

ACTION REVIEW

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Business Meeting on Monday, March 25, 2019 at 5:02 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Tariq Bokhari, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, LaWana Mayfield, Greg Phipps, and Braxton Winston II

ABSENT: Councilmembers Dimple Ajmera and James Mitchell

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmembers Ed Driggs, Justin Harlow, and Matt Newton

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS

Mayor Lyles said I am going to read a list of things that staff asked would be removed from the agenda. All of these except for Item No. 44 are property settlements. Item No. 44 is commercial fitness equipment, so staff is removing Item Nos. 44, 51, 52, 56, 59, 62, 64, 67, 69, and 71. All except 67 were settled, so 67 had a change in ownership, and it will be on the agenda April 8, 2019.

Councilmember Phipps said I wanted to speak to someone about 69 through 77, because these are property transactions in Hidden Valley that either the owner has been unresponsive or something, so I just wanted to know if there is anything that we could do before we took this action tonight in as much as a whole group in one neighborhood.

Mayor Lyles said well, two of them have been settled, and the remainder, what would you like to do about those?

Mr. Phipps said well, I would like to see if we could initiate another round of contact protocol.

Mayor Lyles said they contact them even after we approve them.

Mr. Phipps said they want to proceed with the condemnation knowing that the process still could work out.

Mayor Lyles said Item Nos. 69 and 71 have been settled.

Mr. Phipps said I am surprised that we have so many. Unless somebody can relay my concerns that the process would still be done in an orderly fashion to try to get in contact with the people, but it is in the Hidden Valley community there are a lot of transactions in my mind.

Marie Harris, Strategy and Budget said yes Mr. Phipps, this will be ongoing. Tonight, as you give approval, in case the ongoing efforts, they need to still move forward to condemnation, but this is still very much ongoing with these properties.

Councilmember Winston said I do not see these as condemnations.

Mr. Phipps said yeah, they are, probably acquisitions-

Councilmembers Harlow and Newton arrived at 5:03 p.m.

Mayor Lyles said condemnation of Upper Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer. So, the answer is yes even with the motion for approval the staff still goes back and tries to work through it as a settlement. Often, the condemnation helps to settle, the motion for the condemnation. We have the staff items that are removed from the agenda; are there any council items on the consent agenda for comment?

Councilmember Harlow said Item No. 36.

Mayor Lyles said is there anything on the Consent Agenda that you would like a separate vote?

* * * * *

PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Lyles said we have agreed to have a policy where if we have more than 10 people signed up, that we will allow 15 people to speak at two minutes. That is not aligned with our rules of procedure, so I need the Council to approve that action to allow 15 people to speak, then on the April 8th agenda, we will put the amendment to the Council's Rule Book to do that on a regular, ongoing basis.

Motion was made by Councilmember Winston and seconded by Councilmember Egleston to allow 15 speakers to speak for two minutes each at tonight's public forum.

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

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

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

Councilmember Phipps said does that mean that what we did the other night was in violation of policy?

Mayor Lyles said no, we had a vote then as well.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 1: CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Councilmember Newton, seconded by Councilmember Egleston and carried unanimously to go into closed session pursuant to N.C.G.S. 143-318.11(a)(4) to discuss two separate matters relating to the location of industries or businesses in the City of Charlotte, including potential economic development incentives that may be offered in negotiations.

The meeting was recessed at 5:09 p.m. to go into closed session in Room 267.

Councilmember Driggs arrived during the Closed Session at 5:10 p.m.

The meeting returned to open session at 5:53 p.m. in Room 267.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: AGENDA OVERVIEW

There was no Agenda Overview.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: LOCAL INITIATIVE SUPPORT CORPORATION FOLLOW-UP

Mayor Lyles said this is a follow up to the conversation that we have been having over the work with LISC and the private sector and the affordable housing bonds and how that process may work.

Denise Scott, Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC) said I appreciate the opportunity to come back and update you on where we are. Our office is open, and we are actively doing business here. Raphine is here, and hopefully the next time she will be

the person standing up here, but I think that most of you met her the last time. We will have three staff people who will join her starting Monday, so she has actively been getting her staff together, and there is still another position that is open. So, the job description has been posted, in case anyone is interested. As we talked about before, I will just go very quickly through what you have already heard and get to the meat of the conversation. We have been doing some work already on the Historic West End. We talked about it the last time, so I will not go over it again today. We are planning to have an introductory event sometime in April to really- She is not going to be introduced to the market but certainly in her new role, so it will be more like a coming out for Raphine. We expect to in this year to spend up to a million dollars in community development resources, including technical assistance and training. I said that before, and we are raising national funding support for Charlotte. In fact, there are two proposals that we are working actively on now, and we will continue to move to bring in the leverage of resources outside of Charlotte to be leveraged with resources in Charlotte. We will continue to do that. Let me refresh the conversation a bit from where we left off. We have really been talking about partnership that would enable us together as public dollars and private dollars to work together as one. We talked about the equivalent of about \$100 million, but clearly there are more resources in play, and as the weeks go by, you will begin to hear about even more, but the idea is to try to leverage as many resources together in order to accomplish the goal of creating more affordable housing and to use the resources from the private sector in a way that they have not been used before.

There is a newer bucket of money I do now want to completely preempt their announcement, but you will be hearing about that soon of additional private dollars that will come to the table. When we last left off, we were talking about a balance of roughly \$38 million in Housing Trust Fund, so when we continue to expand upon private dollars and national dollars, what we are doing is expanding the leverage potential of those \$38 million, and we will continue to do that.

What is also news today that we had not talked about the last time that we were here is that we have been actively talking to the Housing Authority. That would include city staff and ourselves, and today, we are able to say that we have reached an agreement where we are able to; this is based on attrition so the number could vary but up to 75 vouchers per year to assist out efforts. This is very, very significant. The goal here is to try, and this was your charge to us to try to maximize the amount of low-income units that we would be able to do with the partnership with the Housing Authority for vouchers will be able to do that in addition to the public dollars that are already on the table and in addition to the private dollars that are coming in at below market rates. So, when you start to combine all those different resources, you are getting us to the place where you charged us to help you go and that is to produce as many low-income units as we possibility could. So, we are thrilled that the Housing Authority is part of the partnership with those vouchers. It is going to make a big difference. The big difference is to be able to reach some of the lowest income families.

So, we continue to talk about one door, and some have asked why is it necessary for you to have a one-door process? The purpose is to do exactly what we are doing. We are looking at every possible resource and every possible commitment that we can get and bring it together and figure out a way that we can maximize the use of these resources working in tandem, perhaps in ways that we have never worked before, and there is certainly one process way that we should be able to get at producing more affordable units, and that is our goal. We will continue to maximize leverage. We will continue in every possible way. Part of this in our conversation last time, we had in most of the questions that you post to us had to do with the process that the City, your process and you asked that we consider a way to make sure that you had greater input, that you had a way of weighing in early and understood through the process exactly what was happening. So, what you are looking at now, I think if you flip quickly to the next slide, basically these were the steps. What we are doing is, these are the steps of what we are calling phase one, this column with the light color blue.

The City issues a request for a proposal. One of the reasons why it is necessary to do that now is in order to do the vouchers, there has to be some competitive process, so we

are inserting vouchers in the process, then what it also does is it gives us an opportunity to take a look at the entire universe of the pipeline that is here in the City, as well as to encourage others to submit. So, the idea is to create a request for a proposal process so we could maximize the use of, in this case it is actually a subsidy to be able to use those vouchers.

The second step in the process is that we notify you; that is new. That wasn't what we had in the original. By the way, this is the same exact process that the State uses. They notify the universe that they have received proposals. At this state, what you are going to simply see is the list of who submitted. It does not tell you whether it is a good proposal or it is not. It simply tells you that we have received it. So, you are on noticed of what proposals have been received, then we go through this dual process where LISC and the City staff works together, and we try to come out of the room based on the criteria, and by the way, we have collapsed our checklist for review into one checklist. There are a few minor details, and at some point, that will certainly come to you, and you will see it, but it is one checklist where all of our staff will be using the same check list to check the box on how the proposals stack up. So, that is the dual process, and we review together. This was a question that was raised before. In the event that there isn't a unified decision, you will know it, because in the check list, you will see that LISC said one thing, and the City staff said something different. So, you will be able to see in the document that you received if there is any day light between us.

The process goes on back to you again after we have done our review, and we have ranked the proposals that we, again as LISC and the City staff, after we've done that, it then comes back to you the Council for a summary. We are sharing with you at this stage of the process exactly what we think about the deal. So, remember, in the first instance you only have a list. We have done no analysis; we cannot tell you whether it makes sense or it doesn't. It doesn't matter who submitted it. Now we are going through a review, and once we go through the review and we rate them, now you are looking at the deals based on that criteria for how they have been rated. That gives you an opportunity to see that before you move into your Council review process so that you have a sense of whether we are aligned, whether we are not, how much resources are being asked, how much Housing Trust Fund or other dollars being asked, does it pencil out? Pursuant to the question that was asked of us last time, we are not just going to show you the deals that we think pencil out. We are going to show you the entire pipeline. So, you will be able to see what it is that we have decided, based on our review, they will be ranked, but you will be able to see them all.

Then you move into your process, which is where you have your action review committee meetings, then you go on to have your final business meeting where you are voting. So, as you can see, what has changed over the course of time since I was last here is that we have tried to design a process that responds to the level of input that you are asking for, providing the amount of transparency that you were asking for and enabling you to really kind of almost have a looking glass over the process. You can see who we are talking to along the way before you get to a place where you are voting. At the second hour, the project summary level, you get to see what we think about the project. Does it pencil out? How does it meet the criteria? Again, there is a check list. That is a multiple page-long checklist that you will have shortly. That is the checklist that basically we will be checking off those boxes or not and ranking the proposals accordingly. This is essentially a process; what we are attempting to do here is to make sure that you can see all the ideas that come through, we are creating a summary of those deals, and making recommendations that we can pass on to you, but again, the fact that you can see it all, and it is a clear and transparent process for how the deals are being reviewed. Like I said, you will move into your process for review.

Just to give you a sense, these are nine-percent deals that you have; this is just an example. We just chose this because this list was already prepared, but this might be an example of what the notification to the Council might look like. It could be nine percent, could be four percent. It could be NOAHs. It could be any number of things, but it generally is providing you with the lens. This is just the surface of what the deal is proposed at. It does not get into the weeds; it is just giving you really introductory information into the

deal, then the analysis has to go on. So, the project summary that document that is really going to provide you with all of the detail, this is a sample of some parts of it. You have it before you I believe, because I know that you probably cannot see it all that well on the screen, but it is basically covering some of the basic steps. We highlighted the types of information, like who submitted the deal. In this particular screen, you also get to see whether there is any day light between the LISC staff and the City staff as it relates to the recommendations for the deal, what type of funding is being considered, what City policies are being considered, the strength of it, financial strength, and market study, and then the community engagement. So, this is just a snapshot of a much longer list of items that will be considered when the deal is actually being reviewed. So, this is an abbreviated example, but shortly, you will have the entire form, which is several pages deep.

It begins to move into your process again as I said. For us the goal is to make sure that Council has all of the information that you need in order to begin your process and to support the requests that are before you. This is another example of a request that you have already approved. We are not changing the forms, so it will stay familiar. Maybe there is a tiny tweak here or there, but largely it will look like this. By the time you are looking at this, you are in the final stage of your process. This is your form; this is an old deal that was already approved. What do we have in front of us to do? We have to prepare; along with staff, we will prepare and issue and RFP and sort that out. There are details to issuing RFP, which you are aware of. We are going to insert, which doesn't show up here, a process where we get ahead of the issuance of the RFP, more feedback from the development community. We had an initial meeting today. I think it raised a number of questions that would be good for us to continue dialoged. We will open up an opportunity to continue the conversation before the RFP is issued. There will be a submission deadline, City Council notification. You will know at the point when the proposals come in, which one goes back to that first point of letting you know which deals came in. So, it is just a list at that point. It will look like the earlier initial contact. So, that is just to let you know what we have in hand. City Council notification, project summary, these dates are not fixed. What we are trying to do is to work with the development community because some of the people in the development community are re-underwriting deals that they may have already under written. Others are just rethinking what the options are now that there are more resources on the table, then you have certain rules for procurement that you have to follow. It is a work in progress is the best way to describe this. This gives you a general idea of what we are trying to do.

We realize, I heard this last time, that we are bumping into a time of year that is not ideal. I apologize for that. We are where we are; what we are trying to do is make sure we can create this procurement process, then the next time we do it we will be more in sync with the schedule that you would normally expect us to be on. So, here there is a bit of catchup, because we are trying to create the process as we go. Community engagement required, you already have a process in place. We will continue to follow that process, but it has the district representative informed, public meetings at least one. There are guidelines that follow for the public meeting. Our goal as LISC is certainly to empower community voice to our process. There are several touch points that are not currently in the mix. One is that LISC has an Advisory Committee, or at least we will by the time that we get this going. It should be announced, then we are also setting up the grassroots committee.

These are two places while the goal there is to have regular contact with community in different forms, so those are the committees. The first committee, the Advisory Committee really is, for lack of a better term, like a board for LISC, so they will be guiding the direction that we will take. The Grassroots Committee is our way of having regular contact with folks in the room. I would say many of the people on the other side of the room. In addition to that LISC Project Manager will be dedicated to community engagement. This is in addition to the director whose job is to make sure that we are fully engaged with the community that we have and understanding of what is going on and that we are incorporating the comments and concerns that we get into how we consider our work, but this is a part of the process that is added on to the process that the City already has in place.

So, really the next step, we will be envisioning what an RFP looks like. We hope that you will consider this process that we started with here as a way of addressing some of the concerns that you had about how you can continue to monitor the process and make decisions that are throughout the process. You asked us to reimagine how you might play a role that is more substantial than when it was first proposed, so this is our response. That puts you as you can see as a Council, there are four points of contact for the City Council, two of which fold directly into your current review process, but that means two additional points of contact where you are basically informed about what is happening in terms of the underwriting and how resources are being considered.

Mayor Lyles said I think this is really probably one of the most important investments that we are going to be making in the next several months and next hopefully two years.

Councilmember Winston said you mentioned maximizing our resources. The goal was to maximize and leverage and produce more affordable units through private dollars, public dollars and housing vouchers. What type of leverage do we have or does LISC have in ensuring that property owners, property managers that we go into deals with will utilize vouchers? That is an issue that is ongoing. Obviously, we know that if you take Housing Trust Fund dollars that you have to use a certain amount of vouchers or vouchers in general, but understanding all of the tools that you will be utilizing do you see that if there is a situation where you are not necessarily leveraging Housing Trust Fund dollars that you are maximizing leverage to compel developers to take vouchers.

Ms. Scott said because the mission that is our joint mission is to maximize the number of units that will serve low-income families, this may be new for some developers, but we would strongly encourage them to consider taking vouchers, also consider that in terms of ranking, when we weigh all of the deals, that was another reason for creating an RFP process, to create a new one door. So, compared to the competitive other deals that say we do not want vouchers, but you are asking for the alternative of more, say Housing Trust Fund, that may not be considered an optimal way to do the deal. So, we are going to be encouraging. We want to get to a way to support these families. Bear in mind, we have not talked about it yet, but at some point, we will be able to come back and talk about we are not just asking folks to take families with vouchers. Part of the LISC job is to also make sure that we are creating and are maximizing the existing resources that already exist to support families. The goal is more than housing.

Mr. Winston said I guess to be more direct, do you envision LISC going into some type of deal with a property owner that will not guarantee that they will accept vouchers.

Ms. Scott said for this particular fund, this arrangement, this partnership, the vouchers will be underwritten and approved at the time the fund is approved. If you agree to take vouchers and decide not to use them, your deal will not pencil out, because you will have a gap in resources. They are tied together for this purpose. You could not come through this door and do it another way, but through this door they are linked together.

