ITEM NO. 3: BOJANGLES COLISEUM / OVENS AUDITORIUM CONNECTOR FACILITY**

**Tom Murray, CEO, Charlotte Regional Visitors' Authority** said I would like to talk to you about the status and provide you and update on the status of the project at Bojangles and Ovens that we now call the connector facility. First, I would like to introduce in the audience three people here who are in support of the project that are partners in the project: Tara Black, who is the General Manager of the Checkers; Bill Dantos, who is the Vice President of Operations for the Performing Arts Center, then Cathy Buchhofer, our own General Manager for Bojangles and Ovens. On this slide, you will see that the area that we are talking about today, A is Bojangles Coliseum; B is Ovens Auditorium. C is the new connector facility; D, E, F, and G are all Park Ministry buildings, but we use their parking lot to host most of our facilities and have a great relationship with them. H is WCCB Charlotte, and I is the proposed Silver Line that CATS has in place.

So, in 2014, the Community Investment Plan appropriated \$25 million for Bojangles and Oven's Auditorium area redevelopment as part of the east side investments. Following the purchase and the demolition of an adjacent Econo Lodge Motel and construction of an additional parking at the site, \$18.5 million remained. In July of 2017, City Council approved the allocation of the remaining \$18.5 million for a new facility, which would connect Oven's Auditorium and Bojangles Coliseum. Since the investments that the City has been making through the tourism authority and using tourism funds in Bojangles and Ovens, those complexes have improved their performance tremendously. With the addition particularly of Checkers and our relationship broadening of the Performing Arts Center, those facilities are busier than they have ever been historically. In fact, over the last four years, the revenues have doubled on those facilities. That new connector, and Steve Bagwell will talk to you about it a little bit more, is the building that we are talking about in between Ovens and Bojangles to address a lot of the problems that our researches said are needed to keep both facilities viable and keeping our customers happy into the future. So, the objectives of the project are enhance key entertainment and tourism assets on the eastside, creating new strategically located hospital connector facilities, support continued growth in and around the proposed coliseum and Oven's station area, maintain strong historical significance of Bojangles Coliseum and the Oven's Auditorium; certainly strengthening the partnership with the Charlotte Checkers and the Blumenthal Performing Arts. Expansion of both of these facilities will accommodate pre-function and hospitality space for both facilities and concessions for both facilities, which are badly needed; restrooms, which are also badly needed for both facilities; offices for the CRVA and its partners; and storage space for both facilities, which is also badly needed.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said what I wanted to find out is about the offices for CRVA and partners.

**Councilmember Egleston** said this may sound silly, but did we get a cease and desist from the local radio station or something? Why are we- Connector facility is about the most boring name that I could think of for this thing. What happened to The Link?

Mr. Murray said we are no longer using The Link name.

Ms. Mayfield said why?

Mr. Murray said for a number of reasons, one of which is someone else already has a claim to The Link name, and it is not necessary for us.

**Councilmember Driggs** said I will not bring up affordable housing use again for these funds if that helps.

**Councilmember Ajmera** said it is part of the rebranding.

Mr. Egleston said too soon. From a marketing perspective, we can probably come up with something.

Mr. Murray said we are still working on naming rights or naming of the facility, but we are talking about the connector facility, and we have always talked about The Link and the connector facility as just a placeholder name while we are presenting this project to you. It was a project name, not the name of the facility, so is connector facility. It is just a project name.

**Steve Bagwell, VP-Ventures, Charlotte Regional Visitors' Authority** said I did want to take you through some of the renderings and layouts of the project. This is a view from the parking lot side of the venue, where you can see a much enhanced sense of arrival really that is appropriate for the vintage buildings that we are improving here. In the foreground, the pedestrian bridge that leads from the main parking lot into the facility, where you could actually go to either Bojangles Coliseum or Ovens Auditorium, once you enter the connector facility. So, also you see pictured the window into the special event space. That is a critical enhancement for this project that will allow us a tremendous amount of flexibility than we have now. So, you have a really picturesque view out from that and into the facility as you are walking in.

Now we are on the opposite side of the project on the Independence Boulevard side looking at the beautiful glass curtain wall that encloses the pre-function space associated with the connector facility, and again to orient you, the Coliseum is on the right side of this picture, Ovens back to the left, and you can see also that we have enhanced the courtyard area quite a bit between the two facilities to allow for outdoor programming to a greater degree than we are doing today. Also, I will point out letter D, where we are connecting into Bojangles Coliseum so you can enter either way from Bojangles into the connector facility or from the connector facility into the coliseum.

This is an overhead layout of the site plan from way up. I think that the important points to take from this slide are that you can see the enhancements on the Oven's side of the project are much greater than the Bojangles side. That works out very nicely, because the needs are greater as far as restroom capacity and circulation space for Ovens, but also this laid nicely into the recommendations from the Historic Landmark Commission in preserving as much as the exterior in its current state on Bojangles Coliseum.

Here we have a closer up view of the lobby level of the plan, so lots of wonderful enhancements here. First of all the special events space, this is 4,400 square feet of space that will seat 250 folks for a seated banquet, 400 folks for reception style events, and you can see moving to the right letter D. We are envisioning a full service kitchen in this project. It will bring so much capability than we can do today where many of the more complex events for both Bojangles and Ovens are hosted from the Convention Center, so we are actually moving F and B from the center to the complex so there is a much greater capability there to service the events that we envision. Also, letters E on both sides of this map show additional restroom capacity that is so important for both

venues, especially Ovens where we are actually doubling the restroom capacity that is so important for both venues, especially Ovens where we are actually doubling the restroom capacity. Those of you who have visited the complex during intermissions are familiar with how challenging that is. It is really going to add so much better customer service angle at Ovens in particular. Also, we have additional restroom capacity on Bojangles side as well.

Tom is going to speak more about letter K, but I did want you guys to see that. Letter K is what we are calling the performer corridor that allows a private thoroughfare from the back of house at ovens to the front of house. This is a major recommendation that we have gotten from promoters that we need to improve that building. That is an important element. Tom is going to talk about that in a few minutes. Now we are moving down one level and this is the office space that the question came up about. Letter D I believe is the CRVA. Space letter C would be Checker space for offices. CRVA moving into the connector facility also does great benefit to the right where you see the coliseum where the current offices are. It will allow us to program that space differently in a manner that will be very appealing to promoters and will help us draw more business to the coliseum, so in addition to giving a better situation to our team members and having the checkers join us in the complex, it is going to allow for improvements within our existing capital budget at the coliseum.

Mr. Murray said as Steve mentioned, we have something we called the performer corridor. So, promoters and performers often comment about the lack of a private front to back of house performer corridor. The only way that these performers can get to the front of the house from the back of the house is either walking through the audience or walking around the exterior of the building to get to it. So, this has been one of the leading challenges with our performers and promoters willing to recommend. They still do use us at times, but this is an issue that they often discuss, so a dedicated performer corridor addresses performer's safety, customer satisfaction and also our promotor partnership, which we have been working very hard on. Knowing that when promoters are successful and like using our venue, they use it more and we have seen that happen. Cathy and her team were doing an amazing job focusing on promotor satisfaction and promotor success, but clearly this is something that they keep reminding us that this does not work for the facility. So, this is a new add to the project that we are recommending. We also have construction cost, escalation where we cannot reduce scope any further of another \$500,000. So, our recommendation is that rather than going back to CIP, that we tap the tourism one budget to pick up the \$1.5 million in additional tourism funds. Just so you know, there has been an incredible amount of cost engineering that has happened from the original project budget to today. In fact, we have gone down from 45,000 square feet to a 32,000 square feet building to try to stay within budget, and while a lot of sacrifices have been made, the key elements of what we are recommending to you are still there and will work. We think that putting this promotor corridor in this facility, now that we have shrunk the size of the building is a really important part of making sure that we are successful with this project. So, we will be coming back to you on June 25th in our next steps to ask for you to allow for \$1.5 million of the tourism funds to go into the project budget. We will also request approval to award the construction manager at-risk contract for the construction phase of the project, knowing that we have worked really hard on this project and we are hoping to start it this summer of 2018. We hope that we will be able to finish it enough so that when the NBA All-star Game is here and they will have to be using both of those facilities, that we are able to have it in enough of a nice shape that it will not affect that use. We hope to be finished in fall of 2019.

Mr. Driggs said I just wanted to remind everybody, this is general fund CIP dollars that we are talking about, not tourism funds, other than for the \$1.5 million increase, which you would take out of tourism, and I do want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the work that the CRVA does to keep us competitive among cities for events like this. The issue that I raised last year about this was that it is a CIP project that barely resembles what the voters originally approved, and we just heard that we cannot repurpose anything from the CNIP money, because it was all approved by the voters. There is no private-sector partner here. It is not amateur sports, so I think that at



this point, recognizing that we have addressed the affordable housing fund with the \$50 million bond commitment, I just feel that we have an accountability for this as a use of general fund CIP money; therefore, it would be helpful to me if you could make a somewhat more specific business case as to how this investment of CIP money creates benefits or revenues. In other words, let's kind of go back and just reassure ourselves that this use of CIP money is as good as any other use of CIP money, because apparently we have a real shortage of it. If we could not find \$5 million for District 7 just now, and if you look at our capital plans going forward, we see a steep decline to \$180 million in 2020 from \$290 million in 2018 in the Manager's capital budget. So, just for my benefit, if you could kind of put some numbers around the additional events that you hope to be able to book as a result of doing this and the other specific more tangible advantages that we get to the City so that we could look at it as kind of a business proposition.

Mr. Murray said we would be happy to do that; I just would like to remind you that in July of 2017, our Council at the time recommended that we move forward on this project, so I just want to remind that it was not just shifting. It was the Council that shifted it, so we have been acting since then on behalf of the Council to start executing what they asked us to do back then.

Mr. Driggs said I get that.

