

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Strategy session on Monday, December 3, 2018 at 5:08 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Justin Harlow, LaWana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Matt Newton, Greg Phipps, and Braxton Winston II.

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said we are going to start with our Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Assessment; this is a result of our work in terms of we were talking about the Convention and how people would be engaged and involved and I said don't we don't need to know what our policies are, what is going on, our environmental scan and then we will do the Committee Report Outs after that and then the Manager's Report on Boards and Commissions Review. Let me just say, on the Boards and Commissions review I will do a referral to Budget and Executive Government Committee on those topics that we bring up, so we don't have to explain them and approve them today. There are some that are required by policy and others that will require Council to amend that policy. Then Public Records Management and we will do the closed session for the two items that we have at the end of the meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 1: DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION ASSESSMENT

Marie Harris, Strategy and Budget said I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to serve in Leadership and Coordination role for this assessment and one really important note is to note the level of engagement across all Departments within the City and the overall level of commitment for diversity, equity and inclusion. Now, I would like to turn it over to another member of our Steering Team, Federico Rios who is also the City's International and Integrations Manager to go into more detail about the report you are receiving.

Federico Rios, International and Integration Manager said thank you for the opportunity to be here today to share on the work that this incredible team has put together. I'm just going to give you a quick run through of what it is we will be discussing so, we will start with why we are here, review our process and methodology. We will do some defining and then we will go into our findings and recommendations. It is important to acknowledge that this was a 90-day assessment timeline, and so, we need to find out where we were before we could assess how well we were doing. We also didn't have enough time in such a short window to assess our impact so, taking that into account. Also, there is more time that is needed to inventory or work with community and identify needs of current efforts. This an objective report with findings and recommendations so, if you look at the report the format is a summary, findings, and recommendations up front. You will find further detail which also includes best practices and a literature review after that then you will find the demographics section, which includes the overall Charlotte population demographics and our internal employee profile. After that you will see appendices that includes the full inventory of the City's DE&I activities and examples from other cities.

So, Mayor, you led the effort for us in giving us a call to action around looking internally at what our practices and our procedures were and where there were gaps, and we keyed in on this idea of being an Inclusive and Equitable Charlotte and really reviewing this for that purpose. So, to walk through process and methodology again you see this listed in Appendix A, we had 10 steering team members and 26 department dedicated liaison so you will find a list of all the individuals that were a part of this work on page 58. This was led by Marie Harris who introduced me. In that process of designating team members and liaisons we, were able to take an initial inventory where we cataloged 240 different items that were received from departments. These are 240 items that tie back to the DE&I look. We recognized from the beginning of this process that in order to do it justice, we had to have a definition that we all agreed upon in this space. We wanted to look at what Diversity, Equity and Inclusion were and how they fit together. The City of Charlotte is committed to being a role model in championing a culture of DE&I so, it is incumbent on

us to be inclusive and welcoming, embracing difference and offering respective words and actions for all people. It is important to note that although an inclusive group is by definition diverse a diverse group is not always inclusive and increasingly the recognition of unconscious or implicit bias helps organizations to be deliberate; organizations like ours specifically about addressing issues of inclusivity. I don't think you could say it any better than our very own Willie Ratchford who has done this work for an extended period of time for the City does in this state.

I stated that it was a great honor to be a part of this team; I happen to be working with different teams throughout the City on different work. The team that many of you are familiar with that I am also a part of is Leading on Opportunity Council and if you think back to that report everything else hinged on racism and segregation, and that ties in directly to our DE&I work and so we wanted to ensure that highlighted how that tied in and served as a cornerstone for the work that we undertook in this process. We also wanted to ensure that everyone was aware of the literature review that we undertook. It was important for us to look into best practices and how they showed up in different spaces. There are over 33 references of literature review that were used to compile this report. In addition, it was important for us to do a peer city comparison, and so you will see that although we have a lot of cities here very few have it all down pat, and Charlotte as a whole does not have all of these boxes checked off. There is a lot of work yet to be done.

We also took into account the voice of leadership in regards to this work and many of your statements are captured in these quotes. It is important to recognize that and some common themes came out. I just highlighted one area on this first slide; the need for a continued focus on an equity lens, really looking at things from history to today's needs and how they work together. Again, additional input from leadership, the first bullet here incredibly important. These issues won't go away by ignoring them. We can't just throw things on a wall and expect to come upon a solution. It really takes a concentrated effort. So, I mentioned earlier 240 efforts and initiatives were submitted. We took the time to cull those down and came to 120 that directly tied back to the definitions and they are categorized in these three areas so throughout the rest of the PowerPoint you will see that we are going to specifically focusing on our Internal Practices, our Access to Services and Opportunities and our Community Engagement. It was important to make sure that these activities matched our DE&I definitions. Again, you can see this highlighted in pages 27-42 and in more detail in Appendix C.

These Internal Practices include our policies, processes and procedures and how they show up in the organization. It also ties into our environment and culture and these are actual activities that the City has undertaken. These are all recent but they are not within the last year or so; they may be encompassing for a longer period of time and again, you can find that full inventory under Appendix C. I'll mention in this space that one of the efforts that I would regard as being credibly intentional is our work in the Fire Department around recruitment so, really spending their time, thanks to our new Chief, looking at our practices around recruitment, creating a work group to focus in on how do we insure that we have more diversity, equity and inclusion in that space.

Looking again at our Access to Services and Opportunities we are really talking about how easily the public can use or participate in City services as well as openness and inclusion in the decision-making processes, awareness of the services and how the services show up in space. These are all things that we are doing in communities to work with our community members, and again these are categorized on Page 32.

When we look at Community Engagement these are instances where we've sought out input and feedback from community members along with really focused on outreach design to involve the community and service planning decisions. So, this is our work again with community members in this space. Here you will see a definitive overview of where we landed and what some of our key findings were. Again, I'll draw your attention to the overarching piece which is that there is no comprehensive DE&I in our strategy. There is no coordinated approach for the multitude of efforts that are occurring, and so we miss

a lot of opportunities to leverage what strengths we do have in this space. These are again summarized in Pages 3-5 of the report.

I going to spend some time going over each one of the recommendations in a bit of detail. In recommendation one, we are really trying to establish a vision and further define areas of need, which under determined short and long-term goals, targeted initiatives and create meaningful outcome measures. In recommendation two, we are talking about prioritizing and identifying resources, designating a lead staff position with executive level authority and establishing department liaisons to continuously identify areas of improvement. In recommendation three, we are walking through the efforts that have already somewhat been undertaken by Human Resources so this idea that we should continually coordinate the overall activities of recruitment and hiring practices and systemically conduct periodic DE&I trainings and professional development sessions for the entire organization. Recommendation four speaks to conducting a complete review of the current initiatives for effectiveness, impact and redundancy and looking at contracts and programs that require continued funding or continued commitment before we get to the point of having to make a decision around renewal continuation or expansion. In recommendation five we are talking about developing a central repository that accounts for external partnerships and key contacts to look at continuing to expand our efforts. Recommendation six, we are really talking about creating the accountability structure that would move this work forward so, insuring that this work is a priority and measurers must be established to insure accountability so that priority is truly focused in its efforts. In recommendation seven, we are reviewing and improving outdated policies. An example of this is the work that the Department of Human Resources has done already, identifying 17 employee centric policies and working to update those things. Recommendation eight is really us looking at standardizing communication and marketing practices around this work, recognizing that this is vitally important for how we show up in the community.

I want to take the time to read some of the notes I took. This process was incredibly informative for me as someone who is fairly new to City government, someone who is new to our organization, and it is important to recognize how we got here, how we got to this space this moment of some really siloed work, disjointed work, and so if you think back to our one-year business philosophy this idea created a culture in which each department, and its subordinate business unit operated autonomously. It didn't intersperse; they weren't working in tandem around strategic systematic efforts, therefore some functions are replicated across the organization. This creates inefficient distribution of resources and inequitable application of policies and procedures. It is important to promote DE&I efforts systematically across departments and support a common understanding and consistent application of policies, value, and messaging. We are here because of our history. We are in a space where we are doing so many different things because we haven't well-coordinated and leveraged what resources we do have.

Recommendation 10 is pretty near and dear to my heart due to the work that I'm committed to doing to the Office of International Relations; Language access plan and in addition to that our ADA planning, which Willie's team with the CRC is undertaking as well as Terry. These are vital components of insuring that we are addressing specific needs that community members have, especially individuals with disabilities and whose first language is not English. We want to insure equitable access to all City resources and services. In recommendation 11, we are looking at a recently developed best practice; we are looking at what has occurred with the Bridging the Difference conversations that CMPD had initially led and now is working in tandem with Housing and Neighborhood Services and CRC, so this is work the Chief, Willie and Pam have agreed to continue to expand the scope. We are really looking at trauma; we are looking at what has occurred and giving people the people the time to unpack those things and talk about how best to move forward. So, we are offering a framework that is absolutely necessary in this work when it comes to community. In recommendation 12, we are looking at how do we build the foundation on understanding of the need, educate on the aspects of history, develop a cohesive and collaborative communications and marketing plan and highlight initiatives and opportunities for internal communication. In our final recommendation we are insuring that we are engaging community members, business leaders and non-profit leaders to develop a cohesive strategy to build a community that values all people and their needs

equally. This is work that the City should be able to role model for our community. This allows for a representative voice in governance planning and allows others to have access to sustainable livelihoods, housing and affordable basic services.

In conclusion, it is the recommendation of this team that our City Manager identify leadership and coordinate activities to develop the comprehensive framework that this work would need going forward beyond this report.

Councilmember Mitchell said can you go back to recommendation #9? That has been very important to the Economic Development Committee, so can you share with us some expectation and how we are going to measure success on that recommendation?

Mr. Rios said it is important to acknowledge that we wouldn't just be looking at outputs; we'd be really looking at are we doing the structural foundational work to ensure that we can see outcomes through this work. So, are we spending the time to cultivate these businesses and this is work that would live in economic development, rightly so. We are saying in regards to creating a structured leadership, creating the resources necessary to see this through, that that leadership would be able to ensure that this occurs from its top down approach. If you look at Page 48 we also detail some of this.

Councilmember Mayfield said will you go back to recommendation six? We have on there design and implement accountability structure, and maybe I'm the only one that is not seeing it. I'm trying to understand in that structure where is City, community and outreach. We've got return on engagement, return on information and return on economic mobility, return on investment, but it is not really telling me what the structure is going to look like. As we are trying to identify who is at the table to help speak to the structure that is needed representing not only the minority business community but also the community at large or is this just corporate and City?

Ms. Harris said this assessment was an initial 90-day assessment more so focused on internal practices, but my nature what we do we include a lot of community engagement because that is so critical and core enwoven in what we do but the next steps, as you mentioned, would be actually making a plan for growing that out.

Ms. Mayfield said so, as you are moving forward with this we will receive more detail as far as the internal, how we are identifying and reaching out to our external community? That was mentioned like with the Economic Development Committee, we are waiting to get an update on the external partner, and I'm trying to figure out where that would fit in our internal relationship, especially if the City is funding a start-up or a program to address our goals where that accountability structure fits into it.

Ms. Harris said that is a very good point, and that would be something that needs to be considered as we flush out the oversight model that coordinates internal and with our partners.

Councilmember Eiselt said there is a lot to dig into here. Just one question, it may already be in here, but have you included senior citizens in this work as well?

Mr. Rios said back to the point that Ms. Harris just made, this was all based on internal, so I don't know if you mean senior citizens that are employees to the City.

Ms. Eiselt said so this is all internal, okay.

Mr. Rios said yes ma'am and again Madam Mayor; that was your charge so we wanted to adhere to that charge.

Councilmember Driggs said I'm all in favor of gaining a reputation in Charlotte for fairness and inclusion. There are two things that I wanted to comment on; for one as we go down this road, there have been times in the past when people who didn't happen to be a member of one of the groups that are supposed to benefit from this felt like they were just disenfranchised. So, we have to continue to kind of make clear that this

government is here really for everybody and that we are devoting all our attention to these issues. We should probably be devoting a lot of attention to them, but I can just tell you that there are people again who are not kind of intended to benefit from this who start to wonder if they matter. It is a comment.

The other thing I would say is reading this, recommendation #1, I'm very interested in that create meaningful outcome measures and determine short and long-term goals. I think that makes a lot of sense, and I'm interested to know what those look like, because the danger too as you put this out and the issuance of the report is a great feel good moment. Let me go back a year or two later and people are asking themselves, what is really different? So, we need to be very clear about how we are going to answer that later and the opportunities that are being created. I have a similar concern frankly with our housing. We are making a big push in housing but the truth is that our ability to solve that problem or to improve conditions for a lot of people that are looking forward to better housing is limited, so I hope that we will treat this as a negotiation with the people who are watching this anxiously and hopefully in such a way that we are saying these are the things you can expect, and you can come back in a year or two and we will talk about whether we did it.

Mr. Rios said absolutely and I think that speaks to the importance of the accountability structure and focusing in on leadership, insuring that we have a group of people that are dedicated to continuing this work so that is not a one off.

Mr. Driggs said my actual question is what do these meaningful outcome measurers look like? Are we talking about the extended minority and women participation in City employment, are we talking about the mix of our labor force? Where are we looking for those matrixes?

Ms. Harris said that would be something that needs to be developed. We don't have an answer for that yet; we have a lot of output measurers right now, and we think it is important to continue to look at best practices and leverage our stakeholders to see what is important and meaningful to them to measure so we can continue to measure progress. That would still need to be developed.

Mr. Driggs said I'm just saying it is very important that we have tangible matrix and we have something that we can look back at a year or two from now and say look, we did that.

Ms. Harris said yes sir, thank you.

Mayor Lyles said I just wanted to follow-up with Mr. Driggs' point. I really do believe we've got a lot of this that we've done, we've done one off. Let's go do this; let's go do that, and let's get this done. This gets accomplished whether it be for diversity, equity or inclusion, and I think the idea of this is to let's find out what we are doing so we can figure out what we continue to do and what is next. I see this as building kind of a new lens to what has currently been accomplished and identifying some things, and it is an internal focus right now. It is not intended to do an outreach. I think there are many companies in this community and this City region that are doing these kinds of programs. We will probably have a lot of opportunities to learn more versus actually trying to take this somewhere. Then on the final comment, I just want to say that we can talk about who benefits from this but I think there is community benefit. If we are going to have a Police Department that can interact with everyone then it has to look like everyone, and if you look at all the numbers and what is going on we should never leave anybody out, but there are some distinctions here. Disability, I went to an event, it was actually around the traffic safety and our crosswalks I think are about five-feet. Most cars in the City drive beyond that, that drive right up to the crosswalk, and if we are actually going to have people that have physical abilities that are different than ours, we may have to look at crosswalks that are 10 or 15-feet, very simple applications to make sure that we are the kind of City that is welcoming to all. Most people automatically go in this direction and they are thinking well we are going to do something that is about some legal issue or some lawsuit that we've been sued about and this isn't. This is about making a livable

community for people from eight to 80 and looking at every aspect of what we do. I hope that this next step, and I think the next step needs to go to the Manager, and he needs to come back to where we should be focusing, but we've got to have the diversity in this community to be successful, and that means welcoming and opportunities for everyone to participate in it. And as our community is more brown, we need to figure that out; as our community is more professional, and we are trying to keep people here that actually make our City work in so many instances, that means we have to figure this out. I know it is a thick book and a lot of information but I say we ought to continue and you guys come back to us with the next steps, but remember our diversity is not just about race and ethnicity. It is about the diversity of the people that live in this community that need to have access to all governmental services and there are a number of people like that we aren't serving as well as we need to. Mr. Jones, if you could come back and say what would you do. I know this is a lot; 13 recommendations are a little bit overwhelming today, or I feel a little overwhelmed today by the number of recommendations that we have, but I feel comfortable that if we continue the work we will figure out how to eat this elephant one bite at a time. Thank you for the work; a 90-day scan is ambitious, and we appreciate what you've done with it.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: COMMITTEE REPORT OUTS

Mayor Lyles said several of you know I'm having meetings with the Committee Chairs and in our last Committee Chair meeting one of the Councilmembers said well, where do we get a chance to talk about what is actually going on in other Committees and I think that is one of our issues. I've been hearing the word "silo" a lot, and we've got them, and so we need as a Council to discover how we can change and make some changes to integrate what we are doing but this was our best attempt right now where we should be able to challenge each other on a report, question what we didn't do or should be doing on each Committee as they report out on what their top initiatives are that they need your feedback on. It was never meant to be here is a staff report, and I can read it; it was always meant to be here is where we are going, what do you think about it, or do you have another idea? Is there something that you want to see done or not? This is the time to actually encourage or halt or slow down substantively from these reports. The first one is the Environmental Committee on the Strategic Energy Action Plan.

Environment Committee – Strategic Energy Action Plan

Councilmember Ajmera said I'm sure many of remember last November we had a resolution come in front of us for creating a carbon free City for generations to come, but since then the Committee was charged with creating a resolution that aligns with our existing measurers and goals and followed by an action plan. Since then the Committee had worked on the resolution that was unanimously approved back in June, so thank you all for your continued support. Since then, the Committee had worked over the last year to come up with a Strategic Energy Action Plan that has a detailed review of all our departments, 8,000 employees, to get to our 2030 goal, which is very ambitious but it is doable and then our 2050 goal which is community wide goal. So, based on that we as a Committee have approved Strategic Energy Action Plan. It was approved in November, and thanks to the work of our staff, especially Kim Eagle and Rob Phocas for their leadership and also the Stakeholders Committee that was created. We had stakeholders from the private sector, public sector as well as non-profits and faith communities. I would also like to recognize Emily who is with us in the room, for her expertise and knowledge along the way and Dr. Carney for their expertise and knowledge along the way. We are one of very few cities that have created a model for other cities to follow when it comes to taking a lead and creating a sustainable and resilient place to live. With that, I would like to turn it over to Mr. Phocas to walk us through the Action Plan.