Mayor Lyles said all of us heard the story earlier today about the inability for people to find housing with vouchers after six months, and we have reached out to the Apartment Association, and I was going to ask the Neighborhood Development Committee to actually look at establishing a public/private dialogue with the Apartment Association first and reaching out and determining what are those barriers? What are we hearing? Some kind of analysis, we will do a little more on that work later. I think that was a fair assessment responsible to you.

Councilmember Driggs said the dates that you showed us on that timeline look like they add up to more than 45-days.

Ms. Scott said they do, because we have to play catch up. I should have mentioned that. So, the first phase adds up to more than 45-days in order to insert these layers, but as we go forward, we plan to stay within that 45-day process. So, right now, the RFP might have already been have issued much sooner than now. So, the RFP doesn't have to count within the 45-days. This is all stacked together. The RFP could have been issued

months ago or a couple of months ago. The clock really starts at the point that we are reviewing essentially. Because we are trying to integrate the work that is already underway with this new resources and new effort, this is probably longer than 45-day window. As we go forward, we will stage the issuance and submission, so technically when the Council gets its notification, it is technically when that 30/40-days that we talked about; that is about when that really begins.

Mr. Driggs said from early mid-May to mid-late July, is 2.5 months?

Ms. Scott said we put timeframes in here, but like I said, it really isn't baked 100% yet.

Mr. Driggs said in the earlier schedule, you showed us four points of contact. It would be useful to see a day count as to when you think each one of those events will occur starting with zero, ending with 45 for the normal phase.

Ms. Scott said okay, that sounds fair.

Mr. Driggs said is this something that you would expect would happen twice a year once it is in operative?

Ms. Smith said yes and a possibility even now that it might happen again in say September even thought that is pushing up against the window for funding. The answer is yes.

Mr. Driggs said my last point is, it is still not clear to me, when you rank these and make your recommendations to us, I am not sure how you are prioritizing. Is there anything you might be able to tell us subsequently about how do you arrive at the rankings that you submit to us? You have all kinds of dimensions here, like how affordable it is and so on. I would just like to know a little more about how you rank.

Ms. Scott said alright, that sounds fair.

Mayor Lyles said I think that it would be a good thing to go through the cycle and then do an assessment and see how it worked, what worked well, what didn't work and try to figure out all of those things that we would have to adjust, but I think trying through the first cycle would be helpful to figure out what is really important; is this added value or not? I would hope that we would be able to do that and continuously refine and make adjustments. We are trying this, just like our Housing Trust Fund, we had a whole different process when we started that, and this is a little bit new for us, but I am just trying to figure it out so that we are not leaving this at this is it.

Councilmember Mayfield said I need some clarification regarding the housing vouchers. You acknowledge a partnership with Charlotte Housing Authority for 75, but the Charlotte Housing Authority and across the nation, there are not new vouchers being created on the government level, so when you are saying that you have access to 75, does that mean 75 individuals who are currently in the Charlotte Housing Authority system are going to have first priority to housing?

Ms. Scott said it is attrition. So that the housing authority, this is there number, believe that they get roughly about his number a year of vouchers that they can use through what is called an attrition. So, your question is who would be the receivers of the voucher? It should come from their waiting list.

Ms. Mayfield said that is what we are saying; we are saying that you are committing to make sure that they Charlotte Housing Authority's current waitlist will have an opportunity for future housing development?

Ms. Scott said yes.

Ms. Mayfield said the second question that I have regarding you saying that the Council will be more informed in this process. So, since it has recently been decided between the

relationship with you, the Manager, and the Mayor, that there is no longer a housing component, it was in the housing committee where a lot of the questions and the details were asked. So, now that goes to you all for you to review. How do we go to the community? I am asking this so that I can answer the question, when ultimately the community elected us. We went to the community for a bond referendum and asked for \$50 million, knowing that we really would have about \$38 million of that to be invested in future investments. I have already shared both privately and publicly concerns regarding talking to fellow electives in other communities, lest current community outreach and some concerns on the ground. So, how do we explain to the community that elected this body, made an investment based on the request of this body regarding funding to address our housing needs that's now being deferred to you as a non-profit organization that will be leading, for you to then bring back to full Council a couple of different recommendations based on what you see to possibly be the best application that has been submitted.

Ms. Scott said let me be clear. We have added steps to the process, like I said, the notification, which is what the State does now. So, that is going to follow; it will become statewide that that is what is happening. We had added a place where we are doing project summary and combined with staff making recommendations, but this is also what has happened is significant private resources have been introduced. So, we are also trying to find a way to really maximize the resources that the City has to consider, not to shrink it. So, part of this was to create a process that is streamlined in order to kind of get within that window presumably of say 45-days but also the Council's approval is still intact. This is not a LISC decision how the Council decides to maintain that intact. All that we asked for is that there be a process that aligns with the dual review process that we have on the way with the City that allows us an opportunity to move quicker than maybe things have before, because we have the opportunity to introduce significantly more resources. The project summary at that stage, that second arrow where is says project summary, that is the place where the Council will see it all and have some opportunity to weigh in. There are three or four boxes here that represents the Council's input and the Council's review.

Ms. Mayfield said under the third box, the dual review by LISC and the City before the project summary comes to full Council, is that where the community input should be?

Ms. Scott said the community input should really be coming in with the community input intact, right? The developer community should be requesting input from the community. The City and LISC will also go through whatever the process that I just described in terms of our looking together to make sure we are comfortable that there is a review that has taken place and then we go into that fourth box to do that project summary. So, there should be both at the level of the developer and then subsequently through dual review we should be making sure that we can confirm and are comfortable with the community input that has taken place.

Ms. Mayfield said is LISC working with the Housing Advisory Board?

Ms. Scott said what do you mean working with?

Ms. Mayfield said somewhere in this conversation; Raphine, I am going to direct this to you; we have our Housing Advisory Board. This board is the board that has been working on the ground, directly in community. It is great that we have the development community at the table. We need the development community at the table. One you make your development and you are out of the community, it is the communal policy that is left with the impact of these developments. We say that we have a locational policy. We say that we do scattered-site housing. There are a lot of things on paper that we have said; the way that it is planned out in community is that we are re-concentrating poverty in certain neighborhoods. That I am trying to insure and trying to get a direct answer on, not only for me but for the community, is how do we make sure that we are insuring the protections of the community moving forward, now that a major component and major piece of this where a lot of these conversations and questions will be asked, especially since we were in the middle of having a report out come back to the committee. You as an organization

are now taking a leadership role. So, the development community from one point heard, no more four percent. That came out of leadership from the government office that this is not going to happen. That caused a bit of concern. You have multiple projects that are out there that are sitting in limbo, because we still do not have a clarification, even after earlier in today's meeting on what is the role of the partners? What is the role of LISC? When does the trust fund and other dollars come in to play? This is great. It is going to appease some members to give the impression that Council has more review, because that is all it is, review. It is not an oversight, and it is not authority. It is just review of whatever you recommend; what I am trying to insure and hear directly from you is exactly where the community truly has a voice and not just the handful of people that was appointed through the Mayor's office, because we have members in this community that have been working on concerns of housing for more than 30 years. We need to ensure that their voices are not lost in this conversation.

Mayor Lyles said I have made no appointments, and there have been no appointments through the Mayor's Office.

Ms. Mayfield said the only thing you've sent out to this point is a list of names that you have. That is why I am asking directly from the director. Since we do no longer have a Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee; we no longer have an Environment Committee. We no longer have a Community Safety Committee. I am asking specific questions based off of the questions that I have been asked both on social media and Twitter to get a specific answer, because I do not have the answer. So, this way the director gets to answer them.

Mayor Lyles said I agree with you that the director should answer the question; I was just making the statement that the Mayor has not made any appointments, that you said appointments from the Mayor's Office.

Ms. Mayfield said [inaudible] address new committees. You are correct.

Ms. Scott said our whole business model is community engagement; our housing is the subset of the work that we do; our job is to make sure that we are engaged with the community. We have been having discussions; we have incorporated in some of the work that we have done already in terms of how we are looking at the deals, in terms of how we are trying to achieve the mix by talking directly to the community to different parts of the community. We have just sort of got here, so we have not talked to everybody, but we have made it clear that that is our intent. Our Advisory Committee and the Grassroots Committee is set up to be a vehicle through which we have a structured way to hear the voice of the community, any committee that already exists, that were more than happy to participate in or report to/meet with the folks in that committee.

We represent a bit of a hybrid in terms of development. Our job is community and development, so we are bringing resources of development to the community, but our model is really community based. Our expectation of staff that has been hired and if you look across all of the 30 something offices that we have, it is community engagement that really kind of sets the stage for our agenda, and here too what we are trying to do is to, not necessarily the best term, but to coop the private sector, to help play more of a role in the development of affordable housing here, and that is a different kind of model, but other than that, the LISC typical model is Community Advisory Committee that helps to govern LISC, along with the Grassroots Committee. That is another layer of advisory, and we work in tandem with the advocate community and of course here with the City Council. So, this is the LISC model that operates across the country. So, folded into the actual development plan is the process that I talked about earlier. Yes, we will rely on the developer to engage with the community, but we along with your staff will also be engaging with the community.

Councilmember Harlow said we have come a long way since the Retreat, many more touch points. I am appreciative of that. It is no secret when we are trying to take these deals out of the former HAND Committee and bringing them really to this combo committee of LISC and the City, then we still have Council touch points down the road.

What you can likely see already, the Action Reviews will likely become a little more less update like and a little more conversational. What happens or how does LISC foresee if this Council gets in a conversation around these future four-percent deals that you all will show us on the list or NOAH deals for that matter, and we do not take any direct action immediately, or we get to a business meeting and we want to defer something, that is going to delay all of this. Do we get to a place where- What does the fail say? What is the contingency?

Ms. Scott said well, it could mean, to Ms. Mayfield's earlier point, that is part of where the Council has control, because you could get us to a place in any one of the deals where it is just a stop sign, right? We hope that we will have done our review, that the checklist and all of the reviews that we have done have incorporated all of the things that you are concerned about so when we rank them and give them to you, that you are able to make a decision. That is our hope, that everything that you had wanted us to consider, we have considered and given you our opinion, but ultimately, it is your vote.

Mr. Harlow said this is I guess speaking to my colleagues here. I want us to be clear; I know there is conversation around we are taking away our purview or taking away our oversight. I would argue against that and say that we are not, and in fact this might now just become a Council Housing Committee if you will, is how I see it as the new chair of the Neighborhood Development kind of combined committee, this gives us an opportunity to receive information earlier in the process, much earlier than the previous committee had received it, had an opportunity to divulge that how we see fit to our community leaders, have an opportunity to ask questions of staff earlier in the process, then bring those questions and/or future questions and answers to an action review that can become more conversation before we hit a business meeting. I think that we have to look at it that way, rather than we are removing something from a smaller subset. We have always gotten these briefings and Action Reviews before. The thing is that we kind of essentially have been more of a rubber stamp, so I think that this is a good thing, and I would encourage us to look at it that way. Last thing, is it anticipated that every year there is just one round?

Ms. Scott said no, actually two. We did not show the full round, because right now we are trying to adjust these dates. The absolute headline is in October, so we have to kind of work backwards, but the idea will be to have another round so there will be two, even now in this year. So, this is going to get some adjustment; we have already been talking among ourselves about how we can try and collapse this a bit so we can leave more time between this and the next round.

Mr. Harlow said how do NOAHs play into this? Aren't those more ongoing?

Ms. Scott said it is an ongoing conversation. Through this process, we will not exhaust all of the funding at once; there will be another conversation on NOAHs. We are actively considering other sources, as well as how we could combine with these sources, so we expect to come back at some point and talk about something that is very targeted to NOAHs, but in the meantime, we can still do NOAHs with the current process that we have.

Councilmember Eiselt said I think that clearly what we are saying is that this is a process, and we have to be open to tweaking it. We have to see that it is a process; we do not want to be waiting until to end to be able to negotiate a deal. That work should be done in there. The concern I still have is about the community engagement piece, so I hope that we can really go back and do more work on that so that we can talk to the community about where that takes place. You mentioned a couple of times that the developer needs to engage with the community. That will be comfort that that will make the assumption that the community has some engagement.

Ms. Scott said we are really talking about both the development community and that area where your staff and the LISC staff are reviewing. We have to confirm community engagement or we will have to be the ones to take responsibility for community engagement. This was not intended to leave that point out; I think that what we are saying

is LISC is also dedicating staff for that specific purpose, along with the process that the City already has in place. So, we are following what the City already has as your guidelines. That is what is up here now, and our goal is to make sure that we can satisfy ourselves and you that the process has been adequate in terms of community engagement.

Ms. Eiselt said the Grassroot Committee piece, it is critical of that that you engage with them early on, so when it comes to us, that Committee can say, we have seen this and have engaged with the community, because as we see even today in our emails, these things get blown up really fast. One person puts information out there, I think the community thinks that we are voting on 9% deals tonight. Once that goes out, it travels like wild fire. All of a sudden, you are negotiating deal by deal.

Ms. Scott said to be clear on the Grassroots Committee, this is not a Committee that is set up to review deals along the way; this is a Committee that will meet multiple times during a year to understand what the criteria for approval is, to understand how we are evaluating deals to give us feedback on what has happened. So, that is a Committee that we engage with in order to stay abreast of the concerns that the community has about how resources are being expended and how decisions are being made.

Councilmember Phipps said speaking of community engagement by the developer you indicated that you all would check to see if that engagement was appropriate. I just went to one such developer community engagement meeting, and I was the only one there. So, what happens in a case like that.

Ms. Scott said someone from our staff; we will know if it is really community engagement or not.

Councilmember Newton said I am looking at slide four a lot, but I am asking myself some questions about slide 11 actually, more from the standpoint of I love that the District Representative must be informed. I am assuming that is going to happen very early on in the process. From the standpoint of the public meetings; I am wondering where do they fit into the process outlined in slide four, and at the same time, what guidelines direct these, or are their certain notification requirements involved? Is there any guideline pertaining to who is to be reached and so on?

Ms. Scott said this is already your process, but I think Pam is in a better position.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I think that it would be helpful if Pam just described the current community engagement process.

Pamela Wideman, Neighborhood and Business Services Director said in terms of your current community engagement process for when there is a Housing Trust Fund request, primarily we asked the developer to follow the community engagement process that is consistent with the rezoning process, and what that means in the developer is requested to hold at least one community engagement meeting. In many instances that results in more than one, depending on the number of questions that comes out of the community engagement meeting. They are asked to do it after 6:00 p.m. so that people can be there and get off from work. They are asked to do it in close proximity to where the development will happen. If there is not a venue in close proximity, we ask them to hold it near that. We get documentation of the flier or the letters that they send out to inform the community, then we also get a copy of the sign-in sheet.

So, that is your current community engagement process now, and we also asked them to notify the District Representative in the community.

Mayor Lyles said we will continue this at our next Dinner Meeting on April 21st and at that time if you would just think; we are working with LISC under the contract that we all approved in the budget last year; this does not require a Council vote on an agenda, but I feel like the Manager is administering a process, but I certainly believe that he should have the support of Council and the administration of it, so our next meeting on the first,

let's be thoughtful and be ready to say whether or not we are ready to move forward just on the process and the time line to try to accomplish the first round in this process. We will do the 15 people at the public hearing, and we will go downstairs and get started.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: 9% HOUSING TRUST FUND REQUESTS

This agenda item was presented at the end of the Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 6: E-SCOOTER UPDATE

This agenda item was presented at the end of the Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 7: ANSWERS TO MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS

There were no consent item questions.

* * * * *

The meeting was recessed at 6:49 p.m. to move to the Meeting Chamber for the regularly scheduled Business Meeting.

* * * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina reconvened for a Business Meeting on Monday, March 25, 2019 at 6:56 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Justin Harlow, LaWana Mayfield, Greg Phipps

ABSENT: Councilmembers Dimple Ajmera and James Mitchell

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmembers Matt Newton, and Braxton Winston II

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Winston arrived at 6:57 p.m.

Councilmember Phipps gave the Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by Boy Scout Troop 87 from Cross Point Alliance Church.

Councilmember Newton arrived at 7:00 p.m.