**Councilmember Winston** said full disclosure; I do have some experience in these buildings. I am a stage hand, so I work in Oven's Auditorium many of times. I use to be a camera operator for the Checkers. They didn't call me when they moved into the new building. I have some questions from a worker's standpoint. Oven's Auditorium is the largest theater in our city, so when shows like Wicked come, that is the only place in Charlotte that they can go, because it is the only place that they can make sense with selling tickets, that amount that they need to make the profit on that time of a show because of how expensive it is, in terms of traveling it comes once every two years. How many shows do you think that we loose from Oven's Auditorium because a performer cannot go unimpeded to front-of-house from backstage? I could imagine any act that needs to sell the most tickets is going to come to Ovens if they need to.

Mr. Murray said I do not think that you could qualify why people do not go there for one specific reason. I think that it is a number of the most important reasons. We do research to find out why people are not choosing Charlotte or why people aren't choosing the Convention Center or why people may or may not choose Oven's or Bojangles Coliseum for those facilities. That is the issue that our customer points out most frequently is a challenge for them and that is what we are addressing them. I can tell you that parking use to be the issue, and we have made come really dramatic steps, including buying an Econo Lodge and tearing that down, and the parking problem has largely slipped to a lower level of risk for our customer, so this tends to be one of the bigger issues that is left. There are always things that you could improve, like the dressing rooms and other things, but these races to the highest level of priority to the team and for us.

Mr. Winston said my last question or request or comment, from a worker's standpoint and honestly from a show's standpoint when it comes to money, Bojangles Coliseum, which use to just be Charlotte Coliseum, which is a historic building, really there are not too many of them like it left in the country in terms of freestanding dome, when was it build?

Mr. Murray said it is 60-years old.

Mr. Winston said it is built to hold shows from 60-years old specifically how you load shows in. There is no loading dock. I think that from my experience, that severely increases the amount that it takes to put on a show, because you need extra labor and time, and we know that those two things are the most expensive parts of doing any job. I do not see any improvements in these plans to improve that, to kind of get it up to at least late 20th century technology, if not 21st century technology in terms of being able

to put shows in. I feel like that would reduce cost greatly and also make it more acceptable for certain shows. In fact, I know that. Have we looked at-

Mr. Murray said we have looked at it. So, in two 60-year old buildings, you have dozens and dozens of things that you would like to do if money was unlimited. What we are trying to present to you today are the ones that we think would have the highest return. Clearly, we do have docks at Ovens. We do not have docks at Bojangles and that would be an ideal situation, but we also do not see today a way to do that easily and affordably, so we have not recommended that remembering that we have spent a lot of money on Bojangles Coliseum already, replacing all the seats, replacing all the ice, sound system, and the score board. So, we have picked the things that we thought were the highest priority. If money was unlimited, we would have a lot of other priorities that we would put in there, but we are presenting to you our business recommendation on what is our highest priority. Certainly we have talked about it, and we know exactly what you are saying.

Ms. Mayfield said I support the idea of at least seeing what that dollar is for a loading dock, because I think that is something of great value over usher's breakroom or some of the other things, and as my colleague mentioned, I understand that in 2007, Council did continue to move forward with the CIP, but I need to make sure that we are having a very transparent conversation. What was presented to Council was that we did not have additional funding, then fast forward a number of years when we started talking about soccer, all of a sudden in our hospitality and tourism, we had additional funds, and from that point on, both myself and my colleague Mr. Driggs started pushing with, well if we have additional funds in hospitality and tourism then we should not be using CNIP, because when we first approved CNIP in 2015, it was because we did not have funds in hospitality and tourism at that time. I also want us to think about the last conversation that we just had with a request for \$3 million. It makes more sense to spare \$1.5 million here than the idea of the other conversation, because when we start adding these things up, that is \$4.5 million that we are looking at in requests, oppose to recognizing what our responsibility is on Council. The question that I had initially that I was hoping you would get to is the CRVA offices. Are we looking at paying rent in both Bojangles and the rent that is going paid right now in the Convention Center, since that is where our current offices are, with the room that we meet at for NASCAR?

Mr. Murray said no, ma'am, we have some of our staff that runs Bojangles and Ovens whose offices are in Bojangles. They do not pay rent and we are just relocating them because the space that is used for offices would be ideal place for other events that we could hold in that space, because it is so approximate to the floor of the arena.

Ms. Mayfield said so; we currently have office space that CRVA is using. What we are doing is looking at relocating.

Mr. Murray said I just want to remind you on your other point, Council spent a lot of time trying to decide how to spend their CIP, and they were specific about an eastside investment. When we brought this back to you, it was to continue Council's wishes to have an eastside investment. That is why we brought this project back, and that is why CIP dollars were being used; it was to fulfill that investment. We no longer think the amateur sports facility in that area is viable because of the parking and the egress where the transportation forms around the facility. So, we did not want to bring other uses in at that point. We were asked to come back and make a recommendation that we continue Council's wishes to invest in the eastside, and I will say that the success that we have had from that is pretty good already from the success that we have had in job creation activity around the facility. The amount that these venues are now being activated in is an amazing success story. I am incredibly proud of the team for the work that they have done, and I think that if you hear from the eastside, they are really pleased to that it is no longer a quiet facility. It is very active and very in use, particularly by folks like the Performing Arts Center were really challenged to use us because of customer complaints in the past, and now they are not receiving those complaints.

Ms. Mayfield said I am over there quite often for events, but for this conversation, I think that it will be helpful for you to bring back what are those dollars for a dock if we are making investments and if that is something that has been requested. If it is not something that has risen to the top of the list that has been requested by those who potentially be utilized in this space, it just seems like it would be something-

Mr. Murray said well, we will tell you what we think about it. We certainly have heard it before and understand if from our own team's effort, like Mr. Winston said. It is one of the many pieces and facts of knowledge that we know about the two facilities, but it was not one of the ones that we decided to recommend to you.

**Councilmember Newton** said I believe that Councilmember Mayfield touched on the initial thing that I was going to ask, which was regarding CRVA's relationship in the space that it is going to be accommodating within the connector here. It sounds to me like what you are saying Tom is that you are going to have that for free, so you are not going to be paying rent on that.

Mr. Murray said we work on behalf of the City to run your facilities, so we do not charge ourselves rent.

Mr. Newton said in that case, I was wondering, Mr. Driggs was asking about the revenues that this is going to provide, and of course there is going to be some potential revenues that would be providing impact to the area as a whole, but what about these amenities within the connector here? We are talking about the concession, the additional office space or this area where folks can hold events, the revenues from that. Who is going to be collecting those revenues?

Mr. Murray said this would become part of the facilities, and the revenues generated by the facilities will continue to go through the same PNL that they go for today. They will go into the CRVA PNL, where half of the revenues that the CRVA used to run its buildings are self-generated, and the other half comes from tourism funds.

Mr. Egleston said you said you wished to hear from some eastside residents. You are about to hear from one. So, I was, at the time, not on Council, but did agree with the logic or at least exploring the possibility of what you all have talked about, which was finding a different funding mechanism at the time. That obviously did not happen, but I do think a case could be made, because in looking at that background, it says appropriate \$25 million for Bojangles Coliseum and Owen's Auditorium area redevelopment. It does not specifically call out that it is just investment in those two facilities but that it is in the area, and I can tell you as someone who lives a mile from this site, that there has been a significant change in that area. You were saying it had not been very active. It had been very active, but it had been active with drugs, prostitution, and things that some of those very seedy hotels and motels were bringing to that area. Those are now gone, and a lot of those problems are gone with them, and now this site is active with productive uses and tax-generating activities, as appose to those that I think are not generating any taxes. It is generating revenue but not any taxes. So, I do think that the investment that has been made to day has been impactful in that area in a way that goes beyond just the tourism aspect of it. So, I thought that was an interesting thing to explore then, and I am glad that we are using tourism funds now for the incremental addition, but I do think that the case can be made that this was a community investment beyond just the scope of the tourism part of it.

Mayor Lyles said I just wanted to add that those two buildings, while they are historic and old, they probably are one of the areas that you see used so frequently. Sometimes I wonder if we have done enough, but I also respect the fact that I am not in your business, and thank goodness you are probably not in mine. You are probably thinking that right now.

Mr. Murray said I do not think that I enjoy budgeting as much as you seem to.

Mayor Lyles said a couple things, all of us have been to Ovens recently I am sure, and even with that space in the lobby, I just wish that it would be more of an amenity, just because you have so many people in there and intermission, so I am hoping that this actually does help in so many ways the restrooms especially, all of those things are needed for an amenity. I just want to go back, because we are not going to discuss affordable housing, and I promised you that I would not bring it up, but I also want to acknowledge that I think that we were talking about something that was a false narrative, that was a choice that did not have to be made and one that we did not have accurate data on. I really just hope that this time when we come back, we are talking about actual dollars, not projected or borrowed. In this case, let's make sure that we are talking about money that is real for this project, and I do not know where we are over all with the tourism fund, but once again, this is the thing that I have been saying most often, let's make sure that everybody in our organization has the same shared information that we can use for any of this. So, when we are talking about moving forward on this project, if we looked at this, the additional \$1.5 million from tourism funds, the money going there, at some point, let's go back and as often as you get here before us Mr. Murray, I know that you come a lot, but I think that at some point, this Council really needs to sit back and say okay, let's look at our tourism funds. Let's make sure that we are in the same place and maybe do that in a more consistent way so that when we are talking about this, we are actually very much aware and not on a learning curve again. So, with that, I think that we are done. This is coming back on the 25th, is that right?

Mr. Murray said for me, but we have one more presentation.

Mayor Lyles said I know that you have one more, but this one on Ovens and the Link?

Mr. Murry said we will be back.

Mayor Lyles said I am sorry, Ovens and the connected corridor or whatever it is going to be called, the facility.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **ITEM NO. 4: I-277 PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE**

**Dan Gallagher, Deputy Director of Transportation** said I am here to present to you, with Ron Kimble, the Rail Trail, I-277 Pedestrian Bridge. Three things that I wanted to discuss with you tonight is first a little background on the Rail Trail and the proposal for the pedestrian bridge. Secondly, we want to talk about the opportunity that we have before us to finally connect the Rail Trail and South End to Center City. Then we will tough upon the potential funding strategy for making this happen.

