

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Business Meeting on Monday, May 24, 2021, at 5:03 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Greg Phipps, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston II.

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmembers Ed Driggs and Matt Newton.

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles welcomed everyone to the May 24, 2021, 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 notice 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.

* * * * *

Councilmembers Driggs and Newton arrived at 5:06 p.m.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Bokhari gave the Invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag by Councilmember Newton.

Mayor Lyles said tomorrow, May 25th will mark the one-year anniversary of the tragic and senseless death of George Floyd. His death, along with many others, has impacted the ever-changing landscape of this country. The streets of American cities around the entire world were flooded with protestors calling for change to a system that desperately needed reform. George Floyd's death shined a light on long-standing inequities within our criminal justice system, ensuring that we review, improve and restructure the way policing is done here in this country. The reform doesn't begin with just the change in policy, it is just where that ends. Reform really begins when we have a change of heart and is then followed by a change in behavior. We've come a long way and there is still much work to be done so let's remember George Floyd and the countless others whose lives have been needlessly taken. Let's continue to work together to do everything we can to prevent any more of these tragedies from occurring.

I hope that the residents of our City will recognize the work that has been done by this Council by many of the people that assisted us in this community, bringing us their voices and their chances and to recognize our Police Department who has gone through a number of amazing changes and have really come and said we will join this effort for a safer community, a safer Charlotte for everyone. I just want to remind everyone that tomorrow is a day, that it has been a year and it has been a year of challenge and change and I want to say for our City I believe that we have done it well in collaboration and a way that makes us proud to live in this community.

* * * * *

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

There were not Consent item questions.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: ACTION REVIEW AGENDA OVERVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said tonight we have two items on the agenda, our CARES ACT (Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security) update. Shawn Heath will come in and talk about the remaining funds related to the ESG pot of money, and then as we

discussed the last time, we were together, we have an update on the 2040 Comp Plan and one closed session item.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: CARES ACT – EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT

Shawn Heath, Assistant to the City Manager said as Manager Jones mentioned, I wanted to provide a brief update on some of the remaining balances we have associated with the CARES Fund and you will recall that all of the stimulus funding from 2020 has been appropriated by Council, but it has been our practice to keep you informed with what we are doing as we staged investments. Tonight, I will talk primarily about the CARES Emergency Solutions Grant remaining balance, but also give you a little bit of a window into a couple of other remaining balances associated with the 2020 stimulus funds.

As shown here the remaining Emergency Solutions Grant balance is approximately \$1 million and the staff is enthused to share with you tonight that we have two investments that have been staged, one is with a non-profit that some of you are very familiar with called The Relatives. The Relatives have been doing great work in this community for almost 50-years. They do a number of things, but I think it is fair to say it all falls under the umbrella of working with youth and young adults that are in some form of crisis. One of their signature programs is On-Ramp and On-Ramp has been around for about 10-years and it is really a case management model designed to work specifically with young adults in the 16 to 24 age category and the services provided touch on everything from employment to education to housing. I think one of the things that makes this unique is over the past three years they have connected with approximately 1,500 members of the community and this is a particular segment of the community that is very vulnerable in many ways. A lot of the participants that are in this program don't have a high school diploma or a GED. Many of them aren't currently employed or if they are they are employed in a minimum wage job.

With this case management model, it is an opportunity for them to really focus on one thing and that is how do you help these individuals become independent adults? The support that we've staged here is for three years of operating support \$750,000 to help them continue to sustain and scale this particular drop-in resource center. The second investment opportunity is with the Roof Above, of course, the partner that we've worked with on many initiatives in recent years. Here the focus is on the Giles Center, which many of you are familiar with on Statesville Avenue. Just a quick history on the Giles Center, they closed last July as a result of the pandemic and subsequent to that Roof Above took a number of actions, made a number of investments to help reopen the Center in December. So, they reduced the capacity, invested in some sleeping barriers and they found ways to reconfigure it so the beds could be socially distanced. They opened up in December for the winter months with the original vision of closing it down again in March as the weather changed, but it turns out the demand for this particular shelter remains incredibly high so their hope is to continue to sustain this until March of 2022 if possible and our investment opportunity will get them five-months down the path in that direction. Those two particular investments would fully extinguish the remaining balance for the Emergency Solutions Grant.

Pivoting to other 2020 stimulus funds that are still at our disposal, two separate categories here, one relates to the Emergency Rental/Utility Assistance Program, so often times we talk about CARES from 2020, but there were other stimulus packages that passed and one was in very late December of 2020 which translated to \$26.7 million in stimulus funding for the City of Charlotte focused specifically on Emergency Rental and Utility relief. That was appropriated by Council in February and we've been working with DreamKey Partners to put that money into the community. We've dispersed about half of that, about \$13 million has gone into the community. We have a remaining balance of \$13 million. The way the application process is structured for this particular program it opens up on the first of each month, it closes on the 15th. That gives DreamKey Partners an opportunity to process all the applications. I was just in conversation with them today

and it is my understanding they are working through thousands of applications at this time and the enrollment will open up again on June 1st.

I would note as a little bit of an aside, under the American Rescue Plan there will be an additional \$21 million in Emergency Rental Assistance provided under our [inaudible], so the remaining balance of \$13 million here, plus an additional \$20 million under the American Rescue Plan will all be available for members of the community that are struggling with rent and with utilities. I would point the community in the direction of rampclt.com where they can learn more about eligibility requirements for this funding.

Last, on the CARES CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) dollars we have \$2 million still in that bucket and the plan here is to fold this into the broader strategy. I think Council has been very clear, the City Manager has been very clear, let's be strategic, let's be intentional with the American Rescue Plan. We have a tremendous amount of resources at our disposal as we are evaluating opportunities around the American Rescue Plan, we will fold in the CDBG dollars here and we will also dovetail this with the work that is being done under the umbrella of the Charlotte Mecklenburg 2025 Housing and Homelessness strategy co-chaired by Jean Woods and Kathy Bessant. That initiative is really in the process of getting off the ground. There are dozens of leaders from across the public sector, private sector, and non-profit sector that are actively involved; Manager Jones, Housing Director Wideman, myself, and a few other folks from the City are actively engaged in this effort.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said and Mr. Graham.

Mr. Heath said and Mr. Graham, thank you very much. There are a lot of things I believe to like about this, one, of course, is the multisector approach and this will give us a chance as a community to put all the best ideas on the table, develop a menu of funding options, and if you look at the workstream towers that have been developed, it addresses both supply-side and demand-side considerations around housing and homelessness. So, additional shelter capacity, additional affordable housing, yes very much in scope, but so are efforts around mental health, substance abuse, education, workforce development, etc. so strengthening the prevention system and also the social supports that can help us prevent homelessness a year from, five years from now, 10 years from now is really just as important as all of the other supply sites considerations that are being factored into that work.

We will be in the process over the next few months of really being part of this effort, helping to lead this effort, and ultimately evaluating funding opportunities. The next big milestone under that initiative is October 1st when the Strategic Plan is expected to be launched and announced to the community.

Councilmember Phipps said with regard to utility assistance I want to be clear as to whether or not the City is continuing its utility payment abatement program or has that been sunset?

Mr. Heath said, we have indicated to the public that we will not resume our billing and disconnection practices until October of the calendar year 2021. Angel and I were in conversation today to think through what are some additional strategies we can put in place to make sure that all of our Water customers that are struggling with their bills are fully aware of this program. There are eligibility requirements, individuals have to be 80% AMI (area medium income) or below. There also has to be a demonstration of financial hardship associated with the pandemic. With this particular fund, we are expected to place a priority on individuals that are 50% AMI or below, so we are doing everything we can to ensure that before we reach that October milestone the customers that are struggling with their bill have a chance to take advantage of this program.

Councilmember Johnson said I wanted to ask about the utility assistance. Initially, there were several providers in the community that were able to assist with the rental deposit, utility assistance, and Crisis is a very well-known resource in the community, so I wanted to know if any dollars are allotted to Crisis Assistance or even to Social Serv. Both of

those organizations were very helpful at the beginning of the COVID (mild to severe respiratory infection caused by the coronavirus) crisis. I just wanted to follow up to see if there are other partners in the community, specifically Crisis that will be receiving funding.

Mr. Heath said I think Housing Director Wideman may be somewhere here; I could ask her to help me with that question.

Pam Wideman, Neighborhood and Housing Director said Ms. Johnson, I think your question was, as I was running here, will particularly Crisis receive any of our utility assistance dollars or CARES utility assistance dollars. Is that correct?

Mr. Johnson indicated yes by a head nod.

Ms. Wideman said the answer is no, we are working with DreamKey, formerly Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership to administer our utilities, rental assistance, and our mortgage assistance and they are doing so in a way that applicants can just fill out one form, so it is a very streamlined approach. However, Crisis does have other assistance funding from other partners in the community that they are using for the same cause.

Mayor Lyles said I think they are coordinating.

Ms. Wideman said they are coordinating.

Mayor Lyles said I think they have a shared information system between clients so that they can make sure that that happens. That is my recall.

Ms. Wideman said that is correct and the beauty of Crisis is that their funding is more flexible as Mr. Heath alluded to earlier, we have our federal government guidelines, theirs is more flexible so they can [inaudible] faster than we can, so they work together.

Ms. Johnson said what about Social Serv; they won't be receiving any funding from the City either.

Ms. Wideman said you may recall Ms. Johnson, that several Council meetings ago, I think it was \$300,000 that you all allocated to Social Serv so they could hire more housing navigators to assist with the work that United Way is doing, so they are.

Mayor Lyles said can you give us at some point in the next several days an update on what is going on with the evictions. I've heard several different dates from different places and the number of cases. When we started with this we were working with the Clerk of Court, CRC (Community Relations Committee) was doing notes to tell people how to go get legal services, the private sector had volunteer lawyers working with Legal Aide, but I just wondered if you could give us an update so that we are aware and know when these things are rolling up and out.

Mr. Heath said sure, so what is happening here on the ground in Charlotte.

Mayor Lyles said yes, what is happening on the ground in Charlotte. That would be very helpful. Thank you so much. You guys are doing an amazing job with this. The Manager has made these two recommendations so is there any objection to proceeding to get this money out quickly again? I see thumbs up for Mr. Winston and everybody else seems to be good.

I did want to bring up one other thing as a result, as we are talking about some of the homeless issues. Today NACCA announced the partnership with Bank of America for \$15 billion in mortgage assistance for low-income families. This is no down payment, no closing costs, no fees and it is a two percent interest rate for 30-years. We have a NACA Office here in Charlotte; they are a national firm that does this work, but we have one in Charlotte. I think all of us would like to have a 2% 30-year mortgage or a 1.375% for a 15-year mortgage. I would encourage all of us to look at the materials, get that information out because this is where homeownership can really make a difference in our community

and get working with this group who really does do amazing things through workshops and getting people home buying experiences and making sure that they are financially literate to maintain that home. I want to thank NACC and Bank of America for making that contribution to the wellbeing of our City especially.

Councilmember Winston said I was wondering with you mentioning that, knowing that Bank of America has been one of our community partners around the Choice Fund with LISC, wondering that maybe sometime over the summer if there is not a way to kind of have some type of workshop where we might explore how using the models that we have or kind of exploring them, is there a way that we can kind of maximize the utility of this program or this new investment here in the community by using Housing Trust Fund and [inaudible] and whatever fund this is if that makes any sense.

Mayor Lyles said we will figure it out and try to make sure that it makes some sense as we go forward for the summer. Mr. Graham and his group will continue; Ms. Wideman, yes we should explore every option.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: CHARLOTTE FUTURE 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Assistant City Manager/Planning Director said I have a brief presentation to cover some ground, and then we can have a moment of asking questions, and then I will be ready to answer them. The first thing is to acknowledge the fact that last week we did review key policy languages from you and with that, we incorporated them into the released recommended Plan that came out last week. So, what I will be doing today will be to review with you other revisions that are based on comments we heard from you, from the public, or even the County Commissioners or Planning Commissioners, or other agencies. However, before I do that I want to walk us through this slide that is on the screen right now as to how we've been receiving comments, processing them, and then incorporating the relevant ones into the Plan itself. We received upon the release of the first draft and prior to the release of the recommended draft last week, we received over 600 comments in total, and about 515 of those comments actually came from the community and the staff. Over 60 of them came from Council, 500 applause were comments or questions that did not necessarily require a change over 100 of them were technical policy-related clarifications and typographical corrections. So, what we did was to make sure that when people provide comments we reach out to them either as individuals or organizations and we met with them to clarify some of the questions that they may have, and then eventually some of those comments resulted in changes to the Plan itself.

We responded to every e-mail with comments just to thank and acknowledge individuals, but I will note that not every comment made it into a revision and there is a reason for that. If people are thanking you or if people are just pretty much saying some other things that don't have to do necessarily with the Plan what we do was to make sure that we coordinate with the respected department to make sure that they have those comments.

As of today, upon the release of the recommended draft Plan last week we have received over 70 comments between last week and this afternoon. About nine of those people would like to meet with us individually to discuss their comments and within a fairly decent process as we did with the previous draft that was released. The intent is so by the time the comment period is done on June 3rd and we come back to you on June 7th we will be able to share more information with you in terms of how many comments total we received.

This is really the way that we've been asking for our community to provide comments, either to go on the website itself. So, the spread sheet is on the website if people have comments, they want to make they are able to do that directly or they can pretty much e-mail us or call 311. Like I said earlier, the process of receiving these comments will be the same. Let me explain why the next two weeks is very important; number one is transparency in the process. People took that time to provide comments, I think it is just

the right thing for us to be able to release this over a two-week period so people can see those comments, view the document for the comments they made and how they were addressed. Number two, it is likely that there will be comments that were missed and people would say we did not see our comments reflected in the Plan, how did you address that so, during this two-week period as we received those comments we will continue to process them with individuals and organizations to make sure that everyone feels that their comments have been listened to, even if they did not result in any change to the document.

The recommended draft highlights, I will not necessarily spend too much time on this, but this is what you all have spent time on over the last several weeks. We've had comments made around a number of what I call hot topic items whether they be housing diversity in our neighborhoods or 10-minute neighborhoods application, equity infrastructure. That was one that came towards the end, but it was definitely one that we felt was necessary to be included in the Plan recommended draft. Anti-displacement language around that, commission of an Anti-displacement stakeholder group, commission of a Community Benefits Stakeholder Group, community participation in the development process as well as an economic impact analysis conversation. So through multiple [inaudible] community engagement of opportunities, we addressed these items and believe that they were incorporated properly in the release of the recommended Plan that you have.