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said earlier today, we had a shooting that took place in our City, and it is always a very difficult time for our police officers, for our community and particularly when we have a loss of life. We must always remember, that loss of life is someone's child, and for that we are truly, truly sorry that any kind of loss has to occur like that. Keeping order is not always an easy thing. Loosing someone is really, really difficult. So, let me say, on behalf of all of our citizens, we work hard every day to serve you well, and today was a

tough day for anyone that worked for the City, and I hope for all of us that live here. Thank you for allowing me that moment.

PUBLIC FORUM

ITEM NO. 8: PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Lyles said the Council has made a decision that when we have a number of people signed up to speak, that we will have 15 people speak for two minutes, so that gives everyone an opportunity. Often in this case I believe that we actually had more than 20 people sign up to speak tonight, so we will work within in our 15 people. Ordinarily, we have 10, and you will have two minutes, and I am going to go in the order by which we are going to hear from folks, with the exception that I am going to ask Ms. Dana Frady to wait until the end, and we are going to have a proclamation read by Mr. Phipps at the end of our time.

Affordable Housing

Darius Moore, 9510 Puddle Duck Road said the City collects \$15 million every two years to affect affordable housing, with last year \$50 million was approved. The most recent plan states that affordable housing will be available on the light rail and near uptown and along the transit stops, so it is more convenient for those people to community to their jobs and where they have to go. In 2011, the small-area fair market rent rule went into effect, giving hope to some that they might be able to live somewhere in Charlotte without a food desert or without only a Food Lion as the only option for groceries. The reason we mention Food Lion is because there are healthier grocery stores out there; Publix are being developed, Whole Foods, Harris Teeter, and apparently in these low-income neighborhoods, Food Lion or your Giant Penny on the Plaza is the only option, which these stores have records of expired meats and fruits, and those are being served to our lower income citizens. Even thought that small area fair market rent rule went into effect, we visit places like Queens, Dilworth, and SouthPark, and we still do not see familiar faces. Charlotte has reportedly spent \$124 million on affordable housing in the past 16 years. Where are these properties with the below 80% average income, which is basically units that are supposed to be set aside for these low-income families to come into their higher income properties? Again, we do not see familiar faces. In the past 16 years, I have seen many changes to my City, none of which look like affordable housing in the proposed sectors. Instead, only local business being bullied, urban institutions being bulldozed, and my fellow citizens being forced to live a life less than admirable.

Mayor Lyles said that was one of the reasons that we were late coming in, and we were talking about how to leverage your money that citizens approved with the money that has been raised from the private sector and through philanthropic efforts to build the most and do the best job that we can to increase the supply of housing.

Social Work Services

Deronda Metz, 8719 Barrister Way said this month is social work month, so I brought all of our social workers from the Salvation Army, if you all will stand. This is just part of our celebration to talk about what we do. I am the Director for the Salvation Army's homeless shelter in our housing program, so people know that we scramble day and night to get people into shelter, but what you may not know is that we also have social workers to try to help people get out of homelessness. So, we partner with the City on a couple of initiatives, whether it is in our emergency shelter, where we have about eight social workers and our employment person is up here or whether people are in our housing programs. We have social workers just to make sure that people in our community can be a part of our community. I am a professional social worker, and so are they. We signed up to always be an advocate and to be a voice for those persons in our community who do not have a voice. So, as we get ready for the Room in the End to close on March 30, we know that there is about 122 women and children that are there. So, we appreciate

the work that the City is doing. We want to continue to work with you all. We will see a lot of citizens Saturday night scrambling to try to find a place of shelter, so I want us to be encouraged to work together. I also would like to applaud any other social workers in this community. I think that social work is an awesome profession. It is very helpful, and we help our citizens in this community. I want to make one announcement; in effort to support social work month, we have partnered with Johnson C. Smith University, so we will be doing a townhall meeting on Wednesday from 12:00 noon until 2:00 p.m., and it will be a meeting, and we will be talking about how social workers are involved making sure that we promote democracy. On Thursday night at 6:00 p.m. we will have the Dorothy Hyatt series. It is an open public meeting and I hope everybody can come out.

Immigration

Mayor Lyles said I think Ms. Benson-Bell is going to talk about immigration and I just wanted to recognize that UNC-Charlotte Service Learning and the Latino community class, we have several students from UNC-Charlotte. David Whichland, Arianna Nixon, and Alicia Harrison, we are looking forward to what you do and to the research that you have. Thank you very much for being here tonight.

Diana Benson-Bell, 4406 Palustris Court said I am here in response to the disturbing charges made last month at the public forum against you, Mayor, and the Customs and Immigration officers. As a female Uber driver, my safety is key to my livelihood, and I am trusting that the City officials have my back by utilizing every law enforcement tool available to keep this City safe. I never thought that I would have to consider the consequences of illegal criminals finding out that committing more crimes would not get them deported. The Sherriff's elimination of the 287-G program made no safety sense at all, and now we are dealing with the fallout. That was not enough for the illegal activists who demanded that you sign a resolution condemning ICE. Secondly, I drive people from around the world that come to this City, and they sometimes tell me about how they like the City, but I have driven people who have come to this country from other countries and have become citizens and how proud they are to be citizens of this country, and I just think that everyone who wants to come to this country, they are more than welcome, just come and do it correctly. That is all that we are asking, and we would like our laws to be enforced and ICE to stay in business, because everyone, whether you are an immigrant or you were born here, we all need to be safe. So, I would like for you to continue Mayor to stand strong. We are supporting you that you do not sign the resolution and that ICE will be able to work, because the RNC is coming next year, and they will help keep the City safe, because a lot of people will be coming here, and we need to remain safe in the City.

Mayor Lyles said I want you to know Ms. Bell that I do not take it personally about anybody yelling at me. It is just part of the job.

Immigration

Destiny Edwards, 15431 Tully House Court said one month ago, this Council was urged to condemn ICE. ICE was accused of racially profiling on the streets of Charlotte and arresting members of the community without cause, but ICE does not conduct random raids. They target the worst of the worst criminal illegal immigrants. Two-thirds of ICE arrests last year were convicted criminals. By the time that ICE had arrested them, they had already been convicted of violent crimes, including human trafficking, indecent liberties with children, and sexual assault on a female. The vast majority of those targeted by ICE are wanted criminals and known members of gangs and cartels. As a woman and a mom of two girls, I want ICE removing those people from our streets. Yes, immigration enforcement is the federal government's responsibility, but the cooperation ICE receives from local law enforcement is critical to the success of their mission. Failing to cooperate with ICE sends the message to criminal, illegal immigrants that you are safe here. It is dangerous and unfair to not make the distinction between that group and legal immigrants, the legal immigrant community who comes to America to find a better life for their families and love our country and follow the laws. Failing to cooperate with ICE says to the rest of your constituents, we will not protect you, fend for yourselves. Mayor Lyles,

you said that we should not make promises that we cannot keep. The promise that each of you made when you took your oath of office was to support and maintain the Constitution and laws of the United States. If you refuse to do so, you are betraying us. ICE is integrated with law enforcement all around the world looking for fugitives from the law. If Charlotte is going to be the world class city that we talk about it being, we must allow world class law enforcement, like ICE, to do their job.

Mayor Lyles said all of us know how complex this issue is. It is not a simple yes or no. It is just not. So, I want us to all be respectful of each point of view, and we know that things are very, very difficult already. I would ask us to please be respectful. I know that this is a tough issue, and all of us recognize the difficulty that we are having; let's make Charlotte be Charlotte and let everything else take place in a place that when people have their values they live them. Let's live our values with respect for each other please.

ICE Raids

Banu Valladares, 6300 Highland Avenue said I am the Executive Director of Charlotte Bilingual Pre-School, where we prepare Spanish speaking children for success in school and life, by providing them with a high-quality, dual-language education, and I am here just to testify about the impact the raids have had on children. We know that children who grow up in safe, stable, and nurturing relationships and environments survive physically and emotionally, socially, and intellectually. These are the principals that we use to create efficient schools, and these are the principles that we use in our work with families all around. The Center for Disease Control defines the terms like this: safety is the extent to which a child is free from fear and secure from physical or psychological harm within their social and physical environment. Stability is a degree of predictability and consistency in a child's social, emotional, and physical environment. Nurturing is the extent to which a parent or caregiver is available and able to sensitively and consistently respond to and meet the needs of a child. Raids disrupt a child's ability to live in a safe, stable, and nurturing relationship and environment and have negative effects on children, our families, and our communities. Families are the norm in Charlotte, so when someone is deported or arrested it affects everybody. It is not as simple as you mentioned Mayor. It is not that simple. When a family is separated, 70% of their income goes away. That means that a parent has to go and work a second job or third job, and that means that a child has less access to their family. That creates a strong amount of stress on the child.

Vision Zero

Debra Franklin, 1750 Camden Road, Apt 610 said my road to Vision Zero began January 2016. I began to notice that there were many pedestrians and bicyclist collisions with motorists in Charlotte, most of them resulting in death. Also, what struck me as odd was the fact that most of these victims were adults, then the report came out, Dangerous by Design. Charlotte, the smallest town in which I have ever resided, was listed as one of the cities dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists by street design. In addition, I am a bus driver for CATS. At the time of my hire, we had to undergo an eight-week training cycle. Included in that training was a specialized seminar called the Smith System. Despite that vigorous training, we had several operators involved in incidents regarding pedestrians and bicyclists. Unfortunately, operators lost their job; eventually, I began researching Charlotte's traffic history, in particular the crosswalk law. I felt that adults were probably too dependent on the laws and regulation of motorists, versus watching out for their own safety. My search uncovered the Vision Zero concept, and I decided to go to New York. I hoped that I was able to learn information that would save the jobs of my fellow coworkers, thus I attended the Second Annual Conference of Vision Zero 2016 and the 2017 in New York City. At the conference, I sat in front of the mother of Sammy Cohen, Amy Cohen. Amy was founder of the citizens' coalition in New York City, Families for Safe Streets. I listened as Amy told us what happened to her son Sammy. Sammy was a victim of traffic violence.

Mayor Lyles said thank you for attending the conferences and the work that you are doing. You and Mr. Phipps have a really strong bond on this in terms of Vision Zero, so thank you. I saw New York last week, a lot of really nice crosswalks. They were not four feet.

They were more like 12 or 15 or sometimes the whole block, so we have a lot of work to do. We are going to try to make you proud of that.

Ice Raids

Jennifer Trujillo, 4542 Helena Street said this is kind of last minute for me. I saw some posts talking about the immigration community. I actually completely changed my response. I am an immigration paralegal at a law firm. In reference to everything that has been mentioned right here, I do see the impact on the community that ICE has. I do appreciate CMPD going out and spreading awareness that they are not working with the ICE officials in this matter; however, those two-third convictions mentioned, that is inaccurate. I have seen clients, parents, my daughter's classmates for no operator's license being detailed, for not wearing a seatbelt, families separated after having established their life for over 20-plus years. I wish that there was an easier route to come here lawfully, because I guarantee you everybody would do it, but it is not that simple. We have to recognize how fast Charlotte is growing. We are a City that is built on the immigration community. I urge the UNC students that are here to make a report, please. Let's consider the financial impact and contributions made by the immigrant community. Now, if we were to get rid of this and spread more fear with the 287-G being put back into place, what is that going to do to our City when our heart and soul was built by immigrants in Central, South Boulevard, Eastway, the Plaza. We do have a stand, and I urge you guys. I am not okay with the serious crimes either, but when it is something so minor as not wearing a seatbelt or speeding or no operator's license that is when it becomes an issue.

NC National Bank

Howard Brown, 501 Winston Street said on my mother's behalf, I am before you. One time before when I was down here, there was man in a dress praising you all, a man looking like a woman. Now, I am going to tell you the difference between God and the devil. This is the ability that Jesus had. What he can do, do not touch me, because I have not yet ascended to the Father, and before you could snap a finger, he was up there with God, and when he left God, he had the ability, whether he did or not, to go to each and every individual angel and not only that but all of the planet that he had created. He could do that, saying he did it. I am not saying he had the ability to do it. Everything that you call energy today came from the flood, everything [inaudible] that is the residue of a flood. Now, what I would like to do, it is like I am talking to deaf ears, but I am going to pursue what I want. They do not represent America, not that bank, but what I want to happen is this right here. My mother's World War II bond, I want them to give it up.

Mecklenburg Child Abuse Prevention Team Events

Dana Frady, 700 East 4th Street said I am the District Administrator of the 26th Judicial District Guardian Ad Litem Program. The Guardian Ad Litem Program provides a voice for children in court alleged to be abused and neglected, but I am also proud to be a part of a team that focuses on prevention to ensure that child abuse and neglect never occur in the first place. The Mecklenburg Child Abuse Prevention team is a collaboration of local organizations that serve children to build awareness in our community about prevention. The team believes all children deserve great childhoods and that each of us has a role to play in making sure our community is a place where children and families are able to thrive. Preventing child abuse and neglect means helping parents have the knowledge, skills, resources, and support needed to provide safe and nurturing environments for all children. The Mecklenburg Child Abuse Prevention team thanks you for proclaiming April 2019 for Child Abuse Prevention month. We are also honored and grateful for Mayor Lyles participation in a press conference that will be held this Friday, March 29th to launch the Child Abuse Prevention month activities, and we invite all Councilmembers to attend the press conference at 10:00 a.m. by the circle outside of the courthouse. At the conclusion of the press conference, we will plan a garden of pinwheels in the courthouse flowerbed. Pinwheels are used nationwide as symbols of happy healthy lives that all children deserve, and these pinwheels are meant to create awareness of the critical issues of child abuse.

* * * * *

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

ITEM NO. 10: CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH

Councilmember Phipps read the following Proclamation:

WHEREAS, children are vital to our state's future success, prosperity and quality of life, as well as being our most vulnerable assets; and

WHEREAS, all children deserve to have the safe, stable, nurturing homes and communities they need to foster their healthy growth and development; and

WHEREAS, child abuse and neglect is a community responsibility, affecting both the current and future quality of life of a community; and

WHEREAS, communities provide parents with the social support, knowledge of parenting, child development and concrete resources they need to cope with stress in order to nurture their children whereby ensuring all children grow up to their full potential; and

WHEREAS, effective child abuse prevention strategies succeed because of partnerships created among citizens, human service agencies, schools, faith communities, healthcare providers, civic organizations, law enforcement agencies, and the business community;

NOW, THEREFORE, WE, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, and George Dunlap, Chair of the Mecklenburg Board of County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim April 2019 as

“CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH”

in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County and commend its observance to all citizens.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 11: VISION ZERO CITY PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, the City of Charlotte aspires to be the safest and most connected city in the country; and

WHEREAS, Charlotte is committed to building a transportation network that encourages safe walking, biking and driving behaviors; and

WHEREAS, speeding is the leading cause of fatalities on Charlotte roadways and reducing speeds through engineering, education and enforcement strategies is imperative to saving lives; and

WHEREAS, the city and community must work together for safer streets; and

WHEREAS, the City has a Vision Zero Task Force with over 50 members from 25 organizations, from a breadth of safety professions and advocates; and

WHEREAS, Vision Zero distinguishes itself from traditional road safety approaches by focusing on solutions to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries on our streets; and

WHEREAS, a Vision Zero Action Plan was created to build on Charlotte’s long-standing commitment to traffic safety:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim the City of Charlotte as a

“VISION ZERO CITY”

WITNESS MY HAND and the official Seal of the City of Charlotte.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs and seconded by Councilmembers Phipps to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, with the exception of Item Nos. 44, 51, 52, 56, 59, 62, 64, 67, 69, and 71, which were pulled by staff.

Councilmember Harlow said this Item No. 36: Vest and Franklin Water Treatment Plants Upgrades is probably one of the largest contracts that we have on this Consent Agenda, approving a contract for \$29,995,350 to Wharton-Smith for improvements and the Vest Water Treatment Center at Beatties Ford Road and also a contract amendment for a little more than \$2.5 million to Black & Veatch for other administrative and inspection purposes at the Franklin Treatment Center on the Brookshire Freeway.