So, as we go back in time, I need to bring you a little bit back through history. In 2004, we really thought as part of the Blue Line construction that we would also be building a bike and pedestrian bridge with the Blue Line to connect from South End into Center City, but unfortunately, like some projects, budget constraints come into play, and we had a value engineer that key connection out of that project. So, from 2006 to 2018, you really have not been able to get, as a bicyclist or pedestrian, from that South End area, into Center City. Instead, we have had the great example of light rail connecting the Center City, but we have not been able to do the same for peds and bikes.

So, here we are in 2018. We never gave up hope on that. Here we are in 2018, and we finally have an opportunity to make that connection. Throughout this time, as a city, we have envisioned this day. We have planned for it; all of the plans that have happened in this area, the 2020 Vision Plan, your Center City Transportation Plan, South End Vision Plan, your Rail Trail Master Plan, all envision the one day that we would make this connection into Center City. So, since 2006 or so, a lot has happened in South End. We have all seen it, and the Rail Trail has been a really important component of that. It has become a key bicycle and pedestrian corridor through this portion of the City and ultimately as we try to connect to Center City. It is one of those parts of town that we have real transportation choices, and we have an alternative for bikes and pedestrians



to avoid those busy streets. The Rail Trail provides that. It has also become an economic magnet; every time that I talk with Michael Smith at Center City Partners, he talks about that really powerful combination of the Rail Trail and light rail through an area like this and what that has done and how that has really attracted development up and down the corridor, then it has become this key transportation corridor. When we talk about transportation choices for our residents, this is one of the places that you look at and say, we are achieving it. As we emerge into dockless bikes and e-scooters and who knows what is next, the Rail Trail really provides that opportunity to allow it to happen.

Let's talk some numbers. Today, even with it not connected to Center City, the Rail Trail is averaging 2,000 users today, over 5,000 users a year, and we know that, because we counted. So, we have counters on the Rail Trail that tell us by day and by year where we are. Just in the last week we pulled these numbers so far for this year, and we are well projected to go over the 600,000 mark this year on the Rail Trail. With all of the development happening, it is really hard to tell what is the limit for that, especially if we make the connection to Center City. So, when we talk about giving people car-like lifestyle options, giving people choices to achieve and fulfill their daily needs, the Rail Trail does that with the shopping, entertainment options, breweries, with everything that comes and is happening in South End. It is that kind of a place and the Rail Trail really connects it together. Finally, I know a little bit earlier today you talked about place making. If there is one place that we have experimented with place making it is on the Rail Trail. A lot of different folks have done a really good job at trying to make it that iconic place, and it has become one of the places in Charlotte that, when you have visitors in town, you bring them to, because it is a place to show off.

The last thing that I will say before we turn to the second part of the presentation is it is one of those places that have broken down some barriers. It is a place where people have interactions on the Rail Trail and come together as a community, stitches together neighborhoods and residents together, and it is one of those places where you can have an unanticipated interactions up and down the entire corridor. That brings us to the opportunity that we have emerging in front of us, which is we finally have an opportunity to make that Rail Trail connection into Center City. I say that because if you have traveled on the Rail Trail and try to get to Center City, you know it stops abruptly, and it is kind of a what-if moment. You are kind of like, why didn't they continue that? Well, that is why we are here today; we think that there is an opportunity now to continue the Rail Trail and allow you to continue to Center City from South End.

This is the Rail Trail. This orange line is the Rail Trail coming through South End today. It gets to about Morehead Street, and it stops. The I-277 barrier kicks in. What we are proposing is we have Rail Trail leading to Center City, to I-277. We have Rail Trail from roughly the Convention Center out heading north to NoDa. What we do not have is this middle red box, and we are looking to seize on an opportunity to close that critical missing link between South End, Uptown, and certain surrounding neighborhoods. This missing link is important for more than just connecting South End to Uptown. It is really part of a bigger plan to really create a network of bicycle and pedestrian highway network throughout the City.

So, this green line that you see on the right here, that is Little Sugar Creek Greenway, which is part of the Cross Charlotte Trail, which ultimately goes all the way to the University and all the way down to Ballantyne. Irwin Creek Greenway is on the West Side of Center City, and you also know that we have brought to you a proposal, slowly but surely to link together the belt connector that connects basically those four systems together. With that, we begin to stitch together neighborhoods in all directions and give people options in all directions as we stitch together this bicycle network. This will not happen overnight, but these are the kind of incremental decisions that we make that over the course of time, we end up with a complete network that rivals in the other cities.

Let me dive in here. Imagine that you are in a helicopter hovering over I-277 right now. Basically, what we are proposing to do is extend the Rail Trail across I-277 running roughly parallel to the Blue Line Bridge, connecting into the Westin Area and the

Stonewall Station area. Really, to understand how we are proposing to do this, you have to also go a little bit back in time to another really good decision that was made. That was when we had a chance to rethink the I-277/Caldwell interchange. If you notice, this is imagery from 2007 and these big circular ramps that were in the middle of our downtown. That is really not appropriate. You would expect to see that at maybe a suburban mall, but you would not expect to see that in the heart of your Center City, so a lot of folks worked together to reconfigure that interchange and tighten that up to direct ramps and eliminated this ramp and why that is important, Ron Kimble will explain why that is important. That allowed us to free up about 11 acres of developable land right in this corridor. Ultimately, that ended up being a really centergistic moment for the City in that it is ultimately leading to about \$2.7 billion of investment occurring along the Stonewall Street corridor. That is coming in all sorts of forms and sizing. I know that you all have talked about the Stonewall Corridor at time during your meetings, and with that connection, we begin to stitch it all together. So, a picture is worth 1,000 words, and the diagrams are nice, but really when you go out there and just take a snapshot of how quickly the Stonewall corridor has transformed before our eyes and think about the Rail Trail connecting right into the heart of that development and ultimately extending north and all those trails connecting into our Center City, you begin to think about the power of this moment. With that, I want to turn it over to Ron Kimble to walk through a little bit about the funding strategy and next steps and how we can make this a reality.

**Ron Kimble, City Manager's Office** said one slide says it all. We have put together a proposal that takes down the \$11 million that we feel it will cost to build the pedestrian bridge to span across I-277. It would be a free standing bridge. It would be right alongside the rail bridge, but I will walk you through the funding amounts and the partnership that we put together for your consideration. The first part is the City of Charlotte, \$3,103,953; it is an odd number, but it happens to be the residual proceeds from the land sales of the five parcels that were recovered from the interchange modification when we build the NASCAR Hall of Fame. We sold those five parcels for somewhere around \$36 million when they were recovered from the State of North Carolina. We had to pay back a loan to Bank of America and Wells Fargo called the land loan; \$20 million plus interest came to be about \$25 million. We are carrying about \$11 million left over from those proceeds. We have to split the proceeds with the State of North Carolina in the same percentage that we both contributed to the cost of the interchange modification. It is a \$26 million project to redo the interchange. We spend \$21 million; they spent \$5 million. They get 19% of the excess proceeds; we get 81%. Of the remaining \$11 million we get about nine percent and they get about two percent. For the nine percent that we recover, we had to pay back a \$6 million dollar appropriation from way back in 2007. We are carrying now about \$3,103,953. It is a residual amount, because you used \$600,000 from this same account to pay for the City's service agreement for the NBA All Star Game, if you all remember that. So, the residual left over is \$3,000,103. The North Carolina Department of Transportation will get \$2 million of the excess proceeds with Tracy Dodson's help when she was in a different capacity than she is today, with NC-DOT; she was successful in convincing them that maybe they ought to put their \$2 million right here into this project. They have agreed to do that. They also recovered some amounts of money for driveway access and driveway cuts off of Caldwell to a couple of parcels. They have recovered about a \$1,000,040. Tracy was successful in convincing them in put the \$1,000,040 in there. So, that comes to their \$3,288,105. So, given the fact that we had city money and state money of about \$3.1 million \$3.2 million, we decided that we would trek on over to Mecklenburg County, and we asked the County, would you agree to match the City's contribution, and they said sure, we will come up with the \$3.1 million, because it works in terms of our greenway system connecting greenways. We are in the greenway business. We will match what the City is putting in, so they have agreed in their budget for next year to consider \$3.1 million. That brought us to a total of about \$9,492,000; four years ago, this bridge cost about \$7 million estimated. Two years it cost about \$9 million, and now it is \$11 million, and the longer we wait to build a bridge like this, the more costly it is going to become, so we engaged Michael Smith and several others, and we went out to the private sector, and we are fast gaining ground, and we believe that we can raise the \$1,507,942 from private/non-profit and from grants, to arrive at our \$11 million cost estimate for the pedestrian bridge. So, it is a partnership of the City,

County, State, private, non-profit, and grants, to come to an \$11 million to create this crossing that is the, no pun intended, missing link that we cannot talk about from our previous conversation. So, we think that this is a great way for all of us to partner together and come to a conclusion that hopefully you will also support, and this will come back, if you are in agreement, to your meeting next Monday, June 11th for the outline of approving the funding and approving the appropriation, because the money will all come to the City of Charlotte. You have to receive all the other money, and that award ultimately a construction contract for the \$11 million. So, it is an expenditure on one side and the revenue is coming in from your funding partners on the other side. So, there will be an action that will be the action that you will take to move this forward next Monday, again another partnership involving our State, County, and City.

**Councilmember Egleston** said this is I think a good example of how we can continue to be partners in both direction with the County. I think this connection is incredibly critical. I get people all the time that commute using recreational and commuters who use the Rail Trail and then find this to be a huge burden in getting where they want to go. I would propose a name of the Tracy Dodson Connector Facility.

**Councilmember Winston** said we are all government geeks laughing at these jokes right now. It is just getting late. I guess you all should put this behind the Memorial Stadium proposal, because it just kind of evens out, so I guess I would feel much better voting for Memorial Stadium, because we could just- It just evens it all out basically.

Mr. Kimble said so, you may say, why didn't we just even it out and not do anything? It is because of tourism funds. We cannot use tourism funds for a bridge, but we can use tourism funds for a field, but then the County can come back in and partner with us for greenways, because they are in the greenways business. You have to figure out what works and how it fits together, and these are very difficult conversations, but they are important conversations for growing the community together.