There are other revisions, however, that are just as important but have not received the same level of attention. I would like to spend the next few slides sharing some of those with you. I will go goal by goal. Goal #1 on 10-minute neighborhoods, a couple of revisions that we received from the County staff as well as some of our City staff is to collaborate with the County to prioritize investment in public gathering areas, plazas, parks, shared-use paths in parts of our City and County that lack such facilities or amenities today because if we are talking about 10-minute neighborhoods, it is not just providing access for destinations. How do people get to those facilities or to those amenities? We talked about making sure that we have a pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure that meets those gaps in areas that are near schools, parks, greenways, activity centers, and community facilities. We specifically made a change to Policy 1.16 to invest in programs that address cultural and language barriers which may end access to essential amenities, goods, and services.

Goal #2 on Neighborhood Diversity and Inclusion, we called out references to tiny homes, modular housing, co-housing and also to definitely provide education and guidance on the development of innovative housing solutions. We've seen those in other places where you can actually print homes using a 3D mechanism to do that. So, the Comprehensive Plan actually highlighted some of those technology group innovations that could be part of the housing solution as we go into the future.

Goal #3, in terms of Housing Access for All, we wanted to call attention obviously, to naturally occurring affordable housing but also manufactured housing in the Plan. I know there has been a lot of conversations around plex units, but we felt that this was also one that needed to be called attention to. Then to consider working with the County to develop a new program that could mitigate impacts of rising property values because the County has a program right now for seniors on how can we work with them in developing new programs that can actually help mitigate impacts of rising property values, especially on low-income households in areas where housing costs are upwardly appreciating.

Goal #4 did not again get a lot of attention, but we talked a lot about something that we do today that we already doing through CLT (Charlotte Douglas International Airport) which is really the CLT Land Trust which is really establishing a fund for land banking strategies around new transit investment. This money we had from our Executive Director of CATS that we do have the ability to do that today so the Plan wanted to call attention to that and to make sure that while we are talking on one hand about anti-displacement, how can we also continue to work with our own internet partners such as CATS and Housing and Neighborhood Services to see where we can leverage some of the resources that we have today.

Goal #5 talks about Safe and Equitable Mobility. You might have seen these goals before and that is because we highlighted it in our association with the transformation and mobility network that by 2040 every Charlottean shall have access to Safe and Equitable Mobility options in our City, but also to look at those emerging transportation services technologies. If you recall back in January, we invited representatives or experts who came to share with us some of the emerging transportation services and technologies that we may not have today. Councilmember Eiselt, myself, and Ms. Babson, Director of Transportation were on a trip to Columbus a few days ago to look at their mobility hubs. Those are the types of things that we think we need to be investing in our community today. So, the Plan calls attention to that and really emphasizes how that can be done especially when we start going through the different programs and specific projects in the Plan.

Goal #6 Healthy, Safe and Active Communities. Charlotte continues to be diverse in terms of population and we know that is very important. You go to some other communities our size, Atlanta is an example where if you jump on their train system once it gets into another part of the City where there is a group of people who speak different languages, instantly the announcements change into that language so that people who do not speak English can really understand where they are going or where they are. We've talked a lot about Way Finding and how these people are walking on a trail or they want to have access to one, how can we make sure that we make it easier for people to navigate our City streets and our public space. Perhaps the most [inaudible] thing to call out in that space is developing a Public Space Master Plan that identifies opportunities for parks, for plazas, and other public spaces and we are working on these together with our County colleagues of Park and Recreation since they are working on their own Master Plan as well.

On this next slide, the one that I really believe is very important is Goal #7 on Climate Action Plan. That was specifically called out by one of the County colleague's Commissioner and even though the Plan had some things around it before but did not really call that out and we wanted to also make sure you see in the recommended draft a lot of references to connecting this Plan with the Tree Canopy Action Plan, the Strategy Energy Action Plan, not just loosely defined, but with specific policy ideas that can really help us achieve our goal as part of SEAP, but also Tree Canopy Action Plan.

I'm sure that Goal #8 will probably come up as part of what Councilmember Newton had e-mailed earlier, but really it is about when we defined a family-sustaining wage that was the reason we did not call it a living wage is because families sustaining wage also includes benefits. I know that is one of the things that he had brought up, but also making sure that we collaborate with non-profits and other providers in terms of training and mentoring strategies.

The next slide, actually the last one on the goals, we heard these a lot from our Planning Commissioners and from a number of community members as well in terms of neighborhood-defined cultural displacement. How do we need to get that and that is really speaking to our [inaudible] as well; what kind of incentives that we can have right now today for local businesses, markets, and community amenities. We will continue to develop a fund that can help us to maintain and program those, maybe not tomorrow, but at least over the next 20-years.

Goal #10, the one about directing at least half of public infrastructure investment into our most vulnerable communities was recommended by our physical impact analysis, a consultant when they did that, and that is not just speaking to transportation, it speaks to different things whether it be Police facilities or Fire facilities, Fire stations or economic development of opportunities or even things, it is really building on what we have to be a Corridor of Opportunities and especially those vulnerable communities. Today we don't have any mechanism for tracking equity in terms of infrastructure investments. How can we do that for the communities in such a way that it matches our equitable growth framework in the Comprehensive Plan and then based on what you shared with us to perform any economic impact analysis prior to the implementation phase of the Plan?

The last slide is really talking about the next steps and is between now and June 3rd we are going to continue to have dialogue around the comments we received. Like I said earlier, we've received just over 70 of those comments as of today. We will have a community conversation at 5:30 p.m. on May 27th and then we are going to come back to you then to make a presentation to summarize some of what we've had from the community based on this recommended draft and then we will entertain if there are any potential revisions that you want to put forward based on those at that point in time. June 15th the Planning Committee will be making their recommendation to the Council. The Planning Committee is based on the existing Interlocal Agreement between Mecklenburg County and the City, they are the body that will make that recommendation to the Council, and then we will propose June 21st for the adoption of the final Plan.

Councilmember Egleston said I don't have the exact language we voted on last week in front of you, maybe somebody else does, on the 10-minute neighborhoods piece I thought that we had voted in the affirmative to add language that contemplated how technology might change people who voted to access amenities, goods and services via things like, but not limited to, on delivery of certain goods, services or amenities, but I don't see that in here. Is that in here?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes, that is in the Plan, I didn't call it out, but it is in the Plan. I may have to have one of our staff specifically tell me where that is, but we did adopt the Plan to reflect that.

Mr. Egleston said if somebody could point out where that is specifically because it is not reflected in the actual summary of the goal itself, so yeah, I would like to have someone —

Mr. Jaiyeoba said it is in there, we did not reflect it is in the goal. We made a modification to the goal itself, but it is a big picture goal and it is in the document itself.

Mr. Egleston said I think that conversation was foundational, or the goal was foundational so the conversation we are having might be splitting hairs so I will look for it to be pointed out specifically.

Alysia Osborne, Division Manager, Planning, Design & Development said it on Page 71 of the revised document in the righthand corner, Policy 1.6 where it says integrate emerging technology and future innovations and planning policy and infrastructure investments to facilitate delivery of goods and services directly to residents and businesses.

Mr. Egleston said I'm good.

Councilmember Bokhari said it is very crystal clear what we brought forward and voted on which was to change the goal; goal number one in 10-minute neighborhoods to very simply say access to the amenity is the goal, not necessarily a walk or bike rider trip there. A very simple ask that was crystal clear and what was changed, added language of not all neighborhoods are expected to include every essential amenity, good or service but every resident should have access within a half-mile walk or a two-mile bike or transit trip. That is what was added. One, that sentence contradicts itself, and then two, it has nothing to do with what we specifically said there. So, adding some in public investment an asterisk piece that says oh, well innovation that we don't know about. All they had to do was one simple thing which was not just say you have to walk or ride a bike to it; you just have to have access to it, and they couldn't do that.

Councilmember Driggs said I won't restate everything I've said you will be grateful to know, but I do think that the way this is being done kind of buries in the process some big questions. I think that we had a very robust public conversation about some of the principal features of this Plan and I don't recognize that anything in this draft is importantly different from what we got before. I see language changes and I see some softening qualifications being inserted, but it still doesn't look to me like the product of the robust conversation that we had when we had our hearing and we heard things about single-

family, we heard points about the 10-minute neighborhoods. Maybe Mr. Jaiyeoba, I put it to you this way; what do you think if any are the material changes that are different from the way Plan originated that are in here now? How has this Plan actually been modified as a result of 600 public comments and the discussion we had here, and I don't mean okay, we've got this language here, etc., but is there any important feature in this Plan that isn't the same as it was when it was first written?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I will say that this Plan is not different, but it is better as a result of some of the comments that were made and that were included. For example, let's site Goal #1 on 10-minute neighborhoods. One of the things we heard clearly from the community and even from some of yourselves is that it may not be possible everywhere. For example, we did not have it specified half a mile or a mile away from the bike and those were specific. That was not there with the first draft. Another thing that wasn't there in the first draft obviously, is the policy on housing diversity. I think in the first draft we had a different language from what you have in your recommended draft. If you look at Goal #7 on integrated natural and build environment, you see a lot of changes that were made referencing the connection of land use to the Strategic Energy Action Plan and the Tree Canopy Action Plan.

So, there are a number of things because when we thinking some of those comments into consideration we were also consulting with our Unified Development Ordinance Team as well to make sure that some of these things that are being said, regulations can be developed around implementing them. Finally, I think you had a conversation last week with regards to block lengths and also a consideration for what the developer had brought up. We made that change to go from 1,000 to 1,500 but also knowing that that is some flexibility that can be provided during the Unified Development Ordinance space. There were a few other things I believe that the Development Team asked for clarity and definition of micro-mobility, define what active ground space will be. Some of those things were cleared up; active ground space is not just retail because that was one concern that we had from them.

I don't have the Plan itself in front of me, but I can tell you there were a lot of, which is why we had to contract changes. A lot of changes that would actually I would say better, but we were not rewriting the Plan.

Mr. Driggs said Mr. Jaiyeoba, I agree with you that the changes represent refinements and represent an improvement on the Plan as originally conceived, but some of the issues about the legalities, about the conflicting priorities, about for example, whether or not all of the things that we say about trees can be achieved without having an impact on the cost of housing that defeats the purpose of the Plan. There are some really basic questions that I feel have just been skirted in this process. We have kind of looked at language changes, and we've looked at softening something here or there because we don't want to kind of suggest that we are going to break the law so, we recognize this. It is still in my mind, and what concerns me is, it still amounts to a vision that kind of contradicts itself. I think if we try to achieve all the goals we have for trees and sidewalks and other things it is going to be very hard also to realize benefits in terms of housing costs.

I will mention again, as I said before, this whole process has not included any data. We have about the outreach to the community and lots of numbers there; look how much they like it which frankly when we got to the hearing was not the same impression. I don't know what the rest of you thought, but I think the data that we saw about the outreach effort before we got to the hearing was not consistent with the mix of opinions that we heard at the hearing. We don't have data about what kind of housing types we have today, who owns them, what sort of mixed neighborhoods might exist today, whether there is actually [inaudible] or not in the neighborhoods. There are a lot of numbers that we could be looking at in order to satisfy ourselves about this Plan, and the Plan has been done, in my mind, largely on the basis of a legitimate aspiration and desire to do a good thing, which I support. In fact, my aspiration is not different I think from others, but maybe I'm just an unimaginative, hardnose realist and I worry about adopting a Plan that could end up simply being unattainable. So, why haven't we done more, and we got today, by the

way, a new memo from the developer community who have been trying I believe legitimately to help make this plan, to help make it more workable. I don't look upon their input as being some sort of self-serving effort to protect their own profits. I think they looked at it and they are a concern too. So, I won't read from it now, but I hope everybody will look at the five pages that we got today, the product of another review by developers. I would have hoped that we could form more of a partnership the way you would see when the Chamber, for example, is involved if we had a Chamber, and where you get the business community excited and on board and working with us instead of feeling that there is an adversarial relationship between the City and the people who are going to have to make this happen. It is their capital, it is their skill, it is their expertise and we are not listening to them, and I think that is unfortunate.

I will mention also on your slide, direct at least half of public infrastructure investment over the next 20-years to the most vulnerable communities. I think applying that criterion to how we invest investment could be unconstitutional. It strikes me as a violation of the equal protection laws. We should be allocating our money according to where is the most productive in the pursuit of our goals without trying to put a quota on it like that. So, it is just an example, but I can tell you that a lot of people in the community see that and they think there go my sidewalks. They are going to putting in who knows what in the troubled areas and I'm not going to be able to get a sidewalk. If you look at the mix, for example, talking about numbers, if you look at the mix of how much of the money that we are spending is being contributed by the neighborhoods to whom you wish to give half of our investment versus how much comes from other places I think it is too lop-sided. I fully accept that we will put more money into the needy neighborhoods because that is why we are here, but when I look at something like that I can easily imagine that a lot of people who write big tax checks every year feel as if their rights are not being properly represented here.

What we want in the end is a harmonious community; we want a community in which we all like each other and like to live together. One of the difficulties in my mind in this Plan and its reference to segregationist tools etc. I don't think it gets us closer to the goal of harmony and of social justice in the congenial terms where we all live together and respect each other. I think this inflames the conversation and this is what troubles me about it; having a Plan that is not going to do what it says it is going to do for the people that it is supposed to help, and in the process irritates and inflames others. I just don't understand how that is a good way to get us closer to being the kind of City we want to be. I will be looking for legal advice about whether we can put a quota on our investment like that and not open ourselves up to a lawsuit.

It is impossible to kind of go over all of the issues we've talked about, the CBAs (Community Benefits Agreements) and Displacement Commission to not have the legal authority to provide the assurances that we are suggesting they will that no gentrification can occur. They just do not have the power because the only power that exists is our ability in a conditional rezoning process to say no to the land use. But once you go to CBAs, we've heard about what their applications are and what kind of authority can be behind them and essentially you need to have either public investment or you need to have another basis, but we cannot tell developers you must accommodate the wishes of some unspecified population near your proposal before you will get permission to use the land that way. We just can't legally do that, and the Displacement Commission too; what kind of delegated authority will it have that prevents the installation of high costs of duplexes and triplexes into vulnerable neighborhoods today?