Mayor Lyles said this will be the time we will hear the report and if any Councilmember has a question that is not on the Environmental Committee, let's bring it up now.

Rob Phocas, Sustainability Director said this evening we take another big step in our process to address our greenhouse gas emissions as a municipal entity and also as a community and to do our share as a member of the global community of urban leaders. I'm going to share this presentation tonight with Gina Shell, who is the Deputy Director of Engineering and Property Management and as well we will illustrate our work as a community is more urgent than ever and we have arisen over the past year to bring forward this Energy Action Plan to you and both City staff and the community stand ready to implement this plan.

What I have here is just an overview of what Gina and I will be presenting. Our goal is to inform you about where we've been, what we've been doing over the past several months since November and most importantly what is in the Strategic Energy Action Plan and what we will be doing to move our community forward. As I mentioned, City staff and community members have been working together, but we've also been consulting with our peer cities across the country to find out where they've been, what they are doing now and what their intentions are moving forward. Related to that we are still waiting to hear from the American Cities Climate Challenge that the Bloomberg Philanthropies have put out and we hope to hear good news soon to that.

Before we get into more details, let me make a few general comments to address some of the questions that have come up both in Committee and in the meetings that we have had with you all. The achievement of the goals that we are going to outline are going to require innovations as well as advancements in technology and in financial tools. We don't currently have all the tools that we need right now to achieve the goals that we are putting before you. In addition, our organization and community will need to employ new ways of thinking; we need to work outside of our silos and horizontally cross our departments and cross entities in town. We need to start looking at the total costs of ownership of our projects and the programs, not just the delta between a diesel bus and an electric bus, but what are the social benefits to the work we are doing in addition to those costs? We must strike a balance in our actions so that we are not hurting ourselves in the balance that you all must strike when looking at competing interest.

A little history of how we got here, both Mayors Clodfelter, Roberts, and Lyles signed on to the Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy commitment. Basically, the goal of this covenant is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions both from municipal operations as well as across communities. There are four steps that signatories must take, registering your commitment, completing your greenhouse gas inventory and reporting it, creating targets and establishing a system of measurement and finally establishing a Strategic Energy Action Plan. The history that we've gone through is up there, just wanted to remind you that this Energy Action Plan came out of the discussion the City Council had last November and that the SEAP is really a continuation of the work started in November and the passage of the resolution that was achieved in June.

There are three main priorities in the resolution that was passed in June; there is an internal goal by 2030 we are striving to source 100% of our City's energy use in our buildings and our fleet from zero carbon sources. There is a community focus goal by 2050; we are going to strive to become a low carbon City which means the average emission for every Charlottean will be below two tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per person, and as we are discussing here today, we need to develop an action plan as a framework to achieve those goals.

I want to quickly touch a bit of a global context; a lot has happened on the global stage and the national stage and actually on the state stage since we started this process. First, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued their fifth assessment report in October, and more so than ever, it was stressing the need for urgent action to address climate change and the impacts that we are seeing and highlighted the far reaching and unprecedented changes to our environment and potential impacts to our economy. Second, on the national level, the fourth national climate assessment was released in November by the Trump Administration. There were 12 major finding areas and what it showed now is that over the past decades they can say that climate change is primarily due to human induced emissions from heat trapping gases, mainly coming from burning

of coal, oil and gas. On the State Level, Governor Cooper recently passed Executive Order No. 80 which committed North Carolina to fight climate change and to lead North Carolina's transition to a clean energy economy and said that North Carolina will reduce state greenhouse gas emissions to 40% below 2005 levels by the year 2025. Our office had an opportunity to speak with the Governor's Office about this and the role that the Governor sees cities playing, and he sees cities playing a very primary and important role and was very excited for the leadership that Charlotte has shown and hopes that we will continue to lead. To that point, we will continue to participate in the Environmental Defense Fund's Cities Initiative, which is brought together cities from North Carolina to talk about what can be done to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

A few more points I wanted to make before getting into the details of the SEAP, no city has found the silver bullet for what it will take to solve the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to the levels that we need to see to stay in compliance with Paris Climate Agreement, but we need to work together to do it, and we need to find solutions together and we need to come up with new solutions to do so. Our work will also require a new level of commitment to understand the cost and benefits as I mentioned earlier. To that end, Charlotte has joined a group of national groups of cities that are looking at the costs and benefits associated with reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

One point I wanted to make, in putting the SEAP together we undertook a lot of engagement both internally with our City departments but also with the community. Up until now, we've had meetings with the Stakeholders Group, a content expert, advisory group but there is a lot more for us to do going forward. In particular, we would like to take our information out on the road to meet with neighborhood groups and other community focus groups, for example going out to the Tuesday Morning Forum or the Charlotte Rotary to share the SEAP with them and to get their feedback as well. The SEAP focuses on greenhouse gas emissions as we said, but more importantly or as equally important it also focuses on economic development. We want to make sure as we are going through all the work that we are looking for workforce development and workforce training opportunities, thus there is an action area in the SEAP specifically focused on that. As was mentioned by Ms. Ajmera, we developed in partnership with Envision Charlotte and Carbon Captured, Ltd. There are three core components to the SEAP; a baseline assessment; a vision that has targets; and the framework for achieving our goals. It is important to know this is a living document; it is not a document set in stone. You can't have such a document when you have such long timelines, so we will be reviewing this biannually and coming back to Council with updates.

The contents of the SEAP; there are three main areas. It focuses on buildings, transportation and energy generation. It is also done on a foundation of innovation, workforce development and equity/inclusion. There are 11 linked action areas; six are internally focused, and five are community focused. We also talk about the five stages to zero carbon energy, which is on this graphic here. Quickly, I will just walk through what these five stages mean. Shifting our energy demand focuses on the time of day we are using our energy. Reducing our energy consumption focuses on energy efficiencies efforts. Changing the energy consumed means we are moving away from fossil fuels to more renewable energies. Generating energy on-site looks at deploying renewal energy such as solar, wind, GO-thermal and biogas and then purchasing the remainder means entering into purchase power agreements with energy providers such as Duke Energy. I would like to point out that that fifth point is a last resort; we will focus on those first four, and if we can't achieve the goals we want then we will turn to purchasing the energy.

So, how have we delivered and how will we continue to deliver the SEAP? We have several work groups. We have an internal steering team that is guiding the work; we have three internal working groups focused on our buildings, our fleet and budget and then we have four external working groups that are focused on the community. They will take up the areas of buildings, transportation, energy generation, and workforce development. Some of the criteria for selecting members of that work group: we would like there to be no more than 10 people on each of those work groups; we will be looking to select experts from non-profits, companies, academia, and citizens; and diversity is extremely important on these committees, geographic, racial, cultural, and age as well.

I mentioned that we have a Stakeholder Group; we will continue to meet with them. We also have our content expert group; we will continue to meet with them and we plan on bringing quarterly updates to the Environment Committee and periodic updates to the full Council through Action Briefings. I will now hand it over to Gina to talk about our internal piece.

Gina Shell, Engineering and Property Management Deputy Director said in terms of the internal goal in our facilities and fleet, we have momentum in both of those areas, and so we are not starting toward this new goal flat footed. In the area of our facilities, we've always had an eye toward energy efficiency. We were looking at the Focus Area Plan today and are reporting that our facilities in general are 18% more efficient than comparable facilities across the Southeast. We know that some of our facilities are going to be better candidates for deep energy retrofits than some other. We are using this stoplight graphic to try to demonstrate which ones we think will be better candidates. We will be performing several energy audits each year to understand which of these might be the best candidates, but we know that some of the facilities, such as the ones here in yellow may not be good candidates because of operational or financial concerns.

Similarly, in our fleet, we have been recognized as a green fleet. We have been beginning to try to understand what our optimum replacement cycle would be, and now this will enable us to include carbon measurement in that analysis. Similarly, the stop light graphic demonstrates that today there are technologies available in some categories of our fleet, such as the non-public safety sedans. In other areas, we will be keeping a close eye on technologies to know when we might be able to transition and in some areas, at least today, such as firetrucks there is just not a technology out there that our Fire Department would feel comfortable with from an operational perspective, but again we will keep an eye on that and see if that changes.

As Rob mentioned, there is no exact receipt for success; we know that there might be several strategies that we might want to employ and investigate. We may want to look at each facility or each vehicle individually and replace those or up fit those. We may on the other hand want to have a large solar field that might take care of more of our needs, and there are a number of ways to fund what we are going to do, and we will keep an eye on technologies.

This is a graphic that we want to continually update for you that shows the relationship between cost and impacts of varying strategies. This will get more exact and useful to us as time goes on and we will include in this analysis the total cost of ownership and social cost of carbon. These are a number of the activities that we see over the next year; we are calling this our Year of Readiness. We want to build our structures for success, analyze our data and be ready to leverage opportunities.

Mayor Lyles said I think the last several slides, talked about a communication plan and marketing our role and next steps. I want to open it up for discussion now.

Councilmember Bokhari said I will start by saying having sat in with this Committee for several months now it is a great body of work. The Chair, the Committee, staff have all done a lot of work here, and I think overall it is pretty exciting to see what we are doing in relation to what others are doing and we are leading the way. With that, my one critique won't be a surprise to anyone on the Committee, because I have literally said it every single meeting over the last three or four months, and I'll say it one more time here. I think we are missing one part to really make this something special, and that is the thing that actually makes it a plan. I think it is more like a toolbox or a roadmap right now. It says a lot of the things in great detail of which we can do but once we get to doing each of them that in essence becomes the plan and the biggest missing link or hanging chad out there right now is the financial piece, the budgetary piece. I think after learning more from Mr. Phocas and the group over the last couple months, I get it; these things are big and technology changes, but I would encourage us as the next step of this to think of it really in three buckets. There is a long-term bucket, the things that we have no idea what technology is going to be out there, but we still have to quantify it somehow and we can

do that loosely and say okay here is how much it would cost today and over the next decade we don't know what it is going to involve, but we know what types of things have evolved and how it has reduced costs over the last decade, and we can apply that loosely to understand it. That is probably less important. The second and next more important thing is the mid-term, and I was pulling out the SEAP itself and here is a great example of something action area of seven-year zero carbon non-municipal buildings by 2050, and it's got all these different steps, one of which is consider a policy to stop natural gas boiler implementation. That is something right now we could sit down with different groups and understand what the costs implications are, and we haven't done that yet. That is what takes something from a roadmap or a toolbox to a plan when we actually sit down and do it. Then finally, I think this is the most important thing; what does the next one or two budget cycles look like in relation to this? Because the worse thing for any plan in the budgetary process is a surprise, and I feel like we are setting ourselves up for a surprise right now when we think about, okay, well we don't see exactly any dollar amounts here but next year I feel like we are going to have a couple things pop up based on the slides we've seen of a new Police facility or this or that. We know it is going to be expensive but that is the kind of things we should be doing right now and approving as a body rather than getting into budget time to see is that something we are going to have an appetite for when we literally don't know what it means now. I think those three things are really important but none more so than the next one or two-year budget cycles and the surprises we can expect.

Mayor Lyles said I have to agree with you; my bucket is a little bit different but the results of the short-term and what is the costs and how do we do it is actually very, very real, and I hope when the Committee comes back with the plan, I divided it up into what is internal that we can control and what is external that we really can't control. I also divided it up on the slide; I can't remember the high/low impact costs and comparison in that respect, because I do think that if we have low we ought to cost that out because that is the only thing that we can actually do different. We certainly can't go and start buying clean energy. It has impact but high costs, but if we look at where is the high impact and low costs. Now a lot of that is educational awareness but the ones that stand out that we can control we need a cost when we have this adopted. I think that is very important, and I don't mean I've gone out and surveyed for the equipment costs and all of that, but I do think it relates to, and I've said this to Kim and the team that is working on this, when you start thinking about high impact and maybe the cost is low we can start talking about fleet conversions under our existing policy, and what it would be if we decided to do it under this policy? Those are two action steps that we need to take because otherwise plans are plans and if we don't put any money behind it and know what we are doing. I would like to see the high impact and low costs things projected out over the next two to three years. We've got milestones for the next 12 months and when I look at that most of it is around internal communication. The policy recommendation with the costing for the budget are absolutely essential. I think my buckets were different but the results are the same.

Councilmember Winston said to carry on the conversation from Mr. Bokhari and the Mayor, kind of building on the comment you made about sharing information and working across committees, I think Mr. Phocas might say that this is going to be a living document and it is going to change as things go forward, like you said the unknowns, but what I would suggest for us as a Council should this be adopted, this is a policy that is going to touch everything, every piece of what we do, and we should kind of do how we are looking at the action areas where we take SEAP really back to every Committee, and we start diving in and say what does this mean in terms of how we approach economic development? What does this mean in terms of how we approach our Intergovernmental Relations and how we are going to form our Legislative Agendas moving forward with the kind of ideas like Mr. Phocas said, the Governor is going to want us to lead? So, how can we partner with the State and Federal levels of government so that we can know what kind of funding is out there to approach different problems? How are we going to implement this through Transportation and Planning, our policy decisions so that when we are looking at streetscapes or the next round of buses or other public transportation or multiple transportation options how are we taking this SEAP and kind of implementing the purpose or this policy in the way we think about it? I agree, I think those are very valid concerns but I think those answers are going to come in the next – we criticize many

plans. We just make a nice book and put it on a shelf and it collects dust. That is not going to be good, but if we kind of live by this as we take this as a paradigm change for how we are thinking about policy, how we are making purchases that is really going to be where this document and this policy has its power in my opinion and my experience pushing this over the finish line.

Councilmember Newton said I agree with my colleagues; I think it is important when we talk about our budget we talk about costs. We also include the greater social impact. So, the greater social purpose we would be serving with this type of policy and the savings as well. We may actually spend less by investing in green technology and in turn maybe that can be kind of factored in as some savings. I just wanted to; this is a biproduct with a whole lot of hard work, wanted to thank Rob, Gina, and all of my Committee colleagues and the [inaudible] colleagues that showed up at Committee meetings. This is a very ambitious endeavor particularly given the timeline to try to accomplish carbon free emissions within the City internally by 2030. We always understood that it was going to be aspirational, but I think putting pen to paper what we are doing is we are becoming a leader, and I think that is so critical particularly in this field where there aren't a whole lot of leaders and that sets us apart. I want to thank staff for also taking the time to talk with me pertaining to the communications plan. The strategy of that communications plan, because we can set this goal for 2030 but we have to keep in mind it is an external goal out to 2050. In Committee, there was discussion pertaining to technology and how that technology can radically change the viability of this plan and our success so trying to achieve that 2030 goal. I had a question pertaining to that, and so from the standpoint of that technology, and the legislative underpinning that maybe prevents us access to technology frankly, but assuming technologies do emerge in the future maybe gets us closer to a 2030 and 2050 goal, how is that going to be addressed? Is it going to come to Council; will it be something that is simply in that two-year review or will it happen in the interim?

Mr. Phocas said I think generally speaking and this talks to the larger budget point as well there will be no surprises; that is our intent and we will bring items before Council, not only updates but as we are moving forward it may be new technologies, obviously any budget expenditures that we need to make, but that is part of the process. The City's process is the process that we are going to follow; there is nothing unique about what we are doing here so we will have an opportunity to present to you new technologies, new financial options and definitely budget requests that are associated with the work that we are doing.

Mr. Newton said will that come through Committee? Is that how that would work and then percolate up and then be a part of our budget discussions too?

Mr. Phocas said I think it will be both depending on what the topic is.

Councilmember Driggs said those of you who were here last November remember that I spoke out strongly against the resolution that was proposed then precisely, because it wasn't supported by this. I'm pleased to see this has happened and I will also say that having gone over it and discussed it, one of the appealing features of this that we need to make very clear to the community is it is level headed. This is something that perceives without making huge assumptions that we may not be able to fulfill. It states goals that I think anybody can get better behind and on a continuing basis we need to be mindful of the fact that there are different points of view on the environment subject. So, one thing that we can demonstrate and which Rob has done a great job of doing already, is that we are being responsible about not incurring costs that don't actually return much except for a feel-good result. The one thing I would say to you is that, as we go through implementation if you have a situation like one where you've got two different kinds of buses you can buy, you are going to pay more money for this bus, because it is cleaner then I would likely to say for transparency to see that identified as an investment we are making in our environment plan so that we are very clear about what investments we are making and why we deem them to be cost effective. I don't think there is anybody who thinks that we should be completely insensitive to environmental questions and I think the City benefits from having a vibrant and visible policy on it. My only qualification is let's be

sure and can give assurances to anybody who is not as committed that we are not being extravagant about this.

Councilmember Ajmera said I wanted to address some concerns that were raised around the cost, the effectiveness. I recognize my Committee members here: Vice Chair Mr. Egleston; Mr. Newton; Mr. Phipps; and Mr. Winston, so we had discussed the cost, and as you know, this is the first Strategic Energy Action Plan. This is the framework that is going to guide us or transition to a low carbon future. As we move on to the next steps would be around the cost, the short-term, the mid-term and the long-term. So, that would be followed by the implementation plan. I know that we have so much work to do as we move on to implementation, but I think we should all take a moment to appreciate the work that we have done in just eight months alone. You are talking about 8,000 employees, so many departments, reviewing every single policy out there to ensure that we look at our existing standards and how do we get to attaining the goal. The goal that we came up with, which is 2030, it didn't happen just because someone said it is 2030. Staff had done an amazing job of reviewing all of our existing policies, reviewing multiple handbooks and meeting with internal stakeholders over 40 or 50 stakeholders, even external stakeholders from 40 to 50 stakeholders and some of the debates, I have sat through some of his debates and discussions where we had some heated discussions and debates, and there was some resistance. I think we have some a long way to get to this goal of 2030 and 2050, so I do understand the concerns around the cost and the effectiveness. I think that would be followed up after the plan is adopted before the budget so that there are no surprises. I do want to recognize the work that we have done. Again, it is just the first Action Plan as a City that really sets us as a global leader in the nation.

