

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Business Meeting on Monday, April 27, 2020 at 5:04 p.m. in Room CH-14 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, James Mitchell, Matt Newton, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston II.

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said tonight's meeting is being held as a virtual meeting in accordance with the Electronic Meeting Statute. The requirements of notice, access, and minutes are being met through electronic means. The public and the media are invited to view this meeting on the Government Channel, the City's Facebook page, or the City's YouTube page.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

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

* * * * *

PUBLIC FORUM

Crime Rates

Everleen Richardson, 103 Green Needles Court said the reason why I am calling is because we have a huge problem because of this unprecedented and this pandemic. I live in public housing, right now, I live in a very small public housing complex off of Nations Ford Road which is called Cedar Knoll. For the last few months there have been criminals coming into our community because they know there is no-one here and Charlotte Housing Authority (CHA) has cut back staffing with their resident safety investigators and we used to have a real good working relationship with Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department (CMPD), and right now, what I want to do is I want to thank CMPD for coming to help us during this time because right now we don't have security and we don't have staffing on-site. We have people who used to be here years ago coming back and like I said this is very small so, all of the larger Housing Authority projects, I am really concerned about. I really want to thank right now Officer Peace and Sergeant Campbell because a few of our neighbors have been calling to our Precinct and asking to speak to Sergeant so we could find out what is going to happen between CHA and CMPD as far as protecting us during this pandemic and even before that. Even last year we have had people arrested on this property for resisting a Peace Officer, having a concealed weapon in their car, and having several marijuana charges. I know last year we had a whole bunch of murders here in this City, and a lot of it was our young people. I am out here now speaking; I've spoken before the HA Board of Commissioners, I refuse to call it Inlivan. I have spoken before the HA Board of Commissioners twice, I've had a conference call with Mr. Meacham and someone from Legal. What their priority is right now is evicting the head of the household. Well, right now we know we can evict the head of household, but we have criminals running around in our community selling drugs, shooting guns, and every day in the summer it is going to get worse. But as I said I want to thank CMPD, but I also need somebody within CMPD to go to Charlotte Housing Authority and say what happened to the relationship we used to have when we had an unauthorized banned guest who has been arrested on the property.

Mayor Lyles said we certainly get your passion and the information you provided. We will have a follow-up and you will get a call from the staff.

COVID-19

Stuart Collins, 1825 Windham Place said recently I have been engaging with all of your offices on the health concerns in connection with 5G cell phone technology and I am aware of the complications and the conflict that exist with FCC (Federal Communications Commission) on the matter. I am going to continue to engage with all of you by sharing information with you that I want you all to review and to consider heavily because the FCC really has no authority to tell you or the people of the City of Charlotte or Mecklenburg County that you can't do anything about them putting in questionable technology within public areas. This technology has been clearly shown to pose a significant health risk, not just to humans, but also to animal and plant life. In the countries and localities where it has been fully implemented there are very obvious signs of that happening to where the healthy trees are dying over the course of a couple of weeks from the towers being put in beside them. All the scientific evidence has talked about the fact that it disrupts the natural functions of human and animal and plant life. There is another consideration here that you all need to take under your wings and that is privacy considerations. The 5G technology, its ultimate telecommunication purpose and the reason why it is being put in is because it provides greater interconnectivity for the internet of things and as all of you are aware there are masses of privacy violations across this country by lots and lots of tech companies and this will only increase that and make it more prevalent because of the special sort of imaging capabilities that comes with this technology. Think of it sort of like solar or radar. It allows for the signals to be pinged all across the areas where it is located, and it is going to be a more evasive violation of our privacy. The third thing I want you to consider is the fact that this is an isolation device, meaning the fact that the waves that it operates upon are not fixed. They can be turned up or turned down and we are giving this power to private corporations and it should be questioned whether or not private corporations should have such a power.

Affordable Housing

Nash Patel, 3420 Queen City Drive I first would like to take this opportunity to thank the City of Charlotte Councilmembers during these difficult times. Also, I would like to thank you for giving me a chance to speak on behalf of some of the Hotel Owners in Charlotte, North Carolina.

I am the owner of 7 different hotels in the Charlotte area. I own hotels, motels, and extended stays. I have been designated to speak on behalf of our concerned community members and hotel owners. I am here representing myself along with my colleague in the same industry who own and manage their own hotel, motels, and extended stay lodges in and around the Charlotte area.

I understand that these are difficult times, all businesses are doing their part to help during this pandemic. The Hotels, Motels, and Extended Lodges are doing their parts to house those in need and those most vulnerable in our society to take care of them. We are in the hospitality business, so we want to take care of them. We typically house individuals who have been evicted, individuals who are escaping domestic violence, and most importantly, we are currently housing a lot of people that have nowhere to call home, which is just the homeless population in general.

I am here today to bring you an issue of affordable housing needs in the motels and extended stay industry located right here in Charlotte. I have already spoken to some of you privately and you already know about the North Carolina State Attorney General's letter, stating that hotels, motels, and extended stays could not remove guests from their premises due to the eviction laws. This has created a major issue for us in the sense that a lot of our guests have just simply stopped paying because one, they don't have the financial means and two, they are unemployed or whatever other various reasons there maybe that may be associated with their financial situation.

So, I am here today to ask the Councilmembers to consider additional funding or increasing the capacity or create the capacity to assist those businesses that are

affected by COVID-19. Businesses such as hotels, motels, and extended stays. My colleague and I have incurred massive losses. Since the April 3rd letter it is escalating even further. As you can imagine the travel industry has just been hammered by COVID-19 so we are facing an imminent closing of our hotels and extended stay lodges because of that letter from April 3rd. Our customers and our guests have figured out that we can't evict them.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Patel; your three minutes are up but if you will send in your remarks to the City Clerk, we will get them distributed to the City Councilmembers. That would be helpful for us to hone-in on this issue that you want to address.

The following comments were submitted to the City Clerk by Mr. Patel:

We are facing liquidity issues, we are not asking for a bailout, but asking for financial assistance to those in need which in turn providing liquidity to operate our businesses to thwart further unemployment. We are a hospitality industry and are happy to shelter those in need, but we also have financial obligations to our creditors, vendors, and suppliers.

Thank you for your time and consideration! If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to me at nash.patel@gmail.com or call me at 252-258-2079

* * * * *

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

There were no consent agenda item questions.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: AGENDA OVERVIEW

There was no agenda overview.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: CLOSED SESSION (AS NECESSARY)

There was no closed session.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as printed, with the exception of Item No. 39 which was pulled for a separate vote, Item No. 61 which was settled, and Item No. 62 which was deferred by staff.
--

The following items were approved:

Item No. 19: Resolution of Intent to Abandon an Unopened Portion of an Alleyway between Bertonley Avenue and Millbrook Road

(A) Adopt a Resolution of Intent to abandon an unopened portion of the alleyway between Bertonley Avenue and Millbrook Road, and (B) Set a Public Hearing for May 26, 2020.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 528.

Item No. 20: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center Upper Roof Re-Cover Project

Approve a contract in the amount of \$690,305 to the lowest responsive bidder Tecta America Carolinas, LLC for the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center Upper Roof Re-Cover Project.

Summary of Bids

Tecta American Carolinas, LLC	\$ 690,305.00
Interstate Roofing Company, Inc.	\$ 835,000.00
Rike Roofing Services, Inc.	\$1,220,000.00

Item No. 21: Citywide Janitorial Supplies

(A) Approve a unit price contract to the lowest responsive bidder MSC Industrial Supply Co. for the purchase of janitorial supplies for 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.

Summary of Bids

Alegna	\$1,169,916.24
All American Poly	\$69.00
Brame	\$51,335.47
Excel Wipers, Inc	\$1,631.60
W.W. Grainger Inc	\$ 35,718.22
Home Depot	\$ 69,043.85
Interboro Packaging Corp	\$7,165.56
MSC Industrial Supply Co.	\$69,729.82
Pyramid School Products	\$18,018.94
Sanders' Enterprise Inc	\$5,265.00
Staples	\$67,008.28
Wesco	\$85,123.75
WizArk Medical LLC	\$128,031.65

Item No. 22: Commercial Flooring

(A) Approve the purchase of commercial flooring and related services from cooperative contracts, (B) Approve unit price contracts with the following vendors for the purchase of commercial flooring: Interface Americas, Inc. for a term of three years under Sourcewell Contract Number 080819-IFA dated October 11, 2019, Shaw Industries, Inc. for a term of three years under Sourcewell Contract number 080819-SII dated October 11, 2019, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to extend the contracts for additional terms as long as the cooperative contracts are in effect, at prices and terms that are the same or more favorable than those offered under the cooperative contracts.

Item No. 23: Construct Peachtree Hills Sidewalk Project

Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,045,000 to the lowest responsive bidder M & V Builders, LLC for the Peachtree Hills Sidewalk Project.

Summary of Bids

M & V Builders	\$1,045,000.00
Nassiiri Development	\$1,129,397.50
United Construction Company	\$1,188,836.00
Armen Construction	\$1,196,562.40
D.E. Walker Construction Company	\$1,229,739.20
DOT Construction	\$1,377,506.02
Sealand Contractors Corp.	\$1,526,263.20
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$1,678,741.90
Hoopaugh Grading Company, LLC	\$1,695,202.32
Zoladz Construction Co., Inc.	\$2,310,000.00

Item No.24: Markings for Vehicles and Equipment

(A) Approve a unit price contract with industrial Sign & Graphics, Inc. for vehicle and equipment graphics 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. 25: Public Auction for Disposal of Surplus Equipment

(A) Adopt a resolution declaring specific vehicles, equipment, and other miscellaneous items as surplus, (B) Authorize said items for sale by public auction on May 9, 2020, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to approve certain administrative and storage fees as may be required from time to time for auction events.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 529-535.

Item No. 26: Utility Relocation Agreement for I-85 North Bridge

Authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement with Duke Energy in an amount of up to \$2,500,000 for the relocation of transmission facilities for the I-85 North Bridge.

Item No. 27: Construct Storm Water Repairs and Improvements

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$3,893,512 to the lowest responsive bidder OnSite Development, LLC for the Storm Water Repairs and Improvements Fiscal Year 2020-F project, and (B) Approve a contract in the amount of \$3,786,775.58 to the lowest responsive bidder United of Carolinas, Inc., for the Storm Water Repairs and Improvements Fiscal Year 2020-G project.

Summary of Bids-FY2020-F

OnSite Development, LLC	\$3,893,466.00
United of Carolinas	\$3,985,772.39
Blythe Development Company	\$4,744,537.25
Sealand Contractors Corp	\$4,959,491.08
Zoladz Construction Co., Inc.	\$5,155,000.00

Summary of Bids- FY2020-G

United of Carolinas	\$3,789,775.58
OnSite Development, LLC	\$4,285,867.69
Blythe Development Company	\$4,796,862.25
Zoladz Construction Co., Inc.	\$4,936,000.00
Sealand Contractors, Corp.	\$4,959,491.08

Item No. 28: Construct Whispering Pines Drive Storm Drainage Improvement Project

Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,394,558 to the lowest responsive bidder United Construction Company, Inc. for the 445 Whispering Pines Drive Storm Drainage Improvement Project.

Summary of Bids

United Construction Company, Inc.	\$1,394,558.00
Zoladz Construction Co., Inc.	\$1,461,790.00
Sealand Contractors Corp.	\$1,506,940.60
Nassiri Development	\$1,617,488.40
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$1,626,737.20
Showalter Construction Co., Inc.	\$1,636,767.77
Blythe Development Company	\$1,718,310.00

Item No. 29: Professional Engineering Services for Storm Drainage Improvement Project

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$875,000 with D&A Wolverine, PLLC for planning services for the Hidden Valley Storm Drainage Improvement Project, (B) Approve a contract in the amount of \$960,000 with the Isaacs Group, PC for the design services for the Chatham Storm Drainage Improvement Project. (C) Authorize the City

Manager to negotiate and execute a contract in an amount up to \$500,000 with STV Engineers, Inc. for planning services for the Perth/Milton Storm Drainage Improvement Project, and (D) Authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute a contract in an amount up to \$625,000 with Armstrong Glen, PC for design services for the Farmer Storm Drainage Improvement Project.