Just a comment, I will probably steal this one from Mr. Mitchell in his absence, since he is always commenting around our MWSBE goals. In a \$30 million contract we are establishing the contract of just 10%. There is a variety of scopes of work that are being done in this effort to kind of really just basically transform our water treatment facility and have a committed goal of 4.3%. We really, I think, undershot the established goal, then the bidder who did not earn good-faith efforts committed less than half of that on a \$30 million contract. It is really unfortunate to see something like this. I do not say this just because the project is in District 2. I would have commented on this one regardless of where it is. Not often do we see \$30 million contracts come across our agenda, and to see these goals not be met and set so low, I continue to challenge the staff. I know that we do great work. We have talked about this in the ED Committee, and I think we have to continue to look at ways to advocate around making sure that we are connecting our subcontractors in a variety of industries to these primes, especially when we know that these goals are set after the contract is already awarded. So, continue to make further efforts to not only push ourselves to increase these goals but also to push these primes to make the contacts that are appropriate so that we can get a significantly better participation in this first action. There is no reason why a \$30 million contract and only four percent should be MWSBE participated.

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

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

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

The following items were approved:

Item No. 29: Sexual Assault Kit Testing Services

(A) Approve unit price contracts with BODE Cellmark Forensics, Inc. and DNA Labs International for the testing of sexual assault kits for an initial term of one year, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and renew contracts with BODE Cellmark Forensics, Inc. and DNA Labs International for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the City’s business needs and the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 30: Resolution of Intent to Abandon an Unopened Alleyway Off of Drummond Avenue and Catawba Avenue

(A) Adopt a Resolution of intent to abandon an unopened alleyway off of Drummond Avenue and Catawba Avenue, and (B) Set a Public Hearing for April 8, 2019.

A resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 421/

Item No. 31: Resolution of Intent to Abandon an Unopened Alleyway Off of North McDowell Street and North Myers Street

(A) Adopt a Resolution of intent to abandon an unopened alleyway off of North McDowell Street and North Myers Street, and (B) Set a Public Hearing for April 8, 2019.

A resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 422.

Item No. 32: Charlotte Vehicle Operations Center Expansion

Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,911,680 to the lowest responsive bidder Carmel Contractors, Inc. for the Charlotte Vehicle Operations Center Expansion.

Summary of Bids

Carmel Contractors, Inc.	\$2,911,680.00
W. C. Construction Company, LLC	\$3,003,480.00
John E. Jenkins, Inc.	\$3,028,305.96
Shiel-Sexton Company, Inc.	\$3,075,535.44
Edison Ford Construction Services, Inc.	\$3,099,600.00
Encompass Building Group, Inc.	\$3,226,489.20
Walter B. Davis Company	\$3,984,431.04

Item No. 33: Hough Road Storm Drainage Improvement Project

Approve a contract in the amount of \$731,935.33 to the lowest responsive bidder United of Carolinas, Inc. for the Hough Road Storm Drainage Improvement Project.

Summary of Bids

United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$731,935.33
OnSite Development Company	\$733,119.25
Sonny Development	\$760,519.15
North American Pipeline Management, Inc.	\$794,264.75

Item No. 34: Alanhurst-Cherrycrest Storm Drainage Improvement Project

Approve a contract in the amount of \$4,140,614.50 to the lowest responsive bidder Blythe Development Co. for the Alanhurst-Cherrycrest Storm Drainage Improvement Project.

Summary of Bids

Blythe Development Co.	\$4,140,614.50
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$4,192,612.38
Zoladz Construction Co., Inc.	\$4,262,500.00
Sealand Contractors, Corp.	\$4,799,295.55
North American Pipeline Management, Inc.	\$5,374,381.10

Item No. 35: Water Main Replacements

Approve a contract in the amount of \$3,513,514.20 to the lowest responsive bidder Propst Construction Company for Fiscal Year 2019 water main replacements.

Summary of Bids

Propst Construction	\$3,513,514.20
Dallas 1	\$3,537,783.90
State Utility Contractors	\$6,331,206.00

Item No. 36: Vest and Franklin Water Treatment Plants Upgrades

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$29,995,350 to the lowest responsive bidder Wharton-Smith, Inc. for Vest and Franklin Water Treatment Plants upgrades, and (B)

March 25, 2019
Business Meeting
Minutes Book 147, Page 886

Approve contract amendment #1 for \$2,608,000 to the Black & Veatch International Company contract for construction administration and inspection services for the Vest and Franklin Water Treatment Plants upgrades.

Summary of Bids

Wharton-Smith, Inc.

\$29,995,350.00
\$33,649,350.00

Adams Robinson Enterprises, Inc.

Item No. 37: CATS Financial Advisor Services

(A) Approve contract with Davenport and Company, LLC for financial advisory services for an initial term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 38: Airport Parking and Revenue Control System and Online Booking System

(A) Approve a five-year contract with Designa Access Corporation to provide a Parking and Revenue Control System and associated maintenance and monitoring services necessary to keep the system operational, (B) Approve a five-year contract with KMP Associates, Ltd. t/a Aero Parker to provide an Online Parking Reservation System and support services necessary to maximize Aviation's use of the system, (C) Authorize the City Manager to approve price adjustments and amend the above contracts consistent with the City's business needs and the purpose for which these contracts were awarded, and (D) Authorize the City Manager to purchase such additional software licenses, hardware, and associated services as needed from time to time to optimize the City's use of the system.

Item No. 39: Airport Concourse A Expansion Phase 2 Design Services

Approve a contract in the amount of \$8,428,000 to Perkins+Will North Carolina, Inc. for design services for the Concourse A Expansion Phase 2 Project.

Item No. 40: Airport East Terminal Phase 2 - Food Court Construction Services

Approve change order #1 in the amount of \$2,998,817.67 to Messer Construction for the revisions to the Food Court area of East Terminal Phase 2.

Item No. 41: Airport South Campus Node Communication Room Construction

Approve a contract in the amount of \$711,634 to the lowest responsive bidder Catalyst Construction Company for the South Campus communication room construction project.

Summary of Bids

Catalyst Construction Company

\$711,634.00

Whiting-Turner Contracting Company

\$708,230.00

AKW Electrical

\$ 44,909.59

Item No. 42: Nuisance Abatement Services

(A) Approve contracts with the following companies for nuisance abatement services for an initial term of three years: Carolina Lawn Service, Dunlap Commercial and Residential Services, LLC, GDC Supplies, Equipment & Contracting LLC, GMB Enterprises, HRGC LLC, Lightning Fast Lawn Care, Maintenance One, Millennium CCF and DJF, LLC, and RCS Surface Restoration and Preservation, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 43: Audio Visual Software, Hardware, and Services

(A) Approve the purchase of audio visual software, hardware, and services from a federal contract, (B) Approve a fixed price contract with Activu Corporation for the purchase of Activu audio-visual system, including hardware and software services under General Services Administration, Contract #GS-35F-0632N, dated May 22, 2003, (C) Authorize the City Manager to extend the contract for additional one-year terms for as long as the federal contract is in effect, at prices and terms that are the same or more favorable than those offered under the federal contract, (D) Authorize the City Manager to purchase

maintenance and support for as long as the City uses the audio-visual software and hardware, and (E) Authorize the City Manager to purchase such additional software licenses, services, and hardware or amend the contract as may be required for additional enterprise implementations of this audio-visual solution, consistent with the purpose for which the contract was awarded.

Item No. 45: Refund of Property Taxes

Adopt a resolution authorizing the refund of property taxes assessed through clerical or assessment error in the amount of \$7,536.43.
The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 423-424.

Item No. 46: In Rem Remedy: 1239 Caldwell Williams Road

Adopt Ordinance 9538-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at (1239 Caldwell Williams Road) (Neighborhood Profile Area 113).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 62, at Page(s) 155.

Item No. 47: In Rem Remedy: 2724 A & B Mayfair Avenue

Adopt Ordinance 9539-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at (2724 A & B Mayfair Avenue) (Neighborhood Profile Area 321).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 62, at Page(s) 156.

Item No. 48: In Rem Remedy: 8509 Mount Holly Road

Adopt Ordinance 9540-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at (8509 Mount Holly Road) (Neighborhood Profile Area 348).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 62, at Page(s) 157.

Item No. 49: Meeting Minutes

Approve the titles, motions, and votes reflected in the Clerk's record as the minutes of: February 4, 2019 Strategy Session, February 6, 2019 Budget Workshop, and February 11, 2019 Business Meeting.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 50: Property Transactions - Chandworth Drainage Improvements, Parcel #6

Resolution of Condemnation of 516 sq. ft. (.012 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 1,468 sq. ft. (.034 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 3814 Chandworth Road from Paul G. Durham and Brandi P. Durham for an amount to be determined, for Chandworth Drainage Improvements, Parcel #6.

A resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 425.

Item No. 53: Property Transactions - Cross Charlotte Trail Brandywine - Tyvola, Parcel #15

Acquisition of 7,617 sq. ft. (.175 ac.) in Permanent Greenway Easement plus 1,197 sq. ft. (.027 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 2116 Hassell Place from Matthew Paul LeBlanc and Catherine Ann Mellon LeBlanc for \$75,000 for Cross Charlotte Trail Brandywine - Tyvola, Parcel #15.

Item No. 54: Property Transactions - Irvins Creek Trunk, Parcel #5

Acquisition of 4,520 sq. ft. (.104 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 6,362 sq. ft. (.146 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1100 Lawyers Road from Hilda M. Bradley, et al for \$20,157 for Irvins Creek Trunk, Parcel #5.

Item No. 55: Property Transactions - Irvins Creek Trunk, Parcel #8

Acquisition of 7,977 sq. ft. (.183 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 5,169 sq. ft. (.119 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1124 Lawyers Road from James Curtis Bartlett and Elizabeth Wentz Bartlett for \$30,296 for Irvins Creek Trunk, Parcel #8.

Item No. 57: Property Transactions - Little Sugar Creek Tributary Trunk Sewer to North Tryon Street, Parcel #8

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,018 sq. ft. (.023 ac.) in Fee Simple and 16,255 sq. ft. (.373 ac.) in Storm Drainage Easement, plus 17,824 sq. ft. (.409 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 8,167 sq. ft. (.187 ac.) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement, plus 10,689 sq. ft. (.245 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 5,916 sq. ft. (.136 ac.) in Retaining Wall Easement at 1224 North Tryon Street from Amerco Real Estate Company for an amount to be determined for Little Sugar Creek Tributary Trunk Sewer to North Tryon Street, Parcel #8.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 426.

Item No. 58: Property Transactions - Matthews Commons Gravity Sewer, Parcel #1
Resolution of Condemnation of 8,665 sq. ft. (.199 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 6,206 sq. ft. (.142 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 8547 E. Independence Boulevard from Waters Construction Company, Inc. for an amount to be determined for Matthews Commons Gravity Sewer, Parcel #1.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 427.

Item No. 60: Property Transactions - Matthews Commons Gravity Sewer, Parcel #10
Resolution of Condemnation of 4,294 sq. ft. (.099 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 7,837 sq. ft. (.18 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 2424 Sam Newell Road from Barbara C. Stegall and Paula O. Haigler for an amount to be determined for Matthews Commons Gravity Sewer, Parcel #10.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 428.

Item No. 61: Property Transactions - Matthews Commons Gravity Sewer, Parcel #20
Resolution of Condemnation of 4,774 sq. ft. (.11 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 6,519 sq. ft. (.15 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at Tory Oak Place from Matthews Commons Owners' Association, Inc for an amount to be determined for Matthews Commons Gravity Sewer, Parcel #20.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 429.

Item No. 63: Property Transactions - Sardis Lane Bridge Replacement, Parcel #2
Resolution of Condemnation of 230 sq. ft. (.005 ac.) in Storm Drainage Easement, plus 2,530 sq. ft. (.058 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 4,637 sq. ft. (.106 ac.) in Utility Easement at 701 Sardis Lane from Karen D. Rosenheimer and Robert L. Rosenheimer for an amount to be determined for Sardis Lane Bridge Replacement, Parcel #2.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 430.

Item No. 65: Property Transactions - State Street Pedestrian Improvement, Parcel #2
Resolution of Condemnation of 2,176 sq. ft. (.05 ac.) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement at 536 State Street from Savona, LLC for an amount to be determined for State Street Pedestrian Improvement, Parcel #2.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 431.

Item No. 66: Property Transactions - State Street Pedestrian Improvement, Parcel #4
Resolution of Condemnation of 133 sq. ft. (.003 ac.) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement, plus 220 sq. ft. (.005 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 524 State Street from 2030 South Tryon, LLC for an amount to be determined for State Street Pedestrian Improvement, Parcel #4.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 432.

Item No. 68: Property Transactions - State Street Pedestrian Improvement, Parcel #36

Resolution of Condemnation of 388 sq. ft. (.009 ac.) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement at 1801 Rozzelles Ferry Road from The Charlotte-Hospital Authority for an amount to be determined for State Street Pedestrian Improvement, Parcel #36.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 433.

Item No. 70: Property Transactions - Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #4

Resolution of Condemnation of 29.55 sq. ft. (.001 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 437.29 sq. ft. (.01 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement from at 600 Dobson Drive from Wilfred E. Phoenix, et al for an amount to be determined for Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #4.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 434.

Item No. 72: Property Transactions - Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #13

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,214.37 sq. ft. (.051 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 1,886.28 sq. ft. (.043 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 5512 Snow White Lane from Merlin Efrain Torres Milla and Angelica Maria Herrera Rodas for an amount to be determined for Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #13.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 435.

Item No. 73: Property Transactions - Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #15

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,214.66 sq. ft. (.051 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 1,797.12 sq. ft. (.041 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 5515 Snow White Lane from Home SFR Borrower IV, LLC for an amount to be determined for Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #15.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 436.

Item No. 74: Property Transactions - Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #18

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,936.64 sq. ft. (.044 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 618.77 sq. ft. (.014 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 2501 Massey Court from Sabino Omar Ramos for an amount to be determined for Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #18.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 437.

Item No. 75: Property Transactions - Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #21

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,162.69 sq. ft. (.027 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 1,498.15 sq. ft. (.034 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 6143 Spring Garden Lane from Linda D. Reese for an amount to be determined for Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #21.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 438.

Item No. 76: Property Transactions - Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #26

Resolution of Condemnation of 31.41 sq. ft. (.001 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 601.71 sq. ft. (.014 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 911 Georgetown Drive from Home SF R Borrower IV, LLC for an amount to be determined for Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #26.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 439.

Item No. 77: Property Transactions - Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #27

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,213.76 sq. ft. (.051 ac.) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 2,851.1 sq. ft. (.065 ac.) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1001 Georgetown Drive from Teresa McClinton and Melvin Houston for an amount to be determined for Upper Little Sugar Creek Sanitary Sewer Replacement Phase 2, Parcel #27.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 440.

Item No. 78: Aviation Property Transaction - 7611 Byrum Drive and 4170 Timberley Place

Acquisition of N/A at 7611 Byrum/4170 Timberley Place from Richard E. Stillwell for \$300,000 and all relocation benefits in compliance with federal, state, or local regulations for Airport Master Plan – Expansion.

Item No. 79: Aviation Property Transaction - 9618 Markswood Road

Acquisition of N/A 9618 Markswood Road from Randy B. and Lu Ann Schultz for \$315,600 and all relocation benefits in compliance with Federal, State or Local regulations for EIS Mitigation Land South.

PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM NO. 12: PUBLIC HEARING ON CONVENTION CENTER FACILITIES AND REFUNDING OF 2009 CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Harlow and carried unanimously to close the public hearing regarding approval of an installment financing contract, not to exceed \$142,500,000, to finance the City's renovation of the Convention Center, construction of a Conference Center in partnership with The Foundation of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, and refunding of 2009 Certificates of Participation.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Phipps and carried unanimously to adopt a resolution authorizing and approving an installment financing contract for the proposed financing and calling for the execution and delivery of various documents necessary to complete the sale of Certificates of Participation.

A resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 400-404.