Kim Eagle, Assistant City Manager said I just had one addition comment for a budgetary context. There are funds already in your approved budget for the current year that speak to energy audits. We've already been so active in energy space that we believe in the short-term analysis for the next two-years there is either existing funds or internal work that we can do and then for additional funding we would follow the budget process, look to grants, look to partnerships, so I wanted to put a little bit more context around the work that we can do over the next 18-months to two-years and how we go about that.

Mr. Bokhari said I think all the points made were completely on point. Just to be really clear I think the thing that we need to do in the immediate terms, it is almost in between like it is kind of in the plan framework but it is not until you get to the implementation plan, something before that is almost a clarifying factor so that next year during budget cycle when literally someone pulls this out and throws it on the table in front of us and says well this is what we agreed to and this Police facility is going to cost \$6 million more, but we are bought into this. How do we police that conversation or like we can buy 80 buses or 160 buses? What I'm trying to figure out is we've said all of the art of the possible here and we've said alright we will figure it out. We didn't box ourselves in, which is one of the reasons I think this makes senses, but in the very near term is there something we can do to make sure we understand the implications of how people are going to use this in our own processes from a budgetary perspective? I'm wholeheartedly behind this with a little bit of nervousness before we come into the first vote of how people will start using it internally or the next year or two from a budgetary perspective.

Mayor Lyles said I think that is a fair point, and so I especially like the action steps being broken out into what is internal to the City versus external to the community. This is a great document and if someone says well you approved this, and this is what you are going to do then we can certainly say no, we have internal action areas, we are very careful to say where there are areas for engagement and cooperation, but it does not say we will accomplish and the focus on the internal action areas I think are very important to get done. I remember area plans would come up, and people would bring them to us or the Bicycle Plan and people would bring them to us, and they weren't fully funded, and I just think we all as a Council understand how difficult that path is to walk, and we are balancing I think what Mr. Winston suggested as we are making specific purchases that the plan be applied there not in just a budgetary context. I think that is what Ms. Eagle was saying, and I think that is what Mr. Winston was saying. So, we are not creating a

new line item to go in and say well on action number X we are going to update the fleet and motorized equipment. We are going to have an understanding of what our fleet replacement schedule is, what is available and the costing of it. I think this work is phenomenal. I think that we are out as a leader in both our region and our state, but I think we can approach it the way we always do in Charlotte, with an idea of accountability both financial accountability and [inaudible] accountability, so I have complete faith that this group will do that.

Ms. Ajmera said I just wanted to follow-up to what the Mayor mentioned so to your point about procurement, in fact that is already underway. Mr. Phocas has already started meeting with the procurement folks so that is already part of the plan along with meeting with all of the Department Heads. Actually, many of the Department Heads already attend our Environment Committee meetings and they are all part of this plan so as we move forward when we look at any new purchases we are looking at it from the lens of sustainability as well.

Mayor Lyles said I absolutely agree. I think I'm just trying to chunk this off in a way that identifies our responsibility and that this document not be taken as a mandate to the community to do things without an engagement that they sign off on and a mandate that we can have options on our regular purchasing procedures around the things that we think are practical to do.

Mr. Newton said the SEAP touches on so many things that we do as a Council and as a City, and I just hope that when we talk about budgetary considerations we are taking that all into account. We are looking at this from a comprehensive standpoint; it is more than just retrofitting or up fitting our fleet, but it is also about creating jobs from what I understand and that is something else do. There are savings; there is value and worth, there is wealth, so if it means on one hand maybe we are spending a little bit more to be green or if we are creating jobs. I think there is quantification to that, so I hope we take these comprehensive data points into consideration as well, and I hope there is a way that we can do that when we start to talk about these budgetary considerations.

Mayor Lyles said thank you for this work; we will have this follow-up and ready to go on our next agenda on December 10, 2018 for adoption.

Ms. Ajmera said that is right; I think the adoption 2018 will go down as one of the historic year for sustainability as the work that we've been able to do.

Mayor Lyles said I think the staff heard on the adoption of the document that it perhaps needs a resolution of adoption around it that has some of the information that we've talked about and the things that you've heard from the Council today.

Transportation & Planning - Transit Oriented Development

Councilmember Phipps said our last Committee Meeting was on November 26, 2018; we had a robust discussion on a number of issues. At every meeting, we've decided to talk about what is going on with the Comprehensive Plan update so everyone can be on board or what is going on in terms of outreach and where we are. We also had an update on the Transit Oriented Development Ordinance; that is normal part of our meeting to make sure everybody is engaged when that comes before us in the near future hopefully. I will turn it over to Mr. Jaiyeoba to talk about the Comprehensive Plan and TOD.

Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Planning Director said I will actually not be doing that, but I will introduce our advisor who will be speaking on the Transit Oriented Development, but I will kind of do a high-level connection of the dots for you. Remember, when we talked about embarking on the Comprehensive Plan we also said that would push back the completion time for the Unified Development Ordinance; however, there was some near-term projects or pursuits that we were going to continue, so we can complete them between now and September of next year. One of those efforts is the Transit Oriented Development Ordinance, so we have an advisor here with us today who will talk more about the market reality of those petitions around our stations and then Monica Holmes,

who you know is managing the TOD will kind of wrap that up, but we just have a few minutes to share this with you and the reason is because on December 5, 2018 we have an engagement [inaudible] where there will be a number of Committee members coming in and we just don't want you to be taken by surprise if they are calling you and asking questions. Todd Noel is our advisor who will share some of this with you.

Todd Noel, Planning Consultant said I am real estate consultant out of Atlanta. I am also a former City of Charlotte resident and former City of Charlotte employee many, many moons ago. I was retained by the Planning Design and Development Department to look at long-term demands for different land uses in Charlotte's sphere, the six sub-areas within 17 different activity centers, five different transit corridors and the Gold Line, so a lot of slicing and dicing. Took a look at five different land uses during this process [inaudible] apartments for sale, attached residential for sale, detached, office and retail, and we are going to take a look at a couple of these land uses, rental apartments and offices as they apply to the transit corridors, really focusing on the Blue Line and the Blue Line Extension.

When we started looking at development- I've done this a couple of times before; I did a study back in 2009 looking at a similar scope and then I think back in 2002 or 2003, and what we found and what we reconfirmed is development opportunities along the Blue Line and Blue Line Extension to the north are strong for both rental apartments and for office. We found demand for somewhere around 12,000 apartments going forward in each corridor heading north and south which is pretty strong and that is through 2045 and we found demand potential for around three million square feet of office, about a million and a half on the Blue Line north through that same timeframe, so strong development. Again, what we found is that the opportunities really varied significantly by the station location, the value proposition they have and frankly the feasibility of what can be developed in these different locations. They are very different, both corridors traverse very different areas, very different opportunities, and I will summarize that for you really quick.

The Blue Line of course came into being in the early to mid-2000; it only captured a couple of percentage points of Charlotte's absorption for apartments. It was up to around 15 to 17% at peak; it's averaged somewhere around 14% of Charlotte's sphere absorption for apartments which is pretty significant, one of the most active sub-markets in the City. We are forecasting that to remain strong, somewhere around 16% going forward, and it is interested we started slicing up the corridor about 94% of the apartment absorption, apartment development in the corridor has happened in those first three or four stations coming out of uptown. Carson, Bland, East/West down to New Bern have captured a massive amount of apartment development. The opportunities have diminished a little bit and not been realized when you get further south from around Woodlawn down to the end of the corridor at I-485. The South End Stations have done really well; they benefit from convenience access to uptown, downtown, center city; they also have a higher walkability, which is a big factor for folks these days and a greater mixed-use dynamic. So, much stronger locations that really have that lifestyle that allows them to achieve a lot higher rents, more intense development that they can support. When you get a little bit further south the dynamic drops off a little bit, the convenience factor diminished a little bit and the lifestyle play isn't quite there as strong as it is in South End.

When you head north the north corridor or the Blue Line Extension really is almost three different areas in one. You've got that intown area from NoDa back in, which is supporting much more urban kind of hip and funky development. You've got that stretch roughly from Sugar Creek Road out to Tom Hunter Road, which is a little bit more challenged economically and a pretty quiet area in terms of development, then you've got the University City area which is a mix of greenfield development, which you can still do some out there, and then redevelopment over time. University Place, that big power center out there represents a real significant opportunity to do something pretty interesting out there. Again, it went from almost no development to about 15% of Charlotte's absorption in that current cycle, so adding those two up, you are getting upwards towards 30% of the absorption that Charlotte is seeing is happening in these two corridors, which is pretty substantial.

We think it will be strong going forward in both areas, but again very different opportunities. One of the things in looking at this, as we took a look at different types of development models out there and what is being developed and talked to a lot of developer folks. This is informed by developers we worked with here but also Atlanta, Nashville and other locations in the southeast. Development costs are going up; to support high rise construction you are going to need to come in somewhere around \$2.50 per square foot. Another way to look at this is a 1,000-square foot unit would rent for about \$2,500 per month, a pretty substantial rent to get to high rise. Podium, where you put the parking underneath the building, somewhere around \$2.20. Wrapped product, which is what you guys have seen a lot of in South End. You've seen it in Park/Woodlawn. You're seeing it in Plaza/Midwood and SouthPark. That is where the deck is wrapped by the buildings themselves, about five or six-story product, that is going to be about \$2 per square foot from what is being built today. It has been about \$1.70 to \$1.80, so you can see the construction costs have really jumped up.

Garden/Ervin which is a four-story product feels more urban in nature but is surface parked, so I think the Blue Line was one we had talked about earlier today on the Blue Line North was an example of that. [inaudible] has some of that as well, a little bit less expensive product to build but still about \$1.60, or so and even your basic garden apartments you are really looking at \$1.30 to \$1.35 per square foot so costs are going up to make these products work.

What we found when we started looking at the corridors, this is the south, and when you get in the inter Blue Line, South End, New Bern Stations we have apartment rents today that are \$1.75 to \$2.25 per square foot for newer products so it supports that wrap product and it is getting close to high rise, so it is an area that can support that more intense development. When you start getting down to Scaleybark Road, Woodlawn Road, Tyvola Road, there hasn't been an apartment development in those locations in a long time. Our suspicion is that a product that would come in there would probably come in at \$1.50 to \$1.70, so you are somewhere around that urban garden product which is the surface parking, four-story kind of stuff or maybe mid-rise. You've got some big shopping centers if they developed and could create something more significant there than just a free-standing apartment deal. You could get more higher rent supported in a different type of product but then when you start getting down to the lower Blue Line you are really looking more at garden product maybe some urban garden product depending on the location but a little bit more modest of rents that it can support. A big factor that we pointed to when I looked at this in 2009 is value creation, more parks, more greenways, more sidewalks, more walkability in these areas to try and push some of these rents and get them to where they can support different types of development here.

Blue Line Extension same story, when you are in the inner part Parkwood Avenue, 25th Street you are looking at \$1.50 to \$1.80 per square foot, so you are getting into that wrap product, you are at that urban garden. When you get the novel NoDa, Mercury Street, those are true wrap deals that are supported there. You hit that spot Old Concord Road, Tom Hunter Road where you would probably have to struggle to get market rate garden to float at this point right now, but I think certainly opportunities going forward. Then University City can vary a good bit; it could be garden; it could be more urban garden. If someone were to be able to redevelop significantly that University Place, the huge power center out there into something more intense you could see some kind of mid-rise out there. Again, it is a widely varying corridor with different opportunities, different lifestyles, different affordability.

Really quick on office, I will say real quick that office dynamics are changing. It has always been driven historically by where the boss wants to live. You follow executive housing in any city, and you are going to find office scores that are growing Charlotte to the south, Atlanta, which is where I live, due north. So, that has been the historic model, bosses don't like to drive; they move offices closer to where they live. Competition for young talent; millennials are now the biggest part of the workforce, have changed that dynamic, they want more walkable, more vibrant intown locations typically. A lot of them do like suburban locations but want more walkable, more transit oriented, don't want to have to rely on getting around by car at all. That has really led to the rise of intown development.

The Blue Line has only captured around two or three percent of office development historically in the current cycle it is about 10 to 13% of office demands. You've got several sizable office properties going in there driven by that lifestyle and a really different proposition than maybe what Center City provides today. The BLE has been very quiet as well, but we are seeing demand start to pick up on that. I think probably not quite as strong as the Blue Line to the south, and we think demand as I mentioned the Blue Line heading south could be around three million square feet, the Blue Line Extension to the north being about 1.5 million square feet. Like the apartments when you get into South End, you are looking at potentially more intense development and you could support structured parking for office. You see buildings under construction now actually going up to about eight or nine floors. When you get further out you are going to be looking at much lower intensity; you can't support the structured parking, and you would be looking at low intensity, smaller type office developments so very different opportunities, very different rents and lease rate supported, and I think tying into what Monica is going to be talking about needing some very different treatment in terms of long-term planning.

Monica Holmes, Planning said with that, I'm going to give you all an update on our Transit Oriented Development zoning district and where we are in that process. We really want to try to set the stage, because we feel like it is important when we are talking about the development and the development patterns in our transit station areas that we are looking at it with a reality and what is actually happening out there and what is going to happen in the future. As most of you probably have heard and know and we've been here before, we are embarking on a journey and we are about a year into it to redo our Transit Oriented Development districts in our zoning ordinance, and it is really four new districts that are building on a foundation of our existing policy so things like Charlotte Walks, Charlotte Bikes, our Station Area Plans like the University City Area Plan, how do we build on that and really create zoning districts that reflect the policy that we've already adopted? It sets a model for our new ordinance and it really raises the bar with design and form. It also improves the function of the ordinance with clarity, so you will see a lot graphics, a lot of tables, and it is really to make it user friendly. Zoning ordinances are not that fun to read, so we are attempting to make it as interesting as possible and as user friendly as possible so that if you are a property owner you can pick it up and figure out how you can develop your property. We also want to give appropriate flexibility, so that we don't continue to have every TOD project be a conditional rezoning with a lot of conditions tied to it. So, we want to know the outcomes; we want predictability for what it is going to look like but if the market changes like the information Todd was just giving us, if the market changes we need to be flexible enough to be able to respond to those changes.

I think this ties really well into what he was just saying is that Transit Oriented Development is not a one size fits all. So, you can see here on the left; this is near South End, and you can see that higher density intensity development and on the right you can see a station like the Sugar Creek Station where you have industrial old buildings that are really prime for reuse, and they are two different stations, so we have to have different districts that respond to the needs of these different stations. You can see here, this is the blue project that he was mentioning on the left and then the Colonial on the right where there are also two different types of apartments. Both housing, one is an urban garden style, and one is that wrap style, different costs and different types of development, so how do our standards reflect those different styles?

What we are proposing are four districts that really meet that wide range of need, so we have the transition district which is the least intense and it has moderate design standards. Still raising that bar on design but creating a clear expectation that reflects the intensity in the district. As you get further into the stations, they get higher intensity, taller buildings, and their expectation level rises, so as the height rises so do the ground floor expectations. More windows, we want less parking to be visible from the street, we want wider sidewalks; we really want that public realm to reflect that high intensity of development. So, whereas not our TOD zoning districts are really a one size fits all, they are all the same intensity, all the same density and all the same design standards, the new districts have a spectrum, so you go from least intense to most intense, moderate standards to higher standards, and those get applied in different ways so as you are

closer to town those higher price point stations. Those higher intensity stations you use the higher intensity zoning district, and as you get further away from town you would see the transition zoning district and the community center. This would likely change over time so as stations grow up they can also change from one to the other so they could start off as a community center or transition station and as they mature go up to the urban center or neighborhood center.

This shows you what that type of development might look like so upper left seeing that highest intensity and then lower right being the transition, so it could be building reuse or it could be a lower intensity housing. So, where are we today in this process? We've received over 1,000 comments; we've had 25 plus Ordinance Advisory Committee meetings. We've had additional stakeholder meetings with a couple of public meetings. We actually have one on Wednesday as Taiwo mentioned. We've had three public drafts and comment periods, and we've put a lot of elbow grease into this so we are planning to file the Text Amendment for the new TOD Zoning Districts this month, so we really wanted to be here tonight to let you know that this is on the horizon. We feel good. We are actually getting ready to release a new draft this week where we will be giving that to you all, so you can really take a deep dive in. We are going to engage, modify and adopt the districts this winter/spring and then following that we are going to align the zoning and policy with rezoning. So, that is what I'm going to dive into right now really quickly and just kind of preview that for you because you are going to start to hear from some constituents that this is going on.

So, what is this aligned zoning with policy look like? All this area in purple here is what is recommended for TOD. Our number one priority is to protect existing neighborhoods, so that is the white area that you see here. That is from our Station Area Plan, and it could be right next to the station, like you see here with Parkwood Station. That area is right next to the station, but it is a priority to protect that neighborhood and keep the pattern of development that is there. Then we want to look at the recommended for Transit Oriented Development, so everything that is in purple is what is what is recommended for Transit Oriented Development district from the area plan. Those are the parcels that we are focusing on in this effort, so if it is not recommended for Transit Oriented Development we are not focusing on it in this effort. It is not part of what I am describing today. We are also not going to focus on conditionally zoned TOD urban projects, so if you guys have looked at it, vetted it, and voted on it, it is taken off the table, and we are not looking at it as part of this project and process. By right TOD meaning it is a conventional Transit Oriented Development district that exists today will be automatically translated to one of the new districts when we adopt the text. So that will be the first parcels that actually use the new zoning district.