I'm sorry to be such an angry naysayer because this should be a happy time for us. We should be celebrating this Plan and I'm sure some of us look forward to doing exactly that. I'm just troubled by the fact that I really don't think we are being fair to the people that are probably the most hopeful because of this.

Councilmember Newton said I want to draw our attention to Goal #8 which is the economic opportunity goal. I was under the impression that the language that I had put forth a couple of weeks ago via e-mail would be considered by the Council for inclusion in the document. I don't want to take anything away from what has been changed because

I agree with the new language, it is just it is not the language that I was proposing and I was under the impression after our last conversation that it would come back before the Council for consideration. Just to be labor the point we did have roughly six Councilmembers that seemingly supported the original language when it was first proposed two weeks ago at the same time we had 10 Councilmembers that had voted to bring it forward for a Council vote. I know that Taiwo, you had sent an e-mail out to us last Friday, so I do appreciate that e-mail, and I do think it does provide clarity on the language so, to the extent we are talking about 8.14 and workforce agreements, I appreciate our City Attorney weighing in on that, and I'm not opposed to that language being excluded, but I did wonder about whether we should have more of an emphasis on workforce development.

Then again too, I think in 8.17 I'm on board with us including the language in worker protections but wanted to ask about benefits. I think that certainly, we want to encourage a sustaining wage, we want to encourage worker protections but let's face it, particularly in this day and age benefits are really important. Also, the proposed language 8.32, for anyone that maybe is a little bit lost here in what I'm talking about, if you can pull up your e-mail you will see that I resent the e-mail last Thursday and it has these three proposed changes. Once again Taiwo had followed up so I thought that with the follow-up e-mail here that this would put it in front of us because at this point we have what I thought was the equivalent of staff weighing in and possibly giving some recommendations here, but inasmuch as 8.32 was concerned we do have a new 8.32 which I like. But at the same time, it is a different language really in its entirety from the proposed 8.32 which apparently is consistent with our Plan goals and City priorities. So, even more, the reason for me to question why we wouldn't be considering our including this language from the e-mail I sent as well.

I say all of that to ask that we actually consider the language that was proposed, so not to the exclusion of language that has now been included within the Plan because once again I like it, but at the same time maybe we consider some of the proposed languages as well. Including my e-mails, this is the fourth time I have asked this and so I want to put that out there and ask that we as a Council maybe consider some of this language and come to some sort of conclusions on whether we want to add additional language to Goal #8 and really more specific language that kind of strengthens our commitments to workforce development, our City workers, and also our apprenticeship programs.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said thank you Councilmember Newton; my response to you essentially has not changed except for 8.14 in that e-mail that I have sent. My understanding was Council was going to have a discussion today around this particular subject and so we did not do anything beyond what you sent us. With 8.14 I think we talked about that today with the Attorney's Office and the way we understand it is you want something that says community benefits on workforce agreement, but we cannot legally do that. So, we just have to keep workforce development in that language but not necessarily community benefit and workforce agreements.

With that conversation we had on 8.21, I can send something out to all of you tonight, and then if you are good with that then we will definitely include that in the final draft that will come to you.

Mr. Newton said maybe I'm getting ahead of myself because I didn't know if we actually have that scheduled as a conversation for us tonight, and if that is the case then maybe I'm jumping the gun here. I completely get where you are coming from when it comes to that language and I would agree with that, but I'm just asking about the other proposals aside from that language.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said the other one on the family-sustaining wage, at the risk of being too [inaudible] here, Page 132 of the Plan actually defines what family-sustaining wage is and that it includes worker benefits. So, we can add that into our emphasis and call it out in the Plan for Policy 8.17, but the reason we call it family-sustaining wage is because that also includes benefits. But if that is not satisfactory that is nothing wrong in calling that out in the policy.

Mr. Newton said I'm really grateful you pointed that out because I think that answers that question. There was some additional language within 8.14 pertaining to workforce development possibly maybe being able to be tacked on the back end of this, but really kind of the general idea being that in this concept of Community Benefits Agreements that we do not lose sight of workforce development. Certainly providing resources so the support development, retention of community assets and amenities, absolutely, but also just maybe more of that nuts and bolts kind of this workforce development as well which I kind of view as something different, but also something that I think would be tremendously beneficial for us to explore in the concept of Community Benefits Agreements. Once again, I don't know if that is a conversation we will be having as a Council. I didn't know if this was the time for me to bring this up, but I didn't want to lose the opportunity to bring it up if it was the only time. Maybe it is not, so hopefully, we do have that conversation tonight.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Newton, I'm looking at the page and what I thought is that this is our first Workshop and then there was a second one that we would also have at the Strategy Session, that we would actually be at that point having some final ideas or questions before we came to the end of June. I don't have my schedule in front of me so I might be a little bit off in terms of our second Workshop. I think what we need to do is figure out because obviously, I think we are kind of talking and I'm not really sure that we are communicating.

Mr. Newton said and some of us might be a little lost.

Mayor Lyles said I understand this so let's try to get on top of this.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said what you have in terms of a schedule is that on June 7th at the Strategy Session this would come back before you again. My understanding is the Strategy Session occurs before what has been deemed the final release. I do believe that this was an outstanding issue from the last discussion and once there is an opportunity to talk about it tonight, I think it is appropriate.

Mr. Newton said do we think everyone is up to speed on this; I wouldn't want us to not have an understanding of what we are talking about, but assuming we are listening, and we do.

Mayor Lyles said there is an e-mail that you sent with the materials and what I'm going to ask is can we get someone to pull that e-mail up that Mr. Newton has and make sure everybody gets a copy of it?

Councilmember Winston said I just want to make two statements just for the record; there was a statement that said that we haven't seen any data and that is just incorrect. This is a data-informed plan and for those that are watching if you want to learn about how data was used look at Section 1.3 and learn about the equitable growth framework and all of the different data matrices that were used and that have been used and will be used to measure the effectiveness of the Plan, measure equity and all of the above. The appendices that are not this particular version but were in the first version also provided a whole menu of examples of the data, the different sets of data that were used for this matrix. This is a very, very data-informed Plan, data-driven Plan and you don't have to take my word for it, you can check for yourself.

Also, it was said about the goal of the 10-minute neighborhoods, about how integrating these emerging technologies doesn't fit whatever guidance. I think I would disagree with that, I think what my colleagues were getting at, yes there might be a situation or many situations in the future where folks don't necessarily need to walk very far, maybe not far being their front door or down their driveway, but that still does completely fit the goal of creating a 10-minute neighborhood. That is probably the shortest walk that you can take or a bike ride or however, you want to do down your driveway. Some people have to drive down their driveway, but that would in fact factually fit right into that goal and we know that we have a lot of work to do to be able to get there to bridge the digital adopt to buy for instance for folks to be able to take advantage of those amenities. I really see staff as

listening to Council and creating the corrections and guidance into these revisions, so great job.

Councilmember Eiselt said I want to say first of all I do support the Plan overall and I've said that before. It is a great step forward, but I will admit because of family events over the weekend I didn't have to go through the whole document. But in looking at the things that were on my mind I'm glad that we revised that language about uptown density, so it is not specifying that there is a legal document attached to that goal and desire. Colleagues have mentioned the 10-minute neighborhood and including what we had agreed to include in there. Mr. Newton, I did respond to say I like what you are saying about workforce development. I will say though to be honest I am struggling to fit that into this because I think we risk in some of the things that we are doing getting away from what a Comprehensive Vision Plan is and it is a master document to guide land-use decisions and create a vision for the future. When we try to put too many things in the soup sometimes you lose the flavor of the soup altogether. I think that discussion under CBA is a great place to have that conversation and again, going back to the Asheville example where they had that, they took action around CBAs separate from their Comprehensive Vision Plan and I don't know why we can't do that and talk about the things that are important to us like workforce development. But, overall, I think we just have to really make sure that we remember what we are trying to pass is a master document for the future and not get ourselves too tied into a couple of things in here in these revisions.

I do agree with my colleague Mr. Driggs; I did not see that comment at first about directing at least have of public infrastructure investments over the next 20-years to the most vulnerable communities, especially within the populations vulnerable to displacement overlay. That just took me by surprise because I'm not sure how we are defining all of that. If we are talking about wanting to give more people access to high opportunity neighborhoods wouldn't we want to be investing in those neighborhoods in a way that gave people more access? Again, I go back to our bus system and having a better public transportation system to allow people to work and live in different areas. It is how we use our Housing Trust Funds and so I actually find that statement in the revision to be rather limiting and I don't know that that really stays with the spirit of developing a master plan for land use. I'm struggling with that particular revision and the comment for that revision, but otherwise, that is it for my comments. Again, I absolutely support the overall intent of the Plan.

Councilmember Ajmera said I just want to thank our Planning staff and the entire team for working on this. I did have an opportunity to go over some of the changes that the Council had approved and the majority of the questions and concerns that the Council had that had more than five Councilmember's support have been incorporated. I think many of us received a memo from [inaudible] earlier today with specific questions and asks. Mr. Jaiyeoba, you may not have had an opportunity to respond to those, but I didn't see that you were copied in that e-mail, but do you have a copy of those concerns that [inaudible] and others had raised?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said tonight is the first time I'm hearing about it and I checked with my staff and we don't have it.

Mayor Lyles said it came at 4:07 p.m. Ms. Ajmera, you have it, but I don't know that everybody else has it yet, but we can look for it.

Ms. Ajmera said I will forward it to Mr. Jaiyeoba. If you could respond to those comments and questions that will be great.

Councilmember Phipps said I would just like to say when we get documents that are containing post questions I would hope between now and the time that we vote that they will be addressed or looked at. Some of the questions that have been presented in that correspondence have been brought up here like the height concerns and things, but I'm thinking that there might be others, even the block lengths for industrial. Those were mentioned in some of those documents, so I want to make sure that we've looked at those

and reviewed and opined on them in a way such that there would be some response and to make sure there won't be any unintended consequences when the Plan is voted on, that maybe some of these things had not been addressed in a satisfactory manner. That is what I would hope that we would undertake and make sure that there are not any other items that need to be brought forth for more clarity and response. I look forward to talking to the Planning Director to see how we incorporated or looked at some of those things. There were a host of them and one of them was about 13-pages and this one was five pages. I just want to make that that is done as we move forward.

Councilmember Bokhari said I will start with a question for Mr. Attorney or someone on your staff and this is the same question I posed to you this afternoon. Obviously, knowing that there is a lot of underlying detail so I will preface it as saying from your guy's quick analysis that you've done and where we are on 2.1 and not like the art of the possibility of practical implementation down the road, but just now from a legal view. When you see the statement allow duplex and triplex housing units in all place types where single-family housing is allowed, regardless of how mapping works and all of those things, is there any reason for us not to interpret this as, well everything is going to have a place type and where all single-family housing is allowed is in a place type, therefore duplexes and triplexes being allowed everywhere is the exact same thing as saying all lots where we were before versus now saying this?

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said thank you for your questions; I've spoken with Ms. Hagler-Gray and I will let her take the first attempt at that answer if you wouldn't mind.

Mr. Bokhari said please.

Teri Hagler-Gray, Senior Assistant City Attorney said Mr. Bokhari, yes that is our understanding that this language informs the public that there will be an immediate step between the adoption of the Comp Plan and the implementation step with the UDO (Unified Development Ordinance) so that place typing will take place after this, but it won't change the place types that you were going to adopt which are N-1 and N-2 and will allow duplexes and triplexes on single-family lots.

Mr. Bokhari said that should be crystal clear to everyone, and I will say it in another way; I'll say it the way my colleague Mr. Winston said it several times and I haven't fully comprehended it until seeing this draft which is if A equals B and B equals C A equals C. So, it is very crystal clear this is fancy footwork in saying all lots which the community rose up against and put pressure and now we've said all place types, which means the same thing. It literally means the same thing. So, I will just end my comments, we have been debating this and fighting this and arguing this for months now and it seems like people aren't listening to logic. They are held up in their positions so I will just at the end of my rope on this one address my final comments to the community and this is to you the citizens of Charlotte. It is up to you now.

Everyone's positions have been made here, if you are paying attention it is crystal clear so now it is up to you to ask the questions of this Council over the next couple of weeks because you see what is before you, this is it, and if you do not speak up and ask your questions this is what will be approved. Some of the questions you should be asking simply are what analysis went into this Plan stating things like 50% of capital investments going forward over 20-years need to go towards specific parts of town. That is an awful round number that doesn't seem like it has a lot of analysis. Why did that happen? What other Departments were part of that? Here are more questions; why have you decided to cherry-pick a set of tactical tools in this Plan that you don't understand how they will even work, yet you've left others off.

Other tactical you left off you should be asking questions like why wouldn't you put things in like state tax credits for affordable housing if we are picking and choosing tactical things that are in here. Other questions; why do you continue to include Community Benefits Agreements in the Plan siting how they will enable communities to get daycares and grocery stores when we know this isn't the case. If you want to know what Councilmember Newton was talking about and asking for us to have a conversation earlier, it was literally

how are those things going to work and can we put a little meat around them now. And the punch line, even though he and I probably fall on opposite sides of that issue we are actually united because no one will talk about it. They just want us to jam it in this Plan. So you have to ask those questions, you have to ask the question of did you actually change the approach to abolish single-family zoning or did you just change the word "lots" to "place types" and it is going to result in the exact same thing. For the Councilmembers who opposed the original language and now support the Plan, what has changed? You need also ask why are we so opposed to doing a cost-benefit analysis on what the specifics of this Plan will do for affordable housing.

Then finally, we need to ask the question why are we not allowing a public hearing for you to come to speak to us again as we work to jam this thing through, an opportunity for you to come to tell us what you think about this draft that we've just arrived at. So, remember citizens of Charlotte, that is who I am speaking to now because it is in your hands at this point; we are in the narrow of the six-five vote on the most fundamental parts of this Plan to pass and again a Comp Plan is designed to convene and unite this community and the only unity that exists right now on this whole City is the development community and they are against the Plan. So, this Council is not being close to being united on this, it is six to five and it is not divided on party or race lines. The only real division is that the five of us that are opposed to it in this form are District Reps. That should tell you something, so ask your question. It is up to you now, that is it and six-five is a very narrow margin that you can have an influence on with one very simple question which is what is the rush?