Item No. 30: Airport Area Water Line Design

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,028,409.90 with Garney Companies, Inc. for Design-Build design services for the Airport Area Water Line project, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to acquire all easements and real property interests, including by condemnation, when necessary, for construction of the project.

Item No. 31: Charlotte Water Modular Units

Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,218,768 to the lowest responsive bidder Swartz Building Solutions, Inc. for Charlotte Water modular units.

Summary of Bids

Swartz Building Solutions, Inc.	\$1,218,768.00
Danforth Construction Group, LLC	\$1,272,920.00

Item No. 32: Idlewild Road Water Supply Design

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,470,755 with R. H. Price, Inc. for Design-Build design services for the Idlewild Road Water Supply project, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to acquire all easements and real property interests, including by condemnation, when necessary, for construction of the project.

Item No. 33: McMullen Creek Tributary Coltsgate Road Sanitary Sewer Replacement Construction

Approve a guaranteed maximum price of \$4,726,230 to Park Construction of North Carolina for Design-Build construction services for the McMullen Creek Tributary to Coltsgate Road Sanitary Sewer Replacement project.

Item No. 34: North-South Transmission Main Design

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$9,439,056.14 with the Joint Venture of BRS/Sanders Utility Construction for Design-Build design services for the North-South Transmission Main project, and (B) Authorize the City manager to acquire all easements and real property interests, including by condemnation, when necessary, for construction of the project.

Item No. 35: Replacement Submersible Mixers

(A) Approve the purchase of replacement submersible Mixers and system parts, by the sole source exemption, (B) Approve a contract with Landia, Inc. for the purchase of replacement submersible mixers and system parts for the term of five years, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract as approved.

Item No. 36: South Boulevard Water Main Construction

Approve a guaranteed maximum price of \$18,162,932.20 to R. H. Price, Inc. for Design-Build construction services for the South Boulevard Water Main project.

Item No. 37: Stowe Regional Water Resource Recovery Facility Preliminary Design

Approve a contract in the amount of \$6,911,323 with Joint Venture of Crowder Construction Company/Garney Companies, Inc. for Design-Build preliminary design services for the Stowe Regional Water Resource Recovery Facility project.

Item No. 38: Surveying Services

(A) Approve unit price contracts with the following companies for surveying services for a term of four years: CES Group Engineers, LLC; Lawrence Associates, PC, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 40: Airport Electric Bus Recharging Infrastructure and Bus Lot Reclamation

Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,201,540 to the lowest responsive bidder Showalter Construction Company, Inc. for Electric Bus Recharging Infrastructure and Bus Lot Reclamation project.

Summary of Bids

Showalter Construction Company, Inc. (only bid received) \$2,201,540.00

Item No. 41: Airport Parking Management Services Contract Extension

Authorize the City Manager to approve an 18-month contract extension in the amount of \$5,747,544 with SP Plus Corporation for parking management services.

Item No. 42: Piedmont Advantage Credit Union Lease

Approve a five-year lease agreement with Piedmont Advantage Credit Union for a credit union branch at Charlotte Douglas International Airport.

Item No. 43: Refund or Property Taxes

Adopt a resolution authorizing the refund of property taxes assessed through clerical or assessment error in the amount of \$2,720.15.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 536-537.

Item No. 44: Meeting Minutes

Approve the titles, motions, and votes reflected in the Clerk's record as the minutes of January 12-15, 2020 Annual Strategy Meeting; January 21, 2020 Zoning Meeting; January 27, 2020, Business Meeting; February 3, 2020 Strategy Session; February 5, 2020, Budget Workshop, and February 10, 2020, Business Meeting.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 45: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #3

Resolution of Condemnation of 4,428.9 square feet (0.101 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement at 2402 Cumberland Avenue from Phillip H. Cook for \$31,500 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #3.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 538.

Item No. 46: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #6

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,123.1 square feet (0.048 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement and 1,990.6 square feet (0.045 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1590 Clayton Drive from Lee B. Johnson and Stefanie S. Johnson for \$46,000 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #6.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 539.

Item No. 47: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #7

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,104 square feet (0.05 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement and 2,040 square feet (0.05 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1586 Clayton Drive from Katrina Schott McLin and John Lee McLin for \$42,550 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #7.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 540.

Item No. 48: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer improvements, Parcel #8

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,117.5 square feet (0.048 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement and 2,029.8 square feet (0.046 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1578 Clayton Drive from Robert E. Cassell, III and Erin K. Cassell for \$42,075 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #8.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 541.

Item No. 49: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #9

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,098 square feet (0.05 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement and 1,996 square feet (0.05 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1574 Clayton Drive from Jeff Meier and Laura J. Meier for \$42,875 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #9.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 542.

Item No. 50: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #10

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,099 square feet (0.05 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, 2,158 square feet (0.05 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1568 Clayton Drive from Robert S. Blair, Jr. and Susanne W. Blair for \$35,275 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #10.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 543.

Item No. 51: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer improvements, Parcel #11

Resolution of Condemnation of 3,162.4 square feet (0.072 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easements and 2,207.2 square feet (0.05 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1562 Clayton Drive from Steven W. Larson and Mary Lynn Larson for \$44,675 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #11.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 544.

Item No. 52: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #12

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,599 square feet (0.06 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement and 2,028 square feet (0.05 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1554 Clayton Drive from Geneva P. Griffin for \$37,950 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer improvements, Parcel #12.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 545.

Item No. 53: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer improvements, Parcel #13

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,958.9 square feet (0.067 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement and 3,346.3 square feet (0.076 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1550 Clayton Drive from Mark R. Busch and Valerie Y. Bush for \$39,375 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer improvements, Parcel #13.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 546.

Item No. 54: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer improvements, Parcel #15

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,931 square feet (0.067 acres) of Sanitary Sewer Easement and 4,818 square feet (0.11 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1538 Clayton Drive from Geoffrey S. Shaw and Erin D. Shaw for \$52,150 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer improvements, Parch #15.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 547.

Item No. 55: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer improvements, Parcel #16

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,772 square feet (0.06 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, and 2,270 square feet (0.05 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1532 Clayton Drive from Stephen M. Thomas and Jennifer C. Meth for \$36,650 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer improvements, Parcel #16.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 548.

Item No. 56: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #17

Resolution of Condemnation of 2,161 square feet (0.05 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement and 736 square feet (0.02 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1526 Clayton Drive from Erika Lopez and Leonard A. Lopez for \$37,000 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer improvements, Parcel #17.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 549.

Item No. 57: Charlotte Water Property Transactions – Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #18

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,919 square feet (0.04 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement and 668 square feet (0.02 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1518 Clayton Drive from Robert James Brietz, Jr. and Ashley B. Brietz for \$32,375 for Dairy Branch Tributary Sewer Improvements, Parcel #18.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 550.

Item No. 58: Property Transactions – Alleghany Street Sidewalk Bike Project, Parcel #19

Resolution of Condemnation of 643 square feet (0.015 acres) of Sidewalk Utility Easement, 755 square feet (0.017 acres) of Temporary Construction Easement at 2610 Alleghany Street from Home SFR Borrower IV LLC for \$1,525 for Alleghany Street Sidewalk Bike Project, Parcel #19.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 551.

Item No. 59: Property Transactions – Alleghany Street Sidewalk Bike Project, Parcel #40

Resolution of Condemnation of 214 square feet (0.005 acres) of Sidewalk Utility Easement plus 264 square feet (0.006 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1610 Ashley Road from Rosen Charlotte LLC for \$775 for Alleghany Street Sidewalk Bike Project, Parcel #40.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 552.

Item No. 60: Property Transactions – I-85 North Bridge, Parcel #3

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,054 square feet (0.24 acres) in Storm Drainage Easement, plus 11,501 square feet (0.264 acres) in Sidewalk and Utility Easement, plus 408 square feet (0.009 acres) in Waterline Easement, plus 13,039 square feet (0.299 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement. Plus 4,035 square feet (0.093 acres) in Utility Easement at 8921 Research Drive from Cellco Partnership for \$103,075 for I-85 North Bridge, Parcel #3.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 553.

Item No. 63: Property Transactions – McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #6

Resolution of Condemnation of 4,294 square feet (0.099 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 3,508 square feet (0.081 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at

625 McCullough Drive from NHG Charlotte Fund I LLC for \$36,350 for McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #6.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 554.

Item No. 64: Property Transactions – McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #7

Resolution of Condemnation of 10,225 square feet (0.235 acres) in Utility Easement, 281 square feet (0.006 acres) in Storm Drainage Easement, 7,538 square feet (0.173 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 1,865 square feet, (0.043 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 429 Tyler Trail Court from CRLP McCullough Drive, LLC for \$64,475 for McCullough Drive Streetscape.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 555.

Item No. 65: Property Transactions – McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #8

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,662 square feet (0.038 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 1,728 square feet (0.04 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 6510 Brentmoor Drive from Baseline NC Partners LLC for \$9,800 for McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #8.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 556.

Item No. 66: Property Transactions – McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #11

Acquisition of 5,703 square feet (0.131 acres) in utility Easement, 2,871 square feet (0.066 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 610 square feet (0.014 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 416 McCullough Drive from PLP Properties, LLC for \$57,940 for McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #11.

Item No. 67: Property Transactions – McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #13

Resolution of Condemnation of 697 square feet (0.016 acres) in Storm Drainage Easement, 23,535 square feet (0.54 acres) in Sidewalk utility Easement, and 1,115 square feet (0.026 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 8301 University Executive Park Drive from ATAPCO UEP, INC for \$84,025 for McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #13.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 557.

Item No. 68: Property Transactions – McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #14

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,068 square feet (0.025 acres) in Utility Easement, 1,420 square feet (0.033 acres) in Storm Drainage Easement, 5,903 square feet (0.136 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 6,468 square feet (0.148 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 301 McCullough Drive from ATAPCO UEP INC for \$63,050 for McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #14.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 558.

Item No. 69: Property Transactions – McCullough Drive Streetscape Parcels #15 and 16

Resolution of Condemnation of 4,522 square feet (0.104 acres) in Storm Drainage Easement, 9,193 square feet (0.211 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 3,251 square feet (0.075 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at Ikea Boulevard from ATAPCO UEP INC for \$110,650 for McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcels #15 and 16.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 559.

Item No. 70: Property Transactions – McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #18

Resolution of Condemnation of 6,676 square feet (0.153 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 3,684 square feet (0.085 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 8220 University Executive Park Drive from ATAPCO UEP INC for \$69,7000 for McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #18.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 560.

Item No. 71: Property Transactions – McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #31

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,550 square feet (0.036 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at McCullough Drive from LJW Land LLC, for \$2,350 for McCullough Drive Streetscape, Parcel #31.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 561.

Item No. 72: Property Transactions – Morehead at Caldwell Pedestrian Safety Project, Parcel #1

Acquisition of 533 square feet (0.012 acres) in Utility Easement, and 742 square feet (0.017 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 435 East Morehead Street from JFW Realty, Inc. for \$36,900 for Morehead at Caldwell Pedestrian Safety Project, Parcel #1.

