

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Business Meeting on Monday, February 8, 2021 at 4:03 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Matt Newton, Greg Phipps, and Braxton Winston II.

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmembers Dimple Ajmera and Victoria Watlington.

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles welcomed everyone to February 8, 2021, Charlotte City Council Business Meeting and said this meeting is being held as a virtual meeting in accordance with all of the laws that we have to follow, especially around an electronic meeting. The requirements also include notices and access that are being met electronically as well. You can view this on our Government Channel, the City's Facebook Page, or the City's YouTube Page.

* * * * *

INVOCATION

Councilmember Egleston gave the Invocation, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag by Councilmember Graham.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 1: MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Mayor Lyles said the staff has asked for a deferral of Item No. 37 until February 22nd.

Councilmember Winston said I had asked to give a comment on Item No. 23.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Councilmember Phipps, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to go into closed session pursuant to G.S. 143-318.11(a)(3) to consult with the City Attorney in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege between the attorney and the City Council in matters of (1) Dearing v. City of Charlotte, (2) Melissa Wright v. City of Charlotte, (3) David Wright v. City of Charlotte and (4) Daedalus LLC v. City of Charlotte.

The meeting was recessed at 4:09 p.m. for a closed session. The closed session recessed at 4:55 p.m. for the regularly scheduled Business Meeting.

Councilmember Ajmera arrived at 4:13 p.m.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: ACTION REVIEW AGENDA OVERVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said tonight for the Action Briefing we have two presentations/Council discussions and one is the Transformational Mobility Network Update and the other is the Source of Income Discrimination. The first item has been discussed at certain levels in our Transportation, Planning, and Environment Committee as well as the Source of Income Discrimination has been discussed at some level at the Great Neighborhoods Committee. So, if it pleases the Council, we can go right into the Transformational Mobility Network Update.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: TRANSFORMATIONAL MOBILITY NETWORK UPDATE

Marcus Jones, City Manager said before I turn it over to Taiwo I just want to do a little bit of level setting with the Council. We received this at the end of your Annual Strategy Meeting and so what we've been doing as a team is we've been reaching out to the Towns, having discussions internally, briefing you also, but this is the first time I think since the Annual Strategy Meeting that we have an opportunity to look at this from multiple levels. I will say that this is a complex and complicated task that we have before us and we will be thorough in our assessment and our analysis. There are legal ramifications, there are also financial ramifications as well as having a better understanding of the projects that are associated with this. I just wanted to make sure that as we talk about this there are discussions about the Silver Line, but I can assure you this is not one single project, it is a multitude of projects, both from a transportation and from a transit standpoint, and we are at the beginning stages of doing our assessment.

Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Assistant City Manager/Planning Director said this is going to be a tag-team effort and we will have a number of us that will be sharing with you tonight. What we will be presenting to you tonight is likely new information that we will cover going from the legislative outlook and funding strategy. We talked to you earlier about bringing a refined funding strategy to you by April but wanted to show you the beginnings of that and then I will talk about the legislative. Kelly Flannery, our CFO will talk about funding and then Liz Babson will talk about the projects and how we want to engage you and then I will wrap it up with our recent polling data. Dana, if you will step up and kind of walk Council through this and hand off to Kelly and then from Kelly to Liz and back to myself.

Dana Fenton, Inter-governmental Relations Manager said I will be reviewing the Legislative Schedule with you this evening. As you know over the past several weeks, we have presented the Transformational Mobility Network, the key points to elected officials locally, regionally, and at the state. While there is still a lot more work to be done, we want to provide some clarity on the timeline that allows us to preserve the option for a November 2021 referendum as well as identify key milestones along the way. The timeline also presents opportunities for you to get involved in the program. Perhaps, the most important part of the work is what we do in this month of February. This will result in how we progress further in this journey. Based on our ongoing conversations with you, our partners, and Delegation, we will return to you at the end of the month with an assessment as to whether or not to move forward with a 2021 referendum. While this process is ongoing, we will continue to develop funding scenarios, general project list and produce statistically relevant polling data.

As for the slide that is in front of you, this provides a snapshot of what the process is. It is not an all-inclusive chart, but we have the major points on there. For example, this month, actually pre-March column we've been working on securing support for the plan, especially with the County and the Towns. We are also in the process of drafting legislation for this effort. We still have a lot more work to do, especially working on carveouts with the Towns and the County and things like that, so we are nowhere near close, but certainly, we have a framework in place. Then we will return to Council at the end of this month, probably in another two weeks, and then there are a couple of arrows at the bottom; these are things we will be doing over a longer time span, refine the funding, the project listing, the prioritization, and the polling and surveys.

Moving on to the March through June timeframe, that is what we envision as being the meat of the legislative process and we have several steps in there. Again, these are illustrative, not all-inclusive of everything that would have to be done in the legislative process, but we have work with the Administration and the General Assembly Leadership, Committee Chairs, our Delegation and other members of the General Assembly all the way down to the approval of a Bill by the Governor.

Moving to the July through October timeframe; in July that is when we would envision that the County Commission would have to take action to place the question on the ballot for

this coming November 2nd General Election. Then after they place the question on the ballot that is when a voter campaign would start. The voter campaign is not something that the City operates, that would be operated by another party like the Charlotte Regional Business Alliance, and then of course in November we would have the referendum early on and if the referendum is a success then the Council Commission could adopt an ordinance implementing the proposed sales tax.

Kelly Flannery, Chief Operating Officer said over the past couple of weeks we have been developing a financial program around which debates the spending of potential one percent sales and use tax. It is important to remember this is currently based on receiving the legislation for one percent sale tax from the state. We are currently envisioning that approximately 70% of the proposed one percent will go towards bus and rail transit while the remaining 30% will go towards non-transit modes divided between the City, the County, and the six Towns. The non-transit component is elected to include roadway improvements, greenways, bikeways, and pedestrian ways. The County and the six Town carve-outs are an important part of the discussion because they afford the ability for the tax to not only address the City's needs but all residents.

We are working on a financial program and as part of that financial planning process, we always start with goal setting our principles and not that I have a favorite one, but the one that I prioritize most is maintaining the City's financial condition. In addition, everything that is going to be contemplated in the transformational vision. It can't all be built in one day and that is what Director Babson is going to speak about next, but staggering implementation is critical. It is impractical to assume that we would receive funding to construct everything for all the proposed rail lines all at once, so we expect to stagger the implementation starting with Envision my Ride and the Red Line in the first year for funding.

The City has the Steady State Model that contemplates approximately \$100 million dedicated to roadways, bike lanes, and pedestrians for every bond cycle and we are looking at increasing the quantity of projects. We have to be realistic about the amount of work the construction industry can handle and how we can ramp that up and we have to be mindful of how that construction is going to impact and disrupt the community. We have begun to develop a financial plan around these principles that includes several elements that including the funding source and revenue forecast, proposed capital projects, and the annual operating and maintenance expenses for the proposed projects. We will continue to refine the financial program and its assumptions over the next several weeks, but I just want to be clear, this is a program. The pencil won't ever be put down until the project is completed. With that, I would like to turn it over to Director Babson to discuss the strategy around project prioritization.

Councilmember Watlington arrived at 4:57 p.m.

Liz Babson, Director of Transportation said I'm going to give you an overview of where we are with our current project and programming development and what is next. On this slide, reflects some of the conversations we've had with you last week, for example, in our Budget Workshop on Wednesday. Our current Transportation Action Plan which was adopted in 2017 identifies a multi-billion-dollar Transportation Plan for our City over the next 25-years. Our CIP (Community Investment Plan) implements projects and programs that are defined in that Transportation Action Plan and identifies transportation investments that advance the idea of a safely connected transportation network for all users of our system, motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists. As you heard from us last week our current CIP funds programs for improvements like sidewalk and pedestrian safety, bicycle improvements, bridge repair, and replacement and traffic devices and signal communications improvements. But we also invest in major construction projects that improve our streets and intersections and make them complete streets for all users. As we discussed these projects move through an advanced planning fund which allows us to do the planning and early design work necessary to develop strong project budgets and schedules that we can then advance through capital funding. As you saw last week in the CIP budget presentation at our current CIP Steady State of funding, we are only able to deliver, for example, one road project and one intersection project over two bond

cycles or four years. So, the four that we previewed with you last week could take twice that long.

So, what is a Transformational Mobility Network? You hear us keep talking about that and it is important. It is a slightly different way to think about how we move projects through capital funding and build that transportation infrastructure that provides the connected mobility network for all users. It is about accelerating the implementation of those projects and increasing the quantity that we put on the ground. This is important because we know that we need to be strategic in our investment and align that transportation investment with the growth and development of the City coupled with expanding transit investment to support transportation in the future. This is about continuing to invest in projects that improve the capacity on our most congested streets, be strategic about building a bike network that is connected and comfortable and have pedestrian facilities throughout our transportation system that also provides for that safe and comfortable access as well as supporting transit. By doing this we can build a transportation system that connects more of our residents with the services and businesses that they need and offers them choices and how to travel to those places. So ultimately more people can take advantage of shorter trips to their destinations and some of those trips can even be made in something other than driving a car.

The most important piece in developing this Transformational Mobility Network is what comes next and that is the opportunity to get you, Council, and our residents involved in reviewing projects and programs, and priorities through the Transformational Mobility Network program and project development process. This Transformational Mobility Network development process is an opportunity to review and refine projects with Council and the community for accelerated implementation. Our plan is to engage the community over the next several months to accomplish this. We will work with you to schedule mobility townhalls in each District over the coming months and we will also host stakeholder discussions and use the survey tech tools to ensure that we are using multiple ways to gather input from you and the community. This community engagement process will ultimately influence the definition and prioritization of what we are calling these non-transit projects for roads, bike, and pedestrian infrastructure citywide and it will allow us to really refine and define that Transformational Mobility Network program with a refined list of projects and programs that form the basis for a potential November 2021 referendum. So, ultimately that Transformational Mobility Network program will result in a defined and prioritized list of projects for the first three to five years of Transformational Mobility Network and it will establish ongoing project definition and prioritization for the full implementation of a Transformational Mobility Network that will take us through the next couple of decades. With that, I will turn it back over to Taiwo.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said like I said earlier, a lot of information and a lot of numbers but I'm just about to overwhelm you with another set of numbers. Hopefully, we can work this back and answer questions. If you will remember back in August; actually, at an October Council meeting I shared with you that we have a third party ALG Research that has been funded by the grant we go through Bloomberg. [inaudible] We have had them conduct a set of polling for us throughout this process. Back in August, right in the middle of the pandemic, they conducted a full set of polling, and then in November, post- election they did some focus group. I will not walk you through that focus group exercise tonight. I want to focus us on this [inaudible] relevant polling that they did again back in August and then the one they did just recently. So, the first slide in front of you shows that they surveyed 501 registered voters from Gaston, Mecklenburg, Iredell, and Union Counties and you see the breakdown of the demographics there as well as the breakdown of political affiliation. One thing I want you to notice quickly is that 61% in Mecklenburg actually is about 304 out of the overall 501 people that responded. Out of that 304, 233 respondents were in the City of Charlotte. Obviously, the result was that 84% agreed that having more transportation options is important for our City and then when you look at 75% at the bottom of the list, there need to be move transportation options like buses and light rail.

I shared a little bit of this information last year so let's go to the next slide, which is really the newest information. I think this was done right after letters from the northern Mayors to Mayor Lyles with regard to what they would like to see and concerns that they would

like to see addressed and we've got a lot of information out in the media with regard to this. This was conducted after people understand what the increase in sales tax may be, the potential for this to be \$4 billion to \$6 billion of the \$8 billion to \$12 billion programs, and the fact that this could take a while to build out. We did not survey Charlotte in this exercise because we did it back in August, so this was specifically focused on the six Towns in Mecklenburg County. You are going to notice again the breakdown by demographics but also by Towns. The only Town that we did not have anyone who took part in the polling exercise was Mint Hill. Again, this was not done by the City, it wasn't done by City staff, it was done by a third party, ALG Research and they do this generally all around the world. Huntersville had the most and so they did this based on the population of each Town and then most of the constituents interviewed were Republican. We actually have in addition to this about 12% were leaning Republican. Despite all of that information there 62%, two to one margin in favor of increasing funding for local public transportation infrastructure in Mecklenburg County.

Obviously, you look at the 50% and the 58%; 50% support increasing the county sales tax to fund; 58% we did not explain what bonds are, we just pretty much went to them and asking the specific information as to would you support bonds, will you support increasing sales tax. One number that isn't in here is that about 70% said they would not support the property tax increase. So, there was definitely support for sales tax, but also increasing funding. Again, I need to emphasize the fact that these were non-Charlotte respondents. This was based on all the six Towns, especially once we got the letter and a lot of media information out there. A lot of what we shared with you in the prior slides with regard to what this does within transit and non-transit, what this does between extending the Red Line to the North, Blue Line to Ballantyne and Pineville, Matthews the Silver Line to the Airport, and Gold Line to Rosa Parks and also to Eastland. I'm going to wrap up with this because this is a lot of information I know. This data here was conducted by a third party, we don't have all the details, but this is the type of margin information they gave us that we can share with you, and overtime if there are further questions I'm sure they are able to answer them. I'll stop here and if there are specific questions to the four of us, we will be glad to address them.

Mayor Lyles said are there specific questions about the polling data?

Councilmember Driggs said when we ask these questions did, we talk about any particular amount of tax increase, or did we just ask them in general whether they thought the idea of increasing funding made sense?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said Mr. Driggs we were specific with regard to increasing sales tax.

Mr. Driggs said did you talk about by how much?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes, we did.

Mr. Driggs said so these responses were related to an increase of one percent in the sales tax.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said these responses were yes, responding to an increase of a half percent or up to one percent in sales tax yes.

Mr. Driggs said up to one percent.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I will add to that quickly also that this is a snapshot in time; we do not intend to stop here. Dana said at the beginning during his presentation that we are going to continue to have polling data, not only of residents but also of businesses. It might be that the next time I'm in front of you or maybe in March we will show another set of data that could be conducted again by the third party. The City will not be conducting any of these polling exercises and they will all be statistically relevant to this work.

Councilmember Johnson said I heard the number; there were 500 people that were polled, is that right?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said if we go back to the previous slide, on this particular one for the Towns it was 400, but for the full County region it was 501 and 304 of those from Mecklenburg County, 233 of those from Charlotte

Ms. Johnson said what was the response rate then?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said it is really what you see on this slide; 84% agreed that having more transportation options is important, but there is a caveat to this particular slide. At the time we did this the Task Force had not come up with its recommendation for the one-cent mobility tax. This was the response then; by the time we got to November to do the focus group we were already talking about a potential for one cent mobility sales tax. I do not have the information on the focus group in front of you right now, I share it earlier, back in December, but the number was still up over 70% of the respondents supporting that even after giving you the information.

Ms. Johnson said I see the 84% of the respondents felt a certain way, but I was asking you about the overall response rate of the surveys that were sent out. I don't know if you have that information available; 304 responses from 500. Is that about 80% of the response rate?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said we possibly can get that for you, but what I'm saying is that the 61% that responded in Mecklenburg County has 233 of those in Charlotte, but I don't know the specific percentage, if that is what you are asking, of the Charlotte respondents.

Ms. Johnson said no, I was asking how many people responded overall. Is there a minimum response rate that we consider a valid response?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I think I see where you are going with that.

Mayor Lyles said how many calls did you have to make to get to 501?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said they were selected, and they were paid to participate in this effort just like any polling.

Ms. Johnson said my question is what is the response percentage that we require in order for it to be considered valid?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said in order for us to win I believe it is 51% that you need to win a ballot.

Mayor Lyles said I think Ms. Johnson had a different question.