ITEM NO. 13: PUBLIC HEARING AND DECISION FOR LEMMOND FARMS VOLUNTARY ANNEXATIONS

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Eddie Moore, 3430 Toringdon Way said my name is Eddie Moore with McAdams. We are assisting the Helms family and Alliance Residential with this voluntary annexation, and I am just here to answer any questions that you may have.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmembers Newton and carried unanimously to close the public hearing for the Lemmond Farm voluntary annexation.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmembers Newton and carried unanimously to adopt annexation ordinance 9531-X with an effective date of March 25, 2019, to extend the corporate limits to include these properties and assign them to the adjacent City Council District 3.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 62, at Page(s) 119-124.

ITEM NO. 14: PUBLIC HEARING AND DECISION ON RIVERBEND PHASE 3 VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmembers Harlow and carried unanimously to close the public hearing for the Riverbend Phase 3 voluntary annexation.

A motion was made by Councilmember Harlow, seconded by Councilmembers Driggs and carried unanimously to adopt annexation ordinance 9532-X with an effective date of March 25, 2019, to extend the corporate limits to include these properties and assign them to the adjacent City Council District 2.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 62, at Page(s) 125-128.

ITEM NO. 15: PUBLIC HEARING AND DECISION ON STEELE CREEK LANDING VOLUNTARY ANNEXATIONS

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmembers Bokhari and carried unanimously to (A) Close the hearing for the Steele Creek Landing voluntary annexation, and (B) Adopt annexation ordinance 9533-X with an effective date of March 25, 2019, to extend the corporate limits to include these properties and assign them to the adjacent City Council district 3.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 62, at Page(s) 129-135.

ITEM NO. 16: PUBLIC HEARING AND DECISION ON SUTTON FARM PHASE 2 VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION *

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmembers Newton and carried unanimously to (A) Close the public hearing for the Sutton Farm Phase 2 voluntary annexation, and (B) Adopt annexation ordinance 9534-X with an effective date of March 25, 2019 to extend the corporate limits to include these properties and assign them to the adjacent City Council district 2.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 62, at Page(s) 136-140.

* Clerk Note: Due to an error in the legal description in the legal advertisement for this public hearing, on August 26, 2019, City Council held another public hearing and adopted annexation Ordinance No. 9620-X with an effective date of August 26, 2019, to extend the corporate limits to include this property and assign it to the adjacent Council District 2.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: PUBLIC HEARING AND DECISION ON WITHROW DOWNS PHASE 3 VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmembers Bokhari and carried unanimously to (A) Close the public hearing for the Withrow Downs Phase 3 voluntary annexation, and (B) Adopt annexation ordinance 9535-X with an effective date of March 25, 2019, to extend the corporate limits to include this property and assign it to the adjacent City Council district 4.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 62, at Page(s) 141-146.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 18: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Marcus Jones, City Manager said have capacity on the April 1st Strategy Session if there were any items that were not covered tonight, that we could slide those to April 1st if necessary.

Councilmember Egleston said I think that is a good idea. Fifteen months or so in and the Manager is still very optimistic about how much we can get done in any one of our Dinner Briefings, we have, I think very reliably shown that we would like to unpack these things thoroughly, and maybe we should try to have a more digestible list for our Dinner Briefings until we demonstrate that we can move more quickly.

Mr. Jones said only three items on the eighth is a Dinner Briefing. The other is a Budget Workshop and a Strategy Session.

Mayor Lyles said I do agree with Mr. Egleston. We added two closed items in closed session that took really as much time as anyone of the two items that we did not get to. In the past, we tried to do our closed sessions when we were alert and just having everybody participate instead of at the end of meetings, which were often 10:00 p.m. or 10:30 p.m. when perhaps we were not as sharp. So, I do not know the balance, but I think that if there is something that is really important, we will probably start moving our closed sessions to the end of the meeting so that we can get through the regularly planned agenda items. If you have some ideas or thoughts about that, we have never set a time that we would stop our regular Business Meeting, unlike our Zoning Meetings, but I think that it is just something, unless we start our meetings at a different time, earlier or whatever. If you have some ideas or thoughts about that if you will send them to the Manager, we will get a list of them and maybe at some point start thinking about what time do we need to start our meetings and what time do we start our meetings and what time do we end them.

Councilmember Winston said this is something that I brought up a couple of times over the past 15 months, the reality is that we have more work than I think can be done in our current structure, and I think that as we look at the way that committees are being reorganized I think that there is one that is supposed to look at good governance practices and I think that this is something that we should look at more critically as oppose to just having people sent emails of ideas. Perhaps there is another meeting that needs to happen. It may be the responsibility of future Councils to take in mind when they are taking this job; maybe it is something that is done Tuesday morning or another day during the week to do things like closed sessions and other things that might popup and were not accounted for. While we might have three things on the agenda right now, there is a

lot of time between now and then that might need to be dealt with, so I think that this is much deeper and much more important than simply throwing ideas on the wall and seeing what sticks.

Mayor Lyles said well, there is one that is sticking already, so I think that we will put that one on the hopper and start collecting others and have a discussion around it. I agree with you. We have to have conversation about it. That would be good.

Councilmember Driggs said I just wanted to ask, are we going to do the 9% Housing trust fund request and E-scooter update then on April 1, 2019, or are we still going to do that tonight?

Mr. Jones said I put that out as an option. I believe the Mayor said at the Action Briefing that you could come back tonight. I just gave you an option that you wanted to move it to April 1st that could be an option.

Mayor Lyles said it is up to the Council to decide; would you like to take on the Housing Trust Fund, the 9% request tonight?

Mr. Egleston said do you want to see what time we get through our agenda?

Mayor Lyles said let's see what time we are done, then we will go back to it.

Councilmember Newton said those items were pretty time-sensitive weren't they? Are we under a time crunch on any of those?

Mayor Lyles said under the submission of the 9%?

Mr. Jones said yes, the 9% submission, we just need to have a vote from you in the April time frame. That can be late April.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: RESOLUTIONS TO CORRECT PAYOUT FOR RECENT FIREFIGHTER RETIREES AND ADOPT VACATION, SICK, GARCIA, AND T-13 LEAVE POLICY

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Newton and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution approving leave payout adjustments for firefighter retirees who retired between October 15, 2013, and March 25, 2019, and (B) Adopt a resolution approving a vacation, sick, Garcia, and T-13 leave policy.

Mayor Lyles said it is a good point, and I want to thank both the various members of the Fire Department, Chief, your team and the Manager's office for getting us through this and making sure that we were moving forward appropriately.

The resolutions are recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 405-406 and 407-411.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 20: GUIDELINES FOR PRESERVING NATURALLY OCCURRING AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield and seconded by Councilmember Harlow to Approve the Housing and Neighborhood Development Committee's recommendation to approve the Guidelines for Preserving Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing.

Councilmember Phipps said I would like someone from the Committee to clarify the rationale for the 50-unit requirement versus a lesser unit count. I know that I read that it was considered to be a best practice for 15-years and a minimum of 50-units, but why 50-units? Suppose we have a 30-unit complex, are they just out of luck?

Pamela Wideman, Housing and Neighborhood Services Director said the Committee had a lot of robust discussion with this; the answer would be two-fold. One, it is consistent with when we did research across other cities about how NOAHs are categorized, then it comes down to economics, and when you get down to less than 50- units, the deals pretty much just do not pencil out or when they do, they require a larger investment, so we are trying to leverage our dollars as best we can.

Mayor Lyles said I had a question about one of the other ones. It said per the guidelines, the level of funding investments that the City will range between \$10,000 and \$35,000 per unit, and the \$35,000 per unit, I wonder why that occurred. I am not asking to change it. I think that the recommendation is fine, but I would like to track that against what we define when we are doing rehabs or acquisitions of other properties. We have NOAHs, and we are going to have new construction, so I would like to see where that \$35,000 compares as we go through this so that we can have an assessment of whether that target of \$35,000 per unit should be higher or lower.

Ms. Wideman said yes ma'am.

A vote was taken on the motion and carried as unanimous.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: AMEND ARTICLE XII - RESIDENTIAL RENTAL REGISTRATION AND REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Motion was made by Councilmember Harlow, seconded by Councilmember Driggs and carried unanimously to approve the Community Safety Committee's recommendation to amend the Residential Rental Registration and Remedial Action Program and adopt Ordinance 9536.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 62, at Page(s) 147-153.

* * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 22: PRIVATE DEVELOPER FUNDS APPROPRIATION

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Harlow and carried unanimously (A) Approve developer agreements with Dominion Realty Partners, LLC, Pappas Midtown, LLC, Rea Farms Construction, LLC, and RRPV South Tryon Charlotte LP for traffic signal installations and improvements, and (B) Adopt budget ordinance 9537-X appropriating \$362,877.95 in private developer funds for traffic signal installations and improvements.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 62, at Page(s) 154.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 23: MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT FOR ORR ROAD RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATION FEASIBILITY STUDY FUNDING

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield and carried unanimously to adopt a resolution to execute a Municipal Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation to the amount of \$75,000 for the Orr Road Railroad Grade Separation Feasibility Project.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 412-420.

ITEM NO. 24: VEHICLE DONATION TO YORK COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Motion was made by Councilmember Winston and seconded by Councilmember Harlow to deny a resolution authorizing the donation of a 2005 Ford 500 vehicle to the York County, South Carolina Sheriff's Office.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Harlow, Mayfield, and Winston

NAYS: Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Newton, and Phipps

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari and seconded by Councilmember Eiselt to approve a resolution authorizing the donation of a 2005 Ford 500 vehicle to the York County, South Carolina Sheriff's Office.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Newton, and Phipps

NAYS: Councilmembers Harlow, Mayfield, and Winston

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 49, at Page(s) 441-442.

ITEM NO. 25: APPOINTMENTS TO THE CHARLOTTE INTERNATIONAL CABINET

The following nominees were considered for one appointment for a partial term for an At-Large member beginning immediately and ending June 30, 2021:

- Paula Broadwell, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs and Egleston
- Gina Esquivel, nominated by Councilmembers Harlow and Mayfield

Results from the ballots were as follows:

- Paula Broadwell, 3 votes, Councilmembers Bokhari, Egleston, and Winston
- Gina Esquivel, 6 votes, Councilmembers Driggs, Eiselt, Harlow, Mayfield, Newton, and Phipps

Ms. Esquivel was appointed.

ITEM NO. 26: APPOINTMENTS TO THE CITIZENS' TRANSIT ADVISORY GROUP

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

- Michael Cataldo, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs and Phipps
- Lisa Rudisill, nominated by Councilmembers Mayfield and Newton

Results from the ballots were as follows:

- Michael Cataldo, 6 votes, Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Harlow, and Phipps
- Lisa Rudisill, 2 votes, Councilmembers Mayfield, Newton

Mr. Cataldo was appointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 27: APPOINTMENTS TO KEEP CHARLOTTE BEAUTIFUL

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

- Casey Brewer, nominated by Councilmembers Bokhari and Driggs
- Virgil Hughes, nominated by Councilmembers Mayfield and Phipps
- Linh Quach, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera and Newton
- Wendy Sellers, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs and Mayfield

Results from the ballots were as follows:

- Virgil Hughes, 1 vote, Councilmember Phipps
- Linh Quach, 1 vote, Councilmember Newton
- Wendy Sellers, 7 votes, Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Harlow, Mayfield, Winston

Ms. Sellers was appointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: 9% HOUSING TRUST FUND REQUESTS

Marcus Jones, City Manager said Pam Wideman will come down and provide you with an update on the 9% credits; I do believe last Wednesday, these eight items were presented in the HAND Committee. They are being forwarded to you tonight.

Pamela Wideman, Housing and Neighborhood Services Director said thank you for the opportunity to present the nine percent tax credits to you tonight. We are going to just remind you all of the background, remind you of the Housing Trust Fund status, review the eight proposals that have requested funding, then go through the next steps. You all will recall that in your adopted housing frame work that you adopted in August of last year, one of the recommendations, it is built on three pillars. That is building new construction, preserving existing construction, and supporting family self-sufficiency initiatives. Supporting new tax credits is around the new construction, so that is what is before you, particularly for households earning 60% and below the area median income. I will remind you that we started with the \$50 million. Out of that, you guys have already funded some four percent deals. You are adding NOAH. You are left with a remaining balance of \$38.3 million. Anything that you all approve and gets funded out of here gets subtracted from that \$38.3 million.

Our evaluation criteria are as follows, we look at what your city policies are, included in that is the number of years the proposed development will remain affordable. We want to

make sure that we are supporting any revitalization efforts. We look at the strength of the development, particularly the number of units that are going to serve households earning 60% and below the area median income to put that in dollars; it is a household of four earning about \$44,000 per year. We want to make sure that we have an experienced developer. We want to look at the financial strength to see how your dollars are leveraged with other dollars. We look at the City investment per unit.

There is also a required market-study review. It is a third-party market study review. This is important, because we want to make sure that there is a demand for these types of units, and that always comes back stating that there is a demand, then you all have all talked a lot about community engagement. I will remind you that the developer is required to have at least one community engagement meeting. They are required to notify the surrounding neighborhoods seven to 10 days prior to that. They are encouraged to have it in a location that is in the community. If they cannot, they have to have it close by, and they do it after six o' clock and not on a holiday, to allow maximum attendance.

We talked a little bit about the market study. Specifics in the market study and this is what in this case the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency requires a third-party market study, because they too do not want to make investments in units that are not going to be occupied. The components of the market study, we look at vacancy rate, the occupancy rate meaning to the degree that these types of units are going to be occupied. They look at the capture rate. They look at the absorption rate, and many of you all know that most of the time when we go to the ribbon cutting, these units are 100% leased up with a waiting list. So, there is a huge need out there.

In terms of the timeline associated with the nine per cent tax credits, you all will remember that the State offers one opportunity per year for a developer to apply for these very competitive tax credits. So, there is a schedule that we must stick to. The State issues their qualified allocation plan. Developers this year had to submit preliminary applications by January 19th. The final application is due in May. The credits will be awarded in August of 2019. The developments that get awarded will be closed during the September to December timeframe. Construction will begin, and these units will actually get on the ground in 2021. So, you can see it takes about 18 months from start to finish.

You have eight proposals that have been submitted to us; we have reviewed these proposals. LISC, our new partner, they have also had an opportunity to look at these proposals as well, and I will walk through each of them with you. What I will say, I will remind you all that due to the competitive nature of the tax credit program, remember that these are being awarded across the State of North Carolina. If we get our fair share, we will get up to four of these. I will remind you that we have only gotten four here in recent history. It is more so like two or three. I also wanted to present this slide to show you that we hear you. The State also hears you. You can see the allocations for households earning 30% and below, all the way up to 80%.

I will remind you that the locational guidelines that you guys approved earlier this year, remember these do not apply to nine percents; they only apply to four percents, but we wanted to put this here for you just to acknowledge that we did run these developments through what that tool is in the event they would have been four percent or other developments, but again, the main take away is the locational guidelines do not apply to nine percents. The reason why that is, is because the State has a stricter scoring criterion, and they want to target census tracts that have a low poverty rating, as not to concentrate across the City. You all have asked over time, what does the North Carolina Housing Finance agencies clarifying action plan, what is the site scoring evaluation? A site, to receive a perfect score, a perfect score is 60. The plan looks at the neighborhood characteristics. They look at whether the neighborhood is well maintained and what type of blight is there. They look at amenities in proximity to grocery store, shopping, and pharmacy, and they have a prescribed list in the QAP of exactly what those grocery stores are. They look at site suitability. So, they want to make sure for example there are no incompatible uses, such as adult entertainment or prisons.

I will walk through each of these with you. This first you see, Abington Westside, there was a HTF request of \$1.5 million. It is 46-units. You can see the total development cost. The affordability period will be 30-years. There is a one to six leverage ratio, and again it is a total of 46-units. Brook Wood apartments, the Housing Trust Fund request is \$1.5 million. The total development cost is \$10.6 million. This too has a 30-year affordability period, a leverage ratio of one to seven. Connally Creek Apartments in District 3, the request is \$1.9 million with the total development cost of \$13 million.