Item No. 73: Property Transactions – Morehead at Caldwell Pedestrian Safety Project, Parcel #2

Acquisition of 33 square feet (0.001 acres) in Utility Easement, 117 square feet (0.003 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 574 square feet (0.013 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 501 East Morehead Street from 501 Associates, LLC for \$14,789 for Morehead at Caldwell Pedestrian Safety Project, Parcel #2.

Item No. 74: Property Transactions – Oakhurst Amity Gardens, Parcel #3

Acquisition of 13,181 square feet (0.31 acres) in Fee Simple, and 700 square feet (0.016 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1640 Chippendale Road from Oakhurst Apartments LLC for \$98,000 for Oakhurst Amity Gardens, Parcel #3.

Item No. 75: Property Transactions – Oakhurst Amity Gardens, Parcel #4

Resolution of Condemnation of 36,633 square feet (0.84 acres) in Fee Simple, and 1,890 square feet (0.043 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 1629 Chippendale Road from Luz Latorre for \$239,350 for Oakhurst Amity Gardens, Parcel #4.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 562.

Item No. 76: Property Transactions – Oakhurst Amity Gardens, Parcel #5

Acquisition of 32,031 square feet (0.74 acres) in Fee Simple, and 1,933 square feet (0.74 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at Pierson Drive from Try-Star LLC for \$151,725 for Oakhurst Amity Gardens, Parcel #5.

Item No. 77: Property Transactions – Oakhurst Amity Gardens, Parcel #7

Acquisition of 1,611 square feet (0.04 acres) in Fee Simple, and 167 square feet (0.004 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 700 Pierson Drive from Jung Properties, LLC for \$17,700 for Oakhurst Amity Gardens, Parcel #7.

Item No. 78: Property Transactions – Old Providence Road Sidewalk Project, Parcel #8

Acquisition of 4,332 square feet (0.099 acres) in Fee Simple in Existing R/W, 5,515 square feet (0.127 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 2,675 square feet (0.061 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 6828 Old Providence Road from Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for \$21,980 for Old Providence Road Sidewalk Project, Parcel #8.

Item No. 79: Property Transactions – Oneida Road Sidewalk, Parcel #10

Acquisition of 845 square feet (0.019 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 4923 North Graham Street from Dimmette Properties, LLC for \$14,789 for Oneida Road Sidewalk, Parcel #10.

Item No. 80: Property Transactions – South Tryon Corridor (Dunavant Street Brookhill Road), Parcel #2

Acquisition of 51 square feet (0.001 acres) in Utility Easement, 265 square feet (0.006 acres) in Sidewalk Utility Easement, and 333 square feet (0.008 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement at 2301 South Tryon Street from FHN 2301 South Tryon LLC for \$13,047 for South Tryon Corridor (Dunavant Street/Brookhill Road), Parcel #2.

Item No. 81: Property Transactions – Thomasboro Drive Sanitary Sewer Replacement, Parcel #1.1

Resolution of Condemnation of 15,627 square feet (0.359 acres) in Sanitary Sewer Easement, plus 20,251 square feet (0.465 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 9,161 square feet (0.21 acres) in Easement to be abandoned, plus 2,792 square feet (0.064 acres) in Existing Sewer Easement at 1000 Thomasboro Drive from Starnes Pellet Service, INC for \$17,925 for Thomasboro Drive Sanitary Sewer Replacement, Parcel #1.1.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 563.

Item No. 82: Property Transactions – Water Oak Storm Drainage Improvements, Parcel #6

Acquisition of 609 square feet (0.014 ss) in Storm Drainage Easement, plus 665 square feet (0.015) in Utility Easement at 4511 Water Oak Road from Joel L. Adelman and Stephanie W. Adelman for \$16,500 for Water oak Storm Drainage improvements, Parcel #6.

Item No. 83: Property Transactions – Water Oak Storm Drainage Improvements, Parcel #13

Acquisition of 2,367 square feet (0.054 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 30 square feet (0.001 acres) in Utility Easement at 4618 Walker Road from Helen Biegel Hackney for \$14,900 for Water Oak Storm Drainage Improvements, Parcel #13.

Item No. 84: Property Transactions – Water Oak Storm Drainage Improvements, Parcel #18

Acquisition of 1,933 square feet (0.044 acres) in Storm Drainage Easement, plus 328 square feet (0.008 acres) in Temporary Construction Easement, plus 289 square feet (0.007 acres) in Utility Easement, plus 765 square feet (0.018 acres) in Existing Drainage Accepted as Storm Drainage Easement at 1000 Brantham Court from Mary Helen Hackney for \$15,850 for Water Oak Storm Drainage Improvements, Parcel #18.

Item No. 85: Property Transactions – Water Oak Storm Drainage Improvements, Parcel #26

Acquisition of 1,296 square feet (0.03 acres) in Storm Drainage Easement at 4742 Emory Lane from Brian Clair and Sharon Clair for \$21,850 for Water Oak Storm Drainage improvements, Parcel #26.

ITEM NO. 39: CATS MOBILE TICKET SALES APPLICATION

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Egleston to approve a contract in the amount of \$250,000 with Passport Labs, Inc. for Transit Mobile Payment Application services for a term of one year.

The vote was recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, Johnson, Mitchell, Newton, and Watlington.

NAYS: Councilmember Winston.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 6: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I have two items for you tonight. As we are getting Chief Johnson into the room to give you a COVID-19 update, which we have been consistent with that. Just a couple of things; I do have my 30-day memo for you which basically puts out next Monday. I will do the proposed budget at the Strategy Session, on the 11th there is a Business Meeting, but there is also the Budget Public Hearing, and on the 18th there is a Zoning meeting and on the 26th we will continue to have the COVID-19 response update. We will also add to that updates from the Municipal Service District Reports that typically would be a part of the budget process, as well as an update from the CRVA (Charlotte Regional Visitor's Authority) and we will have Tom here to discuss that.

Before I turn it over to the Chief, I would like to do a little bit of product placement. I want to say thanks to everyone in Charlotte Water and the innovation and creativity as we are developing hand sanitizer so, a big shout out for all the folks at Charlotte Water. The City Attorney is looking at me; we are not selling it, it is just something that we are doing to keep ourselves safe.

Mayor Lyles said have you tried the product Mr. Manager?

Mr. Jones said it is a great product. With that said Mayor; unless there are questions of me, I would like to turn it over to Chief Johnson for another series of COVID-19 updates.

Chief Johnson, Charlotte Fire Department said before I turn it over to Chief Cindy Bonham to give us the update I would like to take the time to just say thank you to all of our first responders that are out there meeting this on a daily basis, whether they are for the City or the County as well as the Towns. I would like also to thank our Charlotte Mecklenburg Emergency Management Office as well as all of those participating in our Emergency Operations Center. I would like to say thank you to all those folks as well as all the essential employees that continue to come to work every day to make sure that the City, County and Towns services are continuing to be provided to the citizens here. With that I will turn it over to Chief Cindy Bonham for an update.

Chief Cindy Bonham, Charlotte Fire Department said today is the 47th day that we've the Emergency Operations Center open. It has been busy all 47 of those days. The Joint Information Center has also been active that long and continues to coordinate public information jointly. The Incident Management Team that we've worked hard to develop for the past couple of years is also continuing to support the situation. The latest updates we have from the Health Department was 1,491 cases and 43 deaths. That was as of this afternoon.

The CharMeck Response Coalition or Volunteers Active in Disasters has been outstanding. I have not heard anything else going on in the State like we have it here. They continue to provide volunteer opportunities for groups and individuals, many of these efforts are related to delivering food. There is a PPE drive going on throughout the County; there are eight YMCA locations that are drop-off points and as of today there have been more than 15,000 items that have been donated. There is a website charmeckresponse.org where volunteers can sign up for various things. I think sometimes events have been pulled so it looks like there is nothing available, but it is a

rolling calendar so if someone comes across that just keep trying and there will be other events on there.

Here are some numbers associated with what we've done so far. Total donations to date through helpcharmeck.org are \$16.6 million. The total number of organizations in this coalition is 194. There have been over 2,700 volunteers that have been mobilized. Parks and Rec have been operating three facilities for childcare for emergency responders and essential workers. Today they had 41 children in these facilities. The YMCA is operating nine facilities for children of healthcare workers and they have 168 children today. So, usually on a week-day 200 children are being cared for and this was set up within the first week of our operation, and I'm very proud of that. Yesterday CMS provided nearly 37,000 meals; that was on a Sunday. To date there have been 827,518 meals that have been served by CMS and some partnering agencies. That is outstanding to make sure that our children have been fed. There have been 2,700 meals delivered to people in quarantine along with health and medical needs. There are nine long-term facilities that have outbreaks. An outbreak is two or more than two, so three or more individuals with COVID or any specific diseases in an outbreak. So, there are nine long-term facilities and two facilities under investigation within the County.

I'm going to pass on to Chief Graham, who is following probably our most pressing issue or the biggest issue coming down the pike. He has been talking about it for a couple weeks, so Chief Graham will talk about our food chain.

Chief Graham, Charlotte Fire Department said I do want to highlight what Chief Bonham said because I want to talk about for a second the CharMeck Response Coalition and what a massive big deal that is. It is fantastic. I only know one other area in the country that has something like that, and they stood that up during this event so, that is one of those blessings that come out of disasters. One-hundred ninety-four organizations being part of that will be there forever so that organization, they stood it up for each disaster moving forward will be there to support our community, and it is truly amazing to watch them work.

We do continue to monitor our supply chain; North Carolina Emergency Management reported that five of the 200 meat processing facilities in North Carolina have been impacted. John Tyson of the Tyson Food Company pulled full-page ads in the New York Times and Washington Post yesterday, discussing their issues with their meat processing facilities. One, they continue to have workers that are affected by COVID-19 and two, because of the shutdowns that their overall stock that they are pulling for will be reduced for some time to come. We've been monitoring this for several weeks. FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) created a task force to look at our supply chains specifically nationally. North Carolina Emergency Management also has a working group and here locally, Emergency Management and the Emergency Operations Center, it is a priority for us, our food pantries, and our food bank which originally goes to the food bank at Second Harvest and moves to the food pantries. So, we have field observers out in the field every day working to look at our supply chain, not only there, but also in our stores across the County.

North Carolina National Guard was requested, and they are currently working with Second Harvest to move supplies from the food bank into Loaves and Fishes, which is one of our primary food pantries in our County. Also, our field observers report that we continue to have issues with paper goods, toilet paper as you know, and also paper towels. They are reporting 43% of our stores remain out of paper goods throughout the community and only seven percent of our stores report that they are fully stocked. Seventy-one percent remain with disinfectants within the community. I would say that our supply chain at this point is just as high a priority as other things that the EOC (Emergency Operations Center) is looking at. So, number one, we want to identify the problem and we continue to do that every single day, but then number two and number three, have plans and contingency plans to ensure that those who are the neediest are able to receive food in our community. A lot of the folks that we are dealing with at the food pantries and through the food bank don't have access to our supermarkets, and

we've talked about it in our normal business, the food deserts. So, we want to make sure that we are able to supply those areas throughout our County.

Chief Johnson said just to kind of pinpoint that, our goal and one of the things we need to do in Emergency Management is always looking ahead as to what hazards are coming. The long-term care facilities are one that we've been monitoring as well as the food chain, but these are our two highest priorities at this point to make sure that we continue to monitor those just in case, and we've been working with the State quite a bit on both of those situations. That is our COVID report.

Councilmember Watlington said I have a general question about the Manager's report, but not about this, in particular, so I can hold mind for a second.