Mr. Jones said she wants to get a better understanding of how we look at this as being significant polling.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes, there is necessarily no significant number, but you will have to do a random sampling; 501, in this case, is what was the timing statistically relevant, and in the case of the next slide which asks 400 that is also what was the timing to be statistically relevant for non-Charlotte Countywide polling.

Mr. Driggs said I was just trying to clarify the prior question because I would be interested to hear the answer; how many people did you have to poll in order to get 500 responses?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I can get that information for us; I don't have that with me right now.

Councilmember Ajmera said so the polling data this is presented here doesn't align with the comments that were made by North Mecklenburg in the letter that they had sent to us. Have you shared these results with them and what has changed because the last I heard there was varied [inaudible] from North Mecklenburg?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said those were the types of statements that really led us to want to poll this right after all of that information but that is the plan, we haven't shared this information with them, at least I have not, but that is the intent that we will do that.

Ms. Ajmera said to follow up on that the concern that North Mecklenburg leaders had raised was around the Red Line so has the timeline changed or has anything changed in our plan to garner their support?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said not really. We think that the needle has moved in a positive direction with regard to the opportunity to continue to have positive conversations with Norfolk-Southern with regard to the Red Line. If you recall, one of the things that Ms. Flannery, our CFO shared earlier in a slide is that two things are going to be a priority if we were to get authorization from the NCGA (North Carolina General Assembly) if we want the one percent increase in sales tax, one is implementing the Envision my Ride recommendations about improving our bus services throughout the county, but the second was to be the Red Line. You don't have all of that information in front of you, but even when you look at the cost breakdown in commuter rail transit system is the most affordable to build when you compare with light rail. I think it is really more of having conversations with Norfolk-Southern and I think that is going to go in a positive direction than what we had previously.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Jones has anything else occurred besides the Red Line?

Mr. Jones said to Ms. Ajmera's question about has things changed; I will just make it clear that in my discussions with the Town Managers, especially the Town Managers to the north, I would say nothing has changed. It is going to be very difficult to get this coalition together in terms of the City, the Towns, and the County and the region and a lot of has to do with what occurred at the end of 1998 and what the northern Towns thought that they would receive based on the half-cent sales tax. A lot of what we are doing right now is trying to work with all of the Towns in the County and as Taiwo talked about earlier, it is going to be even larger than that to get this for a regional approach. What I will say, this is just one data point; there is a lot of data that has been discussed, that has been shared, but I don't want the Council to walk away tonight believing that all of a sudden there is a 180 from the northern Towns.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you Mr. Manager. Certainly, it is going to be very crucial for us to get support from our North Mecklenburg neighbors, especially from Towns like Davidson, Cornelius, and Huntersville. I'm trying to figure out, certainly, they had raised concerns around trust issues, however, there were comments in the past, but those comments were not being delivered on. So, I'm trying to figure out is this survey just one part of the puzzle, but we are trying to figure out what I would say that staff has taken to garner their support and to build trust with North Mecklenburg leaders.

Mr. Jones said one of the things that we started off with is me having discussions with the Town Managers and basically reiterating what you just said that I know while I wasn't here there were a couple of the Managers that were around. There were thoughts about what would occur, and they didn't occur, especially with the Red Line. So, what we are trying to do is continue to have these conversations with the Towns, specifically with the Town Managers for me and some of the elected talking with the elected, but for us right now I think what is important is not necessarily just the polling, but tonight is the first time that you see an analysis that with this one-cent sales tax there is an opportunity to have both a transit component, but also a transportation component. That transportation component is just not for the City, it is for the County, it is for the Town and includes greenways and roads and sidewalks and bike paths and I think that is something that in our initial discussions with the Towns has intrigued them. We've used terms like a carveout, it is too early to say what a carveout could be, but I hope that one of the take-aways tonight is that the one-cent sales tax can cover multiple transit opportunities for the City, the County, and the region as well as transportation projects too.

Councilmember Phipps said I had a question about the slide that had the 70/30 split.

Mayor Lyles said I think everybody seems more interested in the section at the beginning so we will just start with the section on Funding Overview. Mr. Phipps, you are asking the question about the Funding Overview, right?

Mr. Phipps said I've heard comments that seem to express some optimism with some potential progress with the Red Line so that is encouraging. I don't know what it will lead to, but my other question is you have here these 22 bus routes countywide that is supposed to be some improvement; are those mostly express bus lines or some of our internal street routes included in that?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said first of all let me clarify the conversation with regard to Red Line. I think it is moving in a positive direction because there is a change in leadership that we can work with and they are willing to also have a conversation with us. That is a good thing, so I'll say that is positive. With regard to the 22 bus routes, that is coming straight out of the recommendations of Envision my Ride. These are top-performing routes that maybe today 30 minutes, 45 minutes frequencies between them and they are Countywide. They are not express routes, they are not necessarily rapid bus transit, they are just regular buses that we can improve frequencies on them today. I know that in the next few years that we will be able to reduce those 30, 45-minute intervals to at least 15 minutes between the bus services.

Councilmember Winston said Mr. Fenton; what is your potential impact referenda in November given the possibility that City Council elections may be going away?

Mr. Fenton said because your question involves legal issues with both the state and federal government, I'm going to have to defer to the City Attorney on that.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said there are several moving parts that are happening here as it relates to us waiting for the results coming back from the census and what impact it may have on the City, also the School Board could potentially be impacted as well. We do anticipate and we are monitoring that situation and we do anticipate, and I haven't spoken with the Manager about this yet, but we have briefly discussed bringing back to you an item to discuss that more in-depth because again, there are a lot of moving parts but it is a consideration if there are no municipal elections whether or not we can actually even have a referendum going forward and will have a more comprehensive answer for you at a later, but very close in time date.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Baker; I didn't have a chance to talk with you about this, but I've heard a lot of conversations in the media, various programs, and a lot of people talking about the census data and the redistricting issues. Tomorrow, I plan to send out a referral to the Budget and Effectiveness Government Committee to the extent that we know the 2020 census data is received later than normal, if it may affect the drawing of any of our City Council District lines. I recommend that we take this question of the City's options proceeding with or postponing municipal elections be referred and evaluated by the Budget and Effectiveness Committee. I think we ought to have a plan and another plan and maybe another plan, but I would ask them to develop principles and options for redistricting and decision making available under the law for consideration by Council so that when the data does come in, we know which direction we are going in. I know that the Planning staff has the availability of current population data for the City. This would be something that I would suggest, and I would also put a call into the Chair of the School Board just to let them know this is what we are going to start to begin to do. Right now, if you go to the Board of Election site, they say the schedule, offices, dates for filing, and fees for filing are just not known or are available at this time. I think we have some time to think about what is our process for doing this and I would like to refer that or am referring that to the Budget and Effectiveness Governance Committee to work with the City Attorney and the Planning staff to put together some process options for the Council's consideration, come back if we can in the next Strategy Session with some ideas of what that means.

Mr. Winston said I think it would be important for our folks to know what the Democratic process is moving forward. I do have another question for Mr. Fenton; maybe he can give

us some light about what is happening or if we do have a referendum in November, what our partners in the state are doing if not with us. Is there a possibility that there is a state transportation bond or tax bond on the ballot, how unlikely is that and how does that affect our strategy moving forward?

Mr. Fenton said a couple of things in there; the last couple of years there have been a chance to try to get some sort of statewide transportation bond and they haven't gone anywhere. Generally, the Senate has been more conservative when it comes to issuing debt, but what is happening in the last year with the pandemic and with the NC-DOT revenue situation there may be an opening there so there very well could be serious consideration of a statewide transportation bond this year. Now, apparent as to whether that election would be held this coming November or at a later date we just don't know right now. But certainly, with the possibility, if we do decide to move forward this year, try to get the legislation, and let's say we do get some moving on legislation, then there is some synergy there that we might be able to tap into. But in terms of placing it on a certain date, I'm not really ready to talk about that right now.

Councilmember Watlington said I've got a few questions; a couple I just want to make sure I understood from Ms. Babson's presentation, where I saw the plus or minus \$102 million per bond cycle. Can you help me understand where that would be coming from?

Ms. Babson said yes, that \$100 million per bond is what is reflective of the current Steady State of funding. If I can, I would like to refer you back to some of the conversations we had with you on Wednesday in the Budget Workshop and so that is the current capacity with our Steady State of CIP investment for transportation infrastructure.

Ms. Watlington said so it is not plus or minus \$102 million like there is an additional \$102 million available?

Ms. Babson said no ma'am.

Ms. Watlington said you talked about the four years' worth of project execution, just so I'm clear, the funding through would still be limited to that bond cycle.

Ms. Babson said yes ma'am, that is taking that \$100 million every bond cycle and applying it towards the projects and the cost estimates that we have provided to you and the rest of Council on Wednesday as part of that Budget Workshop.

Ms. Watlington said but those funds would be distributed over more than one bond cycle, or they would be funded in one bond cycle even though they are executed across two bond cycles. I'm trying to get an understanding of the cash flow.

Mr. Jones said Ms. Watlington; I'll take a shot at what I think you are asking. So, in the Steady State, and let's say it is a little bit short of \$200 million, over the course of the next few weeks Council in these Workshops and Strategy Sessions may find that \$100 million for roads or for transportation is not enough. You may decide that \$50 million, don't fall out of your seat Pam Wideman, but \$50 million every bond cycle for affordable housing may be too much, depending on your priorities. So, what we have is we just started off by using some averages and what has been spent over the course of the last few years, but just think about your bond as being physically constrained and how you populate that, how much is roads, how much is neighborhoods, how much is housing will be a decision for this Council.

Ms. Watlington said let me ask it differently; we have \$200 million per bond cycle, if there is a project or a sum of projects that cost \$200 million but they are going to take two bond cycles to be executed can we split that total costs over two bond cycles, therefore I still have \$100 million for affordable housing in this bond cycle despite not being fully incumbent based on the balance of the other project?

Mr. Jones said I'm going to make sure I don't trip myself up so Kelly can bail me out. The way that we set aside funds, I call it to draw schedule, for how do you spent, what is your

spend rate for a particular project? If the project takes you two years to two and a half years to actually execute and you need dollars out the door, there is a way to set this up so that you potentially could split it over two bond cycles, but I think ultimately what Liz suggested last week is given where we are, assuming this Steady State assuming about \$100 million related to transportation with everything else you do, sidewalks, bike paths, things of that nature if a road is going to cost about \$70 million and an intersection is going to cost about \$30 million than over the course of four bond cycles you could basically do two intersections, two roads. Did I get that right Liz?

Ms. Babson said yes sir, that is correct.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Watlington may I follow up on your question?

Ms. Watlington said please.

Mayor Lyles said one of the things that I think we have to think about Mr. Jones when we lift out on our bond referendum in the public vote if we decide to divide up a road over two years wouldn't we have to have either the total costs on the referendum or say something different like land acquisition for a road versus construction of a road? I'm just worried about how, if we are going to the voters does the referendum have to say that we are going to do 50% of the project or the total project?

Mr. Jones said I will buy some time for the folks in CH-14 and I'll use the example of Bryant Farms Road; we put it in two bond cycles. We said that we couldn't build it in two years so in the first bond cycle, the 2018 bond cycle, Mr. Driggs, you put \$2 million in. It is a \$20 million road, we said in that first bond cycle, \$2 million would pay for the design and you would have \$18 million for the construction. Now, I remember my first year or so here, and I went to one of the Ballantyne Breakfast's and someone said well Mr. Manager, you put \$2 million in design, I want to make sure in the next bond cycle I get my road. So, as we start to think, some of this is how do we finance it, but the assumption is that your planning fund has given us an opportunity to get the 30% design and we have more certainty with the costs of these projects. So, if we get the green light to go forward we are going to build the road, whether we put it in one bond of two bonds but getting to this 30% design is something we didn't have during the Big Ideas and we have more certainty with costs.

Ms. Watlington said I just want to make sure I understood, this TMN (Transformational Mobility Network) versus the CIP, are these two different buckets or this TMN on this slide just supposed to be how you are developing new projects because I know we already have our CIP projects. For instance, in District three that we know are still in the pipeline. Is the intent that we are identifying additional projects over that TMN process?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said let me take a stab at that and then you can jump in. The CIP what you have is what you currently have today based on what the Manager was saying. Remember that the slide that Kelly shared with you on the funding shows a \$500 million Steady State CIP over a 10-year period. That is about five bond cycles, right and that has about \$100 million-plus or minus or around \$2 million every bond cycle. That takes you to your Steady State, that is what you have today. That is incremental, if we did not get anything with regard to a sales tax increase that is how we are going to continue to operate but once you move into the TMN, that is the Transformational and Mobility Network which says you have a one-cent increase in sales tax and 30% of that one-cent increase allows you to be able to focus on the non-transit piece, just roadway, bicycle, pedestrian allows you to not only have more projects to do but to actually rate this project. If you look towards the right of that screen in the middle in terms of outcome, focuses on the first three to five years because there is some certainty with those projects within the first three to five years with regard to advanced planning, with regard to construction designing and building that. That TMN is an improvement over how we do it a day which is really the CIP, which is really what you get every bond cycle. Liz, I don't know if I covered that well, but you may want to add to that.

Ms. Watlington said before she starts, I just want to make sure I have this clear. What I'm asking is there is a list of about 15 to 20 projects already identified as CIP projects in District three that we know at least within Steady State there is not enough money to do. Is the idea then that this TMN work is going to find us new ways to fund what we already know are the needs or are we looking to create another list is needs?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said it will allow you to be able to do what you have today.

Ms. Watlington said and then finally, the polling questions, I just wanted to ask on the polling data, did you have social-economic data for the respondents? I'm just curious as far as the sales tax is across the board regardless of income levels people were supportive of the sales tax increase.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I don't have all of the details, but yes, for all the polling data that we've done and including the focus groups socioeconomic data was very important in terms of income bracket, not even that including those who use the system and those who don't.

Ms. Watlington said and so we didn't see any discrepancy were any difference between support levels across incomes.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said there was no significant difference in the data.

Ms. Watlington said then as far when you talk about 80% or 84% is supportive of these particular taxes, what form did those answers take? Were they like formal questions or was it simply a yes or no, was there an option to rate their preference level, or were they given other options to select from? I want to understand where the question is posed.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said if I recall, again, this was done by a third party, this wasn't done by the City, so we never drafted those questions, but from what I saw that they shared, there were rarely any yes or no questions. They were very direct and specific to this effort and not asking a generic question like what do you think about this or that? There were some really good questions in there.