**Councilmember Phipps** said I think that this is a prime example of what I was talking about all along that we see now that we have lots of funds to fund bike infrastructure. You noticed that there was not any mentioned that we are using any proceeds from the Bike Plan for this that we have these partners in place, and we have all kinds of trails and things. So, this is just another example that proves my point that there are a lot of avenues of bike infrastructure donation to the City of Charlotte, and \$4 million is just a drop in the bucket compared to things like this.

**Mayor Lyles** said with that, you have heard that it comes back for an appropriation at some point?

Mr. Kimble said next Monday on June 11, 2018.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **ITEM NO. 5: COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT-OUTS**

**Mayor Lyles** said when we started out, we talked about the Committees coming back and making sure that people would share what is going on to allow the full Council to give feedback. Now, I understand that a lot of people go to all the Committee meetings. This may be redundant for some folks, but I do believe that we have better conversations when we each have the opportunity to participate and build upon each other's questions and knowledge and information. So, I would like to actually ask us to focus just a few minutes on each of these so that as we are getting out, there are some of these tonight that have some big actions that are underway that need the discussion. Others are doing a lot of work around moving forward. So, what I would suggest is let's hear from the Chair, let them make their report, and make sure that we are all aware of what is going on, so no surprised happen.



## **COMMUNITY SAFETY**

**Councilmember Eiselt** said the Committee met on May 17th and the Committee heard a briefing on the Police Foundation's final report, which included a review of the report methodology and structure and provided a general review of the recommendations, which we have categorized into the six pillars that follow the 21st Century Policing Task Force. We decided not to vote on the report to accept it as our own, because the topic came up that Vice Chair Winston did not feel that the accounts recorded in the report, the accounts of the protest itself were complete. He wanted an opportunity to include comments on that. Basically, we have decided that is something that did need to happen and that Mr. Winston is working with Deputy Chief Estes on that to be able to record his accounts of the events of that evening, then we will have to decide how to include that, if we include that as an addendum or make sure that is recorded along with the Police Foundation Report. So, with that, we decided to have an additional meeting so that we could hear the rest of the recommendations. The additional Community Safety meeting will be next Monday at 10:30 a.m.

**Councilmember Winston** said I just wanted to clarify. It wasn't necessarily that my account specific to September 16, 2016 were being included; there were two, basically portions, of the Police Foundation report, one that looked at CMPD's response to the demonstrations of September 2016 and the other that outlined the recommendations coming out of that. I thought that it was very important to get the facts of the actual account as it occurred on the street, kind of the totality of it, because as the Police Foundation laid out at the beginning of their presentation, it was the most recorded, photographed, written-about event in Charlotte history, but when it came to the actual telling of the facts, the chronological events, it was very watered down. It was very singular sourced, and it did not include all of those primary resources. So, I believe that if we are to really understand, this was part of the table-top exercise that we dealt with a couple of weeks or months ago at this point in time. If we are to really understand what we did well and what we did wrong and improve our responses to extraordinary situations, as we move forward, we have to be operating from a complete and accurate set of facts, and I do not think that is what is in the Police Foundation's report, not just based on my experience or the evidence that I have but the totality of information that is out there in our spectrum.

Mayor Lyles said I think that is an excellent point, and I would encourage the Committee to maintain the police report, because that in itself is a document that is represented of them and not necessarily any other perspective, and I think that we ought to try very hard to bring both of those items forward. I think that it is time in some ways to actually look and integrate our table top exercise with social media and communications portion of it. We have two things that I think really would drive this to coming forward that we could, as a Council, I would assume that the Committee is going to make a recommendation to accept the report with comments, and those comments would be inclusive of those other areas or areas that recommend, so I think if all of us who sat on this side of the table versus the other side of the table, have invested over \$400,000 in a report that I think that the Council either should say we accept or we adopt or whatever the appropriate action from the Committee discussion. It needs to be acted on, because I think that this community is owed a response to the work that was done, and adding the additional topics to say this is what the other side of the people who were there is an important part of what we want to chronicle and have. So, I would say that we would hope that the committee could move forward in the next- I have said this. We have had once policy item in six months. Today is our six-month anniversary. Did anybody notice? I want you all to know this is our six-month anniversary serving together as this Council, and I think that it is time for us to begin to pull some of these policy items out so that we can begin to act on them, so I would assume it would be the police report, chronicling of the activities from the communities perspective and others, as well as integrating some of our communication's table top on looking at that. An opportunity to move something forward I think is really important to this community before the summer is over.



Mr. Winston said that is sort of how I had framed my request that if we were to receive this, that it be with some, lack of a term, protest or comment, and we had a pretty lively discussion within that. We agreed that we need to be moving forward at every point in time, so I do not want to put any words in anybody's mouth, but Chief Putney and I have talked, and we both agreed that we need to be operating from the same set of facts, so working with Ms. Eagle and Deputy Chief Estes, myself and the rest of the committee, we are going to try to find a way to get this to full Council, while also coming up with a process internally that allows us to tell the whole picture of what actually did happen and what we really need to learn from.

Ms. Eiselt said that is the goal, then with regards to the Domestic Violence Advisory Board, we had a presentation from the Advisory Board, and with their recommendations based on their annual report, they came up with a budget of roughly a million dollars that they felt included different buckets of money that they would need to move forward to have a really healthy system to assist our domestic violence victims. When we broke that down, there were a couple of different categories that we looked at. A large percentage of that money, roughly \$750,000, so three-fourths of that had to do with housing, rental subsidies, finding housing for victims, and having a person that worked with the shelters to help find the housing for victims, and we felt like we could have that discussion in part of our own housing allocation, so that was not something that we were going to act on right now.

The second part of it is the e-Filing, and that has to do with the software and two temporary individuals that would be needed to help the Clerk of Courts with the new software program. My understanding is that the County has allocated funds for that in their budget; so, at the moment, we do not see a need for us to do anything about that. That was basically a million dollars. There are roughly some additional monies requested for implementation, people to help implement some of those programs. At the moment there, we really were not sure if there were an ask or not. We were going to do a place holder, but it looks like most of that is accounted for, and we will continue to further refine that, especially as the County moves forward with their budget, but it is our understanding that they are going to take care of the E-Filing recommendations. So, that was the discussion on domestic violence.

The Family Justice Center study, the last couple weeks ago, the organization came to town that is doing the consulting work that was paid for by the grant through the Jaime Kimble Foundation. So, I know that I was there. I think that Councilmember Winston was there as well for their kick off. Councilmember Phipps was there as well, so they came to town for a couple of days, and they are looking at our system and understanding that, then they will come back with recommendations to the Foundation, so at the moment, we do not have a direct role in that, but I will look forward in seeing what their recommendations were. It was a very interesting report. That was sort of an information only piece right now. As I mentioned, we will have an additional meeting on June 11, 2018 that will focus on the Police Foundation recommendations. We will wait to get an update from Mr. Winston and Deputy Chief Estes on how you have decided to record additional perspectives on the protest, and it is our intention that will be the complete report then that we would accept as the Council's so that we can have a full and balanced perspective to work from and focus on the outcomes and recommendations. So, that is it.

**Councilmember Phipps** said so, what is the revised timeline on the when can we expect that to be accomplished, finishing out the report?

Mr. Winston said I think the plan is out of next week, we will just be dealing with the Police Foundation Report, so we will be moving forward with this. I think what Deputy Chief Estes and I are going to be working on is going to be something that we are going to look to dive into immediately, but it will be separate from the Foundation Report.

Ms. Eiselt said then the question will be will we be comfortable with our second June meeting to go ahead and accept the Police Foundation report and recommendations? That will be the focus of that meeting.

Mayor Lyles said I want to draw the distinction. We can accept the report and may not agree with every recommendation. So, accepting the report is that you have received that the community understands it and you have accepted it but comments on it, and I do not know that there is any urgency, because I think that if they had that time to do this, the time to actually put together something that could be presented as a part of a community reaction, probably merits even going to the Levine or someplace where papers are kept, around that. So, if it is done well, I think we ought to try to figure out a way to do that. I would say accepting of the report with comments and recommendations would be-

Ms. Eiselt said at the same time?

Mayor Lyles said yes.

Ms. Eiselt said so then that might not happen by the June 20, 2018.

Mayor Lyles said it does not have to include the community's report, which I see as something that you are saying that you can work on continuously.

Mr. Winston said yes, what Deputy Chief Estes and I are hopefully going to do will be from us, the City. This is what happened; this is the fact of the matter. This is what happened in total. I think the front of the crowd, back of the crowd, side of the crowd, and this is how we respond.

Mayor Lyles said but it would be a report by the community.

Mr. Winston said if we are the community.

Mayor Lyles said no, I mean it is going to be written by people that were there, and we were not there. As a people, all of us were not there, so it is a report from people who were there, to this Council.

Ms. Eiselt said in other words, we will not be amending the police report, but we would connect the two, so we would not want to just file the Police Foundation reports without mention to the fact that the City felt that we needed to include additional perspectives from the public.

## **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**Councilmember Mitchell** said ED Committee met on May 24<sup>th</sup> and first of all let me say thank you to Debra Campbell. Her last meeting was May 24, 2018, and I would like to appreciate Debra's leadership with the ED committee, and welcome Ms. Tracy Dodson. It was Tracy's first meeting joining with us, so we really appreciate Debra getting us to this point.

On May 24, 2018, the ED Committee is Mr. Vice Chair, Mr. Driggs and Dr. Justin Harlow, LaWana Mayfield, and Matt Newton. We really talked about providing background and vision for Eastland Mall redevelopment. The previous community engagement component and overall a recommendation, evaluation, consideration, and criteria, and not to belabor the point, but we spend a lot of time talking about the proposed, how did it fit into the 10 winning traits of tomorrow? Will this development, I would also allow us to partner with other potential non-profit and public agencies, and we had a great discussion about the mixed use and estimated price points of each diverse price point housing. So, then we really talked about other words that we were missing, as we talked about the redevelopment. So, we used the word like destination should be a part of our vision. Councilmember Newton would say that the project serves as a catalyst for the redevelopment of 69 acres, and Councilmember Mayfield really talked about that we ought to look at the collective experience as a group and not just how long a team had been together. So, Mayor and Council, what we need from you all today is probably just a head nod that we are going in the right direction on the proposed evaluation criteria. So, I asked staff to provide this one sheet and we can go

through it. This is what the ED Committee kind of felt very comfortable. Number one, qualification and experience of the development team, you can see that there are three built points under that and I am not going to insult your ability to read. Number two, Mr. Driggs amendment, financial qualifications, and strategy and we had three bullet points under that. Probably of my favorite is project approach and timeline. Could we make sure that this project could be done in a timely fashion? Then to Councilmember Newton, master planning and due diligence, we would like to make sure that we are going in the right direction, get you all feedback, a nod of the head to say yes or that you think that there is something missing, because we are talking about evaluating the proposal that we have based on the full criteria that is laid out.