Councilmember Winston said thank you to the Chiefs for the update. I was able to drop by the Emergency Operation Center last week so, I just want to give a big thank you to all of the staff there from the City of Charlotte, Mecklenburg County, the Towns, Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools and all other service providers that were there. I encourage all of my colleagues to give them a drop-in and please if you go bring them some coffee. Bring them good coffee, they have a deficit of high-quality coffee over there, so I'm sure your gifts will be well received. I do have a question for the Chiefs and the Manager. Can you give us an update on the status of COVID-19 amongst our City's workforce? Do we have any counts of any employees that are sick and/or infected?

Chief Johnson said Mr. Winston; we do normally keep track of that, but as far as basically our first responders, we keep track of emergency medical professionals, but we don't keep track of all of the City numbers. That sometimes becomes an HR issue and concern, so we don't always share that information as well. But if we have it, we can provide some.

Chief Bonham said again this is just emergency services, so it is not all City workers. Yesterday the number was 62, so that does not mean that 62 people have COVID-19, it just means they have either been near someone and they are quarantined, or they've been exposed on a call. That doesn't mean that they have COVID, and that is across Police and Fire Departments in the County.

Chief Graham said it was updated to 35 just this evening. They track it every day, but the difference in numbers may be that there was an exposure, so as they go on calls there is what they call possible exposures for our first responders. Like the Chief likes to say, we've put them on a shelf, and then we have them tested. Our testing capabilities have gotten much better. I was talking to Gibbie Harris about this today, and originally, we were at two-weeks and now we are at 24 to 48 hours to get someone tested. So, we are able to handle that a little bit quicker and move them through the process, So, that is why it might go from 60 something to 35 in a 24-hour period.

Mayor Lyles said, so we are at 35.

Councilmember Johnson said I've seen reports that we are tracking numbers from positive cases in long-term care facilities, but are we tracking positive cases in the other stores that are considered essential, such as grocery stores, gas stations, public improvement stores, the food pantries? Is the EOC tracking cases in those places where the public has a lot of exposure?

Chief Johnson said I don't think we are capturing that information specifically for those types of locations. We can easily try to determine that information. The reason we are keeping track of the long-term care facilities, no different from the jail is that those occupants don't always have an opportunity to leave, so they are like Petri dishes, ready to just explode. We really do need to pay a little bit more attention there. But your question is valid and that is something that we can look at gathering more information.

Councilmember Graham said I also want to thank Chief Johnson and Chief Graham for all the work they are doing along with all the other first responders. My question is in

reference to when and how are we peaking? Can you talk about Mecklenburg County? I understand the peak is now May or early June. Am I right in that assessment or is there a new timeline for peaking for the County based on the work that we are doing on social distancing?

Chief Johnson said I will start off and then I will turn it over to the other two Chiefs to try to clean it up a little bit. The reality is when you start talking about data and the information, we are getting our positive cases are always going to continue to go up because that is just counting the number of people that become positive as tested. Some of the other data we are looking at, and I believe if you go to the Mecklenburg County Public Health it has a lot of data there that is available as well. We've been looking at hospitalization and that is kind of where we've been getting information from the hospitals, and that has been relatively flat now for about seven-plus days. The more we social distance, the peak that you are talking about was originally in mid- April, but the more we social distance and the stay at home order, that kind of spreads it out a little bit, so if you think of a wave, it can either be a tidal wave or it can slowly trickle down and trickle-down which kind of pushes the date out. The last time I think I spoke to you all the date was like mid-May. I think we are now into June. People may say why is it getting spread out, well the reality is it is getting spread out so that our hospitals and our medical facilities have the capability of treating that number of patients instead of looking for a possible alternate mass care facility like we discussed before, now we are within the range where the hospitals can take care of the number of patients within their own walls at that point. I think right now, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we are looking sometime in late May or June.

Chief Graham said talking with Gibbie Harris this morning, we were talking about that same issue. There are a couple of things, one Novant and Atrium, as we look at the numbers, it appears that they are getting experience of treating COVID-19 patients, they are doing a better job. So, the number of cases that result in someone being on a ventilator which in this case would be significantly bad has dropped, and so we are happy to see that. Also, the hospitalizations are leveling off, but that doesn't mean they are going down. Our numbers continue to rise, and so Gibbie pointed out that our peak is moving into June, but if we look at the Spanish flu that had three peaks, we don't know if that is going to be our future or not. We are just pontificating on what could possibly be down the road. We don't have a vaccine, we are doing a better job of treating our patients we believe, but we may have a peak and then it diminishes and then another wave as it comes through. We are going to be in this, we believe for the long haul, and as we look at restrictions and pulling back from restrictions there is going to be a period where we're going to have to look as we pull those restrictions away, what does the data show in our community and are we being effective with that or are we doing well. If we are not and if our numbers spike, we may very well be back in the same boat again, so we want to let the data drive us to what we are doing and constantly evaluating where we are as a community, and then working together. I will say that when you come to the EOC, and Mr. Winston was there the other day, and unfortunately, I was at the new EOC. I heard he came down and the next time he is going to bring us some coffee, which is going to be great, but when you come to the EOC you've got the County and the City and our Towns. Every morning on that 10:00 call, and that call this morning was an hour-long. We are constantly discussing these things, but Gibbie sits with us in the Command Room down there every single day and her staff is readily available, so you almost can't tell where the County starts, and the City begins or any of the other Towns as we roll through this. We believe that we will be in that type of situation where there are fully staffed Emergency Operations Center or a partially staffed for some time to come.

Councilmember Eiselt said Chief; thank you, I add my appreciation to what my Councilmembers have said for the work that you all are doing, and I'm sure you've had a lot of sleepless nights and you are sort of running on fumes right now, and we really appreciate all that you are doing. I do have a question about going back to the CharMeck Response Coalition; could you repeat the e-mail address or the website if people want to do something in terms of make a donation of paper towels or toilet tissue or whatever? Is there sort of a central depository that people could bring that? I do hear

a lot of people that want to help with that and in addition to making monetary donations, so is there a way to do that?

Chief Bonham said Ms. Eiselt; helpcharmec.org is where the donations are being made.

Ms. Eiselt said for financial or other donations such as paper towels or anything like that?

Chief Bonham said charmecresponds.org

Mayor Lyles said helpcharmec.org I thought was the donation of money.

Chief Bonham said charmecrespond.org is if you want to donate your time or goods.

Chief Graham said the problem with the donation of goods in any disaster, they are looking for PPU right now, but the actual normal goods may be problematic for them. You can go to the website and look, but just like we do in hurricanes, the best type of donation is the financial donation or donation of time because it allows them to use the funds in the manner that they see fit, so if they get a million rolls of toilet paper that toilet paper may not ever actually be used and it became problematic for them. They have to move it around and it requires logistics. Certainly, as we go to those websites it is always important.

Ms. Eiselt said Chief; are you comfortable that there is sort of this centralized procurement effort for masks? I'm sure you get a million phone calls a day from people that want to donate masks, whether they are home-made, or they are procured from businesses that are making them now or overseas? I see to here that there is a disconnect between the number that you've been able to procure and people that want to help with that. Are you satisfied that you can procure what you need for PPE (Personal Protective Equipment)?

Chief Johnson said yes, I feel a lot more comfortable today than I would say several weeks ago, and I have to tip our hat to Chief Owens who is our Logistics Section Chief. They have been doing double duty. They've been doing logistics for the Charlotte Fire Department and also responding to this emergency in the Emergency Operations Center. I look at it is two-fold; I look at it as the Logistic Section is purchasing PPE as much as they can get, and a lot of that request comes through the web EOC portal and those want to donate. I know you and I have had some conversations. The donation part needs to go through the charmecresponse.org, and what happens is right now, when we are purchasing PPE we are focused on first responders and that type of avenue, but some of the donated goods may be able to help out other non-essential employees or help out at the nursing home facilities, etc. We try to cross-link those two so we are able to check those boxes for let's say a nursing home requests so many masks, well they may not the N95 mask, but there may be some donated masks that we can get to help them out in certain aspects.

Ms. Eiselt said you guys are playing that role to try to go through those requests?

Chief Johnson said yes.

Mayor Lyles said I want to add to Ms. Eiselt's comments, I think getting those requests, we probably get a lot of e-mails about I've got this, and I want to help you do this, or I can procure this, or I've got a connection or a contact. I send them all of charmecreponse.org because Chief Owens does to the review of those. Sometimes people are your friends and they say well, I can really help you, but we need to have the screening done by the Department, and so what I would suggest for all of us that we send charmecresponse.org and have those sorted by the Department because they have the ability to look at the type and where they are best needed.

Councilmember Ajmera said I have two questions; first is for our City employees. Do we need to approve additional leave beyond 80-hours for our employees with compromised immune systems?

Mr. Jones said I'm not sure of what you are asking. You did early on approve the 80-hours. We have done some additional things for employees so what I would like to do is get to Council all of those things that we have done for employees during this crisis.

Ms. Ajmera said I appreciate that we have provided leave for our employees who are not able to currently work because of medical reasons. I would like to see if there is enough or do we need to do more? We have gotten e-mails from several employees asking us to expand our medical leave beyond 80-hours. I would like to see if you could provide us an update on how many employees have used that and whether there is an ask for additional time?

Mr. Jones said we can give you an update.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you Mr. Manager. The second question I have is around the shelter. I know one of our speakers had mentioned hotels and motels are incurring huge losses because we have hotels and motels being used currently to provide shelter to those who do not have it. What I'm concerned about is that if hotels and motels were to go out of business they might end up on the street. I know that you are in communication with our County Manager to address that we continue to have shelter for those folks, has been any update on that?

Chief Johnson said we do have some numbers and we continue to work with the County. We do have a section within the Emergency Operations Center that actually tries to help in managing the homeless. So, we do have hotels that are available to assist us in social distancing. Obviously, when you social distance in our current homeless shelters that decreases the capacity so that we have almost 200 people in one of these hotels and I think we are in conversation with the County about expanding that number.

Ms. Ajmera said that is to provide shelter for those who have called us directly, right? Or, who have gone through some sort of program, but how about for those who are already in some of the existing hotels and motels were not able to pay rent because they have been affected by COVID-19? What happens in that scenario?

Mr. Jones said what I will do is get to all the Councilmembers and Mayor tonight, an update that Anthony Troutman gave the County Board last Wednesday I believe that basically outlines some of the many things that the County is doing in this space, so I would like to get that to you so you can see what is occurring and as we talked last week I will follow-up with Dina and Angela will continue to follow-up with Anthony to see what is happening in that space.

Ms. Ajmera said I would also like to see where we have seen e-mail where folks who are getting shelter were non-profit agencies were paying for their shelter for a day or two, but beyond that there was no reimbursement to hotels and motels to continue to provide shelter. In that case hotels will eventually, sooner or later, if there is no payment coming in where they are still having to pay their employees and provide shelter, they might go out of business. We do need to find a solution for that. I do not want any of these folks to end up on the street because businesses can't continue offering where they have no revenue coming in.

Councilmember Driggs said Chief; I wanted to add my voice to the chorus of appreciation for emergency response and for everything you are doing. My question has to do with the fact that what I'm seeing is people are starting to get impatient and restless, and there is some discussion out there about whether what we are doing is absolutely necessary. I think some people have the impression that because the steps we've taken are working and have slowed the growth of the virus, therefore we actually didn't need to take those steps. That is clearly a discussion I think for others. My

question to you is do you see any sign of lessening of compliance; are people still playing exactly by the rules we've established under this stay at home order?

Chief Johnson said I would not be able to answer the compliance portion. I think CMPD could talk a little bit more about maybe the number of complaints they've received or the number of calls they've had to run. I would say that our number of hospitalizations shows that this has worked and that people are still being compliant. Our hospitalization has not gone up and we are in discussion as to what our future holds. The Governor has already put his stay at home order out till May 8th and the Policy Group is in discussions now to determine whether we fall under the Governor's order or if we continue our order till May 8th. That is a decision that will be made within the next day or so.