Councilmember Bokhari said if I could just summarize what my feelings are at this moment given an incredibly tight timeline, a whole lot of actions left, and a lot of good people working hard on it I would say that part of me is very concerned that we are considering doing something that potentially raises taxes in a material way and goes down certain paths in deciding on what we are going to make our bet on the future of transportation and where it is going to be, discussions we've been having for years now in this environment that we are in. But the other part of me is still at the table trying to productively work because I feel like there is an opportunity here that we could get right or wrong and the opportunity could be wrong in a thousand different ways. The opportunity is really around the premise that there is, and potentially will be more, federal funding and those who are ready are going to be ready to take advantage of the federal funding and have transformational opportunities. So, I'm still in good faith trying to operate here. I think my gut reaction when I see kind of this presentation today is there is some good work, we are laying out what is going on with the Legislative Agenda over this, but I get very uncomfortable when I see this polling information because on one side, and this is why I think there might be some folks confused watching us right now, on one side of the coin we know there are people in Charlotte and the Towns surrounding us that want more transit opportunities and depending on how they were asked, we can make a poll literally say anything we want. But, I think there is a more fundamental point which is the problem is the people polled or the methodology that has done so, the problem is those folks in the Towns elect their own representatives that we have to partner with and deal within order to find an ultimate solution here. The last thing I want is for, particularly those leaders in those Towns to think they are seeing some kind of view of what the folks that elect them to want because clearly without the cross tabs and all the other things you need to understand polling, this can be completely shredded from one way to another. So, we know we have work left to do there, we know we have our own Council work, we have General Assembly work and community work. I think the biggest thing though, does anyone have an update on what is going on the federal side because that to me is a

game-changing moment while a lot of people who may be frustrated or promised things in the past and now it is time for a new conversation and is there a new deal? All those elements, that big carrot that is floating above is what is going on with the new administration, with the federal funding that it makes transformational things like this whether it is rail or roads or sky or everything in between possible? Hopefully, that made sense as I how I am just gut feeling right now, but why I'm still trying to work with everyone to see what the path is. Does anyone have an update on the federal side of all of this?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said maybe I can speak to that and if John is available maybe he can. What we do know is this, the infrastructure plan at the federal level includes multimodal efforts to invest in a multimodal system like we are proposing here. [inaudible] meet with them, but one of the things we have quickly found out also is that the cities that have done what we are about to do all of a sudden are ready. There are no guarantees, it is a state competitive effort obviously, but we thought any local match or opportunity to be able to say we have the potential to have a local match seeking federal funding in the process if not even a thing because that is the first question that will be asked. There is no guarantee obviously, which is why Kelly said what she said, we do not want to compete with ourselves when that opportunity comes to enter into the federal process. We have a Silver Line that is going through design, engineering, and [inaudible] process right now, we have a Red Line that was designed up to a higher percent some years ago that needs to be refined. We have a Gold Line that was designed up to 30% and needs to be refined, but all of those things are for naught if we don't have a local match that could actually step forward and say we want this Red Line of this Silver Line or this Gold Line to enter into an environmental process.

What we have put in front of you and what we are going to be sharing with you does not even put the Envision my Ride into a federal process. It put that on us that we can do it within this exercise, but all the rail efforts will have to be entered into a federal process, which right now everything sounds positive from what we are hearing with regard to infrastructure funding, but again we are not even having conversation unless we can answer the question as to whether we have a local match to be able to get into a federal funding process. We do know that there is interest there, there are conversations going on with our competing cities that they know their position in themselves for this type of opportunity that we are about to get into. But again, there are no guarantees, it just makes us more competitive if we have something to show for.

Mr. Bokhari said so no new update from the feds.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said nothing new.

Ms. Ajmera said I will keep it brief because some of my questions have already been addressed here. Can you go back to the slide of prioritization? I'm trying to understand where we have under countywide bus and rail transit system, are we prioritizing the bus service frequency before working on our light rails such as Red Line, Silver Line, and Gold Line?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said definitely that is the priority. We know that again as I said earlier, you cannot just get into a construction mode. You still have to do some environmental work, some design work like we are doing for the Silver Line right now, or refining existing work. You don't need to do all of that for a bus system and so for our bus system, we think that is a priority for us regardless of what comes out of NCGA. At the end of the day it will remain a priority for us to improve our bus network system. What this does for us, however, is it allows us to get into an accelerated timeframe to be able to implement the recommendations of Envision my Ride.

Ms. Ajmera said I think that also addresses the short-term issue of getting from A to point B while we work on a long-term plan for the Light rail. So, thank you for prioritizing that.

Mr. Driggs said I just wanted to quickly respond to Ms. Watlington's question. You should understand that when we put something on the ballot for the 2022 bond cycle that doesn't mean we are going to issue bonds in 2022. It means that we get authorization from the

public to issue bonds for the purposes described on the ballot and in fact that authorization extends out seven years. So, in practice what happens is, we have that authorization in hand, we start work and typically we would issue bond anticipation notes as construction financing and the bonds themselves would be issued at some future date to refinance those construction notes. I just want you to appreciate the 2022 ballot does not constitute an undertaking to issue the debt at that time and I think that explains a lot of what you were trying to get at unless anybody on staff disagrees with that description. I just wanted to know whether it is our intention that the referendum will ask for one percent. I was interested to hear that we were starting to recognize constraints on when the work could happen or the sequence, etc. Is there any thought being given to actually requesting authority for the tax in stages over time or would referendum this year say does the public authorizing one-cent sales tax increase?

Mr. Jones said Mr. Driggs, I believe the task that was handed to me was to do an assessment of a one-cent sales tax increase that would allow for transportation and transit projects to be on a 2021 referendum. As you know me and you know the team, we will always look to see whether or not there are any deviations from that, but that is where we are starting off with and we try to put that out tonight, the possibility of a one-cent sales tax increase for these types of projects with the November 2021 referendum.

Mr. Driggs said understood and would your expectation be that if that is approved that the collection of the one-cent sales tax commences virtually immediately, or would it somehow track the progress of these projects?

Mr. Jones said I think what we have done Mr. Driggs is been able to make some assumptions, whether or not this begins in July of 2022 or sometime afterward. So again, we are trying to keep our flexibility, but right now it is with the assumption of the projects that are listed which includes the Red Line, and with a November referendum.

Mr. Driggs said right, and final quick question on the first slide of the funding overview section you've got a .3% allocation to the County, the City, and the Towns so does that mean when we look at the \$4 billion to \$6 billion local cost component of the total scope of the Mobility Plan that we are expecting the County and the City and the Towns to pay \$1.2 billion to \$1.8 billion to be funded by their share of the tax?

Mr. Jones said Mr. Driggs, as we go forward; that was a Task Force number and I will tell you that the Task Force numbers are not necessarily consistent with the numbers that we are working on right now. So, if we can leave that as Task Force work and pivot over to staff work, we do have some different numbers and I would like to get those cleaned up a bit before we start producing a new set of numbers. Is that fair?

Mr. Driggs said yes, I understand that. I'm just making the general point that if we are allocating 30% of the revenue from the sales tax I'm assuming that 30% of the costs of the projects within the scope of the Mobility Plan will be born by the County and the Towns and that they are not going to have funds for investments other than we've been discussing in the scope of our Mobility Plan as a result of that allocation. So that will be part of the total Mobility Plan and the money that is allocated to them will pay for a portion of the Mobility Plan. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said it will pay for the non-transit piece of the Mobility Plan, yes. So, for example, the County greenways, town roadway improvement, bikeways, pedestrian, but it is only for the non-transit piece. The same goes for the City.

Mayor Lyles said thank you so much for the update on the process Mr. Jones and thanks to the entire team for the information.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: SOURCE OF INCOME DISCRIMINATION

Councilmember Graham said the item that we have before us is a topic that has been surfacing within the Council environment since June of 2020 starting with the COVID (mild to severe respiratory infection caused by the coronavirus) Task Force. There was a recommendation made from that Task Force to the Great Neighborhoods Committee; the Committee began doing our due diligence in terms of taking up the issue. We've had two Committee meetings relating to this specific topic, one in December where we received the first overview based on instructions given to staff to bring back recommendations and/or an ordinance. Those recommendations were brought in December, they have reviewed again in January and we voted out a series of recommendations for the Council's considerations, those recommendations will be presented today. The presentation is longer than usual because there is a lot of information to be considered and the Director of Housing, Ms. Wideman, will be here to present those recommendations of her team for the Council's consideration.

Pam Wideman, Housing and Neighborhood Services Director said let me start by saying this is indeed a lot of information as Mr. Graham has said; this is a tag-team effort and so I'm going to kick off the presentation walking through the Committee charge. Willie Ratchford, who is the Director of the City's Community Relations Committee will join us to provide some background on the Fair Housing Ordinance. Warren Wooten from Housing Services will walk through some research, I'll come back to you to discuss our landlord survey and then you will hear a SWAN (Southwest Area Neighborhood Association) Analysis from Willie Ratchford and Anna Schleunes from our Legal Department, and then I will come back to close it up to talk about some recommendations and some next steps.

Let me also preface this by saying again, this is complex information. Our goal here tonight is to provide you with a full overview of our Source of Income Discrimination work. I also think it is important to begin by just restating and framing the discussion tonight. The first thing I want to point out is that your staff does not support discrimination based on the source of income or otherwise. We are here to address what we believe is a very complex problem and here to offer you some practical information. I also would like to say it considers all sources of income, however, because the Housing Choice Vouchers are the largest source of rental subsidy in our community, you will hear a lot about Housing Choice Voucher, but I want us all to be assured that we considered all sources of income and discussed that.

As Mr. Graham alluded to, this has been in Committee; you've discussed it most recently at your Annual Strategy Session and so with that your staff was charged with the following. We were charged to do four things; we were charged to draft a proposed local Source of Income Discrimination (SOID) ordinance and complete a SWOT analysis providing some alternative of that ordinance. We were charged to provide a list of cities that prohibit discrimination based on the source of income. You will see that in the research. We were also asked to engage INLIVIAN to understand what type of mitigation factors that they could help with and we were asked to provide alternatives in recommendations and incentives and perhaps some educational opportunities that would help mitigate landlords concerns when we talked about the source of income discrimination. At this point, I want to invite Willie Ratchford into the discussion to provide some background on the Charlotte Fair Housing Ordinance.

Willie Ratchford, Director of Community Relations said I would like to thank you for this opportunity for us to share information regarding the Charlotte Fair Housing Ordinance, especially as it relates to discrimination based upon the source of income. As most of you all are aware, the City of Charlotte has a Fair Housing Ordinance that is actually administered by the staff of the Community Relations Committee and this ordinance has been in existence since 1980. The ordinance prohibits discrimination based on race, religion, color, sex, national origin, a familiar status which means that you have children 18-years of the age of younger in your custody or in other words you cannot discriminate against a family because they have children in housing and of course disability.

The Community Relations Committee receives anywhere from 30 to 40 complaints a year and the actual basis for those complaints, for the most part, is race, disability, and familiar status. In the last three years we have only had three inquiries, not cases, but inquiries where folks have alleged that they were victims of housing discrimination based upon their source of income, so we don't really get that many complaints as a result of this particular status.

The City's Human Relations Ordinance, Article Five actually encompasses the Fair Housing Ordinance and as you see on the highlighted area of the slide, the general purpose of the ordinance is to secure for all persons within the City freedom from discrimination because of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, handicap or familiar status.

Mr. Ratchford experience trouble with his auto and Ms. Wideman took over for the rest of his presentation.

Ms. Wideman if I could go to slide #4, I think he finished that up, but I think one of the key points there, and we tried to bold them on the presentation, is that in the last five years we've had three inquiries that have been received for a potential source of income discrimination. Because there is currently a Fair Housing Ordinance in place and so what Mr. Ratchford informed us of is that we would not need to create a separate ordinance to add a source of income. You can see the language there and he has already alluded to that in our current Fair Housing Ordinance we currently protect discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin, sex, handicap, or familiar status. If we were going to go down this path, we simply would need to add a source of income into the purpose of our existing ordinance.

The purpose of this slide is to show you if we added a source of income into our current Fair Housing Ordinance the following Sections would need to be updated to include that so that Sections 12-107 through Sections 12-116. It was important for us if we are going to go down this road to have a proposed definition of source of income and so I'm not going to read that definition to you because you have it in front of you, but this is what was suggested from a legal perspective and in consultation with Mr. Ratchford about how we would consider the source of income. What I would point out there is we want to make sure that we are including all sources of income. Let's try to get Mr. Wooten in to walk through the research, but if you can't I will come back and do my best with that as well.

Warren Wooten, Housing Services said the staff did research on both the national and municipal levels. Looking at this issue, and here is a summary of what we found. The majority of states do not have a source of income laws; 16 states do have some type of source of income law on the books, but four of these specifically exclude the Housing voucher program. Two states that we found specifically had already preempted any local source of income protection. We did research on some of our peer cities; these cities should be familiar to you. These are typical cities that we use when we compare Charlotte to our community. Out of the 14 that responded we found that eight had some kind of Source of Income Discrimination Ordinance on their books, but four of those were not active. One was found locally to be not enforceable and then three others, the two in Texas and the Memphis ordinance were all superseded by their state governments.

Here are the five that had no Source of Income on the books and one had already been preempted so Indiana had already preempted any action in Indianapolis, but we did find Columbus, Ohio is in the same stage as you are, and are considering what action to take. This is looking closer to home at some of our partner cities here in North Carolina. You will see that the three at the top, Durham, Raleigh, and Asheville had some thinking around this; two of them are sort of looking at what their options are and monitoring activity around Source of Income Discrimination but their incentives were basically focused on helping someone homeless getting housing.

Here we started looking at what other incentives were being used across the county to incentivize landlords accepting all forms of vouchers [inaudible]. We found that several were in place; I'm not going to read this entire slide to you, but we did find that for instance

in California there was a sign-up bonus very similar to Durham and we found in several locations including Oregon and Washington there was a guaranteed program which basically provided the landlord the guarantee that if they rented to people that had alternative forms of income and payment for their rental that they could if their deposits exceeded damages they could use these special funds set up to mitigate those damages to their property. We also looked locally; we've actually been doing some work around incentivizing landlords here in Charlotte to take tenants, you will see some of those incentives look similar to what you saw going on nationally. Again, they have a mitigation program that will cover access damage; they are using a sign-up bonus to incentivize landlords to take these tenants. They are also hiring some private inspectors to speed up the inspection process and all of this is being managed through the Housing CLT Program which is a partnership with many partners here in Charlotte, but it is hosted and run by [inaudible].

We were asked to look at what INLIVIAN was doing to increase the acceptance of their vouchers and what we can do to assist them and we found that INLIVIAN had actually already surveyed landlords about what landlords were looking to INLIVIAN to do to increase acceptance of their vouchers and they have already done some really good work around this. For instance, they have speedup their inspection process, they have created positions just for doing outreach to landlords and working with landlords and the tenants. They also established their own sign-up bonus and they've started their own media campaign called Housing For Everyone and you will see when we get to the end of our recommendations that we have some recommendations for how we can even assist INLIVIAN more for the good work that they've already done. I will turn this over now to Ms. Schleunes from the Attorney's Office to talk about the legal challenges.

Anna Schleunes, Assistant City Attorney said in the interest of time and because these legal cases that we looked at are not particularly valuable from a presidential perspective for North Carolina I will just do a quick overview. I think the big take-a-way from these is that there was always a quick challenge to a jurisdiction that adopted a Source of Income Ordinance and not only was there a quick challenge but these cases took quite a while to get through the court system, often between three and five-years. The only jurisdiction that had any kind of a win really just got a remanded meaning that the highest court in the state sent it back to the trial court to evaluate it on the merits of the argument and there is no resolution in that case here. I would note that even in a Home Rule State like Pennsylvania, the Supreme Court in Pennsylvania determined that the Source of Income Ordinance even exceeded the Home Rule authority in Pittsburg. With that, I will send it to Ms. Wideman to discuss the survey.

Ms. Wideman said our landlord survey; we asked six questions and I'm going to walk through those questions in just a moment. I wanted to give you kind of a snapshot of who we surveyed. We surveyed a total of a little over 5,000 individuals, we sent our surveys to landlords who recently participated in our emergency rental assistance program, we sent our surveys to Social Serves list that was about 4,000 people, we partnered with the Greater Charlotte Apartment Association and sent surveys to 220 of their members and I think you also may have received a letter from them today or sometime over the weekend and we also sent our surveys to our affordable housing developers. In addition, what you don't see here is we also sent out surveys to our six local subsidy providers; those are providers like Salvation Army, Charlotte Family Housing, Crisis Assistance Ministry, and Supportive Housing Communities or Roof Above and Our Way Home. We tried to get the survey out to as many of our partners as possible.

Here is where I will begin to walk through the six questions that we asked. We wanted to get as much information as we could, so we started by asking on our survey, the first questions were, what is the size of your rental real estate portfolio? What I will point out to you is you can see 62% of the landlords surveyed had a portfolio ranging from one to 50 units. Then the next largest portion had portfolios with units between 101 to 500 units. That is really important because we wanted to make sure that we got the smaller moms and pops if you will, and we also got the people who had more units in this community. You can see kind of how those numbers panned out over the course of that question.

