The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Business Meeting on Tuesday, May 26, 2020, at 5:05 p.m. in Room CH-14 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, James Mitchell, Matt Newton, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston II.

* * * * * * *

Mayor Lyles said welcome to the May 26th Council Meeting. I hope everyone had a wonderful Memorial Day and I hope that everyone took some time to remember those who have passed away just because of war in our country and the things that they had to do to make it possible for us to have meetings like this one tonight. I would like to call our May 26th Council Meeting to order; this is a regular Business Meeting and tonight as in the last several months, we are holding a virtual meeting in accordance with the Electronic Meeting Statute. We have met all the requirements of that statute to be able to do this through electronic means. We hope that each of you will take the time to view this on the Government Channel, the City's Facebook page as well as on the City's YouTube page.

* * * * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Ajmera gave the Invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance by Councilmember Winston.

* * * * * * *

PUBLIC FORUM

My Brother's Keeper Charlotte-Mecklenburg

Don Thomas, 400 East Morehead Street said I want to first say thank you for your unwavering commitment to Charlotte, a fair and equitable community. I am the Executive Director of My Brother's Keeper Charlotte Mecklenburg and My Brother's Keeper Charlotte Mecklenburg is committed to improving outcomes of boys and young men of color by serving backbone organization of a collective impact strategy. My Brother's Keeper will work to support policies and organizations that address persistent opportunity gaps and helps to ensure that all of Charlotte Mecklenburg boys and men of color have the opportunity to achieve. In our effort to make transformative outcomes to our boys and men of color a reality, each of whom is critical to the collective success of Charlotte Mecklenburg, we understand the essentiality of a clear, comprehensive and collaborative strategy which facilitates system change that solidifies a brighter, more promising future for our boys and young men of color in our entire City, County, and region. As we look to lead a cross-sector county call to to action, focused on the safe and supportive system for our boys and young men of color MBK has resolved it in ourselves that this is not an anecdotal exercise, but vision driven data [inaudible] structure that embodies the intersectionality of belonging, wealth and wellbeing. My Brother's Keeper has created a systems approach framework that facilitates collective impact through collective action. This approach takes into account capacity building, research and learning, practical application, and community building. Our approach takes seriously the dynamic relationship between systems, structures, and individuals. Our framework is targeted in its strategies, yet universal in its goal, which is why identifying key levers and strategic intervention was a priority. The impetus of this framework is rooted in the necessity of a racial equity lens and seeks to destroy power structures that have had a devastating impact on black, brown, and indigenous communities for centuries. This pathway forward recognizes that in order to make transformation we much challenge the historical and current context that impedes the actualization of purpose. In order words, our collective impact model takes into account a root cause analysis as well as understanding needs for a result-based accountability

structure that allows us to adapt to the [inaudible] of community and simultaneously be purposeful in achieving desired outcomes while black and brown boys and their families. The only investment in our collective impact framework and your resourcing of My Brother's Keeper implementation plan will without question have an indelible impact on the lives of thousands of boys and young men of color here in Charlotte Mecklenburg. It is our ambitious goal to ensure that every black and brown young man born in Charlotte has everything they need to fulfill their purpose without systemic institutional or organizational impediment and in order to make this a reality we need all hands-on deck.

Mayor Lyles said we look forward to our Budget Workshop tomorrow where we will have discussions around all of the expenditures that are proposed by the Manager and you've been recommended as My Brother's Keeper to continue to work with the City on the project with your intent.

Bus and Bike Lane Pilot Project

Meg Fencil, 5124 Shady Grove Lane said I am the Program Director at Sustain Charlotte and I am addressing you today to voice support for the recent bus and bike lane pilot on Fourth Street between McDowell Street and the Charlotte Transportation Center that CATS CEO John Lewis reported on at last week's Transportation, Planning and Environment Committee Meeting. For decades streets have been designed primarily to meet the needs of people driving in cars alone which is how about 76% of Charlotte commuters get to work. But it is a formula that just won't work in a city with a population growing as fast as ours. The Fourth Street Bus and Bike Lane Pilot Project demonstrated that on-time arrival of buses to the CTC improved, bus operators liked the lane and cyclists felt more comfortable in the lane. Although traffic is light right now as many people are still working from home, we know that those volumes will pick up again and as the economy recovers, we need that recovery to be as equitable as possible. For an individual who may have lost months of income and now needs to find a new job, perhaps as he approaches the town, perhaps no longer able to afford a car, public transit can be a lifeline to opportunity. As a bus rider myself I can tell you there is a big difference between a one-hour ride and a 30-minute ride. Bus prioritization is an important part of the CATS Envision My Ride initiative because innovations like bus and bike only ways, transit signal priority, and queue jumpers will enhance the speed and reliability of the bus network. It is not just about getting more buses on the road, if they are getting stopped in traffic then transit begins to lose its appeal as an efficient transportation choice. The speed reliability and frequency of buses are all factors that depend on buses not getting stuck in traffic and as you are well aware, many of the thoroughfares that have major bus routes on them have become increasingly congested in recent years. The scheduled delays have resulted in bus trip times getting longer and longer will only get worse as our population grows, and more people bring their cars and less action is taken to prioritize buses. We urge you to support the continued study of additional transit corridors that are in need of bus prioritization and to make bold decisions that keep bus riders moving quickly to their jobs, homes, schools, and other daily destinations. If the City wants to create a strategic mobility plan it will be important to include strategies for making transit an appealing viable daily transportation choice. More people riding transit combined with a move towards the adoption of battery-electric buses will help the City to reach its greenhouse gas reduction goal set forth in the strategic Energy Action Plan.

Finally, a note on funding; as you work on the budget, we are excited to see that many of the projects in the proposed budget include bike and pedestrian elements. We also ask you to fully fund implementation of the Charlotte Bikes Plan at the level of $4 million per year to help build an all ages, all ability bike network. Thanks for your commitment to planning for Charlotte's future transportation needs while also being responsive to the present crisis with fast and adaptive action.

Mayor Lyles said we really appreciate your advocacy around mobility and look forward to working with you on a number of these projects.

Opening Small Businesses

Matthew Jannazzo, 10509 Camelback Circle said thank you all for being here, I truly commend you guys. What you guys are going through is very tough in its current environment and I don't think you guys get enough recognition for the efforts that you are putting forth. I'm coming here as a concerned member; I wasn't sure where to go with this topic around the reopening through the phases. I wanted to discuss the kind of a larger level of what we are opening and what we are trying to get open. As you may know, we are currently in Phase 2, moving towards Phase 3 and we really look toward more vanity items than mental health. I have several friends in the community who own dance studios, gymnastic studios, yoga studios, etc. that really our community at a tremendous level, and that are some of the core businesses and small businesses within our community. As you know in these last few weeks, we've had a tremendous increase in child abuse and domestic abuse and sometimes these are the only outlets for either children or people in these situations to get out. I know this is more of a state-level issue, but as we move forward, I just urge you guys to discuss what these smaller business openings look like in comparison to some of the larger gyms. I really look for you guys to be the voice for these small businesses and help us differentiate what these gymnastics, yoga studios, and dance studios really look like and how they positively impact the community. That is all I have and again I just want to say thank you for all your support through this tough time and we greatly appreciate what you are doing for the Charlotte Community overall.

Mayor Lyles said thank you; we will relay this information to our policy group which is made up of many of the professionals in our community, including the Public Health Director. We will pass your comments on as well.

Unemployment

Sebastian Feculak, 3008 Enfield Road said I work with a number of our labor organizations across the State of North Carolina. I'm currently working with the ironworkers and previously worked with the Federation of Labor. I'm here in support of our brothers at the Airport. A number of our colleagues that work for HMS Host, employees many of whom are furloughed as well as many other workers in other companies at the Airport. One of the concerns is that the City currently has a number of commissions or task forces working on finding ways to support the different businesses during the COVID situation as many folks have become unemployed etc. One of the concerns is there has been a recommendation from the Airport Task Force for a number of subsidies including HMS Host who one of our labor organizations represents many of our colleagues at Unite Here workers, many of the culinary workers at the Airport. Many of these individuals may be losing their healthcare insurance on May 30th and during this time, this is kind of a very tough time to lose those kinds of benefits by the company and considering that the company and many others are about to receive these subsidies and possibly funding in different ways, we are really concerned that this doesn't come with some sort of condition to make sure that these workers do retain those benefits and other promises to make sure that they do have that sort of support during this time.

One of my other biggest concerns is, I've worked with many City Councilmembers here in the past and I know that worker issues are very tough to work on in North Carolina. I find it rather unacceptable when I reviewed the Airport Commission discussion, we have over seven unions representing thousands of workers at the Airport, many who have been affected and have been laid off or furloughed, however, none of those organizations were represented at the discussion. Therefore, I feel the recommendations that are coming out of these committees to support the workers that are being affected are not enough. It is very concerning, I think it is absolutely unacceptable to have these kinds of broad discussions and not include the workers themselves to speak on those issues and therefore, I do think it kind of puts a lack of effort by maybe the City or maybe by the Airport Committee specifically in finding innovative solutions to make sure that the workers who are affected do get some sort of support during this time. I think it is unacceptable that companies are dropping

healthcare coverage for workers at the Airport who are many of whom are already working minimum wage jobs and will have to transfer over to an expensive Cobra System or payments while some concessionaires may be receiving these subsidies.

Lost Benefits for HMS Host Employees

Ian Funderburg, 222 North Weldon Street, Gastonia, NC said I appreciate you allowing me to speak tonight. I would like to echo Mr. Feculak's sentiments. I actually belong to a Flight Attendant Union locally here in Charlotte and I come into contact with many of these employees at HMS Host as well as LSG Sky chefs who are represented by Unite Here. It was brought to my attention about the fact that they would be kicked off of their healthcare insurance as of May 30th and as someone who directly benefits from the services that HMS Host provides, I had to speak out against their decision to do this to their employees. I would echo Mr. Feculak's sentiments that if HMS Host is to receive any subsidies that it is required to provide and continue providing health insurance to their works. I also understand that the City Council has the power to place a condition on those subsidies requiring the company to do so. It wouldn't interfere with any of their existing contracts and I'm aware that City Council is able to do this on a regular basis with other companies such as Chitketia and Honeywell, both of whom require a minimum number of employees and in both instances, the subsidies to those companies are lawfully dictated by those employee contracts and I'd like not to forget the HMS Host as an International Corporation that has an annual sales of more than $3.5 billion and it can afford to maintain the health insurance. I also want to see that the Airport Task Force reconsiders these recommendations and again considers these conditions before doling out any subsidies especially since 80% of HMS Host employees are now being furloughed. Thank you for letting me speak tonight and I hope that the City Council will continue to do the right thing for employees such as those at HMS Host affected by this pandemic.

Healthcare for Airport Workers

William Voltz, 4033 Seaforth Drive said I am honored and privileged to be speaking this evening. I've been working at Charlotte Douglas International Airport for HMS Host for 12-years as the warehouse supervisor and I've been a resident of Charlotte my entire life. Since this pandemic started, I continued working at the Airport, range of hours between 18 and 35 and I'm in fear of losing my healthcare in the next week. I implore upon Charlotte and the City Council to go to Host and say look, we want Host to be a substantial company and we are not denying them to get the subsidies. We are just asking that you condition those subsidies on them continuing our healthcare because the Charlotte Douglas International Airport does $24 billion each year towards the local economy. As I work every day I come in contact with hundreds of people, employees, and passengers and to be putting our health at risk every day, and to be in fear that we are getting ready to lose our healthcare is unacceptable. We just ask that you stand by us. The host has hundreds of millions of dollars in cash in the bank so they can afford to continue our healthcare and to ask for these conditions be subsidies which are in the Task Force meeting was told it was unlawful, which it is not unlawful. It is allowed and the City Council does it every day and entices companies to come to Charlotte and puts conditions on them coming to Charlotte, their hiring practices, and their paying out practices. I'm just asking that you as elected officials stand by the people as Mr. Egleston, Mr. Newton and Ms. Watlington did in the Task Force Meeting, they stood up for us and we ask that you guys join with them.

HMS Host Employees Healthcare

Tara Jo Williamson, 9917 Glenbridge Way said thank you for hearing us this evening. I'm also with HMS Host; I've worked there for 13 years as well and as you can tell there is an outrage over HMS Host employees losing their benefits. I find it kind of redundant to continue to go over the facts as far as what is going to happen. I'm a Union Stewart and I get phone calls a day in and day out from people explaining their fears and their worries. I just want to share some of those stories with you. I have a couple of co-workers; some of you may have heard my testimony already two co-workers that meant

a lot to me and there were diagnosed with terminal illnesses. I recount their last days, they were working through their pain to simply live, maintain their much-needed insurance. I just imagine if they were here today, same scenario, but now in the midst of a global pandemic finding out the company that they had been so loyal too was abruptly kicking them off of their insurance and they would now have to choose between basic necessities like food or housing or private insurance because having both is not an option for those already living paycheck to paycheck. I could give examples that go on and on. As it stands now with the Task Force vote HMS Host, mind you, as you have heard, annual sales over $3.5 billion dollars is going to receive these subsidies granting them tremendous corporate relief and is going to kick over 700 furloughed employees off of their insurance.

Mayor Lyles said we are going to discuss this item; the Aviation Report that you addressed later in the meeting, I believe it is Agenda Item No. 10, but we would like to make sure that this is brought to our attention. This is something; I think there was a song a long time ago That Change is Going to Come. At some point, we have to look and make sure that people can make enough money to live in this place. I understand clearly what Skychef has been doing so we will have a conversation about this. I hope at some point we will be able to make some changes. I'm not sure when that will happen, but we talk further about that.

I want to alert other speakers waiting that if you've signed up for an item that is later on our agenda please hold on, we will come back to you so that you can be called on to speak. I believe the remaining speakers are on Item No. 12 and there are 12 speakers and each speaker will have two minutes. If you have written your remarks, you might have a chance to practice your timing for two minutes for that item on our agenda.

*** * * * * * ***

ITEM NO. 2: MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

There were no consent item questions.

*** * * * * * ***

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as presented with the exception of Items 38 and 40 which have been deferred to June 28, 2020.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 18: Beatties Ford Road Widening Project
Approve Change Order #2 for $2,113,091.99 to the contract with J. T. Russell and Sons, Inc. for the Beatties Ford Road Widening Project.

Item No. 19: Land Acquisition for Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department Northwest Division Station.
(A) Approve the purchase of a 7.75-acre parcel located at 1800 Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road (parcel identification number 031-112-35) in the amount of $435,000 from Stanford and Connie Baker, (B) Approve the purchase of a 1.62-acre parcel located at 1818 Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road (parcel identification number 031-112-34) in the amount of $305,000 from Jose Ortuno-Zolorio and Aide Pineda, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute any documents necessary to complete these transactions.

Item No. 20: Little Hope Creek Tributary-Marion Diehl Segment Sanitary Sewer Construction

Approve a guaranteed maximum price of $6,104,621 to Park Construction of North Carolina, Inc. for Design-Build construction services for the Little Hope Creek Tributary-Marion Diehl Segment Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project.

Item No. 21: Airport On-Call General Contractor Contract Amendment
Approve contract amendment for $750,000 to the contract with Kelby Construction, Inc. for on-Call General Contractor Services.

Item No. 22: Airport Runway 18C/36C Joint Seal Replacement Construction Contract
Approve a contract in the amount of $2,491,950 to the lowest responsive bidder Hi-Way Paving, Inc. for the Runway 18C/36C Joint seal Replacement project.

Summary of Bids

Hi-Way Paving, Inc.	$2,491,950.00
Interstate Sealant and Concrete, Inc.	$3,151,750.00

Item No. 23: Airport Terminal Ramp Light Pole Fixture Replacement
(A) Approve the purchase of pole harness fixture assemblies form a cooperative purchasing contract, and (B) Approve a contract in the amount of $1,199,994.64 with Graybar Electric Company, Inc. for the purchase of pole harness fixture assemblies under US Communities - OMNIA Partners, February 1, 2018, EV 2370.

Item No. 24: Resolution of Intent to Abandon an Alleyway off West Hill Street
(A) Adopt a Resolution of Intent to abandon an alleyway off West Hill Street, and (B) Set a Public Hearing for June 22, 2020.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 634.

Item No. 25: Refund of Property Taxes
Adopt a resolution authorizing the refund of property taxes assessed through clerical or assessment error in the amount of $55,511.65.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 635-636.

Item No. 26: Meeting Minutes
Approve the titles, motions, and votes reflected in the Clerk's record as the minutes of April 20, 2020 Zoning Meeting, April 27, 2020, Business Meeting, and May 4, 2020, City Manager Budget Presentation.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 27: Aviation Property Transaction – 9428 Snow Ridge Lane
Acquisition of 0.77 acres at 9428 Snow Ridge Lane from TAH 2016-1 Borrower, LLC for $207,161 for EIS Mitigation Land South.

Item No. 28: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #23
Resolution of Condemnation of 585 square feet (0.01 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement and 439 square feet (0.01 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 2659 Idlewood Circle from Brian S. Pace and Stacy Y. Pace for $5,800 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #23.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 637.