Mr. Driggs said I just think that almost as a PR observation there are people who think that because this hasn't grown as fast as we feared that means it wasn't as bad as we feared, and we need to make clear to everybody that any lack of vigilance on our part could lead to an acceleration again. There has been talk about a possible rebound later this year, so just wanted to point that out and be interested to know Mr. Manager, as well, whether you see any signs that the people are sort of applying their own interpretation to some of these rules. Meanwhile Chief; thanks again for everything you've done.

Chief Johnson said could I just add one thing here because I think it is very important for people if they look outside of Charlotte and look outside of the State of North Carolina I think they can see those particular locations that did not take decisive action right away and they can take a look at those numbers and determine that the decisions that were made early here I think were needed and have paid off in a positive manner.

Mr. Jones said Mr. Driggs; I would add to that, I think there is something to be said about how Mecklenburg County, the City, and the Towns all were unified in our approach and as we move forward, I think that is an important point.

Mayor Lyles said recently I saw a report where North Carolina was considered one of the model states for the way that we've handled this with our stay at home and all of our declarations.

Ms. Watlington said I just wanted to follow-up on an item from last time. I just wanted to ask about this transportation piece; I see, and I was excited about the policy referral regarding the topics to the TAP (Transportation & Planning) Committee and I just wanted to make sure I understand. I see the background information here, is this to serve as the answer to the December piece or is that going to come baked into the budget requests? Can you give me a little bit of context for this that I have in my hand?

Mr. Jones said Ms. Watlington; yes, and yes. This is a response to the December requests and instead of just stopping here the Mayor has made a referral to the Transportation, Planning, and Environment Committee, and also this is serving as a baseline for a portion of the budget that we will deliver to you next week.

Ms. Johnson said I have three questions; the first question is, is childcare being considered for City employees that are not first responders?

Chief Johnson said yes, the Park and Rec locations that Chief Bonham mentioned are for not only first responders, but City essential employees and that has been shared through our HR Department.

Ms. Johnson said can you repeat what you said? You said something about May 8th the stay at home order, but we will be taking a look at our own tomorrow. Is that what you said?

Chief Johnson said we have our own stay at home order through the County that is probably a little more restrictive than the Governor's, and so we are having some

conversation as to where we are going to proceed following April 29th is when our order currently ends. So, whether we are going to continue to May 8th with our current order or we are going to just fall under the Governor's order after the 29th.

Ms. Johnson said I wanted to follow up on what Ms. Ajmera was talking about, the hotels. I know we've been talking about that for the last three meetings, but I know that you said you had talked to the County about it, but that is a critical issue. I'm not sure if it is being collaborated with the County because they are considered homeless, but this is for individuals who had permanent residents in the hotel and if the hotels are not receiving reimbursement, as we know that they are not as Mr. Patel spoke, and we've received numerous e-mails. I just think it should be at the top of our list for discussion because this is going to leave families out in the cold. I think the hotels are being really nice for evicting folks, but it needs to be said that they are not receiving payment. Probably 60% or more of them have not received payment in over a month. So, if we could really address that as City leaders, I think it is very important because there is a domino effect, not just from the small businesses, but also from the individuals who are occupants there.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Jones; anything further?

Mr. Jones said that is it?

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 7: ORDINANCE NO. 9778 TO GOVERN PERMITTING OF EVENTS ON PUBLIC PROPERTY FOR THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Bokhari, to adopt an Ordinance No. 9778 authorizing the City Manager or his designee to implement content-neutral permitting procedures for allowing City streets and City property during the 2020 Republican National Convention.

Mayor Lyles said before we begin, I thought it would be good since we are having to do this virtually, that the City Attorney walk through the ordinance and what it does.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said the proposed ordinance that is in front of you changes your current ordinance as it relates to permitting for particular areas of public spaces. This is a relic of the 2012 Democratic National Convention where there was an extraordinary events ordinance that was put in place that gave the City Manager at that time the authority to change the permitting process for public spaces during the Democratic National Convention. At that time the chosen process was to go forward with a lottery system. That seemed to be the fairest system in terms of allowing people an opportunity to secure space to express themselves rather than having one particular entity take up all the space by signing up in advance. Right now, your permitting process is a first-come/first-serve so, if you want to reserve a park or a public space, the first person who reserves it get the space assuming they meet all the other qualifications. Again, based on our experience back in 2012 we felt that a more fair and equitable process would be essential to do it in a random lottery situation which is what we have here. The actual ordinance doesn't direct the Manager to do a lottery, it allows the manager to implement a policy or procedure that is content-neutral, but I anticipate that we would be going to the lottery system in that regard.

I have spoken to several of you about the ordinance that has been proposed and there have been a couple of questions about what happens if the Convention ends up getting canceled, particularly in light of the current pandemic that we have. I turned your attention to Section 4 of the ordinance which speaks to the specifics of when the ordinance would come into play. It is currently scheduled based on the current plans of the schedule of the Republican National Convention; the ordinance would take in effect August 21, 2020 at 11:59 and end on August 30, 2020, as well. If there are changes to that schedule the ordinance would change to three days before and one day after the

Convention. If the Convention is canceled then the ordinance would never come into play at all, but there have been some questions about that. Additional language could be added to specifically state that the ordinance will cease to be effective upon the official closing or cancellation of the 2020 Republican National Convention or if you wanted to have additional language, we could take a look at that. Happy to answer any questions that you have.

Mayor Lyles said before we have Councilmembers, I want you to know that we are joined by Chief Putney who works with the Federal Authorities on our security for the plan and then Angela Charles who I think leads our employee response efforts for the RNC.

Councilmember Winston said I would like to say that I am overall in favor of this permitting ordinance change. As I was having conversations with Mr. Baker, the understanding is that this is trying to ensure first amendment rights for all folks. The idea was as the permitting process stands there is the ability for groups too, for lack of a better term, kind of stuff the box, and take up all spaces. For instance, around Charlotte that would need a permit, and if they didn't want to show up they could not show up and inherently switch the ability of any other groups to use that space and use that permit to voice their opinions. I did ask for some additional language, and I was actually asking more in the whereas as the first full whereas statements come to set the agenda for what we are expecting to be, and we are expecting to be in a global pandemic during the Republican National Convention. I think that should be acknowledged in the ordinance. I do appreciate the additional language and I would make a motion to update for the amended language, but I would love to hear from my colleagues if they would see fit to see any acknowledgment of the global pandemic that we are going to be facing.

Councilmember Egleston said does Mr. Baker have that language he could read to us?

Mr. Baker said the language that I have, and keep in mind that what actually appears in the ordinance books comes after the Whereas and comes after the parts of Now, therefore, be it ordained. That is the language that will actually be on the books. In Section 4, based on my conversations with Mr. Winston, if the Council was so inclined, I would add at the end of that section one more sentence that reads; in any event, this ordinance will cease to be effective upon the official closing or cancellation of the 2020 Republican National Convention.

Councilmember Watlington said I am inclined to second Mr. Winston's motion, but I do have one piece of maybe, I need to know if warrants a complete substitute motion or not.

Mayor Lyles said he didn't make a move yet, he said he wanted to ask his colleagues what they were thinking if I heard that correctly. I think Mr. Winston asked that his colleagues discuss it.

Mr. Winston said I did make a motion for the amended language, but I would love to hear further discussion about a separate language that would acknowledge the expected existence of a global pandemic during the Republican National Convention.

Mayor Lyles said I'm sorry I did not catch it; I thought I heard you conclude with you would love to hear what your colleagues said so, the sentence that Mr. Baker has does that. Is that what I'm understanding?

Mr. Baker said what I understand is that Mr. Winston wants to make a move which will be a substitute motion at this stage to add the language that I just read in at the end of Section 4, but I further understand that Mr. Winston would like to hear from the rest of his colleagues as to whether or not to acknowledge the global pandemic in the Whereas section of the document.

Mayor Lyles said sorry, that is where I was getting confused.

A substitute motion was made by Councilmember Winston, seconded by Councilmember Watlington, to adding a sentence at the end of Section 4 that reads, in event this ordinance ceases to be effective upon the official closing or cancellation of the 2020 Republican National Convention.

Ms. Watlington said I guess I just want some further clarity because I heard Mr. Baker say that the actual piece of the ordinance is actually going to be entered into the record, only that page after the Therefore. So, I'm not exactly sure how then to address the Whereas assumptions. I appreciate them but the sentence that you've offered up doesn't sound like it acknowledges in the event that there is not a cancellation but maybe modification in the method of the Convention. I know right now we haven't addressed a Plan B if you will, but if there is some kind of virtual component or something to that effect, I don't hear that. I hear an either-or; either we go forward under the assumption of the Whereas or it is canceled and so the ordinance is obsolete. That would be the only additional piece I would have, is how would we operate in the event there is some kind of adjustments to the Convention that doesn't fall under the initial for a statement.

Mr. Baker said I would say that, and obviously, we are dealing with a situation to where I can't tell you what that Convention is going to look like in August, if there is going to be a Convention in August, so the language that we have here I think gives us flexibility, both for the dates and the type of Convention that was contemplated at the time the contract was entered into. It also contemplates a potential postponement if in fact it is rescheduled Section 4 would cover that and then the additional language addresses the fact that the ordinance would never go into effect if there is no Republican National Convention, and I would say that if there is a virtual Convention or some sort of truncated Convention, that would also be covered under this particular ordinance as written.

Councilmember Driggs said Mr. Baker; you just said if there a virtual Convention that would be covered. What is applicable under those circumstances according to this?

Mr. Baker said so much of it depends on what does a virtual Convention means. A virtual Convention could take Charlotte completely out of the process totally, so this language gives us a little bit of flexibility, but I just don't know what a virtual Convention looks like. I think a virtual Convention is somehow tied to Charlotte where the virtual nature of the Convention is occurring in Charlotte, but if for instance, it is determined that the Convention can't be hosted safely under the pandemic that we have now, and that the RNC host a virtual Convention that is run out of their DC office, assuming that there is a DC office, then the ordinance wouldn't apply because there would be no need to have a permitting ordinance here or to make changes to the permitting ordinance here if there is actually no physical Convention in Charlotte.

Mr. Driggs said okay, got that. As far as Mr. Winston's other comment about an acknowledgment of the virus or COVID, I'm wondering what that looks like and how that bears on the effectiveness of the provisions of this particular motion. In other words what would we say about the virus if we did take that onboard?

Mr. Winston said one, the first five Whereas statements in ordinance kind of set up what we are expecting to be dealing with in late August in our City, which is setting up the reason that we are having this ordinance, and my question to the colleagues, I believe this is so but is that something that we should we acknowledge as we are putting together this process to provide for the constitutional rights of people who are in Charlotte, but also taking in the public safety aspect of it if there is a reason, for instance, that permits for mass gatherings are not given. One thing I will foresee are those decisions being challenged by folks, so I would like to take every opportunity to acknowledge that there is a very good chance that we will be in a public health crisis, and while we want to ensure that gatherings are able to happen under normal

conditions, be aware that we might have to, and probably will have to pull back some of our typical permitting processes and regulations to come.

Mr. Driggs said I don't have a problem with that; just in terms of drafting the document, and Mr. Baker; maybe you could help here. If we put in, for example, another Whereas and it says Whereas the current COVID virus situation could mean that plans for the Convention have to be substantially altered or that a cancellation thereof is called for, what does that actually do in terms of limiting the authority that is being given or modifying the effect of this?

Mr. Baker said it doesn't change the authority that has been given, it is just another Whereas to set up why we are doing what comes after the Now, therefore, be it ordained portion of the document. So, the Whereas is really just set up what it is you are about to do, and it wouldn't impact the permitting process.

Mr. Driggs said would you expect then interpreting what Mr. Winston said, would you expect that in order to take that on board we would simply add a Whereas for all the lines that I just described?