Mayor Lyles said on slide 11, the site can obtain 60 points and must have 45. Are those points reflected by individual developments?

Ms. Wideman said each of the developments that you see Mayor has a perfect site score.

Mayor Lyles said so they all have 60?

Ms. Wideman said yes ma'am. We did not bring you anything that did not have a perfect site score.

Councilmember Newton said I had a question about this because; we discussed this in Committee. Is it QAP guidelines?

Ms. Wideman said yes sir.

Mr. Newton said I broke down and looked into this perfect site score analysis, and what I found was that every application in the State of North Carolina from every developer received a perfect site score in the year 2019. I did not know if we have had any follow up on that. We can talk more about that. I do not personally find that particular number or the fact that we have eight perfect site scores compelling, because I do not know how high or how low that threshold is if everybody is getting perfect scores throughout the entire state. I mean, we are talking something like 170 development proposals. Every single one got a perfect score.

Ms. Wideman said Mr. Newton, I think what it is reflective of is that developers know that this tool is so competitive that if they have a site and it does not score perfectly, they do not decide to submit it, because they know it is a waste of time. So, everything that you see in Charlotte or across the State, developers have really, really made sure that they have a site that will score due to the competitive nature of this tool.

Mayor Lyles said thank you; that helped a lot to clear up the 60 points.

Ms. Wideman said I think that I left off on the Connelly. There is a \$1.9 million ask, total development cost of \$13 million there, 30-years affordability period as well. I will remind you of Mayfield at Sugar Creek; you guys held the rezoning public hearing last Monday night. You will be making a decision at your April meeting. The request is \$1.7 million. The total cost is \$9.9 million there. Parkside at Hickory Grove, the request is \$1.7 million. Your total cost is \$14.4 million. The total development cost of a one to eight leverage ratio. Rosewood Commons, the Housing Trust Fund request is \$520,000 for 52 units. The total development cost is \$8.5 million. Sugar Creek Greene, the total number of units is 72. The Housing Trust Fund request is \$1.3 million, with a total development cost of \$12.8 million. The last one, The Park Seniors, the Housing Trust Fund request is \$1.3 million with a total cost of \$13.7 million.

I will remind you again that all of these will not be awarded, but in the event that we received four, as we did last year, our fair share, we have done a little math for you. Worst case scenario, we have added the most expensive trust fund request here and to the extent that all four of those got awarded, that would be a little over \$7 million, which would leave you a balance in your Trust Fund of \$31.3 million. Any of these that are not awarded, the funds would be returned to the trust Fund; we will know in mid to late August exactly what is rewarded, and these will be coming back to you for approval at one of your April meetings. With that, the last thing that I will say is your approval is required in order to

allow developers to submit their final applications to the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency by May 10th. That is the deadline.

Mr. Newton said I think in the past, what we have often times done is we framed our nine percent deals in the context of an all-or-nothing proposition, right? We have eight deals, maybe more that come before us, and we are tasked with the decision to approve them all or not approve them all. I get the impression that this is kind of in framed in that way here today as well. My understanding is, we have a role to play in this process to approve or not approve, and frankly we can look at these individually on their own merit. Am I right or wrong on that? If there is something, a project or multiple projects that do not advance the policies, the goals, the objectives of this Council for this City, then we have the ability to point that out and to exclude it from what we send back up to Raleigh.

Ms. Wideman said Mr. Newton, the Council has previously, with the site scores, set up all of the proposals. You do that because you do not want to limit yourself from receiving your fair share of awards. What you would essentially be doing is taking an opportunity off the table to receive one of the largest amounts of equity sources that goes to support these types of developments that we as a community have said is important to your community.

Mr. Newton said isn't that what we want to do thought, if it is something that is going to be detrimental and undermined the policies and objectives of this City and this Council in building sustainable communities of upward mobility for the residents. I know you had said before Ms. Wideman that the State targets census tracts with low-poverty ratings in this approval process that apparently everybody gets a perfect score on. When we look at that locational policy slide, clearly it shows that there are areas that are full of lower-income folks, maybe areas that we would say by placing more development within, we would be concentrating poverty, and I think that our own statistics in data suggests that here. Wouldn't we want to avoid that rather than send them all up and have the State select one that is once again contrary to the very policies that we have been discussing and passing here as a council over the past couple of months?

Mayor Lyles said I think that is a question that you are going to ask your colleagues.

Mr. Newton said I guess that the crux of this question is what is our role to play here? Why is this in front of us if we did not have an opportunity to weigh in on an individual basis? Some of these projects clearly ask for our locational policy; they make sense, right? They should be passed along. Maybe others do not, and I think that maybe it would behoove of us, particularly if we want to follow the policies that we discuss, have deliberated on, and have passed over the past two months, to start to draw some of those distinctions in this process.

Councilmember Eiselt said when you submit these, like these one through eight, do you rank them in terms of priority to what you would like to have approved?

Ms. Wideman said we do not rank them, because we do not want to limit our opportunity to get our fair share from the State, so they are ranked in the sense that they all have a perfect score according to the State's QAP.

Ms. Eiselt said the reason I asked that is because I did not see any particular order for these here one through eight. The second question is, have you been able to look at the ones that we have approved? So, I do not know for how many years we have been submitting for nine percent deals, and let's say every year we submit eight, and every year we get two to four. Has anyone really sort of studied the data to figure out what the State seems to like so we can kind of come up with some sort of a correlation as to what they end up approving. To Mr. Newton's point, if we decide to leave one out, we have a better field to whether that one would have passed or not.

Ms. Wideman said each year, the State's QAP is adjusted. It is tweaked based on kind of edits from every community around the State of North Carolina. The State, they look at things like credit requests per unit. Again, they come down and drive the area, because

they have a big investment in it too. So, they want to make sure that these developments are located in good areas, if you will. So, to directly answer your question, we have not kind of studies what they have approved over the years; what I will tell you is that we are involved. We comment on the QAP. We attend the annual meeting that they have. As your staff, we try to stay abreast of kind of how the industry is moving and the State as it is editing the QAP.

Councilmember Phipps said the list that you gave us of the eight, would it be fair to say that the Neighborhood Services Department views that list as being consistent with what we as a Council want in these types of projects already?

Ms. Wideman said I want to make sure that I am understanding; when you say what you want in these types of developments-

Mr. Phipps said do they meet our goals and objectives for what we want our communities to be by virtue of our submission of these eight to the tax reviewing authority or whatever?

Ms. Wideman said I think the answer is Mr. Phipps, is yes. We have heard this community say that we want well maintained affordable housing. We want quality construction; we want affordable housing to be located in close proximity to transit; not necessarily a light rail but bus stops. I think the check your boxes in terms of what we hear you say around the dais in terms of what you want in affordable housing. I will point back again to your framework that you approved in August of last year. One of the strategies to continue to do new construction is to utilize a nine percent tax-credit tool. You also talk about how you want to leverage your dollars. Again, this is one way. This is the largest equity source that is available to leverage your local dollars.

Mr. Phipps said when these projects are submitted, when should we hear back on whether or not we were successful in getting any of them approved?

Ms. Wideman said these developments, the awards will be announced in mid to late August of this year.

Councilmember Harlow said I made this similar comment in the Committee as it relates to this. We had all of the discussion around our framework, and we passed that policy, and we have had more conversations around housing in this term than maybe past Councils have had. We have always understood that we should always go for the most equity. It just makes sense, as we learn about the financing of these deals. To try to pick and choose and guess what the State might or might not do by plucking one out or one or two of these out sends the wrong message I think to the Housing Finance Agencies who are looking at these, NCFHA.

I know that we have got a lot of emails Mr. Newton from your constituents in particularly about this one. Frankly, I wish that you would just say what you want to say. I think that we are speaking in circles a little bit, and speaking a little vague.

Mr. Newton said it scored a 1.0 out of 10.

Mr. Harlow said all I am saying is, I know that we are getting a lot of emails from your constituents, and there are concerns prospectively around this particular Hickory Grove development, and I am fine with having a narrow scope conversation about that. I think though at the end of the day, we would be doing ourselves a disservice and we would be doing the community a disservice, and frankly we would be doing ourselves a disservice of all the time that we talked about what we wanted, the message we want to send to our community as it relates to making sure that we have affordable communities everywhere in this City, and at any point where we have an opportunity to provide those opportunities to take it by rejecting the perspective nine percent deal, which are the best deals out there, would be literally making a 180 as far as our messaging and our goals and our priorities, particularly around housing in this community.

Councilmember Driggs said in the same vein, a nine percent deal pays for 70% of the entire cost of the project. So, you really would be cutting off your nose to spite your face to say you know what, I am going to turn that down. I do not want that. It also allows you to have 25% or more of 30% units in there. This is the only way you can achieve results like that. So, I do not think with the small number of deals that we can accomplish in the 90% domain that taking a chance on missing out on any of that money is going to have a huge effect on our overall policies. Bear in mind that there are four of these maybe. There is a total of \$8 million, and the leverage factor involved here and the opportunity to create that and recognizing the criteria that the State uses for approving deals, which are already very much in align with very many of the things that we care about; it just doesn't seem to me that it would make any sense to miss out on an opportunity to get this kind of funding because of some perceived discrepancy from our policy.

Mr. Newton said so, it is not about the deal; it is about people's lives. There is plenty of money in this for the development community. I am talking about location, where we place these developments, because it is on us to make sure that we aren't concentrating poverty in our City so that every citizen of the City of Charlotte has the ability to be successful in life, regardless of their station. I do not think we should be a rubber stamp. That is exactly what we have been for the many, many years that we have considered these nine percent deals, and we do not have to be. That is the point that I am making, because the State has given us the opportunity to actually decide what is good for us here in the City of Charlotte. My only question is why don't we seize that opportunity? Why don't we look at these individually? I spoke with our City Attorney about this earlier today. We should have criteria. We should be looking at things like the notice given to the community for these meetings. We know, because of the emails that we have been receiving, that there was little to no notice given for a recent community meeting that actually went off the rails. We all know that too. We should be looking at the reputation of these developers, seeing what they are in this for. Do they really care about our community, or are they in this to make the developer fees associated with these deals? We should ask ourselves about the trust fund ask. These are all questions that we should ask ourselves, right? There is clearly; we have a new policy that this Council adopted two months ago, not even two months ago, for location, and that policy, if we want to talk about The Parkside at Hickory Grove, that policy found, out of a score of zero to 10, if can go anywhere from zero to 10, on proximity, so the ability to get yourself to an amenity to sustain your life and the life of your family, it scored a one. We do not quite know what is good, but I think that we can all agree that a one is pretty damn bad. Same thing with diversity, in that particular project, it scored a 3.4 out of 10 in diversity, meaning that there is no housing diversity. It is all low income in the area. You want to talk about the very definition of concentrating pockets of poverty in our City, that is what it is. We have the ability right now, because once the State gives us this opportunity to say, you do not have to send it back to us. We have the decision to make right now. It is in our court. I just wonder why, why we keep defaulting to this rubber stamp when we do have this opportunity to actually break down some criteria here, see what actually advances the policies, the goals, the objectives that we have been talking about for the past year and a half.

Councilmember Egleston said I won't belabor the point, but there is actually of the eight, there is one that by our criteria, which admittedly is not exactly what the State is looking at, though it is many of the same types of metrics that they are going to weigh when they make a decision as to which ones to award. There is actually one that scores lower than the one being discussed. There has not been any proposal to withdraw that one, which is interesting, but I think that the cream will rise to the top here, and looking at these scores, which again is ours not theirs, if we are awarded two or three or four, I think that people can rest assure that the State will weigh a lot of those same criteria we weigh and choose the ones that are the most beneficial for the areas that they will be built in and for the people who will live in them and for the people who already live in those communities. So, I think that it is unlikely that the two or three that score significantly lower than the others, would be the ones that would be selected, but I do think we set a precedent that could come back to haunt us if we set a precedent with our nine percent deals they are subject to neighborhood rejection, and if people just decide to say we do not want this in our back yard then we do not send them to the State. I do not think that this one that Mr.

Newton is concerned about will end up being one of the ones that is awarded, but I do think that it opens a door for us to pull it from consideration.

Councilmember Winston said so, I am always very sensitive to District Reps who are very in tuned and in contact with constituents that live within the boundaries of their Districts. I think that the District Reps on this Council do a phenomenal job of that work. You do it better than I ever think that I could ever do it. I will say as an At-Large Representative, and I do not think that is necessarily unique, because we deal with these every third Monday, we hear the same gripes and responses wherever development of any type happens. Whether it is District 5, District 3, 2, 1, 6, or 7 but when it comes down to it, we are trying to make the best decisions for the City as a whole, and I have confidence that my colleagues and I along with the staff and the community partners are doing a lot of work to ensure that we are approaching this on a holistic level and not just a case-by-case basis. Can we be better at communicating? Absolutely. That is a challenge that I think that every human being is trying to deal with, and we sure need to do a better job with it as a City and the new frameworks that we have, we are taking steps in the right direction to fix this, but when it comes down to it, we do have the ability to not be a rubber stamp, if you so wish. If there is something here that you want to make a motion to take off an agenda or take off of consideration, we can do that. I think it is disingenuous to say that we do not have the ability to do that. It is up for us to change the status quo. So, if we can do that, make a motion and change it and get it off and work the votes to get there.

Mr. Harlow said I just want to ask Ms. Wideman a clarifying question from Mr. Newton's comments about developer fees and things like that. The QAP, which is really the guiding document that drives this and informs developers on what the State might be looking for and kind of getting their criteria. Does it speak to developer fees at all?

Ms. Wideman said it does Mr. Harlow. Thank you for that question. I am not going to remember the exact dollar amount, but the QAP specifically caps developer fees on these types of developments. So, developers, while they are earning money, they are not getting wealthy from doing this, because there is a cap. The State caps the developer fee.

Mr. Harlow said the margins are just thin.

Ms. Wideman said correct, which is why the subsidy is needed as well.

Mr. Harlow said that makes sense. Thank you.

Mr. Newton said this is not ambiguous, right? We have our own data, our own numbers that we can draw conclusions from, and when I see a number and let me be clear about his too. Councilmember Egleston's point is well taken. I would like to know what the threshold is, because we do have three projects in front of us that score below 20, and I agree with you. I question whether those are good projects for us to move forward on. It is not just the Parkside project. I will say thought, the Parkside Project though scores the lowest in two categories, very important categories, proximity and diversity. I just ask myself, when we get data like this and we still move forward, what will it take? Are we talking about you need to have zeros across the board before we say that this is a bad location? Is that where we are going to be?

I had a question for Pam as well. Before I touch on that, I want to mention I did read the QAP. What I noticed when I assimilated that to a particular project, the 80 units, you are talking about a million dollars is what you are talking about. That is developer fees that the developer makes upfront. I do think that it can be lucrative. Now, having said that, the question that I have is what do we do in the case where a developer hasn't dealt with the community in good faith and has broken the rules? I think that we have seen that here in this past week, a developer not following the rules. Do we take that into account? Do we use that as some sort of a criteria to say, well, wait a second; maybe there should be some consequences for that. I am not hearing that.

Ms. Wideman said there is a lot in there, so let me try to unpack that. There is no such thing as an \$80 million developer fee associated with doing-

Mr. Newton said I mean a million total.

Ms. Wideman said okay. I just want to clarify that. So, again that developer fee is capped per the State's regulations. Of all of these, and we have evidence; we have had conversation in the Committee meeting last week. All of these have had at least one community meeting. We have evidence of those community meetings. They are again the criteria is that they have to send a notification out to the surrounding community at least seven days before that meeting occurs. So, again we have evidence where all of these folks have had a community meeting. Whether or not people came or not, people make decisions about whether or not they are going to come. We use our current planning list. The developers send fliers as well. So, each developer has had an opportunity and has taken that opportunity as required to have that meeting.

Mr. Newton said I will push back slightly on that, because I have evidence. I think that the criteria were seven to 10 days prior, after 6:00 p.m., maybe notifying Councilmember in the District.