Why are we doing this now? We are doing this now, because we think it is really an opportunity to leverage our \$1,000,000,000 investment in our transit line, and we think it gives us the potential to provide access and affordability to new people in Charlotte that are not currently along our Blue Line. We think it provides economic benefits to property owners and makes doing the right thing easy. So, right now, if you want to build a TOD development on your property and you are in a Transit Station Area you have to pay the rezoning fee, hire an attorney and spend tens of thousands of dollars going through the City Council process to be able to do what we have all said we want you to do, so we are trying to make the right thing easy. We really think it serves as a model for the full Unified Development Ordinance. So, we are learning a lot from this process; we will be doing it again once we get to the UDO for the entire City.

So, what factors are influencing this alignment rezoning? Number one is prioritizing recommendations that you all have already adopted, and number two is taking this market demand and using it for each station to help us calibrate what districts are appropriate and which stations. Who will it affect? By adoption, those TOD by right translation property owners, it is about 630 parcels, and they will be translated on the day it is adopted. That is about 12% of all the land recommended for Transit Oriented Development. The alignment rezoning, which is everything else not including the urban conditional and the TOD conditional, it is about 2,000 parcels, and it is 73% of the land recommended for Transit Oriented Development. So, for those of us who like to do math, from that equation

right there, you can see that there is about 27% that is conditional TOD or mixed-use district, so that is the remaining portion. At the end of the day, 100% of the land recommended for TOD on the Blue Line will be entitled to be developed for Transit Oriented Development, and we really feel like that is a huge opportunity.

So, what upcoming meetings do we have? We have a meeting this coming Wednesday at the Powerhouse to really focus on the translation so those 630 parcels, it's about 260 property owns. We will be focusing on them during lunch time and the evening to go over what does that mean. What district are you getting translated to and what are the standards of the new district? Then we will have another Ordinance Advisory Committee meeting December 13, 2018 to go over and review the new draft that will be coming out in the next couple of days, so we will give that to them. We will review hot button topics at that meeting with them and then we will be continuing on the path of the Text Amendment. We will be bringing back to you all a process guide for that alignment rezoning, so before we begin we are going to bring back to you, what are the priorities, and how are we making decisions and also who all will it affect? We will be bringing all of that information to you all and then we will be filing the alignment rezoning following the adoption of the text. So, it is best practice that you have the district first before you decide where they are going to go, so we will not be doing any mapping before we adopt the actual text for the district. If you have any questions for Todd or I, we will be happy to answer them.

Councilmember Winston said I don't necessarily have a question about this; the presentation consulted me about the kind of zones on the Blue Line Extension, and one of the things that really stuck out to me is the hot areas or areas between South End and Sugar Creek that are areas that have been or currently are going under some intense gentrification. The issue always remains, and what we want to do is give people more opportunities to live and work and play specifically right now around Transit Oriented Development. It seems like that is going to be difficult because of the types of construction that is going to be cost effectively available, and I think where we want to be as a body especially as the other areas around the Blue Line Extension catch up and are more developable, we want diverse price points of housing and different types of housing. I'm still trying to see how TOD by itself, I don't think it can by itself get us there. What stuck out to me also in those numbers, and you kept coming back to parking structure, and what I hear over and over again is that parking is what is so expensive, and I think we should do something about that. I would like to recommend to our TAP Committee that we look at changing through the Text Amendment process parking requirements for new development, either reducing or eliminating in some instances the parking requirements that we have, because I think that can go a long way in creating more opportunities if we let the market decide how much parking is necessary in a structure as opposed to our ordinances. I think that can go a long way in reducing the cost of housing and development opportunities that are available, not just in Transit Oriented Zoning but throughout the City.

Ms. Holmes said in the proposed TOD draft you will see, especially in the new one coming out, that we don't have parking requirements, they are actually the parking maximums, so you can't build more than a certain amount of parking. You will see that in the draft. There are some market tensions as to how much you should actually make people build less versus just not requiring them to build it.

Mr. Winston said again we speak of markets, if we are only doing this with Transit Oriented Zoning, we know there are many zones and the market for development is just not determined by the development that goes along transit corridors. I see the correlation here between the parking requirement that we have Citywide, and if the idea is to get more diverse price point housing, especially along transit lines, how can we take the strongest and most effective way to make that happen period? We can't just look at what is happening along transit lines of course to do that. We have to look at how development is done throughout the City. I would like to see how we can get to a place that overall drives the cost of development down period overall. I think we can do that by reducing, if not eliminating, some parking requirements.

Mr. Noel said the only thing I was going to add to your point a little bit; parking maximums can work, but what you have to watch out for is not to make them too strict and not have them somewhere else to where developers say I need to build more parking. You have to watch out and make sure you apply things evenly across the board so it might be that it applies to Center City or SouthPark or some of those other areas. The parking stuff of the other TOD parts of it may be different, but I was just saying watch out for some of those kinds of issues.

Mr. Winston said that is why I think we should look at it in Committee, our parking requirements, and I would love to look at that overall.

Councilmember Eiselt said I will follow-up with that a little bit, because I asked the question about whether or not we could uncouple parking requirements from rentals, and what I learned from legal is that we cannot do that, because North Carolina State Law says we cannot regulate private apartments buildings, so we are not able to do that like some cities have. I still would love to see an effort to be able to do that going forward or at least have a market practice where leasing agents separate that and offer parking as a separate –

Mr. Winston said I'm talking about construction.

Ms. Eiselt said my question is with the density bonus. So, there was a lot of community discussion on that as to whether or not our density bonus as it exists was sort of counter intuitive. It costs more to build higher, so they are not going to take the density bonus. Where did that fall?

Ms. Holmes said we are still kind of tweaking the height bonus as to what is exactly the appropriate. Again, you want to allow people to build to what they can build to; the bonus is something we really see being used for one out of ten developments so a small portion of development that really has the demand. We are fairly aware of where the breaks in construction costs are, meaning where you go from kind of a wrap construction to high rise construction, so we've been calibrating those accordingly so the bonus is not thought that every project will use it. It is something that I think 10% of projects will use it. I think you will see in our latest draft that is coming out tomorrow some work on that, and we have continued to have community conversations, and we have partners in Housing and Neighborhood Services and Transportation that we've been working with to make sure we are calibrating it the right way.

Mayor Lyles said I don't understand what you just said. Don't try to explain it to me, because I probably won't understand it again. What I'm going to say is this, we are putting a lot of money into the idea that we can do housing, but we know that we can't do housing with that amount of money. It wouldn't matter no matter what so, if this doesn't fit, I would like to see how it is going to work. If density bonus isn't going to work for after five-stories then what would be the alternative, and what would we do? I don't know where this is, but I figure you know that housing is really important for us, and so you will come back and show us how this actually helps us get some.

Ms. Holmes said we understand that; we hear that loud and clear, and we know that no one has taken advantage of our existing bonus structure, and so we are working very hard to take a different approach with this to make it the easy choice that if you use the bonus you are choosing that.

Mayor Lyles said I don't want people to come in and say I'm building five-stories of stick built housing and the next story requires me to go concrete, and we are going to split that cost with your money. I just don't want to see it. It just doesn't make sense for us to do that. We can't afford that kind of – I don't know what you are going to do, but maybe I'm just asking let's be careful and still get the outcome that we want.

Ms. Eiselt said with regards to the research that you showed us along the Blue Line; how are we going to use that information to help us with regards to housing and be proactive and not reactive of where we might be acquiring land or doing something and maybe that

is another way to have some sort of an incentive program that we get involved early on knowing where the growth is going to be and knowing where the demand is going to be so that we can put housing in high opportunity areas?

Mr. Noel said I think it was several strategies to deal with it; what we did I think informs a number of things. It informs how much land potentially and how much TOD zoning is needed out there in the different station areas, the types of development you are looking at and the intensities that we are looking at. To Monica's classification systems when she was talking about which ones are more appropriate and which locations, but I think certainly toward your goals with housing it does inform where demand is. We did a study about four or five years ago looking at affordable housing and housing needs assessment for Charlotte and found a pretty significant amount of demand and depth out there for it. There are different ways to approach it; parking is one. Montgomery County I do a lot of work in- they have a Parking Authority, and they've built parking decks and then reduce parking requirements for deals around it, not only for housing. Marriott just moved where it went, because they could take advantage of public parking and contract with employees, so for office development it takes the heat off of that as well. That is one strategy you could look at but there are certainly other density bonus strategies. We've done a lot of work with different companies that are involved with affordable housing and below market housing. Forest City for instance we do a lot of work with, and we can talk with them about some other different strategies and things they do to kind of help inform some of the efforts with the density bonus.

Ms. Eiselt said I think since we've gotten you involved in this and the research is being done, we really have to start talking about that and how we are going to be able to accomplish our goals by looking far enough forward with this information.

Ms. Holmes said this work is really helping us validate that the alignment rezoning is the right step to get the entitlements on the ground at the right intensity level for what the market wants to build there, so we can actually see that type of development in some other stations that we don't currently have a lot of development.

Councilmember Newton said I just wanted to comment on Mr. Winston's point and also had a question as well. I get what Mr. Winston is saying, and I just wanted to clarify that I see the wisdom in it, particularly when we are talking about existing transit lines or TOD development in the City, because I think that certainly encourages pedestrian oriented communities where people can live, work, and play. I just kind of caution out beyond that point, because I think for many folks in a southern City and I it that this is part of the UDO too and we are talking about that kind of density and consolidation, but in a southern City that has a lot of sprawl, I just question kind of limiting the access to motor vehicles and that type of transportation.

Mr. Winston said I didn't say anything about limiting, just lessening the requirement.

Mr. Newton said less parking spaces so less place for someone to put a vehicle that they might otherwise need. My question is often times in rezoning hearings, we are asked to approve a rezoning that is inconsistent with the plan, and that is because circumstances for a given area have changed. We've talked about TOD in anticipation of transportation development, and I'm wondering is there any accommodation for the possibility of change occurring? I think we are facing lots of challenges that relate to funding that can be prohibitive for some development, particularly now on the federal and state level. I'm just wonder is that being taken into account, these changes over time is there a timeframe where we say maybe we need to reconsider a particular type of plan or plan area, and how was that addressed?

Mayor Lyles said is this on TOD specifically?

Mr. Newton said yes, on TOD.

Mayor Lyles said I want to make sure the question is how do measure the impact of this on developers?

Mr. Newton said when it comes to TOD plans and the potential for circumstances in a particular area may be changing inconsistent with that plan. Are we keeping up with that and is this going to keep up with that?

Mr. Holmes said I will say that if you take TOD's numbers and then look at the amount of acres that we recommend for TOD, the demand in 25-years does not exceed the amount of land that we have identified on the Blue Line for TOD. We think that we have ample land identified for Transit Oriented Development. Now, the comprehensive plan, that is the goal of the comprehensive plan to be that mechanism to look at land uses every five-years and say, has there been something that has changed the dynamic in this location, and does the boundary need to change? That really lives in a policy document; the zoning tool is with the implementation to get there. We feel like taking this route with the comp plan combined with this gives you a clearer direction as to why something inconsistent should or should not be considered because you have a clear vision and there is land entitled there also.

Councilmember Driggs said the locations that go from old TOD to new TOD, is that going to create an immediate burden on anybody to make changes in order to conform to the rules?

Mr. Holmes said no.

Mr. Driggs said have we done an economic impact analysis? I think we've kind of heard some references to this, but how this affect the kind of usability of that land from the standpoint of the developer? Are we creating more restrictive requirements, and have we studied how it might affect the choices of people coming from out of town to locate here because of how inviting do you look at that?

Ms. Holmes said I would have to understand exactly; we have about 12% of land that is ready TOD. Every other property has to go through a rezoning.

Mr. Driggs said that was the first question; the second question is not about that. The second question is if all the other land that you want to designate this way, by introducing this TOD, are we making it more difficult for our commercial people to develop that land? The question is whether it could end up going in a direction where that requires things that are no longer current, for example, and I'm just wondering compared to where we are does it create a more restrictive zoning requirement than the one we have now?

Ms. Holmes said the standards are different; I think if you take fine tooth comb and look through them, you will see that in some cases the height plane is more gracious to property owners and in some cases sit is not. You really have to take a parcel by parcel look and say, how does it flush out? Yes, there are more standards around things like open space, sidewalks, some of the design standards. They are really focused on the ground floor. We've been looking at projects and seeing how they would test in the new ordinance, so we can provide that information for you.

Mr. Driggs said I would love to see an analysis maybe by Tracy Dodson or from Economic Development perspective of how this affects [inaudible] because we are creating [inaudible] burdens to development in that area and it is a completely different lens than this one.

Ms. Holmes said just to point out to you we have our Ordinance Advisory Committee is about half development community and half neighborhood and sustainability community, so those are the members that have been involved since the very beginning and giving their continual feedback. So, we feel like we are in a fairly good place right now and we are continuing to take feedback.

Mayor Lyles said he would like to see some analysis around that versus this is what we believe or think. I think that is the point; analysis versus opinions from the Advisory Committee.

Councilmember Harlow said this is about TOD but less about TOD around the Blue Line and Blue Line Extension, and I don't know if this question goes to Taiwo or to the Chair of TAP or to you all as it relates to the Advisory Committee. A couple comments as it relates to leveraging our investments on a million dollars, and we've also got this hundreds of millions of dollar investment for the Streetcar Line [inaudible] Have there conversations been had around TOD on the Streetcar corridor, as it relates to West Trade Street and Central Avenue? The whole goal here is saying, how do we make it easier to make sure we get this leverage of our investment for more development and we are doing that seems relatively well; lowering burdens, changing design standards? We are making TOD by right now, all of those things in the north/south pattern, and my concern would be an east/west pattern where we have a lot of investment. It is not the same as light rail, and I'm not saying the light rail or the Streetcar. Let me be very clear about that, but at the same time, we just had a presentation in the very beginning about equity, so let's have that conversation as it relates to how are we applying these same standards, or are we even applying these same standards to our Gold Line?

Ms. Holmes said you will actually see that TOD in our current ordinance does not apply to the Streetcar. These four new TOD districts can be applied to the Streetcar. The only reason why we are not currently pursuing an alignment rezoning for the Streetcar is because we don't have the existing policy in place to recommend TOD there. You really have to have a Council adopted land use plan that recommends TOD in a location before we can rezone parcels to that. I think during the comprehensive plan, that really gives us a good opportunity to do that and to get the right kind of districts and the right place types in place on the Streetcar that can then translate to the TOD districts. Once these districts get adopted, they can be used on the Streetcar and we expect that to happen. When you look at the purpose and applicability of the ordinance, you will see that they are very clearly intended to be used on the Streetcar.

Mr. Harlow said I'm a little confused when you are saying we don't have policy that applies currently, and you are also saying with the snap of a finger and a text amendment the policy is changed. Is the policy changed with the amendment or is it not?

Mr. Holmes said we have the PED Overlay Districts, which is the zoning districts in place in those corridors. When I say the policy, I mean there is not a Station Area Plan on the Streetcar that has adopted land use policy for the Streetcar that recommends Transit Oriented Development, so that is really where the gap is, and that is something we think will be solved with that future land use.

Mr. Harlow said this doesn't solve that, and I'm looking for a referral almost now and exploring that in TAP going forward. I'm not trying to slow this process up as it relates to the Blue Line and Blue Line Extension, but there has got to be a conversation here on a longer term. We've put money in this, and we want to have some form of development in those corridors as well.

Mayor Lyles said I think you need to get us a response that talks about exactly what Mr. Harlow is saying.

Ms. Holmes said we can't legally rezone properties that don't have policy in place. We can get a full response to you.

Mayor Lyles said he didn't say rezone it; I think you said because we don't have an area plan or any policy document along that corridor then we can't go ahead and make recommendations based on that. I think what Mr. Harlow is saying is nobody is waiting; they are all doing, and if we wait for that then we lose the opportunity, and I know that it is as you said, not north and south but one of the problems is we didn't do north and south fast enough. I think he is just trying to get out ahead. Can you get back to us with what it would be required to do some type of planning effort and whether or not that supports our comprehensive plan schedule or it disrupts it or lines with it. Is that fair?

Mr. Harlow said that is fair and I've had some conversations with staff a little bit [inaudible] we had that conversation around PED versus TOD. If Debra was here, she would probably be standing up there right now talking about some of the same stuff. I'll be frank. I wasn't so satisfied with the response then, and some of it is identical now and I just think that there is an opportunity for the Council to set policy rather than saying we know what the problem or we know that we are absent of a policy at the moment so, let's get the ball rolling on having that.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said that is reason we embarked on the comprehensive plan process; that is the major reason we decided to do that. The problem is we don't want to put the cart before the horse, because that is really what we've been doing. My concern is that if we start doing something with the Streetcar right now, we are going to run into some issues but we will kind of dial back and take a look at that and then get back to you, but right now where we do have those policies are really on our light rail corridors that will allow this type of thing to happen, but that is not to say what you are saying is not valid. It is, but we just have to make sure that we are very, very careful from a legal prospective and also from a planning prospective how we can do this.

Mr. Harlow said I totally understand we've got to tow that line. It is worth towing, and I feel like we are trying to dance around not doing it rather than saying I want to get in the business of let's get the ball rolling and while we are moving that ball tell me what we can do, and that is why we have the City Attorney and all that [inaudible] oh, we don't want to do this because it might run into this.