Item No. 29: Property Transactions – Barclay Downs Drive Sidewalk, Parcel #1
Acquisition of 1,282 square feet (0.029 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, 2,698 square feet (0.062 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 3935 Barclay Downs Drive from Kelly L. Straub and Sheri F. Straub for $11,000 for Barclay Downs Drive Sidewalk, Parcel #1.

Item No. 30: Property Transactions – Barclay Downs Drive Sidewalk, Parcel #13
Acquisition of 4,141 square feet (0.095 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 3719 Barclay Downs Drive from Christopher M. Johnson and Joy E. Johnson for $12,250 for Barclay Downs Drive Sidewalk, Parcel #13.

Item No. 31: Property Transactions – Barclay Downs Drive Sidewalk, Parcel #21
Acquisition of 2,002 square feet (0.046 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 3337 Ferncliff Road from William Ellerbe Ackerman III and Shannan W. Ackerman for $19,825 for Barclay Downs Drive Sidewalk, Parcel #21.

Item No. 32: Property Transactions – Barclay Downs Drive Sidewalk, Parcel #23
Acquisition of 3,159 square feet (0.073 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1961 Runnymede Lane from 1961 Runnymede Lane for $12,900 for Barclay Downs Drive Sidewalk, Parcel #23.

Item No. 33: Property Transactions – I-85 North Bridge, Parcel #11
Acquisition of 693 square feet (0.016 acres) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement, plus 423 square feet (0.01 acres) in Waterline Easement, plus 32,930 square feet (0.756 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 2,741 square feet (0.063 acres) in Utility Easement at 9139 Research Drive from BellSouth Telecommunications LLC for $60,325 for I-85 North Bridge, Parcel #11.

Item No. 34: Property Transactions – Mallard Creek Reuse Line Extension to UNCC, Parcel #1
Resolution of Condemnation of 11,583.98 square feet (0.266 acres) in Sanitary Sewer easement, plus 5,941 square feet (0.136 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 11310 North Tryon Street from Hill/Gray Seven LLC for $64,625 for Mallard Creek Reuse Line Extension to UNCC, Parcel #1.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 638.

Item No. 35: Property Transactions – Mallard Creek Reuse Line Extension to UNCC, Parcel #2
Resolution of Condemnation of 16,775 square feet (0.385 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement at 200 Pavilion Boulevard from 200 Pavilion LLC for $55,350 for Mallard Creek Reuse Line Extension to UNCC, Parcel #2.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 639.

Item No. 36: Property Transactions – Mallard Creek Reuse Line Extension to UNCC, Parcels #4, 5, 7, 13
Resolution of Condemnation of 138,076 square feet (3.170 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, 180,964 square feet (4.154 acres) in Access Easement, plus 2,620 square feet (0.060 acres) in Existing Sewer Easement at East Mallard Creek Church Road from Martin Marietta Materials, Inc. $102,225 for Mallard Creek Reuse Line Extension to UNCC, Parcels #4. 5, 7 and 13.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 640.

Item No. 37: Property Transactions – Mallard Creek Reuse Line Extension to UNCC, Parcel #9
Resolution of Condemnation of 102,428.63 square feet (2.351 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 10,628.22 square feet (0.244 acres) in Access Easement, plus 33,512.46 square feet (0.769 acres) in Existing Sanitary Sewer Easement at 10400 North Tryon Street from James Frosst Alexander, Susan Burr Alexander Boone, Stella Watkins Harman, and John William Alexander for $13,250 for Mallard Creek Reuse Line Extension to UNCC, Parcel #9.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 641.

Item No. 39: Property Transactions – Mallard Creek Reuse Line Extension to UNCC, Parcel #14
Resolution of Condemnation of 2,417 square feet (0.055 acres) in Access Easement at 400 East Mallard Creek Church Road from Bellsouth Telecommunications, LLC for $325 for Mallard Creek Reuse Line Extension to UNCC, Parcel #14.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 642.

Item No. 41: Property Transactions – McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #12
Acquisition of 4,460 square feet (0.11 acres) in Fee Simple, 10,910 square feet (0.25 acres) in Fee Simple in Existing Right of Way, 7,200 square feet (0.165 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, 6,342 square feet (0.146 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 401 McCullough Drive from Tempus 401 McCullough Drive, LLC for $75,000 for McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #12.

Item No. 42: Property Transactions – McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #17
Resolution of Condemnation of 3,782 square feet (0.087 acres) in Utility Easement, 3,090 square feet (0.071 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, 105 square feet (0.002 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 8302 University Executive Park Drive from Harris Realty investments, LLC for $41,750 for McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #17.

Item No. 43: Property Transactions – Tom Hunter Streetscape, Parcel #11, 12, 13, and 14
Acquisition of 12,448 square feet (0.286 acres) in Fee Simple in Existing Right of Way, 8,173 square feet (0.188 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, 7,099 square feet (0.163 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 332 Tom Hunter Road from The Church/La Iglesia, Inc. for $14,405 for Tom Hunter Streetscape, Parcel #11, 12, 13, 14.

*** * * * * * ***

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM NO. 5: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE AN UNOPENED PORTION OF THE ALLEYWAY BETWEEN BERTONLEY AVENUE AND MILLBROOK ROAD

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham, seconded by Councilmember Newton, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing on the subject to close an unopened portion of an alleyway between Bertonley Avenue and Millbrook Road.

*** * * * * * ***

ITEM NO. 6: PUBLIC HEARING ON GRIER MEADOWS AREA VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Motion was made by Councilmember Watlington, seconded by Councilmember Graham, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing on the subject of Grier Meadows Area Voluntary Annexation.

*** * * * * * ***

ITEM NO. 7: PUBLIC HEARING ON OLD MOORE'S CHAPEL NORTH AREA VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing on the subject of the Old Moore's Chapel North Area Voluntary Annexation.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 8: PUBLIC HEARING ON STONEYGREEN AREA VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Motion was made by Councilmember Watlington, seconded by Councilmember Johnson, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing on the subject of the Stoneygreen Area Voluntary Annexation.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Councilmember Watlington, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to go into closed session to consult with the City Attorney and preserve the Attorney client privilege pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 143-318-11 (a) (3).

The meeting was recessed at 5:37 p.m. to go into closed session and returned to open session at 5:28 p.m.

* * * * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 9: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Mayor Lyles said the Manager will not have any other reports; you've got the 30-day report that was e-mailed to you. We will go to Item No. 10 with the Community Recovery Task Force Report Outs from each of the Task Forces and then we will go to Item No.12 which is the appropriation of the ordinance adoption and we have speakers as a part of the recovery Task Force Report.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 10: COMMUNITY RECOVERY TASK FORCE REPORT OUTS

Airport Task Force Group

Mayor Lyles said I would like to ask Mr. Driggs to review the Airport Task Force recommendations.

Councilmember Driggs said the Airport's Task Force consisted of 11-members, three Councilmembers in addition to myself; Larken Egleston, Matt Newton, and Victoria Watlington. Our citizen members were Seth Bennet, SVP of consumer engagement for Hornets sports and entertainment, Rachel Geathers, CEO of Geathers Enterprises, Lucia Zapata Smith, CEO of Metro Landmarks, Yolanda Johnson, CEO of SB&J Enterprises, Dennis Harris, Former President of NC Airline Pilots Association, Robert Stolz, Managing Partner at Sunbury Capital, LLC, Erin King Sweeney, Aviation attorney. I would practically like to thank Brent Cagle, Haley Gentry, and Angela Maynard on the

staff for the work they did and the preparation of this recommendation and also the participation by American Airlines, Dec Lee, Mike Minerva, Tracy Montrose, Paradies-Lagardere, Greg Paradies, Renee HMS Host, Daryl Benton, and Steve Johnson. Thank you all so much for your contributions to this effort.

The Task Force met a total of five times. In the first meeting, we got a briefing by the Aviation Department about the contractual relationships among the principal parties operating at the Airport and the economics of the Airport. In the second meeting, we talked to Concessionaires and sub-concessionaires about the special situation that they are in. The third meeting was devoted to talking to American Airlines on behalf of Airlines operating at the Airport and in the fourth meeting we had an Aviation Overview and Concession recap. The conversation allowed us to draft the report which was then adopted in the next meeting.

I will highlight some of the provisions of the recommendations; the Aviation Department for one is going to utilize North Carolina Investment Improvement Program and Federal CARES (Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security) Act funds to meet essentially its own financial obligation. Those funds are principally for the purpose of ensuring the financial of solvency and the ability to operate the Airport itself. They will allocate approximately $50 million of remaining stimulus funds to offset the Aviation Department's fiscal 2021 operating and maintenance expenses which will enable the Aviation Department to avoid a reduction in staff and maintain its industry meeting low costs for an enplaned passenger.

A second point, the Aviation Department will provide the Airport tenant [inaudible] access to a transit pass at no cost in the fiscal year 2021 which becomes relevant again because CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System) has started to charge for ridership on buses and trains. Will provide the Airport concessionaries with terminal services as to finding their contracts including pest control and trash removal at no cost to the concessionary during 2021. I am just highlighting a few things here; directly fund a public information campaign to the extent permitted by the FAA (Federal Aviation Administration) revenue and use policy that will support the Airport and its tenants during the COVID-19 recovery and inform the traveling public of the safety measures in place to help or stop or limit the spread of COVID-19. The Airport will also continue the work of both firm concession contract holders and their sub-concessionary partners to provide rent relief where feasible legally, operation, and financially. Current items under consideration include continuing to allow concessionaires to determine operating hours throughout the COVID-19 crisis and recover with the understanding that the concessionaries will need to provide the Aviation Department with a reopening plan for review and approval, wave annual certified audit requirements for 2020 and allow concessionaries to submit annual statements that their CEO has certified as accurate, adjust annual revenue guarantees which are a key provision in their contract so there is a minimal annual guarantee that number is being adjusted in negotiations, provide concessionaries payment flexibility for the fiscal year 2020 profit share settlement and allow HMS Host and Paradies to defer fixed space rental payment for the period of July 1, 2020, to December 30, 2020.

In addition to these recommendations the Task Force recommends to City Council that the City take the following actions: Where possible provide local businesses, including small local sub-concessionaries information on and access to other City of Charlotte small business support programs. And, I will just comment on that; we studied the situation of a lot of people who work at the Airport or do business at the Airport and in fact, there are something like 690 organizations whose employees have badges to work at the Airport and in looking at them it was very difficult to identify ownership structures, who was local, who wasn't local, what the real size of the business was and how much of it was actually conducted at the Airport. So, the feeling was that the best way to serve the businesses that are eligible is to refer to them to the Small Business Relief Program that the City is operating separately. Where possible provide small businesses, information related to other federal or state level business support programs that they may be able to access, express support for the North Carolina Airport Improvement Program and recommend that the FAA develop a consistent set of COVID-19 guidelines

and rules to airports so that there is uniformity among airports. These recommendations will enable the Aviation Department to address the additional funding needs to be required due to COVID-19, protect bondholders and thereby protect the City's AA Airport credit rating, maintain CLT's industry-leading low CTE and cost of enplaned passengers, give Airport stakeholders the relief and support that they need during the crisis and recovery period.

Taken together these recommendations will provide Airport Concessionaires an estimated $7 million in rent relief and program support through the fiscal year 2021. Due to the uncertainty around the speed of recovery, these numbers do not reflect any estimated amount of rent deferrals or rent abatement for 2021 however, the Aviation Department is certain that both HMS Host and Paradies and their sub-concessionaries be entitled to rent relief in 2021. Those are the outlines of the recommendation. I did want to address also some of the comments that were made by speakers this evening related to health benefits for employees of certain operators at the Airport. For one the relationships between those companies and their employees are governed by national labor contracts and those have provisions in them that actually did provide for a continuation of health benefits from a pre-funded source. There was a fund that they had established to allow health benefits to continue and at some point, the money in that fund is exhausted, the companies themselves have experience drops in revenue of up to 85% and it is very difficult for us in the course of trying to protect businesses to impose on them extra costs that could be comparable to the benefit of the rent relief and the other measures that are being taken to give them a break. I think there are in fact many employees in Charlotte outside of the Airport who are confronting the same challenges about health insurance and there is no question those are serious challenges, but to try to solve that problem in the context of this Task Force's work seems like a bit of a can of worms frankly and they were advised during the meeting by Council for the Airport that there were definite legal questions about attaching conditions on labor relations to the kinds of support that were being conceded. Most of what the Airport has done is basically negotiate with its contract counterparties in the context of their current contracts for some extra relief or to bend as much as possible to give concessions. There isn't really a huge handout of such going on, it is just the question of trying to keep those companies alive frankly because they are facing, regardless of their $3.5 billion in revenues, they are facing the same challenges everywhere and even big companies can fail. I think the majority view of the Task Force in a vote that we took was that trying to address those concerns in the context of the work that this group was beyond our scope frankly and that is why you don't see addressed in here. I do believe we would probably create more problems than we would solve if we tried to fix it.

That is the quick overview. If any of my Council colleagues in the working group would like to add a comment, I'd be happy to hear it.

Councilmember Ajmera said how were the Task Force members selected for this Committee?

Mr. Driggs, they were selected based on subject matter expertise. I read their affiliations at the beginning, and two of them are actual sub-concessionaries at the Airport. We have somebody who was a pilot and has that perspective of the Airlines. Robert Stolz actually has a personal history in negotiating with the Airport. Erin King Sweeney is an Aviation Lawyer and Seth Bennett of the Hornets is somebody that has expertise about concessions and how they work because of the concessions that are inherent in his business. Everybody that was on there was actually able to make a useful and informed contribution.

Ms. Ajmera said were they selected by you or were they selected by the Task Force Committee?

Mr. Driggs said I had recommendations from members; I think the only one of those that I actually came up with myself was Mr. Harris and also Ms. Griffith is CEO off Metro Landmarks. She was part of it too because she has a lot of clients at the Airport and most of these were actually recommendations I received from others as to people who

are knowledgeable in this space in which we were going to be working and it proved that they were able to make very useful contributions.

Ms. Ajmera said it goes back to a concern that was raised earlier at the Public Forum by a labor union. Why were they not part of this conversation? There are many employees that work at the Airport and I know they expressed concerns around being left out of this discussion and they were not at the table when the conversations were taking place.

Mr. Driggs said for one, I was approached by a representative of United here who communicated some of their concerns to me and I asked her to write up their issues and offered to have them included in a conversation and in a meeting in which she would be able to participate. I never heard back so, basically, the only input I got on these issues was from an individual, Mr. Murrow and he I think represents one of the locals, but in my mind was not a representative of all the people who are affected by this. So, there was some dialogue and I was just not able to incorporate the appropriate spokesperson for all of those workers into our conversations.

Ms. Ajmera said recommendations by industry experts who serve on this Task Force Committee, but I think we need to have the representation of workers in that Task Force Committee. While I appreciate Mr. Driggs' outreach to United Union member, I feel that recommendations that have been presented lacks that perspective that was raised earlier today by some speakers at the Forum. With that being said, I know there was a request that was made for the healthcare benefits to be continued and I know that when we look at PPP and other loans that are being provided by the federal government, then asking employees for those loans to be forgiven, they either have to keep folks employed or hire them back. I wonder why such a requirement was not part of this conversation and I see the total relief package here that is being proposed is $7 million in rent abatement. Is that correct; $7 million for 2020?

Mr. Driggs said it is rent relief and program support, yes.

Ms. Ajmera said do we know what it would cost for the healthcare coverage to be continued for some of those workers that have been laid off?

Mr. Driggs said we didn't get specific estimates; we had input from the two principle concessionaires that they were effectively struggling to avoid bankruptcy as it was and that it was just inconceivable for them because of the amounts involved and we don't have the details of those amounts.

Ms. Ajmera said I would like to understand the details and how does that compare to the relief we are providing to those vendors. I don't think it's an unreasonable ask at least we should discuss it. We might come to the conclusion that it is not something we would be able to accommodate but having that conversation would be crucial for us to hear both sides of that.

Mayor Lyles said there is a problem with the sound system and the only way to fix it is to stop and restart. You guys would be still on, but I thought we better get through this and if you don't mind and if you live through the crackling sound, we will try to fix it after we get through with this discussion.

Councilmember Newton said I think it is important to note upfront that there is a difference between receiving written recommendations and actually having a seat at the table. I recall requesting very early on that we have some labor or employee representation and I'm surprised that as of Thursday there was none. Inasmuch as any votes were concerned, Councilmembers were actually out seated or there are more non-Councilmember votes than Councilmembers. I did receive a quote of roughly $700,000 to provide health insurance for employees. We are talking about 700 employees, possibly more that are going to be kicked off their health insurance, so we are looking at about $700,000 to provide that health insurance. I did have a question upfront because I don't know what the timeline is for us here. I wanted to ask do we

know when these recommendations are going to come back before the Council for a vote?

Mayor Lyles said tonight. It is Item No. 12 on your agenda.