We also asked does your portfolio primarily consists of single-family or multi-family development and you can see the one to 50, and this makes sense, consisted mainly of single-family units which are good. The 51 to 500 mainly consisted of multi-family and the same with those people who had portfolios of over 500 units. We asked to do any of your properties within the City of Charlotte accept subsidies including Housing Choice Vouchers, so subsidies including Housing Choice Vouchers. You can see the data here, property owners with one to 50 units, 63% of them said yes they do; 51 to 500 56% of them said yes they do and then over 500 units 65% of them said yes they do. We went a step further and we said what rental subsidies or vouchers do you accept and gain, Housing Choice Vouchers is the most common and the largest rental subsidy that we had in our community. In addition to Housing Choice Vouchers some commented that they accepted our Home Tenant-Based Rental Subsidy assistance, our HUD (Housing and Urban Development) Vas Vouchers, those are vouchers for veterans. When we deploy ESG (Emergency Solution Grant) vouchers for rapid rehousing they accepted the A Way Home endowment, the key voucher from the state, and then rental subsidies provided through our HOPA Program. So again, we wanted to be inclusive here.

In terms of the feedback we receive, and again I'm not going to read this to you, but we tried to kind of theme it for you. We asked if you do not accept rental subsidies to tell us why what is the reason. What you will see here in green is again, I want to build on Mr. Wooten's point; INLIVIAN has done some great work over the past several years in trying to increase this. You can see what we've highlighted in green is the work that INLIVIAN has worked to address and so I want to point out to you here is just a couple of other things that we believe we can build on. The inspections are too rigid, and they take too long and the lack of accountability of a tenant and the program itself. We ask if you do not accept rental subsidies, tell us why; what is the reason. Again, I will just highlight a couple of things. You can see what INLIVIAN has already done so I will just point out what we heard from landlords and property management that they can readily find tenants without the hassle of the voucher process. Again, this is just about the program itself, it is not about INLIVIAN, it is about the program.

We asked from their perspective what do they believe are the pros and the cons of adding Source of Income protection to the City's Fair Housing Ordinance. The highlight here is the pro obviously is that people believe there would be more housing opportunities for low-income families. By the same token we ask from your perspective, what do you believe are the pros and cons when we talk about the cons again, not to rehash what INLIVIAN has already done but this gets to unintended consequences and I think Mr. Bokhari you really pushed this hard and I appreciate that in Committee about what might unintended consequences be. One of the things I will point out here is that an intended consequence could be landlords raising rents above the fair market rent rate that are allowed for housing choice vouchers by HUD across the City.

We continued on that question and this just builds on it. Again, it won't be enforceable, and it won't result in increased housing. We didn't just leave it with talking with property managers and landlords, we also wanted to hear the voice of the organization and so again, we talked with the Greater Apartment Association, their ED, we heard from the Apartment Association of North Carolina, we heard from the National Apartment Association, the National Multi-family Housing Counsel and the National Rental Income Counsel. Some of the issues that they share are the issue is not the source of income discrimination or the tenants, but it is the various aspects of the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Then the Greater Apartment Association noted that they are aware of the recent enhancement made by INLIVIAN and that they are willing to participate in a city facilitated discussion with INLIVIAN of course to identify additional improvements that can be made to the Housing Choice Voucher Program. With that, I'm going to turn back to Anna and Willie to walk us through the SWOT analysis of a proposed ordinance.

Ms. Schleunes said again, we have provided slides for you to review and the team did a good job diving in on this SWOT analysis, but I just want to give you an overview of the highlights. I think from the Strengths side the biggest strength that we have is the existing infrastructure of the CRC. They have a 40-year history of experience and successes with Fair Housing Enforcement and Education. On the weakness side, obviously, the biggest

one is that there is no authority in the State Statute or our Charter to expand the seven categories of protected classes which means that we would need legislation and approval from the General Assembly to add that category. The concern would be that that might create an expectation in the community if the Council were to adopt an amendment to the ordinance that the new ordinance would fix the problem even though there would be a lack of enforcement ability with that ordinance.

On the opportunity side, I think there are a number of opportunities here, not the least of which that there is a new administration in Washington, DC and we are hopeful that perhaps we might get some guidance from HUD and some movement on this issue out of Washington. Also as reflected in the survey there appear to be opportunities to provide education and greater awareness in the community regarding rental subsidies, housing choice vouchers, and new and creative ways of increasing their use in the community. I think the big opportunity here is to explore some of those alternatives. Lastly the Threats again, obviously, the General Assembly is unlikely at least with the current makeup to provide enabling legislation for the City to amend the ordinance, and based on the experience of many other communities across the county, likely there would be a very quick legal challenge to an amended ordinance that would include a source of income and probably we wouldn't have a lot of success in North Carolina trying to defend that at this point.

Lastly, and you can see that on the slide with Threats and Pam alluded to this so I won't go back over it, but there are several unintended consequences that might result from the adoption of the ordinance at this point. With that, I will pass it back unless Willie has anything he wants to add

Mr. Ratchford said you did a great job Anna; I think the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats are the exact things that we needed to share with Council.

Ms. Wideman said thank you both for that. Let me see if I can expedite this a little bit. Now we are at the Landlord Recommendation and let me just preface this by saying you all received a supplemental guide to this presentation and so we have verbatim comments and all of this information is in that supplemental presentation. In terms of the Landlord Recommendations, if I had to theme them the five themes resonated and the themes were inspections and what I will point out there is that what we heard is that we need to work on being realistic in the unit criteria. In terms of accountability again, you can see in green what INLIVIAN is already working on. I would just add the subsidy provider must hold the tenants responsible for damages. We heard that a lot from the survey and some recommendations.

The third theme is Tenant Self-sufficiency. There was a recommendation around guaranteeing case management for the voucher holder, perhaps a financial coach, and then providing a path to self-sufficiency for the voucher holder. In terms of the financial perspective, simplify the process for rent increases, eliminating the cap each year making a rent increase automatic. A few more financial recommendations, providing larger deposits, and then to the extent, the payments to the landlords can be made faster. In terms of Programs Process and Administration, I will point there that there was a recommendation that INLIVIAN should pay 100% of the rent to the landlord and then collect the tenant's portion. That was a recommendation and a big recommendation was having a more transparent process and the use of more automation for landlords to decide to participate in the program.

With that, I will get into some of the alternatives that your staff recommends and some of the recommendations. The first thing that we recommend is that we adopt a policy requiring mandatory acceptance of Housing Choice Vouchers and other forms of rental subsidy in all City supported housing. As I have stated before this happens to currently happen in your Housing Trust Fund-funded developments. We have already, your staff and your Housing Department, we are shoring up our Community Development Block Grant, our Home dollars, our HOOPLA, and our emergency solutions where we are putting money in voucher assistance programs. We want to encourage and monitor changes to the Housing Choice Voucher Program at the Federal level with the new

administration. Again, Anna alluded to this and so we are hearing some very positive talk come from the new administration about improvements to the Housing Choice Voucher Program. We also suggest and would ask of you to create or appoint an ad hoc advisory group to develop some further program enhancements and process improvements to the Housing Choice Voucher Program. We suggest, but you all should feel free to add to this list that that group should consist of representatives from INLIVIAN, private sector landlords, property management professionals, the Greater Apartment Association. You will recall a few slides back that they are willing to participate, other subsidy providers and then other people that you think should be a part of this ad hoc advisory group.

Then after this work is done, after the ad hoc advisory committee has had a chance to work, if we have not seen, which I believe we all want, increased use or acceptance of rental subsidy, including Housing Choice Voucher Program, at that point we would consider amending the Fair Housing Ordinance to include Source of Income in that ordinance. This is how we envision it would play out: February to March you all would appoint the Advisory Group; we would convene the group. March to May, a lot of work would get done, again, we've already begun updating the City's document, strengthening our language. Ms. Watlington, thank you for really pushing hard on this, we would do some matrix setting. I won't read this to you, but a couple of things that will really be important here is that we need to quantify the number of unused and returned Housing Choice Vouchers and other unused subsidies. In doing that we need to determine if the unused subsidies were redeployed. It might be one person didn't know how to use it, it got returned, another person understood better how to use it, that could inform our education and then also we need to identify reasons that the Housing Choice Vouchers and those other rental subsidies are not used. You can see the outline of the work that we plan to do between March and May. In May we would finalize all of our matrix based on what we are learning and then from June through December we would monitor to see if we are indeed seeing an increased acceptance of all rental subsidies and then we will present our findings and recommendations to you.

If at any point during this timeline where we feel like we are going faster or we just see that this is not going to work we would like to ask if we could come back to you and we would also be willing to provide you updates on a periodic basis so that you would know how the work is going. I think I have pretty much wrapped it up, the next steps, I will turn it back to the Mayor and we would ask you to appoint the ad hoc Advisory Committee, we would convene the work and then we follow the schedule that we just laid out to you. With that I want to thank my colleagues, thank the ones that you didn't see tonight who also helped us in this work and we are ready to answer any questions that you might have.

Mr. Graham said I just want to thank the staff for the work that we put into providing the information for Council's consideration. Again, I just want to reiterate the charge that the Committee gave to the staff and how they responded. I think they responded very appropriately. Again, the draft for the proposal local SWOT ordinance complete with the SWOT analysis and you can see for yourself for your consideration the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats, you heard from the City Attorney in terms of legal hurdles that we may encounter. You heard in reference to legislation that we do not have those types of authorities from the State government or even within our Charter and you've heard the recommendations that staff has laid out for your consideration so I'm very interested in hearing the questions from my teammates.

Councilmember Egleston said a couple of questions, the first one is for Ms. Schleunes. We went through this a little faster than I could look at every peer city. Did your research indicate to you that there was not a single large city in a Dillon Rule State that has enacted one of these and ultimately been able to enforce it?

Ms. Schleunes said yes, in the sense that for the reported cases that we were able to find that, that is correct. There are a few jurisdictions that had specific authority in their State Statutes and so there are communities around the country that do have a Source of Income Discrimination protection in their ordinances, but none that are similarly situated to how things operate in North Carolina.

Mr. Egleston said so the ones that have been able to enact it successfully and defensibly and enforcedly have been in the Home Rule States exclusively?

Ms. Schleunes said no, I don't think it is exclusive and I know Warren and his team did a little more research for the non-reported communities that are doing this that haven't necessarily been sued, but there are a couple of states that actually have specific authority in the General Statutes and so in those states whether it is Home Rule of Dillon's Rule those communities can add this protection.

Mr. Egleston said this is probably for Ms. Wideman; obviously the perspective of the property owners, the landlords are critically important in this conversation. I didn't see much in there in terms of trying to survey residents and I'm not surprised that we've only received three complaints about something that is not illegal. The Police probably don't get a lot of calls for things that aren't crimes and it would be anecdotal so I'm just curious if we attempted to find those anecdotal stories from residents in our surveying.

Ms. Wideman said Mr. Egleston, we did not reach out to residents in particular but what I would suggest and I think it is a great idea is if you all were to move forward with this ad hoc Advisory Group that we do include residents in that group to get their perspective as well.

Mr. Egleston said the only other question around the data that we've got there would be doing the low response rate from the property owners concern us in terms, and again, if I am reading this right, the response rate seemed low from the property owners and the landlords. If it was that low should there be some concern that maybe there was a self-selection process where people thought well if I am one of the ones discriminating based on the source of income, I'm sure as hell not going to answer this survey and we might have gotten somewhat a distorted view because the people who were doing it right would probably be more inclined to answer that survey?

Ms. Wideman said I'm not sure about that conclusion Mr. Egleston, but what I would say to you is that, and I don't have the exact numbers off the top of my head, but for example, the National Apartment Association, they are a federation of 153 affiliates, they have over 2,000 members and so to the extent, and we did, we heard from groups like that. I just want to point out those numbers so you can see the wide representation. In terms of the National Rental Income Home Counsel, they had more than 23 million properties and over 720,000 of those are in North Carolina. I totally recognize that the response rate was low, but also would remind us that we heard from larger organizations that represent a large number of property owners.

Mr. Egleston said a lot of those are organizations that I think have some deserved credibility and probably are doing things the right way. I would be curious to know and again some of the anecdotal stories from residents might be able to help inform this but to be curious to know if when and where the Source of Income Discrimination is taking place. If it is taking place with larger entities or smaller, as you called them earlier, I think, Mom and Pop landlords. I would assume the larger organizations have been more mindful of this issue and probably have implemented some sort of processes or protocols that would help to minimize the number of times that have taken place within their units or their member's units or things of that nature. They probably in many cases operate in multiple states where they might have to navigate both places that do and don't have this sort of protection. They might have some uniform way that they approach it to accommodate the different laws that they have to abide by. I don't think we can use people not calling in something that is allowed as too much evidence but I'm also not interested in this Council pursuing or I'm not individually interested in us pursuing something simply for the sake of saying we did something if it ultimately doesn't address the concern or address the problem. So, while I am certainly wanting to see us do everything we can as it relates to curbing any occurrences of Source of Income Discrimination I certainly want us to do that with our legal counsel's advice as it relates to what we can actually enforce. If we put something on the books that we can't enforce we are doing it to help the residents, we are doing it because we think it looks good politically. I hope we will do as much as we can but only what we can in that regard.

Councilmember Johnson said I have so many questions because I'm so passionate about this subject. Full disclosure, I've been a Section 8 Landlord for 18 years, so it is just disturbing to me that we have to have a political debate to protect our most vulnerable. I think we as Council should be doing everything that we can. I drove today and got off on Brevard and saw the tents so I think is just a situation where we need to have all hands on deck and if it requires some type of ordinance specific to the City that our Legal Department can protect I think that is our duty. There is also a re-entry ordinance and so many barriers that we need to take a look at. I just have some questions for Ms. Wideman. I would like clarification of a fact for my colleagues who might not be as familiar with the Housing Choice Voucher or Homeless Services. Ms. Wideman, I do have several questions.

Ms. Wideman said yes ma'am, I'm ready.

Ms. Johnson said I asked in the earlier presentation about the statistic validity of the response rate and I believe it was about 61% of responses for that subject. Are we considering a three percent response rate from landlords a valid example?

Ms. Wideman said this was intended to present you with the information that we received. I think we could argue about what is the statistical significance of a statistically relevant survey. What I would say is all that we didn't receive in the survey, the survey results are what we received. Like I said I alluded to the organization and their representation, their members, but I also think that the beauty, if you all decide to go down this road with the ad hoc Advisory Committee, that gives us an opportunity to invite more voices to the room to really figure out a way to do what I think we all want to do is increase the acceptance of Housing Choice Vouchers and do it in a way that we can really see results.

Mr. Johnson said one of the things that Willie said was that the CRC (Community Relations Committee) Department had only received three complaints. Well, I would say that since I've been on Council, I've heard from INLIVIAN and Habitat for Humanity, and One Meck and we all receive hundreds of letters in support of this from the community. While the City might have only received three complaints, there is also a petition with over 1,200 signatures in support of an ordinance. I don't want to minimize the fact that the City might have only received three complaints, that this is not an issue in the community. There were some specific concerns from landlords; we know that the Section 8 wait list can be up to 10-years, we also know that Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher is transferable among states, so this is a very viable and desired housing subsidy for many people. Seventy percent of individuals receiving the Housing Choice Voucher work and so we know that affordable housing is challenging here. Here is an option and we are allowing any landlords in the City to reject it. When we talk about the Source of Income Discrimination we are also talking about individuals on social security, individuals on disability so I'm just really concerned, and I'm saddened that we wouldn't all do as much as possible. I understand the legality that is the only concern, but anything else, these anecdotal opinions from three percent of the landlords, if I add myself does that increase the percentage because I don't have a problem with Housing Choice Vouches?