Mayor Lyles said I think we heard your sentiment loud and clear.

Councilmember Egleston said what Mr. Harlow is saying I think if you look at the current land use for Phase I and Phase II of the Gold Line, there is less opportunity for TOD type uses, because a lot of is already built out, but I think whenever the time comes that we start talking about Phase III, which we haven't yet, at least not since we all got sworn in, that has got to be part of the discussion because Phase III is where there will be a lot more opportunity for new development or redevelopment or TOD type use as opposed to uptown. The edges of uptown where we have a lot of institutional use that is likely not going to change, but I think we can't talk about Phase III without talking about what Mr. Harlow is saying.

Councilmember Mayfield said I want to thank staff for the beginning of the conversation. This goes back to why Committee Chairs need to be in more communication, because the bulk of this presentation was talking about housing yet, this conversation never came to the Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee for us to share, because had it come through the Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee, along with TAP, then some of these questions would have been asked as far as the east/west connection, because what we know today is previous Councils there were recommendations regarding the Blue Line before it was developed. What we also know is land is being bought up quickly to be sat on. Land that is being sold today has been in some families a decade or more, and it is just now the economy is at a different place. One of the pieces that I think will be more helpful, along with the fact that we need to have a real conversation in Housing and Neighborhood Development as far as how TOD will move forward, is around the business aspect, because what we see on the ground and what has been one of my challenges within South End is the number of businesses that are being displaced for multifamily development, so at the same time we are having conversations at Economic Development Committee regarding business job opportunities, we are creating language that potentially is displacing some business along the light rail, whereas when we talk about accessibility and walkability is not just for housing and entertainment, we say live, work and play, but we have yet to have a conversation. Mr. Manager, this is directly for you for your team. We are not having conversations about as we potentially are creating language that may displace a business. What recommendations are we giving to connect that business elsewhere? And/or when we make an investment and recently within the last three days there was an article regarding a building in Camp North End where we have made a major investment and now an investor is coming in, you have multiple businesses inside of this building that

are now being told you need to vacate these premises. As we are creating this language, we need to really look at the first presentation where we are looking within staff equity and bias. That conversation needs to happen over all departments, because as we make investments and then investors come in, if we don't have clear language of the expectation or the type of City we are attempting to build then we are going to be the ones left with very bad product in our community, because these aren't people who are making an investment to stay in the community. They are just making a financial investment that may or may not benefit. So, as we are having this TOD conversation, I would like to recommend if we are going to have conversations that is heavily focused around housing that our Housing Committee, my Director of Housing, and my City staff of housing are aware of these conversations so that we will be able to have input, but also in here under Urban Center, Community Center, Transition, Neighborhood Center, and even though we were able to go over it, there is no clear and if I was a resident looking at it I don't see clearly how my business is protected along the light rail investment and/or the Gold Line investment, because we know there are conversations of expanding our rail that we have been having, and we know some of our regional partners are potentially having conversations about connecting to the rail. We have the opportunity to try to get this done right, but if we don't get some language in place we are going to continue to be reactionary and be behind the eight ball. I really hope that we understand it is not a conversation of putting the cart before the horse; we really are playing catch up because that horse got away from us a long time ago, so we are trying to run up and catch the horse, so we are just going to go ahead and jump into that Dodge and just go ahead and catch up to the horse in order to figure out how we are going to make the adjustments to direct us correctly.

Mayor Lyles said I think the horse is carrying a heavy load right now. We talked a little bit about scooters earlier today; do we need to talk about them again? I think the Manager heard a lot about scooters. I don't think we need to talk about scooters again; I think Mr. Jones recognizes –

Councilmember Phipps said if he recognizes that there is a lot of concern surrounding scooters in the way of safety and many of us learned today that the pilot program has been extended now till sometime maybe this summer. I don't know that we are all aware that the pilot would be going that long. We don't have any real guidelines, so I don't feel comfortable with waiting that long to come up with something.

Mayor Lyles said I think where we are is that the Manager had three options and he has a recommendation. I think those ought to go back to Committee and the Committee hammer it out and come back to us again. I think that is something we learned today, and there is a recommendation, and I don't think that everybody understood why that recommendation was being made or how it was managed. To go back to Committee with his three options today, is that okay?

Mr. Phipps said yes.

Ms. Eiselt said I just want to go on record also to say that we did not know that the pilot had been extended, and I for one like to see some other action to either limit the number of scooters on the road until we have rules in place so I'm happy that it will go back to Committee because it was a surprise to all of us in Committee that day when the report out in the media was that we were putting more scooters on the streets.

Mr. Phipps said we do have a draft E-Scooter Shared Mobility Plan that we need to read and comment on by the time of our next TAP Committee meeting to see what those recommendations are and what tweaks we can make in them before that draft comes to us.

Mayor Lyles said I think you heard the Manager say three options that he would bring back and explain what his recommendation was.

Councilmember Bokhari said I just want to make sure, because I think we've said several different things, and I don't want people in the media and the world to be confused. The pilot period, there is a long-term date out there that doesn't mean anything literally. We

are in the extended pilot period until we figure out what we are going to do, so whether that is in a week from now or six months from now, it is up to us.

Mayor Lyles said I think you have to have a discussion in Committee about that because I think that a pilot period could end before you have a solution. You could just decide some things and so that may not be the best option but I'm just saying the pilot period can be a separate item.

Mr. Bokhari said I don't think anyone ever said we are putting more scooters on the street or putting less scooters on the street.

Ms. Mayfield said yes, we did; we increased the number.

Mayor Lyles said okay, I don't know anything about that, but I think the perception is that we put more scooters on the streets. The perception is that.

Inter-governmental Relations - Legislative Agenda

Mayor Lyles said this has been a little bit different for me; it seems we've had a lot of staff presentations. Are you trying to see if I notice these things or not?

Councilmember Egleston said we are going to switch it up for you Mayor; Mr. Bokhari and I did not get the memo that our report outs from our Committees were supposed to be the same length as the Committee meetings, so as such, ours will be much quicker. You've got in your packet the proposed Legislative Agenda that you saw last week. We are going to talk about that with Dana in a second. I do want to thank Dana and LaWana. We had a great time down in Raleigh last week with the North Carolina League of Municipalities working on setting their legislative agenda. We are obviously a member of that organization and they advocate for all of the municipalities around the state. Those 15 items that they narrowed down a much, much longer list too, obviously having to take into consideration a lot of things for urban areas and for rural areas both. Dana sent those out to you a couple of days ago, hopefully you have seen them, if not let he, or I know and we can get them to you again if you are interested. With our Legislative Agenda, the one change you will notice since we showed it to you last week is on Page 8 of 12 and that is the change where we are not in our State Legislative Agenda now planning on seeking the flexibility in the calendar for CMS and conversations we have had with different folks at CMS there doesn't seem to be the need for us to involve ourselves in that. They are working through it and seem to have it under control, so we are not going to water down our priorities by adding something to it that is not needed by the body that we are trying to assist.

Councilmember Bokhari said the one thing I would add to that is I think in conversations it is quite clear that especially to those who are stakeholders on our side, like CMPD and others, it is indeed important to us, so I don't want anyone to think that it is something that isn't important. It is clearly important; it is just that we believe the other bodies are better suited and positioned to handle it, and should they need our assistance we may put it back on the agenda or come back to this body with questions, but for now, as Mr. Egleston said, that is the approach.

Mr. Egleston said Mr. Fenton is going to buzz through this and like I said, we saw this last week so this should not look new to anybody and he will not do so in an extended time period.

Dana Fenton, Inter-Governmental Relations Manager said what we have here tonight is simply just what presented to you last week, or introduced to you last week, that is, the proposed Federal Legislative Agenda with positions on the 2030 Transit Plan, Food Security, Infrastructure Initiative and RNC 2020. None of those positions we are recommending change from last week's presentation. The State Legislative Agenda we have Affordable Housing, Citizens Review Board, Commercial Service Airport Improvements, Minimum Housing Standards, NC Search and Rescue Teams. No changes with those five, but as Mr. Egleston said RNC 2020 for the State, we would leave

in there the authorization to utilize out-of-state law enforcement officers, dropping the CMS School Calendar Flexibility for the time being.

Under Letters of Support we talked about this week, the Aging-in-Place. This would involve sending a letter from the City to the County supporting a Legislative Study of the N. C. Homestead Act. Then we also had in here the other issues we talked about what is in the Committee parking lot and also the special assessments for critical infrastructure needs acts. A note on that; last week the Metropolitan Transit Commission did adopt its 2019 State Legislative Agenda that includes advocating for the special assessments sunset date extension. I'll be glad to answer any questions if needed.

Councilmember Driggs said are we supposed to be discussing [inaudible] what happens next?

Mr. Fenton said last week was more of an introduction to it; this was intended to be the night for discussion and then next week on December 10, 2018 it would be before the Council for adoption.

Mr. Driggs said I have some concern about a couple of these frankly from my experience under Inter-Governmental Relations Committee. I think we need to be more specific, so I look at Infrastructure Initiative, and I'm not sure I understand what it is we want them to do. [inaudible] is near and dear to the heart of Ms. Eiselt. It was controversial before, so I think we ought to know what we are getting into before we [inaudible] and send it to them. Then from a housing standard, similar stuff. I guess my general suggestion would be to kind of test market these things a little bit and lay some ground work and not just publish a Legislative Agenda that lets them see the first time, at least improve those [inaudible], because I think we are going to have to create a lower receptivity for what we really want to accomplish. If we can be focused on what we are asking for then it can be actual kind of request, and again, I'm afraid they are going to see this list [inaudible].

Mayor Lyles said the only one that I have to say is the Citizens' Review Board was something we adopted unanimously as a Council, and it has been on our program of work last year, and it is something that the Council hasn't said that they want to not do, and we do know how the reception has gone, and we do know the amount of work that has to be done with it, but that is backed by, you remember the study that we did a year ago for that effort? So, that one I think clearly has a foundational balance with a report. I just wanted to bring that one up, because I want to be specific around the questions that you feel like we don't have the background to, and I don't feel like the Citizens' Review Board subpoena power [inaudible].

Mr. Driggs said I want to maximize our chances of success, and I want to be pragmatic about the relationship between us and Raleigh and therefore not create unnecessary resistance to the things that we can achieve and really want to do because of things that they probably are not going to accept. Really, I'm talking about you guys sort of test marketing and looking but let's not spring this on them.

Mr. Bokhari said in response, I think you nailed it, and we are actually working on a lot of that. For example, there is a lot of underlying detail with all of these things and things that staff is indeed still working on that will be part of a broader package so we would never vote this and release and say CRB and Subpoena power. For example, in that one right now the direction we've given staff is Chief Putney has put out probably in my opinion the most compelling argument for why this makes sense, so we are gathering from him a direct account of how it works today and then what it is that he thinks it actually plays out to help him and his officers going forward actually get a more fair shake in the Citizens Review Board process than in its current form.

In the infrastructure one, that is just kind of like a huge listing of items there that is broken down, not only in much more detail, but in particular angles of what we plan on doing versus the angles of let's say 5G infrastructure and where the state versus federal. There is a lot more detail there. I don't know at what point in the process you are planning on breaking the more detailed plan out for adoption by Council versus the Executive

Summary and saying we adopt it or not timing wise, but I'm assuming we could escalate some of that before the 10th, but I don't remember last year's timeline but we weren't done even finalizing the package until March, so there is a timeframe in which we get the broad strokes done and then we have the more detailed, but the point is valid of we don't risk, especially with a hot button item, a one bullet point angle of it being the thing that we released to the delegation.

Mr. Egleston said creating a headline that we are not looking to create.

Mr. Driggs said preview the thing with the right people and make sure nobody [inaudible]

Mayor Lyles said again, I'm just going to go back and say that while we may feel like something may be difficult to do and we know that, and we have known that; I'm just not willing to take Citizens Review Board. We just need to acknowledge that it may be difficult, but I think it has been the Council's policy to do that and if anyone wants to raise that as something that we take off as a policy item then we need to have that discussion before we remove this from our Legislative Agenda.

Mr. Driggs said taking it off is not the point; [inaudible]

Mayor Lyles said I understand you asked for the risk assessment reaching out trying to talk to some folks about this. I completely get that, but I do believe on the infrastructure initiative I don't quite understand that one, so I'm interested, as Mr. Driggs is, in understanding how that works.

Mr. Bokhari said while we won't have the final February/March version, we will make sure that the detailed version of things we have in working papers and other things like that makes its way into something digestible for this body well before the 10th.

Mayor Lyles said we don't have to do it by the 10th. If we feel like we can do this in January. When do they go in session, January 30th, so we could do this in January to get it right.

Mr. Egleston said I think a lot of these could be bundled and it could be a shorter bullet so that doesn't seem so omnibus, but I think they were flushed out a little bit because there were some of these that maybe came in separately, and we wanted folks to know that those had been included and were being considered in this larger infrastructure idea.

Mayor Lyles said having the idea of risk and reward is something that is qualitative decision. I think knowing where it has to go first and who is in charge of where it has to go first, that is probably more of a value to analytical point that we can use.

Mr. Bokhari said we've got a real good take away, and if we find in the next couple days that it is not a satisfactory level of depth, then there is nothing stopping us from pushing this out.

Housing and Neighborhood Development - Housing Locational Policy

Councilmember Mayfield said we are going to keep this real short and sweet as I ask Ms. Wiseman and Mr. Wooten to make their way up. They are going to just get everybody caught up with a quick follow-up. As Council already knows, we on November 26th approved our targeted rehab pilot, which is now a full program and the full Council will be receiving an update in an upcoming meeting for our City owned surplus and land disposition policy. We are still hashing that out and our next Committee meeting for Housing and Neighborhood Development, because unfortunately two of our meetings, one for Thanksgiving and the one that we would have had earlier today were postponed so our next meeting will be December 19, 2018. Now, I am turning it over to the experts.

Pam Wideman, Housing and Neighborhood Services Director said I am keenly aware that we are close on time so we will get through this as expeditiously as possible, yet

inform you to that. You guys are very familiar with the Housing Locational Policy, so I'm going to spend a little time giving you some background and then we are also going to spend some time telling you what we propose. It is our goal to have this in front of you on your Council agenda on December 10, 2018 for approval, should you all get comfortable enough.

Many of us are familiar that the original Housing Locational Policy dates back to 2001. It was established as an evolution of the City's scattered site housing policy that was created in the 80's, when we were doing all public housing when that was our housing for folks earning 30% and below the area median income, so the goal was to scatter it throughout the community so you didn't concentrate poverty. The policy was last updated in March 2011, so it is old, and what the policy is intended to do is to provide a guide for the location of housing earning 60% and below the area median income. That has been updated to 80% and below the area median income, which is also considered workforce housing. The policy applies to today; this is the current policy. We are going to talk to you about what we are suggesting, but I just want to level set and do some background. The current policy applies to multi-family development of 24-units or more. There are two exemptions in the current policy; that is for senior developments and developments for disabled populations. In 2011, when the policy was revised the Council revised it to where there are permissible and non-permissible areas. What we've learned over time that within itself is a negative approach to the policy. There are policy waivers, and you guys will remember that policy waivers were becoming the norm. Since 2011, you guys have approved 20 waivers to policy, so that was becoming the norm hence the need where we need to revise the policy. You all have the ability to approve waivers, and you've done that as I said.

A little bit more about the current policy; you have permissible and non-permissible areas. The other thing that I think is fair to point out is in the existing policy we looked at neighborhoods in three categories. They were stable, transitioning or challenged and they were based on NSA (Neighborhood Statistical Areas), which was a much larger portion of neighborhoods. Since that time, we've removed the labeling at the community's request, because it had negative stigmas on neighborhoods. Nobody wanted their neighborhood to be labeled as transitioning or challenged, so we've removed that, and that is consistent with the quality of life study. So, we look at neighborhoods in a much smaller geographic area that is more consistent with how folks actually identify with their neighborhood, so they are NPA (Neighborhood Profile Areas) now and we removed the language of transitioning, stable, and challenged. This geographic applicability has not been updated since that time. Again, another need we need to update this.

So, this was referred to the Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee in 2017. The Committee began discussing the update in February of 2018; in August, you all adopted the Housing Framework, which also pointed out that we needed to revise the Housing Locational Policy and that the current policy is an impediment to doing new affordable housing. In August and September, we had seven community meetings; we didn't want to develop this in a vacuum. We wanted to have lots of community input on this, and I would say thank you. I think everyone of you all came to a public meeting. In October, the Committee approved staff's recommendation, which we are going to talk to you in just a little bit. It was a four to one approval.

With those community engagement sessions lots of robust conversations, our goal was to have them in four quadrants of the City at least. We also had one in Center City and then at the request of the community we held an extra one where we dug a little deeper; we held it at the Fire Headquarters on a Saturday. People said we can't come out at night. Could you hold one on a Saturday? We did just that. The meetings include just a wide variety of participants; it also included the development community, and that was really important because we know the development community does this work. A total of 258 unique citizens, so different people attended all seven of the meetings. The feedback we heard at the meetings was as follows: we heard that we still needed to disburse throughout the City of Charlotte; that the new policy needed to address displacement and gentrification; that the new policy needed to promote income diversity; and we heard varying opinions about whether there needed to be exemptions or not. More folks thought

that we ought to keep the senior's exemption, the disabled exemption and add a veteran exemption which might be inclusive in the disabled and the seniors, that we ought to eliminate permissible and non-permissible areas. Again, folks wanted the policy to be set up in such a way that it really encouraged the development of affordable and workforce, rather than discouraging it. People really liked and said that site scoring is a really good tool but in it being a good tool they asked us to keep it simple, make it flexible and updated on a regular basis. One of the good things we heard was that the developers expressed support of this new site scoring tool that we are going to talk you through.