Mr. Newton said that is much sooner than I anticipated so, I think this is a conversation that we absolutely have to have. I think the work of the Task Force was great, with this one exception of course because we are talking approving contract breaks for a prime concessionaire here that is going to kick over 700 of his employees off their healthcare insurance. We know that and this is going to happen during a public health crisis. We did have a very robust conversation about this in the Task Force; I think it is important that we talk about it as a Council. I also think it is important to note that we do routinely place pre-conditions on [inaudible] businesses requiring a certain number of jobs at certain salary rates which through our subsidy, through the benefits that we concur upon these businesses do affect their employee contract. Honeywell, in particular, comes to mind. I think that might have been one of the larger more recent ones that we were engaged in. The Task Force conversation did prompt me to reach out to the City Attorney and ask for some conclusions here to give us [a break in the recording] what I received in return so speaking with the City Attorney, I was notified that a pre-condition here, it was not controlled by federal guidelines. That is because these are contract break, it is not a CARES Act distribution to the prime concessionaires. A pre-condition here would also not be an interference with a third-party contract and that the City Attorney's Office would defend our decision if we placed a pre-condition on the contract or on contract break here. More specifically, a pre-condition whereby employees [inaudible] particularly the furloughed employees. Furloughed employees would remain on their employer's health insurance through the furlough. I think we are doing a lot here. We are not just talking about rent abatement, we are talking about audit waivers, we are talking about profit sharing, we are talking about adjusting revenue guarantees, other types of payment flexibility. I think it is only fair that we ensure, much like we can because we have, this is an arms-length transaction between the City a relief that they can take or decide not to take. I think it is only fair that we have the opportunity to place a pre-condition on that and to the extent that they are already issued with that, they can just walk away from it. While alternatively, any acceptance of that relief would be an agreement to the pre-condition. So, I would ask seeing as how we are going to be deciding this tonight, I would ask that we include a pre-condition here. It would possibly be under number seven, bullet point F to that number seven whereby prime concessionaries to obtain the relief being offered from the Airport prime concessionaires must maintain the health insurance of their furloughed employees. I'll make that motion I guess right now.

Mayor Lyles said no, we have still had people to speak on the idea so we can come back to the motion and the motion should be made when we are actually taking an action on the contract which will be Item No. 12. This is just the report out to get those kinds of issues on the table. When we get to that next item that would be the place to make the motion. Mr. Baker; did I hear Mr. Newton say that you had addressed this? I am sorry the crackling is so bad I hope it is not as annoying to all of you as it is to me. Oh, somebody fixed it. Mr. Newton; did you talk with the Attorney about this in advance?

Mr. Newton said I did; there was an e-mail exchange that all Councilmembers were Listserv and attached to and then we also had further conversations. I think the take away here that I had mentioned just a moment ago is any pre-condition here is not subject to federal guidelines because it is not [inaudible]. This is an existing contract in which we are talking about providing contract breaks; at the same time, it is not an interference with a third-party contract because they have the ability to either accept or deny this in effect after we [inaudible] to the pre-condition. I think those are the important take-a-ways that were confirmed via the conversations I had with the City Attorney, and I guess one last one is that we can choose to do this, and the City Attorney's Office would defend the action. That was confirmed to me and I just wanted to repeat that here.

Mayor Lyles said I see that he is ready to go; he is over there writing already on his legal pad.

Councilmember Winston said I concur with Mr. Newton and I am disappointed that workers were not represented at the table. I could say specifically this Councilmember and past Councils have often spoken up on behalf of third-party workers at the Airport. I have spoken to Mr. Cagle many a time as well Mr. Menerva and Ms. Montrose at American Airlines about being able to triangulate the importance of our third-party workers at the Airport. There are three things that we know people need during this pandemic; people need access to home or a safe place to go and social distance; they need access to food, and they need access to healthcare. Any relief that we provide we should try our best to hit all three and we are able to do those first two with wage relief and will be able to do this if we made those pre-conditions. I will not support anything that does not use all the leverage that we have to get as much for workers as possible. We have to remember that is what we are here for first and foremost. We are here first and foremost to ensure the safety of our people and not just our corporations. If business models are not able to make their workers whole, then they need to re-evaluate that business model and we need to use all of the tools in our toolbelt to do that. I applaud Mr. Newton for using his expertise, I guess is why democracy takes from regular people that have normal jobs so, he put his legal aptitude to this. I was meeting with Mr. Baker past forward and it seems that this has run a fowl of any type of labor laws or third-party. They can deny this help if they don't want, in fact, there are specific business models where businesses do not take government funds because of those strings attached. I think this is a fair tool to attach and I will not be supporting it if it does not have that pre-condition.

Councilmember Watlington said I just wanted to add, I agree with much of what my two colleagues have already said. The only thing that I am thinking about is the smaller primes that are not both multinational companies if there is a way that we can construct language so that it doesn't basically put them out of business, I would be inclined to do that, whether that is something about them having to demonstrate hardship or whatever in providing these funds or if that includes in their application that they can apply for enough funds to be able to meet the needs for healthcare. That is the only caveat that I would live up. I don't think it is an either/or, I think we've got to do it as a both-and with our smaller primes in mind.

Mayor Lyles said what size is a small prime at the Airport? Do you recall?

Ms. Watlington said I'm thinking about some of our primes that have 100 employees or less.

Mr. Driggs said Mayor; I just wanted to say for the City Attorney, my understanding was there is also an issue with state law that says the City cannot impose terms of employment on anybody that it does business with or any of its contract counterparties. I think maybe we need a full and legal exposition. I can tell you that the senior Airport Lawyer advised us that this was not something that we should do during one of our meetings and I would also note that if there are, I think 1100 employees at Paradies and at Host the typical full cost of health insurance is Mr. Manager; what, $7,000 to $10,000 employee and employer shares?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I'm not sure what this is for somebody that we have a contractual arrangement with so, I'm not sure Mr. Driggs what their healthcare costs are.

Mr. Driggs said the City's is somewhere in that range, aren't they?

Mr. Jones said much higher than this, yes.

Mr. Driggs said all I'm saying is that I think we would find that if we cost this thing out the amount of the healthcare insurance obligation exceeds all of the benefits that are currently being discussed with this company and leaves them worse off than they were

before which they will decline. Maybe some work is needed on this; I certainly talked to sub-concessionaries, the concessionaries, the Manager, Director of the Airport and it looked like this was an understandable, but really impossible ask on the part of these employees. I don't think we should incorporate a requirement like that here not knowing more and then the question is depending on the will of the majority of Council how we proceed by adopting this with the understanding that you will study the issue further or get more data. I would like to hear from the Airport Director on the subject as well and let you hear some of the things that we heard in our working group. But, for us to lock in right now an obligation like that to this recommendation and adopt it tonight would probably be we just sabotaged the entire effort to provide the survival assistance to the concessionaries including the sub-concessionaries.

Mayor Lyles said I think Mr. Driggs has pointed out we don't have the cost of the change and I also think that he said the City Attorney who works for Mr. Baker advised against it, so I know we can fight anything in court, but we are we on that Mr. Baker?

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said let me if I could just expand a little bit on that the conversation that I had with Mr. Newton and it does dovetail into the e-mail that I sent to all of you and Mr. Egleston; I think I realized on Sunday that I hadn't sent it to you, so hopefully, you did get it, but I think you got it separately. I did inadvertently mix the source of funds, I had been having conversations with the Administration about a different source of funds and a different method of distributing the funds, so I did mix those two together. What is going on at the Airport is not a distribution of funds to anyone, in particular, it is rent relief that is being offered. As you all know the prime concessionaires that are out their Host and Paradies competed through a bid process to provide that service out there, and North Carolina law does not allow a City to put in as a pre-condition to a bid award certain work relationships or work requirements such as the payment of a livable wage, sick leave, insurance, etc. We just don't have the authority to make that as a pre-condition for a bid on a contract. So, this isn't something that is the "normal" course you could require of Host or Paradies that is anything related to their insurance benefits to their employees beyond what is required by applicable state or federal regulations. My advice to the Administration on all of these programs, these new programs that are related in any way shape or form to COVID is to, and this really depends on the risk assessment and risk tolerance that the folks have, is to not require new elements or introduce new elements or requirements into the receipt of these funds or relief. In this case that you couldn't normally exact through a normal contracting process. That is my sort of standard advise to the Council because I know for a fact that you are not going to have any issues or challenges if you simply provide the funds pursuant to how you provide other funds, or in this case, if you were going to do a relief program or bidding process to have the prime concessionaries out there, you wouldn't be involved in their insurance benefits or livable wage or anything like that. That is my sort of stock advice. When you get beyond that I can't tell you with any degree of certainty whether there would be a challenge to that. The argument would be that you don't have the authority to condition the relief to require us to provide a benefit that you wouldn't be able to require of us in the normal bidding process. Mr. Newton's argument that I think he has provided to all of you would be the argument in favor of the fact that the City does have that discretion and I don't know if there would be a challenge and I don't know how that challenge would come out. So, ultimately, I hate to push this back to the Council perspective, but this is really a policy call and we'll make the most out of whatever policy directive you decide on. That is the only issue that I raise with Mr. Newton and again, I don't have case law that says you can't do this, but I do know that we wouldn't be able to get into any discussion about their benefits, their wages through a normal bidding process. There is a substantial difference legally between incentive contracts when you are bringing Honeywell or any corporation in and you have requirements about the number of employees or the average salary of jobs versus this bidding process because obviously, Honeywell didn't compete in a bid process to get incentives. That is a separate deal that the City has the absolute discretion to enter into or not to enter into. I hope I haven't confused folks any more than normal.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Cagle just walked in and Mr. Cagle; you have heard the discussion, you were at the Task Force meeting and the question has been suggested that there be a section added the prime must provide health insurance for those workers that are being furloughed. You've heard Mr. Baker so can you address?

Brent Cagle, Aviation Director said a couple of clarifying things to start out without getting into the actual suggestion that has been made last Thursday and tonight. Number one, the CARES Act funding that the Airport that is specific to the Aviation Department or to CLT is only legally available for the Aviation Department to use to pay our expenses. We cannot distribute to any of the tenants, whether it be an airline, whether it be a concessionaire or anyone else doing business at the Airport. We cannot distribute those funds to them so that they can sustain their business. This is not a subsidy or a payment; we can only use those funds to pay for Aviation Department expenses and that is very clear in the CARES Act funding regulations and requirements that have come out through the FAA in this case because the FAA is the overriding agency for airports and this part of the CARES Act funding. That being said, when it comes to a concessionaire we do not pay any of their business costs; they are private independent companies who are tenants of the Airport, so to the Airport, they represent a revenue stream to the Airport, they pay us to rent and that rent is convoluted and complicated, but at the end of the day, they pay us to rent for the privilege to do business at the Airport. Because of that, because we can't pay for their expenses, so then the question became their business is suffering, the Airport has seen a reduction in passenger traffic of 95% which means they've seen a reduction in revenues of 95% so what we can offer to them is a reduction in rent because we collect rent from them. We can reduce those amounts. Now both Paradies and Host have rent relief requirements already in their contract, but those contracts and the rent relief requirement did not ever envision a crisis like COVID-19. They envisioned a crisis like 911, like the great recession, they envision crisis that we had seen, and no one has ever seen this before, so there were a couple of elements or rent given the depth of this crisis and the depth of the reduction that they came to us and asked us about, would we consider amending the contract to give them, in addition to what they are contractually obligated to, as far as to rent relief, to give them additional relief and that is what we are really talking about. So, the recommendation was really intended to make sure that the Task Force and ultimately City Council was comfortable with that so that as the Aviation Director, I could make that recommendation to Mr. Jones as the City Manager, to execute that contract amendment or amendments. That is really what we are talking about, these are not disbursements or subsidies, they are really a reduction of rent or a deferment of rent, various rent measurers to allow them time to stabilize their finances and to allow us all time to start to recover. Now, that being said when we talk about the concessionaires and the prime concessionaries; when it comes to Terminal concessions there are two contracts that we hold, one with HMS Host for food and beverage and one with Paradies for specialty retail. We do not hold contracts directly with any of their sub-DBE partners. They hold those contracts with their DBE partners so, Ms. Geathers, who was on the Task Force and she is the CEO or Geathers Enterprises. She runs her businesses, if you will, in the Airport under a sub-agreement, in this case with Paradies. Ms. Johnson, who was also on the Task Force runs her business through a sub-agreement with Host.

Now, one thing that was very, very clear early on, and this has always been the case, is that we expect both Paradies and Host, any provisions that they are afforded in their contract we expect them to also convey those benefits to their sub-concessionaries, and their sub-concessionaries are, generally speaking, the DBE partners who are local, not all of them are local, but generally speaking they are local businesses. I guess my concern with this is I'm not sure how we would make recommendations related to employment or benefits for Host or Paradies without making those requirements or recommendations for their subs because those subs are basically living under the terms and conditions of the prime contract, they are not separately contracted out. So, I think for me, I guess that would be a secondary legal question of how you split the baby so to speak in this instance.

Councilmember Johnson said I'm a little more confused after hearing from Mr. Baker and from the Airport. Mr. Winston said we've been hearing from HMS for a long time, even prior Councils. I know that HMS employees have been coming before Council longer than I have; they've come to us about not getting a livable wage therefore, they are not able to upwardly mobile, therefore they are not able to afford to housing. So many of these problems are so big and outside of the scope of what we can do something about. Medicaid is not expanded here in North Carolina, COBRA is very expensive. I think if we are in a position to do anything directly to help these individuals at this time, not to lose health benefits if it is $700,000 if there is a way that we can work that into the assistance; it sounds like an incentive. We know that the government requires stipulations for COVID funding so I think there is a way to say yes to this and I would be in support of voting for this stipulation. Another thing I want to say is that I listened to the Task Force meeting last week and this was brought up by Mr. Newton so, it is not like there was no time to research the answer. His idea was not brought forward to Council, although the question was still being asked. It was asked by Mr. Baker, so the answer, again I will use the word foreseeable, this information or this question was foreseeable I would have hoped that this information or this question could have been asked and if it is not illegal and there is a way that we can do, we've heard from HMS employees for months now and the Mayor said at the beginning of the meeting a change is coming. I think this is an opportunity if we can add this to that assistance then I'm prepared to support that.

Councilmember Egleston said a question for the Attorney that I think cuts across this issue and others. I tend to want to defer to the City Attorney's legal opinion; that is what we hired you for, so when you tell us that you couldn't assure us something would be defensible or; I guess I'm just trying to gauge what your bar is because I often don't know whether you wouldn't recommend something to us unless you were 100% certain, 90% certain, 50% certain. Do you have a general rule in that regard if you were 90% certain that we would be covered in trying to add this provision, would you say I'm reasonably confident that you could do this and it is not going to be a problem or is it kind of a 50/50 test that you more than 50% confident you would say yes if you are less than 50% confident you would say no?

Mr. Baker said I'm laughing because it has been a while since I've had the conversation of what I mean by legally problematic and how my inflection may give away the percentages here. If I felt certain with a reasonable degree of certainty that the risk was very high, that you would get sued and that we would lose my recommendation would be done not do this. It would be very clear and emphatic that I recommend against doing something. For this particular matter, and I've had a couple of conversations with the Administration as we are dealing with, and I hate to keep comingling them, all of these funds that we are getting to provide relief in our community, I think is the umbrella. They are such new programs, and I don't want to criticize them because the geneses behind them are to provide relief to folks, but they haven't thought out all the things and haven't had the full vetting which creates a situation where we are guessing in certain instances. So, my recommendation which I put together in the e-mail that I sent to everybody, even though I comingled a couple of programs together inadvertently, has been when I see legal precedent when I see there is a certain way we can do something that has been tried and tested I prefer to keep you in that particular lane because the risk is low and I know that we can do it and we don't have to worry about issues. When you get outside of that vain into areas that we under normal circumstances wouldn't be able to require from either of these entities as a condition of getting the bids to provide the services then I have a concern that you could be in a situation where the argument is that the City is using these funds and this opportunity to exact certain concessions from these entities that you wouldn't be able to require in the normal contracting process. That area is the place where I would say my recommendation is to stick to tried and true and then I have to kick it back to the Council about what your risk tolerance is for going further. Again, all of the arguments that Mr. Newton has raised would be the arguments in favor. We are not forcing this on you, we are not unilaterally making this a condition of your contract, we are simply offering you a benefit that you are free to accept or not accept and these are the conditions if you choose to accept it.

Mr. Egleston said is your personal risk assessment of this that us pursuing this particular provision would be low, medium, or high risk?

Mr. Baker said I would say medium in part because I'm hearing from other things that have been raised, particularly as it relates to you might not want this provision to apply to all of the concessionaires or entities that are out there because that raises my concern if you are picking and choosing which entities need to provide insurance through September and which entities you are not going to require them to do that. Now, you get into a potential equal protection argument if it is the same program, but you are making a distinction between one entity over another in the requirements. That then adds another layer that I have to explain to whoever the trier of fact is should there actually be a lawsuit in the first place.

Ms. Watlington said something for that Madam Mayor, being that I brought that up; first let me walk back what I said earlier about smaller primes. Thank you, Mr. Cagle, for reiterating that they are not primes but they are sub-contractors. If there is a way to meet the same intent without creating an issue of unfairness if you will, I'd still like to see that included, but just wanted to clean that up a little bit as that has come up and it sounds like it is causing you some concern.