The tenant self-sufficiency right now, [inaudible] case management and also education courses to their tenants. I could just go through a couple of these to simplify the process for a rent increase and simplify virtual options or something. Right now, you can have a virtual reinspection, which is a direct deposit. If you are looking at the average rent for HCV the average price that they pay for a three to four-bedroom, I saw between \$1,400 and I think \$2,700, so they do have allowance to pay market rent. I just think some of these concerns are so unfair and if we are truly intent on upward mobility and reducing disparity, this is an opportunity for us to do that. The other thing I wanted to ask, some of these concerns talked about tenant damages. Is there a guarantee for damages for market rent apartments?

Ms. Wideman said yes ma'am. In the form of that, you will not get your deposit back and you can be charged additional damages as well.

Ms. Johnson said and the same thing goes for Section 8 landlords, you can keep the deposit, and if there are damages we can take the tenant to court and the one thing that Section 8 offers if you take the tenant to court for damages they will lose the Section 8 Voucher forever. So, there is more accountability for renting to a Section 8 tenant than there would be for a market-rate tenant. So, I'm just concerned with some of this language that the damages, is that some type of stigma surrounding the Section 8 tenant. Again, as far as the deposit, the landlord has that right, the landlord has the right to screen those tenants, that is their responsibility to screen the tenant. I think some real education to the landlord of what Section 8 or Housing Choice Vouchers is actually doing; I think a more fair sample. I think hearing from tenants, which I hope we do at the public meeting and I think allowing the presentation from INLIVIAN and at one of the Neighborhood Committee meetings, I think would be a fair representation of this option. The Housing Choice Voucher is transferrable, it is desirable for those who can't afford housing here in Charlotte. It is like the door is just continuously closed for the most vulnerable residents. I've said all I have to say; I ran on affordable housing; this is a problem and to close the door and defer this any longer is a disservice to our residents in my opinion.

Ms. Wideman said Ms. Johnson, just one thing and you said a lot and I certainly understand your passion and I'm equally as passionate about it as well. What you pointed out thought is that there is lots of room for education on both sides and so again, that is one of the opportunities I believe we have if we get the right people on this ad hoc Advisory Committee. Again, to do what we all want to see done is increase the acceptance of voucher and rental subsidies throughout this community. So again, thank you for that and I hope that we can come to some agreement where we can get that education out and get that insight that we need on both sides.

Ms. Johnson said thank you for that, but do we know that there are landlords that are terminating leases for individuals who receive assistance through COVID funding, through the money that we gave and NC Hope, there are landlords that are terminating leases because people received assistance. So, 18 to 24-months is a long time. We have the ability, legally again, I keep saying that, it is a caveat obviously, but if we can create something now and put it on the tables, let's do it and first of all we only heard from three percent which is not even a valid sample. I say we could create something, we could definitely create something, not just for developers who received a tax credit, anyone who received who receive any public dollars, and James Mitchell used to say public dollars are for the public good. So, when you are talking about a TIG (Tax Increment Grants) or a CIP or any funding from the City, any public cash dollars which people on Section 8 pay those taxes also, that they would be required to not discriminate the source of income, but also reentry as well.

Councilmember Phipps said I guess in view of the work that INLIVIAN has done, it looks like they've done a lot of work in this space, I guess I was struck by the fact, given this proposal, this recommendation that we are looking at anywhere from 18 to 24-months timeline. In my way of thinking that seems to me to be so protracted. You are talking about almost a full Council term on something that we would consider to be an important issue. We've already concluded that any success, we don't have the authority for the legislature, and any attempt to get it would probably be not successful at this time. I guess we've broached the subject with them at some point, has this even crossed the latitude of our Legislative Agenda or anything like that yet?

Ms. Wideman said Mr. Winston and Mr. Bokhari are on the line and they headed up the Legislative Committee, so I'll invite one of them to speak to the Legislative Agenda.

Councilmember Winston said I don't have a presentation prepared on our Legislative Agenda. I don't think Mr. Bokhari does as well, but this is something that we have discussed. I'm going to try to reach out for a lifeline, Mr. Fenton, to see if he has that State Legislative Agenda and notes on the discussions that we've had in the Committee available to brief Mr. Phipps or it might be more appropriate to do that offline.

Mr. Phipps said I was just wondering had it even been broached as a subject for any future consideration on the agenda or what.

Ms. Wideman said Mr. Phipps if I can remember correctly Mr. Fenton when he presented this current Legislative Agenda it was the recommendation based on past discussions to not include this on the State Legislative Agenda, but again, Mr. Fenton is the staff expert so we will check in with him.

Mr. Phipps said given the timeline that you described as a recommendation from 18 to 24-months, do we have a goal? I see that we are in the mid-50s moving up to mid-'60s depending on the number of units that we sample. I know every incremental increase in the acceptance rate is good, but in that timeline what do you expect to accomplish as far as moving the needle? What would you consider to be a success from 63% to 70s percent or what? What is our goal in trying to get any kind of legislative ability to do so?

Ms. Wideman said thank you for that question. That is the beauty and gain, I don't want to harp on this too much, but that would be the beauty of having the ad hoc Advisory Committee around the table. You have landlords who actually have the units, we would have INLIVIAN, we would have City staff, we would have residents for us to collectively and collaboratively come up with a goal that we believe that we could all achieve success. As your staff, I don't want to tell you an arbitrary goal, and I think one of the things that Ms. Watlington talked about in the Committee was, we need to make sure we set some matrix, right. I alluded to, we need to quantify the number of vouchers that go unused, are they returned back and are they redeployed? We really just need to work with INLIVIAN to understand if vouchers are returned and they are not redeployed, are they then project-based. That is important because if they are project-based that helps bring down the cost of the unit and you ultimately create more project-based housing units, which ultimately are rented cheaper. So again, I think that work, that matrix setting will occur in the ad hoc Advisory Committee; as I said to the extent that we get done sooner, coupled with our periodic update to you, we will be coming back to you. If we do our work really well, perhaps we get done in 10 to 12-months, I don't know, but what I recognize is that you all have to appoint, we have to convene, we have to finalize our matrix and then we have to actually deploy our process in the market. My hope would be to work with landlords who say I have units that I want to put in the program to accept vouchers and we increase that. It sounds like a long time, but there is a lot of work to be done to achieve the results that we want to achieve.

Mr. Phipps said thank you, but I still have the concern about that contracted timeline. I would hope that we could accomplish something in less time than that, but I do think the establishment of some sort of Committee could be a good step to take, but the timeline is what is giving me pause at this time.

Mr. Winston said Ms. Wideman; how many more people right now would be in safe, secure affordable housing if all vouchers that exist in our community were accepted tonight?

Ms. Wideman said I can't give you an exact number Mr. Winston, but we probably could all agree that there would be more.

Mr. Winston said are we talking about the tens, the dozens, the hundreds, the thousands, the tens of thousands?

Ms. Wideman said I can't give you an exact number; you could say that if we decreased our waiting list you could use that number, but I don't want to stand up here and give you a number that I can't defend.

Mr. Winston said what is our current waiting list?

Ms. Wideman said I would have to check in with my colleagues at INLIVIAN, I don't know that number off the top of my head, sir.

Mr. Winston said I will give the staff credit when you get into politics the first thing they tell you to do is know your audience, know the room that you are talking to and you definitely gave us a presentation that illustrates the type of political will and the difficult conversations that we would have to have if we were to take bold actions to eliminate

Source of Income Discrimination, and I think we all know that it would take a paradigm shift for this Council to go that route. So, I hope we will see through the negativity and the completeness of this presentation that many of my colleagues have pointed out.

I would like to point out that North Carolina is a strange state legislatively and legally because it is a state that has both aspects of Home Rule, but then of course a tighter than Dillon Rule State because of that pre-emption factor, however, a pre-emption law would have to have a Governor's signature on it. Have we engaged the Cooper Administration about his views on the Source of Income Discrimination and what our Governor's Office would be willing to support the municipalities of North Carolina in doing to end it?

Ms. Wideman said your Housing staff has not Mr. Winston; I'm not sure if Mr. Fenton has at any point, but unequivocally your Housing staff has not. Your Housing staff has, as demonstrated in the presentation, reached out to our colleagues like Raleigh, Asheville, Greensboro, what we believe to be the bigger cities in North Carolina to understand what they are doing and if they are looking to go down the path of adding Source of Income to their Fair Housing Ordinance, and as you saw in the presentation none of them are considering adding it to their Fair Housing Ordinance. Some of them are thinking along the same lines that we are.

Mr. Winston said I would just like to point out again the staff presentation included anecdotes from the Legislature as well as the judiciary, but it has not taken any account of what the executive branch would do or support here. I think we need to go bold, I think we need to go very bold in order to eliminate the Source of Income Discrimination, that is the only type of action that can be taken. I do believe recommendation number four should be recommendation number one. We need to make a bold definition of what a Source of Income Discrimination is and add it to our Fair Housing Ordinance. We also have to be bold strong advocates for all of our constituents here, that is the role of government. I've been engaging both renters as well as property owners, specifically, I've been talking to some of the folks at the Apartment Association and I do believe that they have valid beefs but their beefs I don't think are with the tenants, I think they are with the federal government, particular housing and urban development and the contracts that facilitate these voucher payments. I believe, the big problem I see is that the federal government has to be a more efficient and flexible partner with contract holders, I mean landlords, and I think it is our job to be bold advocates to Washington for them.

As has been said, we know a lot more than we let alone here so if one of the already barriers to accepting vouchers is the amount of red tape, I don't see how we help the problem by adding more red tape through another ad hoc committee after we've had so many committees that have dealt with this and we have a City Council as well as the ability to deal with the many different aspects of this through our different committees and their work. For example, our City's housing framework which we have recently affirmed as we have been looking through things dealing with COVID relief, objective to Strategy Three, particularly points two and three spells out that in order to preserve the affordability and improving the quality of existing rental housing stock, we must support and extend the use of rental subsidies and vouchers, align local resources with policies that support voucher use as well as coordinate with Charlotte Housing Authority, aka INLIVIAN and other local voucher programs on opportunities to use vouchers to support target populations, particularly in areas with strong pathways to opportunities. To me, that already says that staff has the authority to go out and explore recommendation one as well as recommendation two, whether that be through an outside committee or just through staff work. I would like to kind of get an idea of the type of work that has been employed since our adoption and affirmation of the housing framework and why we need additional authority to take this step that we've already had the Task Force, Stakeholders Groups, tons of community engagement, why do we need to do this again to do something that we've already affirmed?

Ms. Wideman said Mr. Winston let me try to answer you; you said a lot there. Your question was why are we proposing I believe this ad hoc Committee if we already have the ability to do some of this work. You are correct, we reaffirmed our housing framework, that is where we say 20% of all Housing Trust Fund awarded projects have to accept

vouchers and they have to have units in there for individuals who earn 30% and below the area median income. You all also took another step forward that is going to help with this when you did your NOAH (natural occurring affordable housing) rental subsidy program. That enabled us to have some additional units for 30% of households. We have not had an opportunity to really sit down in I will say in a more holistic way with landlords to really hear from them about what it would take and that is what we hope to do in this process. I will remind us that we do partner with Social Serve, they have one person that is a housing navigator and he has yielded some really great success by doing just this. That is his job to go and work with landlords to understand why they don't and what they would need to do. One of the things that I hope would come out of this is perhaps we would put some funding from the City's perspective to help create more of those people, that is just one thing that could come out of it. So, you also talked about City supported developments and so that is why we put that in there, is we are working right now to ensure that not only Trust Fund dollars but other City housing dollars. We have not had a conversation yet, but that is one of the things we want to do through this process, and I would argue we could do this with even talks about folks who are receiving TIG, to Ms. Johnson's point, don't know the answer, don't know if that is where we will land so I think we've done some of the work, but I do think through this process, getting some other voices like residents, like property owners around the table we could yield even more successes.

Ms. Winston said I get it; I would just like to let the community look back to that housing framework. There was a lot of work done to engage all types of folks, including our residents in this work. I had a half-hour conversation with the Apartment Association; we are very easily able to identify places within the contract between the landlords and the federal government that need work now and if we were to take a bold stance up to Washington, we are going up there next month, of ways that we can advocate for changes I think that is the role that we need to take. If we engage with those landlords through the Intergovernmental Committee I don't see why we couldn't come up with something in short order that we could engage, for instance, invite the new Housing and Urban Development Secretary down here to Charlotte to meet with residents and talk and work through these things. In the meantime, while the federal government gets its act together we should partner with our local, we should lead, but also engage other government entities like the County and State to stand up local support to fill the administrative financial and inspectorate gaps that come from the current relationship between landlords and the federal government. I think that is where one of the biggest cruxes of this problem lies and instead of dealing with that we continue to put it on residents about screens that get broken and windows and children flushing things down toilets and that is what has rejected people from living in [inaudible] housing.

Again, I just want to reiterate I think recommendation four needs to move up to the top of the list to recommendation one and it should not be determined based on this arbitrary success of any other recommendation. I think we should definitely adopt a policy requiring mandator acceptance of Housing Choice Vouchers, but we have to look broader than that. We need all forms of sources of income to be accepted. I don't think we should add an ad hoc Advisory Group, I think we the City Council can do its work if we have intentional use of our existing meeting schedule including our Committee structure, and I think we need to go beyond encouraging and monitor change on the federal level. This City Council can resolve as to what those changes we need to see and then we go and build coalitions around the state and around this country to put pressure on the federal government to be a response much faster than 18 to 24 months. I have one more question for Ms. Wideman; did you ask if landlords accepted subsidies before they started accepting COVID relief money

Ms. Wideman said yes sir we did.

Mr. Winston said what was that response?

Ms. Wideman said, we ask, and I want to be clear Mr. Winston, we asked do you accept rental subsidies including Housing Choice Vouchers.

Mr. Winston said sorry, but did we ask if they accepted subsidies prior to their acceptance of COVID relief dollars?

Ms. Wideman said we did not ask that question specifically; we asked the question; do you accept rental subsidies including Housing Choice Vouchers. I don't want to make an assumption, but COVID subsidies are new to the world.

Mr. Winston said I think it is a relevant data point to see what the true status quo is of landlords out there as our constituents.

Ms. Wideman said yes sir.

Councilmember Ajmera said Ms. Wideman, thank you so much for sending us this presentation so we can read through it prior to this Council meeting, I certainly appreciate that. I hope that is the practice we can have moving forward for our presentations. Some of my questions have already been addressed here but you acknowledged early on with this issue when it comes to income source discrimination is much larger in scope than just the Housing Choice Voucher Program. I understand that is one of the largest rental subsidies, however, a lot of folks rely on social security income, disability income, even financial aid for students to pay their rent. I did not see any data on that. Can we get data on that? We certainly have heard in the news report people being discriminated against because of their social security checks, or because of their disability income so it would be great to have data points for those.

Ms. Wideman said Ms. Ajmera, I hear your request and we will honor that. The one thing that I do have to say to the group is that there is no such thing as survey fatigue. We can send these surveys back out, we can ask these questions but I can't promise you how many respondents we will get, but I do believe there is power in getting folks together to talk whether that be in a virtual environment these days or around the table. We will try to get you the additional data that you are requesting.

Ms. Ajmera said I appreciate that and also if we can be more comprehensive in where we send these surveys out which includes whether we are being intentional including housing providers as well as tenants so that we are getting comprehensive data sets back. I know that my colleagues had raised the concern about the three percent response rate and I share the same concern here and that is why we need to be even more intentional about getting a higher percentage in response rate and sending it out to other groups in addition to the housing providers. Can you go to slide #4; I know Mr. Egleston had alluded to this earlier. Could it be a reason where we are not seeing any complaints because there are no protections in place?