Mr. Baker said I believe so, and I would leave that to Mr. Winston to determine whether or not that hits the point that he is trying to make, but in my conversations with him I think that is pretty close.

Mr. Winston said Mr. Driggs has hit the nail on the head.

Mr. Driggs said alright, on that basis then I don't have an objection to it. I think we can acknowledge if there is some uncertainty. I just don't want us to try in this to legislate every contingency and to modify whatever authority the Manager has based on this circumstance or that circumstance, but I don't have a problem with acknowledging that the plans could unfold differently from the description that [inaudible] Whereas.

Ms. Watlington said just really quick, and maybe it is a more general question as it relates to the Whereas. I agree with what Mr. Driggs said, I just want to make sure that I'm clear in the event that the Whereas, because of the Whereas is just a setup of the motion, if something changes that is different from the Whereas, does that call us to come back and take another look at the ordinance or would that take some other separate action, seeing that the Whereas is now a part of the record.

Mr. Baker said I don't believe there would be a need to come back and change the ordinance because ultimately, what you are doing is you are allowing the Manager, in his very limited authority to make changes to the current permitting process, so the conditions of the Convention or what potentially happens, I don't think is necessarily contingent upon the authority that you are giving to the Manager, so I don't think you will need to come back. If the virus goes away completely tomorrow, you do not have to make any changes.

Mayor Lyles said we are ready for a vote with the two amendments; one, the City Attorney stated which would be in the ordinance under number 4, and the other Whereas to acknowledge the COVID-19 virus being something. I'm not sure what it is being, but it is not good.

Mr. Baker said the COVID virus being in a situation where it may impact and potentially cancel the event. What we will do, if it is okay with Council, is that we will read back the language that Mr. Driggs spoke into the record. I think that hit the nail on the head per Mr. Winston's comments and we will just add that as a Whereas to the document.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Winston; would that be okay with you for the Whereas and the change in the body of the ordinance?

Ms. Winston said yes ma'am.

Mayor Lyles said we have second; Ms. Watlington good?

Mr. Watlington said yes.

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

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 001-003.

* * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 8: BY FY 2020 REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE NOMINATING CONVENTION GRANT

Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, to (A) Authorize the Mayor to accept an 18-month 2020 Republican Presidential Candidate Nominating Convention grant in the amount of \$50,000,000 from the Bureau of Justice Assistance within the United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9779-X appropriating \$50,000,000 from the Bureau of Justice Assistance within the United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs for the 2020 Republican Presidential Candidate Nominating Convention.

Mayor Lyles I would like to have the City Attorney make a presentation on what this is, and I believe he is prepared to do so.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said what you have before you in this item is the \$50,000,000 grant that was contemplated in the contract that was executed to bring the Republican National Convention to Charlotte this year. This is \$50,000,000 to provide financial assistance to the City for reimbursable costs in fulfilling the City's obligations and for the purposes of this contract those obligations are around the areas of security, emergency medical services, technology, and insurance. Again, the \$50,000,000 that has been contemplated that the City would have to fulfill its obligations and allows us to do so under the contract. I know that I have received a number of questions from folks and let me just hit some of the major ones, particularly it relates to COVID-19 and the concerns of the pandemic that we are dealing with now. One of the concerns that have been raised does the acceptance of this grant automatically mean that the Convention will occur in the manner in which it was anticipated regardless of whether there are state laws or county ordinances or orders that prevent mass gathering?. I do want to be clear that that is not what this grant does. There is a section, Section 11.11 of the contract called compliance of laws, rules, and regulations, and it is understood that all the parties will comply with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations in the performance of their duties and responsibilities under this contract. So, I would say that if the Convention were to occur tomorrow based on the stay at home orders and the prohibitions against mass gatherings it would not be lawful for the parties to go forward with the Convention at this time. But we are not in a position tonight to be able to determine precisely what the conditions are going to be at the end of August.

Another question was what happens if the City declines the grant?. If we decline the grant, we would need to identify another source of funds to perform our duties and obligations under the contract. It would not relieve our obligations under the contract, so the gist is that if you decline the grant that doesn't mean that the Convention won't happen, and if we don't identify another source of funds, it could be viewed an anticipatory breach of contract by one or more of the partners to the contract. The last question was will COVID-19 be factored into the RNC planning and I know that it already has. I am speaking more from the legal perspective that we have had conversations with Council from the RNC about developing a Plan B or even Plan C depending on how this all plays out. I know the Administration is working with our partners as well as it relates to potential alternatives to the planned Convention that was

anticipated when the contract was put out. Happy to answer any questions that you have.

Mayor Lyles said again, we are joined by Chief Putney, Assistant City Manager Charles, and the City Manager.

Councilmember Mitchell said City Manager; I will try to be very brief, just one question for you and one question the Chief of Police. City Manager; in the event, we do not pass this tonight have you identified Plan B of \$50,000,000 out of our budget?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said Mr. Mitchell; I have not identified \$50,000,000. We would have to turn this thing upside down, but that is where we would be at this point.

Mr. Mitchell said Chief; in the write-up you said that we start incurring costs October 1, 2019; do you have a year to date expenses that we have already incurred as it relates to the RNC?

Mr. Jones said Mr. Mitchell; what I want to do is frame this the same way that we handled the 2012 DNC (Democratic National Convention). The 2012 DNC, the grant was more or less opened in the fall of 2011 and you approved the receiving of the \$50,000,000 in April 2012. So, much like the DNC you have given me the authority to make certain purchases and we started those in November of 2019 and the grant is being voted on tonight. The biggest purchase so far has been insurance and that is something we had to do. So, the insurance has been the largest purchase up to this point.

Councilmember Johnson said if the largest purchase has been insurance, Mr. Jones, that is for a policy that is effective those dates of the Convention, right?

Mr. Jones said it would cover us through the Convention, yes.

Ms. Johnson said so this is what liability insurance; what type of insurance policy have we had to purchase for the event I guess is the question?

Mr. Jones said I will turn it over to the Chief and Angela, but this is what we needed to do, to begin with and I will tell you that the insurance is in and of itself about \$9 million associated with having the event.

Ms. Johnson said okay, I was thinking it was just for those posed dates, but it sounds like this is something that we needed to have to start in October, right?

Chief Putney, Charlotte Mecklenburg Police said you had to secure it prior to the event, yes ma'am.

Ms. Johnson said is the insurance just for those specific dates or was there some type of error and omission or liability insurance that we had to have from October through August? Is the policy effective now, I guess is the question?

Mr. Jones said yes Ms. Johnson. So, the insurance had to be paid in advance because it does cover the RNC event.

Ms. Johnson said is deferring this vote until we have more certainty regarding the lifting of the stay at home order; is it possible to defer the vote until we are at least into Phase 1 of lifting the stay at home order because right now, what the Attorney said, if the RNC took place today we could not have it based on current laws. But, as of today we are still under a stay at home order, so is it possible to defer this until we have more information and can make a more educated vote?

Mr. Jones said I will start off and then I'll turn it over to the City Attorney. In anticipation of this question tonight, I did have a conversation with the County Manager because there was a question or a request whether or Gibbie Harris would come tonight and talk

a bit about this. As we discussed it, it is not that someone can tell us tonight what the conditions will be in late August or what the conditions will be in mid-July or even mid-June. So, the question of delaying the vote, my understanding is that we have been given a timeline in which this vote has to take place, and this was the last Business Meeting before that timeline expired, if that is my correct understanding.

Mr. Baker said I would concur with that. We do need to acknowledge the acceptance of this grant. If we are going to accept this money this has to occur, I think the expiration is May 6th, it simply needs to be executed by the Mayor at that time.

Councilmember Winston said my first question is for the Mayor. We learned over the past few weeks that the County is not able to limit public gatherings in cities; the Mayor has to agree to certain things to exit order from the Governor. When would you be comfortable or what conditions would we have to have in the City of Charlotte for you to be comfortable not to call a ban on a large public gathering given our current public health crisis?

Mayor Lyles said that is a great question because I think we are having that debate right now with six other Mayors in this County, and what my position has always been, is that we are going to follow the guidance of our Public Health Director and the two hospitals that are actually responsible for that. So, when they say that we need to do something that is the way that I would see action being taken. Of course, there are other Mayors in this County that don't necessarily agree with me and that debate is taking place now so, it won't be just the question of the Republican Contention, it may be a question before us in the next several weeks.

Mr. Winston said Mr. Manager and Mr. Baker; are these the only funds that are being allocated for public safety spends? Is the Host Committee responsible for any money that gets spent on public safety?

Mr. Jones said if I understand your question Mr. Winston, the concept behind the grant was such that the grant would cover the public safety elements of having the RNC and it has been our goal all along to make sure that we utilize the grant to its fullest to cover those costs, and I believe we submitted a budget back in January that would have provided us with a number of items that would be funded by the grant and not the General Fund if that is what your question is.

Mr. Winston said my question is, is the Host Committee responsible for any public safety spend and can any of their money be applied to public safety spends?

Mr. Jones said I will start off and then if I go off the rail Patrick will bring me back in. We did have a provision or we do have a provision in this agreement that if we had certain items that were related to public safety for the RNC that went over and above the \$50 million and there weren't items per se that we kept here in the City of Charlotte, that there would be a provision that the Host Committee would cover those costs over and above those costs that don't relate to items that we would keep here in Charlotte.

Mr. Baker said that is correct; they are officially entitled "additional costs" and that is a conversation that the City and the Host Committee would have when it appears that we are going to go over that \$50 million, but it is for these security costs that are contemplated to be the City's obligations. Generally speaking, the Host Committee is not fundraising for the purposes of providing security, but it is possible that they could be tagged with additional costs related to security if we need to go over the \$50 million.

Mr. Winston said Chief Putney; are there any public health officials that are a part of the RNC planning process?

Chief Putney said yes, especially given where we are now, they are always a part of the conversation in consultation, and as you know the EOC, they are a part of the Emergency Operations Center, which is also a part of the planning process for the

RNC. So, yes, they would always be consulted, especially if we are still in the pandemic come August.

Mr. Winston said can you give us some insight into what that consultation has been in terms of planning for a 50,000-person event in four months by public health officials in that planning process?

Chief Putney said it has not been about the planning for the RNC in particular; it has been about us navigating the pandemic currently, and again if it continues into August those conversations would continue. Right now, what is around us enforcing the order in particular, and making the adjustments as they adjust the order, and that will continue as well right up into the Convention if the pandemic continues through the month of August.

Mr. Winston said Mr. Baker; as I understand the contract the only way that the City or the state of the County can compel a traditional, physical Convention from not happening in its current form is if that Governor's order gets extended through the duration of said event, in this case, the RNC. Is that correct?

Mr. Baker said yes if the Governor's order prevents a mass gathering from occurring in the State of North Carolina and you are talking about a mass gathering of 50,000 people or 10,000 people or whatever the number is, then I would believe based on that hypothetical that that would not be able to comply with the laws of the State of North Carolina if that was in place. That is why I used the hypothetical of if the RNC was supposed to start tomorrow we simply could not have that under the clause, nor could any of the parties force another party to proceed with its obligations in contravention with the law.

Mr. Winston said so, hypothetically given the way our recent history has been going the stay at home orders and the emergency declarations have really been reassessed on a two-week basis and extended from there. So, should we be under the hypothetical situation that we won't get any guidance from the Governor's Office or the Department of Health and Human Services, probably not until about two weeks before the Convention is supposed to start?