Mr. Newton said I just wanted to ask a question pertaining to whether we consider this a bid contract because I looked at it and I think it is separate from that. The reason is that we are beyond the bid process here, aren't we? This isn't anybody asking to be awarded a contract; this is us considering giving relief to a company that is actually asking for that relief. Completely separate from the bid process and I really wonder if we start talking about this in terms of it being a bid contract. We are talking about here in this instance, we are talking about reduced terms or reducing the terms of the original bid contract, would we be looking at materially altering the original bid process in the first place, unbalancing the playing field, possibly exposing ourselves to the folks that didn't get the bid before because we are going below those bid terms. What kind of liability would we be exposing ourselves to by assuming or by framing this in the context of this being a bid contract from the standpoint of the folks that didn't have the opportunity to get those lower terms and didn't get the award? To that extent why are we even talking about it being a bid contract? I'll just throw that out there for the Attorney.

Mayor Lyles said did you throw it out for a response or just throw it out?

Mr. Newton said I guess my original question here is what kind of liability are we exposing ourselves to by framing this as a bid contract?

Mr. Baker said we are not framing it as a bid contract. The argument on the opposite side will be that you are conditioning this on terms that the North Carolina State Legislature has prohibited you from negotiating with us and whether that is a winning argument or not I can't say yes or no. I can tell you that if you didn't have that proposal we wouldn't be having this conversation and you can clearly do the rent relief, but when you start requiring or getting into areas that you wouldn't normally be able to get into that gives me pause for concern that I feel as the Attorney to the Board, I need to bring to your attention that this could be problematic. Again, getting back to Mr. Egleston's questions about what does problematic mean and what are the percentages, I would say that I am certainly not recommending you cannot do this, this will be a problem and we will lose. But it does add a condition because if you can do this you can do a lot of things. You can say and we want you to pay a minimum wage, and we want you to fix all these other issues if you can do this one thing. I think the more of those you add the more someone who doesn't get the opportunity for the relief because of the conditions that you've put on could make the argument that we used this opportunity and this situation to delve into areas of the employee/employer relationship that we are not allowed to delve into. Again, all of the things you have said Mr. Newton on the other side would be my arguments for why this doesn't apply, but I feel it is incumbent upon me to advise the Council of potential issues if you go down this particular road, but we

can defend it. We will do the very best that we can as we always do, and I have zero case law that says you cannot do this. This is all so very new but that is ultimately where I am.

Mr. Newton said from what I thought I heard a moment ago, really your only concern here is associated with this possibly considered a bid contract because that is the only time that anything like that would even arise, right?

Mr. Baker said it won't be termed as a bid contract. The question will be is this a permissible area for the City to negotiate with these particular entities. And again, all your reasons for it is not, this has nothing to do with it, this is a completely discretionary opportunity that these companies are free to make a business call as to whether they want to take advantage of it or not would be my argument to the contrary.

Mr. Newton said I guess maybe I'm a little confused then because it was my understanding that any restrictions would only be considered in the instance of it being considered or framed as a bid contract, which is what you are saying it is not.

Mayor Lyles said as soon as we have the ability to have in-person conversations, I'm going to have Mr. Newton and Mr. Baker have an hour in advance of the meeting so that we can have these debates offline and have the results online. I know that this is difficult for us to go back and forth, but it is just the virtue of virtual conversations.

Mr. Baker said there is a policy call that you have to make.

Mayor Lyles said I want to say something too; my concern with this report is that I think at some point, on Page 3 it says the recommendations will enable the Aviation Department and it goes through a couple of things. The last one says it is the reference that we make to our Airport, it is on Page 2 and it is under Task Force recommendations number one and it is the item at the bottom. It says in the last part that we want to be the industry-leading low cost per emplaned passenger and I think the issue here is that we have done that and we've done a very good job, but it has had some problems and the problems are generally that we are not seeing the kind of wages that we feel people in this community deserve. Now I don't know how to get through this; its COVID or not, but I think this is a real question and a real debate that we've always been, we're going to be the lowest cost and a lot of our success of being a hub and being able to work with so many really good things about our Airport is because of that. But I think the consequences for some small groups of people need to be resolved. I don't know if it is the insurance issue that we have because I don't think we have a costing for it. I think we've gotten clarity that the Attorney may have some problems with it, but it is not that it's clear. I'm more concerned about what this does operationally and practically. I think we are talking about trying to provide services to people that have come to us and said we are making $8.50 an hour and that is just not right, but I also want to hear from you the impact of doing this and what it requires. Just like any other business that we would work with, if I were going to make this kind of change and I have had to do this in a family business, it is to say I know that this needs to be changed. How do we change it, so it is equitable, fair and also allows the time that nobody fails, that there are no losers in it? Mr. Cagle; I'm going to ask you to address that because we've got to figure something out and it needs to be done with a lens toward equity and fairness and right now I think we are taking advantage of something that we can do right away that helps some people right away and that is where we may end up. At some point, this has got to be more than so, if you will help me on that.

Mr. Cagle said having a lost cost per emplaned passenger in the eight and a half years that I have in Charlotte, that is one of the things that we site for our growth. Is it the end-all, be-all of Airports? It is debatable, I don't know if it is or not. I think that it is clear that the growth in Charlotte, the outsized Airport for the size of the community is because we are a primary hub, and we are a primary hub, one of the reasons is because of our extremely low cost to the airlines. Now, I don't disagree with you, and with the entire Council and with the community when we talk about, we need to have a community that is equitable and fair for everyone. Again, I'm not your attorney, but we have an

obligation to make the Airport available for use by the airlines, that is a federal requirement and we cannot stipulate that with other things. Then the North Carolina law has always been kind of what has been the problem. This is not the first time that I've had a conversation about this with Council or others. We are trying to do our best to project our values which are fairness and equity and higher wages for all; mobility and still maintain all of the great elements of the Airport. With that being said I don't know that this particular issue has an impact on the cost per emplaned passenger, but I will say one of the things that go into this that Mr. Driggs and the entire Task Force talked about was how do we go through this with our concessionaries, this massive downturn like none we've ever seen and we all survive and come out on the other side?

When we start talking about rent relief, at some point it would be the easiest thing to do to say look the rent relief that you agreed to when you signed that contract is exactly what you can have and that is the end of the discussion. But that may mean that some of them don't come out on the other side. So, what we were trying to do was create recommendations and provide information to the Task Force that balanced the airline perspective and the concessionaire perspective, and I understand that we have heard from Unite Here, we continue to hear from Unite Here and from other unions who have employees represented at various places. Employers at the Airport, I understand the concern, and I understand the issue here, I just don't know that I have a solution for it. I think what we were trying to do, or in my mind what I was trying to do was provide them some amount of rent relief that we think protects the Airport and our credit rating, protects the business side of the Airport and the Aviation Department and ultimately the City of Charlotte. It helps the airlines and helps the concessionaries so that we can all survive this crisis.

Mayor Lyles said I understand the crisis and I'm just going to say this; I know that Mr. Winston and Mr. Driggs are going to talk, but the final thing is I don't know where we are going to land when we vote on this, but I would say this Mr. Cagle and Mr. Jones that we have to address this problem of wages at the Airport and I would like for us not to have the standard of low cost but competitive and I would like to see us address – this has just come up way too much and too often for people that are working every day. We either are going to subsidize their housing, we're going to subsidize their food, or we are going to give them enough money to live on and I don't think it is fair because when we are subsidizing all of us that have the fortune to actually support the system that we are subsidizing to me is backwards. If we are going to talk about the value of work, we ought to pay people for it and that we ought not to have people live in governmental subsidies that work hard every day and often that way. So, no matter what happens today I would like to see a plan in the next budget year to address the issue of wages at the Airport and a real platform that starts the discussion the right way. I don't know if the Council will support that or not, but I just feel like this is going in the wrong direction. If it is difficult now in this time and that is why I'm not weighing in on whether or not the Council ought to do that, but at some point, when we come out of this, we have to do the recovery for all, and we've just got to do something about it.

Mr. Winston said I'm speaking to all my colleagues right now. We heard the Attorney tell us that he would like to make recommendations in the affirmative when the issues are tried and true. He is not saying we shouldn't do this, but he is only going to say yes to things that are tried and true and that was in response to Mr. Egleston's question. We also heard the CEO of Charlotte Douglas International Airport say that none of this has been planned or has been considered by folks associated with the Airport. So, there is nothing right now that is tried and true, and to the Mayor's point and to the point that I have brought up many times, several of my colleagues have brought up many times over the years, a change has to come, and if that change doesn't happen now I don't know if it will ever come. I still stand where I am, I'm not going to support this unless we leverage those companies to make their employees whole, now is the time to make those structural changes.

Ms. Ajmera said this is for the Manager; I think you hear loud and clear from my colleagues about our priorities and you have heard our priorities for the past two-years. It is frustrating in many reasons where we cannot do XY and Z. We need to find a way

to make this work and I don't know what that is and I hope that you and your Administration will figure it out, but today you heard from myself and many of our colleagues that we want to see the healthcare benefits for many laid-off workers being included as part of our relief package. I don't know how that can happen legally with the least amount of risk, but I hope that you would bring us forward some alternative, some option where we can address this.

Mr. Driggs said for one I think the terms of employment of a lot of the people we've been hearing from are actually the subject of National Labor Agreements. Is that right Mr. Cagle?

Mr. Cagle said I believe that is correct yes, I believe so but I'm not a legal expert in the National Agreements that have been referenced. I've heard that said.

Mr. Driggs said that was the impression I had in the earlier conversations about American Airlines, so I don't think we are the lowest cost for the emplaned passenger because we are underpaying compared to other airports. Although I agree with the aspiration to maybe rebalance and trade away a little bit of cost for emplaned passengers for better employment conditions. We do need to look at the context of that particular labor market, those employers, and where else they do business. That is something maybe for a discussion later. I was curious to know, the number of $700,000 was kind of tossed out there, is that a monthly figure, an annual figure, or exactly what does that represent?

Mayor Lyles said I think Mr. Newton suggested the number.

Mr. Newton said it is my understanding that that is the whole amount necessary for up to a four-month period to cover the 700 plus employees that have been furloughed and are subject to losing their health insurance next week.

Mr. Driggs said alright, so we are talking about $7 million for a year for the two major concessionaires and for that matter everybody else and I think it could well turn out that if you adjust the numbers you find that by adding a requirement that they pay health benefits they end up worse off accepting any of this. So, that is something we need to determine because there is no point in telling them that they should accept this money and with it an obligation to pay a larger amount out again. The other thing they are entitled under the terms of their existing contracts to certain kinds of rent relief and the contract adjust their dynamic so, I want to make sure also that we are not counting entitlements that they have for a reduction in rent against this cost of healthcare benefits because they could well argue, well I was going to get that anyway, you can't tell me that that money which I was entitled to under the contract is now subject to a commitment from me to pay health benefits. I think basically where we are at the moment is frankly, we are not done yet and the question is how we want to proceed past tonight. I think to put an ironclad requirement into the Council's decision contrary to the 9 to 2 vote of the working group might well turn out to be a big mistake. If there has to be any reference to it, I think it should be in the form of exploration with the intent to follow up by Council.

Mr. Jones said I actually thought this would be the easiest of the three, but I see that this may be a little difficult so, I just want to make sure that there is a general agreement of how tonight would work so the Task Force recommendations will be reported out and this is Item No. 10, and then Council would go to Item No. 12 which is the appropriation of the $154.5 million. I know the Airport money is different, $135 million but some of the things that you heard tonight from the City Attorney will be heard in some of these additional recommendations because as Patrick said earlier the way that the rules and the guidelines are coming down it is not as much specificity as we would like. I say that to say the concept is when you get to Item No. 12 under Action Item A, there would be an addition that basically says you will appropriate the $154.5 million and accept the recommendations of the Task Force. I just wanted to make sure that everybody was aligned with what we are trying to achieve tonight and whether or not that pulls one Task Force recommendation out, I'm not sure, but the concept would be to go through it

this evening, and to Ms. Johnson's point, the issue that popped up at the last Airport Task Force meeting, it was addressed as Mr. Baker tried to give some input but it is reflective of how difficult a balancing act this is with some of the recommendations that have come out of the Task Force.

Mayor Lyles said I just want to make sure that I heard this clear that we have a goal that we want to do this, but we haven't weighed whether or not the people that we also want to help at the Airport would be willing to accept it as a condition, and that would mean that what we are allocating to keep those folks, the sub-contractors to Host viable may end up not being. I think we need some more information and a way to do this. I definitely think we ought to do it, but I don't think the Task Force would want to stop our retailers and concessionaires from having the benefit of a program either. We need to do both of these things, but I just don't know that we are set up as it is presented today to accomplish both. I would love to have some advice from the Council on how to proceed by the time we get to the next item, which is to approve the recommendations. We don't want to have all of that good work and then not be able to help the people that are our concessionaires to be successful in getting their rent reduction. We don't have the cost of that. Let's think about that and when we get to No. 12, we will be ready to come back to it.

Ms. Watlington said just really quickly, I've been in conversation with one of our [inaudible] and I just wanted to go back to the number you asked me for an idea. It looks like all of our [inaudible] have 200 employees or less so 200 employees or less would cover all our [inaudible] and I'm hoping that at the end of tonight we do agree to continue to investigate how we can help the employees that are contractors and sub-contractors, but also recognizing the net cost with very little revenue as to small businesses. I will be on board to support taking the recommendations but also continuing investigation on this particular piece around health insurance.

Housing Task Force Report

Councilmember Graham said first let me take the opportunity to thank for giving me the Committee that has the Housing COVID-19 Task Force. We have a great group of public servants and Renee Johnson and Braxton Winston and Larken Egleston lead a charge as members of the Council and a great group of private citizens working along with us. Lee Cochran with Laurel Street Residential, Kathy Cummings with Bank of America, Fred Dodson with Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership, Kim Graham with Greater Charlotte Apartment Association, Anthony Lindsey who is a Commissioner on the North Carolina Real Estate Commission as well as a broker with Coldwell Banker, Deronda Metz, with the Salvation Army Center of Hope and Connie Staudinger with the Housing Authority, now The Inlivian. This group has been working extremely hard for the past four weeks alongside our staff Pamela Wideman and her staff who have been providing excellent support to the Task Force and making sure that we have all the information that we need moving forward.

We meet every Thursday at 12:00 and we have already met about four times and one of the first things that we did was to understand and know that having public hearings and getting public interest is really important. We really made a conscious effort trying to identify voices in the community through public testimonies to come before the Task Force to lend us their expertise as well as to educate and inform the Task Force on issues that we are dealing with within the community. For example, Anthony Trotman with Mecklenburg County came and talked about what the County is doing regarding homelessness issues and support. Kathryn Sellers with United Way talked about the COVID-19 response fund, which there is a lot of dollars that are being distributed in the community to non-profit organizations, Boots on the Ground, dealing with housing-related issues. We had Assistant Attorney General from Josh Stein's Office came and talked to us about eviction and the stay at home orders relating to hotels and residents and our local judges, Kimberly Best and Elizabeth Trosch talked to us about the eviction process as well as others who have come before the Task Force and will be providing us a sense of direction, information, education, and support.

The first thing that we did was to identify an action plan that was adopted on May 7th and the action plan consist of seven key categories; increasing the supply of affordable housing, financial assistance, evictions, homelessness and supportive services, regulatory and legislative issues, marketing and communications and general affordable housing topics. Each of these topics is being led by a lead from our Task Force who kinds of takes the lead in the kind of helping to develop, shape, and provide recommendations for the Task Force that will be moving forward to the Council. This coming Thursday we will get the first recommendations from the Task Force dealing with the issue of how do we increase the supply of affordable housing? Many of those recommendations will be coming to the full City Council for your consideration and approval, so we are really excited about that and then we will pivot to our second work plan, financial assistance. We are working extremely hard in terms of trying to understand the issue that is happening in our community. It goes without saying that the major issue that we've been talking about from top time and again is the issue of rent relief and mortgage relief, understanding what is going to happen come June 1st when the Courts reopen and the currently 1,800 cases pending before the court, many of them dealing with folks dealing with evictions. Those were two of the major topics that we've been really dealing with and want to again work with the Manager's Office to identify funding recommendations that would help support those two endeavors. Again, planning the recommendations we would like to make, and these are not recommendations from the Task Force, but acknowledging the work plan that the Task Force has adopted and established in trying to identify those resources that would support the goals and objectives of the Task Force. One would be mortgage assistance; this is something that we have heard over and over again and we would like to work with the Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership, as recommended by staff. I think that is a really good recommendation, up to about $8 million for a mortgage and rental assistance. This will go a long way to again, provide the type of relief that people are asking and seeking. We've heard this time and time again and we also would like to make sure that is a system-based approach. We understand and know that there are a number of other organizations, i.e. United Way and others that are putting money into the community regarding mortgage and rent relief and we believe this is a great investment for the Council to make to do our fair share to ensure that our citizens are not being duly impacted in terms of their living space as a result of COVID-19.

You see the chart in front of you in terms of the partner and the vehicle in which we want to work with, the Program Eligibility and the Timeline so I will not read that verbatim but it is clearly outlined what it is that we would like to do, how we would like to get it done and the organizations that we believe that fits those descriptions. I think the staff has made a really good recommendation because it ties in directly with the work plan that the Task Force has already adopted and established. That would be a total of $8 million.