Ms. Wideman said Ms. Ajmera, we talked about the three complaints and that is small, and I understand that. The three complaints that we received over the five years, Mr. Ratchford shared with us that two of those complaints that he received, he could have investigated based on race, which is already included. But, when asked if the filers of those complaints wanted him to proceed with the investigation based on race, they elected not to move forward. So, I do want to point that out, two of the three could have been further investigated, but you are pointing to a problem I think Mr. Winston has said it, Ms. Johnson has said it, is perhaps the reason we are not seeing more complaints is there is an opportunity to educate people, particularly residents. They may not know that they can file a complaint, and so we do believe, and Mr. Ratchford is prepared to increase the source of income education. If he is still on the line, if I have misstated any of that please correct me.

Mr. Ratchford said Pam, I hear you and you are exactly correct. I think one of the things that we all need to be considering in this discussion is that at this point we have not built a business case for adding Source of Income Discrimination to the local Fair Housing Ordinance. We have talked about this ad hoc Advisory Group and I think you used this ad hoc Advisory Group to actually begin to build the business case. I don't know if that takes three months or six months, a year or two years, but you can use it for that purpose. When it comes to this issue of Source of Income Discrimination it sort of reminds me of

air; we don't see it, but we know that it is there. We have to do a better job of finding out whether this type of discrimination is, in fact, occurring in consistent numbers in our community and we do that as you have indicated Ms. Wideman, through education and outreach through additional surveys and having conversations, as someone had mentioned earlier, with tenants to see what their experiences are compared to what we are hearing from landlords. We can talk about this from now until forever, if we don't build a business case for doing this then we are not going to be able to do this. Let's add this ad hoc Committee, let's make one of their charges to build a business case for doing this if we think that type of discrimination is in fact happening in this community.

Ms. Ajmera said I think if they are looking at the Source of Income Discrimination, and if they are looking at Housing Choice Voucher Programs, we can just ask INLIVIAN. It used to be Charlotte Housing Authority, and I served on Charlotte Housing Authority Board before serving on City Council and we have often gathered the data where residents were not able to get housing, even though they had the voucher in their hand they were not able to get housing because there were housing providers who wouldn't accept it. I think that is also one of the samples that you could tap into where survey all the tenants who have attempted getting housing using the voucher or who are still on the waiting list. I think that is the population we need to reach out to when we get another comprehensive data set that includes social security and disability vouchers and other vouchers that are out here.

Ms. Wideman said I want to go back to that; you raise a great point and I just want to remind you on slide #41 particularly. That is one of the things we want to do; first of all, we want to quantify the number of vouchers that are going unused and that are being returned. We want to understand that number, we want to understand are they being redeployed, and if they are being redeployed how are some people successful, others are not. We want to identify a group of landlords who are willing to accept these, and we want to make sure as many, including INLIVIAN market-rate developers, want to understand if they are indeed accepting housing choice vouchers. I think we all this amount of passion and we are trying to do the same thing; we are just saying it a little bit differently.

Ms. Ajmera said Ms. Wideman, I think you are absolutely right. We are all saying the same thing, we all want to protect our residents from being discriminated against based on their source of income, but how we go about it is an important step. I know some of my colleagues have pointed out earlier, especially Mr. Phipps, around the timeline and I agree with him. I think we need to do a better job in terms of the timeline, especially with what we are seeing with our affordable housing crisis to get to the bottom of this issue. On slide #28, you had mentioned that it is not enforceable. I know that cities like Atlanta that is also a Dillon rule state, have passed this ordinance so maybe this might be a question for Anna. If cities like Atlanta who is in a Dillon rule state have passed an ordinance if it is not enforceable why would you have an ordinance?

Ms. Wideman said let me take a stab at that and then Anna can come and I'm glad you brought that up. I participate in what is called the Southeast Housing Coalition and that consists of my counterpart, Atlanta is included in that Coalition. When we first started doing our research there, they were kind enough to spend time talking with me about this and so you are right, they passed an ordinance, but their counterpart had the same complexity. They have an ordinance that they cannot enforce. In fact, their legal has told them that they cannot enforce it and their Legal Department says that they don't support the ordinance. What they intended to do, what the staff intended was that they would do what we are intending to do, they have an ordinance that says that people who accept Atlanta's housing dollars must accept Housing Choice Vouchers, but they passed an ordinance, it is not enforceable.

Ms. Ajmera said I think that points to Ms. Johnson's point about could we look at entities that accept public dollars, such as Housing Trust Fund dollars or even TIG or other public funding, could we enforce it there? I think that would be the follow-up question for me there. The other question I have is around enhancement to the program itself. During my time on the Housing Authority, now INLIVIAN, I'm pretty certain that any enhancement

that we recommend has to go through HUD for approval. So, what kind of authority does City Council have there to enforce additional enhancement to the program?

Ms. Schleunes said if I understand the question I think we can enforce any conditions that we place on our financial partnership agreements with housing providers is certainly enforceable. If you are talking specifically about the Section 8 guidelines and rules, I don't really know the answer to that question. That would probably be something that INLIVIAN would have to answer because the City of Charlotte isn't directly involved in the administration of Section 8 Vouchers, but my understanding is there is some flexibility that housing authorities can get working with HUD in the way that they administer and there may be someone in this meeting that knows more about the ends and outs of that than I do.

Ms. Ajmera said to follow up on that, we are both on the same page here, certain housing authorities, if they are moving to work or a certain status, they have more flexibility than others. Do we have someone here from INLIVIAN? I remember having multiple questions that have come up for INLIVIAN, so I want to give them an opportunity to respond to that.

Ms. Wideman said we don't have INLIVIAN as a part of this conversation, but what I think you are alluding to is one of the flexibilities that they have as they move to work housing authorities is that they can charge more than the fair market housing rent to increase the acceptance of Housing Choice Vouchers. Again, I want to acknowledge that they are doing some of that today and that is noted in the supplement that we sent to you. We still face a dilemma thought; they can charge up to 150% I believe it is of the fair market rate. In some instances that would still not be enough to significantly increase the acceptance of vouchers. So, again, those are the things that we want to certainly partner with INLIVIAN on, and then if we can collectively go, if we are still not seeing that increase utilization rate, we've built the business case, someone said that earlier, where we can go to HUD, we can go to the Legislature and say we did all of these things, we tried to use every tool we could at a local level to get this done and we have built that business case. What we want to do again, we want to work collaboratively with our market-rate community who has the units that we need. INLIVIAN only has a certain number of units, the greatest preponderance of the is with the market rate community and so we want to work with them to do this work.

Ms. Ajmera said I think when we have our next session on this, I would also like to see INLIVIAN being present so some of these questions can be addressed directly by them. When we have our next session make sure to invite someone from INLIVIAN so we can get direct answers to some of these questions. You are absolutely right where we have to work with them to figure out how we could address some of the concerns that have been raised by housing providers and some of their concerns are valid. I went through the presentation you e-mailed us and I saw the number of items that have been addressed by INLIVIAN and they has incorporated some of those recommendations into the implantation in the last couple of years which is a great start and maybe you can even do more to address the housing crisis that we have in our City. I know we have taken a deeper dive into this and that is great, but at the end of the day, the question becomes who do we want to be? Do we want to be a City that discriminates against people based on their source of income whether it be social security, Housing Choice Voucher Programs, disability, financial aid for students, whatever the source may be, irrespective of what the state says, ultimately the question we have to answer is who do we want to become?

Councilmember Watlington said first I want to reiterate what many of my colleagues have already said and what Mr. Ratchford said and certainly what we can see right here on this slide where it says Section 8 specifically is known to be onerous and therefore avoid it. We know that source of income discrimination exists in our City and I've said this before, I'm severely disappointed that we don't have a piece of data that invalidate what we all know is true. To Ms. Ajmera's point in regard to what INLIVIAN has already done, I'm assuming that Fulton [inaudible] is watching, go ahead and just send the data rather than wait for this ad hoc Committee. If you have it just sent it to us, and I think that will help cut down some of this timeline. Again, I will reiterate that what concerns me about

the information that has been shared is that it has not at all captured what is actually happening to people with vouchers and what is the impact. Ultimately, we can talk about the legalities of putting together an ordinance, but at the end of the day, the real pain point is the impact that it has on our residents in this community. And every day that goes by that we haven't done something is a day that they are still experiencing this issue. Obviously, we know that if we put together an ordinance that is not enforceable that doesn't help either so I would also like to reiterate what some of my colleagues have said that whatever we can do to actually reduce the impact would be preferable.

I am just very, very concerned about some of the recommendations that have come from the landlords. When I look at things like going to their homes quarterly, make sure that they know financial literacy, make sure their children are in school and doing well, this in and of itself feels like a Source of Income Discrimination. I hope that we are not walking away with these recommendations as marching orders because much of what we hear needs to be challenged and I would not be supportive at all of pursuing down a path or allowing any resources to go work on some of these items. I find some of them frankly offensive. When I think about the strengths that were listed in the SWOT analysis, it seems that those are more about our current program rather than Source of Income Discrimination specifically. I would have liked to hear, to Mr. Egleston's point, for the cities that have been successful, although we understand that there are circumstances that are different than ours, I would love to know what their matrix look like and how their Source of Income Discrimination Ordinance has reduced their issues in terms of being able to use their vouchers. I think that is a key piece of the information that we still don't have. That is really what would tell us whether this is worth our energy or not, as if where they are and where are successfully implemented, do they work? I would love to see that information.

In regard to the Unintended Consequences slide, that is another one where I just question the credibility of some of the items that were listed there. Some of them seem to be hyperbole if you will, so I just want to make sure that as we are putting together the information that we make sure that we've got an objective view of what our options are and what the challenges are, but also what the upside is. When it comes to the staff recommended the one thing I would like to offer up for feedback from Ms. Wideman or others, is I would love to include in our required housing, not only the housing that has been funded partially by the City, but also housing that requires city rezoning. That is also a public investment. If it needs to be rezoned in order to be built, I feel like that is a perfect place to also require that they accept Housing Choice Vouches.

Ms. Wideman said I want to make sure I understood your question; your question was you offered up for us to look at including where housing needs a rezoning in exchange for that public investment have them include accept Housing Choice Vouchers. Did I understand that correctly?

Ms. Watlington said yes.

Ms. Wideman said what I would say is I have that note; I'm going to make sure before I promise you something that I can't deliver, I've got Mr. Jaiyeoba in the back I believe and I've got Ms. Schleunes on the line as well as the other attorneys and so we will have that discussion and we will follow up with you.

Ms. Watlington said okay, and then the other piece in regard to the ad hoc group, whatever we can use that INLIVIAN already has in place, I think that would accelerate the timeline. Also in regard to the utilization piece when it comes to a goal, while I can appreciate that the ad hoc Committee can give us the data to help guide us, I do believe that it is on the Council to set that goal and it can be something simple as 50% reduction in the unused vouchers. I would offer that up as a starting point or even a stretch goal. If you all could return with what would have to be true in order to achieve that we can determine whether or not that is a realistic goal.

Ms. Wideman said thank you, got that, that is good.

Ms. Watlington said and finally, I just wanted to really challenge us as a Council; I heard a lot of energy around what we can do to push the state and push the federal folks, I would have loved to have seen that in the Legislative Agenda given particularly Mr. Winston's passion for it as one of the Co-chairs. I hope that this session we really leverage our existing processes to incorporate some of those things because now that the General Assembly has already gone into session, we are behind the eight-ball so whatever we can do going forward to not miss those opportunities that I certainly would like us to be bold not only in activism but also in our policy and our approach to it. I did ask in the Committee meeting specifically what the state-level strategy was. To piggyback on Mr. Phipps' question what has the state-level done or has there been any update to my original question?

Ms. Wideman said Ms. Watlington, I think the short answer is no. Again, we checked in with our colleagues around the state, there is no state kind of led action from my housing colleagues around the City about going to the Legislature to pursue adding Source of Income to their Fair Housing Ordinance. The response that we got is that they had a number of other things that they are considering that they did not want to jeopardize. That is the best answer I can give to you; we are happy to take another crack at it if we need to.

Mr. Graham said if I can add to that Ms. Wideman, we said very early in the discussion that going to the state was a non-started even the advocates who are pushing this forward had conceded that. It is very problematic to get this authority from the state in this current makeup and so we discussed that. I think Dana is somewhere in the building; I think he even sent an e-mail or report to that effect as well. We certainly can do it, but again, one of the things we were trying to do was to alleviate barriers that we know was there and part of the rationale for those who are encouraging us to do a local ordinance because they do realize that getting the authorization needed from Raleigh would be problematic. Secondly, I'm not sure that the Governor would play in this field at all, just thinking out loud in terms of some of the conversations that I'm hearing and the fact that we have a new administration coming on board. It is going to take them about 12 to 18-months really to see any significant policy change that might impact the source of income specifically which goes right with the timeline that staff has recommended, which could be amended, that is an option as well. I think Willie made the best argument all night and that is why I think the staff made the recommendation for the ad hoc Committee is that we have to develop the business case for it and if we can do that then we should do the ordinance. But again, I think Ms. Wideman said it right up front that all they've got to do is add two words in the current ordinance as it exists today, and it is done.

Ms. Watlington said I would like to see Mr. Fenton's report again, if I missed it I apologize, I would like to see it. My question was really about what our delegation and what the Legislature is initiating, not what the other cities are initiating. I'm clear on what you shared, certainly, that sounds familiar, but what I'm asking is anybody in the Legislature driving this at all and my concern is that we are not sure. Regardless of what we think the probability of success is, we need to identify who is doing work at that level and that is the piece that is missing for me. I do believe that regardless of what the General Assembly is doing I don't think that [inaudible] us of doing the right thing and there is certainly a place for understanding even from a legal standpoint, but I don't think that anybody here is saying or advocating for us washing our hands. We need to put the onerous on the state to do the right thing and we do that by the right that by doing our right thing. To Mr. Graham's point, and I will finish with this, this timeline can certainly be amended as being recommended so what I heard very clearly here today is that the direction is that this timeline needs to be shortened. When I think about how do we get in a position to actually put something in our Legislative Agenda, it would seem to me that we need this timeline to be shortened in line with that so instead of December 2022, we would be in December 2021. I'm not sure if that needs to go into a motion to be put into effect, but certainly what I'm hearing and what I would ask in terms of adjusting the timeline.

Mayor Lyles said I would like to say that I think that after this discussion, it's been a great discussion of a policy issue that the Council has to resolve and I'm going to send it back to Committee. I don't think we need a motion; I think we need to get those questions out

on the table and as I said this is the kind of discussion we ought to be having at a Strategy Session. The Committee voted unanimously, to bring it forward and this is the week we would ordinarily have it presented and then put on the agenda, but obviously, we are not ready for that. So, my suggestion is that we actually do start thinking about this.

Ms. Wideman said just want to reiterate for the Council; I've heard several times tonight the landlord recommendations that you saw. We wanted to provide you the verbatim responses in this and in your supplement, please understand these are not staff's recommendations. These are not staff's responses; we are sharing information that we heard from our landlords. That is all it is, we are not taking one side or the other, we are simply sharing with you all the data.

Mayor Lyles said I think it is fair to say that sometimes we hear things we don't necessarily like from people when they have the opportunity to present a question like that and it may not be something that we feel comfortable with or that we see through it a different way. It is the reality of the rental market; was this done pre-COVID?

Ms. Wideman said we got the charge from the Committee in October, so we were in COVID.

Mayor Lyles said I think that you might have seen the frustration that many people feel about just the pandemic. I don't know what it is but I think that generally these things have been stated over and over again about the Choice Vouchers, about how the landlords feel and sometimes it is not every landlord, it is just the person who had that one. Remember they used to say if somebody said something negative about you it takes seven times before somebody changes it. I can't remember whether that was in good to great or whatever, but some landlords have had a bad experience and it might take seven years to get over it. That just may be where we are. Before everyone has spoken, this is going to Committee and I think after everyone has spoken, I'm calling it an end for the discussion. This is a Strategic item that will go back to Committee.