Mayor Lyles said questions or comments on this material as submitted? Take a minute to read it.

Mr. Mitchell said thank you all for attending our meeting on May 24, 2018. We really appreciate it. It really helps when we have outside Councilmembers there to really just hear the presentation first hand. We are going to make sure that the food gets better.

Ms. Eiselt said one question that I have is when we decided to stop after Phase One with Jacob's Engineering; it was because we didn't want to move forward until we knew that we had a commitment from a developer, and I asked this in the committee and I wasn't sure that I understood how we are moving forward. Is there a plan to still work with Jacob's Engineering or an engineering firm or does this new process replace that? It replaces that?

Mr. Mitchell said yes, you are right. We put a halt on an additional \$400,000 that we had earmarked for phase two, because I think that our conversation then was; let's make sure that the development community was showing some interest. Part of our new criteria though is to allow whatever team that we choose to continue that community engagement without our \$400,000. We want to still retain that, because I think our position was, let's use that part of redevelopment and not use as part of an additional study.

Ms. Eiselt said okay, so is there any type of a commitment at all financially as a part of this criterion? That is kind of what we were leading to in phase two was saying we are going to split the cost of that with the developer so that they know we are really serious. Is there any kind of hooker on this that shows a commitment? We can tell if they have a financial commitment, but how do we keep them on the line and show that they have some skin in the game on this or don't we?

Mr. Mitchell said I do not think that we have had that discussion in the committee meeting. That is a good point; we can have that discussion.

Mayor Lyles said I just want to agree with Ms. Eiselt on this. If you are starting out, and I am just going on our prior experience, where people kept saying I have got it, and they never produced it, so at some point you have to get someone to sign on a dotted line or put up some ability to show a bond or an escrow or some sort of thing, because this is a huge project. It says anticipate a public investment, but I think that if there is an agreement, there has to be a developer agreement. I am just seconding.

Mr. Mitchell said to me, this is a strong suite of Ms. Tracy Dodson being in the public/private world, and I am confident that either through a letter of interest or some type of agreement that will be in place to make sure that a developer has the ability and has skin in the game, I feel confident that she brings that skill set to the table.

Mayor Lyles said so; skin in the game means more than just a letter of interest?

Mr. Mitchell said exactly.

**Councilmember Driggs** said to amplify on that, I had talked in the meeting about the fact that we do not have the RFP. People will recall that conversation, and my point

about that was that it would have been a lot more specific. So, on the other hand, I think that where we have come out is four groups have stepped up, right? Based on the work of the consultant. I think that our next step needs to be to develop capital structures, to put some numbers around it, and that will be part of our due diligence. That is why this second point is important, because we need to know what kind of financial commitment is required. That in term would probably lead to a Memorandum of Understanding or some sort of an agreement where we give a party that would deem to be responsible using its criteria, the green light and a certain amount of protection and comfort that we are going to work with them. From that will come in stages, the levels of actual underwriting commitment to get it done. So, there is a little bit of iteration that goes on here. The thing was closed at that meeting, which I did not agree with, but we are now at the point where we have these four people who were identified as being thoughtful and having solutions and being responsive, and we are basically going to identify one of them.

**Councilmember Egleston** said just a request for the Chair, as you mentioned a lot of non-committee members on Council have been attending your meetings, because several things that you guys have on the docket right now are of interest to a lot of us. I know this one in particular is of interest to a lot of us. As you mentioned, lots of folks have been there. One of the two meetings dates that was sent out today, Monday, June 25, at 11:30 a.m. is, while I know there are no overlaps in the Committee members of Transportation and Planning and Economic Development, I know there is overlap in the interest of those two committees, so my request would be that the meeting specifically and future meetings as you consider the dates and times of them, not be in conflict with other committee meetings, so that those of us who are interested could still be in attendance.

Mr. Mitchell said point well taken Sir.

Mayor Lyles said I heard Mr. Driggs use the word closed, and we are dealing with four people. Since we have approved-

Mr. Mitchell said Mayor, to address your concern, in the Committee, to Vice Chair, we had discussion about closing it to the fourth proposal that we had received; however, because of the opportunity zone that we had presented back here in March, I would like to amend it just a little bit to say that we would like to allow new proposals that would come in that would utilize the opportunity zone concept. If you will remember those were the ones where we had to rush and the State had to approve, and Eastland just happens to be in the opportunity zone. So, we do not want to miss out of any developer who may want to take advantage of that opportunity. I would like to kind of modify what we did in the committee.

Mayor Lyles said I guess for me it is an and, like we have the four, and we just approved opportunity zones on that site. It is like adding this huge tax break for workforce. If someone came in and said, I am going to take advantage to that, I think that we would be hard pressed to say we closed this, and it is too late. I just wanted to make sure that both of those things would give us the capacity to do our very best. Now, when they fight over which opportunity zone it is but I think that we all want them to be able to choose the one if they can develop on it to develop and assess that.

Mr. Mitchell said let me just reiterate they have to come in using an opportunity zone. I do not want people thinking it is back open again. They much have a separate proposal that relates to the opportunity zone.

**Councilmember Mayfield** said since committee did walk away with closing it, I can see why we would want to give opportunities. Does that mean that the four also have the opportunity to amend what they have submitted, since we have added additional information since when they initially presented to us. Have we had staff reach out to the four to say that we are going to give an opportunity and this also could be an opportunity if you feel like you need to amend, just to make sure that you have a balanced process?



Mr. Mitchell said we were going to make that call after we get some agreement.

Mayor Lyles said but you might not get anybody.

Ms. Mayfield said we might not, but I just want to make sure that if we do, we give the current four the opportunity to amend if they so choose, and that is by us reaching out to them, because as far as they are concerned, it was closed, because all of them were in attendance at our Economic Development Committee meeting.

Ms. Eiselt said have we let developers know about this opportunity zone for Eastland?

Mayor Lyles said we have not; I do not think that we have done any work to talk about opportunity zones coming up. It is not just Eastland. It is Freedom Drive-

Mr. Mitchell said we have 12 in the City of Charlotte, four clusters.

Mayor Lyles said I think that we do need to go and make that is something that is known and visible and available. We haven't gotten the final yet. We have not gotten a letter. We have gotten a response from the Department of Commerce saying that we have approved, but they have to go to the President, and once the President or whomever is going to sign off, I do not know if it is the Urban Initiatives Office or whatever, but the states were allocated, so we are pretty certain.

**Councilmember Ajmera** said I just need to clarify a few things. So, I know that committee had voted to close the proposal submission. So, this opportunity zone that you are referring to, I know that Eastland is part of that. Is that an entire 69 areas that is part of the opportunity zone or just certain?

Mr. Mitchell said entire.

Ms. Ajmera said entire, okay, so I guess would that mean then that the line is open again?

Mayor Lyles said it would have to meet the criteria of the opportunity zones.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, so there are certain criteria. I know that I had brought this up at the committee meeting, where certain developers had expressed concerns about how they had presented their proposal that includes their vision and the overall plan for the site. Now that it is out in public, some of them are concerned about how anyone could replicate that, because usually most of these presentations and negotiations happen with staff, but this is the first time we have done it where we have presented in front of the committee. So, I guess how would we address that concern?

Mr. Mitchell said I think that the common conversation that we had in the committee was trying to make sure that we had integrity in the whole process and we were being as fair as possible. I think that what we are trying to say now is if the current four would come or any new proposal, as long as they meet the opportunity zone criteria, we will accept it. So, we are not just going to have anybody come in and say hey I have an idea and I want to submit it. We are not accepting those proposals.

Mayor Lyles said have they submitted and proprietary information?

Mr. Mitchell said no financial information is on the website.

Mayor Lyles said even with that, I talked to Mr. Newton about this. I have seen some of the proposals, and they have logos on them, and those logos did not have any letters of endorsement or commitment to them, so to me, the information that they have presented, and I went through all of them, they have used that as a prototype or an example. They do not have commitments from all of those logos that they showed on those programs. So, it is basically a big picture, and you are going to dive down into that with those four points.

Mr. Mitchell said exactly.

Mayor Lyles said I just want to make sure, because it is easy to cut and paste a logo somewhere.

Ms. Ajmera said I just need to understand opportunity zone. I think that is the first time we have heard of this concept was a few months ago when we adopted those. What are some of those criteria, if you could just give us more information on that?

Mr. Mitchell said let me take the big one as far as low-income census tracts area where the poverty rate is 20 percent and greater of family income. So, that is just one criterion. I can send the rest out to Council just so everyone would get comfortable.

Mr. Phipps said I know that we say we have 12 opportunity zones, but the one that is most immediate is the Eastland one. So, are we going to communicate- We cannot communicate until such time that they have been approved by-

Mayor Lyles said by the federal government.

Mr. Phipps said but we do not know when that is going to be, right?

Mayor Lyles said we can find out. It is pretty close. It has been a while since they have submitted it. I do not think that it is going to be two years. We have done Eastland Mall proposals for at least two years, so we have to do better. Do you have enough feedback Mr. Chair?

Mr. Mitchell said yes, are the heads nodding that we are in the right direction?

Mayor Lyles said this is an important project; thank you for the work of the committee. I know that it is hard, but it is going to pay off for us.