It was developed by Housing and Neighborhood Services staff and our office of data analytics, so I want to give Rebecca Hefner and her team a big shout out for their help. The data will be used to determine how close a proposed site is from a locational perspective to your related goals; you've told us a number of times that we need to have affordable housing near employment centers. We need to have it near commercial centers. We need to have it near existing and proposed transit that we just talked about; we need to have it in the Center City. We need to also be worried about our neighborhoods that are experiencing change or that are going through gentrification and we need to also continue to support our revitalization efforts and that we ought to at the end of the day, everything we ought to do we are promoting diverse communities, mixed income communities. The site score and applicability, it was our recommendation is that it still applies to multi-family rental developments that are 24-units or more; that it applies to all of the four percent low income housing tax credits. That is really important because we know that you all with your new bond approval. You are going to see more requests for four percent deals than you've ever seen before. So, we know that those cost more and as you are approving it that amount of money and those deals they really, really ought to be aligned with your goals and then this would apply to any development that is seeking funding from the local, state, or the federal government.

What we proposed as the exemptions is that nine percent low-income housing tax credits be exempt, and the reason why that is is because you are only going to get three of those per year, and those bring most federal money. They leverage our Housing Trust Fund or other dollars better than any other funding source that you have, so because of the limited amount that you are going to receive and the high leverage that those units that those ought to be exempt. Senior citizen developments ought to be exempt and then any multi-family rental development with less than 24-units and then single family as they are today, single-family developments are exempt. At this time, which is really the meat of the presentation. I'm going to turn it over to Warren Wooten who has done amazing work on developing the site scoring tool, so at this time I will introduce to your Warren Wooten who is also part of our housing team.

Warren Wooten, Housing and Neighborhood Services said as Ms. Wideman pointed out, what this tool does is it replaces your old Housing Locational Policy. With a scoring tool, what tool does is, it looks at four areas and it looks at how well a development meets four Council area priorities. The first one is proximity, so how close is that development in proximity to amenities? Income diversity, to what extent does that development add a diverse housing choice into that existing neighborhood? Access, what kind of access does that development provide to jobs? And neighborhood change, is this an area that is experiencing rapid change that we need to place some housing there to sort of stabilize that neighborhood?

I'm going to talk to you very specifically about these. The first one is the proximity tool and you will see at the bottom of the data sheet here how those points are added. Each category has a 0-10-point scale, and on proximity half of those points are based on proximity to transit and half of those points are based on proximity to other amenities. So, on the transit piece, what we are looking for as a transit option, which is your light rail, your Gold Line and your rapid bus, and is it within a networking route of half-mile to those locations? They get all of their points if it is between a half-mile and one-and-a-half mile they are going to get a pro-rata portion of those points. Then it scores it based on amenities, amenities that we all like. Is it close to a grocery store? Is it close to your pharmacy? Is it close to medical service, and the grocery store gets a maximum of two points and then they can bundle together three other amenities out of a basket of

amenities to come up with another three points. If it is within proximity to all of those amenities it is going to get a total score of 10 points on proximity.

Income Diversity, again, you see at the bottom it is split in half. Five points based on the unit mix in the development and the other five points are based on the poverty level in the community. So, what this is looking at is two different things. One is the unit mix providing a different housing option to that community than is currently available, and two, is it being located in such a way that it is not concentrating poverty? The first five points are based on the unit mix, for instance a development that has 60% AMI units, and is that development now located in an area that already has lots of housing available for persons at 60% AMI? It is going to get a very low score, but if it is being located in an area that has 80% AMI, it is going to get a much higher score, because it is providing a diverse housing option to that community. The other half of those points are based on poverty level. If it is being suggested that we put housing into an area that already has a high level of poverty, it is going to get very low points and in areas that have lower areas of poverty it is going to score higher in this category.

The third category is access, and this is looking at access to jobs. It is being scored two different ways. It is looking at how many jobs are accessible within a 60-minute commute by your transit system and within a 45-minute commute by car. It scores those two separately and then averages those scores together to give you a score on a 0-10-point scale. All of these have been normalized to a 0-10-point scale so that you can look at it very quickly, and if it scores a nine that means it is very high on the scale, means it has lots of access to jobs in this situation, and if it low on that scale it means that it has less access to jobs.

The final one is Neighborhood Change, and what this is looking at is, is this community a community that is experiencing lots of change? It is looking at three factors; it is looking at median area income and then it is looking at change year-over-year to sales prices and to permit activity. So, where you are going to see very high scores are in areas that have lower-median income and have much higher year over year price increases and permit activity. It shows you have a lot of neighborhood change that may be causing displacement in an area of the City where you have higher incomes and lower year over year changes, you are going to see a lower score on this category.

I just want to point out that this is just one of the scoring criteria that is used when we present you a development. We look at all sorts of things before those recommendations are made, but the way this will work, the developer will come in and will seek gap financing from the City. The developer will have access to this information so the developer can actually go ahead and pre-score projects and know what kind of score that site is going to receive from our scoring criteria, then that developer is going to propose that as a potential project. That information will come into Housing Services and Housing Services staff will look at the locational score along with all of the other things that go into making decisions about what projects should move forward, such as what kind of leverage ratio that they give you; how long the affordability period is; and the number of affordable units that they are proposing and what level of subsidy they are proposing those units. That information will all be packaged together to go through your current process in terms of making recommendations and improving recommendations for new affordable housing.

Here is the staff recommendation and then I will step aside for questions; implement the site scoring policy to replace the existing Housing Locational Policy. The Housing Locational Policy required that you give a waiver, and it was either a yes or no. It is either permissible or not permissible. The new housing scoring tool gives you a whole lot more information for you to make an informed decision about what projects that you would like to approve. Treat the side evaluation sort of as a rezoning; this is just one piece of information that comes together to you with a bundle of information to help you make decisions about what projects that you are going to choose to approve and move forward and then again, it would eliminate the permissible and non-permissible areas which would make it so you don't have the need to approve waivers anymore on your funding recommendations.

Councilmember Newton said I am the one Committee member that voted against this and just wanted to comment on that. I think we are all in support of affordable housing in our community, and we appreciate the need. I find it interesting that we acknowledge that we haven't followed our policy, and we've had 20 waivers over the past eight-years, and we find ourselves in a situation where we are 50 out of 50 in upward mobility economic opportunity, and instead of saying let's follow our policy for a change we are saying we need to revise it. I think in the conversation often times we are talking about numbers of units, and we have to weigh that against quality of life considerations, and I feel like we need to, particularly when it comes to locational housing policy, we need to make sure that we are cognizant of quality of life and we are not sacrificing that setting some communities further behind. I view this as relaxing our standards and in so doing we are in effect incentivizing subsidizing development in vulnerable areas and just to kind of touch on a few things, and I see this particular policy as incomplete. I think subjective in nature, non-transparent.

I wanted to touch on a few things that we discussed in Committee and maybe there could be a chance or some time here for clarification even. We were talking about amenities and location of these amenities. We had pinpointed the existence of amenities within one-half mile of any proposed new development, but we didn't really talk about how those amenities would be graded. Maybe the quality of what those amenities provide, what I mean by that is when we talk about an employment center and this had actually come up in Committee, we didn't talk about whether or not that center had business or if it had a lot of vacant store fronts. It was simply the existence of this center that was being considered for scoring. We talked about schools; we didn't talk about the crowding of those schools and the performance of those schools. I think we might have discussed nutritional centers as well, but we didn't really talk about the quality of the nutrition if we could score that, which I think there are parameters and data points for these sorts of things, the quality of that nutrition was just the existence of the amenity. Once again, my concern is not leaving a community behind and making sure that we are creating communities for people to not just live, work, and play but to thrive and to experience economic opportunity regardless of your station in life, how you were born. We had talked about some of the plans, particularly transit plans, but the policy doesn't take into account the long-term nature of some of these plans and how that might be an immediate impact for some of the communities that we would otherwise be subsidizing the creation of, and when I speak about transparency what stuck out to me is, I've always appreciate the idea of there being a map, and we have that in our current existing policy, a map that anyone can access clearly defining what sets expectations and we actually have so what I was pleased with is, and I think there is a slide that shows this. We actually have a map, but in Committee when we discussed whether or not- So yes, this right here constitutes a clear defined map of what is allowed and what is not allowed. When we talked about this in Committee, it was my understanding that this would be available to developers but not to the general public, and I take issue with that. I also take issue with the scoring system itself, where we are looking at certain amenities getting maximum score for minimum deliverables. So, I would like to see this publicly available. Those were some of the issues I had here.

So, I will end it here, but what I see in this policy is I see a policy that incentivizes, subsidizes development in the crescent in our most vulnerable area. If we are talking about encouraging desegregation both racially and economically and if we are talking about providing upward mobility for all of our residents in the City of Charlotte, I think we need to also focus and incentivize development within the wedge. One of these key points that we talked about was development, so with the community what I heard from the community was development throughout all of Charlotte. I don't know if this gets us there.

Councilmember Ajmera said Ms. Wideman could you go back to the slide that has site scoring exemptions? With the senior citizen developments and pretty much all last three bullet points does that mean it includes four percent so even it is four percent would that qualify under exemption?

Ms. Wideman four percent yes; we would still say that senior citizen developments would be exempt. We would still say that any development less than 24-units would be exempt and any single-family development, just as with your current policy, would also be exempt.

Ms. Ajmera said what if it is four percent?

Ms. Wideman said four percent, correct, we are simply saying the different here is that the nine percent would be exempt, because you are only going to get three and they bring most leverage to the developments.

Ms. Ajmera said plus they get 30% and below AMI that is mandatory.

Ms. Wideman said correct it is mandatory, but yes.

Ms. Ajmera said could you just sort of elaborate; even though this last three would be four percent tax credit deals, why would that be under exemption criteria? I'm not part of the Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee, so I probably missed the conversations, so if you could just elaborate on what was the discussion around that and how you all concluded to this last three being an exemption even if it is four percent.

Mayor Lyles said which one are you questioning as an exemption?

Ms. Ajmera said the last three, from what I understand the last three bullet points, even if they are four percent they will qualify under exemptions. Am I correct?

Ms. Wideman said let me see if I can say it this way that would help us. So, under nine percent and four percent single-family development would be exempt; for both of those it is exempt today in your policy. Under nine percent and four percent today, it only applies to units that are 24-units or more, so that would be the same. Senior Citizens today are exempt whether or not it is a nine percent or four percent; the difference is we are saying we would add the new exemption, the nine percent low-income housing tax credits would be exempt from the locational policy, because all of what we just discussed in terms of the amenities that is already taken care of at the state level for nine percent developments, because they are so competitive, four percent developments are not.

Councilmember Eiselt said I like the scoring; I think it gives us something to measure and the piece that seems to be missing for me is per area, what is our aspiration? What are we trying to achieve with the different categories? What score, and is that different in Ballantyne versus the east side? I'm just saying that is what I'd like to see a little bit of and you can comment on that. The second part of that is I'd like us to go back and test what we've done in the past to see how those would have come out so we can see whether or not this is the right kind of measurement.

Mayor Lyles said you mean a sample of the four percent or one of the four percent deals or something like that?

Ms. Eiselt said right, I think we should test it to see what we've done in the past and what does that really tell us, because we are not really sure this is going – do we end up concentrating neighborhood change. I just don't know how we are taking those values and what we are measuring them against or what our benchmarks are and how that is going to work out for us in running some of our past most recent deals.

Ms. Wideman said Ms. Eiselt, that is a great point, and we did some of that testing for the deals that you approved last year. We ran those through as we were building this but we are happy to show that to you. I think one of the things this really does for you guys is that you are going to get- and I say this because we are already getting calls, because you have the increased bond if you add that with the Foundation and LISC, and we've shared this with them so I want you to be really clear so if they want to use it that is fine too, but you guys are going to get an onslaught of requests for four percent deals that cost you a lot of money. So, what we wanted to do is provide you all the way to balance the requests that you are going to get with your goals, and we wanted to be able for you all, these are my words not yours, to really draw the line and make some decisions around

a four percent about which ones you want to fund based on them meeting your goals and the community's goals. So, that is one of the beauties of this tool.

Ms. Eiselt said okay, I just don't know that we have anything to say 6.2% on the diversity scale is a good score. That is still really vague for me.

Ms. Wideman said one of the reasons why we said you see this like a rezoning as a staff analysis, we will write a description; you will have that information in front of you in advance of your approval, and we would have already written that; this is how it scored on diversity and explained that before it got to you all.

Councilmember Winston said from what I'm seeing this is along the lines of where I want to be going. Have a tool more than just borders. I'm thinking of one rezoning that we are going to consider coming up how this might be helpful is something in Steele Creek, but it is an industrial area. I'm just using this as an example of how I might use this tool as we are considering things. One of the issues there is quality of life as it relates to the environment that it is being built in, or is that in any one of these measurements?

Mr. Wooten said it is not directly included, but what you will find is a relationship between adverse zoning and amenities. Typically, you are not going to find the amenities there, so where you will see adverse zoning -

Mr. Winston interrupted and said this is a situation where I think that might not be true, because you have a lot of jobs close by; you have schools close by. You have everything that you want close by, but it is near heavy industrial areas and some of my colleagues, we all have a fear of putting affordable housing in places that are less desirable, and there is a history in this country of putting low income housing in dirty soil.

Mayor Lyles said I guess the question I have Mr. Winston is that this would be a rezoning not the site scoring, but you wouldn't have to rezone it if you decided not to then you could stop it there.

Mr. Winston said what I'm saying is that when we rezone it that petition is going to come back and ask for some Housing Trust Fund dollars.

Mayor Lyles said if you rezone it, but would rezone residential in a highly industrial brown field without remediation?

Mr. Winston said I don't know if it is a brown field.

Mayor Lyles said I don't know either but heavy industry use is usually not a place -

Mr. Winston said well we know this is the process; we rezone it that doesn't mean it is going to get build there. Let's say it gets rezoned; would that come into any consideration in this equation? Does that make sense?

Ms. Wideman said we didn't have an environmental variable in this process; what I would say though Mr. Winston is that I don't know the specifics of that deal, I don't know what they are planning to ask for. I would say if they went to the state, and I know that is not the only place you go to get money, but if they went to a state to ask for a nine percent tax credit funding, if it is what you are describing to me in an environmental, the state is not going to fund that more than likely.

Ms. Mayfield said what if it is a four percent deal?

Ms. Wideman said if it is a four percent deal, they still want to look at where folks are going to be living, so they are not going to put it in an adverse environmental district. If they put together some other funding on their own, I don't know how that might shake out but we would look at it in the process of is it uplifting the community; is it meeting all these other things that we've laid out here for you?

Ms. Ajmera said I hear what Mr. Winston is saying; I think adding the quality of life component to the scoring point which addresses the clean air and clean water, etc. so yes, I understand to some of my colleagues point that we could stop it at rezoning, but I think what Mr. Winston is saying if it does go through rezoning and if it comes back and ask for funding from our Housing Trust dollars, where we do not want to put more affordable housing when it is surrounded by industrial sites where it truly impacts the quality of life how do we stop that from getting the Housing Trust dollars? I wasn't sure if we had looked into the environment factor.

Mr. Winston said just because it is near industrial doesn't mean it is not a good place to put housing. I don't know how to score that other than just what we perceive it to be, and I want a way of knowing whether that is a good or bad thing as we make these decisions.

Ms. Wideman said I think we could address it here on the amenity locations; we could give it like a negative point there for being close to something. That is just one thought, but we didn't put an environmental variable here.

Mayor Lyles said I think we are in a hypothetical and a question and I'm trying to figure out instead of talking about a rezoning the question I think as Ms. Ajmera said, do we want to have one? Now the problem of having a clean air and clean water is who defines clean air and clean water.

Ms. Ajmera said to that point I remember when I looked at that the County had some certification; it had environmental agency, so there was a report on that which we had received that we could look at. That is one of the matrix.

Mayor Lyles said was it creeks and streams?

Ms. Ajmera said no it was specifically environmental related. I don't know the name of the agency but I think that is one of the matrix we could look at.

Mayor Lyles said let's look at that, bring back the information; this is coming back to us on December 10, 2018, try to get the information to us about environmental areas and see if there is any definition that we can use.

Councilmember Driggs said I just wanted to say we are replacing a brick wall policy with a tool, okay, and this is a data driven approach to try to quantify how responsive a particular proposed location is to a number of our priorities. It is not limiting, right? If we go too much further into detail, we are going to have a completely unwielded device, so I like the work that you've done, and I think that we should move forward and see how we go using this tool. It doesn't prevent any environmental conversation or other thing from occurring, but I'm really concerned that if we add more variable, and so on, we are going to get a thing that is really not helpful.

Mr. Winston said I was just asking whether it measured.

Mr. Driggs said I know; I understand what you are saying, but against that is the need for a certain amount of simplicity and usability.

Councilmember Harlow said I agree and we had some similar conversations in Committee, and I understand we are trying to get to a more objective view of it. There is always going to be a level of subjectivity that rests with us; that is why we are elected to be here in my opinion. I do believe though when we add some of the quality of life components to it; before it was just Ms. Wideman giving us an address and how many units and how much money they wanted and that was it. Outside of that, that was all the information we were given. We are getting I think a lot more depth and info as it relates to a variety of other data points, so I think this will be very useful. The development community has access to it, so they can plug and play with it long before it reaches us. I think that sets a little bit better at the level of expectations, and for me, I'm going to support this moving forward. A quick point to Ms. Ajmera, I think she is talking about the Mecklenburg County Land Use and Environmental Services Agency. They did have a

decent comment on that one rezoning; that is isolated, but none the less, I think that is what you were referring to.