Councilmember Bokhari said I think we can all start with one statement which is everyone on Council and the staff cares about this topic and wants it to happen. We fight for affordable housing and everything which is part and parcel of that solution. I think that goes without saying, but I just want to make sure the entire community hears us all say that. I have maybe just a slight challenge to this going back to Committee, however, I would defer to the Committee Chair's opinion on that, but the whole premise why we voted it out of Committee, with people having different feelings probably in the back of their minds, however, I think what makes it a unanimous vote out was we didn't have enough information to make any kind of decision. So, we were 100% certain, or at least I will speak for myself, I am 100% certain this is a waste of time on any Legislative Agenda that we have today for the North Carolina General Assembly because it is a non-starter. Like, full stop, we are not going to do anything with it and in fact, unless we do more prework we will poison the well with other things we are going for right now. So, the premise on moving it out was we are not going to learn more of what we don't know while it is in Committee and there was a study group that was supposedly going to go and do that and whether you were 100% behind whatever the answer was or you weren't sure what the proposition was at that point we all agreed, yeah, more information would be helpful. So, the premise here is, and I will use Mr. Graham's own words again, we need a business case that says this is why this makes sense. I had big concerns about unintended consequences of we all feel good about doing something on the top end and then there are real case studies out there that show rents rise on the backend of that and does it net out affordability and the benefits that come? I don't know, but I certainly wanted to have that conversation we move forward.

I'm not convinced going back into Committee will actually solve anything unless that is just a way where this study group is then going to be accountable to bring something back. I do think whatever that path we end up choosing is, we need to be really clear that we are not trying to figure out how to jam something through within a couple of days or weeks like it is literally impossible right now. There is no chance we can do it, so if we want to do it we've got to make a case that we can go sell and either we sell it to a new

federal administration that is behind it and in a year or two they will be ready to get behind it or we figure out a way to sell it to the General Assembly, of which I'm down for that, but it's got to be justified, we have to look at the unintended consequences and I think most importantly we have to think about the audiences and folks that were there. I actually feel exactly the opposite about [inaudible] the wording of some of it, but by the perspectives of the homeowners and the apartment owners, because the fact of the matter is we are not trying to just have a home solution or rental solution or a voucher solution, we are trying to create upward mobility. We may call it and it may not seem right when it says financial coaching or whatever, but what we are really talking about is comprehensive wrap-around services that enable folks that are there to get out of there and move forward.

Now, whether the homeowners and apartment owners felt like they were in good faith saying that or they just wanted someone more potentially long-term security that would be renting from, I don't know. I won't speak for them, but I will speak for myself, I want that stuff kept into our conversation because to me that is the whole crux of this. We are not trying to solve housing or vouchers or rentals, we are trying to solve upward mobility. Unless we provide people the wrap-around services necessary to complete the entire thing, all we are doing is adding a subsidy that there will be a group of people that that subsidy now is what they need and we need more subsidies for the next set when we should be arming them for upward mobility. I think that is a very important part of the conversation. I will defer to the Chair and the Mayor on should this go back to Committee, but I don't that is the right answer.

Mayor Lyles said that may not be the right answer, but right now we have no answer. Out of the Committee at least two of the Councilmembers that voted to support this effort have raised different models of asking how it is done. I don't know how the Committee got it out, but what I'm saying is you now have the full Council's questions about it, and you have the full Council's sentiment and perspectives on it, and it has been a great discussion. I think there are three questions that I would say, do we try to create a business case for this effort, do we want to be a City that raises hope with no enforcement, like Atlanta, or do we want to actually get something done in terms of how do we get it done? I'm just saying I think we've got some options that the Committee can actually raise some big questions like do we want to do a business case? Do we want to make sure that we look at those unintended consequences that would make a difference and do we want to have the ability to do this in a way that is enforceable and works for our residents? Especially those who need to have the ability to find a place to live. I'm still suggesting that it go back to Committee because those are big questions. It is not whether or not what the landlord said or whether or not we have wrap-around services. Until we come to some of these large issues and answer them then we can't move forward. Mr. Bokhari, do you have anything else to add?

Mr. Bokhari said no, I was just trying to defend why it came out of Committee and if the answer is this study group that has got 12 to 18-months of work ahead of it is going to spend that time reporting back to the committee, and that is what you and the Chair both feel is right, okay that is fine, but it seems like we had a lot more questions than answers and a lot higher of a mountain to climb than is fair of normal Committees to like in a short term take on and it needed something more. I think it is damn near impossible is the best way I can say it unless we have a severe like somebody is focusing on this like it is their own company they are launching.

Mayor Lyles said I agree with you, but I think you have to focus on some of the questions that you have to agree to some of the big questions like do we want to have something that is enforceable, do we want something that avoids the unintended consequences and do we have a business case to make that would be defensible to accomplish those things?

Councilmember Newton said I did have a question for Pam and I just wanted to ask about the Atlanta ordinance. From what I understand, Georgia much like us is a Dillon Rule State, Atlanta in that regard is very similar to us. They did pass an ordinance pertaining to Source of Income Discrimination or included an amendment within their existing Discrimination Ordinance for Source of Income Discrimination and I was just

wondering, we keep hearing that it cannot be enforced. I guess my question is and the natural conclusion that anyone would draw is that it is not being enforced, but I guess my question here is do we know that? Is Atlanta not enforcing the ordinance that they passed?

Ms. Wideman said Mr. Newton, I will restate, again in speaking with my counterpart in Atlanta, they have passed an ordinance, it is not enforceable. So, they are not enforcing this ordinance.

Mr. Newton said just so I'm clear on this, what you are saying is if someone were to violate their ordinance, they take no action.

Ms. Wideman said that is correct, they cannot enforce the ordinance that they have based on the source of income. Like us, they can investigate Fair Housing complaints based on race, familiar status, all the other things that Mr. Ratchford pointed out earlier, but they cannot enforce the ordinance that they passed related to the source of income. It is not enforceable, and they are not enforcing it.

Mr. Newton said they are not because there is a difference and I guess that is the point of my question. There is a distinction between the idea of cannot and are not. So, what you are saying is they are not, so if someone were to violate their ordinance, they take no action.

Ms. Wideman said that is the case. That is what I was told by my colleague there.

Mr. Newton said I will conclude by saying I am in support of this going back to the Committee. Although, we've had a very robust conversation with a lot of very productive input, and I feel like the Committee has work left to be done on this.

Councilmember Eiselt said I'm not going to repeat a lot of what my colleagues have said because it is very clear we feel very passionate about this and there is a lot of room for improvement here. I just anecdotally, I'm on the Board of [inaudible] and we've had a lot of great success in housing our young people in scattered-site housing and that is because the organization has worked with those landlords. When I look at the data that Pam presented what really struck me is that anywhere from 35% to 40% of landlords aren't even taking vouchers, so that is a big chunk of landlords that we should through the Committee or through whatever, the CIP to starting working with those organizations to counter what Ms. Johnson is saying is some stigmas that have been around for a long time. Maybe in some cases are true, you are never going to get a perfect group that you can defunct that, but the bottom line is we could be doing a lot of work with the landlords in this community when such a large percentage of them don't even entertain the application for somebody with a voucher. That is probably why there aren't a lot of complaints because where are you going to complain if somebody wouldn't even talk to you about renting? I think it could go back to Committee, but to dig deeper into that kind of work, I just have felt strongly that if we can't enforce an ordinance I think it is unfair to people to pass an ordinance that has absolutely no enforcement power. I think it is misleading and lead them down a long road that has already been pretty difficult. So, I hope that we can did in deeper on this and make some improvements with some of the work we've talked about.

Mr. Graham said we've certainly had an interesting and robust discussion. I think we can all agree that, and I don't speak for any Councilmember if I think I can do so in this case that discrimination in any form is unacceptable in our community. I think we all agree upon that. I think we all, based on the information that we presented understand the complexity of doing the ordinance, but again, these were only recommendations and that is why I felt it was really important to provide a meaningful outline of the information that the staff presented today and the recommendation. We can always amend the timeline from 18 to 24-months. A lot of the work that I'm hearing that the Committee is supposed to be doing, which is a lot of work, our goal is that the ad hoc Committee would do some of that. That was the purpose for the Committee that the Committee would really do a deep dive. A lot of the strategies that were outlined by many of the Councilmembers will take some time,

it will take 18-months. It will take 12-months, we probably shorten that, but certainly, there is no microwave solution to some of the issues that were brought forth today. So, Ms. Wideman, how long do you think we can cut it back?

Ms. Wideman said we will work very diligently with Mr. Graham to cut it back. I will say it will be even more helpful in cutting it back if we could have this ad hoc group do a lot of the work with us, not for us, but with us. We really need a collaborative democratic approach to developing some of these solutions and to understanding the problem to increase the success in the vouchers. INLIVIAN has done wonderful work, we need their voice at the table, we need landlords, we need residents at the table so I think we will be more successful in cutting it back if we can have an Advisory Group help us do this work.

Mr. Graham said Madam Mayor, I hear your recommendation and I agree with it to send it back to the Committee, but that doesn't prevent us from moving forward tonight with the ad hoc Committee if there is consensus.

Mayor Lyles said what this was, was the Action Preview before something goes on the agenda. It actually turned out to be the kind of debate we should have had on an actual formal recommendation; it was a Preview. I do not see that there is any reason not to come back with a Committee at the next Council meeting because this would have been on the next agenda, Ms. Wideman.

Ms. Wideman said if that is your pleasure, yes ma'am; we wanted to hear your feedback tonight, we would take that, and we would put it on your February 22nd agenda for approval. What I'm hearing tonight is that you all want to decrease that time, we will certainly shore up our recommendation to do that, but that would be the next step.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Graham, would it be appropriate to go ahead and continue what you had planned to do tonight, which is bring it to the next Council agenda as taking into consideration?

Mr. Graham said I concur with that and I really would like to reach out to Councilmember Watlington and see if we can kind of put our heads together as well as all the Committee members of the Great Neighborhoods Committee. I think there might be some synergy on some of the things in terms of a path forward, so I will give you a call tomorrow.

Ms. Wideman said just as a reminder, we have our Great Neighborhoods Committee on the 17th which would be before the 22nd if we wanted to continue with that. Your call.

Mayor Lyles said the Chair can work with the Committee and figure out what that would be, but my suggestion would be that you do not stop because there is a sense of urgency about doing something. Put something on the 22nd if the Committee can work together, if the Chair and the members can figure this out and get something out early that is always better, or if it is only like we need this group to help us do the business case, but please give us some sense of direction, we are going to do a business case or we are not. I just think we need to know what we are going to do, if what we are trying to accomplish even with the ad hoc Committee. We've had a great deal of good discussion around it and so right now I think we take it to the Committee. If the Committee members want to have an additional discussion about any of these topics, but I wanted to say proceeding toward the February 22nd agenda is appropriate.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

Marie Harris, Strategy and Budget said Mr. Winston would like to comment on Item No. 23; also Ms. Watlington wanted to have clarification on Item No. 23 and also wanted to express publicly again about how the INLIVIAN bonds that are your Consent Items as 30, 31 and 32 just to clarify again that these are on Consent because they do not obligate the City financially as an IRS requirement that INLIVIAN gets bond approval through us so that it is more that type of formal approval authority.

Mayor Lyles said it is a tax issue, not a financial one against the City. Ms. Watlington do you want to comment on those three items?

Councilmember Watlington said no, I just wanted clarification on it.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Newton, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented with the exception of Item No. 37.

Councilmember Winston said I just wanted to point out Item No. 23, SAFE Charlotte Professional Consulting Services starts the transition from responding to some emergency calls with a civilian professional response as opposed to law enforcement response. I think this is a great step for us to continue to take. My question for staff is how is RAND Corporation going to engage Council and the community so that we do have a vision and are able to give feedback to this transition from law enforcement to non-sworn duty responses?

Ms. Harris said part of this has already started to take place even before we did the RFP we sent out with the Community Engagement Group, the same group that was used for the SAFE Charlotte initiatives, to begin with, Scopes so draft Scopes we put that committee on. Part of their RAND program includes 25 to 35 interviews and some of these are with the Stakeholder groups but also they were going to look at specific individuals in the community. We have that SAFE Charlotte website which is charlottenc.gov/safecharlotte. Right now, it is just populated with the actual report recommendations, but we are going to fully flesh that out with progress and links to information on that as well. The staff is working on a tool to kind of gauge how we are doing, what are the ongoing concerns and how are we doing with the SAFE Charlotte initiative. So, there are several things in place, but RAND is definitely going to be reaching out and working with stakeholders and continue. In two weeks from now, they have another follow-up meeting, the internal groups with the community input group so they are going to stay engaged throughout the process as well.

Ms. Watlington said I'm good now, thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said I wanted to know if the Cure Violence contract is also a part of this.

Ms. Harris said no ma'am, this contract before you tonight is separate and apart from that. Of course, they all dovetail and try to work together for violence prevention, but this is a totally separate initiative. This contract tonight is more so focused on three of your specific SAFE Charlotte recommendations.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 23: SAFE Charlotte Professional Consulting Services

(A) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute a contract for \$600,000 with RAND Corporation for SAFE Charlotte professional consulting services for a term of five months, (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract with possible price adjustments consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved, and (C) Authorize the sharing of specified CMPD personnel data and records with RAND Corporation for the purpose of research and analysis in support of the SAFE Charlotte Plan.

Item No. 24: Citywide Uniform Rentals and Other related Services

(A) Approve a unit price contract with Rental Uniform Services of Statesville, Inc. dba Sunshine Uniform Service for uniform rentals and other related services for an initial term of two years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, two-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 25: Construct Hinsdale-Tinkerbell Storm Drainage Improvement Project
Approve a contract in the amount of \$8,455,760.50 to the lowest responsive bidder Onsite Development, LLC for the Hinsdale-Tinkerbell Storm Drainage Improvement Project.

Summary of Bids

Onsite Development, LLC.	\$ 8,455,760.50
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$ 9,590,739.40
Blythe Development Co.	\$ 9,861,257.56
Sealand Contractors Corp.	\$10,282,143.03
Crowder Construction Company	\$11,221,872.34

Item No. 26: Construct Storm Water repair and Improvement Project
Approve a contract in the amount of \$3,671,345 to the lowest responsive bidder OnSite Development, LLC for the Storm Water repair and Improvements FY 2021-B project.

Summary of Bids

OnSite Development	\$3,671,345.00
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$3,721,607.37
United Construction Company, Inc.	\$3,759,600.63
Blythe Development Company	\$4,358,315.50

Item No. 27: Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation Professional Services
(A) Approve unit price contracts for the Fiscal Year 2021 sanitary sewer rehabilitation professional services for an initial term of one year with the following companies: Frazier Engineering, P.A.; Freese and Nichols, Inc., and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to three, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 28: Water Main Replacement Contract
(A) Approve a unit price contract with Dallas 1 Construction, LLC for the Fiscal Year 2021 Water Main Replacement Contract 1 for an initial term of one year, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to three, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Summary of Bids

Dallas 1 Construction, LLC	\$2,167,290.95
State Utility	\$2,608,650.00

Item No. 29: Valve Assessment and Rehabilitation Services
(A) Approve a unit price contract with Kemp Construction, Inc. for valve assessment and rehabilitation services for an initial term of one year, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to four, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 30: Bond Issuance approval for Ashley Flats
Adopt a resolution granting INLIVIAN's request to issue multi-family housing revenue bonds, in an amount not to exceed \$20,500,000, to finance the development of an affordable housing development to be known as Ashley Flats.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 216-222.