The second would be the Supportive Housing Program. We've time and time again that there is a need for the Council to play a role in homeless support. We have been doing I believe more than our fair share in supporting homeless programs within the community. We understand that this is a County initiative and a City concern. So, the recommendation that has been brought forward which is $2 million to support Urban Ministry and to provide single room occupancy of housing I believe is a great recommendation. It supports and invests in permanent solutions with wrap-around service along with it so, we believe that is a really good investment to make to really demonstrate from the Tasks Force perspective investment in homelessness through the COVID-19 as well as working with the community partner Urban Ministry who has changed their name to A Roof Above to help them fulfill their capital plan funding and to invest in SRO housing so I think that is another recommendation that I believe demonstrates in the right direction. Also, we understand and know that there are some outstanding issues in terms of how these dollars can be utilized and so we are still waiting for additional feedback from the Manager's Office and the Attorney's Office in terms of additional dollars that we believe we would like to invest in the community relating to rehab housing as well as other initiatives that we just need a little bit more time to analyze the documents to make sure that we are making an investment that we could defend if necessary. I think this complies with the Manager's recommendation in

terms of putting the money on the ground right now, $10 million as well as another $10 million that we can invest in the fall.

Lastly, we also talked about the Housing Trust Fund as a Committee and again we are so appreciative of the Council for the vote that we took several weeks ago to invest in that. I also talked about the upcoming November election and the bond referendum and hopefully, we can make a compelling case to go back to the community and demonstrate how responsible we were with the last investment of $50 million to ask the community for their support in November for an additional $50 million. We are looking at how those dollars can be used differently, but we believe that we are at a strong start with a strong Committee with great input from our Councilmembers Johnson, Winston, and Egleston in terms of what we are doing. I will pause at this time to take any questions and I invite the three other Councilmembers if they have any additional comments that they would like to make, now would be an appropriate time to do so.

Councilmember Ajmera said Mr. Graham; I know we had this issue come up for many residents who stay at the hotels or motels who are considered residents because they have stayed there for a longer period of time, they are not considered a guest. Would they be able to apply for rent relief?

Mr. Graham said that would be a staff question so if Ms. Wideman is there, she can answer that.

Mayor Lyles said we will come back to that question when Ms. Wideman comes in; we'll her to respond to that.

Councilmember Winston said I wanted to ask Mr. Graham, you said those recommendations are going to be presented on Thursday?

Mr. Graham said no, these are recommendations that we are making tonight, and as I said earlier, these are recommendations that are not coming from the Task Force which staff has done and I agree with [inaudible] our work plans and we have matched the dollars in our work plan to the recommendations. For example, we talked a lot about rent relief and mortgage relief and so there is $8 million that takes into consideration that recommendation as well as $2 million for homelessness by supporting SRO housing. These are staff recommendations and as I said earlier in our Task Force meeting –

Mr. Winston said where these recommendations made?

Mr. Graham said these are staff recommendations, as I told you at the Task Force meeting, this decision would not be in terms of how the dollars would be utilized but not be made by the Task Force but be recommendations from the staff and the full Council will [inaudible] and so that is what we are doing tonight. The recommendations are consistent with what we said in our Task Force meeting and support our work plan. One, rent relief, two mortgage relief, and three helping out the county related to homelessness by providing supporter service by way of SRO. So, the dollars relate back to [inaudible] that was adopted by the Task Force.

Mr. Winston said I do not remember discussing these specific recommendations any time before tonight. We haven't discussed any of these recommendations in the Task Force. Am I correct in that?

Mr. Graham said you are absolutely right, we didn't and remember what we talked about on the $20 million commitment, I said at the Task Force that that decision was above our pay grade and that we will getting a recommendation from staff and the Council as a whole will determine how the $20 million will be invested based on the recommendations from staff and they are directly correlated to our work plan.

Mr. Winston said so we are being asked to consider recommendations on $20 million of a spend tonight without having discussed this. Is that what I'm tracking?

Mr. Graham said all of the Task Forces making recommendations, not only housing but the Airport and small business in terms of how we would like to invest the money that the Manager is recommending. So, it is just how housing.

Mr. Winston said I know Task Force have been discussing specific [inaudible], I've been shared those documents, but I'm on this Task Force and I have not seen these numbers before. I'm uncomfortable with that, it kind of threw me off real quick.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Winston I think it is $10 million on the information that came out to the Council, it is not $20 million. I think the report says that the Task Force will continue this, but it is not $20 million in the report that we have in front of us.

Mr. Winston said I'm pretty sure the other two Task Forces have voted out their recommendations. We are still in discussion mode because I raised my hand to speak to the preliminary work that is being done around the eviction sub-group. Graham has been leading that and we are working along with the District Court to figure out if there is a way to ramp up the mediation process. We learned that the City actually already has mediation programs with the District Court stood up. We are exploring ways that we can really amplify that once court proceedings start back, but we are still in a very much discussion phase and have not voted on any recommendations or any money behind this. I'm just confused about what we are doing here right now.

Mr. Graham said again, Mr. Winston; the four meetings and the large volume of conversations centered around mortgage relief and rent relief and so we've heard that really loud and clear and I made it a point mentioning to the Task Force if you remember that this decision would be a Council decision and not a Task Force decision and that we would make those recommendations based on the work plan that was adopted by –

Mr. Winston interrupted to say Council hasn't given staff any guidance of the direction we want them to go so how can – who is the staff here?

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Wideman can address Ms. Ajmera's questions and perhaps give us some guidance. This is a recommendation that the Council would vote on, but it would be for the $8 million for rent and mortgage assistance and $2 million for the SRO which addresses the Urban Roof Above strategic plan for putting more people into housing. Ms. Ajmera do you want to restate your question so Ms. Wideman can address it?

Ms. Ajmera said Ms. Wideman; as you may remember we have had several residents who have reached out to us via e-mail and several business owners have reached out to us via e-mail and calls frustrated that there were many residents, I'm talking about the guest, but residents who are considered tenants because they have stayed at the hotels or motels as extended stay for a longer period of time they are considered residents and some of them are not able to pay their rent or their fees, whatever the motel would call it. Can those residents apply for rent relief and the reason I'm asking this question, we have had many residents who have stayed at Days Inn, Extended Stay and so many other locations that they are on the verge of being evicted and you need to take care of those residents or they end up on the street. I need to know whether they can apply for this rent relief program.

Pam Wideman, Director of Housing and Neighborhood Services said Ms. Ajmera; thank you for that question. Let me preface by saying I may have to do some additional follow-up with you on that question. I will remind us that the initial dollars that we put out in both rent relief and mortgage relief were designed to help people who have been impacted due to COVID. Not necessarily to assist people who were in hotels prior to COVID. What the eligibility requirements are to show either a job loss or reduction of income due to the COVID. I will also say that I do recall that there were a couple of names that came over; the Housing Partnership is in the process of reviewing all of the applications that they have. I think they have received about 325 and they are in the

process of reviewing all of those applications. I'm not sure if that answers your questions about the initial round that went out of CARES Act funding. What I would say this funding that we are discussing now also is designed and has to, according to the federal guidance that we've received, has to be for folks who were directly impacted as a result of COVID.

Ms. Ajmera said to follow-up on that; I understand this has to be used for a COVID-19 related issue. There was a story that WSAE did where a couple has stayed at the hotel and they were considered tenant; they were staying at Extended Stay or a similar hotel where both of them had lost their jobs in restaurant and they were staying this motel prior to COVID-10, but they lost their job because of COVID-19. They both worked in the restaurant industry and we know how heavy they are impacted. Would they be able to apply for this relief program?

Ms. Wideman yes ma'am they would be, and I would encourage them to contact the Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership who is administering the funding for it.

Ms. Ajmera said got it. I think there needs to be some sort of guidance for hotel owners and motel owners that if they have residents that are not able to pay their rent because they have been impacted by COVID-19 they refer this resident to Housing Partnership because there are so many people that are in this situation and we have gotten so many e-mails and we do not want to see them end up on the street as soon as eviction starts. I don't know what the process would be like, but I know that in the past Crisis Assistance and other organizations have communicated with small business owners who have provided housing to those families. There needs to be some sort of communication because in rental relief I have also seen it is not clear in terms of the guidance that it is only for folks who live in apartments or folks that also live in other locations whether it is hotel or motels or extended stay lodges etc.

Ms. Wideman said thank you Ms. Ajmera; that is exactly what this round that we are discussing tonight, that will further help us to be able to assist the type of clients that you just described.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I'm trying to be helpful with where we are on this particular Task Force recommendation. It goes back to something that the City Attorney said earlier. These are two programs; the mortgage relief and the rental relief is something that has already been approved. You voted on this from the first batch of CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) funds, so we feel comfortable that these are in line with the guidelines. We believe, and I will use the term believe, that the $2 million for Roof Above may also be within the guidelines, but there are other things that are going on that have been discussed like rehab to houses and things like that that we are just not sure so we tried to take a safe pathway, to begin with, not eating up too much of the resources and understanding, if I got this correct Councilmember Graham, to make sure that there is money out there to address the need that we know through programs that we can defend. This is a policy thing for the Council, but that is why the team came up with some of the recommendations they came up with.

Mr. Graham said I think you are absolutely right Mr. Manager; these are tried and proven policies that we know that the money would be eligible for and this also an immediate need that addressed COVID-19 right now. As I said earlier it has been a topic of this conversation while not a formal vote and again, I told the Task Force that we would not be voting on how the monies would be utilized but will be following what is in our work plan and certainly the work plan talks specifically about rent relief and mortgage relief and other items that need to be vetted by the Attorney's Office.

Mayor Lyles said I don't have any other speakers and I'm assuming that we will be voting on $8 million for the mortgage and rental assistance and we would also be voting for $2 million for a single room occupancy program.

Councilmember Johnson said I'm a little confused; I'm sorry. I am on the Task Force and it is a great Task Force. One of the things we talked about was the eviction

alternative so the City does have a program to mediate evictions through landlords; tenants can make the [inaudible] referral so that is a way to decrease the evictions that are filed in court. That is something we are working on is mediation for the evictions. But as far as this funding I'm confused. I'm confused because Mr. Jones just said something that kind of added to what we were saying before. Mr. Jones, this money that we are looking at tonight; is this what we've already approved? Is that what you just said?

Mr. Jones said yes, Councilmember Johnson; earlier I believe it was in April that $5.7 million of CDBG funds, a portion of those were used for mortgage and rental relief so we know that those are programs that will be acceptable given this additional fund related to the $20 million from this Task Force. This is over and above that.

Ms. Johnson said let me peel back a layer just a little bit. That initial funding was for recipients of the House Charlotte dollars and that is why it was administered through the Housing Partnership. I ask Pam a question via e-mail and I just want to clarify. Pam sent me an e-mail today and said the mortgage assistance program is available to anyone earning 80% below the area median, not just House Charlotte participants, although we are especially interested in working with them to help them avoid foreclosure. So rental assistance program is available to residents residing in City supported properties meaning any property where the City has invested dollars into a housing unit. Were you referring to the $5.7 million or are you referring to this new $8 million also?

Ms. Wideman said yes Ms. Johnson. Thank you for that; my response was referring to the actions that you all took on April 13th around the initial tranche of rental assistance and mortgage assistance. You will recall there was a big discussion about wanting to support the House Charlotte recipients and there was also discussion about not just limiting it to them. I believe the language on the RCA says folks earning 80% and below, including House Charlotte Programs participants. So, that was for the initial $5.7 million that we got before.

Ms. Johnson said so this new money; because I looked on the website and I saw a code I think ERAP (Emergency Rent Assistance Program) or something like that is the code and it is for an approved property. If we are talking about these new dollars, is this open to the general public to apply for rental assistance or are there specific programs or locational requirements?

Ms. Wideman said Ms. Johnson; let me just refer you over to our next steps on Page 6 of the document that you received today. In our next steps, we acknowledge that many residents are grappling with either current or soon to be delinquent mortgage and rent relief so we combined this recommendation with kind of what we've been hearing at your Housing Recovery Task Force meeting, knowing that there are 1,800 pending evictions when the courts will open on June 1st. What we want to do is build on our existing infrastructure with CMHP (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership) but we also want to develop a systems-based approach based on what we are learning to be able to assist more residents coupled with the mediation process that we learned about that CRC (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Community Relations) has so we can assist more people outside of House Charlotte participants and properties that are approved. You will remember Kim Graham on your Task Force, she is the Executive Director of the Apartment Association and she talked about how there are landlords out there who have NOAH (Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing) properties that are being used for affordable and so how do we continue to work with those folks to keep them housed as well. So, this is over and above our initial allocation.

Ms. Johnson said again, I'm sorry; is this rent relief for the general public or are there requirements that they live in certain properties?

Ms. Wideman said no ma'am. At this point, the biggest requirement would be for folks earning 80% and below. That is why if you will see on our timeline, again the information that you received, the anticipated timeline on Page 6, we really want to work with our partners to establish what those expanded guidelines will be.

Mayor Lyles said I'm going to see if I can say this back to you Pam; the $8 million is to model, but expand beyond what we had before and to bring in more people, but the requirements are it has to be COVID related loss and you have to be low to moderate-income to qualify, and you have to live in the City of Charlotte. That is what I hear but I hear the other $10 million needs to come back after we get an idea about how these evictions work. Is that correct?

Ms. Wideman said that is right, and more clarification about how we can use the money.

Mayor Lyles said that helped me a lot. Thank you.

Mr. Graham said that is consistent with the discussions that we were having in our Task Force meeting so I think all the issues that we brought up over the first four meetings, those dollars can be applied to take care of some. I'm a little confused that folks aren't more excited because we are doing exactly what you said you wanted us to do.

Mayor Lyles said does anyone else want to speak to the Housing Report?

Ms. Johnson said Ms. Wideman also said that individuals who are living in hotels could apply for this funding. During the Housing Task Force meeting it was stated that the individuals in the hotels are considered homeless and that is a County issue, so are we stepping back to say now that the City will assist individuals who are permanent residents in need of assistance paying their hotel fee?

Ms. Wideman said Ms. Johnson; what I heard Ms. Ajmera say, and what I responded to was, if someone needs assistance who was in a hotel who has lost their job due to a COVID related issue that they could be assisted. Again, the funds have to be used for folks who are impacted due to COVID related issues. We recall that again, we've not been through this and when we first started having our Task Force meetings back in April, we had not talked about this tranche of funding. We were referring to the CDBG dollars that we received and what that program was designed to do.

Ms. Johnson said that is really different than what we had been advised before any other time before tonight, from the City Manager, from the Housing Task Force, so if that needs to be corrected this is the time to put that on record. If we are going to be assisting residents of hotels that is great news. Thank you.

Ms. Ajmera said Ms. Wideman addressed my concerns, so I'm good. Thank you.

Mr. Winston said again, this feels like new information; this action and this recommendation are based on a vote that Council took already, and you think you have all the guidance that you need to make recommendations. Is that correct?

Mayor Lyles said you are you directing your question to?

Mr. Winston said, Mr. Jones or Ms. Wideman. This is staff recommendations based on a vote from April?

Mr. Jones said yes, Mr. Winston. For the most part, there were a number of questions around what we can do with this money and trying to get to tonight where the Council was going to discuss different recommendations. All we tried to put forward is what we thought, one there was a need and two, something that could be defended.

Mr. Winston said if it is based on a vote from April what have we been spending 90-minutes each Thursday doing? Is it just a show or are we in here to do the work to figure out how to get through this?

Ms. Wideman said Mr. Winston; let me see if I can address this better. On April 13th or April 23rd, you all approved CDBG dollars for rent relief and for mortgage relief. You had a limited amount of dollars, you approved that relief for City supported properties and

rental properties. That is where the City had invested money in, and you also approved mortgage relief for a group of people. We started the Task Force, we heard that the need is immediate, so we needed to do something immediately and we also learned that we have a huge number of pending evictions and so there needs to be more help out there. We also learned through the Task Force again from Kim Graham, that we needed to look broader about who we were assisting, not just folks who were living in City assisted properties. You've got a lot of private landlords who are doing good work and they need some assistance so that is the thinking that went into; okay, now we have more dollars to work with let us expand on the existing infrastructure that we put in place with the Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership to try to address the Task Force concerns and to be immediate and to help more people. We know that people will need help through this crisis for a long time with both rental and mortgage. The last thing I will say is this new round of funding allows us to take into consideration all the great work that our partners like Crisis Assistance and the United Way Board are doing to really try to leverage this funding throughout our community, the City of Charlotte, for the long-term. So, we don't have all of the particulars built out, but we do know, based on what we are hearing that there is going to be a longer need for both rental and mortgage and also to try to continue to partner with the County improving social distance in shelters to get this SRO going. So, again that is what we talked about for 90-minutes in the first four meetings. We are trying to again, you heard me say a lot of times, building this plane as we go so, we are trying to be immediate and we are trying to be responsive to your concerns and to the needs of the community.

Mayor Lyles said what I'm hearing is that Mr. Winston feels like while this general guidance has occurred and we are getting this report done that he doesn't really feel like the Committee had an opportunity to vote yes/no and it has been pulled from the dialogue but not necessarily does he feel like it is something that entire Committee suggested and recommended out. That is what I'm hearing.