Councilmember Johnson said I just wanted to ask a question about the Plan being divided into three volumes. I see that language is discussed several times throughout the Plan, but I wanted to clarify that the Council will vote before each volume is adopted. So, can you tell me Taiwo if that is going to be defined or documented so that we have that information in writing?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said the Plan is streamlined into three different deliverables, those three volumes. The first volume is the policy, big ideas, the goals, and different programs and projects. That is what we propose that Council should adopt because that is really what is going to guide first of all the place types mapping and the Unified Development Ordinance. Without that, we cannot go into those two steps. The second volume is implementation strategy. We are not proposing that Council shall adopt that, but that is just a proposal. Again, because that is the one you are going to see over and over. Council can make a decision that you want to adopt it, we have no problem with that. What I think is more important with that implementation strategy is that you want a seat so that nobody goes away and start doing something else without Council oversight.

So, we get that, however, we choose to do that without your adoption or coming back to you over and over we are fine with that. The last volume is the appendix; that is where you have the acknowledgments for the most part of people and the different manners, you do not need to adopt that. So, it is really the first volume and then you can decide and give us guidance as to how you want us to approach the second volume whether that is through adoption or coming back to you at every point in time.

Ms. Johnson said this is starting to feel like Ground Hog Day. We spent like 20 hours discussing what change we want to see, and we talked about the adoption of each volume. We talked about that for a while several times throughout the last meetings when we had straw votes which is a whole other issue I would like to discuss at a later time. Councilmember Newton, if I understand him correctly, what he was requesting has not been updated; 2.1 what Councilmember Watlington requested, is not designed, according to her understanding and I know for certain what we talked about as the adoption of the policy I'm concerned that Council is spending a lot of time on this communicating to the staff what we are wanting in the Plan and it is just not being implemented. Mr. Jones, I would speak to you about this at this point. We have asked if someone needs to revisit some of the suggestions that we've made over the last two meetings, I would ask that that be compared with the revisions because I don't feel like Council is getting what we are asking for. It feels like the same document with a few words changed, even the place

types to lots and so we really, really need to be heard and the revisions need to be made especially this one. I can see for myself on this one, it was my understanding that the straw vote we passed this, and I don't know why that there would have been any confusion on that. If you need to look at the video last week it really was my understanding that we communicated that we wanted to adopt each volume. So, correct me if I'm wrong but I just need some help on this, how do three Councilmembers feel like what we understood or what we requested has not been updated in the Plan.

Mr. Jones said Taiwo was mentioning the prerogative of the Council so absolutely volume one, volume two if you want to vote on those absolutely. If you want to vote on an appendix that is as acknowledgments, absolutely you can do that. In terms of what is happening in this revision, and I will try to do it very quickly, is that the Council started off with Committees and the Committees took certain items and the revision of 2.1 actually came out of a Committee and that was voted on I think eight to three and put in the Plan and so I think that is consistent with the words that came out of that Committee. In terms of some of the changes to this document, first of all, Councilmember Driggs, I agree with you in the sense of bringing the City together and having collaboration and working through all of this. I think that is exactly what we all want, we should all aspire to have. In terms of a major rewrite, basically, the discussions with the Council were around what came out of the Committees and those 19 items that were for a straw vote and some other items that were informational. So, things outside of that from the Council discussion would not be in this so, again if you want to vote on the three volumes yes. In terms of what came out of the Council discussion, it really was a part of the straw votes as well as the Committees, but again we stand ready to take direction from the Council.

Ms. Eiselt said I was just going to ask if we could get a copy of the straw votes that we voted on with the wording that we voted on so we can compare it side by side to the revised Plan.

Mr. Jones said yes.

Councilmember Watlington said I just want to say in particular to 2.1 and I think I wrote this a couple of weeks ago in my e-mail. My intent to changing to place types was to preserve exactly what you ask about on the 10th, was would we have an option between single-family exclusive and something flexible. So, the original intent of my place type wording was absolutely to preserve that option, but that vote has happened and okay, we've done a straw vote, we have not voted on the Plan so obviously that is until Council decides if that is what we want to do officially, then it is still discussion, but I just wanted to make that clear. I think that speaks to some of what I'm hearing around the table and I don't think this has to be difficult in terms of this is what we said, let's bring it back. So, if there is a way that we can figure that piece out, where the breakdown is that the majority of us are walking away with the impression that some [inaudible] is different and then maybe it doesn't look exactly like what we thought it would. I think that is what I'm hearing from folks, whether it is 2.1 or block length or whatever it is, and I'll leave that there.

Mr. Jones said I think that is fair in terms of trying to have a matrix if you will about what was put in the document, especially from the Council's deliberations and getting a better understanding of that was the intent of Council, I don't disagree with you at all.

Mayor Lyles said so can we get this done prior to; I know it is a holiday weekend, but it is probably good because that may be the time that some of us have to read and if we could get that as quickly as possible I think that makes a big difference as well Mr. Jones.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I think maybe where the confusion is could be this. I tried to explain it last week, but I will try again. So, there are three parts to the Comprehensive Plan; volume one which is the Policy, which Sections 1, 2, 3 of what you had in the old document. Volume two is Section 4 in the old document which is the implementation strategy and volume three is where you have your appendices, the acknowledgment. That is just the three parts to the Comprehensive Plan; the process itself also has three parts and I believe that is what you were talking about. After the Comprehensive Plan is done you will still have an opportunity to adopt the place type mapping but until February of 2022.

Council will still have the opportunity to also adopt the Unified Development Ordinance in the Spring of 2022 so, there are three parts to the Plan and there are three parts to the process. The Manager said if you want to adopt all three volumes of the Plan that is fine, including the appendices and acknowledgment, that is okay. We are just trying to separate those because you had asked us to bring back a streamlined document and that is the reason for setting apart the acknowledgment, the appendices, the place types manual so that you only focus in volume one on policy, big ideas, goals, programs, and projects. Those are the ones that will drive the place types and the UDO. Without them, we cannot progress into those areas. A decision about implementation strategy as well as the appendices, but this is different from the place types itself, which we will still adopt next year. So, I don't think that is what Ms. Johnson is saying, but we will go back and review, but we know that everything we had from you, we as much as possible working with Constituent Services made sure that we were looking at everything to the best of our ability to have what you have in front of you.

Mr. Driggs said I would just say very briefly I wish we would all consider that we are divided almost right down the middle on probably the most prominent feature of this Plan. It is not a very satisfactory outcome. It would be nice if we could work a little more and come up with an answer that a greater majority of us felt good about. There are ways that we can achieve the purpose of 2.1 without a meaningless wording change that will move us in the direction of liberalizing land use, diversifying land use, etc., and not totally erase every single-family neighborhood in all of Charlotte. As I said, I just think the fact that we are so evenly divided on this ought to be a signal to us that maybe we could work a little more and reach a greater majority.

Councilmember Graham said or we are just equally divided, and I don't think the Plan calls for eliminating every single-family housing development in the City. That is just a mischaracterization of the Plan. It would be nice to have all one million citizens in Charlotte agree on the Plan, that we are all in this together, that we all agree about every aspect of the Plan. I'm not sure that is realistic and based on the performance of the Council I'm not sure it is possible for us to get nine votes, 11 votes for it either. I think the Plan is what it is, and I don't want to be a broken record, but it is aspirational, it is what we aspire to be, it is how we want to build the City. No, it won't be perfect, and no it won't have 90% of the folks in the community behind it. I don't think that is realistic, but I think it is aspirational and I think we can achieve it. Every Councilmember has the prerogative to see it as they want and deliver the type of presentation that they believe they should, but I don't think that it is fair to the staff nor fair to those who believe that the Plan is a document we can work with moving forward to suggest that it is something else.

Mr. Newton said I just wanted to weigh in on this one, just to bring to everyone's attention for anyone maybe watching at home, these place types are specific in nature and there are a lot of specifics within this plan so to simply say that it is pure aspirational I think just isn't accurate frankly. We know that adopting the current schematic of place types is going to limit community options within the UDO mapping process. That is specific. I would disagree I think with my colleague pertaining to the elimination altogether of single-family development or single-family communities by virtue by the existence of 2.1 here in its current form, but at the same time, I think the proposal that many Councilmembers have made would not eliminate the possibility of duplexes and triplexes in single-family either. It is more of a compromise; it is what as Ms. Watlington was saying is, it is what is flexible. It allows for the flexibility it allows for more community input outside of a context where we know CBAs are not going to be applicable. At the same time too, it allows for protections that we all can readily acknowledge exist. Your protections for adverse outcomes that we can all readily acknowledge existing in this Plan. Why are we having all of this conversation about non-displacement? Why are we talking about a Non-Displacement Committee? It is because that we can acknowledge that this Plan frankly will accelerate gentrification. Why are we talking about infrastructure so much? It is because we can acknowledge that this Plan in subdivision growth can accelerate units in areas that don't have the critical infrastructure, amenities in place to support the growth. So, having said that, why wouldn't we look for a way to find a middle ground to create more options, more flexibility. Why wouldn't we want to have some sort of contingency to protect those areas we know could be vulnerable to the very things that we see as

problems that will arise out of this Plan later. That is what I've gathered from the conversation.

Mr. Bokhari said I think there is probably not someone on this Council that is more frustrated with what is in this Plan and how many things that are in it that are just wrong, and I think they are not right. With that being said on me on that far side of this, as much as I dislike those things the broader point is we are here to try to find common ground and I am telling you right now if we went back to the point of discussion where we agreed on two simple things, one 2.1; remove all the special footwork and their different wording that is in there, bring it up to the appropriate level that we understand now which is we as a City over the next 20 plus years are going to go after an aggressively pursued density in all ways we can as long as we can ensure that it doesn't have detrimental effects to affordability. You say that I'm on board.

Then secondarily, you replace all places that say Community Benefits Agreements which is a capital letter word that means something very legally specific and you just replace those words with community engagement, something that is more generic which says we don't know how any of this is going to work yet, but we value grocery stores and daycares and all of these things we've said. We all value those things, in fact, going back to that first part I don't actually have that huge of a problem with single-family zoning being abolished, I just think it is complexly unstudied and we have no idea what it will do to affordability, so there is a chance that I could get behind that down the road if the proper analysis is done and we see what it is going to do around displacement and gentrification.

However, right now I'm not asking for us to not do that, I'm saying bring it up a notch so that is included in the scope, and let's do it. If you do those two things, CBAs to the word community engagement and 2.1 away from the specific tactical wording up to we are going to aggressively pursue density as long as we ensure affordability, despite all the other things I hate about this Plan, I will vote for it. Promise. So, anyone who is looking for compromise I right now am signing up for those two edits and I will move forward with everything else I hate because that is a compromise, but for those of you on the other side of this who are saying oh, we changed lots to place types and that was why I jumped on board this. I think we've made it clear tonight there is no difference so if you were opposed to it before you have to answer why you are not opposed to it now.

Ms. Ajmera said I want to address the comments that were made by some of my colleagues in terms of displacement and infrastructure. Yes, this Plan could result in higher density and hence the majority of the Council approved infrastructure counsel which was not in the original Plan and Anti-displacement Commission. So, for both of those things, I do want the residents to know that we are taking infrastructure seriously, and hence there is a Committee that will be in place as part of the implementation along with the Anti-displacement Commission to provide recommendations on the strategies to address this issue moving forward.

Ms. Watlington said many of you know professionally I'm an engineer. I'm also a Project Manager and I lead multistage initiatives and the idea when you begin an initiative if feasibility is to converge and you want to continue down that funnel to get more specific as you move into conceptual, as you move into project commitment because when people commit to something everybody needs to be on the same page about what if I were to say the Charter or what the outcomes need to be of the particular initiative. If we are committing dollars, we need to understand what the economic impact is. As you go through design then you start to understand more specifically alright exactly how much are these estimates off. There is a contingency in the Plan because further down the road we are going to mitigate that risk as we get more specific, we get more answers as you move into a start-up, as you move into a turnover. The idea is that you decrease risk as you go further through the process. So, when it comes to decision-making sequencing you don't want to lean in too far and commit on certain aspects before you have the opportunity to do the analysis.

So, I think as it comes to this Plan, well first of all I think what I'm hearing in the room is that people have different definitions of plans. There is a vision, purpose, values,

principles and I feel like that ultimately when we say this is aspirational is what this document is supposed to be. We shouldn't have a whole lot of fundamental differences when it comes to our purpose, our values, and our principles. When we get down to a Plan you are talking about implementation level, you are talking about specific tasks, who owns them, what is the schedule. Those are the components of a plan, so I feel like there is an opportunity for us to really align on what we are trying to do here because if it is truly supposed to be our vision, I think that is wonderful. As a vision, I would think that there are a lot more people that would be on the same page in regard to some things and it sounds like there is an opportunity to go in here and really separate out, and I think that was a request of Council previously, to separate out what is aspirational versus the tactical items.

I think Mr. Bokhari said this earlier, there are some things that are tactical that I feel are being determined ahead of the work to really understand the options. I'm not understanding why that is happening, so I guess that is my question for the room is why do we feel the need to do that because I agree with you Mr. Graham, that this is a living document. The work doesn't stop after we approve it, we are going to continue to refine and do that. I think we are all on the same page in terms of that so they why does our document not reflect that? We are choosing to make decisions here that we don't have to make today and that is the part that I'm not understanding.

Mayor Lyles said I think that is a really good question Ms. Watlington and I'm going to take a stab at it. Mr. Bokhari said we all agree on increasing density and we should all agree that there should be citizen engagement. I think that the problem that we have and I'm just going to speak candidly is that people don't trust us because of the history of what we've done before. When you think about the Odell Plan and what happened to Brooklyn and how the black churches weren't put back, and I know you think that has been at least 30 years ago, well memories where people and systematically passed down, think about it. All of us talk about our childhood and what we learned from our parents and how we feel about how we shape life today.