Item No. 31: Bond Issuance approval for Dillehay Courts Apartments
Adopt a resolution granting INLIVIAN's request to issue multi-family housing revenue bonds, in an amount not to exceed \$17,500,000, to finance the development of an affordable housing development to be known as Dillehay Courts Apartments.

The resolution is recorded in full in resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 223-228.

Item No. 32: Bond Issuance Approval for Evoke Living at Arrowood Apartments

Adopt a resolution granting INLIVIAN's request to issue multi-family housing revenue bonds, in an amount not to exceed \$19,800,000 to finance the development of Evoke Living at Arrowood Apartments.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 229-234.

Item No. 33: Resolution of Intent to Abandon Cecil Street

(A) Adopt a Resolution of Intent to abandon Cecil Street, and (B) Set a Public Hearing for March 22, 2021.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 235.

Item No. 34: Meeting Minutes

Approve the titles, motions, and votes reflected in the Clerk's record as the minutes of January 04, 2021, Business Meeting, and January 07, 2021, Legislative Briefing.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 35: Property Transactions – Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel #3, 4, 5, and 6.

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,933 square feet, (0.07 acres) Fee Simple, 4,134 square feet (0.10 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 1100, 1104, and 1108 North Caldwell Street and 1111 North Davidson Street from Thomas R. Hunter, Carroll E. Hunter, and Linda Hunter for \$206,800 for Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel 3, 4, 5 and 6.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 236.

Item No. 36: Property Transactions – Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel #10

Resolution of Condemnation of 640 square feet (0.01 acres) Fee Simple, 1,426 square feet (0.03 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 401 East 15th Street from Kyle Short and Meggan Short for \$45,3215 for Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel #10.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 237.

Item No. 38: Property Transactions – Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel #14

Acquisition of 1,686 square feet (0.04 acres) Fee Simple, 1,427 square feet (0.03 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 405 East 19th Street from James L. Atkinson for \$53,700 for Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel #14.

Item No. 39: Property Transactions – Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel #15

Acquisition of 1,612 square feet (0.037 acres) Fee Simple, 2,078 square feet (0.05 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 1607 Julia Maulden Place from John W. McBride, Debbie W. McBride (AKA: Debbie S. McBride) for \$24,976 for Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel #15.

Item No. 40: Property Transactions – XCLT Davidson to Matheson, Parcel #1

Acquisition of 2,740 square feet (0.063 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, 433 square feet (0.01 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 2100 and 2116 North Davidson Street from 2100 North Davidson, LLC for \$69,650 for XCLT Davidson to Matheson, Parcel #1.

Item No. 41: Property Transactions – XCLT Davidson to Matheson, Parcel #2

Acquisition of 2,856 square feet (0.066 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, 473 square feet (0.011 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 2120 North Davidson Street from Supportive Housing Communities, Inc. for \$84,144 for XCLT Davidson to Matheson, Parcel #2.

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM NO. 7: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE AN ALLEYWAY OFF ROYAL COURT PARALLEL TO EAST MOREHEAD STREET

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers either for or against a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing to close an alleyway off Royal Court parallel to East Morehead Street.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 8: HOSPITALITY REVENUE CAPITAL INVESTMENT POLICY

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a Hospitality Revenue Capital Investment Policy to be used for prioritization of hospitality revenue-supported capital investments, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to make administrative updates to the policy consistent with the original intent of the policy.

* * * * *

ITEM ON. 9: LEGACY COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, to approve the Great Neighborhoods Committee recommendation to approve and begin implementation of the revised Legacy Commission recommendation.

Councilmember Egleston said I hope all of you saw the e-mail sent to us today from Marie Harris, but wanted to make sure the public knew, one of the things that had been brought to our attention as a concern; I think there is general agreement around the direction that this moves us in in terms of not doing things in our community that honor the legacy of people who were leaders of the confederacy or white supremacist. It doesn't mean we are erasing that history; it doesn't mean that we don't teach that history, it simply means that we don't honor those folks in the way that they have been honored up till now. One of the things that I had heard from constituents who are residents or business owners on some of the streets that would be part of the recommendation for the changes was a concern around the impacts to them in regard to changes they will have to make with the postal service, with the utilities for their bills and things of that nature. I'll quickly read a short note that Ms. Harris sent us just so that the community knows. The City has cross-department workgroups to implement the street name changes recommended by the Legacy Commission, staff from C-DOT, Housing and Neighborhood Services, Economic Development and Strategy and Budget are working collaboratively to support this effort but Housing and Neighborhood Services and Economic Development are reviewing grant opportunities to offset costs for residents and businesses to change street names. Part of the initial pilot will include an assessment of the need for additional funding to complete the project. In addition, the Community Engagement Team within Housing and Neighborhood Services will partner with residents to provide one on one support for residents that will likely need a higher level of support in navigating the changes. Staff will also be available to anyone who has questions or needs additional guidelines. I just wanted to reiterate to everybody watching and everybody who will be impacted by this. We don't want this to be a burden on you. I think there is an agreement, it is the right thing to do but we don't want it to cause hardships for anybody who lives or works on those streets and the City has been thoughtful about that to make sure that it does not negatively impact them.

Councilmember Winston said I just wanted to clarify one thing about my notebook during Committee. It is simply a matter of scheduling; I entered the meeting while I was at work just before the presentation. [inaudible] wanted to vote yes on something that I was unknowledgeable about, so I have done my homework since this and I support this wholeheartedly.

Councilmember Phipps said I had a question about the criteria for naming those streets; I was wondering if current policy comports with these changes in as much as we have subdivisions under construction and streets being named and eventually going to be turned over to the City. Did we cross-reference our current street naming conventions with this in any way or how did we sort of reconcile two policies?

Tiffany Blackwell, Senior Strategy & Budget Analyst said thank you, Mr. Phipps, in our new process moving forward we will collaborate with C-DOT on new City-owned streets which will help ensure that we did not run across this path again. In addition, we will be collaborating with the Levine Museum of the New South and Historic Land Commission to also review street names to ensure they are in accordance with the new criteria.

Councilmember Bokhari said again, I will just reiterate but also a message for staff that I want to reiterate. I plan on supporting this, but I very much want you guys and staff to look at and bring us back options for a new policy where we simply don't name anything after people anymore. It is impossible for us to understand with today's lens or a future lens what is happening today nor anticipate that. I would just like to save Councils in the future any kind of issues alongside that by just stripping that out or out entire playbook altogether.

Mayor Lyles said the staff has heard that consideration from Mr. Bokhari.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 10: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

There was no report from the City Manager.

* * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 11: EMERGENCY RENTAL AND UTILITY ASSISTANCE IN RESPONSE TO COVID-19

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Graham, to (A) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9990-X appropriating \$26,714,160 from the U. S. Department of Treasury for Emergency Rental and Utility Assistance in the General COVID-19 Assistance Fund, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to execute any necessary contracts related to the Emergency Rental and Utility Assistance Program.

Councilmember Winston said I think it is important that we communicate effectively to our community, not just people that need this relief during the pandemic, but all taxpayers for them to understand where their taxpayer dollars are going. I think there is a better way to do that and I think working with Corporate Communications will figure out how to better communicate the investments that we are making.

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

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 532.

ITEM NO. 12: SET A PUBLIC HEARING ON AIRPORT 2021 GENERAL AIRPORT REVENUE BONDS AND BOND ANTICIPATION NOTES

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt an initial finding resolution and authorize the Chief Financial Officer to make appropriate application to the Local Government Commission for issuance of General Airport Revenue Bonds not to exceed \$500,000,000 and revenue bond anticipation notes not to exceed \$300,000,000, and (B) Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing on February 22, 2021, for this financing as required by Internal Revenue Service regulations.

The resolutions are recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 209-213.

ITEM NO. 13: BUSINESS INVESTMENT GRANT FOR INTERCONTINENTAL CAPITAL GROUP

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Bokhari, and carried unanimously to approve the City's Business Investment Grant to InterContinental Capital Group for a not to exceed amount of \$109,661 over seven years.

ITEM NO. 14: 2020 CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Phipps, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution approving the 2020 Charlotte-Mecklenburg Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, and (B) Vest the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Emergency Management Office with the following tasks: Inform all concerned parties of the action; Cooperate with federal, state and local agencies and private firms which undertake to study, survey, map and identify floodplain areas, and cooperate with neighboring communities with respect to management of adjoining floodplain areas in order to prevent exacerbation of existing hazard impacts; Continue oversight of the Radiological Emergency Preparedness program and countywide hazardous materials, also addressed in the plan; and Appoint the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Emergency Management Office (in collaboration with the City's Storm Water Services and Planning, design, and Development departments) to assure that the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is reviewed annually and every five years to assure compliance with state and federal regulations.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 214-215.

Mayor Lyles read the following Proclamation:

WHEREAS, volunteers working with young people who are our job of today and our hope for tomorrow, are exuberant representatives of the potential to be reached and for dreams to come true; they are also unbounded in their enthusiasm to use their own talent, skills, and hard work to make a difference in others' lives; and

WHEREAS, members of the Optimist International will celebrate Optimist Day throughout the world on the first Thursday of every February, to promote their efforts in helping and

recognizing young people that make a difference in their communities and who will encourage a greater exchange of ideas between young people and adults; and

WHEREAS, there are 2,400 Optimist Clubs, with more than 70,000 members in Optimist International and Optimist members throughout the world that carry out more than 6,500 service projects that serve six million young people a year;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim the first Thursday of every February as

“OPTIMIST DAY”

in Charlotte and commend its observance to all citizens. May this day instill pride in our city’s Optimists for all of their accomplishments and for the impact they have to truly make a difference in others’ lives.

Councilmember Phipps said thank you, Mayor, I was surprised, I thought I had passed the deadline, but on behalf of Hidden Valley Optimist Club where I serve as President and all the Optimist Clubs in North Carolina [inaudible] and domestically and abroad, I certainly thank you for recognizing February 4th as Optimist Day worldwide.

Mayor Lyles said we appreciate all the work that you do for the Club and the work that all of the Optimist members do.

* * * * *

NOMINATIONS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor Lyles explained the rules and procedures of the appointment process.

ITEM NO. 15: NOMINATIONS TO THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

One appointment for a three-year term beginning April 29, 2021, and ending April 28, 2024.

- Damiko Faulkner, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Damiko Faulkner.

Damiko Faulker was appointed.

Two appointments for three-year terms recommended by the Charlotte Regional Business Alliance beginning April 29, 2021, and ending April 28, 2024

- Lindsey Haaser-Braciale, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston
- McLean Godley, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Lindsey Haaser-Braciale and McLean Godley.

Lindsey Haaser-Braciale and McLean Godley were appointed.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Certified SBE-Hispanic Contractors Association beginning upon appointment and ending April 28, 2023.

The vacancy will be brought back for nominations on the April 12th business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE BUSINESS INCLUSION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

One appointment for a two-year term for an At-Large representative beginning March 1, 2021, and ending February 28, 2023.

- Jamal Cook, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Jamal Cook.

Jamal Cook was appointed.

One appointment for a two-year term for an At-Large representative for a Prime Construction Company beginning March 1, 2021, and ending February 28, 2023.

- Chyna Green, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Chyna Green.

Chyna Green was appointed.

One appointment for a two-year term for a Black Chamber of Commerce representative beginning upon appointment and ending February 28, 2022.

- Harrison Williams, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Harrison Williamson.

Harrison Williams was appointed.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a two-year term for a Carolinas Association of General Contractors representative beginning March 1, 2021, and ending February 28, 2023.

The vacancy will be brought back for nominations on the April 12th business meeting.

One appointment for a partial term for a Latin American Chamber of Commerce representative beginning upon appointment and ending February 28, 2022.

Stephanie Kelly, City Clerk said there were no recommendations received for the Latin American Chamber of Commerce.

The vacancy will be brought back for nominations on the April 12th business meeting.

One appointment for a two-year term for a National Association of Women Business Owners representative beginning March 1, 2021, and ending February 28, 2023

- Nicole Reina, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Nicole Reina.

Nicole Reina was appointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: NOMINATIONS TO THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Two appointments for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 20, 2022.

- Paul Lawrence, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Newton, Phipps, and Winston
- Kelly Turrubiertes Cielo, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Newton, Phipps, and Winston

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Paul Lawrence and Kelly Turrubiertes Cielo.

Paul Lawrence and Kelly Turrubiertes Cielo were appointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 18: NOMINATIONS TO THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a partial term for a Resident Owner of Heritage Court beginning upon appointment and ending December 31, 2023.

The vacancy will be brought back for nominations on the April 12th business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: NOMINATIONS TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD MATCHING GRANTS FUND

One appointment for a Business Representative for a two-year term beginning April 16, 2021, and ending April 15, 2023.

- Jamel Cook, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Jamel Cook.

Jamel Cook was appointed.

One appointment for a Neighborhood Representative from within program boundaries (Northwest, Northeast, Southeast, Southwest) for a two-year term beginning April 16, 2021, and ending April 15, 2023.

- Diane Langevin, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Diane Langevin

Diane Langevin was appointed.

One appointment for a Non-profit Sector Representative for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending April 15, 2022.

- Rhonda Dean, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to Rhonda Dean.

Rhonda Dean was appointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 20: NOMINATIONS TO THE PRIVATIZATION/COMPETITION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Seven appointments for two-year terms beginning March 2, 2021, and ending March 1, 2023

- Tara Bright, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston
- Eric Cohen, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston
- Ken May, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Johnson Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston
- Angela Shealy, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston
- Owen Sutkowski, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, and Watlington.
- Andwele Beatty, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera and Johnson
- Jakob Gattinger, nominated by Ajmera and Driggs

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Tara Bright, Eric Cohen, Ken May, Angela Shealy and Owen Sutkowski.

Tara Bright, Eric Cohen, Ken May, Angela Shealy, and Owen Sutkowski were appointed.

The remaining two nominations will be brought back on February 22nd, 2021.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: NOMINATIONS TO THE TRANSIT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

One appointment for a partial term in the Local/Express Service Passenger category beginning upon appointment and ending January 31, 2023

- Conner Burdno, nominated by Councilmembers Driggs and Graham
- Linda Webb, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, and Watlington

Nominations will be brought back on February 22nd, 2021.

One appointment for a three-year term in the Neighborhood Organizational Leader category beginning February 1, 2021, and ending January 31, 2024.

- Samuel Grundman, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Samuel Grundman.

Samuel Grundman was appointed.

One appointment for a three-year term in the Suburban Employer Served by Charlotte Transit category beginning February 1, 2021 and ending January 31, 2024.

- Leroy Fields, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Leroy Fields.

Leroy Fields was appointed.

There were no nominations for one appointment for a partial term in the Vanpool Rider category beginning upon appointment and ending January 31, 2022

The vacancy will be brought back for nominations on the April 12th business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 22: NOMINATIONS TO THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS

Two appointments for three-year terms as Alternate Members beginning January 30, 2021, and ending January 31, 2024.

- Roderick Davis, nominated by Councilmembers Graham and Winston
- Amar Johnson, nominated by Councilmember Ajmera and Johnson
- Raghunadha Kotha, nominated by Ajmera, Egleston, Eiselt, and Phipps
- Marshall Williamson, nominated by Councilmembers Bokhari, Egleston, Eiselt, Newton, and Phipps

Nominations will be brought back on February 22nd, 2021.

Two appointments for three-year terms beginning January 30, 2021, and ending January 31, 2024

- Eric Sanderson, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston
- Douglas Wilson, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to appoint Eric Sanderson and Douglas Wilson.

Eric Sanderson and Douglas Wilson were appointed.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk, MMC, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 3 Hours, 52 Minutes
Minutes Completed: April 2, 2021