Mr. Winston said you are absolutely correct.

Mr. Graham said but again, I'll make one point because my head is about to explode. I said that we informed the Committee about what we were about to do as a Committee $50 million, we informed the Committee that the Committee would not be making any recommendations, that this would be a Council decision and informed the Committee that we would use the work plan to help staff guide those decisions. It was loud and clear on many levels over three meetings that rent relief and mortgage relief was the direction that we needed to go from the Task Force members and the public speakers that came before the Task Force.

Mr. Winston interrupted to say you had two Councilmembers that disagreed.

Mr. Graham said I'm speaking. He said and so that is what we did. We were very consistent, we were very intentional, and we are literally giving you guys what you said you wanted. I'm just a little, and maybe because it is late, and it has been a long day.

Mayor Lyles said it has been a long day but let me say this; I can understand what both of you are saying. I think perhaps I may not have been as clear in saying tonight that we would like to have the recommendations, but I do hope that if people could get comfortable with the description and knowing that the Task Force still has to come back and address the issue of mortgage and rent for the evictions that we are headed in the right direction based upon your dialogue. It is just the formal kind of wrapping it up and I may not have been clear in sufficiently saying that this is what we would be doing tonight. I hope that we will give the grace to process sometimes even though I may have not gotten there and that we are ready to move forward, but if there is any reluctance on this from the remainder of the Council or any of the Councilmembers, we will that in a few minutes as we go forward on the agenda item.

Ms. Johnson said I just want to say that I agree with Mr. Winston. I'm sorry Mr. Graham, but at the Task Force, it was not clear that actual numbers were going to be presented tonight.

Mr. Graham said you know we talked about this as a Council and the $50 million was no secret.

Mayor Lyles said maybe I didn't make it clear that we were going to have this for a vote tonight with the numbers. I asked for the grace because we urgently need to spend this COVID money, it has a deadline and so if we could work around that, that would be great. I'm ready to go to the next report which is Small Business Recovery.

Small Business Task Force Group

Councilmember Eiselt said I'm going to get us started and then I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Mitchell for details after this. The Small Business Recovery Task Force is made up of Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Mitchell, and myself and then we have some incredible people from the Small Business Community and from the Business Community in Charlotte who has been helping and giving us guidance. That is Sarah Baucom with Girl Tribe, Malcomb Coley with Ernst & Young, Dave Matthews from Bank of America, Vinay Patel, SREE Hotels, Chad Turner with LGBT Chamber of Commerce, Mark Vitner with Wells Fargo and DeAlva Wilson with the Business Advisory Committee. We really tried to get a representation of folks in the Committee on the whole spectrum of businesses. We really appreciate all the work that they did, and we also took a lot of phone calls and e-mails. We had a dedicated e-mail line and e-mail address for small business owners to give their input as well. We met once a week, on Tuesday mornings and we put forth a proposal for what we are calling two phases, Survive and Thrive Business Recovery Plan. That is in conjunction with a couple of efforts that have already started. Staff under the amazing leadership of Tracy Dodson and Holly Eskridge have put together the City of Charlotte Open for Business Initiative which launched April 17th. That created a comprehensive digital platform that is connecting small local businesses with residents who want to support them and let them know that they are open for business, under what conditions they are, and they are out there. Then as you all know the Council did agree back it feels like five years ago, but it was last month to allocate $1 million of our existing CDBG money to a micro business grant program and that LISC ((Local Initiatives Support Corporation) is administering. To carry on with that, as I mentioned, we developed the Survive and Thrive phases to help our small business community and we focused on businesses that have employees of 25 or less and that most likely did not, for whatever reason, have access to the CARES Act funding. So, we really wanted to help those businesses out there that have needed a little bit of, not just direct funding, but also programmatic support to get up and running so they can let their customers know that they are open for business. I'm going to let Mr. Mitchell talk about the first part of that, the survive access to capital program then I'll mention the partner support program and I just want to emphasize that those are the two main parts of the program that we are really asking for you guys to support tonight. The rest of it we are going to make references to with regards to the thrive program which is talent development, business innovation, business incubation, and while we have set aside monies allocated for those programs nothing is set in stone. We really just want to get the $35 million, which is the first phase of this program allocated, but in particular for these first two buckets of money. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Mitchell.

Councilmember Mitchell said to me just follow-up; as Ms. Eiselt mentioned, we spent a lot of time in Task Force on access to capital. We heard a couple of things back in April that there was a need for urgency to help our small businesses in our community. Our project description, Access to Capital, includes a $30 million grant to our small businesses throughout the City of Charlotte. A Piedmont rising non-profit organization found that only 2.5% of North Carolina small businesses received funding through the PPP (Paycheck Protection Program) Program. So, our Access to Capital will focus on two different categories, businesses with less than five employees; they get to apply up to $10,000. Businesses with employees six to 25, a maximum will be $25,000 and we wanted to prioritize those businesses in the City of Charlotte. One, those who did not receive any federal funding; two, did not receive any state funding or three, did not

receive any funding from our first initial $1 million of our CDBG funds, provided to the Micro Business Relief Fund.

It was clear from our discussion we wanted to make this totally easy for small businesses to apply. One thing we heard loud and clear was that sometimes the application information required was so intimidating. So, we came up with a menu of options to make it easy for our small businesses. There are a couple of documents that we would like for them to have. Here are the options; a schedule C from 2018 tax return, a lease agreement with their business name, a mortgage statement with their business name, a bank statement with their business name, an IRS letter with their EIN number, a profit and loss statement, a balance sheet, a certificate of insurance with business name and sales and use tax reports for Mecklenburg County. Once again, I would really like to thank Ms. Ajmera because she talked about from her experience someone preparing taxes that some of the things, we need to make very easy for small businesses to be able to obtain without spending extra cost to apply for our funding. I'm excited about the work we did. I think it sends a strong message tonight that the Small Business Task Force really believes in our small business community and it is the first step in our survival to really get money out there in our community to our small businesses.

Ms. Eiselt said thanks, Mr. Mitchell. The other part of that in addition to the $30 million is a $2 million allocation that we are going to use for small business partner support grant and what those are is that is open to any organization that has a plan to help Charlotte small businesses that fit into the same category that we are trying to help with the Access to Capital Program, but it might be done in a different way. So, it would be done in a way that the direct grant or Access to Capital Program cannot accomplish. Again, that is open, we don't have the specifics out yet as to what the requirements would be, but it would be more us saying this is your criteria, let us know what you would like to do. We are trying to make it easy.

The other portions of the program, and again that is what we are really hoping that Council can get behind tonight are those two pieces and the $250,000 which is the Open for Business platform, again I mentioned once, but I have to reiterate how helpful and how much work Tracy Dodson and her team have done and Holly Eskridge on this program and we thank them for that. The $250,000 is to really build out that Open for a Business platform as the City's portal for information and for connection for small businesses. In addition to that we tried to share, we kind of split all the Councilmembers and tried to get this information to you on a timely basis, but I know it probably came a little bit late, but the remaining buckets that we've identified are an intensive career cohort program that would focus on paid training and work-based learning experiences with guaranteed job placements and a focus on high growth industries and we're going to set aside for $1.5 million for that; $750,000 which would be for workforce development support and that would be working with partners and providers to sort of a revision of our Project P.E.A.C.E. or a continuation of our Project P.E.A.C.E. program. Then the other area is a Business to Business Accelerator Program. Councilmember Bokhara has done a lot of work on that and that will also be a platform that is meant to help a lot of different businesses in the community through a cohort of businesses who can give them some technical digital assistance and I'm not going to try to wade into waters that I don't know enough about, but we've set aside $500,000 for that. Again, these are still programs that we are building out, so we are just asking you to approve those buckets and there is flexibility in that. We can come back and work on that, but with that, we really are asking for your support. I don't know if Ms. Ajmera or Mr. Bokhari want to add anything to the work that we've done.

Councilmember Bokhari said I will just add one point other than obviously, thanking all of you as well. When you look at the $30 million buckets as it relates to, and you will see that we purposefully used the words Access to Capital. We want to be very proactive and transparent to the community. There are somethings that we still have to figure out in order to deploy this capital because the federal funds come with a timeline and its own limitations and we reside under State Statute that also has limitations that are at a bit of odds with each other right now. We've been in deep conversations with the City

Attorney on this and we've come to a simple conclusion that our small businesses disparately need this Access to Capital in our community and we are going forward designing the program, allocating an amount of money and then we will move into next phases after this of choosing our partners for administrative elements and things like that, but there is a big question that still has to be solved in order for us to understand can this take the form of grants or loans or some other things. We just want to be real transparent with everyone that we understand that still a bit of a hanging chad out there, however, we also understand that we are not the only group right now that is in this situation. The County is experiencing something similar, the state themselves are experiencing something similar so we feel very confident that as a team we can all come together and address this and figure it out, but in the meantime, we are going to continue on and make sure that there is nothing holding us back as an organization getting to a point where we understand how these funds are going to be deployed than hopefully, that will have solved itself in parallel. I think it is important for us to note that it is indeed an ongoing item in our critical path that we are very much cognizant of.

Councilmember Ajmera said I was just going to add just so that we are being objective and fair in our partnership, whether it is clear cohorts or small business [inaudible] that there will be an evaluation criterion, and that will be open to everyone to apply. If you had an organization or anyone reaches out to you who is interested in applying for this partnership, it is open to everyone. I just wanted to make sure, we have gotten some requests about that so please let them know that it is open or all organizations.

Ms. Eiselt said with that, we would of course, we would like our colleague's comments on the deployment of Phase I of the $35 million, but I would like to make a motion that we adopt round one of the COVID Relief Budget for small businesses and workforce for the $35 million allocated in the following areas. The $250,000 Open for Business, $30,000 million for small business Access to Capital, $2 million for small business Partner Support Program Access to Capital, $1.5 million for the intensive care career cohort, $750,000 for workforce development support and $500,000 for the Small Business Support Program.

Mayor Lyles said We've got 12 speakers to speak on this topic. We have to have a motion I hoped that we may do all three of them at the same time. If we could go to agenda item # 12.

Mr. Bokhari said second.

Mayor Lyles said okay. I want to say we still have speakers here. So, I'm going to read the actions and so that the speakers will know what we are talking about if they have been listening. To adopt a budget ordinance appropriating $154 million plus from the Corona Virus Relief Fund provided by the Corona Virus Aide Relief, Economic Security Act, CARES Act, and the COVID Stimulus Fund, and accept the Charlotte Recovery Task Force Reports, for the Aviation Department, Housing, and Small Businesses that's outlined by the task forces. Authorize the City Manager to execute the necessary contracts and agreements related to those recommendations and the funds.

Motion was made by Councilmember Eiselt, seconded by Councilmember Bokhari, to adopt round one of the COVID Relief Budget for small businesses and workforce for the $35 million allocated in the following areas: $250,000 Open for Business, $30,000 million for small business Access to Capital, $2 million for small business Partner Support Program Access to Capital, $1.5 million for the intensive care career cohort, $750,000 for workforce development support and $500,000 for the Small Business Support Program.

There was not a vote on this motion.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 12: CORONAVIRUS RELIEF FUNDS

Charis Blackmon, 6437 Terrace View Court said I come before you as a lifelong Charlotte resident and the Executive Director of the Westside Community Land Trust, but most importantly as a community member with relationships and experiences with some of our communities most vulnerable residents. During COVID-19 I have witnessed the exacerbation of challenges among vulnerable groups of people, specifically housing challenges like that of the Days Inn resident and the thousands of residents that are facing impending displacement as the eviction moratorium is lifted largely due to the economic implications of COVID-19. While I acknowledge and appreciate the allocation of the first wave of CARES Act funding that is assisting with homelessness prevention and affordable housing efforts, I would like to suggest that a portion of the $155 million of federal COVID response funds be provided to support a strategy that prevents displacement, both for renters and homeowners while also re-appropriating land and space for permanent affordability.

The Westside Community Land Trust employees has empirically proven a model that stabilizes communities, protect families during market fluctuation, generates welfare families with limited income, addresses racial inequities and access stable housing and homeownership, and creates affordability and perpetuity, the only model of its kind in all of Charlotte Mecklenburg. We would like to partner with the City in response to shorter-term housing challenges exacerbated by COVID in a strategic way that also supports a much larger, longer-term impact. We are uniquely positioned as a resilient city with a resilient budget to support the creation of resilient communities. We have a strategy that I will be submitting to you and the Recovery Task Forces Housing Committee in the coming days and hope that we can leverage this opportunity to emerge from this COVID-19 pandemic in a more equitably and resilient and inclusive way. I appreciate your time and thoughtful consideration.

Clifton Castelloe, 2630 Country Club Lane said I currently serve as the President of the Plaza/Midwood Merchants Association. We've been watching the City Council meetings and the meetings of the small Business Recovery Task Force for weeks and we've been anxiously awaiting this day and the outcome of tonight's vote on the Small Business Recovery Task Force proposal of $30 million towards small business grants. Plaza/Midwood feels great pride in our history of supporting small businesses. We are a place where small businesses can take root and thrive. The original Family Dollar Store, Pic & Pay Shoes, W. T. Harris opened his first grocery store on Central Avenue and there are many other examples like the Common Market, Midwood Smoke House. Small businesses are not just a secondary feature, but they are an essential part of what makes Charlotte such a vibrant, welcoming City. They define our neighborhoods and it is vital and appropriate that they have a strong singular voice before City, County, and State governments. This is why we in Plaza/Midwood have united with similar organizations to represent small businesses and small business owners in the formation of the Charlotte Small Business Coalition.

The grant relief proposal that is before you tonight represent a very real and necessary lifeline for Charlotte small businesses that employ thousands of residents and influence the quality of life in every neighborhood of the City. We urge you to provide relief now during this survive phase, but also to reserve substantial grant funding during this last phase as well so that every small business can feel that their City is behind them and what will be an ongoing fight for survival. Just because we are entering Phase 2 of opening it doesn't mean that things are solved for our small businesses in Plaza/Midwood and across the City, businesses are making up for lost revenue due to a required closure. Thank you so much for all you've done to get us to this critical point and to you our City Council, Madam Mayor, and City staff I want to express our appreciation from all the small businesses on the Central Avenue Corridor.

Michelle Castelloe, 2008 Commonwealth Avenue said kudos to your stemma for these calls; I've been with you since 4:30 and my children are surprised that we are just speaking now. While I'm speaking on behalf of small businesses, I am married to the guy that just spoke. We own a small business in Plaza/Midwood, and we actually

operate both as a small business with under 25 employees and also as micro-business as a landlord to three small businesses within our own building. These grants, I can't say enough about how much it means to me as a business owner, our community and Plaza/Midwood to know that the City is pushing to support and taking a stance against turning only towards big business to be supportive of, but really standing behind small business and making us feel like we are in a place where we will be supported, hired by and patronized by our City members from all around different parts of the City. I just want to say thank you for getting us to this point. These grants are so important, the last thing any small business needs is a loan to have to repay and get themselves out of an already really dire situation. Thank you for your time tonight, I'll keep it quick and appreciate all you've done so far.

Jim "Doc" Foster, 2801 Selwyn Avenue said my friends call me "DOC" because I'm a Professor at Queens. First of all, thank you so much for your service in these precedent times and I may be a little different from some of the other speakers in that we don't actually qualify for any of these grants, but for we do qualify for is loving Charlotte and wanting to lean in and support small businesses. We have had the privilege of operating a little pub restaurant in Myers Park for 30-years, will be June 16th, and I want to support people that have similar dreams that are doing a great job in the community and I also want to offer the support with the blessing of Business Dean Rick Matthew. Of all the resources in the [inaudible] School Business on a volunteer basis to help any businesses that need help in crafting or recrafting business plans to make it. We want everybody to make it and unless we all make it, we don't get Charlotte back. I'll make your evening just a little shorter, thank you so much for your service. I have never been more optimistic about the people that I've met, and Charlotte is coming back.

Hollis Nixon, 3409 Ritch Avenue said I am currently helping with the Charlotte Small Business Coalition. Previously, I was the President of the NODA Neighborhood and Business Association and volunteered for my neighborhood and my City for 15-years. So, thank you to the Small Business Recovery Task Force. I am a woman and small business with less than five employees here in Charlotte and my Concrete Shop is located in an opportunity corridor. My business recently became a Certified SBE with the City of Charlotte. I had to temporarily close our doors for about a month. Though we are back up and running now and it became a full-time job applying for loans and grants out there, but most grants available are national with a small possibility of getting awarded. There are costs to apply with no full-time bookkeeper or accountant or lawyer. Those that were lucky to receive loans are now facing loan debt had to for self-preservation, but most people were not that fortunate, and many small businesses have been shut down entirely, so I urge Council to vote tonight in favor of allocating the grant money outlined by the Task Force. It will give many the lifeline that is so desperately needed and needed now. Months may seem short in the long-term, but it has been a crippling lifeline to a small business owner.