So, I believe if a compromise is available to this group and it is important to get there then you can't just say increase density without defining what that really means because people don't understand it. They have their lived experiences in this town and Mr. Driggs came when Piper Glen was being built, he has a beautiful home in Piper Glen and so that is a lived experience where everybody lives in these beautiful homes and then there are other neighborhoods that they thought they had a beautiful home and someone came with a bulldozer and took a front-page on the Charlotte Observer and pushed it down. So, these are very different experiences to really just say well we believe in increased density without some idea of what that means and I think it is a little bit tough because perhaps many of us are trying to figure it out from where we sit today. I think that part of this if we want this kind of compromise it has got to go beyond the elevation of, we believe in increased density because we don't have to believe in it because it is coming anyway. That is pretty much a fact. So, that is the actual thing that we can predict from the data that we have that the growth in the City is increasing, that housing costs are going up. The volume of housing available is getting smaller and so these are some of the things that I think we talk about, but we don't have the tactical or even the idea of what tactical criteria we would have.

When I was looking at this, I often think about what principle am I trying to follow, so how do I define a principle around density? How do I define a principle around engagement? What does that mean and then how do you take it places where people will believe you when they don't have that belief? Everything that everyone has said I think has a moment of candied discussion right now and I think that is a really important moment to have because I don't think we are going to get any further going up and maybe we won't do very well when we stay down at the tactical level of what we are embracing in this Plan as you said, if we were doing this from a clean slate which doesn't exist in a City that is living and growing like ours and has a path and a history like ours. It is just not that neat and I wish it were.

But at some point, we are going to have to decide do we come in a different direction and how do we do that. But I never remember saying eliminate single-family zoning, I would have said in single-family zoning we must increase the density with duplexes and triplexes. Once we use that work eliminate, no let me just say it, you've got to prove to me that you would do it and right now I have no proof or validation in this community that people will do it except on corner lots. That is all I've heard. Nobody has given us the one really strong way of stating how density would be increased except on a corner lot. Now you know there are a lot of blocks in Charlotte and that is really what we have now, and it hasn't created density. Corner lots have not created density in our building so I don't know the answer, I just feel like it is not as deep as if I were given a problem to solve that didn't have so many known and unknown factors to it. Nobody wants to increase the affordability pricing of housing, but it is going now. We all know that the price of housing is increasing now and all I can say, and I said it at the beginning of this discussion, the status quo is not acceptable.

Ms. Watlington said I think we agree on a lot, but by no means was I suggesting that we start from a blank page. I never said that, so I just want to make sure if it was unclear what I said.

Mayor Lyles said I didn't understand you to say that.

Ms. Watlington said the other piece though is that I agree with you because there are so many things that are lack trust, that is why we need to have a very regimented look. Let's start with what we agree with and let's not lean forward on things because just like you said living in my neighborhood, when I hear eliminate single-family zoning, and we are going to allow duplexes, I'm like you are about to throw a whole bunch of more rental properties in my neighborhood when I already a lack of stability

So, I absolutely appreciate that people hear things from where they are and so I don't think the answer is to give them specifics that we haven't vetted. I think the answer is to commit to the vision and I like what you said about single-family because I think that is what everybody around the table is saying, we want to increase density in places that were single-family. Not status quo, I don't think anybody wants to keep the status quo, but at this point we can agree on that, cool. Let's go to the next step, now let's engage the community before we take things off the table because that is where you lose trust.

When you say we are going to engage the community, but you've already taken the queen off the board and so people say why am I showing up when you made the decisions that I cared about. I think we agree that because there is a lack of trust we've got to be more upfront, but I also think that doesn't mean that we lean forward on specific decisions when we don't have the analysis that backs it up.

Mayor Lyles said we can have this dialogue because I would like to continue it because what I would say about that is that we have had this dialogue in many parts of this community and they would say why are you not taking this action, whereas other parts of the community that would say why are you taking this action. I get that and I understand it, but I don't think that this is going to get solved today in this room. What I'm saying is that if the Councilmembers don't get a place that they can understand that there has to be a definition around increasing density for people to be able to live in this city, and I don't know what form it takes. I'm fine if we can come to some agreement, but right now I had a Councilmember tell me I've got the votes to get this Plan passed and it is going to be the right plan and we've been at this now for almost a year and it is not passed, it is not necessarily what I'm hearing people say, but six people on this Council say it is the right plan for them. That is just the basic reality of it and it can go that way, but if somebody really wants to say something that is going to be different and bring it, you just can throw it out here at this meeting every Monday night. This is a conversation that you need to be having among yourselves and not in a way that is confrontational and indicates anger and fear.

Ms. Watlington said I think people are angry and afraid because we've had this conversation a hundred times and things are not changing.

Mayor Lyles said all the time over and over and over again.

Ms. Watlington said, and it doesn't change and that is where the frustration comes from.

Mayor Lyles said I don't know where this is going to go from now. Actually, it is 7:00 and we had a Public Hearing that was scheduled for 6:30 and it is 7:00. What I would actually say is that the staff has given you every piece of information that they can give you tonight and Matt I'm going to ask the question around this if you would give just some grace, everybody has got the document that has been translated and read I hope, would give people time to read it and then maybe we can come back to that as a first item on our next meeting when we discuss this or we can do it at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Newton said I did have a quick comment on the conversation from the floor which I will make very quickly. I think you hit the nail on the head just now Madam Mayor, with your language. The idea here being that yes, I think we are in agreement that we would be okay with more density, duplexes, and triplexes in single-family. The only question is, is that going to be everywhere. Certainly, that wouldn't be the status quo because the status quo is right now is that is not the case, it is only on corner lots. To that point that we don't know if it is going to work, well we have been restricted today, no one is saying not to open it up, not to put more duplexes and triplexes in single-family, it is just a matter of saying what areas do we know where we can identify there being adverse consequences as a result. Frankly, that could be a very small fraction of the overall size of all single-family throughout the City, but at the same time, I think there are some of us who are saying those areas are deserving of more protection and this one size fits all approach.

Mayor Lyles said I don't know how you protect yourself without protecting equally in a government.

Mr. Newton said frankly there are neighborhoods that have deed restrictions, that have resources to protect themselves that will go out there, get the overlays and there are others that just don't have those abilities and unfortunately, so this is my fear and I don't think I'm the exception to the rule on this and I'm not the only one saying this, but my fear is that those are the communities that are going to be targeted, those are the communities that are going to be exploited and if we don't actually carve out exceptions for those communities and we move forward with a one size fits all approach we are going to be counterproductive in the goals that we are trying to achieve.

Mayor Lyles said I understand that, but I don't know that we have unanimously agreed on that premise. I understand what you are saying.

Mr. Newton said you are saying your language is spot on [inaudible]

Mayor Lyles said but I'm going to tell you that I'm disagreeing with you that everybody should have something.

Mr. Driggs said excuse me Mayor, but we did not do it. I really take exception to the suggestion that we are not trusted because of what we – you used the term we did it before. You said we did it before, "we" did not. What percentage of the population of Charlotte today was a party to any kind of redlining or anything else? It stopped legally 50 years ago and I just don't like to be characterized as a segregationist because I think there are values associated with single-family neighborhoods that deserve to be preserved and I do not see the need to completely eliminate the existence of single-family zoned neighborhoods in order to further the goals of this Plan. I think the intention is to declare some kind of political victory and it is at the expense of the quality of the Plan.

Mayor Lyles said I really regret when I get into a disagreement with Mr. Driggs; I'm really sorry of that because he is one of, I think my favorite Councilmembers. No neglect to the rest of you guys, but Ed, when I say that I really speak in the context. I've been here since 1969 and I watched in this building as people made these decisions and a bulldozer did come down with a white guy in a suit tearing down a neighborhood so it is kind of hard

for me to forget about those things. I'm not calling "we" in terms of we, Ed and Julie, and Vi, but we as a City did impact and make decisions. There was a study done in the late '70s that showed that we didn't build infrastructure where it was most needed on the west side and the City Manager commissioned the study. So, when you start thinking about that I don't mean it in the context – I think every one of us have gotten to a place that we understand this country is on a path and it is a path that I think has been going in the right direction and I think everyone here has seen proven more times not that they are ready to look at the issue of equity and inclusion. Our values are equity, inclusion, and welcoming diversity so I understand that, so if I say we please forgive me for we in the context of historical perspective. That is all I ask, and I promise you it won't be because you are being pegged as someone that did this. You were probably in Germany driving in a convertible having a nice time and a good life.

We are going to go to our Business Meeting now and come back at the end of this. I think the public has gotten accustomed to us doing that right now.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

The following items were approved:

A motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Newton and carried unanimously, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Item No. 19: Construct On-Call Services for Intelligent Transportation Systems.

(A): Reject the low bid submitted by Lumin8 Transportation Technologies, LLC for Miscellaneous On-Call Services for Intelligent Transportation Systems Project A project, and (B) Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,925,814.82 to the lowest responsive bidder STS Cable Services, Inc. for the Miscellaneous On-Call Services for Intelligent Transportation Systems Project A project.

Summary of Bids

STS Cable Services, Inc.	\$1,925,814.82
Utility Services Contractors	\$2,999,174.82

Item No. 20: Citywide On-Call Cabling Services

(A) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and approve unit price contracts for citywide on-call cabling services for an initial term of three years to the following: AFL Enterprise Services, Inc., Cabling Solutions, Inc. dba CSI Technology Integrators, TelWare Corporation, Universal Phone Systems, Inc. dba Universal Voice/Data, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 21: Construct Ardrey Kell Road Sidewalk

Approve a contract in the amount of \$998,425.34 to the lowest responsive bidder DOT Construction, Inc. for the Ardrey Kell Road Sidewalk project.

Summary of Bids

DOT Construction	\$ 998,425.34
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$1,120,213.05
Sealand Contractors Corp.	\$1,328,393.77
Blythe Development Company	\$1,592,944.32

Item No. 22: Construct Charlotte Mecklenburg Animal Care and Control Intake Room Renovations

Approve a contract in the amount of \$572,504.80 to the lowest responsive bidder Carolina Contracting & Investments Inc. for the Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department Animal Care and Control Intake Room Renovations project.

Summary of Bids

Carolina Contracting & Investments, Inc.	\$572,504.80
Holden Building Company, Inc.	\$576,800.00
Edison Foard, Inc.	\$594,563.20
AVM Contractors LLC	\$672,944.16
D. E. Brown Construction, Inc.	\$699,977.60
Miles-McClellan Construction Company, Inc.	\$782,880.00

Item No. 23: Construct City View/McAlpine Street Project

Approve a contract in the amount of \$729,686.11 to the lowest responsive bidder Carolina Wetland Services, Inc. for the City View/McAlpine Stream Project

Summary of Bids

Carolina Wetland services, Inc.	\$729,686.11
Pressley Siteworks, LLC	\$770,859.51
GreenWater Development, Inc.	\$787,359.13
Blythe Development Company	\$908,441.88
Baker Grading & Landscaping	\$995,390.83
Shamrock Environmental Corporation	\$1,062,196.94
Sealand Contractors, Corp.	\$1,497,569.39

Item No. 24: Irwin Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements

Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,921,814.50 to the lowest responsive bidder Gilbert Engineering Company, Inc. for the Irwin Creek Wastewater Treatment Plan Rehabilitation Improvements project.

Summary of Bids

Gilbert Engineering Company Inc.	\$2,921,814.50
Harper	\$3,288,200.00
State	\$4,252,500.00

Item No. 25: Water Treatment Chlorination Equipment

(A) Approve the purchase of chlorination equipment by sole source exemption, (B) Approve a contract with Piedmont Chlorinator, Inc. for the purchase of Regal smart valves, vacuum regulators, related chemical feed equipment, and maintenance services for the term of five years, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 26: Airport Passenger Boarding Bridge Maintenance Services

(A) Approve a contract with National Jetbridge Services for maintenance services for passenger boarding bridges for an initial term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 27: Airport Runway Passive Safety System Maintenance

(A) Approve the purchase of materials required for seam sealant retrofit and field strength testing of the Engineered Material Arresting System (EMAS) for Runway 36F, by the sole source exemption, (B) Approve a contract with Runway Safe Incorporated for the purchase of materials required for EMAS retrofit and field strength testing for the term of one year.

Item No. 28: Airport Waste Hauling and Disposal Services

(A) Approve a contract with Waste Management of the Carolinas for airport waste hauling and disposal for an initial term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew

the contract for up to two additional, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 29; Set Public Hearing on the Edgewood Plantation Historic Landmark Designation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 28, 2021, to consider amending the existing Historic Landmark Designation for the property known as the “Edgewood Plantation” (Parcel Identification Numbers 027-611-04, 027-611-05, and 027-611-06).

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 517-518.

Item No. 30: Set Public Hearing on the Ervin Building Historic Landmark Designation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 28, 2021, to consider Historic Landmark Designation for the Property known as the “Ervin Building” (Parcel Identification Numbers 131-111-10 and 131-111-14).

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 519-520.

Item No. 31: Set Public Hearing on the Larkwood-Chadbourn Hosiery Mill Plant Historic Landmark Designation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 28, 2021, to consider Historic Landmark designation for the Property known as the “Larkwood-Chadbourn Hosiery Mill Plant” (Parcel Identification Number 083-067-07).

The resolution is recorded in full in resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 521-522.

Item No. 32: Set Public Hearing on the Victor Shaw House Historic Landmark Designation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 28, 2021, to consider amending the Historic Landmark designation for the Property known as the “Victor Shaw House” (Parcel Identification Number 095-055-44).

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 523-524.

Item No. 33: Set Public Hearing on the William H. Peeps House Historic Landmark Designation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 28, 2021, to consider Historic Landmark Designation for the Property known as the “William H. Peeps House” (Parcel Identification Number 121-082-08).

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 525-526.

Item No. 34: Set Public Hearing on River District Phase 1 area Voluntary Annexation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 28, 2021, on the River District Phase 1 Area voluntary Annexation Petition.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 527-530.

Item No. 35: Meeting Minutes

Approve the titles, motions, and votes reflected in the Clerk’s record as the minutes of March 1, 2021, Strategy Session, March 3, 2021, Budget Workshop, March 15, 2021 Zoning Meeting, March 22, 2021, Business Meeting, and April 5, 2021 Strategy Session.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 36: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Little Hope Creek Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #24

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,018 square feet (0.05 acres) Permanent Easement, plus 60 square feet (0.01 acres) of Temporary Construction Easement on Mockingbird Lane

from James Glidewell Bolton III and Catherine Bolton Hudspeth, heirs of Catherine Dunn Bolton for \$1,225 for Little Hope Creek Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #24.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 531.