Ms. Wideman said yes, that is exactly right. There is a letter.

Mr. Newton said so when we have clear evidence of that not occurring in this one case over this past week, and I am just wondering seeing how that is possible. What I will do is I will get up with you, and I will actually show that evidence to you Pam.

Ms. Wideman said please do, and I will actually share what we have as well.

Mr. Newton said with that, what are the consequences? Do we still drag our feet and say oh well and still push it forward?

Mayor Lyles said okay, I do not know that was a question for Ms. Wideman. The information today was to give us the information.

Councilmember Bokhari said with every conversation that we have had over the last year and a half almost, one thing has risen to the top for the data that we have looked at and parsed through the locational policy changes that we have made to score carding. It has all been about number of units. There is 24,000, depending on which numbers you are looking at of an affordable housing crisis, and we have to solve that problem. There are going to be uncomfortable situations, like we have had in our own Districts over the last year and a half in rezonings, where we have to stand back and say there is a broader need here that we have to attack, and when you look at these competitive nine percent deals, it is not like taking one off is going to increase our odds of success elsewhere. In fact, it decreased our ability of getting two to three to potentially four that we have seen, so it is the competitive dollars that we need to get the units in the AML areas that we need in our City, and we just have to step up and hope that not only do we get our fair share, we present with our partners in the private sector who are taking a haircut on these types of deals, while also making a profit, that we have the most compelling cases possible to bring forward. So, I would urge all of my colleagues, and it sounds like that is the case, that we look back to everything that we have discussed passionately for a year and a half, and it all comes back to these number of units and the fact that we are investing significant capital amounts in CIP in significant projects like Eastland Mall and other things, we are making a bet on that part of town, and let's make sure that we proactively think about the opportunity for affordable and without the stigma that keeps getting brought up to us about what this means, and I have been pleading with the development community and others every conversation I have had to find me one. Bring one to District 6. Now, that is really challenging, because property values are five to 55 times more expensive, but I am excited at the prospect of getting an opportunity to go up to my neighborhoods and my constituents and make the case of why this is for the greater good of Charlotte, and I would encourage us all to do the same thing.

Councilmember Mayfield said when we had this conversation in last week's committee meeting, Mr. Newton brought up a number of the concerns that he had. I asked at that point the role of LISC of which you shared that all of these were sent over to LISC for them to review as well. The question that I have for you, and this is going to be a question for moving forward since the process has been updated, if LISC is going to be the overseer of tax dollars, there has to be a place on the frontend where you are taking into consideration that what we supported as far as a locational policy, knowing that years ago we had a scattered site plan in order to insure that we were not concentrating poverty, that when a project comes and it is not meeting our requirements and it is scoring a one or a two or a three, there has to be a conversation on the frontend to either send those back to the developer or for those not to even make it to full Council for a vote, because there are two different priorities that the State is looking at and what we are looking at. We have had this conversation, because none of this conversation that we are having tonight includes housing and single-family housing, because that is where you build wealth, not in multifamily. You do not build wealth by renting an apartment for 10 or 15 years. So, that is a different conversation that happens later on, but if we are going to be making these investments and if we are going to consistently allow a project to come before us, even if it is nine percent and we take the bias out of it and we say we send them all up, there has to be a stopping point on the frontend, because what was said to committee and said to Council repeatedly is LISC is supposed to be this oversight to help. Projects like this should not even come through moving forward. They shouldn't be through now, but we are where we are, so at this point we move forward, but when they are scoring low on our goals of scattered site, of not concentrating poverty, of addressing the access needs both for public transportation, not being in a food desert, having access to the library, and other things, there has to be either in our new formula that we have approved as a full Council the language has to be in there to assure that we are addressing those goals, because I have residents that are seeing projects that we are supporting and/or approving, and we are supporting them a year in between, because it takes about a year. The impact of that is three multi-family units that are being developed honestly within a mile and a half of each other. That is how it is playing out on the ground. So, it would be helpful to get a better understanding and a lot more clarity for the development community and for your Council to understand our aspirations, what our language says, and what is actually coming out of the ground.

Ms. Wideman said what I want to remind the Council is of two things, and your points are well taken. Number one is that your locational guidelines are intended for the four percent deals that you will see coming forward, because they are not as competitive as this, and they do not bring as much equity from the state. So, we needed a way to rank those, because we knew you would be oversubscribed. The locational policy guidelines that you see here are intended for four percent deals.

Also, it was never the intent, and maybe we can do a better job explaining it, as this is a new tool. You can never look at the proximity or any one category in isolation. You have to look at those as a whole. I do want to be clear to my duty here to remind you of those couple of things when we are talking about the locational policy, but your points are very well taken, and we will continue to stay in constant communication with our partner LISC as we build this partnership with them.

Ms. Mayfield said that helps for the clarifications, especially for community, the four percent and nine percent, for those who were not able to be at the meeting. The challenge that I am hoping you are hearing with the nine percent is we need to figure out language on the frontend so that we are not creating an opportunity for concentration. Yes, we only receive up to four, but if we go back and look at where projects, look at a three-year snapshot. Where have those nine percents been approved in proximity to our same conversation with this hand of where four percents are approved. So, we may want to have conversations that these are separate entities because they are separate pockets of funding. There are separate processes, but the impact on community is being built across the street, around the corner, a block and a half away from each other, so what we may say in our language and what we may present to the community is not lining up when we are not recognizing the totality of these two separate conversations.

So, for the nine percent, when it comes to us, there still should be requirements on the front end that protect a community before it even goes up to Raleigh for them to make a decision of yay or nay these are the ones we are going to approve, appose to saying all of them go out and then our default if, well we didn't know that one would get approved. We may have had some concerns about it, but we did not think that was the strongest one. We can do a little bit better to help level the impact, not even the playing field, on community.

Mayor Lyles said I think that Ms. Mayfield makes a really good point, that if we are going to do a nine percent and we are having a choice about a four percent, it ought to be acknowledge, and we ought to be aware of that. I think that it is that idea that if we do a nine percent and when four percent come in, the nine percent has much more financial benefit to us for leverage. The four percent next to a nine percent should not compare at all and the proximity should not be there, so I think that it is a really good point that we ought to consider as we are going forward on the four percent deals, and I would hope that there is general agreement that we are not trying to concentrate these within a certain distance; I do not know what that distance is, but I mean that is an excellent point.

Mr. Newton said I think that the message we are sending here to the development community is if you want to skirt or bypass our rules, you do it through a nine percent deal. That is what we are looking at here; we do have segregation in our city, and I feel like if we do not recognize that, if we do not recognize our own policies or look at what we passed recently to prevent that from happening, all that we are doing is we are supporting that, and this is our opportunity. So, I would ask my colleagues to think about all of that; think it through. Know that this is our opportunity if we want to pull any out. This is the opportunity to do that, once again to make sure that we are not leaving it up to chance in the inevitability that we do not want to see occur.

Councilmember Eiselt said I just want to kind of put into kind of a different frame; nine percent deals are not going to go anywhere except for low-income areas, and maybe we need to do a better job at communicating that to the community. They are only going to go in low-income neighborhoods. As someone pointed out, a nine percent deal covers about 70% of the costs. If we just isolate those units alone and acknowledge that they are going to be in a low-income neighborhood. Then do we start saying, okay that is fine but not in my District? That is the question. Whose District should they go in if they are going to be in a low-income neighborhood? That is why I think that we have to focus on the ones that we do have control over, like the four percent deals, and that is a very fair and valid statement, but we either say to the State, no thank you, we do not want the money, or we have to acknowledge that this is what the State is saying.

Mr. Newton said there are some good deals. That is what the scoring is for.

Mayor Lyles said we've had a discussion; everyone has spoken on this issue and so now the timeline is on the screen before you with the preliminary application and final application credit award, and this comes back to Council when we adopt it in September or December.

Ms. Wideman said no ma'am. It will need to come back to you in April so that the developers can submit their final application by May 10, 2019. That is the exact date.

Mayor Lyles said okay, so it will be on our April 8th agenda. There is no vote needed tonight.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 6: E-SCOOTER UPDATE

Marcus Jones, City Manager said you will recall January is when Council voted on the rules of the road, for a lack of better term. Liz and Dan in C-DOT got together with Passport and other members of the team to come back to the Council with this dynamic pricing concept. The main change is often, Dan are we back with dynamic pricing? Well,

you surprised me. The concept here is that the pilot will begin in mid to late April. We wanted to get in front of you to give you an update on where we are.

Dan Gallagher, Transportation Deputy Director said so, since January 14th, when you adopted text amendments associated with E-Scooters, we have done a lot of work, and tonight, we want to dive in a little bit deeper into the dynamic pricing pilot that we have been talking about. We have been developing a model with Passport and with the vendors; like the City Manager just said, we will be doing live testing over the next three months, and we are going to share a couple of examples with you tonight.

So, since January, when you amended the City Code, we immediately updated the permit program and updated the webpage. In February and March, we also did a lot of work, and we really are about to hit a pretty key milestone. We are, as of last month, at 850,000 E-Scooter trips since last May. So, I expect in the next 30 to 45-days that we are going to cross over the million-trip mark of electric vehicles/electric scooters traveling around Charlotte. I believe that is pretty amazing, but since that time in February and March, we installed the ped only pavement markings in Center City. We worked with the ADA community and the vendors to have a one-hour response time or less for any ADA complaints that come in, and we have been working, Councilmember Egleston you suggested reaching out to Center City Partners and using their ambassador program. They have been out there diligently helping us to educate people on the streets in Center City.

Finally, in items that are underway and are coming close to actually being completed, we have tested E-Scooters for the 15-mile per hour cap that you implemented. So, that is now in place and the E-Scooters are all at 15-miles per hour or less. The unique identifiers, if you have not seen them already, they are on the stems of the E-Scooters, and we are also implementing in April, do not drink and scoot signs on some of our high-traffic areas like the Rail Trail.

Really, what we wanted to talk about tonight is the dynamic pricing pilot. As we discussed previously in December and January with you, most cities charge a per unit fee that is usually an annual fee. We talked with you that those annual fees can range from \$20 per unit to \$300 per unit. Raleigh has a \$300 per unit fee, Durham \$100, and Greensboro \$50 but really no cities were encouraging through their fee programs good behavior, good riding behavior, safe behavior. So, that is where the dynamic pricing comes in, and that is where we are today. So, since January, you may have seen an announcement last week that passport is working with Detroit, Omaha, and Charlotte to basically partner on a dynamic fee pilot, and we know that cities around the country are looking at us. There were several others that are very interested in this. I think that they will be watching our progress. I think that all eyes will be on Charlotte.

So, what is dynamic pricing? It is a monthly fee charged to the vendors that fluctuates based on a series of variables. Really, it is a fee system that gives incentives and for the things that we want and disincentives for the things that we do not want. What are some of the things that we know that we want with E-Scooters? Well, we want some safety improvements, right? So, a couple of those are that we do not want scooters parking and blocking the sidewalks. We also want to encourage helmet usage. We talked a lot about first/last mile transit, and we will show you how we have incorporated that into the dynamic pricing model, and we also want the fee to vary based off of how long is the scooter parked in a place and varied by geography. We will share that in just a second.

So, this is how we have created zones across the City. You will see five zones here; those are the five zones across the entire City, and when we dial in on this area that is within the black line, the area of what we call inside route four, you can see the five zones in a little bit more clarity. So, you see the purple areas are the neighborhood zones. The orange areas are the corridors, and the blue lines are the top-10 highest bus ridership routes in the City. So, each one of these zones have a different fee associated with it as we embark on the dynamic pricing.

So, a couple of examples, as you can see in these two pictures, we have a gentleman who is riding without a helmet, and if you can imagine with me, when he finishes his trip, he parked his scooter right there at a crosswalk. That is not what we want. So, this person did not wear a helmet, parked in a high-pedestrian area, blocked the sidewalk, and the scooter was parked for four hours. That is not what we want. That is what we want to discourage, as opposed to this gentleman who wore a helmet, parked near transit, did not block the sidewalk, and the scooter was parked for less than an hour. We want to incentivize that behavior, so we want a lot more of those green check marks and a lot less of the red circles.

As we dive just a little bit deeper into that first example of the type of example that we do not want, the dynamic fees help us address that, so imagine we are going to have a million trips. We are about to cross that threshold, so what the dynamic fee does is we charge penalties if you do not wear a helmet, block the sidewalk, or park your scooter for a long time. In this case, .45 cents, so if every single one of those million trips did exactly that, I guess theoretically we could be collecting for those trips about \$450,000 in fees each year. That is probably not going to happen; I do not think that everyone is going to behave that poorly, so hopefully we are going to have a lot more of this, and again, with this scenario the dynamic fees, the person used a helmet, did not block the sidewalk, and they parked for less than an hour. In this case, they got a whole series of discounts. The vendor gets a whole series of discounts. It results in a negative .30 cents for that trip. We are not going to give back a negative .30 cents to the vendors, but theoretically, if every single trip of those million trips does exactly that, we might collect no fees for E-Scooters. So, that just gives a little bit of what we think about as we work towards dynamic pricing pilot, understanding the inputs that we are looking at.

Finally, as I wrap up, dynamic pricing gives us the opportunity to grow the system here in Charlotte. It allows the number of scooters to grow as ridership grows but to grow responsibly. I think that is what we all want. We are using the threshold that has been used elsewhere. Austin is the model that we look to for that. More than three trips per scooter per day allows you to grow the system. If a vendor each month, through the dynamic pricing pilot, can demonstrate that they are meeting that threshold, they can expand their system. If a vendor has scooters on the street and they are not meeting their three trips per day threshold, there is a penalty for that. Really, that is to help us keep in balance and check the number of scooters that are out there. We do not want the system growing faster than there is ridership.

So, let me just wrap up with our schedule. You can see here that in January and February we did all that work with Passport and the vendors. The press release was last week, and the pricing modeling analysis is underway right now, and we hope to be finished by April 15th. That meets the 90-day deadline that you gave us for advancing this work. Finally, the implementation, we plan on going with live testing April 15th, generating a series of invoices for each month as we head towards the summer, May, June and July. That will allow us to tweak those invoices, see if it is where we want. Are we getting better behavior based off the pricing mechanisms that are put in place? Hopefully come July we will see a lot better second year than we did the first year, even though the first year in many ways was very successful.

Councilmember Harlow said the helmet is kind of like the honor system and I haven't ridden a scooter since we past these new things; do we have any fear that these companies will pass the cost on to riders to increase the cost to ride the scooter?

Mr. Gallagher said that is always a potential. We are working on a free-market system here; however, if you do the right thing, the fees can be minimal or perhaps even nothing. So, there may be no costs to pass on if everybody is doing the right thing.

Mr. Harlow said if we know that there will be scooters that will block sidewalks and possibly be scooters that are parked for a long period of times and so these fees will add up, why are we not then deducting down off of that?

Mr. Gallagher said we are going to be deducting off of that.

Mr. Harlow said I guess that in your explanation you said the negative is really just zero, it is not a deduction off of any fees that might have been incurred for.

Mr. Gallagher said in my example was the opposite direction that we were going, so when the person did not wear a helmet, it was a .15 cent charge; when they blocked the sidewalk, it was a .15 cent charge. When they parked for more than four hours, it was a .15 cent charge. So, that trip actually would have a whole series of penalties associated with it.

Mr. Harlow said it is adding and subtracting over time. Okay, I guess I misunderstood that.

Councilmember Egleston said I think that was the question, if you had good actor and one bad actor, would they offset each other as far as the company goes.

Mr. Gallagher said potentially.

Mr. Egleston said my hope, to Dr. Harlow's point, would be that the companies will reward riders for good behavior. The presumption on the helmet thing is that they would do the same thing that they do with parking, which is you have to take a picture with your cellphone camera to demonstrate. You already have to take a picture with your cellphone camera to demonstrate that you have parked properly. In this case, it would just flip the camera around, and you would just have to take a picture of yourself in real time wearing a helmet. So, hopefully they reward riders and maybe it ends up being less expensive for people to utilize these. One thing on slide nine, which is the map, I would like to see in our Carolina blue little light rail zones there include the Gold Line in there as well, and that is not currently reflected on that map, because that certainly, the portion of it that goes east on Trade Street to Hawthorne right now to the hospital certainly as phase two opens and extends further into my District than into Dr. Harlow's District, those are corridors that we certainly want to encourage use and parking and things of that nature. I would like to see those added in.