## **ENVIRONMENT**

Ms. Ajmera said we have had very productive sessions, so this is our second policy that was just adopted earlier today, thanks to the committee members for their hard work and staff. They have been working for the last several months on the resolution that was in front of us in November. I know that we were charged with adopting a resolution that is not just aspirational but achievable and inspirational. So, the language that was adopted today will be emailed out to you, and that address is not just the clean energy plan but overall broader goal of being a sustainable and resilient city. That includes our waste, agriculture, energy, and also includes some of the sustainability initiatives that we will be doing along the way, so just circular economy. Followed by the adoption of the resolution, which will be coming up for a vote on June 25th at the Business Meeting. We will be bringing forward strategic energy action plan that will have all of the details of the short term, midterm, and the long term goals that you all had asked for and we have had multiple stakeholder sessions where we have met with various environment advocates to faith community to business community leaders, and the language that was adopted today was recommended by many stakeholders, and also we have had conversations with Duke Energy on this resolution, and this is the first time that Duke Energy is also at the table. So, I think that this is a big achievement for our City, because we have come a long way where we have included multiple stakeholders from various communities, including Duke, because we do recognize that we have two nuclear plants here, so our resolution also accounts for that and recognizes that.

There were some key changes that were made to address some of the concerns by stakeholders, and you will see that in your update, where we had changed some terminology. I am not going to go into a lot of details here. It is very technical, but I am sure that you can all read the update. So, that is on the resolution.

Mayor Lyles said may I ask, I wonder if the committee really feels like we need a resolution versus a plan.

Ms. Ajmera said there is actually both, so first will be the resolution, then you will see strategic energy action plan. That would have all the details. So, the resolution is more high level, showing our commitment to what we will be doing. So, what we will be doing is in the energy action plan.

Mayor Lyles said I look at this like I look at a number of our plans. We usually have a plan and it is like an energy plan that has a vision statement, versus a resolution that is kind of like, I call them a fancy proclamation, versus having an actual vision statement that says this is where we are trying to go. It is just something I was not expecting that you necessarily needed to have language that just was therefore, therein, and all of that versus consistent with our other plans we usually have something like the vision statement and then the action plan all together

Ms. Ajmera said committee felt that we needed a resolution, because there are several grants that we will be applying for. One is Mayor Bloomberg's program, which when you have sort of a resolution that shows the City's commitment to being a sustainable and resilient place for all of our residence, it just shows the leadership that we are taking. So, I would say that a resolution certainly helps, but also we are not putting an aspirational resolution like we had done in the past. I know a lot of other cities have done that where it is more aspirational, but ours is actually more achievable, and that is the reason staff has done so much work looking at our baseline data to come up with the goals that we have set in our resolution.

Mayor Lyles said the most important thing is the plan and the goals, and I think that is where we really show our commitment to adopting the plan. I just feel like with accepting the Police Foundation report, approving the plan, just the thought, I wonder about that, and I would like for you to think about it.

Ms. Ajmera said the way that I see this is similar to the Community Letter, where we had like housing, community safety, or good paying jobs. It is similar where we are showing that here is our sustainable and resiliency commitment, and we are going to follow this with a detailed plan that staff has been working with for several months now.

Mr. Driggs said I think that this is a replacement for a very hastily drawn and quite general thing that we looked at the end of last year, and personally I appreciate the fact that it is a resolution, because it is very far reaching and profound. This is not a bicycle path plan for \$4 million. This is something that is going to reach into all areas, and I do not know whether we have enough information about what types of commitment, resources, limits, whatever it is, yet to call it a plan.

Mayor Lyles said so; it is not a plan coming forward? I thought that it was a plan and a resolution.

Mr. Driggs said no.

Ms. Ajmera said the plan will be coming in October.

Mr. Driggs said this is a statement of intent, and it needs to be followed up with more work that is going to take action-

Mayor Lyles said I am sorry. I misunderstood you; when you said it was a resolution and a plan, I thought you were bringing both of them forward.

Ms. Ajmera said not at the same time. So, the resolution then the action plan will be followed in a few months.

Mayor Lyles said okay, that helps a lot. I like the use of statement of intent versus the whatever.

Mr. Winston said that is what I was going to clarify Mayor; it is sort of like kind of where we are with this UDO process. UDO will be the plan to implement the vision, so we really need this vision, which is this resolution in place first and I think that what we did today in committee and should it pass Council, is something that is going to kind of shape- I would imagine that a plan like Councilmember Driggs is really going to involve buying from all different parts of the City. So, to get there, we are going to have to look at we kind of develop and grow moving forward to achieve these goals. So, for instance as we kind of do go forward with this UDO process and step back to look at this comprehensive vision, I imaging that this resolution will shape how we look at formulating this vision and how we take steps to achieve that vision. I really do think that this pragmatic approach is necessary and with merit.

Ms. Ajmera said we also had one more item in our agenda, which was the war on litter. Mr. Phipps had referred that to the committee, so we had one session on this topic. So, we reviewed our current ordinance for littler control ordinance. We also looked at various programs and resources that are in place. Finally, there is a new pilot program that is led by Solid Waste and C-DOT, in response to some of the neighborhood requests for centrally located bins. That is actually underway currently in NoDa, and depending on the success of this program, we would potentially look at replicating this across the City. Also, staff is looking at some other tools and resources. So, we will be providing a follow up report in the fall. Those are our only two items. I think in the last six months, we have delivered two policies. One was for the Storm Water and you saw results being reflected in the budget, and this is the second one, which is the energy resolution, and the budget that the majority of you had supported does have an additional position for a strategic energy action plan, so that will give us additional resources to put together not just a plan, but also start working on achieving some of those goals moving forward.

Mayor Lyles said let's just remember our process that once the committee has something that comes forward, it would go to a Dinner Briefing where we would have everybody come in, then it would go on the agenda at the next meeting, then we will continue to do that with the resolution of statement or intent that we have coming up. So, we will probably see that mid-June.

**Councilmember Harlow** said it sounds like a lot of ground work has been put in here by committee and staff. I know that we have been getting a lot of emails and what not from various stakeholders, a lot in opposition, and you are right. It is very technical. It is allot of nightmares of my organic chemistry days and what not. Do you feel as Chair that a lot of this has been addressed or we are going to get another draft and there is going to be another barrage of emails as it relates to this? The concerns are a little bit of, is this ready for a Dinner Briefing?

Ms. Ajmera said fair enough, in fact, I would say that this is the fourth iteration that we have seen, so we have a stakeholders committee made up of various subject matter experts who all they do is work on this. They go in depth about this. I also had to get up to speed and so on. I will tell you staff has worked very closely with them. Some of them were not comfortable with the wording, but we also had to make sure that we are being realistic and pragmatic, because I understand that was the charge that was given to the committee, but at the same time, we wanted to make sure that Duke Energy continues to be our partner in this process. There is a fine line there. I would say when we had our stakeholder session today before our committee's vote at noon; there were several changes that they had strongly suggested. I would say that we worked with those stakeholders, and we came up with a language where everyone is satisfied at this point. So, I am sure over the next few days, you will get an email saying how satisfied all the parties are, and I think we have worked tremendously hard in the last few months to make sure we not only address the concerns of environment stakeholders but also our economic development stakeholders and faith communities. I can say this very confidently that I think that we are at the right place now, and I think that we are ready to move forward. I will say this; we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of good. So, even though this is the nearly perfect language that we have, let's make sure that we do not



continue to vet this further. I think that this has been vetted by many scientist, stakeholders group, various stakeholders. I think this is as best as we can do. I think that today I would say that when we had the Environment Committee meeting at noon, this was the first time that I had seen people applauding at the committee meeting, because a lot of Environment Committee meetings are not attended by various stakeholders, but residents do want us to pass a resolution and send a message that we are taking a leadership and that we are also being very pragmatic in that leadership.

Mr. Phipps said the resolution is one phase then the plan, and that is something that is going to have to be approved and adopted by the Council as well, right?

Ms. Ajmera said yes, so the reason that we divided into two phases was depending on this, once it is approved, staff is going to have to actually do even more work, but obviously this is contingent upon adoption of this resolution. When we say strategic energy action plan, you are literally talking about 8,000 of our employees, because staff Rob Phocas, and his team are talking with every single department and trying to figure out a way of how can we be more energy efficient, and how can we be effective in achieving this goal that we have set in our resolution.

### **HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT**

Ms. Mayfield said I would like to start out with thanking my committee members and that will be: my Chair, Mr. Ed Driggs; Mr. Egleston; Dr. Harlow, and Mr. Newton, and to our honorary member, Mr. Bokhari who comes to all of our meetings. Of course our purpose, which everyone knows, ultimately we believe that every neighborhood in our city should be valued and celebrated, and the committee works to insure that each neighborhood is livable and distinct by developing, reviewing, and recommending policies and opportunities that align with creating great neighborhoods. We had a meeting earlier today where we had a discussion around our housing and strategy policy; we have another meeting coming up where hopefully from committee we will actually support a recommendation that will come to full Council. Our Housing Charlotte Plan represents a 10-year plan that comprehensively addresses the housing affordability challenges and the limited access to opportunity through the creation of mixed-income communities, which triggered more than a year ago, me trying to change that conversation from affordable housing to diverse price-point housing, because it is a different conversation. When we look at the final plan that is going to guide our implementation of short term, one to three years; medium, four to six; and of course long term, seven to 10 years.

At our May 16<sup>th</sup> meeting, we spent quite a bit of time reviewing and affirming the draft plan policies that were identified, and that draft is partly what we reviewed today. The priorities center around the who, where, and how. Who should be targeted at what AMI levels? Where should the City focus our investments from a local perspective, and how do we plan on focusing the investments meaning expansion, new creation of diverse price point housing, both rental and home ownership, preservation of existing housing stock, and support of those anti-displacement efforts both in housing, neighborhood transition and multi-family where we are seeing purchases happening. While the committee has determined that no production goals should be set at this time, staff is currently reviewing all the available data to determine if the net number of affordable units, both those newly added, as well as those lost due to demolition can be determined to help inform production goals in the future. We got to that because of our initial 5,000 unit goals in five years that we then accelerated to three years. How do we balance that with the units that we are losing? Staff provided a summary of the key strategies and tools recommended in the plan to address expansion, preservation, and anti-displacement efforts. Once the Housing Charlotte plan is reviewed and approved by Council, it will help inform the consideration of new policies and the review and update to a number of existing policies, strategies, and ordinances, such as the housing locational policy. Do we need to update it knowing what we know today and how growth is happening?