Item No. 37: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Little Hope Creek Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #26

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,535 square feet (0.06 acres) Permanent Easement at 4514 Halstead Drive from Eric M. Sprouse for \$20,575 for Little Hope Creek Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #26.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 532.

Item No. 38: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Little Hope creek Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #35

Resolution of Condemnation of 18,121 square feet (0.42 acres) Fee Simple at 1230 East Woodlawn Road from James P Ngo and Yen N. Ngo for \$240,000 for Little Hope Creek Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #35.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 533.

Item No. 39: Property Transactions – Brown Grier Road Improvement Project, Parcel #10'

Resolution of Condemnation of 14,200 square feet (0.33 acres) in Fee Simple plus 1,224 square feet (0.028 acres) Storm Drainage Easement, and 8,076 square feet (0.185 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 13901 Brown Grier Road from Randy B. Schultz and Lu Ann Schultz for \$61,625 for Brown Grier Road Improvement Project, Parcel #10.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 534.

Item No. 40: Property Transactions – Brown Grier Road Improvement Project, Parcel #12

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,340 square feet (0.03 acres) in Fee Simple, plus 814 square feet (0.019 acres) Utility Easement plus 2,146 square feet (0.049 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 3855 Griers Ford Drive from Kinh S.Thai and Anh Tuan Thai for \$11,075 for Brown Grier Road Improvement Project, Parcel #12.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 535.

Item No. 41: Property Transactions – Brown Grier Road Improvement Project, Parcel #24

Acquisition of 4,733 square feet (0.109 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 3860 West Arrowood Road from Circle K. Stores, Inc. for \$33,152 for Brown Grier Road Improvement Project, Parcel #24.

Item No. 42: Property Transactions – JW Clay Boulevard, Parcel #21

Acquisition of 1,020 square feet (0.023 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, 1,566 square feet (0.036 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 9311 JW Clay Boulevard from Dagger Properties, LLC for \$25,225 for JW Clay Boulevard, Parcel #21.

Item No. 43: Property Transactions – Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel #3, 4, 5 and 6

Acquisition of 2,933 square feet (0.08 acres) in Fee Simple, 4,134 square feet (0.09 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1100, 1104, and 1108 North Caldwell Street and 1111 North Davidson Street from Thomas R. Hunter, Carroll E. Hunter, and Barbara Hunter for \$233,107 for Parkwood Avenue Streetscape, Parcel #3, 4, 5 and 6.

Item No. 44: Property Transactions – Pearl Park Way Public Infrastructure Project

Acquisition of 485 square feet (0.01 acres) in Fee Simple, plus 299 square feet (0.007 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 1,060 square feet (0.024 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 741 Kenilworth Avenue from 741 Kenilworth Avenue, LLC,

Mecklenburg County, and Darlene S. Jones for \$80,000 for Pearl Park Way Public Infrastructure Project.

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM NO. 8: PUBLIC HEARING ON CHARLOTTE WATER REVENUE MANUAL REVISIONS

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 joint public hearing with the Charlotte Water Advisory Committee regarding approval of proposed revisions to the Charlotte Water Revenue Manual.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 9: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Marcus Jones, City Manager said the only item I have is the 30-day memo and I believe it is at your desk. What we have is what you had before in terms of the budget straw votes this Wednesday, the Council Strategy Session on June 7th, which as we talked about tonight, there will be another discussion on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and then on the 14th, we have the Municipal Service Districts Annual Update which comes to the Council once a year. Pam talked a bit about the Housing Trust and the 4% selection coming back to you. We had a discussion last week about city-owned sites so we will give you a preview of where we are for the city-owned sites for affordable housing and then we have scheduled for the 21st the vote on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and then on 28th, I know I went a couple of days past 30, but there are two items that I said we would get before you before the July break and that is the Transformational Mobility Network Update as well as our first discussion with you about the American Rescue Plan and that will be an update. We do have, as I mentioned before, members from my Team, the County Manager's Team, and the Superintendent's Team working together to see how we can collaborate on those funds.

Councilmember Winston said Mr. Jones, I would like for you and Mr. Baker to get together; I was actually watching the County Commissioner's meeting last week and they had a discussion that might impact us regarding open meetings, virtual meetings, post the removal of the Governor's Emergency Order. The County Attorney believes that there is no legal protection for Board Member's vote to be counted if there is no emergency order in place. I know we have changed the rules to allow for us to remain virtual indefinitely, but since we have some pretty important votes coming up in June, I wouldn't want us to be caught flatfooted by the potential of virtual members not being counted. I think we really need to know going into June with anticipating there not being an emergency order statewide how we should be guided to handle upcoming votes.

Mayor Lyles said we have referred that to the Committee and Mr. Driggs do you know if you are all set to have a meeting on the policy of meetings and attendance at meetings and is Mr. Baker engaged in this conversation with the County Attorney?

Councilmember Driggs said I don't think we have a date there; we know it is near term, we need to do it soon.

Mayor Lyles said we need to do it before the first meeting in June. I think this is becoming more of an issue about the emergency order and what flexibility we have. Thanks for

bringing that up Mr. Winston, the deadline is really something that we need to be prepared for. Maybe you can have a virtual meeting first and then after that decide.

Mr. Driggs said I can put something together quickly.

Councilmember Bokhari said Mr. Manager, a question on your memo; do you think it could be a good idea for us, given we are talking about the Comp Plan so much and it's evolving for us to hear from the community any public hearing now that we've got this new thing before we vote on it, somewhere to schedule and how can we go about setting that wheels in motion?

Mr. Jones said I guess I would have to defer to the City Attorney about rules around public hearings after having a public hearing.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said Teri just if she needed to stay and I say no but let get some information and I will get right back to the group as quickly as I can.

Mr. Bokhari said my only point would be whether that rule [inaudible] I think we could argue there are substantial differences or lack thereof differences that have now been interpreted that hearing from the community I think, would be warranted.

* * * * *

PUBLIC FORUM

Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence Week Proclamation

Pamela Grundy, 1713 Tippah Avenue said I am speaking to history and I think it relates very effectively to what the Mayor said about the issue of trust and particularly issues of rhetoric and reality. I thought those were very thoughtful. Two weeks ago, a City Resolution proclaimed May 20th to 24th as Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence Week. Now it is clear to everyone that the declaration's most famous words, we do hereby declare ourselves a free and independent people were not meant to apply to the many people of African descent enslaved in Mecklenburg County on May 20, 1775, the day the declaration is said to have been signed. Let's fast forward to May 20, 1867, Charlotte's newly emancipated African Americans seized the spirit of the declaration choosing Meck Deck Day to officially form that first political organization and aligning the date as "connected to liberty and the political equality of man".

If Charlotte's white leaders had welcomed them with open arms, we could have had the most marvelous May 20th celebration this week, one that celebrated the 1775 event and the 1867 event and the steady expansion of freedom. But of course, as we all know that didn't happen. So, I'm going to fast forward again to 1963, almost 100 years after emancipation, after the end of the Civil War it still makes sense for activist Reginald Hawkins to choose May 20th for a civil rights march and to use the contradictions in the declaration's promise of liberty and the reality of oppression for African Americans to underscore his message of ongoing struggle, "there is no freedom as long as all of us are not free". Given the current often contentious efforts to address the full realities of this nation's history which have had a profound effect on the situation we face today if the City is to declare a Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence Week next year it should commemorate not simply the events of 1775, but also the long struggle waged by Mecklenburg County's African Americans along with many others to also become a "free and independent people". I urge everyone who is listening to the articles on the subject in the May 19th issue of the Queen City Nerve and I thank you very much for your time.

Mayor Lyles said we will certainly take that into consideration before our next year's request to look at Meck Neck Day.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 10: APPROVE AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 5, ARTICLE II – REGULATION OF NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

Mayor Lyles said we've had a presentation on this, and they have explained the conversations they've had with the community.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Egleston, and carried unanimously to approve amendments to City Code of Ordinances Chapter 5, article II – Regulations of Non-Residential Buildings and Structures.

* * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 11: APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR THE INSTALLATION OF SUSTAINABLE INFRASTRUCTURE COMPONENTS

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Newton, and carried unanimously to Adopt Budget Ordinance 74-X appropriating \$105,793.60 in solar panel system rebate and Smart Saver Incentive Program funds from Duke Energy to the General Capital Projects Fund.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 704.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 12: APPROPRIATE PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNER FUNDS FOR A STORM DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Egleston, and carried unanimously to adopt Budget Ordinance No. 75-X appropriating \$302,500 in private property owner funds for storm drainage improvements to the Storm Water Capital Project Fund.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 705.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: CHARLOTTE WATER PROPERTY EXCHANGE WITH CHARLOTTE MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution ratifying a land exchange agreement with the Charlotte Mecklenburg Board of Education, and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all necessary documents to complete the transactions in conformity herewith.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 506-507.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 14: INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR SANITARY SEWER AND GREENWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to adopt a resolution ratifying an interlocal agreement with Atrium Health and Mecklenburg County for sanitary sewer and greenway improvements.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 508-508.

ITEM NO. 15: INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR RELOCATION OF WATER AND SANITARY SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution ratifying an interlocal agreement with the Town of Cornelius for construction of water and sanitary sewer line relocations, adjustments, and improvements, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to approve the reimbursement request for the actual cost of the utility construction.

The resolution is recorded in full in resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 509-509.

ITEM NO. 16: APPROPRIATE PRATE DEVELOPER FUNGS

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 76-X appropriating \$73,135 in private developer funds for traffic signal installations and improvements to the General Capital Projects Fund, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 77-X appropriating \$18,500 in supplemental developer funds for traffic signal installations and improvements on projects currently under construction to the General Capital Projects Fund.

The ordinances are recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 706-707.

ITEM NO. 17: METROLINA REGIONAL TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution ratifying interlocal agreements to reimburse the City of Charlotte for the development and maintenance of the Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model for a term of five years with the follow local governments: City of Concord, City of Gastonia, City of Rock Hill, (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to negotiate and execute municipal agreements to reimburse the City of Charlotte for the development and maintenance of Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model for a term of five years with the following agencies: North Carolina Department of Transportation, South Carolina Department of Transportation, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the agreements consistent with the purpose for which the agreements were approved.

The resolutions are recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 510-511.

ITEM NO. 18: REFUNDING OUTSTANDING TRANSIT DEBT

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Newton, and carried unanimously to adopt a resolution authorizing and approving the execution of an installment financing contract in an amount not to exceed \$200,000,000 to refund outstanding 2008A Certificates of Participation and 2015D Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act financings.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51 at Page(s) 512-516.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Watlington, 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 the matter of Habershaw v. City of Charlotte.

The meeting was recessed at 7:28 p.m. and reconvened at 7:31 p.m.

* * * * *

CHARLOTTE FUTURE 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CONTINUED

Mayor Lyles said I want to make a couple of thoughts that I have; I think that as we are sitting here minds are changing and thoughts are not getting where we need to be. I guess the real question I would like for you to think about is if you really believe that there is a way to go about this that would perhaps get us to a place that is beyond what I see what we think we are doing. I really want to say I think on this 2040 Plan, it is either six-five or six five up or down, and right now if you believe that there ought to be some way to move that ball I thought that was what we're trying to do the last four to six weeks and I didn't see it happening. I had very few conversations that were around the idea of how to pull something together. It was kind of like this is what we are doing, and this is what we are doing. I guess the real question is that we ought to make a decision and I'm going to suggest that we actually have some small group meetings with each other and if you choose to attend you come because you are willing to figure out something that gets you and a person that is not in the same place that you are to a place that you come out with both of you agreeing on the same thing if that makes sense. I don't know if that is possible, but that is the only way I see us going from these meetings where we are just once again saying the same thing unless somebody is changing their mind. I don't know how we get as a Council because our business is public except to have these kinds of Council one on one or on three discussions. With that, I would like to have you think about where this is going no matter which side you are on.

Councilmember Egleston said I have an idea for how I think we can move forward in this, one of the people with some very clear objections I want to see what Ms. Watlington's thoughts are on this as well, but I think what Mr. Bokhari said earlier could be, and I don't mean those specific points, but I mean the strategy he has laid out as far as what does it take for someone who is a no vote to be a yes vote, I think is the conversation we are having because I do think that this Plan will be more widely accepted and embraced by the community if there are more than just six people voting on it. I think it would be a shame, and if it has to pass with six votes it has to pass with six votes. We've been having discussions where people have said changes they want to see, but at no point has been asked would change get you to a yes vote. I think, and again it is up to each Councilmember, but it people who are currently in a spot and there seems to be five probably that they don't think they can support the Plan, who are comfortable and willing to do what Mr. Bokhari did, and I would suggest that those meetings be individual meetings with each Councilmember, Manager and the Planning Director and layout specifics of if you made A, B and C changes as Mr. Bokhari put forward for his own

perspective, then I could be a yes vote. I think if you compile those things and look at them there would likely be some on that list that might turn some of the yes votes to no votes if the change was made so that obviously would have to be considered. But there would also probably be things that maybe the people who are currently in the yes column would think were reasonable compromises. To me if that process, if people who are not are willing to, and frankly I'm currently in everyone's six-five prediction being counted in the yes column. That doesn't mean that I don't think there are things in here that should be changed. I've made clear some of those last week.

So, I'm not saying that I don't think anything needs to be changed from this draft and I would imagine other people who are leaning towards yes would feel the same as well. To me having those very explicit items laid out by each individual Councilmember to the Manager and the Planning Director could be the path to say there is a way for us to get to seven or eight or nine votes. There is probably, to Mr. Graham's point, not a way to get to 11, but I do think it would have a lot more strength and weight to move this thing forward with a larger majority of Council than just the six-five and that to me would be the only path forward. If people are willing to say if you make these changes I will vote for it because to date they have said I would like to see these changes made, but they have not then indicated that change is the way they feel about the Plan.

Mayor Lyles said that is a great point, Mr. Egleston. It really is about is someone willing to change their vote, so I think that is where we stand.