Mr. Baker said that it is a little bit beyond my level of expertise in terms of that consultation, but that is something with our health care partners would be discussing as we went forward. There are some timelines where things have to happen well in advance of the two weeks before the Convention. For instance, they need to get access to the Spectrum Center; that starts unlimited access July 17th and the Convention Center is August 3rd, and if they can't proceed with construction activity or if we get another spike in our numbers where there is no reason to believe that the mass gathering prohibition will be changed, that is something that all the partners of the contract have to be cognizant of as we go forward.

Mr. Winston said since construction is considered an essential service under this stay at home order why would you believe; I heard you insinuate that we might revisit on July 17th the ability to stop construction in the Arena. My understanding is since construction is an essential industry and job and we are contractually obligated to give them the Arena, what legal ground would we have to stop that from happening if we are as expected, under this global pandemic?

Mr. Baker said it is a challenge to answer that question given the potential hypotheticals that occur. There is fundraising going on and obviously, and again, I'm just throwing out, if there is a spike in the number of deaths and folks getting the virus or somehow it is kicking back up again. Keep in mind the Host Committee has raised a good bit of money as well, and if it appears that money is being spent for an event that has no chance of occurring then the parties may make some changes to that regardless of the construction piece of it. These are factored that as we continue on getting closer to the event that the parties will be taken into account. I didn't mean to suggest that the

construction was a trigger point. It is what are constructing for and those are going to be the considerations among many other considerations going forward.

Mr. Winston said Chief Putney; are we currently planning on a traditional Convention for approximately 50,000 people to come to our City in August?

Chief Putney said absolutely. That is the primary and priority in the planning right now is for a genuine Convention that would be full scale, yes.

Mr. Winston said Mr. Manager; do you know the status or the percentage of the ability to stand up a regimented testing and contact tracing program in Mecklenburg County as well as the United States?

Mr. Jones said no I don't. That would be something that we would discuss with Gibbie Harris.

Mr. Winston said do you know the status and the percentage in terms of the ability for us to stand up a process that separates the affected people from non-affected people or sick people from non-sick people?

Mr. Jones said that I could not answer.

Mr. Winston said do you the status percentage-wise of the progress that we are on for a vaccine for COVID-19?

Mr. Jones said I do not.

Mr. Winston said do we have a status on the ability to set up a plan for a traditional Convention that employs social distancing rules?

Mr. Jones said I would say Mr. Winston; that is something as the City Attorney had said earlier, as this evolves absolutely, we would have to understand how this could morph into something different than what we are planning for today.

Mr. Winston said so in terms of making plans a traditional Convention with social distancing rules read, you are zero percent in creating that plan? Is that correct?

Mr. Jones said it is the exact opposite of what I just said. What I said is that we would have to continue to look at something as this potentially morphs into something different than what it is today.

Mr. Winston said thank you for allowing me to ask my questions, and just to the constituents out there, I will be voting no on this. I think tens of thousands of people in this country and countries around the world have lost their lives because governments resisted from speaking matter of factly as far in advance as possible to this virus. I think we have to be honest with our constituents; we will not be having mass gatherings of any sort whether they be political, whether they be entertainment-wise in late summer and for the foreseeable future. In order to do that we have to have a regimented program of testing, contact tracing as well as the ability to separate affected people from uninfected people. We have to get a vaccine, and we have to be able to socially distance. We are nowhere near that; unfortunately, we have wasted a lot of time to do that so, I make this decision, and not from a political standpoint. I would like to speak to the City of Charlotte, to the City of Milwaukee, to the DNC, to the RNC, to both Host Committees and to everybody involved. We need to stop this charade right now. We should not tell our City staff or CMPD to use our resources to plan for something that we know that it is not going to happen. And for democracy sake we all need to come together to figure out how to make virtual conventions work. The Republican National Committee as far as I am concerned is welcome to come to Charlotte to figure out how to make that happen, but it is ridiculous for us to not make a statement, to be honest. I hope that we can leave this meeting tonight and figure out for democracy's sake how to make this work, but it sends a bad message to everybody that we are supposed to

make decisions in mind to do this. You know our number one responsibility of a government is to ensure public safety, and as anybody that knows me knows that I look for alternative methods from traditional policing to do that. I think we can make a bold statement for public safety tonight to say let's drop the charade, we will not have mass gatherings in August, and we have to figure out a better way to do this.

Councilmember Ajmera said I have a couple of questions; first, if there is a virtual Convention would the City need a \$50 million grant?

Mr. Jones said I'm going to take another shot at what Mr. Baker said earlier. So, what the City did back in July of 2018 was, vote to have the RNC here, and tonight what is before you is the opportunity to get a grant that will pay for the security associated with it. If the Council chooses not to receive the grant we still are obligated to have the Convention, whether it is 50,000 people or whether it is virtual. Whatever the costs associated with either the 50,000 people or potential virtual Convention would be paid for by the grant. But if you don't have the grant you don't have the capacity to pay for either a 50,000-person event or something significantly less.

Ms. Ajmera said so this grant allows us to pay for safety; can this grant be used for securing PPEs for all our employees?

Mr. Jones said no.

Ms. Ajmera said if there is an outbreak of COVID-19 as folks are coming for this Convention, can this grant be used for addressing any outbreak if there is any?

Mr. Jones said Ms. Ajmera; I want to take one step back; when you said all employees and I quickly said no. So, what I would do is trust Chief Putney who has actually put one of these on once before to make sure the grant is utilized in the correct way as it relates to safety. That is what he would do with his very established team to work through this.

Ms. Ajmera said this question is for Chief Putney; do you anticipate using this grant for PPEs for Police Officers?

Chief Putney said it is hard to say what we will be doing in August when right now, we have sufficient PPE to protect our people. We just got a huge supply through Honeywell, a local partner, so we can sustain this for months to come. So, I'm not concerned about the PPE as far as needing to provide it for our people; that has been done here locally already. What happens in August we will prepare for as we move forward and if additional is needed at that point I think we have the resources to do so absent a grant because right now, we don't have an RNC, but we do have the need for PPE which is why we in partnership locally have provided for our people. That is not going to change regardless of what happens in August.

Ms. Ajmera said currently the PPEs are enough for our Police Officers, but I understand that we are going to need more Police force for this Convention if there are 50,000 visitors that are coming into our City. Would we need more PPEs, and can this grant be used for that in the event we do need PPEs?

Chief Putney said the grant can be used for any of the public safety charges and if we needed PPE in August during the RNC we could specifically buy it for people who are here to provide public safety at that time.

Ms. Ajmera said thank you Chief; that answers my question. I had asked another question about the outbreak. We have seen what has happened in New Orleans with the Marti Gras Festival where it quickly became a hot spot because of the heavy visitors in the City. Would insurance or would grant cover if there is an outbreak of COVID-19?

Mr. Baker said Ms. Ajmera; I would have to look into the specific language of the insurance, but I don't know that the insurance policy would. When you say cover the outbreak, I'm not sure what that actually means.

Ms. Ajmera said let me clarify. For example, if there is an outbreak of COVID-19 and if our hospitals are over capacity would insurance cover the cost of additional capacity if needed and also, I understand that currently, the testing is free, but treatment is not free so, would insurance cover if any folks that are attending the Convention and are being affected by COVID-19, would their treatment be covered if they don't have insurance?

Mr. Baker said I do understand your question now; thank you, and I would need to speak with our Risk Management folks. They are the ones that actually procure the insurance, to determine the answer to that question unless someone else knows it.

Councilmember Newton said I don't know if I have a question, I think a lot of great questions have already been asked, and I'm sure more great questions are going to be asked. I just can't help but reflect on the contract. Hine sight is always 2020, but maybe it is about time that we went back to the drawing board on this. We know we are in a new world here, a new paradigm. We don't want to be the epicenter of the next outbreak, we don't want to offer up our City as a petri dish. We don't want to be Marti Gras, we don't want to be New Orleans, we don't want to be Miami after South Beach. I do have major concerns and questions pertaining to this grant. I don't know given the scope of the task at hand here knowing that we are going to need so many more things than we ever contemplated before. I've heard PPE; I think I'm hearing containment, ensuring social distancing all of which I think are not just hills to climb, we are talking about the equivalent of Mount Everest here for us to be prepared. I just wanted to make those comments and I'm hearing all of the questions and I'm waiting to hear the comments and questions from my other colleagues.

Councilmember Eiselt said as one of the Councilmembers that was on the Council when we voted for this, my concern at the time was safety. I supported the Convention because I felt that if we want to say that we are an inclusive City then we have to be welcoming, and you can debate whether that is fair or not, but that was my vote. However, my conditions for the acceptance of this responsibility was that we would have a clause in there that said if Congress did not appropriate the \$50 million security grant that the City of Charlotte could back out of this because we should not have to take the responsibility to secure our City against whatever could happen. We know this is a different Convention than most, and so they included that in the contract. This is the continuation of that essentially it is to say we are not going to pay for the security of this convention and we at this point now where, as I am hearing Mr. Baker say, tonight is not an opportunity to back out of the Convention. Tonight, is an opportunity, and I think the Manager called it an opportunity, I see this as a responsibility to the City. We have a physical responsibility to the City that if this thing comes here in some form that we shouldn't have to pay to keep our City safe and to keep our first responders safe and for all of the security needs that come with it. I'm hearing that we have a deadline to do that, is that correct Mr. Manager that we have a deadline to accept this security grant?

Mr. Jones said yes.

Ms. Eiselt said and that is May 6th, did you say?

Mr. Jones said yes.

Ms. Eiselt said so, if we don't accept that May 6th essentially, we could be forced to have this Convention if nothing else changed, the dates didn't change or whatever, and we would be on the hook to pay for it. Is that correct?

Mr. Jones said that is correct.

Ms. Eiselt said given that I just feel it would be really dangerous, especially when we know we are going to take a hit to our budget because of COVID-19, to then say we are on the hook for tens of millions of dollars for this Convention. That is my first point. My second point is if we are talking about the safety of people and the health and wellbeing of people and social distancing should we not then be talking about every convention

that is on the books that are coming to Charlotte? The estimates that there is a vaccine in 12 to 18-months and if somebody doesn't want to have a convention here until we have a vaccine then we've got to treat every convention the same, and we've got to think about every gathering that we have booked to bring to Charlotte. I think we've got to be fair about this; we cannot like the convention, okay I'm in that camp too, but it is a convention and if we are going to say that for one convention then we've got to be fair to every other convention and treat it the same way. I guess those are the only two comments I have, but I would implore my colleagues to understand the financial risk that is at stake here should we decide not to vote on this prior to May 6th and accept this grant.

Councilmember Egleston said similar sentiments to Ms. Eiselt, but I think there is a bit of false premise in a lot of the questions that have been asked to this point which is that a no vote tonight does not cancel the Convention. A no vote tonight or even whether the answer to some of those questions about what the grant can and can't pay for, the answer to those questions is a bit irrelevant because it is going to get paid for one way or another if it is necessary that we spend money on those things. The question that is being asked tonight is if we have financial obligations to host this Convention in whatever form and shape it takes, and I concur with Mr. Winston that it will likely, this and the DNC in Milwaukee will likely look very different than any convention that has ever taken place, certainly very different from the Convention we hosted here in 2012. But whatever form and fashion it does take place, if any costs are incurred for the RNC to take place, even if it just 100 people here in Charlotte, the no vote tonight essentially says we'd rather pay for those costs with local taxpayer dollars than with federal dollars. That is what we are voting on tonight, so I agree with Ms. Eiselt that in a year when we know we are going to have significant revenue shortfalls because of this virus, there will come a time when the decision will have to be made, can the Convention be held, and if so in what fashion. That decision will be made by Roy Cooper, it will be made by Mandy Cohen and it will be made by Gibbie Harris, and I have the faith in them that they will make a decision based on data and based on what is best for the public health interest. If this decision were being made by the President or the Head of the Republican National Committee, obviously, they might have other motivations. Again, for Mr. Winston's point the DNC should be included in this conversation too. It is being made by people whose best interests are in the people of Charlotte and the people of Mecklenburg County and North Carolina. But, when they make that decision we've got to be as prepared as possible to do this in whatever form or fashion it takes place, and we need to be doing it with federal dollars, not trying to dig into a budget that is already going to be very short of where we hoped it would be on the revenue side. So, a no vote tonight does not cancel the Convention, it does not somehow advocate us of our financial responsibilities here, it in fact only puts us further on the hook with our own dollars to pay for the same things that we could have paid for with federal dollars.