Affordable housing at transit station areas, naturally occurring affordable housing, which we hear as NOAH, those being those units that are older units from the 70's and 80's, also looking at tax-relieve grants, voluntary housing density bonus, just to name a few, and we will continue looking at these, and due to the importance of the work, again we will be meeting June 13<sup>th</sup> and hopefully to finalize the plan if needed. At our meeting today, we did receive our Housing Charlotte strategy plan, just a draft, that all of the committee members will be reviewing and sending any questions that we have. This is the first review of an actual draft document, which is a follow up to our first ever housing retreat that we had two months ago now. At a previous meeting, the committees discussed broad strategies, but we did not have a detailed draft plan that reflects both the committee and the community stakeholder issues, concerns, and proposed strategies related to the delivery of diverse price-point housing. I am not going to read through all of it, but I do want to give time for any of my committee members. I do want to share that in our planned priorities, we are asking a question of who to target when we talk about the resources, so what percentage of 80 percent, 60 percent to 40 percent, and 30 percent and below? We have some initial numbers that are 25 percent to 30 percent. They are still based on what we see in the community, an opportunity for us to be more flexible and looking at high-opportunity areas for a focus of our investment. That is where we are seeing a transition and seeing more people who are more at risk due to displacement. Higher income areas where housing is limited, and making sure that we have that access to transportation.

Mr. Driggs said this is a frame work. I think that staff prefers to think of it as a framework, so it consolidates all of the conversations that we have had, the research reports, into a set of policies and goals. We intend to work through the summer to take it from that point forward to a more developed plan. The committee is going to look at it again, as the Chair pointed out. I think that it has been made public, right? Which means that any member of Council can see it, as it is currently proposed, we got it today, so there is no endorsement yet from the committee. It is something we are thinking about, and the goal is then on June 11th, for the committee to make a recommendation to full Council that we adopt this as basically a jumping off point for a process that will go on for a few months to get more specific about what we are trying to achieve in housing.

Mr. Harlow said I know that I missed the committee meeting; I will be there next week. I did get the opportunity to look at the draft; I talked to Ms. Wideman a little about it. I think it is the same concept. This is a framework that we have had ongoing discussions. This is a big, beefy document that crunches a lot of data, but I think steers us to a direction that I know some Councilmembers have had some concerns about with saying hey, if we know that we are going to put \$50 million on a ballot, then whatever the private sector is going to put there, the question has always been, what is the plan? This is really kind of that driving force of, here are some new strategies that we have not done. I am very supportive of that, specifically the NOAH and anti-displacement ones and challenging ourselves a little bit, especially in that income strata below 30 percent, knowing that yes, deals fall apart at a certain level, we have hit that nail all the way in the ground to understand the finances of it, but challenging us to say okay if the State is only going to do certain things, what could we do with the flexibility locally that could be a good benefit to the population that we know is in need the most?

Ms. Mayfield said when we look at how we look to focus our investments, that is where we are also looking around the specifics and where over the summer we will have time to dig into it a little more regarding expansion, preservation, and again a real focus around anti-displacement and recognizing that we are not trying to establish that production goal yet but really creating the language.

Mr. Egleston said I wanted to reiterate the charge that you gave to the committee earlier today to myself, the rest of the committee, and anyone else on Council who is interested. We spent a big part of our Council Retreat in January talking about housing. Two months ago we did a Housing Retreat unlike anything any other committee has done. The last HAND meeting we spent talking about the draft of the plan, and today we spend talking about the draft of the frame work, so I think that all that time was needed,

because this is probably one of the most complex, nuance, important issues that we deal with on Council this year, but I would challenge myself and everybody else who is interested and wants to give feedback to not only go through that framework between now and the next meeting but to talk to staff offline before that next meeting so that we can come out of the next meeting with action of adopting it and moving forward, because I do think that we have to take action in the committee now that we have put in the necessary time, and I hope that we do not bring our questions just to that meeting but that we start to address them with staff ahead of time so that we get the answers out and have shared information to move forward.

Ms. Mayfield so, for those who are at home, when you go online, this is what you are looking for. This is our draft, and this draft has been sent out to all of Council during the time that we have been meeting, so if we have any members of Council that also may have questions outside of the committee- this is an opportunity for clarification; this is a great foundational piece that we are at where that we can actually look at some real goals, identify, and be able to report to the community that here is what we are doing, and it is not just a focus on one; here is everything. Give us the \$50 million; as a community here is what we can do with it. Private sector, that three P, if you bring additional funds to the table, this is what we can do to further our goals within our community.

Mayor Lyles said I am really appreciative of the work being done by the committee, and I would like to just add, after the committee's adoption and the plan is put together, I think that the most important thing is that we all know that we cannot solve this problem as a City organization, that the housing issue is much bigger, deeper, wider, longer, however you want to describe it, and the idea of being able to put in play the actions that are included in what we are doing with \$50 million and I hope would be a consideration that we would not say to the private sector, this is what we can do with your money, but it would be more of, who can do what best? There are things that the private sector will be able to do much more quickly. They do real estate more quickly. They do acquisition more quickly, because all of those things allow them to move, so there are some wheelhouses that work, and to me, the biggest thing is that if we can agree on a set of strategies that you have, how do we bring in the private sector and as well the folks that we are coming in and are going to build neighborhoods and workforce development with [inaudible] how do we work that in? I hope that this would not be a City Council plan. I hope it would be a City Council plan that will generate a community action plan that is not just one thing, and I am just wondering if the committee has considered how to incorporate that spectrum of people that are participating with us in this process.

Mr. Driggs said the briefing that we got today emphasized the fact that a lot of what is in this framework is the additional tools that we have as a result of partnering with the private sector. I think that we are focused on that. We did have some conversation today about whether we wanted to look at the City's investment, which is a commitment that we are getting ready to make, in conjunction with commitments that are not yet in hand from the private sector, so we also have to balance our planning around money that we are committing and that we know we are putting out there with involvement from others that is not yet completely in place. I think that we are trying to be holistic about it. We are trying to sort of look at it and think, what are the possibilities that we have now with the private sector money, not only because it is more money, but it is different money?

Mayor Lyles said I think that is an excellent point is that it can be money that perhaps gives us flexibility or the community flexibility that we could never take on, and I would hope that we would always continue our nine and four percent deals, but there are a couple of other things. In the plan, I would hope that we would actually look at some legislative action too. We have strategies on housing production, but we all know that the point system is unfair in so many ways in the review of these deals; I shouldn't say unfair. It is so standardize that it could often be unfair to other urban areas. So, for example, you get points for a bus stop and points for the bus stop having a cover on it. You get points for having a grocery store within a mile, but you do not get points for

being on a rail line that the grocery store is in two miles. I think there are some legislative things that I would hope the committee, that it would not just be strategies that would be able production goals but actually how to accommodate things, and I would say also in our rezoning process, so those are some wheelhouse things that we perhaps could look at that would make a difference, and I do not know. I have read not all of that. I got it with you guys today and had a little chance. I got it Thursday or Friday.

Ms. Mayfield said in summer time is when we are really going to go into more detail. Committee has already been having that conversation regarding legislative.

Mayor Lyles said I am really encouraged that this is one of the first times that we have had such strong community support for something that makes it something that the community wants to achieve, and for that, I want to say thank you to the community for the work on it.

**Councilmember Bokhari** said Mr. Driggs said most of what I wanted to say. We had a good discussion today about it is really hard in this to visualize a plan that takes all of these unknown factors like the private money and everything, plus you do not know where that is going to be slotted, so I challenged and kind of drew a parallel to what we had been exploring in SouthPark CNIP but on a much smaller level of, if we are trying to create a vision in the form of a play book, that we almost tee up with what we can control and know that if you go this route with a private equity fund or this route or whatever it may be, you can activate our plays as the private sector, because even with the work in the summer, there will still be an unknown until after the ballot is successful or not in that case. They will actually kind of make hard commitments there, so no matter how much work we do this summer, we are going to have to take a leap of faith and be creative in what we design as a strategic plan or playbook in this case.

Mr. Phipps said I noticed that the Planning Commission had drafted or adopted some sort of affordable housing plan. Was that incorporated in you all's plan? I understand that their plan was presented to you all. How was that intergraded?

Ms. Mayfield said in our strategy plan, I am going to give complete and total credit to our Assistant City Manager, Ms. Campbell and our Director Pam Wideman, because they did incorporate those conversations in some of these recommendations that we are going to have, as far as what is in the packet, as well as what we are going to be discussing in the summer, so yes, they did incorporate those conversations with the Planning Department and what they are attempting to do in to what is being recommended to committee for us to then recommend to full Council. I have an amazing team.

### **INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE**

Mr. Bokhari said with my Co-Chair here, Larken Egleston and also thank you to our committee members Mayor Lyles, James Mitchell, and Greg Phipps and of course JCK and Dana Fenton. Our Committee, the IRC, met for the first time on May 21, 2018. We focused on three major items: the committee charge and philosophy, our strategic plan, and our upcoming actions and legislative opportunities. Our charge, again focusing on state and federal issues, we went deep into that and the philosophy, which basically is inclusive, as a process; nimble, as a process; and action oriented, and we are focusing really on relationship building. Larken will talk a little more about what we have done, but essentially really focusing on, in an action oriented way, figuring out priorities of some of our partners that fit within these concepts of the strategic plan that we have built, like our IRC zones and key relationships, adopted initiatives, legislative pipelining process, our continuing learning process. We have put a lot of meat that we will not go deep into, into this police item that we will be voting on in our next meetings that Larken will cover the date of that. That will really be covering our really first actionable 30 of our 30, 60, 90 plan that this committee has been working on.