Mr. Egleston said I guess just to put a bow on that if I can, there will undoubtedly be some members of Council that put forward things and say this is what it would take for me to be a yes and we can identify those. Some of those things potentially as just not realistic because it would lose too many votes in the other direction or there is just not the will on Council to do it. I think we can call a spade a spade on those things too and say that is not going to happen, so if that is required for you to be a yes then we just have to accept the fact that you are going to be a no.

Councilmember Eiselt said was going to have the same comments as Mr. Egleston, more or less; I have said all along I was hoping we could get to a place where Councilmembers would say what they do want instead of what they don't want. I think there are a couple of important things though that we have to point out is that when we talk about community, the community doesn't support this, we have to acknowledge that not everybody has the same constituent base so it is hard to think that we are going to come to an agreement with another Councilmember when they are representing that everybody feels one way and then somebody else is representing that everybody feels a different way. I'm on board to have discussions with my colleagues if we can all accept that we all have different constituents and that in fact, the one thing we should be able to agree on is there are a lot of different opinions in the community about this issue.

The second thing is that we've got to stop saying we are asking to keep single-family zoning only in designations, we don't have it now; R-3 allows duplexes so I don't care if they're a couple of corners and that is it, it allows duplexes. So, we would have to create a single-family housing designation to get what some folks say they want in order to pass the Plan, and if that is what you want to do then let's talk about that. But let's not say we have to retain what we have because that is what is making the community's hair on fire because they think we are taking something away from them that they currently have now. Absolutely, a lot of those neighborhoods do not use those corner lots for duplexes. Why not? I don't know. Are those lots more valuable than the lots next door? I don't think so. There doesn't seem to be a market value issue and I agree we should figure that outright, but let's also start from that standpoint of what we are really talking about is how do you take those predominately single-family zones and find a way to add more duplexes and triplexes. This should just be a market issue. We are never going to agree on the cultural differences that have some people feeling really strongly about where they are. That is something that we all have to work on ourselves, but we have to be talking about how to get more duplexes and triplexes into to currently predominately single-family zoning districts.

The last thing is again CBAs, completely agree, don't lock us into something that doesn't have any definition behind it. I would support the idea of CBAs, but again you can do that without locking us into that. Put it all small c, small b. Nobody has lost anything through that and as far as that 50% or more I apologize, I have to go back and look at that one because again, what does that mean? We don't even know what that means. It doesn't mean that we can't continue to have those discussions so absolutely I'm on board to talk to my colleagues, but if you are not willing to talk and I called some of you and you don't want to meet. You didn't want to get together. If you want to I am absolutely on board, but don't talk about things that have nothing to do with land use because I'm not down for that, otherwise I will approve this plan as it is, but I want to get more than six. I think that is good for everybody that we get more than six on board and so that is where I am.

Councilmember Watlington said I just want to say a couple of things based on what Ms. Eiselt just said. So much of what you are saying I agree with and I think that is the crux of this, how we maintain the flexibility piece like you just talked about Community Benefits Agreements. I'm an opponent of Community Benefits Agreements. I'm fine with putting in there we figure out what it looks like, but I also understand completely why people feel like there is too specific for here because that is how I feel about 2.1. I do want to understand more about, let me say it this way, we know that 2.1 was added into this Plan for a reason because it is distinctly different from what is existing, but to your point about how we talk about it, I think that demonstrates that there needs to be some more conversation around what we are actually trying to do.

I've said it before, I believe that the role of government is to correct market failures. If we don't understand where the failure in the market is, I think it is premature for us to try to prescribe a solution and I think in particular to 2.1, but broadly I like what the Mayor said in regard to we are not starting from scratch, we have a City that has been built and steeped in the redlining, steeped in how we have discrimination in these kinds of things, but because of that for me, it doesn't make a lot of sense to try to put a blanket policy in place when we know that it is going to disproportionately impact the very vulnerable neighborhoods we are trying to help.

That is no different in my mind than urban renewal. We know that infrastructure went into certain neighborhoods and spit them completely down the middle in cities all over this country. On the surface, it was State-sanctioned and it was for the greater good, but we are right now trying to put a plan in place that undoes that mitigates those very same things so I just ask that we are careful that we pay attention to the outcome and it doesn't mean for me that I don't want to do anything. I think we were supposed to meet this Thursday so I'm happy to talk but if we are going to have these conversations, let them move somewhere. All I am trying to say is that if we are going to be prescriptive, let's make sure we've got some analysis to back it up.

This is a \$2 million enterprise; I don't think anybody can go anywhere in a company or an organization that size and say we are going to do this, which draws the line in the sand without a business justification. So, I'm not against any of the particular components that maybe some of the colleagues are against, I am against making decisions without adequate analysis and I think there are some things that we all can get on board with and it doesn't have to be controversial. Let's go ahead and put those on the table, get them to vote on and get moving on them. The other stuff, let's do our due diligence because then I think it makes it clear, let the data tell the story. Like I said I'm happy to meet but I want to make sure that we are doing something that moves the needle.

I also want to say this I know that this has been a very difficult process, very challenging, I want to make very clear that I absolutely support the Assistant City Manager and Planning Director, I do believe that he came here to do the right work. I don't believe that you are operating without integrity. I think it is very difficult to have this conversation, I do think there are some opportunities, and we've talked about those, but I absolutely want folks to know and understand that I've got the utmost confidence in Mr. Jaiyeoba and the work that he does. That doesn't mean that we are going to agree on every issue, but in terms of the person and the staff that has been working on this, I haven't seen anybody show up to work and not do the right thing.

Councilmember Newton said just commenting on this particular conversation, I am more than willing to have conversations with everyone as well. I also wanted to mention that I feel like we can encourage and incentivize create more units including duplexes and triplexes in single-family development within the City much like Ms. Watlington was saying without a blanket approach and I think that is what we are looking at right now. We are looking at an all-or-nothing blanket approach and I just feel like giving some of the potential unforeseen consequences of frankly some of the foreseen consequences that just feels a little bit reckless to me.

I don't want us to lose sight, not as a compromise here, but just doing the right thing in addressing a couple of items within Goal #8 the economic development portion of the Plan, and yes, this is by in large a land-use Plan, but we have these other sections within it that I think are important as well, and I think economic development is very important. I don't think it will take very long because I think we kind of squared away one of these proposals so the aspects of benefits I think Mr. Jaiyeoba had really explained that one and so it is just two provisions may be for us to consider and I think we could probably do it in 10 or 15 minutes. So maybe on the tail end.

Mayor Lyles said let's come back to that.

Councilmember Ajmera said I agree with what Mr. Egleston said that we can try to get to more than six, but I wonder how realistic that is. These conversations have been going on for weeks, months; we have had seven hours plus meetings each time and we have to keep in mind that when we compromise how compromise could lead to losing support on the other side. We have to keep that in mind as well. We all know what we currently have is not working for many, many families that are being displaced every single day and we cannot accept the status quo. We have to change the way we operate as a City, so it is great to have more than six, but let's be honest with each other. It takes 51% for a referendum to approve so six to five is not necessarily a bad thing. We have approved measures in the past with six to five and that is just democracy, a simple majority, and unfortunately last couple of weeks or maybe even months where certain Councilmembers have made points that are more personal than policy based. There are personal attacks that have went on and I think that is just not acceptable. You cannot come to the table and try to negotiate when we take the focus away from policy and we try to address the other issues that Councilmembers have whether it is trust issues or other issues.

Councilmember Driggs said I think the difficulty of this situation is that we do actually agree on what we want to accomplish and there is a disagreement about whether all aspects of the Plan serve that purpose. I would be hard-pressed quite honestly to just come up with two or three things which if they were changed would cause me to feel a lot more comfortable about it or I'm worried that if I did come up with two or three things I know in advance that those are not going to be ones that we can come together around. So, we are in kind of a tough place that way. I would mention to Ms. Eiselt's point there is a difference between duplexes on corners and duplexes everywhere. So, I guess we are stuck in this place; I would love for us to come together. I raised the point about how nice it would be to have at least a bigger majority and I think that would be the case even if I ended being one of the ones in the minority.

The concern is whether or now we know enough to be confident that the Plan will serve its purpose and we can only gain that knowledge with reference to certain kinds of data or analysis. So, I look at it and I say to myself alright, let's just think about which items in the Plan could be allowed to move ahead because if they don't work they won't do any damage so let's set aside those concerns. I wish we would focus more on the notion of the CBAs and not have a situation where some people expect more from CBAs than they can legally deliver for example. We can leave them in as they are harmless, but if the references to CBAs create an impression that they will be more effective than they can legally be required to be then that is not being completely straight in my mind. Is that a reason for me to vote against the plan, I certainly wouldn't advocate that we need to rewrite the Plan, I don't think that is what it is about. I think there are some relatively minor changes in drafting that would address some of these issues, but I would just note, for example, when you were talking before about the changes that we had voted on, I moved

that we remove block lengths for industrial sites and consider other changes, that was approved 10 to 1 and the block lengths are still in this update. So, things like that undermine kind of the spirit of the corporation.

Anyway, I will happily participate in meetings, I think it is worthwhile for people in the majority to listen to and be thoughtful about what people in the minority are saying. We are not just troublemakers we are not here to block progress. I hope you recognize that some of the things we are saying deserve your consideration. They are serious concerns and they are not mean-spirited or obstructionist, it is just what is the best way to get where we want to go.

Councilmember Johnson said I just need to comment on a couple of things. Mr. Egleston said there has not been a Councilmember that said if this were changed, we would agree, or we would vote on it. I just speak for myself; I've been asked that question Mayor in one of our first small group meetings and I have been consistently against the removal of the 2.1 language that excludes or that allows single-family exclusivity. I don't think we are coming to the meetings and saying different things; for me and for many of us, we are saying the same thing over and over to the point of acknowledgment. I would say that 2.1 be leaving the language that allows some protection of single-family exclusivity. It is a compromise, none of us are saying that we don't need more density or we don't need more options but I think the option to leave some areas and protect some areas for the single-family zoning is the compromise instead of all or nothing.

I would also like to speak to the CBA; I have spoken with members of the BPC and I've said the same thing. The CBA I think it is over-promised the language that relates to CBAs, it feels like we are over-promising and underdelivering. None of us are opposed to the concept of the Community Benefits Agreement. As I stated I've seen developers who have donated \$100,000 to the Sugar Creek Areas a concession. The last week's approval the developer was contributing \$3 million right outside of District 4 as an improvement so I'm certainly one that believes in negotiating and developers contributing to improving the area. We are simply saying the language, if we know that it is not a formal CBA and CBA is a legally binding agreement or document why are we calling it that? I think that is where we can compromise in that area. If you listen to what it is that certain members are asking for, it is almost like a mother and a child, you know [inaudible] call a nag, but you are just really just saying the same thing over and over again. We are not changing our points, we are asking for what we feel that our voters in Districts 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 would have us to ask for or to represent.

Councilmember Bokhari said I really think that I will participate in these small group meetings, but I think that puts us back in the same place that we've been for months now, which is being managed by staff. We've been saying the same things to each other in these meetings, it is not like we have some miraculous moment of discovery today. Those of us who have been saying these things have been saying the same thing the whole time. They don't make it, even when we vote on them the words magically change so what I'm saying is we need to bypass them right now. They are why we are here in this position so if we as a group can sit here and I can say to you I will with those two minor changes and let me tweak them again, take away Capital Community Benefits Agreements and just go to lower case, community benefits, which CBAs maybe that answer coming up. Or it might be something else that is better that, we don't box ourselves in a corner and then we go over to single-family zoning and we say I would rather delete it, but to compromise say leave it in and bring it up that level which says aggressively pursue density with affordability and then if we need to put examples underneath that of abolishing single-family zoning and other things like that or all things that we will explore by all means let's put that. These hard codes in abolishing single-family across the community and anyone who then change their vote when we went from lots to place types you know we can walk away, whether you know now or not with the fact in your mind that this wording is the exact same thing. If we have to bring that up a level and use that as an example that is fine and that to me compromising on things, I think are terrible like capping height unless we do Benefit Agreements uptown. All of these other things, inclusionary zoning, impact fees, what I'm telling you is that I will take all of those things and we don't even have to discuss them because those things while they

hurt, they hurt developers, they hurt the affordability of the real density that we are going to go after in these next 20-years, but these two items right here, CBAs and single-family zoning hurts the demographics that can least afford to be hurt by them. So, that is why I'm sitting here and saying how many people would agree to just that right there?

Ms. Eiselt said I just have to say I don't agree and there were six people that said they don't agree with single-family only designation so that is off the table because six people voted against it.

Mr. Bokhari said but the staff is not giving you that as an option.

Ms. Eiselt said I'm not talking about the staff; I'm talking about us. I'm saying that issue is off the table, okay, but let me just say if you take that issue and say how can you take predominantly single-family zoning and get more density into it if you want to talk to the staff anyone who wants to and come back with an idea let's talk about that. I'm open to hearing about that, but I haven't heard that yet in all of these hours.

Mr. Driggs said I suggested that several times.

Ms. Eiselt said what is the Plan?

Mr. Driggs said there must be a way to establish criteria, I've said it several times, instead of having to from here to this point on a scale like this. All we have to do is define our terms, we have to say these would be the conditions under which some areas might still enjoy single-family zoning protection.

Mr. Bokhari said that is the whole premise of what I'm saying to you right now Ms. Eiselt, which is my whole point, which is we've been agreeing on these things, we get managed by the staff and we are not there. The fact of the matter is if you are saying six people or more were down with that, we just got handed back with a stamp of approval from the Planning Director and the City Manager the opposite of that. What I'm telling you is they divide and conquer us, and we are being managed, and the only way we are going to get past that is not to allow them to keep doing it.

So, you can say we were in agreement and that is a non-issue, the fact of the matter is what is before us to vote is not that so that is why I'm saying small groups, while I will participate, it is just another mechanism for them to divide and conquer us, which is a bad tactic for City management.

Mayor Lyles said I want to say that I've heard a lot of discussions and I haven't heard anyone say that they are not willing to have a conversation. I have heard some people say they are not really ready to change their minds. I have heard that.

Mr. Bokhari said staff yes.