Mayor Lyles said I think we have a responsibility to vote accordingly at rezoning especially, but we can see.

Ms. Ajmera said I think we have taken a very detailed look at this, and I think this would be important for us to look at it. In two years in what I have seen in rezoning, this is the first one where we had seen sort of a warning from the County that Land Use and Environmental Service Agency; we ought to look at that, as you said we will get a lot more four percent deals, and we've got to look at that factor. I think it is very important that we provide good quality of life to all residents whether they live in affordable housing or they don't.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you all for sharing your comments and thoughts. I want to thank our staff and our Director of Housing and Neighborhood Services; you heard from the Committee; we've been having this conversation for a couple of years, but I think we do have an opportunity to be a little more proactive.

I agree with the basis of the comments from my colleague Mr. Winston; it is about us trying to be proactive in our language, not necessarily reactive. I also agree with Mr. Driggs that we don't want to put too much in there but in the scoring, we want to identify, because as was mentioned earlier if it is a business center but 70% of the businesses are closed how does that actually break down in the scoring? One particular project probably because this project is something that recently came to us and is very different than a lot of the other projects but not wanting to highlight one particular piece, just looking as the City is continuing to grow, and we have industrial, and we have the possibility of housing, there should be some language in the scoring process to help identify where that would land, because we do know that there is some land out there that is identified as a super fund site. Those sites, if we already have the language in place, we know that is not even going to come to the table. A lot of people don't even know what a super fund site is as far as brown fields and real high levels of contamination in the ground, but it is a swath of land that at one point a partner was looking at developing.

So, for Ms. Wideman, the question I have with the scoring or request for additional is on the leverage ratio I didn't notice the breakdown when we went through it in the scoring where the leverage ratio fits in, because we have had a number of years where when the proposal comes to Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee, the example we gave just had zeros on there, so that example wasn't as good, but in the scoring where the leverage ratio fits in it would be helpful to know, because that way also as we send this out for the development community to have access to it we are trying to be as transparent and as flexible as possible. When you are looking at that breakdown for the scoring when we are talking about proximity we need some clarification if it is a job center we need some clarification around if it is proximity to public transportation do we have accessible sidewalks for you to safely go from your complex to the closest. So, there are still some language that can be clarified in the scoring in order to make sure that we are achieving the Committee's goals. Unfortunately, because two of our Committee meetings were cancelled that is conversation that the Committee didn't get the chance to have for the clarification, so now we are looking at this potentially coming, and it may or may not be coming to you all on December 10, 2018. We are looking for it to be, because these are very minor things of adding, because there has been a lot of work, and we want to get this implemented and rolled out as soon as possible, but the few recommendations that have been shared this evening are really very simple recommendations to be added in this process so that we can put something out before everyone decides how they spent our \$50 million that we don't actually have yet.

Mayor Lyles said you are so right, and I am very concerned about our discernment on this \$50 million. Thank you; you've heard what the Council said, and I would like to have a conversation about that at our Retreat where we really have some time to deal with the issues of how these requests come in. We've got the scoring; we've got some money, but that doesn't necessarily get us to where we need to be.

Economic Development Committee - Economic Development Strategy

Councilmember Mitchell said let me first thank the ED Committee: Vice Chair, Ed Driggs, Councilmembers Mayfield, Newton, and Harlow. We are going to be very brief, because what we accomplished at our last two meetings is our Four Pillars. This will guide us as we roll our new strategic plan, which we hope everyone will vote on December 10, 2018, and let me say a special thank you to Tracy Dodson and the ED staff for accomplishing 750 jobs, Honeywell relocating to our City. There is more to come; we have a couple more announcements hopefully in this month. Our next ED Committee Meeting is December 20, 2018 at noon, and the topics will be Charlotte Business INClusion, Good Faith Efforts, and Project Peace 2.0. I would ask that this Council give the ED staff some flexibility. Opportunity Zone has become a very popular topic in our community, so we would like to ask for permission for staff to maybe give us a presentation on Opportunity Zone in one of our Dinner Briefings. I think we all need to get up to speed on that topic. Mr. Harlow always get the questions, and he says call James and then I call Tracy, so I do think if we can become more local experts on the Opportunity Zone it would be helpful. That is our presentation you have before you, and Tracy and your staff, thank you once again for Honeywell.

Budget and Effectiveness - Council Four-year Terms

Councilmember Phipps said it is going to take a dedicated Strategy Session to talk about that at a future meeting because [inaudible] to recap what our recommendation were but as far as a detailed discussion that is going to have to be scheduled, because I don't know if we are going to be voting to do that.

Mayor Lyles said one of the questions I had we are approving this schedule, and I think we are going on a Retreat at the end of January; is that a more appropriate subject there where there is more time?

Mr. Phipps said I don't know; [inaudible] we are comfortable talking about four-year terms in Raleigh.

Mayor Lyles said I don't know where we are going but the next Strategy Session would be February.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I think the first Monday in January we would have one.

Mayor Lyles said did you want to defer until then?

Mr. Phipps said I will.

Mayor Lyles okay then we will defer that discussion until January and Ms. Eiselt said she would send out a note on the status of community safety.

Mr. Phipps said we did discuss in August and September a change to our Public Forum format and what we wanted to do was the City Attorney give us an overview of what the North Carolina Law states about public forums. I don't know if everybody has this draft language, but we wanted to change to give more time. Right now, we have 10 speakers, we wanted to go up to 15 and this gives us the language to be able to do by changing our ordinance and we wanted to have it so we could do it at our December 10, 2018 meeting. This would be something that was in Committee; we rolled it out for this group.

Councilmember Egleston said I've got a very relevant [inaudible] that if it goes over 10 they get two-minutes; it doesn't actually change the length of it.

Mr. Phipps said it doesn't change the length of it; it just gives people more time –

Mayor Lyles said no, wait a minute.

Mr. Egleston said it gives more people the opportunity to speak.

Mayor Lyles said okay, what I understand that right now we give 10 people three-minutes, because it is scheduled for 30-minutes. If we have more people to sign up we would do two-minutes, and we would give two-minutes if it were 11 people. This does not require Council's vote; it is something that we can do by saying anyone object to it.

Bob Hagemann, City Attorney said we have proposed an amendment with the changes shown by underlying and striking through to your rules of procedure.

Mayor Lyles said it is okay to try it out for a little while before we do an actual formal vote; or is just something that you want to do?

Councilmember Mayfield said if we are going to turn this time now into the time that we have to discuss things; we already have multiple meetings where those who are signed up don't show up, and we fall to the next. So, I'm not really sure, and this might have been at the Committee meeting that I missed. I don't see a need for us to go up to 15 because there are plenty of meetings where we don't have the 10, and we go to the next person that signed up anyway. People barely have a challenge to three-minutes to try to address their concern, so if we go up to a higher number that is reducing a minute off of speaking time for the constituent.

Councilmember Winston said at first, I had a knee-jerk reaction to Ms. Mayfield, but I understand what you are saying. If we have 15 people signed up and only eight people show up then this rule is- but what I would push back on is that yes, we have several meetings where not enough people show up, but it is the meetings where we do go over and one of the meeting times where this really came up, and I don't think this change addresses that, was during budget time when a well-organized effort by CMPD and the Fraternal Order of Police really commandeered the voices that were able to be heard and other voices within our own organization, we were not able to hear from them when they wanted to and they were trying to sign up. I hear what you are saying, but I think an increase is necessary, but I think we do need to look even deeper into how we fix this, because this doesn't fix it. This is something better than what we have, but it is not a fix.

Mayor Lyles said what is the Council's desire; this is a recommendation out of Budget and Effectiveness to redo this. We can try it for a quarter or let me ask the Clerk; how many times have we gone where we weren't able to get to the 10 people.

Emily Kunze, Deputy Clerk said I don't have the data, but we found that people were able to speak most of the time.

Mayor Lyles said I'm waiting for someone to tell me if they would like to try this process for a quarter and see how it goes. We have two Public Forums a month.

Councilmember Ajmera said how about we disseminate the data that we received from the Committee. I don't have it with me, but I know Mr. Phipps can or I can go back and look at it. That might help.

Mayor Lyles said we will defer this until January.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS REVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I have a memo that is being passed out; however, Sarah Hazel is cued up to walk you through this memo in a pretty quick fashion.

Sarah Hazel, City Manager's Office said I'm going to walk you through the recommendations and Boards and Commission, but before I do that, I just want to remind you that you have over 30 Boards and Commissions, and the purpose of those Boards

and Commissions are to act in an advisory capacity for you as you consider policy and also as policy is implemented.

Over the course of the last several months there has been several conversations around how do we continue to improve our process around making recommendations for appointees, but also how do we make sure that our Boards and Commissions are really effective? How do we build stronger relationships? So, this brings me here today to the Strategy Sessions. At the last meeting on Monday, you referred this to come forward today.

There are three major purposes of today's presentation, so we looked at what you all had been speaking about when you've been having conversation about this, and it really boiled down to how do we streamline nomination processes and make it easier to do. How do we strengthen our relationships, not only with individuals but with the Boards themselves? Then let's have a really strong understanding of the work that is being done and whether it is effective, because that is everybody's goal. Starting with how do we streamline nominations, I have a few key recommendations but they all boil down to insuring that you get relevant information and relevant information only so trying to cut out some of the extraneous information that you need to sift through when you are making these decisions. Primarily, if you only include nomination information for applicants that qualify, let me give you one example, last Monday you made an appointment to a Historic Commission Board, and it was specifically for a Board seat that was in Historic Westley Heights, so there were two folks that you were looking at, reappointment somebody and another person who lived in that area, but you also received 14 other applications for people who live in District all around the City. So, by allowing staff cut out that information for you, you will be receiving packets potentially 40% smaller than you are currently receiving. So, that is one key piece.

Second recommendation is to consider prohibiting members who do not meet attendance requirements from one Board or Commission from serving on other Boards and Commissions. Now, you can always decide like you've done in the past to change on an individual case basis to make a different choice, but the key point here is that when folks apply to Boards and Commissions, quite often they apply to a variety of Boards and Commissions, not just one, and so if somebody does not meet attendance requirements and they are no longer sitting on that Board, as a result, we take them out of the system for you to review for a year and then they go ahead and reapply the next year, but again that will start to cut back on things that you are seeing.

Finally, and I believe this is something Councilmember Egleston brought up, but there is an opportunity for you to receive a recommendation from people who are sitting on Boards and Commissions right now, a recommendation as to who should be appointed. This is something that the Clerk's Office has already put together. It is a standard templet so by really enforcing to Boards and Commissions that they can fill out this form, it will provide you with some more information that you can use when you are making these decisions.

Our final recommendation around just providing you good relevant information and looking for an opportunity to create a summary page for you, which will highlight not only names in Council Districts but some key demographic information and some key answers from their applications. If you look to the picture to the right each application is about four pages long, and so by creating a summary document that will allow you to see some good information at a glance in addition to what is already provided. We believe this can help again in your decision-making process and be able for you to just look at a lot of information quickly and then decide what you really want to get into.

What we really heard also from you is that you want to strengthen your relationships with Boards and Commissions so really focusing on alignment between City Council Focus Areas and the Boards and Commissions, and you can see here an alignment is outlined will make a really big difference and set up more of a forum to continue to strengthen those relationships. As we were looking at this alignment, I do want to note a note that I have at the bottom, which is the Privatization and Competition Advisory Committee, it is our recommendation that you consider phasing this Committee out. It was really created

in the 90's during the run the business model, and at this time we are really looking at One Charlotte; it doesn't seem to be as relevant as it once was. That is just one small example and we will talk a little bit more of a comprehensive review on other committees at the end of the presentation.

Under Strengthen Relationship there has been good results in other jurisdictions where individual Councilmembers have been appointed as liaisons to Committees, so if you looked at this alignment with Focus Areas and Committee Boards assigned individual Councilmembers to be liaisons to individual Boards, you could really provide an opportunity to get to know a couple Boards really well and then bring that information back to Committee and back to discussion around policy. Also, if we just provide some consistent templates for how Committees report information back to you and do that on an annual basis, they could report to you at Committee once a year with a short template and that would be a really good opportunity to sort of package information altogether at once and for each individual committee to hear a good body of work that can support your policy goals and your work on policy.

Finally, and I think everybody here will enjoy this, and I know from speaking with the City Clerk and others the recognition that we did this year for all of our volunteers was greatly, greatly appreciated, and so we recommend let's do this every year, find a way to connect with our Boards and Commissions and appreciate them for the time that they are volunteering to make our City better.

Then to take a more comprehensive view to really understand how effective all of our Board and Commissions are being, we recommend designing a short survey, and we've already begun to do that to send out to all Boards and Commission to understand how they feel about the work of their Board, how they feel about their mission and purpose and what they think could be improved and if they feel like their work is meaningful and adds value. So, some more data that we can use to then come back to you once we analyze this data and make some further recommendations around Boards and Commissions, but I think at this time not any one person has a comprehensive view of all of the work that we are doing and they are doing on your behalf. We look forward to bringing this information back to you and a good opportunity would be at the Annual Strategy Meeting that you are having at the end of January.

Councilmember Egleston said just a couple of minor lightening round questions; this is really good, and I think will vastly improve what is the process that is in need of improvement. I think this is your intent, and I just want to make sure that it is; I like the idea of prohibiting folks who violated the attendance requirement from being able to be put on a new Board for 12-months, but if someone, and there are lot of folks who serve on two of the boards, someone would not be removed from the second board they are on if they had been meeting the attendance requirement because they didn't meet the attendance requirement on the other, correct.

Mayor Lyles said I'm going to assume the way it is written now; it is attendance for the Committee you are on. It would not apply for the second committee, it is only for the committee you were unable to attend.

Ms. Hazel said the intent of that recommendation was to take that person out of the queue for all of the rest of the Boards that they are sort of in waiting for a year.

Mr. Egleston said agree, another thing that I think could really scale down what we are looking at on these is if you look at this slide #6 with a list of all of the committees we see the same names on 20 committees, and there is just no way that the same person has relevant experience or is going to be an asset to all 20 of those committees or probably even has an interest. Some people just want to be a committee for the sake of being on a committee, and I appreciate the enthusiasm, but that doesn't turn out very well for the committee or for them often times. So, I would say in our application process setting a number, check up to five or six, whatever it is and that way we are asking people to zero in on – maybe more than three. I can see people that have relevant experience for a handful of these but not for 20. That way we are asking people to really zero in on either

what their skill set is or what they are enthusiastic about, what they are going to be passionate about and that will make them more likely to attend and make them more likely to be engaged. I did mention it before and I will mention it again. Adam, the Chair of our Bicycle Advisory Committee, you guys all received the recommendation that he gave us last week; I think those are really helpful because having served on a couple of these Boards you know what the Board needs. I was on the Historic Landmarks Commission, and we lost both of our architects at the same time; we knew we needed an architect, so it is relevant to have the Board members that know what the skillsets are that they need, who they are losing or what they are looking for to make recommendations, and I would suggest that maybe we ask them to pick their top three and then maybe we try to focus in on those, and it doesn't mean that we couldn't override that, but I think having served on two of those Boards sometimes they send you a square peg for a round hole, because it is everybody on Council's friend and you go what are we supposed to do with this person; they don't know anything about the subject matter. Having people to be able to weigh in I think that also further engages the Boards with Council, because they feel like they have more of a say and more of a seat at the table for the Chair to be able to make that sort of recommendation and help guide us in the direction that they think are most useful to their mission.

Mayor Lyles said there is a templet that is included for that recommendation now if we are okay with going forward.

Councilmember Newton said I think these are the right recommendations Sarah; we had a young lady who had just had a baby and was on maternity leave, had missed a couple of meetings and was similarly dismissed from her Board. We reappointed her if I remember correctly. I had seen this prohibit members who did not meet attendance requirements for one Board or Commission from serving all Boards, and so on. could we create an exemption and then if we are going to be implanting these rules can we maybe include that and maybe other exception?

Ms. Hazel said it is my understanding and I will defer to the City Attorney if I get this wrong, but you can always choose as the appointing authority to make an exception when there is a situation that occurs like that. This would be the guiding practice, but I believe that is something you can always do.

Mayor Lyles said so you can do that at the Council's discretion, and any one person can nominate that person.

Mr. Newton said I would say if we could include that it would be fantastic.

Mr. Egleston said they are saying we can do that, and we don't have to add it in our policy; we always have the authority to do that.

Mr. Newton said this is what happened; I think the point to be made is the Committee Chair dismissed this individual.

Mayor Lyles said Chairs cannot dismiss people; they have to be either they didn't follow the attendance policy, and they were removed or the Council can remove someone.

Mr. Newton said maybe I misunderstand that, but are we saying now that won't be the case?

Mr. Egleston said we can still do what we did last week regardless of what the policy says.

Mr. Newton said so the person can be dismissed and would have to come back to us, and we would have to reappoint them? Doesn't that seem a little more complicated than having this exception?

Mayor Lyles said it is very rare that it happens; most of the time their attendance isn't because of an illness. I think we all know that there will be some of those, but it more the exception than the rule.

Mr. Newton said okay but I just think it would be smart to put in the rulebook.

Bob Hagemann, City Attorney said I think the proposal here is not to formalize a rule; it is a protocol for the Clerk's Office taking applications and which ones she will give to you. I think in that instance under this proposal, you wouldn't get an application from that person, but if that person contacted you, you would also be free along with one of your colleagues nominate them based in special circumstance, and I can tell you in over 20 plus years of watching this there has been a lot of back and forth in terms of what these rules should be.