Mr. Egleston said our gift to you tonight is to have the shortest committee report out. That was our objective, so you are welcome in advance. I want to thank my colleagues



who were able to join us for the entire day or just for the evening last Tuesday, for the North Carolina League of Municipalities dinner but then also a handful of us were able to go down and meet with a lot of our legislative delegation and some legislators from surrounding counties and different parts of the State. I think that was very valuable. Those meetings went well. We were well received down there, and I think that they see a new day in Charlotte and a new day for Charlotte-Raleigh relations. That was very encouraging. So, thanks to everybody who came and was able to help us have a good show of force there. Mark your calendars for a couple of things, Charlotte Chamber of Commerce is having their quarterly elected official's breakfast on June 15<sup>th</sup>; that is a Friday at 8:00 a.m. That is a good opportunity to interface with elected officials from other bodies. Our next committee meeting will be Monday, June 25<sup>th</sup>, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 280. A couple of the, besides the day in Raleigh, which went very well, Tariq and I and thank you to Councilmember Winston and Mayor Lyles for joining us as well, able to engage with Congressman McHenry from Western North Carolina last week. We talked with him about some of his technology priorities that align with ours, and also we have asked Dana, and he was already on top of it, so if you checked your Council-Manager memo email last Friday, there was a link in there that said legislative update, and you can click on that for Dana's report. He is going to keep everybody abreast to everything that is going on in Raleigh and DC as it relates to Charlotte, so you can find that in your Council-Manager memo next week.

The two things, if you have been following the state budget process that Dana is keeping an eye on for us right now that are particularly relevant to Charlotte and maybe caught us a little off guard is the provision that will allow for municipalities to fund education and then also there is a provision in there that was maybe specifically targeted at the Orange Durham County rail but that would affect our ability to do future rail projects in Mecklenburg and surrounding Counties, so those are two things that he is keeping an eye on as it relates to the business that we do.

### **TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING**

Mr. Phipps said I would also like to thank my committee members, Ms. Eiselt the Vice Chair, Ms. Ajmera, Mr. Egleston, and Mr. Winston and our honorary member Mr. Bokhari. After 20 months of work, this South End Vision Plan will be coming before us on June 11<sup>th</sup> for an up or down vote. This is a plan that has been well vetted. As a matter of fact, we got an update at our last committee meeting on May 29<sup>th</sup>, and it received some careful vetting from both the Planning Commission and the Transportation and Planning Committee of individual Councilmembers met privately with Planning staff to go over some concerns and language that we wanted to have enhanced before the document came before you. As part of those changes, we wanted stronger affordable housing recommendations; specific recommendations included the incentives for affordable housing and the transit oriented development areas of the district. We want to see reducing barriers to affordable housing development and more or less talked about in better detail there. Also, additional ways to provide affordable lifestyle. The Planning Committee added language also in terms of shifting neighborhood demographics and the importance of amenities and daily services of all citizens at various socio-economic levels. So, we took an action, as a result of all of the input, and in those drafts, comments will be embedded in this document. We voted as a committee to move it forward to the rest of the Council in as much as it has been almost two years that this thing has been looked at, and it is ready to go forward. I would encourage my fellow colleagues to read this document and be prepared when it comes at our meeting on June 11<sup>th</sup>, to be able to ask some pertinent questions and get familiar with it as we move forward with it. I am glad to see that it is moving forward. That was one of the things that we talked about in our committee, so I am just going to move on to some other things here.

As far as our place types and the Unified Development Ordinance is concerned, I guess based on really community stakeholder and input, we decided to come up with a comprehensive planning document, I guess our 2040 type plan. I am glad to say that we are going to be recasting our effort; we are not going to be stopping it, but we are going to be taking a more deliberative attempt to add more vision, more aspirational goals by

some more assertive engagement of the community on a go forward basis, and we project that in doing that, that could probably take anywhere from 24 to 36 months to try to get that all encapsulated, but we will be leveraging the various plans that we have in place, especially those plans that are of recent vintage to try to leverage those in as much as those have had a lot of stakeholder involvement, a lot of vision casting in those as well. There are some other things too in the shorter-time frames that we have identified or Mr. Planning Director has identified about 10 areas that we are going to be able to focus in on in the next six to 12 months that will help us as we concurrently do those other things that we will have specific things that we will look at like our TOD ordinance, the ABC and maybe D, those are going to be things that are going to be coming to us by year end, to try to get those things done, but all in all, I think that we now have a plan to go forward that is going to be much more inclusionary and participatory from our stakeholders, and hopefully that will get us to where we want to go with this plan.

Mr. Bokhari said I would just add real quickly to Mr. Manager and our Planning Director, the devil will be in the details of course but what the committee heard last week from our Planning Director, I think is very intriguing, very good work as it relates to the future of planning and how the UDO fits into the broader strategic things. I was very excited when I heard some of that stuff.

Mr. Winston said what you are going to hear from a lot of constituents is that we are putting the UDO on hold or that we are going to waste all this money that we have already spend into the UDO process, and that is just not the case. That is not the case; I guess the metaphor that is being used is we are trying to put the horse back in front of the cart in terms of doing this, that the UDO is going to move forward but in a way that the vision can match up to the work that we have already done. I would suggest that none of us allow that narrative to move forward when we are very much aware that is not the case, and we are trying to do everything. We are trying to correct the course a bit.

Ms. Eiselt said I will also add that a lot of the committee members on the citizen committee: architects, urban planners, are very supportive of the UDO process being slowed down and just reprioritized with an emphasis of figuring out TODA. TODA has to really be tightened up, and I think that is something that they are expressing their opinions on, so that developers know exactly what is expected, and I am really happy to see that, because that is what is really critical right now, that we are making the most of the assets that we have invested in. Land is going so fast. We had two conventional rezonings this past week on the light rail, and you do not know what is going to end up there, so we have got to really focus on the priorities of the ordinances within the UDO and take the most critical ones first.

Mr. Phipps said I might add that the South End Plan and its place types and UDO are inextricably linked, in as much as this South End Plan, the granularity of it is such that it portends where we want to go with this UDO, and I am not meaning to rhyme or nothing, but this document right here really fleshes out with detail on how we want to progress as we move forward with the UDO process. This is really a blue print for where we want to go. In a lot of ways, we have been doing a lot of this with some other plans that we might not have caught it or recognized it as such, but these things have been, more or less, tested, and I think that you will be really pleased with it.

Mr. Winston said this South End Vision Plan, there was a lot of work from when it was first presented to when we passed it, and I would just reiterate what Chairman Phipps said, to take a look at this, because every third Monday, we get these big ol' binders with recommendations about going against plans, and we always complain about what were they thinking? What did other Councils put us in position towards? Read this with a fine tooth comb, because this is going to be a vision plan that is going to be referenced 15 years from now. This is our chance to get it right.

Ms. Ajmera said I missed a few minutes; Mr. Phipps did you include the affordable housing component

Mr. Phipps said oh yes, we delved in and the staff was really amazed that in separate interviews and conversations that we were more or less aligned in our approaches and how we went about that conversation.

Mr. Bokhari said I agree very much with what Ms. Eiselt said. I would just add that while we all still need to get the updates and get into the weeds to a level that we have not gotten to yet with UDO, I think that hopefully everyone will see what I started to see in glimmers of this that the way we start to articulate this to the community is not that we have wasted money and stopped UDO, not that we have even hit the pause button on UDO. It is that there is this broader nature of unified and updated vision plan and ordinance, and we just jumped to ordinance before, so we are not pausing anything. We are adding the cart and the horse and all the other things back into this mode of transportation. I would encourage us when we get to that point, to be able to articulate that we are not pausing anything. We are adding it back into the right line. Again, assuming that all of the details line up.

Mr. Phipps said be on the lookout for a Vision Zero Action Plan that is going to be coming our way for approval, I guess by year end. Staff, they reviewed the City's traffic fatalities and severe injury intendents from last year from 2017, and basically, we had 29,000 reported crashes, resulting in 74 fatalities, including 27 pedestrians killed. This is something that is really critical, and I am pleased to report that with that information and data, they are going to be coming to us with a Vision Zero Action Plan by the end of this year that we can certainly look forward to reviewing and approving there. That is all I have but I do want to share-

Ms. Eiselt said the Vision Zero; I really hope that we talk about traffic enforcement, police informant. That is kind of what you are talking about with the money that we were putting into bike plans and pedestrian plans, and I am so sick of seeing people run red lights, and I am sick of people just zooming through and using the traffic rules that apply to their situation that day. It has gotten out of control, and more and more people are going to be killed. We are making a big investment in this City in pedestrians and bicycles and cars, and we have got to have a discussion about traffic enforcement as part of Vision Zero.

Mr. Phipps said as I move into the final phases of my presentation, I would like the Deputy Clerk, I do not know if you can see some of these pictures. Can this be like expanded a little bit? What I am trying to show there is this is Mallard Creek Church Road and the I-85 ramp heading south. This is four tractor trailers that regularly park here on weekends, at night, and the other ones that we tried to show up, that was the ramp heading south at Statesville Avenue. They are on both sides of the street. It looks like a truck stop.

Mr. Mitchell said you know why right?

Mr. Phipps said why?

Mr. Mitchell said there is a Pilot service station there.

Mr. Phipps said that is the overflow?

Mayor Lyles said that is a place to stop, but now trucks have computerized logs, so you can no longer drive past your time limit, and once they find a place that is easy to congregate and park there, it is attracting everyone else in that area. I think that it is a combination, because they do inforce this in some communities, and the highway patrol can. I do not know what our strategy has been, but you are right. This is getting to be- I think that it is a combination of some place to stop and the new computerized logs that they have to do.

Mr. Phipps said it is dangerous. Even CMPD Deputy Chief Foster commented on it when we were at the last police awards dinner. I am going to be trying to do something,

maybe work with my colleagues on the Intergovernmental Relations Committee to try to see, because this is state highway patrol, we might maybe draft a letter to David Howard or something.

My final thing, I had an opportunity maybe about three-weeks ago, to represent Ms. Carlenia Ivory, the former Councilmember here. She has a position with the I-77 study. I sat in on a meeting for her, and we were talking about the different options for the I-77 toll lanes, and basically out of the whole group, it was Ned Curran and myself. We were the only ones maintaining the course of the construction and seeing how it develops before we make any changes, but the rest of the group was pretty hard core against it. So, it was a very taxing kind of meeting, but those are some of the things that are going on in the transportation and planning world.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Emily A. Kunze". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

---

Emily A. Kunze, Deputy City Clerk, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 5 Hours, 6 Minutes  
Minutes Completed: July 12, 2018