Bruce Nofsinger, 2205 Charlotte Drive said I took on the topics Education here in Charlotte nearly 25-years ago. I'm also part of the Charlotte Small Business Coalition. I want to thank the Council and the Small Business Recovery Task Force for focusing efforts on assisting small businesses like mine. Thank you for the opportunity to share my perspective insight with you this evening. The assistance grants are vital for surviving. The plan recommended by the Task Force and endorsed by the Charlotte Small Business Coalition is a fantastic approach to enable surviving and then spur thriving. Even absent a global pandemic being in business for 25-years requires to evolve and even pivot when certain circumstances dictate. All successful businesses do that but especially small businesses. We are nimble, we anticipate and react to needs and changes in the market place. Like my company, so many others in the small business community may change aspects of their business, but they stay in Charlotte, even if it is in six of seven different office spaces over 25-years. You know it is kind of funny to think about that because when I was at Davidson in the late '80s I did not see myself living in Charlotte. Now I can imagine being anywhere else. The plan that you must vote on tonight to provide grants and to facilitate collaboration and innovation in and among Charlotte's ecosystems embodies what I love about Charlotte. We had an inner connectedness and I'm confident that the efforts will both benefit and benefit from

the inner connected nature of Charlotte. Here is how I look at it, the Charlotte Small Business Community is like a tapestry of diverse threads that were woven together with a strong and beautiful form and function, but I can't overemphasize this, being inner connected and possessing entrepreneurial grit and ingenuity are not enough to weather this COVID storm.

Uday Vedre, 1076 Lake Forest Drive said it has been a long day tonight so, I am representing Carolina Business Alliance which is an organization that has formed in the last five weeks to ensure like most of us, our [inaudible] businesses and [inaudible] businesses are able to sustain and survive and sustain during this time. So, we finally have them in finding ways so most minorities and woman base businesses in this tough time and in crisis times. Tonight, I'm here as we are working with Charlotte Small Business Coalition to support this small business grant program and we appreciate if you guys can award this help the small businesses survive and sustain in our City.

J'Tanya Adams, 309 Lima Avenue said Mayor, greetings to you and the rest of Council; thank you so much for the opportunity to speak on behalf of our small businesses. Tonight, I want to definitely lift up minority-owned businesses and women-owned businesses and I want to definitely say that we appreciate, and we being the Historic West End Partners, being a part of the Greater West Collaborative which includes Ms. Regina Keyo from Swann, Melissa Gaston from [inaudible] Ricky Hall from West Boulevard and of course myself for the Historic West End Partners. We have teamed together with the Charlotte Small Business Coalition chaired by Chad Turner. So, thank you all for your leadership. I want to thank Councilmember James Mitchell for his great leadership with the Greater West, he's been meeting with us pre-COVID for many, many months and so what I want to bring to our attention is the West End alone has 108 businesses on our roster and that doesn't include the other three corridors. They are suffering. We know where they were pre-COVID and we know that they were not able to access a lot of the other programs because they did not have the capital to leverage these reimbursable programs that we have. I ask that you please approve the amount that has been asked for so that we may move them forward. They have rents, utilities, and of course the taxes that are high. Gentrification and the OZ fund has caused a lot of other issues. We need our beat our front-loaded so that we will be able to support and train them so, I think you Ms. Eiselt for saying that we can leverage other support entities because the Business District Organization Program is an excellent avenue urban main and so we need these things front-loaded so we can level set and help them to use the monies that you are going to give them, I think to grant them. I appreciate in advance that you will do that so we can show them how to leverage, level set, and be in a position to thrive even though they were in deeper cesium than many of their colleagues. Thank you again for your support.

Pape Ndiaye, 1215 Thomas Avenue said thanks for everything, and thank you for your leadership, and thank you for our Councilmembers. I am the oldest owner-operated business in the Plaza/Midwood, and we have in our 24-years and haven't seen anything like this in this challenging time. Tonight, it is important for the City Council to vote and approve the $30 million in grant funding for small businesses. We want to thank the Charlotte Small Business Coalition for their work in the small Business Task Force for their proposal. Please say yes and yes and vote in favor of providing this needed assistance to our small businesses.

Coretta Livingston, 6329 Nature Walk Drive said thank you for allowing me to speak. I am a small business owner, a mother, and a taxpayer and I just appreciate the opportunity. I would also like to thank Mr. Mitchell, Ms. Eiselt, Ms. Ajmera, and Mr. Bokhari for your support with the Recovery Task Force. I have three businesses that I've owned for more than 10-years and as a business owner, we need the grants to sustain our business. I personally have been impacted by losing my job at Radio One. I was there for eight years and loved it. It is hard to get up at 6:30 in the morning to do my job and come and run your own businesses after you get off work, but that is what I do. I am in the process of closing one of my businesses due to COVID just because I have applied for so many services and I have not gotten any money to help me. I also want to thank the Historic West End Partners and the Charlotte Small Business Coalition which

represents more than 200 businesses combined in different groups and helping to keep us sustained in this. Most of us have not gotten any funding so please consider passing this bill for our small business and it is imperative that we get this assistance grant and it needs to be a grant. We really don't need to incur any additional debt in this uncertain time and again I appreciate you and thank you so much for allowing me the opportunity to speak on behalf of small businesses.

Renetta Powell, 2206 Beatties Ford Road said thank you for this opportunity to speak. I am a black female small business owner, also president of Historic West End Business Advisory. We tonight, are seeking help from the City for small and micro-businesses. My retail/wholesale store is called West End Fresh Seafood Market, fresh from the sea to you. We are located in the Historic West End Corridor at 2206 Beatties Ford Road. We are a legacy business that has been operating for 22-years. We've seen property values surge due to gentrification, opportunity zone buy-in and on top of that property taxes increased 70%. We already could not leverage the City's grant programs because it was a reimbursement match and now COVID-19. Our industry has been hit hard. Food supplies costs are through the roof. Having to purchase extra supplies, gloves, masks, and labor for cleaning, and don't mention mortgages, rent, utility, and other expenses. Small businesses need the support and financial help of the City so we can continue to survive and thrive. We provide services to the community, we employ members of the community; the support of the City is essential to our existence.

Michael Comer, 3125 Maywood Drive said I appreciate your time. I'm a sports photographer; my company covers events all over the eastern half of the United States. I hire about a dozen freelance photographers each year. I'm also a photo finisher. My studio's in-house lab had its own production, but the bigger plan is to open our lab up to service other professionals across the nation. I rent 6,000 square feet for a lab and what is becoming low-so. At the time COVID arrived, I was employing two people at the lab with plans to expand to about 15. Our business has been devastated by forced shut-downs. The YMCA of America, for example, canceled events that have run continuously since 1947. From the span of March 6 to 8th I lost about $100,000 in revenue from cancellation nationwide, leaving both our free-lance photographers and our local production team completely without work. For me, relief has been exceedingly hard to come by. I missed the EIDL, my PPP, I barely qualified for under inner and final guidance and that is possibly going to be overturned in which case that relief is going to become a loan. I'm still waiting to hear from my LISC grant application. Rent in particular is a major burden. Unlike at the Airport or housing discussed earlier, the only options my landlord was willing to discuss involves their being paid in full over time. Time relief even only comes with a landlord option to give me notice to vacate. That is why I am in favor of grants. Forced to close, killing revenues, but I'm not getting relief from my major expenses. Keep in mind that rent can only be 25% of my PPP. How can I take out more debt when Duke Energy, credit cards, Verizon, my landlord, other vendors are being made whole? Where is the shared burden? Rents fix this. I would gladly hand grant money over to big businesses, but I would prefer to close before going further into debt to do it.

Mayor Lyles said I think we got a really good grounding with your description of your work and what you are doing. I can't imagine a more enjoyable job than photographing a lot of great sportspeople.

Motion was made by Councilmember Eiselt, seconded by Councilmember Bokhari, to (A) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9806-X appropriating $154,549,215.90 from the Coronavirus Relief Fund provided by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) in the COVID Stimulus Fund, and accept the Charlotte Recovery Task Force Reports for implementation and (B) Authorize the City Manager to execute any necessary contracts and agreements related to the Coronavirus Relief Fund.

Councilmember Newton said I would like to offer a substitute motion Madam Mayor. I believe it would portion B on this motion so, correct me if I'm wrong on this Mr. Manager.

A substitute motion was made by Councilmember Newton, seconded by Councilmember Johnson, to take recommendation #7 in the Airport Task Force Recommendation to set that one aside to single that out for deferral so that the substance of the conversation we had earlier, those questions, any possibilities or redrafting that subject to the conversation can be thoroughly vetted and brought back. Later in the meeting this substitute motion was retracted.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I think what Mr. Newton is asking is to instead of adding F to item #7, just pull Item #7 completely, vet it and bring it back?

Mr. Newton said yes sir, so deferral on #7 within the Airport Task Force recommendation so that we can discuss it further as a Council, have questions answered, and possibly redraft it pursuant to those discussions.

Councilmember Eiselt said can I just get a clarification on Mr. Newton's request or substitute motion? Would that limit us in any way if we approved Item B as is so the Manager could at least start working on contracts?

Mayor Lyles said I thought that Mr. Newton was saying only on the Airport Economic Recovery Group, on Page 3, there is a #7 and he is asking to come back with #7 which has a, b, c, if you've got the report in front of you, it is about to continue to work with both prime concessionaries contract holders and their concessionary partners to provide rent relief where feasible, legally, operationally and financially. Current items under consideration, and there is a list. Earlier Mr. Newton had suggested that we add the health insurance provision that has been discussed and he is now asking that we take Item #7 on Page 3 and not approve that but bring that back after some more review by the Airport Port Task Force. Did I restate that correctly Mr. Newton?

Mr. Newton said yes ma'am, and by Council, so we can all further wrap our heads around it.

Mayor Lyles said do you want it to come back for Council discussion or do you want it to go back to the Task Force first?

Mr. Newton said I don't know where we are with the Task Forces. This is one item I think maybe in kind of a smaller singular item, maybe it is better steered to come back to us as a Council.

Mayor Lyles said it is your call; how is your motion to bring it back to Council, is that your substitute?

Mr. Newton said yes, I would ask that it be brought back to Council.

Councilmember Winston said is this substitute motion, are we going to vote on just that #7 or is that for A and B plus the addition of what Mr. Newton added?

Mayor Lyles said the substitute motion would add that as an addition form Mr. Newton and has been seconded by Ms. Johnson. We will vote on the substitute motion first.

Mr. Winston said I will tell you what I want to do; I want to separate the Task Force Recommendations into each three because I would like a chance to look at the Housing Task Force recommendations of the Housing Task Force.

Councilmember Bokhari said a second.

Mayor Lyles said wait a minute, I'm trying to hear what Mr. Winston said. Mr. Winston; would you restate what you would like to accomplish?

Mr. Winston said I want to accept the funds, but I want to vote on the Task Force recommendations separately.

Mayor Lyles said I don't know it is phased out like that. I couldn't hear what he was saying at the end.

Mr. Bokhari said he would like to accept the funds in one motion and then have three separate votes for each thing that was presented. We already have one motion and a second on the floor for one of them.

Mayor Lyles said I think we have a substitute motion on the floor, we can't do another substitute motion.

Mr. Newton said I will retract my substitute motion Madam Mayor, to consider Mr. Winston's substitute motion and then re-raise mine in that section.

Mayor Lyles said just for the record Mr. Newton has withdrawn his substitute motion. Mr. Winston you are recognized to make a substitute motion.

A substitute motion was made by Councilmember Winston, seconded by Councilmember Bokhari, to accept the Coronavirus Relief Funds in one motion and have three separate motions that deal with each Task Force Recommendation.

Councilmember Driggs said I was going to comment on the Airport recommendation so I think we need to know the outcome of this action in which case I would talk about it when it comes up for a vote.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Bokhari; do you want to speak to the substitute motion?

Mr. Bokhari said no I would just to like Mr. Winston's motion approved because there is no other way to do this and I'm quite frankly shocked and surprised with all the planning we put into this coming into today that this has been executed in the fashion that it has where this should be a no-brainer where each one gets to present and I don't know how we got here. So, please let's just move forward and vote on Mr. Winston's before this gets any more bungled.

Mayor Lyles said we have to vote on the substitute motion to vote on each one separately. It would be an A, B, C, D motion.

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

Mayor Lyles said the first item is to adopt a Budget Ordinance appropriating the CARES Act fund.

The vote was taken on Item A and was recorded as unanimous.

Mayor Lyles said the next item would be to accept the Aviation Task Force Report recommendations.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, to accept the Aviation Task Force Report.

Without a second, the motion was not considered.

Motion was made by Councilmember Newton, seconded by Councilmember Egleston, to approve with the exception of Recommendation #7, which will be deferred to the entire Council.

Mayor Lyles said deferred to discuss the issues raised in a prior discussion?

Mr. Newton said yes.

Mr. Driggs said I'm concerned that we should really hear from the Airport Director what the effect is of removing #7. I thought the best cure for the issue raised by Mr. Newton was to include a provision that said we would continue to work on the issue of health insurance and make a decision about whether or not to require health insurance as a condition for these other things. The items covered in #7 have been the subject of lengthy negotiations and I think we achieve the same purpose by just saying that Council will discuss the question of whether or not to require health insurance as a condition to these items and put that in instead of taking #7 out in its entirety.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Newton; was that your intention to take #7 out in its entirety?

Mr. Newton said yes it was my intention to take it out.

Mayor Lyles said he has made a motion to do so; I guess there could be a substitute motion, but I think Mr. Driggs has asked Mr. Cagle to address the concern if we take to delay or defer A, B, C, D, and E as recommended in the Airport Economic Recovery Program. I hope all of you can read those things because I don't know; do you have that material in front of you? It is to allow the concessionaries to determine operating hours during the crisis and recovering; to waive annual certified audit requirements for FY2020 and allow them to submit annual statements from their CFO or CEO; adjust annual revenue guarantees; provide concessionaries payment flexibility and allow HMS Host and Paradies to defer fixed space rental payments. Those are the items that are included in #7.

Ms. Eiselt said can I ask if Mr. Newton would consider in his motion; Council would clearly like to get more information about this, but it doesn't really impact the way the rest of the money is used, so couldn't the motion be stated in such a way that would allow the rest of the work. These Committees have put a lot of work into these recommendations so, I hate to see the whole thing get held up. Could we not just carve that out to back to Committee for them to get clarification on that because it seems to be really a legal issue that doesn't encumber the other components of the Committee?

Mayor Lyles said is that a substitute motion? Mr. Driggs asked Mr. Cagle to address the impact of it but we could have a substitute motion for that.

A substitute motion was made by Councilmember Eiselt, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, to include #7 A-E and then to address the health insurance issue coming back directly to Council.

Mayor Lyles said now Mr. Cagle; the impact plus or minus all of those items staying in for deferral or what would happen if we deferred items A-E. What would be the impact? Is that the question Mr. Driggs?

Mr. Driggs said yes Mayor, it is, because of the ongoing conversation on those topics.

Brent Cagle, Aviation Director said I'm thinking through how to try to answer this in the best way. I guess would I would say I believe the two largest items here of the five A, B, C, D, and E are items C and E. So, I believe that Item A is really continuing what we are doing. If that were deferred I guess the question that I would have does I need to stop doing that and allowing it until further discussion because we are already doing that and that is a benefit to the concessionaires, but if this is not approved I guess the

question on A is do I need to tell them they can't do that. Item B again, I don't think it was a controversial issue, it is really about cost savings specific to the smaller concessionaires. C is a large one, which is one of the largest items and is the bulk of the $7 million so that one would be very material and would probably need to be deferred based on this discussion. D is really a just a matter of how we handle the annual settlement so, again, it is not a large dollar item. E however, is also a large dollar item so I would suggest that possibly if there were a modification it would be to approve 7 A, B, and D and defer C and E.

Mayor Lyles said I think you have addressed it, I think you are saying that most of these are really necessary for you to continue under the plan for the revenue for the concessionaires and for the retailers to be able to see some benefits quickly, you would want to continue A-E and we would still come back on the health insurance. That is what I heard you saying.

Mr. Cagle said yes ma'am.

Councilmember Johnson said we are getting a lot of letters and a lot of detail. Is there a way you can pull that up on the screen because we are all on our computers?

Mayor Lyles said Denada is working on it, Ms. Johnson. I think the question is, no-one had a question about these items when they were presented. It is just the question of adding the health insurance that everyone has suggested that talked about coming back with that to the Council directly, not the Task Force, so you wouldn't convene the Task Force again. It would be a Council discussion.

Ms. Eiselt said if you flip over to Granicus on your computer or your iPad, you just lose your video, but you can get into the agenda without losing the audio of our meeting.

Mr. Winston said none of this stuff was in my Granicus for my agenda this week. I'm in here right now and it is not there.

Mr. Bokhari said I have no idea; there is so much information that was not included in our Granicus in our anything. It was all prepared and ready to go Wednesday and Thursday, so I don't know Mr. Winston, but I feel the same pain that you do right now. This is unfortunate that we are going through this.

Mayor Lyles said you know guys, it may be unfortunate, but you have to give a lot of grace. We are working with a staff of the same 10 people every day, still turning out meetings every week and the information goes out as quickly as we can pull it together and not every report was done and ready to go and the staff tried to do it as an effort so, while it may be, you know, I'm just saying –

Mr. Bokhari said most of the staff is as confused as we are right now Madam Mayor.