There used to be a number of unexcused absences and the Council wrestled with it because what is basis of excusing somebody not to be there, and ultimately, they landed with the current policy. I think it 65% of regular meetings over the course of a year and if you miss three consecutive regular meetings your policy right now says you are off, but as you indicated from last week you can bring it back. This simply would be a mechanism to reduce the number of application forms that are forwarded to you to limit the number you needed dig to, but you could always go outside that and bring somebody in on a special case basis.

Mr. Newton said it would be a write-in at that point?

Mr. Hagemann said it wouldn't be a write-in; that person contacted you and you would nominate them like anybody else.

Emily Kunze, Deputy City Clerk said we submitted the letter and application [inaudible]

Mr. Hagemann said what I'm saying is if they adopt this protocol and if somebody has come off a Board you would not see under this protocol; if you approve it, you would not see from the Clerk's Office that application, but somebody could always work around that directly to you and if you wanted to –

Mr. Newton said to say would we write them in or we would ask for the application.

Mr. Hagemann said either way.

Mayor Lyles said you could ask for an application if you wanted to nominate them or either you could just write them. No matter what the rules are, anyone of us could decide I want Mr. Egleston to be on this, and I nominate him even if he isn't skilled or recognized, didn't serve before, doesn't even want to serve I can still submit his name.

Councilmember Mitchell said Sarah, can you go back to the slide Strengthen Relationships? I agree with everyone and I think is great work so a couple of things that I've done kind of on my own that could add to this. I meet with the Chairs of the CBAC once a month, and it was good to meet with them, because some of the things we were discussing in the ED Committee they were discussing as well, and the Committee Chairs really like engagement with Councilmembers. It gives them value and then once a quarter I actually attended those Committee meetings. Now you just gave me a whole list; I didn't know ED had that many, so it was great when I just had two committees that I thought we were responsible for, so now I just concentrated on the third and fourth bullet point, because we really need their help as far as our policy developing, but I think some of those committees are appointed, and I don't know why I wasn't engaged with the Mint Museum Board of Trustee, because we are not policy related. I don't mind you having those up there, but can you put in bold those related to policy, so I can concentrate on those?

Ms. Hazel said sure, we can do another review for that.

Mayor Lyles said I have your request to put [inaudible] because I think you are right; there would be some of these that we have appointments to and they are not really our

committees. In fact, these arts and cultural institutions they would ordinarily come through the Arts and Science Council as a whole.

Stephanie Kelly, City Clerk said I just wanted to make some clarification around these alignments; I don't know if these are the same ones that have been added to that you originally approved, but the way the alignment was originally approved by you was so that you could get each Committee to give their annual report on the focus areas as a group. That is how they were originally intended and aligned the way that they are.

Councilmember Mayfield said in what year?

Ms. Kelly said originally in 1997 [inaudible]. We think we need the same alignment, and there have been some committees that have actually been disbanded, for example role accountability went away [inaudible] went away, but it still shows on the actual resolution, because that part has not been amended.

Mayor Lyles said people have sent me notes about this so, let's do tonight what we have on our list and then refer some of these other things that people have called and asked about for the staff to come back. You are right I think that list is just [inaudible]

Councilmember Bokhari said I've been asking for this for a couple months now; it is wonderful to see, and I agree with Mr. Mitchell, bolding it and putting the policy items up I think would make a lot of sense. I think the next step is going to be, and I think you could combine this with the survey process and things like that is going to be where can we formalize more regular interactions, not just us on the various Committees reaching out, but every quarter we should hear from one of them. And not just one way report out, how do we engage them in the challenges that we are facing? I think as part of that survey one question to ask them, I saw some samples on that survey screen of how do you feel and things like that. I would also ask them some open-ended text questions as it relates to what is an area that you believe you could be involved as well as us tossing to them if they are under ED, and we are focusing on MWSBE opportunities or enticing new business; what are some particular things the Business Advisory Committee can do there? Really giving them some specific items in the survey to think about from us as well as for them to just have an open-ended way to be able to give us feedback. I think that level of engagement has been lacking for two decades now that I've been here to witness it and probably longer than that. So, I think that is great. I served on PCAC for a while, and I still think there is relevance to that. It may not be in the way that it existed in the run the business model, but I still think there is privatization opportunities, but I think the big thing now is we've privatized a lot of things. Where is the oversight, where is the lookback to are they picking up recycling in the kinds of ways that we would have expected them to from SLAs in the beginning.

Councilmember Eiselt said this is kind of getting into the weeds.

Mr. Bokhari said is that kind of getting into the weeds? Good because that is where we should be with these committees, and we haven't been. That is my point; we need more direct feedback and empower these groups of people a lot more than we have been, and I think the final point is, to Mr. Egleston's point, they need to put a more formal role in helping us filter the kinds of application that we are getting, not just kind of like when they are doing it Ad Hoc, and they are doing it more, and I like it, but they should be a special section for each one of those committees, not only proactively to throw us the feedback as it relates to here is what we need, help us recruit for this, but also when we get them in and they look at the resumes these are the two that rose to the top of our list so we see that front and center.

Mayor Lyles said that is in that recommendation.

Councilmember Driggs said two quick recommendations, the one each Council committee versus the list of committees associated with it and decide if any of them are no longer necessary. Where people get disenchanted they go to a couple of meetings, so let's kind of look at that. The other thing I wanted to mention is there are a couple of

these committees that have kind of standout in terms of their community importance and I think it would be really great if the Council Committee responsible for them, the CRVA [inaudible], and so on took a more active role in vetting the applicant and made recommendations [inaudible], because we've had appointments made to both those committees on the same random basis. It happens in a lot of places, and I think [inaudible] Council committee consider the applications, look at them in more depth, conduct interviews appropriate and then get back to the rest of us.

Mayor Lyles said I have to say I do follow that practice; a group out of all these committees there are several that I think rise to the top, and I go out and meet with the person before I appoint them, because I need to understand. They need to understand we are talking about and what they bring to the table and how it will be use, so I don't know if the Council wants to do that. It wouldn't be that many.

Councilmember Phipps said just to reiterate what Mr. Driggs said; under TAP Committee, I would want to know is there really a line of demarcation between Citizen's Transit Advisory and the Transit Services Advisory or even the Bicycle Advisory; maybe we need a shared mobility committee.

Mayor Lyles said well I'm going to say the Transit Services Advisory and the Citizen's Transit Advisory; they come to the MTC and they give a report. That is required by Federal Law every time. I think this just sorted them without a lot of extra information necessary. That is what I think we are saying, go to each Committee, look at it and say which ones are absolutely important to get done and bring that back.

Ms. Mayfield said with this presentation; is the request now for Council, for the Committee and the Chairs to go through and look at these and check the alignment and make any recommendations for consolidation? When I first had the conversation regarding the number of Boards and Commissions we have, I thought staff was going to be streamlining and/or making a recommendation of more than just one of them being eliminated and/or consolidated, because when you look at this breakdown, and he has a lot of them, there isn't a mechanism in place right now where we have direct communication and a Committee Focus Area in our Boards. So, I thought you all were in the process of looking at some of these Boards that were created decades ago, are they even effective or beneficial today? I was thinking you were going to come back with a recommendation of consolidation and/or elimination.

Mr. Jones said Ms. Mayfield, we believe the survey is the first step in that. As you can see tonight, we did make one recommendation, and that was not universally received so we believe that once we dig into the survey and come back at the Annual Strategy Meeting, there may be some opportunities for some eliminations and consolidations, but for us we thought the first step was that this whole appointment process was becoming very burdensome for the Council, and we believe that we can cut down on 40% of the applications that come your way, as well as create a new spreadsheet that you can just get information very quickly.

Ms. Mayfield said so is Step two then the fact that this information is going to be sent to all of us plus have a conversation in Committee to see if what is identified is actually lined up with our understanding of our Committees? This is the first time some of us has seen this.

Mr. Jones said I think it is a dual track. One is let's make sure that what we have here is what was started back in the 1990's, and we will make some assessment from a staff perspective, but I do believe it goes to the Committee also and the Committee sees to what extent this is aligned with what you are doing.

Councilmember Ajmera said are all of these committees active currently; none of them have been discontinued.

Ms. Hazel said it is my understanding that they are active but I will defer to the City Clerk on this.

Ms. Kelly said except for the Airport Advisory is inactive.

Mayor Lyles said I have a couple of things I would like to ask about; I think Mr. Egleston suggests that instead of you being able to apply for five or 10 committees that we set a limit, and I don't know if that was considered, but for me, you ought not have more than four applications in, but I would be willing to go with three.

Mr. Egleston said just not un-limit it.

Mayor Lyles said but now people apply for anything and the other thing I think about it seems that at some point they ought to expire. What time period is it?

Ms. Kelly said 12 months.

Mayor Lyles said 12 months every year. The other thing that I wanted to bring up is a lot of times we have three-year terms for a lot of these Boards and Commissions, which means that as a City Council, we don't impact unless you are re-elected, the appointment process, and I've actually asked us to study whether or not we should have two-year terms for Boards and Commissions or not and kind of compare it with best practices, but the thing about it there are many committees that are very important and maybe even particular to things like CRVA, Citizens Review and Civil Service, but there are people on those Boards that will outlast our terms. The other thing about this is there has been a tradition of automatic reappointment for a second term, and I have found that people when I've said well I'm looking at some things that we are doing to fit what we are trying to accomplish in our priorities and people will call me and say, but I've just served my first term, and it is like I automatically get my second one. That is like we've built an expectation around that and that is a very difficult thing for us to do, and I wonder if we could look at how many people can just automatically come back up. Now we vote on them but basically, we say they are applying for the second terms and that is it.

Ms. Kelly said in your resolution it says that a person can serve up to two terms so that means you [inaudible]

Mayor Lyles said I would like to have a reconsideration of that amendment up to two terms, and let's just say serve one term. The final thing I got a letter from a person who was a legal resident of this community and the City Attorney told me all of the background on this and on our application, it says you should be a voter. In the past it was something that you had to live inside the City or County, and he said I am legally a resident, and I cannot vote. So, this question is it based on your word that you live inside the City or not? So, that was a verification nightmare, and so voter registration is very easy. You can look it up, so it was easy for verification of it. That is something that the person who wrote me said, I would like to serve on a Committee and I can't. I would like for us to figure out how we might we might address that issue as a resident here and not being able to vote and how do we verify that. Are we willing to do kind of like a random check every now and again, and I don't know how many people are so interested in these committees? We do background checks on several committees and those that are very important around that; that would be a verification because that would include your residency in that background check. Those are limited to a certain number of committees that we have. They are not all. All of those things are debatable; I guess level of trust; what is the level of trust that we can just say to someone self-reporting is sufficient?

Ms. Ajmera said just so I understand, currently we are asking for legal residence, the county as a residence or the voter?

Mayor Lyles said are you registered to vote that is what we ask for.

Ms. Ajmera said you are suggesting that we look at the residence requirement, not necessarily the voter registration?

Mayor Lyles said this is what the gentlemen wrote me and said, I would like to be able to serve and what I'm saying I think we ought to have our residents able to serve. The issue is verification or self-reporting.

Ms. Ajmera said I agree; there have been several applicants, and I had supported them; they were legal resident, but they couldn't vote, so I would like us to revisit that as well.

Mayor Lyles said I think this is a great start; I think it is something that we need to look at. I just want to say; you may look at this and you kind of go, oh my gosh, what is going on? Several of these groups and committees have Charter requirements, judicial requirements. I don't know why the Housing Appeals Board would come to HAND, because they have a judicial code. They are following the law, but they do an annual report, but the relationship should be built upon the engagement that we have so when Mr. Mitchell talked about the arts groups, we actually sometimes appoint someone to those Boards or have citizen representation, but they have very little engagement with us, and they usually engage to the Arts and Science Council where we have a representative. I know that you said liaison in the definition, but we need some definition around that, because we cannot all become advocates for every committee that we have. It is like being a critical friend versus an advocate, but I'd like to define that word very carefully in terms of we are not going there, and people say oh, if you have the Bicycle Advisory Committee report to you that means we are going to get all the bike lanes in the next year. We become advocates for people like that.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: PUBLIC RECORDS MANAGEMENT

Marcus Jones, City Manager said it is really just a response to a question that was asked last time, and that is what is the costs if the City did not buy the technology in order to capture the text messages. So, BK, if you could just point to that question that would provide Council with some additional- You said please don't move forward with this without at least understanding what is the cost if we didn't do it.

Brent Kelly, Chief Marketing Officer said I will cut right to the chase; as Mr. Jones said, on October 8, 2018 Cheyenne went through an overview of text messaging, and I was just asked to summarize what would that cost based on the questions that were asked at the Council meeting. There are on average 453 open records requests for each of the last two years, so it is 38 open records requests per months or one and a quarter per day per month. Of those, nine percent of them include text messages, so that is roughly three requests per month that have text messages. We estimated how much time that takes, and of that time people look at those I'm going to say it is somewhere around 33-hours per week so less than one person to gather the phones to get those text messages.

Mayor Lyles said that is a full-time job pretty much. I can't remember who asked the question.

Mr. Kelly said it started with Mr. Egleston, but several other people commented after that.

Councilmember Eiselt said two weeks ago we had text message request, and I know support staff was really burdened by trying to pull all of that, and I had said I thought that were looking at a program that could do that automatically but apparently the message was that we don't have that or decided not to purchase it.

Mr. Jones said not at all, we slowed down because the question was before we brought an ordinance to the Council, you would like to know what is the costs, if you will, in staff time doing it the way that we do it now.

Ms. Eiselt said just the cost of staff time; do we apply a value to that, via the cost of the software?

Mr. Jones said I have to get an updated number, but when we presented it to you the first time it was half a million dollars for the package, and someone asked before you spend half million dollars can we find out how much does it cost you in staff time currently?

Mayor Lyles said looking at what you have what is your assessment of that compared to the cost of acquiring the system?

Mr. Jones said I think it is very important that the Clerk also weigh in on this. Mathematically, it is less expensive to continue what we are doing now, but I'm not sure that the world doesn't change in the next three months, and every three days we get a request for all these texts so just responding to one of the questions that was raised last time.

Mayor Lyles said I'm just going to follow-up and say is technology changing. You bought your first cell phone or computer you had a big cost and then the technology kind of got better pricing. Do you expect that?

Stephanie Kelly, City Clerk said I just wanted to provide some context around this issue. The context that I would like to provide is the fact that it is not so much about the amount of time that it takes to collect phones, stand at the copier and make those, but it is that we are not able to comply with the North Carolina law as it pertains to being able to archive the text messages. Text messages are but one of the kinds of records that we are obligated to retain permanently for the City Manager, for elected officials and for department heads, but if we don't have the ability to archive and keep those records then we are not in compliance with the law. This is a tool that will allow us to archive, so somebody doesn't have to ask you for your phone to respond to a particular request. We have the ability to go to that software and to pull those records based on the timeframe that the request was asking for. So, it is the ability to archive one of the kinds of records that we are obligated to keep. There are permanent records for the elected officials and all the Department Heads and the City Manager as well.

Councilmember Phipps said you indicated that we can't comply with the law, what kind of fines are we susceptible to for being in non-compliance?

Ms. Kelly said the City Attorney could better answer that, but really none; there are no punitive damages associated with it except if we are not in compliance, the media can and people can file lawsuits against the City for non-compliance of the law specifically.

Mayor Lyles said I know it is late, and we still have a closed session, so I want to do this; bring that back and if there are other alternative ways to comply with the archiving that is not \$500,000 we would like to see that as well.

Councilmember Egleston said I just wonder if that is recurring costs? Is it \$500,000 one time and then we own it and we don't pay any more or it is like it is \$100,000 a year that we are paying to use the software?

Brad Dunkle, Interim Chief Information Officer said there is a certain percentage of that that is recurring; it is a subscription for the software itself. It runs \$175,000 per year and then we would need a person to administer that.

Mayor Lyles said Brad help us with this and find us another way to do this at a better or more reasonable cost.

Councilmember Ajmera said is there a solution that we could build internally, something just for our archival process that would be more cost effective? They are manually collecting the text messages at this point, so really the missing line is just the archival piece. Can there be some repository that you could build or we could use existing repository?

Mayor Lyles said I just asked him to bring us options.

Mr. Dunkle said we will look into it and bring back some options.

Mr. Jones said before we go into closed session I have one more item, and really, I would say that the City Clerk, Stephanie Kelly started the spark months ago when she had a commemorative coin for our volunteers, so on our birthday, we would also like to spark something for all of the Councilmembers. I will share one story; so Lashanda Harts, father works for us and there is this thing called coin. I believe that Councilmember Driggs will be familiar with it; it is mostly a military thing that when you do in you shake somebody's hand and the next thing you know you have a coin. So, her father is a Marine, and he shook my hand, and I keep the coin in my pocket every day so what we have for the Council are 25 commemorative coins that relate to our 250th birthday. The concept here is just don't give them out tonight; they are special, so as you start to think about individuals in our community who have really built this community and people in our community who are looking forward to continuing to build the community for the future, it is just a great opportunity to share this special point in time our 250th birthday.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Councilmember Newton, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to go into closed session pursuant to GS 143-318.11(a)(6) to consider the qualifications, competence, performance, character, fitness, conditions of appointment, or conditions of initial employment of an individual public officer or employee or prospective public officer or employee; and pursuant to GS 143-318.11(a)(3) to consult with attorneys employed or retained by the City in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege and to consider and give instructions to the attorneys concerning the handling of a claim.

The meeting was recessed at 9:11 p.m. to go into closed session in Room 267. The meeting returned to open session at 9:30 p.m. in Room 267.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.



Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk, MMC, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 4 Hours, 22 Minutes
Minutes Completed: December 19, 2018