Mayor Lyles said I'm sorry. Mr. Bokhari, really why do you have to insert your commentary in my remarks? I've even asked you about that. I'm sorry, but it's just not right to interrupt all of the time. That is my perspective that I have heard some people say that I want to have a meeting and talk, but I have not heard everyone say that. If we are going to go with the idea that it has to be someone that is voting at this point, no to go to yes then I don't know that can happen, but I think we ought to try. I don't care if the Manager is in the meeting or the Planning Director is in the meeting because everyone in here has the ability to figure out where people are and to get together.

You can do it wherever you need to do it or whatever, but at some point, we are the people that were elected, and you have to figure out who is going to do that. I'm going to go along and I'm going to have to say Ms. Eiselt has made a point and you said well we should say that we are not abolishing single-family and one of the examples would be to say here is what we would allow or what we wouldn't allow. I think we have to figure that out because that is really the number one issue here and if there is a place that has an example of doing that, no matter where it is, or something that you think what is – I think

I have heard what is the criteria? I think if you have the criteria that you would allow and there is a way to write it into this then we do it, but it is really at this point that we own this. So, if we are going to own it and if there are people that are willing to change or compromise and there are others that are not and that is okay, that is just where it is.

I'm going to suggest this, our next meeting is on the 7th of June and at that point, we are going to have something that is written up. Mr. Newton has asked for 10-minutes to get 8.14.

Mr. Newton said it is 8.14 and then a separate item to be included at the tail end which would then become 8.33. Just to put this as simplistically as possible if you scroll to the fifth page where you actually see 8.14 and then on page 6, you actually see 8.32, that would then change to 8.33 because we have a new 8.32 in the updated Plan. You can see on 8.14 there is highlighted language and then on 8.32 which becomes 8.33 that is an all-new language. Essentially what we are talking about here in 8.14 the language of the Plan says explore policies and programs such as Community Benefits Agreements but I'm just asking that we also explore policies and programs or have something here that talks about workforce development as well and then on the back end of this what would become 8.33, it is just ensuring that we promote partnerships with apprenticeship programs, particularly in the building trades industry. That is it simplistically, those are the two items.

Mr. Driggs said I agree with the two items, I'm not sure they belong in this Plan. I think the fact that you want to see them in this Plan is a reflection of a kind of mission creek that occurs in other places in the Plan like the idea that we are going to deal with obesity. So, I imagine that is why you thought that but I think we should have a clearly defined agenda for topics like that and we do, we should just continue along that path. I don't know that the Plan is the place to try to realize those things and their concerns expressed in these e-mails about them and rather than try to resolve all those issues on the back of this Plan I think we should pursue them separately.

Ms. Eiselt said I would agree with that as well, I think they are very worthy endeavors to really talk about. I think it belongs in our Workforce and Economic Development Committee to fully flush out. I just don't think it belongs in a Land-use Plan. This is for me where I would say that I will stick to what I agreed on if we start getting too far away from that.

Councilmember Phipps said I was wondering; I have no objections to what this language says but is this still something that is embedded in our practices in our economic development area? Is this something that we practice when we recruit, is this a common thing that we undertake anyway?

Mayor Lyles said I think the Workforce Development Plan is being drafted now. I think that this would be a good fit for consideration and actually going through all of these I think would be making sure that we have a connection between the Plan and what we are saying so I would say that it could go in the Workforce Development Plan that is being developed now.

Mr. Phipps said but it is under development, it is not now.

Mayor Lyles said it has not been approved by Council as of yet. Mr. Bokhari, do you know when to expect that to come back?

Mr. Bokhari said it is not going to be within the next couple of months.

Mayor Lyles said in a couple of months the Workforce Development Strategic Plan will come back.

Councilmember Ajmera said I have a question for Mr. Newton, are you doing negotiations right now? I'm trying to understand –

Mr. Newton said no, this is because it is the right thing to do. That is what I mentioned earlier, it is not a compromise, it is not for anyone to take sides, it is because this is a language that isn't clearly defined here, and to be clear there is a lot of specificity in this Plan. At the same time you can just look; I could pull up a provision on practically every single page pertaining to our goals and so all I'm saying here and certainly, this is overall a land-use Plan, but we have a second devoted to Economic Development and there are many items within this section that aren't land use items.

So, having said that I don't see this out of balance. If anything, what I see this doing is further defining what our priorities as a Council are for the next 20-years. We talk a lot about workforce development, about folks particularly right now, we are still in the pandemic, we are seeing a lot of people have to move laterally. They have to get new skills; they have to go through new training and that is something we talk about being a priority of ours. That is why I feel like now is a good time to make sure we live up to those commitments we've made, put it inside this plan. Economic Development apprenticeship programs, I don't think that is such a wild thing to do, but that is just me and hopefully, it answers your question.

Ms. Ajmera said Madam Mayor if we could just see if there are six Councilmembers that support this, or even five and if there is then we move forward, if not there is no point in discussing this. Do we need to make a motion? I'm trying to understand, I know we are having this discussion, but it cannot move forward if it doesn't have majority support.

Mayor Lyles said because you've got the e-mail chain; on Page 3 there is an 8.14 is that what you are suggesting proposed Matt?

Mr. Newton said 8.14 to include an emphasis on workforce development and then as you will see the language here is says 8.32, but now we have a new 8.32.

Mayor Lyles on the 8.14 tell me which language there is proposed, which the City Attorney's office said there are probably are some limitations.

Mr. Newton said that is not included so the language pertaining to workforce agreements, that is not what I'm talking about. I'm just specifically talking about workforce development.

Mayor Lyles said tell me is it on this page?

Mr. Newton said yes, it is highlighted right here towards the bottom.

Mayor Lyles said 8.14 is explored policies and programs such as community benefit and workforce agreements to support the development. Is that it?

Mr. Newton said yes, but not the workforce part, just explore policies and programs such as Community Benefits Agreements, and then it goes on to say to support the development of new retention of community assets amenities and for the purposes of workforce development.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said Mr. Newton is there a language on the handout that is the specific language that you are asking for, or is it something that needs to be augmented? I think that is part of the confusion.

Mr. Newton said the way I would look at this is I think you could simply include workforce development within 8.14. This is kind of the trouble here is the fact that we have a new 8.14 and so we couldn't just simply adopt the language that I proposed two weeks ago because now we have a new language within the Plan so what I'm saying is included within the new language to include workforce development programs.

Mayor Lyles said I'm going to ask Taiwo, was the new language an attempt to capture what Mr. Newton is saying?

Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Assistant City Manager/Planning Director said no [inaudible] but I believe there was another e-mail where Ms. Hagler-Gray said we can have that language just strike out the workforce and keep workforce development. I think it should be at the very top of an e-mail.

Mayor Lyles said but it also includes Community Benefits Agreements.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes, but the current language right now has CBA there but what Mr. Newton is saying is to include workforce development in that language and we are okay if we dig it out.

Mayor Lyles said to support the development of new and retention of community assets amenities and for workforce development. What does that mean, workforce development, gives me the definition of workforce development.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said it is really more of training in the pipeline and getting them ready for the workforce. I believe that these actually and I have spoken to Ed about this, but I think maybe they also play a role in the jobs plan that may be developed in the future.

Mayor Lyles said it is always tough when we don't know the exact language, we can't look at the language right now.

Mr. Egleston said I was just going to propose to Mr. Newton that if we are all expressing a willingness to have conversations either with staff or each other about what changes could move no votes to yes votes might we include this conversation in that because I for one, I am looking at this e-mail and there is a lot going on here so I think having a better understanding of what we are talking about than I'm able to discern from this e-mail would be helpful for me individually. Also, if we are talking about things that help move the needle for certain Councilmembers and again Mr. Bokhari has made reference to modifying the language around Community Benefits in a way that still preserves the objective of them, and that language is included here too. Might this be something that we table for those discussions instead of trying to vote up or down tonight?

Mr. Newton said I'm not asking that this be used as a bargaining chip; I'm asking that we consider this because it is the right thing to do and I think in that context forward.

Ms. Johnson said I was just going to ask if someone could pull up a slide or the e-mail so the public could see the language that we are discussing and two if there are modified changes then it could be typed out and we could take a look at what is being discussed? There is a lot of information and it would really help for a more visual aid for the public and also for Councilmembers. That would be to type exactly what he is saying or pull up the e-mail because I'm sure our public is lost by now.

Mayor Lyles said I think that is a great point, but we don't have it typed. It was a handout of an e-mail that was sent. I think all we have is a handout and you have an electronic copy.

Ms. Johnson, there has been 10-minutes of discussion and the public can't follow us.

Mayor Lyles said I understand, but we were not prepared tonight to know that it was going to be up.

Ms. Johnson said [inaudible] last week if someone would pull up a PowerPoint slide of what was being proposed.

Denada Jackson, Constituent Services Division Manager said the person that was in the room last week to do that is not here so it is going to take a few minutes for me to figure that out because I have to figure out who is going to share their screen because I'm running two or three screens right now and if I share mine it is going to be all over the place.

Mayor Lyles said I agree with you Ms. Johnson, it is tough to have these conversations in the absence of the material in front of you, and I just think we need to make sure that if we are going to do that we need to bring it a little, but I think this is also where we left, the staff left it out, so we take responsibility for that.

Mr. Newton said I have been asking for two weeks for us to have this and I was actually a bit shocked that it wasn't here for us tonight. Having said that I don't know how much more simplistic it could be; 8.14 is to include workforce development so when we talk about exploring policies and programs such as Community Benefits Agreements we do that in a way that we include or create a focus on workforce development policies and programs and the City Manager and I just talked about that two seconds ago so I think he might have an idea of how to put that together, the language for that. The other one is just to work with apprenticeship partners so we can promote an apprenticeship program thought out our City.

Mayor Lyles said let's do one at a time. Why don't we do 8.14? Mr. Jones do you have that?

Mr. Jones said I'm going to ask Mr. Newton to help me so 8.14 in this version that we have in front of us currently says explore policies and programs such as Community Benefits Agreements, support the development of new and retention of community assets, and amenities. What Mr. Newton would like to add now is after amenities as well as promote, Mr. Newton, I need your words.

Mr. Newton said promote workforce development policies and programs, or workforce development because that might be redundant to say policies and programs.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Newton are you making a request that we take a straw vote on this?

Mr. Newton said yes ma'am.

Mayor Lyles said everybody has heard the conversation now I will go through the role call for this.

Mr. Bokhari said this is a point from the ED (Economic Development) perspective, I also don't think it belongs here, but I also don't think a lot of the things that are in the Plan belong in there, so whether it is directing 50% of CIP dollars which is another department which hasn't been able to weigh in or this and the countless other ED related things that are in here so I have a hard time taking a principle stand voting against Mr. Newton's request when literally the document is filled with stuff that doesn't belong in it. So, with that perspective, I will [inaudible]

Mayor Lyles said I think Mr. Bokhari has made his point that he is going to look at this from the perspective of the entire document.

Ms. Johnson said Mr. Newton proposed a new language for 8.32 or something.

Mayor Lyles said we are dealing with just 8.14 right now.

The vote was recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.

NAYS: Councilmember Driggs, Eiselt, and Graham.

Mayor Lyles said that is five votes so it will be put in the revision and it will be word [inaudible] to make grammar work correctly.

Mr. Newton said 8.33, which I don't think we will have as many problems with or as much trouble with, but basically, it says just promote partnerships between existing department

labor registered apprenticeship programs city departments, and contractors in the building trades industry for workforce development purposes. That is the language, it is not as though anything – it is just something new included so no amendments or changes of anything that is already in the Plan.

Mr. Driggs said this is a new 8.33.

Mr. Newton said yes sir, so 8.32 would stay, the new 8.32. This is a new one that would be added to what is already in.

Mayor Lyles said why did you say [inaudible] department? Why not [inaudible] opportunities all across the board?

Mr. Newton said from the standpoint of certified programs there are safety standards and that is something that the Council wants to take out. Certainly, the emphasis is on apprenticeship programs but in my estimation, I was thinking there are heighten industry and safety standards associated with that.

Ms. Eiselt said what does this have to do with land use?

Mr. Phipps said I'm wondering is this not in there now already or is this something we are trying to emphasize even though we are doing it already?

Mayor Lyles said we do have all of the apprenticeship programs inside our organization and we do encourage it. I've gone to several of our businesses, particularly out in our business parks, there are a number of German companies that do this all the time. I think it is an emphasis thing, I don't think it has anything to do with the Plan necessarily, it is just something; I'm going to say Mr. Newton this is one that I think definitely belongs in the Workforce Development Plan because that is what we ought to be encouraging us to go out and recruit new businesses to do this to be able to participate this way. I don't know why we would add another item.

Mr. Newton said you could pick and choose what we already do within the Plan. You could look at this and say there are a lot of plans that we implement today that are scattered throughout [inaudible]

Mayor Lyles said I think it could get lost scattered throughout and in the Workforce Development Plan it is a specific effort for the economic development team to put in recruitment and opportunity. To me, it is watering it down instead of emphasizing it when it is 8.33, but that is just an opinion.

Mr. Newton said why don't we take the others out.

Ms. Johnson said I'm looking at the revised Plan, Page 127 and there are several goals in here, several objectives that speak to workforce development that aren't applicable or specific to land use. It says maintain or increase the number of middle-skill jobs and another one that says increase job training opportunities that allow residents to obtain hard and soft skills needed to qualify for jobs within the City's target industries. There is a page of ED language so I don't know why Councilmember Newton's request would be considered inappropriate or out of place in this Plan.

Mayor Lyles said I don't think that anyone has said that. All I said was I thought it would have more emphasis in our Workforce Development Plan. We are just starting the straw vote, so Ms. Johnson where are you, yes or no?

The vote was recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Egleston, Johnson, Newton, Phipps, Watlington, and Winston.

NAYS: Councilmember Driggs, Eiselt, and Graham.

Mayor Lyles said what I heard from everyone is that you have the opportunity to think about it in the way that Mr. Egleston framed it. If you are willing to actually come up and have a method that would change your vote then go for it and whether you want to meet with the Manager or the Planning Director, it is Memorial Day weekend, I think they would appreciate it if you did it by Friday or at least give them until next Tuesday. We will be back on this one on June 7th. So, take a break over the holiday weekend, think about it, and try to figure out if you can meet on it before or after the holiday weekend.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.



Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk, MMC, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 3 hours, 27 Minutes
Minutes Completed: July 27, 2021