Mayor Lyles said they haven't said that to me, Mr. Bokhari.

Denada Jackson, City Manager's Office said it is in your e-mail at 1:37 this afternoon from Marie Harris. This document that I'm showing on the screen was e-mailed to everyone at 1:37 this afternoon.

Mr. Winston said there are a few things going on today.

Mayor Lyles said now you can see the list of #7 A-E.

Mr. Newton said I think it is really important and you know there are six other items; these are items that were passed by the Task Force, items that benefits the Airport, and make sure that the businesses there stay in business. But I think from the standpoint if we are really serious of the Council about ensuring that everyone survives this, including the employees at the Airport, the folks that are the face of Charlotte when anyone comes through. The vast majority of people don't stick around, they have

connecting flights and go through then this is how we do it. We don't kind of give up the baby here, but what we do is, we say we will have to work this out and from the standpoint of passing say #7 without working that out previously I don't quite understand how we are going to be able to work that out subsequently. I think the whole point here of course is to continue to work on this but deferring #7 really allows us to actually do that rather than passing it all and say we are going to work on it after the fact or alternatively deferring it piecemeal. That I why I'm against the substitute motion and I think that once again if we are really serious about helping the employees who will lose their health insurance then we don't give subsidies out until we ensure that all of that is worked out.

Mayor Lyles said we have a substitute motion and I need to go through the roster on the substitute motion and I believe the substitute motion is to adopt the Airport Economic Recovery Report and to refer the health insurance issue to the City Council for additional discussion.

Councilmember Mitchell said I'm sitting here, and I don't know if it is the long night, but what is the difference between Mr. Newton's motion and Ms. Eiselt's motion?

Mayor Lyles said explain your motion Ms. Eiselt.

Ms. Eiselt said as I understand it Mr. Newton would like to send all of Item #7 back to Council.

Mr. Newton said just Item No. 7; one through six we pass, Item No. 7 we defer and bring it back.

Mayor Lyles said I think the difference is Item No. 7 is the work that has been recommended for the sub-concessionaries so all of the people that run the little retail and the restaurants and all of that, it is not about Host and Paradies. It would mean the people that were on this, the Geathers, and those folks would not be able to benefit from A-E.

Ms. Watlington said but is that true though? That is what I'm struggling with.

Mayor Lyles said I'm turning to Mr. Cagle. That is what I think he said is that he is doing A right now and if we stop that he would stop.

Ms. Watlington said wouldn't we have to vote to stop it; if we deferred to me that is not taking the action to stop.

Mayor Lyles said he would stop until the Council made a decision.

Ms. Watlington said we haven't made one yet and he is doing it right now. So, to me deferring does not mean stop.

Mayor Lyles said I think the way he answered it is that he said that he was doing A and I'm going to let Mr. Cagle speak again. Mr. Cagle; what is the impact of deferral of #7?

Mr. Cagle said I apologize; I assumed that by deferring it there would be a lack of support to continue or institute the items under A-E. If that is not the case and I think that is Ms. Watlington was sort of alluding to. I'm not sure that I understood the motion and so I was making the assumption that if it is deferred the items A-E would need to also be deferred or discontinued and I don't understand if that is correct or not.

Ms. Watlington said you are doing much of it right now and we haven't taken any action, right?

Mr. Cagle said yes ma'am.

Mr. Newton said that was my understanding too, what Ms. Watlington is saying.

Ms. Watlington said so that would tell me that we can defer, you continue as is.

Mayor Lyles said that it is not in the motion. I don't mean to quibble about this, but the motion needs to be clear what we are trying to do, so if you are saying continue to do the work A-E while we defer, is that what you are saying Ms. Watlington, that the Airport Director would continue to do A-E until the Council made a final decision.

Ms. Watlington said that is what I will support but I would defer to Ms. Eiselt because it is her motion.

Ms. Eiselt said I apologize Mr. Newton; if your motion was to carry forward with all of the other actions that the Committee has recommended then that is fine. My goal was to have just that one item sent back to Committee for discussion and let everything else move forward.

Mr. Newton said if I can comment on that; I think that Ms. Watlington is correct. A seems to be something that is already happening so it was my assumption that A would continue. I think D-E are items that aren't happening right now that would need to have action taken on them so if I could enter another motion that motion would be to exclude Item #7 with the exception of allowing A to continue, so defer #7 but allow A to continue until we come back with a final decision.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Cagle; which ones were the ones that you were already doing?

Mr. Cable said A is already being done and then I commented to say that B is a fairly small, but important item to the small concessionary operators, and D is really just sort of a matter of course, it doesn't require a contract amendment. The two biggest items in these are C and E and what I'm not understanding is if A-E are predicated on a future F and if so, I guess I'm not understanding if there is a new measure associated with insurance, are all of these other predicated on it first, and I just don't understand.

Mayor Lyles said alright to give clear direction to the Aviation Director; I think it is difficult sometimes when each Councilmember has an interpretation of what it means. So, I'm just going to say that we really need to give clear direction to the staff and the substitute motion was that we would implement A-E and then F would be coming back directly to the Council. That was the substitute motion.

Mr. Newton said if I may comment on that Mayor.

Mayor Lyles said I think we have commented on it and it is pretty much what the motion was, and it is a substitute motion so I think we can call for the vote. I heard what Ms. Watlington said and what you said Mr. Newton as well, but the motion is the motion.

Mr. Newton said basically what the substitute motion is to pass #7 and then wait to do an F later is what I'm understanding what you are saying Madam Mayor?

Mayor Lyles said I'm saying that was the substitute motion that was on the table, yes.

Ms. Eiselt would you still like to have the substitute motion?

Ms. Eiselt said yes.

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

YEAS: Councilmember Eiselt and Driggs

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Mitchell, Winston, Egleston, Graham, Watlington, Johnson, Newton, and Bokhari

Mayor Lyles said the substitute motion failed; that means we go back to the main motion and the main motion was to defer Item #7; accept the report for everything except #7 and then come back to the Council with health insurance and I guess A-F were as it would be.

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

Mayor Lyles said so now we just have to come back on that. The next item is the Housing Task Force Report. Do I have a motion to accept the Housing Task Force Report?

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, to accept the Housing Task Force Report.

Without a second, the motion was not considered.

A substitute motion was made by Councilmember Winston, seconded by Councilmember Newton, to send the Task Force recommendation back to the Task Force this Thursday so they could be reviewed by the Task Force.

Ms. Watlington said I'm looking for Ms. Wideman; is she still in the room? I just want to make sure I am super clear about the implications.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Watlington has a question, Ms. Wideman.

Ms. Wideman said yes ma'am.

Ms. Watlington said I was assuming that you were tuned in and I was hoping that you could give us a quick recap the same way that Mr. Cagle just did in terms of the impact of deferring this on more work that is already ongoing. I just wanted to make sure I was crystal clear.

Ms. Wideman said sure; what I would say Ms. Watlington is the impact on that, we would continue to do the programs that you approved on April 13th. The impact would be that it would limit us at this point to assisting more people and it would limit getting another SRO. It would slow the process of getting another SRO in the community.

Mr. Graham said I'm going to vote against this. We didn't take a formal vote, as I said earlier, and I told the Committee that we would not take a formal vote and that we would work with staff, the management team to coordinate the funds to the conversation we had as a Committee. We talked about housing, rent relief, mortgage relief, homelessness for three meetings and this is consistent with the framework that the Task Force approved so I hoped that you guys would approve it tonight, but if not, we will just approve it again on Thursday. This is a redundancy issue and I'm not sure why we are doing this.

Mr. Winston said if I may respond; this meeting tonight was the first that this Councilmember and the Task Force member was made aware of this. We were just told that 137 [inaudible] on the day of this meeting. I think it is only fair for transparency and accountability that the Task Force members are able to read and critique this before it comes to the full Council for the vote no matter how many times the coordinator rolls his eyes.

Mr. Graham said I'm just saying Mr. Winston that I'm rolling my eyes because I'm dead tired, tired of this debate as well, but that is here and there. We talked about this [inaudible]

Ms. Watlington said I've got a question; Mr. Winston said is there something specific that you are looking to get out that is different? I appreciate your concerns about

transparency, well noted. I appreciate the principle, I just want to understand, is there something that is specific that you feel like maybe missing?

Mr. Winston said the $10 million that was presented to me that we are spending that has never even been discussed before tonight.

Ms. Watlington said I hear that part.

Mayor Lyles said we can't talk over each other, please. I understand Ms. Watlington asked a question and I think Mr. Winston; you answered it, so we have a substitute motion to defer the Housing Report and I'm going to ahead and start doing the roster for the vote. I'll start with Mr. Graham. I'm sorry, I did not see your hand, Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Mitchell said this is a question for Ms. Wideman; Councilmember Watlington asked you a question and you said something that it would slow down the process. Can you clarify that because I think they have a Task Force meeting on Thursday; we don't meet again until June 1st. Was there some action that would take place before June 1st? I didn't understand you saying it would slow down the process.

Ms. Wideman said Mr. Mitchell; as far as the rent and the mortgage relief, what we endeavored to do was to go ahead and convene a meeting with the partners who are already in that rental and mortgage relief space, again we want to leverage this, so we want to go ahead and begin addressing the gap. So, we wanted to convene a meeting with them, amend the contract to do just that, and then as far as the SRO, we need to get committed to that so that the goal was to hopefully close in the next 60 to 90-days to commit out money. That is what I mean by slowing the process.

Mr. Mitchell said as a follow-up if they are meeting on Thursday and then they come back to Council on June 1st couldn't that still work into your timeline?

Ms. Wideman said yes sir; it could work, we were just trying to be as immediate as we could.

Mr. Mitchell said okay, thank you for that clarification.

Ms. Watlington said I am supporting a delay until Thursday. Is that a Yea or a Nay?

Mayor Lyles said that is a Yea.

Ms. Johnson said I'm glad Mr. Mitchell asked the question as far as the timeframe because I'm on that Task Force and it is our mission, but as far as wanting to provide assistance and rent and mortgage, but Mr. Winston is correct. I feel that it is correct because there wasn't a clear definition that this was discussed if the dollars were going to be presented and voted on at Council tonight. I think part of the confusion is the expectation for the Task Force. Mr. Graham says that the Task Force doesn't vote, but if other Task Forces does vote to move things to Council that is part of the confusion so, it does feel like a lack of transparency, but I don't think that is transparency.

Mr. Graham said that is not accurate, I'm sorry. We've been fully transparent in terms of what we are going to do, and I was very clear.

Ms. Johnson said no, that is not the intent; this is a great Task Force. The difference is another Task Force voted to move things to Council and I think that is where the confusion or appearance of lack of transparency.

Mr. Graham said no, no, because I informed the Task Force and just putting it on the record of what we were doing and how we were doing it. So, this is not a surprise or should not be a surprise how it came forward to the Council, but again, please vote because I'm tired, I'm done.

Ms. Johnson said I know you are tired, and I remember one of the last questions in the Task Force meeting was when are going to vote on the money and you said, and this is on video, and you said there were going to be recommendations at the City Council meeting. The Mayor or you were going to be making recommendations, so it is kind of an afterthought instead of a structure and this is what is going to happen step by step. So, I can understand where there was a lack of clarity. Anyway, so I would vote to send it back to the Task Force as well.

Mr. Driggs said I think we will end up back in the same place so I'm a no on the deferral.

Ms. Eiselt said I'm a no to the deferral. I'm not sure why it is I have all this information and why others don't but I'm a no to the deferral.

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

YEAS: Councilmember Watlington, Johnson, Winston, Bokhari, Mitchell, Ajmera, and Newton

NAYS: Councilmember Graham, Egleston, Driggs, and Eiselt

Mayor Lyles said now we will go to the Small Business Task Force; do I have a motion?

Motion was made by Councilmember Eiselt, seconded by Councilmember Bokhari, to approve the Small Business Task Force Report.

Mr. Newton said I want to thank the Task Force and staff for their hard work on this. I think it is fantastic that we are addressing the small business need in our community. It has been readily apparent for quite some time that our small businesses need help and at the same time, I just want to thank the Task Force and staff for also looking at making an appropriation to workforce development. We know that many folks have lost their jobs and they are going to need to retool and pivot, and we have great organizations within our City that can partner with us on that, so I just want to thank the Task Force for their hard work and staff and this comprehensive effort that is in front of us to vote on so thank you.

Mr. Bokhari said I was also just going to say a thank you, you can thank a lot of people, but I want to thank particularly my Committee members, Mr. Mitchell, Ms. Eiselt, and Ms. Ajmera in addition to all the great work from folks like Chad Turner and Vinay and Malcolm and all those folks. You guys, we've been through a lot over the last month-plus together and the product is what it is today because of those arguments, those brainstorming sessions, all of those things. So, we've got a lot more work to do, but to you, I say thank you and to the small businesses and folks in the workforce waiting for help, it is coming, it is on the way.

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

Mayor Lyles said we will go to the next item; now we've approved the budget, we've adopted with the changes adopted both portions or deferred one for the Task Force Report and the last item for this is one is to Authorize the City Manager to execute the contracts and agreements related to the fund and to the Task Force Reports that have been approved so far. I'm sorry, I shouldn't have said that. I was joking about so far; it is actually to give the Manager authority to execute the Task Force Reports and the contracts for the remaining part of the funding.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, to Authorize the City Manager to execute any necessary contracts and agreements related to the Coronavirus Relief Fund.

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

Mayor Lyles said I would really like to say thank you for everything that has been written up. We are going to ask the staff to put this together as one document so that we can all have it bound together and they will do some introduction, a little bit of the history of it and put together a piece that perhaps could be submitted for some of the recognition that we are doing and I would hope that at some point we would be able to have a press conference so that we could actually talk about what we are doing publicly to the community, not just watching the sausage being made but it is already made. As soon as we can get Item #7 and the Airport back, I would love to have everything back by June so that we could begin to work on the applications that people have to do for housing and to resolve the concessionaries and retailer issue at the Airport. I just really feel like that would help us get this done by June 1st and then we could go ahead and begin implementation on all of them. We will start on the Small Business implementation right away but even that is going to take some time. So, as soon as we get a resolution we can start work and after we get work done then we can announce what will be the benefits to the public and have specific places that they can go to see the value of 50% of this CARES money coming out to the community.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, on Page 73.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 11: AMEND CHAPTER 18, ARTICLE III – STORMWATER POLLUTION CONTROL ORDINANCE

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to approve amendments to the Stormwater Control Ordinance 9802 to Amend Chapter 18 Article III – Stormwater Pollution Control.

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

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, on Page 53-69A.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Watlington, and carried unanimously to (A) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and approve a contract up to $1,143,219 with RS&H Architects-Engineers-Planners, Inc. for the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and, (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

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

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 14: NORTH CAROLINA CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND LOAN APPLICATION

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing Charlotte Water to apply for additional loan funding from the North Carolina Clean Water State Revolving Fund in an amount not to exceed $70,325,678 for the construction of the McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Facility Clarifier rand Aeration Rehabilitation project, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to take necessary actions to accept and complete the financing, including applying to the State of North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality and obtaining local Government Commission approval, and (C) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9803-X appropriating $70,325,678 from the North Carolina Clean Water State Revolving Fund.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 631-632.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 70.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 15: APPROPRIATE PRIVATE DEVELOPER FUNDS FOR TUCKASEEGEE ROAD/BERRYHILL ROAD/THRIFT ROAD ROUNDABOUT PROJECT

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Bokhari, and carried unanimously to (A) Approve a developer agreement with 2317 Thrift Holdings, LLC for infrastructure changes, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9804-X appropriating $20,000 in private developer funds.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 71.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT FOR NEW TRAFFIC SIGNAL

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Watlington, and carried unanimously to (A) Accept private developer funds in the amount of $85,000 on behalf of the North Carolina Department of Transportation, (B) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to enter into a Mutual Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation, and (C) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9805-X appropriating $85,000.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 633

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 72.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: 2020 CITY COUNCIL AUGMENTED MEETING SCHEDULE

Mayor Lyles said when I reviewed this over the weekend I realized that we do need to schedule the June 2020 Council Augmented Virtual Regular and Budget Meeting Schedule, but on the second one we had laid out some time that I don't think we are going to be able to accomplish and we don't have a process so I would like to take some time this week to decide how we can best conduct the evaluation for the City Attorney and the City Clerk. I think those are the two that are immediate in June and July; the Manager is not until fall and we also haven't talked about a process for doing this and I would like to make sure that we all have agreement on what we are doing. Could I have deferral on Item B and an action Item A for the schedule?

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Egleston, and carried unanimously to (A) Approve the June 2020 City Council Augmented Virtual Regular and Budget Meeting Schedule, and defer (B) Direct the City Clerk to amend the 2020 City Council Regular and Budget Meeting Schedule by adding the following meeting dates and times: City Attorney Evaluation – June 22, 2020; Time 3:30 to 5.00 p.m. and City Clerk Evaluation – July 27, 2020; Time 12:00 – 1:30 p.m.

* * * * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 11:01 p.m.

_____
Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk, MMC, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 5 Hours, 56 Minutes
Minutes Completed: June 11, 2020

mpl