Mr. Harlow said second.

Councilmember Bokhari said I just want to congratulate staff for partnering with the scooter companies, with Passport, with all of these innovators in working hard to be innovative, because a lot of big tech cities have gotten this wrong. Some of them have started by outright banning scooters, and you guys have taken an approach of balancing safety, while allowing innovation to thrive in a tough environment. A lot of these cities have put government in the center of this and made government the customer by saying here are the permits, and you can have 500. You have 200. You can have 1,000 and implementing this dynamic cap is allowing the market to work and it is making the rider the customer and the rider gets to vote by who they decide to ride with.

Finally, with this dynamic fee structure, you are taking the power of the free market and the things that you want to accomplish, we as a City want to accomplish, and you are incentivizing. To my colleagues point about, well will they just pass those fee dings versus the positives on, the beauty of this system is one scooter company may decide to pass that on to the customer and say, you know what, I do not really care. That scooter company's rides now become .15 cents on average more expensive every time they ride, while another customer might say, I am going to put my RND department on this and find out a creative way to turn the phone around and snap a picture where AI identifies there is a helmet on, and now they go back to that second dynamic cap and people start riding with them because it is cheaper, more innovative, and the rider is the ultimate customer.

So, I just think that while the story is not complete yet, if people are not taking notice in the general public, I know that people are already taking notice in the alternative transportation and nerdy-scooter world that Charlotte is on the cutting edge of the world right now in this program, not to mention the partnership with Passport. Kudos to the work. It has been painful I know, but it will definitely serve to be a case study for years to come.

Councilmember Eiselt said to your point about AI, I wish there were a way that AI could identify when there are children riding these scooters, because it is one thing to figure out if someone has a helmet on, but I was in uptown this weekend, and I saw eight different children, young little ones, on these things and one with a dad with a four year old on the scooter. I do not know where we are going to make sure that enforcement comes into play, but it has got to, especially uptown. It is dangerous.

Councilmember Driggs said in conjunction with our Vision Zero, are we going to get ongoing reports about safety, about accidents and statistics and things like that on scooters? Some of the community is reporting some real issues.

Mr. Gallagher said we get those accident reports, crash reports, from CMPD, and we work closely with them. We have those numbers.

Mr. Driggs said so, we will have data, like you will compile all of that and we will get reports periodically?

Mr. Gallagher said if you want the reports, we have the formal reports on that.

Councilmember Winston said I think that we need to think forward. We are regulating rental scooters, which you see more and more people actually riding their own scooters, so I think that this is a different type of conversation that we need to have. In terms of the free market, these costs will get passed on to the consumer. I do think, as when we talked about this before, we do have to find a way to recoup the public investment cost that leads to the success of these business models, but we do need to be aware that; I do not know the significant in terms of ridership, but there are some equity issues here. If you are getting incentives, for instance, for taking a picture of using your helmet, some of these companies do have equity programs where you do not need a smart phone to ride these, and you can pay for it. So, if there is a concentrated population who is using the card technology to use it, they are going to have a naturally more expensive ride; therefore, they might be subject to higher dynamic pricing. So, there is that equity issue. On the flip side of it, if the incentive is to give these tech companies more of your behavioral data by snapping a picture of yourself, there again are we incentivizing giving them more free stuff to figure out market solutions for under the guides of some type of safety or use of public dollars incentive? So, it is something to think about. I do not think that this is perfect. We need to kind of keep those two issues in mind.

Councilmember Phipps said did I understand you say that we have reporting metrics on compliance with the rules that we have adopted? I have seen numerous people riding on scooters on the sidewalk in the central business district. Is that reflected on those reports?

Mr. Gallagher said we do not have those metrics; what we do have is we have crash reports when CMPD emergency responders have to respond to any crashes those are documented, and we have those reports. We have those for automobile accidents, pedestrian accidents, crashes and scooter crashes.

Mr. Winston said in terms of safety, I think that we should also think about this 15-miles per hour cap. You can take a scooter from outside of our entrance right here on North Davidson and ride it up to police headquarters, and if you ride it in the street as we ask people to do, you see how fast that thing goes. It does not go much more than 5-miles per hour, and if we are encouraging people to ride it in the street and it doesn't have the power to get to speed, that is a safety issue, so I think that we should look at the wisdom of how we regulate and again the technologies that could put people in a more dangerous situation as they ride around our City.

Mr. Phipps said I do not know if it is called price elasticity when you talk about the impact of increasing in prices on a particular service. I mean, we have not raised bus fares or anything in a couple of years I do not think, and usually when we raise them it is about a quarter or something, and we do get push back on the community on that. So, you have these scooters, I mean they cost a dollar just to unlock it; then it is .15 cents a mile, then

you are talking about these fees and fines. The only person who I have really seen riding scooters; I have not seen any senior citizens or anything riding those scooters. It seems like it is a toy for the millennial class. I am just wondering, is anybody looking at this from a price sensitivity standpoint? Has anybody looked at that?

Mayor Lyles said I do not think that anybody has.

Mr. Phipps said is anybody going to look at that?

Mayor Lyles said are you going to look at that?

Mr. Gallagher said scooters are new; there is data coming at us from all directions all across the United States. It is pretty fascinating when you look at some of the leading scooter companies, some of the data that they have on their usage. I would be happy to share some of that back with Council with what they are seeing in their markets across the United States.

Mr. Bokhari said I just want to make a quick point to make sure it connected with everyone. In the beginning of the presentation, it was listed out the other cities and the fee structures that they are starting to put in place, and there is a range there. I think that the important thing to realize is the math that you have seen here in a more dynamic fee based structure, on average is middle of the pack competitive with what other cities are doing, and when things are not following our incentives it is still in that range, and when they do it and they meet those things, it goes to the lower end of that range, so we are not talking about something crazy that is going to tax the scooters to death, nor give them a free ride. It just gives them flexibility within that range that we are seeing other cities when they are just putting a simple per scooter fee out there and we are allowing them to be incentivized.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 28: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL TOPICS

Councilmember Newton said I wanted to thank Banu Valladares and the great folks at the Charlotte Bilingual Pre-K school for hosting me last week. It was a fabulous experience spending time with the two, three, four-year old involved in the many different Pre-K, youth-oriented educational curriculum programs, and once again, thank you so much. If you ever have the opportunity, anybody watching at this point tonight, to go by there, it is right beside the Hickory Grove Rec Center, and they are a fabulous organization, and they could certainly use your help, particularly for the young folks, many of whom speak English as a second language, becoming more acclimated and familiar with adults and the English language. It is really fantastic work that they do.

Councilmember Phipps said I just wanted to remind my constituents in northeast Charlotte, especially in the Back Creek corridor that we are going to have a public meeting regarding the widening of University City Boulevard or North Carolina Highway 49 from John Kirk to the interchange, and that is going to be on Tuesday, April 23, 2019 at the UNC-Charlotte's main campus at the Cone Center and the Lucas Room, and local official information of the meeting will be from 2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. then they are going to have an open house public meeting from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. in the same location, so that location is 9025 University Road on the main campus of UNC-Charlotte.

Councilmember Mayfield said first, I want to say thank you for all who attended the Seventh Annual District 3 Airport Job Fair this past Saturday, and congratulations to all of those individuals who received offers on the spot. We had more than 230 positions at the Airport that needed to be filled, so thank you for those that came out. I want to invite all of the residents of District 3 out to our 2019 Townhall, which will be this Saturday the 30th. We will have an update from our Planning Department, Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership; Common Wealth Charlotte; Community Link; Congregation for Kids, as we learn opportunities for our youth in other care, formerly known as foster care; the Greater Charlotte Apartment Association; Habitat for Humanity; and of course Mecklenburg County's Department of Community Resources and Social Serve. It will be

hosted this year out on the further southwest part of my district at China Grove AME Zion Church, which is located at 9401 China Grove Church Road.

I also want to thank all of our labor partners for the upcoming first Charlotte Labor convening, we will be having this Wednesday morning at 10:00. Thank my colleagues that have RSVPed and the invitation went out to all of Council as well as School Board and our Board of County Commissioner representatives so that we can learn how to at least hear the concerns of our residents and neighbors within the labor movement representing multiple areas of labor.

Mayor Lyles said I have a few things that I would just like to call our attention to. The first thing is that the Mayor and Council are requesting the presence of all of our volunteers that serve on our boards and advisory groups, because it is National Volunteer Month. We will honor them and their service on April 1, 2019 from 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the lobby of the Government Center, and we will have members of Council there to recognize each of you and just say thank you for the work that you do participating and helping us.

The second thing that I would just like to mention is that if Dimple Ajmera is watching, we hope that everything is going well and Mr. Mitchell as well. We missed your presence tonight.

My final one is that yesterday I had the opportunity to throw out the first pitch at a kickball tournament, and they gave me a jersey, and I want to say this. A lot of times we think about all of the things that are not happening, and this is an event that every field at Revolution Park was full. They had barbeque and ribs and all kinds of things. It was truly a family event, so it is called the Goombay Kickball. Women play on Tuesday nights at Hornet's Nest Park, and the co-ed league is I think the most fun, and they play on Sundays at Revolution, so if you have to get some exercise after riding your scooter, play kickball.

Councilmember Eiselt said speaking of job fairs, this weekend on Saturday, the Latin American Chamber of Commerce is having a job fair at Hal Marshall Service Center from 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. That is at 700 North Tryon, and they have a list of different positions that are available, and they are encouraging people who have bilingual language skills to apply.

Councilmember Winston said municipal government should not be in the business of killing people, but that again happened today, whether it was justified, right or wrong, we are not better off at this moment then we were before 9:00 a.m. this morning. We have an issue in this City, in this state, in this nation about how we deal with justice. We have a sacred duty in municipal government and our police departments not to exact justice but to deliver people into the criminal justice system to ask questions and to deal with those questions. We equip our department, that is given that sacred duty, very well to make those deliveries to the criminal justice system. Once again, it just didn't happen, and yes violence happens in all shapes and forms between citizen and citizen, but again, this is a sacred duty of government, and I know that we have changed a lot in the past couple of years. We have had a lot of conversations but not a lot of policy, not a lot of practice has changed, and that does not just live with us in this City. This is about how we approach this idea of justice and criminal justice and dealing with people who are perceived as threats to our community. I think that we have so many dichotomies at hand when you are dealing with people with firearms, but we live in an open carry state. When you are dealing with listening to police officers and following commands, but we want to deescalate situations versus escalate when we are dealing with potential issues of mental health or what not. We often when we talk from our government response, it usually deals with those last few seconds of an incident, and we have to find a different way to do this. I think that it is a collaborative effort; it is not something that we can do from this chamber. It is something that we have to continue to do with community partners, with county, state, and federal leaders to really change the paradigm of how we deal with somebody's worst day while still insuring our number one responsibility of insuring public safety.

My heart goes out to the families and friends of somebody who is not with them now and forever, their wounds that will be open that will never heal. Again, this is something as we

deal with violence, as we deal with threats to our community, I think this calls for a cultural response and not just a single policy. So, I know that we will continue to work on this from this dais within our organization, CMPD and our Community Relations Committee and so many community activists and leaders that are dedicated to the cause. I will be hosting on Thursday a viewing of a documentary called Whose Streets, which gives the kind of play-by-play as it happened experience of Ferguson, Missouri, and we will have a talk back with the director and the producer of that documentary, and you will see that while you might see a group of people that are affected by things like this that happen, everybody has a different experience; everybody is out there for a different reason. Everybody has different motives, but there are some shared experiences that we have to recon with and we have to deal with, and we cannot just do it in sound bites. So, come on out to the Levine Museum from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Thursday and join me watching this documentary. They are definitely parallels to here in Charlotte and continue to have this conversation and do this work to fix the issues that we have.

Councilmember Driggs said a tough act to follow and I just hope that you will give the same speech every time that we get news that someone has been murdered in Charlotte, because those lives matter too.

I would like to inform everybody that CMPD South is hosting an event in my District, and this is a little different from what they have done. It used to be Coffee with Cops; now it is Pizza with Police. This is taking place on Thursday this week, March 28, 2019 from 5:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. at the Brooklyn Pizza Parlor in Colony Place. That is 7725 Colony Road. It is right in that shopping center where Colony Road and Rea Road meet. So, I hope to see you there on Thursday night, thank you.

Councilmember Harlow said many of my colleagues and the Mayor started the meeting today invoking comments of this morning, the officer involved shooting at the Burger King on Beatties Ford Road. I want to first speak to the Manager and our communication staff for the on the great updates and communications that we have gotten all day. Myself, particularly as the District Representative for the area we have many community leaders on the ground, and I appreciate their efforts for going out and getting the pulse on the community, city staff that were on the ground as well, and the constant updates from them as well, in particular, Officer Hudson and Captain Thomas of the Metro Division, which is on Beatties Ford Road.

As was mentioned, there was still a loss of life today, and I think that is the most important narrative. His name Danquirs Franklin was 27 years old, and his family is grieving today and will continue to do that going forward. We will continue to monitor, of course, this investigation and learn more facts as those come out, as our Chief has mentioned today that they are continuing to monitor all of those things, but we must continue to remember that there are lives lost in these instances regardless of the circumstances and other narratives that may be at play and political stances and all of those things. Families are grieving. This is someone's son; this is possibly someone's brother and possibility someone's father. I do not know his story in particular, but he is no longer with us. This will not be the last time that this happens unfortunately. When these incidents happen so close to home, so close to people that you know or where they live, this is right around the corner from a high school, West Charlotte High School, and lots of pedestrian traffic around these streets. I want us to always remember that. So often, we get caught up in back and forth between community and police relationships, what accountability looks like to certain people, what certain people stories are but the overreaching story should be that there was a young life taken too soon, and that will always be unfortunate. So, my prayers are with his family and his loved ones and as a council and District representative and certainly we will continue to ask questions around our policy and our policy in these certain situations and how we continue to work toward leading to preserving life long term.

Councilmember Egleston said I would like to invite everyone out. The Immigrant Community Committee that the Mayor created last month has had community events going on for the past couple of weeks and this week we have our final three community gatherings. I have been very encouraged by the turnout that we have had, well over 200 people at one of our events last week, and we are expecting big turnouts this week as

well. I would like to thank everybody who has leant their stories, leant their perspectives to the work that this Committee is doing. I would like to thank my colleagues who have made it out to one or more of the meetings and encourage the ones that we haven't to joint us at one of these three. Tomorrow night, March 26, 2019, in District 6, we are doing one at each Council district, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. we will be at the Harris YMCA at Quail Hollow Road. On Thursday, and we will be at the Community Center on Stetson Road and on Saturday, March 30, 2019 we will be at Our Bridge at 3925 Willard Farrow Drive from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. So, regardless of what your involvement with the immigrant community is, whether you are just an ally a naturalized citizen, someone new to the country who is seeking citizenship, whatever it is, we want to hear people's stories. We want to hear people's concerns and their needs and figure out how the City of Charlotte can better serve their immigrant community and our community at-large, so we welcome you to come out. I hope my colleagues will join for at least one of these if you haven't yet, because the charge of this Committee was to bring back policy recommendations for Council to act on. I think it will inform the discussion better if everyone has been able to attend one of these and hear some of these first-person perspectives as we move forward trying to decide what action to take beyond that.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my colleague Greg 'Popcorn' Phipps, who announced that he will not be seeking another term on City Council this past weekend. This is his second go-around on City Council and what a long-strange trip it has been. We will miss your humor, even on the times when you were not attempting to be humorous.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Harlow, seconded by Councilmember Newton, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

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



Emily A. Kunze, Deputy City Clerk NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 4 Hours, 28 Minutes
Meeting Completed: May 2, 2019