Councilmember Graham said right from the very beginning this Republic National Convention was not going to be an ordinary Convention, certainly not like we had with the DNC based on who is coming. The President, who is also the head of the RNC, the goals put out the same, my public position on the Convention is well known. If I were a member of Council when the vote was taken, and which I was not, I would have voted no. I don't think the head of the RNC shares the same values we have in our community in terms of diversity, inclusion, honesty, integrity, and I can go on and on why we should have said no, even if there was another corporation looking to relocate to Charlotte. Those things have the values, we should say no to that as well. I made a commitment to some of my friends on the other side of the aisle that I would support moving forward with the Convention from a business perspective because the decision was already made. It was not made by me, it was made by a previous Council; I disagree with that decisions, but I think there is a fiduciary responsibility to move forward with supplying the necessary means and methods to make sure that it is a success.

I don't have any questions, I kind of asked all my questions earlier in the week when I talked to John Lassiter, who is the Chairman of the Local Organizing Committee for the RNC. I spoke with Tom Murray at our Convention and Visitor's Center, the Manager, the Mayor, and others about, not only the RNC specifically, but I think Ms. Eiselt hit it right

on the head. All the other conventions that are coming to our City, and I have a listing in front of me for the month of July, August, and September there are 19 events. Obviously, the RNC is by far the largest, but there are some events that will be bringing 15,000 folks, the RNC is expecting for the Convention Center itself 25,000, 3,000, 7,500 so there are a number of other events all coming to our community within the next 45-60 days that I think we all should be really concerned about. On the one hand we want to embrace them, we want them to come because the business opportunity for our hotels, restaurants, and those individuals wanting to get back to work is real, and we need to do that. But there is also a real public health concern that we should be all worried about because there is no testing, there is no tracking and there is no tracing and from Washington there is no truth-telling about where we are with this virus. So, I think locally that we have to be really, really concerned. In the life of a City four-years is not a long time. Certainly, three-months is a sprint and so, I think it is really appropriate that Councilmembers are asking the appropriate questions in terms of what is going to happen within the next 90-days as we do some forward-thinking and planning for our community. It is just not about the RNC, it is about all the other events and all the ensues along the way, the folks at the Airport, the baggage handlers, the Uber driver, the taxi driver, those working in our hotels, motels, the Arena, the Convention Center. Unless there is a plan in place that talks about conventions in general and specifically the RNC then I'm very, very uncomfortable. I know from deducting reasoning there will be 50,000 folks coming to the RNC in Charlotte in August, and if they do come then we really ought to be concerned because again, there is no testing, no tracking, there is no tracing and that is a large number of people who will come and leave and within 14-days I guess we can find out the impact it will have on our community.

So, I'm going to vote yes because I want to be consistent with again the business case of the Convention, but Mayor and Manager and Council, I think there are a number of unanswered questions that we really have to get the answer to relatively soon about conventions in general and specifically the scale and the scope of the RNC, who not only can we protect our citizens from the public safety perspective, and that is what the grant is all about, but also from a public health perspective, those who will be directly interfacing with our Conventioneers from all over the country and with the RNC all over the world if you take the organizers word as truth that there will be 50,000 folks and 7,500 volunteers, I don't think that is going to happen, but that is what they are saying. So, if we take them at their word, that is problematic on a number of fronts in terms of how do we protect the public health once the Convention comes and leaves?

I hope that after this conversation that there really can be a broader conversation like Ms. Eiselt indicated in terms of working with Tom Murray and the folks at the Convention and Visitor's Bureau in terms of where do we go from here over the next 90-days in terms of ensuring that if these conventions do come to our community that there are some public standards that will be determined by the Health Director and the Governor and those executive orders, but certainly we need to make sure that we balance trying to get those revenues for our City against the public health of the community as a whole and those front line workers that will be servicing of the conventioneers. So, I will vote yes tonight, and I'll hold my nose in reference to the RNC specifically, but in general I think from a business and convention perspective that we've got a lot of work to do. I'm looking at this sheet again with 19 events, we need the economic impact, but certainly, we need to make sure that every step along the way that there is some safety involved with those who are involved and processing the attendees and the general health of the City as a whole as we invite tens of thousands of people into our community from all over the world, and I'm talking specifically about the RNC which I think without this reasoning suggest that it will take a different form or should take a different form because while we are not fortune tellers in terms of what this virus is doing, I think we all can agree that we are in a marathon, not a sprint and that this virus will still be around in July and August and September. We need to acknowledge that and make preparations to plan for that.

Councilmember Bokhari said this is about as simple as the topic gets; we can either accept the federal security grant that is provided to us for hosting the RNC or we can vote it down tonight and figure out where to find \$50 million in our General Fund to fulfill

our contractual obligation. Here is the critical point; every member of the Charlotte community right now needs to understand and know, this is not the decision point for having the RNC in Charlotte or if it is going to look like the one in 2012 or something very different. Regardless of what some folks here might have you think with their comments, so instead of wasting time imaging what the City is going to look like in four-months when there is going to be dozens of stakeholders and experts and others that are going to help us make that decision, how about we spend this time focusing on what thousands of our small businesses in our own backyard are going through today, which is an unprecedented extinction of that. I bet they would prefer we would be using our time in a different way.

Councilmember Watlington said I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Bokhari in regard to using our time on something that is a bit more pressing. Frankly, I feel like we are having this discussion prematurely and I feel like we've been given a false choice in the sense that we could have been having this discussion many months ago. Not to be a Monday morning quarterback, but when you think about having this discussion now and saying it is just about the fiscal piece, that to me is not seeing the forest for the trees. If we are going to talk about a fiscal piece when are we going to talk about the greater issue at hand? So, I won't rehash everything that many of my colleagues have already said, but I don't like that we are in a position right now to make a financial decision and completely ignore public health [inaudible] That is officially what you are saying here when you can list all of the reasons why we should not do this and then vote yes for the sake of fiscal responsibility or under the guise of fiscal responsibility. When I think about the position that we are in as Council, frankly, I feel like it is incumbent upon the Host Committee to come to the table with a plan and until we have that kind of plan as to what we can do as contingency piece, we shouldn't even be discussing this thing.

The point on the table, we've got to hurry up and figure this out. I think we are already in the wrong position. That being said what I would like to see is data to understand what are the additional costs over and above what we would think in the \$50 million? That is part of the contract and some have already said that really is the game-changer here. If the question becomes over and above the \$50 million how much more money do we need to ensure public safety which would be encumbered by the Host Committee? We need to know if they can even go and raise that money because if they can't then this isn't even a conversation. Or, if they can and they chose not to, again, this isn't even a conversation.

I did read through the contract and I know that I've spoken with you Mr. Baker about this already, but frankly, I'm uncomfortable with all of the presumptions that went into the contract in regard to assuming that the City has to pay for this, but also assuming we are going to get a grant and assuming it is going to be \$50 million. I think there are too many things that were written into the contract under assumptions that were not expressly stated. At this point, I think it would be irresponsible to continue spending any money in this environment considering we don't have any contingency plan because everything that we are spending at this point is on the assumption that we are going to have a Convention that we know has very little probability of actually occurring. I think that is being irresponsible whether it is local dollars or federal dollars. I'd be interested in understanding what specific activities are on the critical path and how much time would we really have to have a conversation. I would be more inclined to have a discussion with our federal government representative, we understand we've got a timeline, is it arbitrary, what does it link to, what are our real choices there? I don't think we've done due diligence to really understand how we can impact that situation. We are just trying [inaudible] is how I feel about the situation.

I would also like to understand what are the damages to each party if we did get into a situation where we no longer that this would be safe in a situation where it is no longer illegal to have mass gatherings, but we don't feel it is in the best interest of the safety of our constituents? I think that is a conversation we need to be prepared to have. When we think about what is the current executive order and the timeline to reopening North Carolina, we are talking about nine-weeks from now? Is that too late to have any kind of contingency plan before the Convention at that point? I think so, but I don't think that we

should continue going forward and waiting to see assuming that it is going to happen. In a perfect circumstance I would like to enter a substitute motion to accept the money, but, take no significant fiscal or procurement actions until those answers are had. I don't know that that will have support.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Watlington I really could get the questions; I know you were talking at Ms. Watlington's speed, which we have talked about that before. I really couldn't get the questions, I hope that you have a list of them.

Ms. Watlington said I will go back to my questions and many of them I've already given to Mr. Baker and he has answered some of them. From an MWSBE standpoint, and I think it is in the attachments of this meeting. I would like to see the status of this, the CBI goal. I noticed there was a difference between the Union's language and the obligation to have a reasonable effort to execute contracts with MWSBE (Minority, Women, Small Business Enterprise). I found that a little bit interesting that there seems to be a harder commitment to go with Union contracts. We got the support, but not with MWSBE.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Watlington; on the MWSBE are you meaning the Host Committee or the City's because the City's program [inaudible] because the Host Committee has an MWSBE Plan and it on their website. I just wasn't sure you were referring to, both?

Ms. Watlington said no, I'm talking specifically about the Host Committee and I'm talking about the language that was in the contract, in regard to reasonable effort. I would like to see the status against that plan in regard to their goal so we can take a look at that. The other thing as we talk about refundable costs, and I think this may be what Ms. Johnson was trying to get at when she talked about the insurance policy, was it already in effect, or is it something that goes into effect only for the time period of the Convention. The question would then be because I saw in the contract that the City was supposed to take every effort to include in all of the contracts prior to a corporation the ability to cancel without any harm or without any loss. Basically, a get out of jail free card, so I would like to know whether or not the current contracts that we have executed include that clause just as we think about trying to quantify the damages.

The other piece I saw in the contract was that while the Host Committee has agreed to allow the City of Charlotte to proceed with the security grant, it appears that there is another way to modify or get out of this contract where it does not require a breach and that is all parties can reassign the security grant to another city. That is absolutely another option and I would like to understand if that discussion has been had given the landscape.

Mayor Lyles said to another city or another party?

Ms. Watlington said another city, yes.

Mayor Lyles said they are not going to go to another city.

Mr. Baker said there have been no discussions around to that effect.

Ms. Watlington said that is my question; have there been any discussions about reassigning to another city and a state where there is not mass –

Mr. Baker said that conversation has not occurred.

Mayor Lyles said and it is not going to.

Ms. Watlington said I would like to understand if there was a situation in which the Convention could not happen what are the losses to date on all party size, just again about quantifying the losses because my question there is about the order of magnitude. We are talking about \$50 million in terms of security grant and again, it sounds like about \$9 million to date. I'm just curious as to what other obligations that the

other parties have encumbered to date. Just trying again, to understand exactly what the situation is that we are given just now. Finally, my other question is what are the critical path activities? So, in the event that we accepted the money, but would like to get these things flushed out before we started spending any more money or making any other procurements, what is the critical path? Do we need to execute within nine months? I understand that the insurance piece looks like it requires up to having insurance by May 24th, so I get that we bought it in advance, but it appears that we only had to have it three months in advance. That being said, to Ms. Ajmera's point do we need additional insurance? That is another question I have in regard to this and will we be able to get it by May 24th given the current pandemic conditions, and if we can't get anybody to cover us for that where does that leave us in terms of the contracts? Those are my questions.

Mayor Lyles said do you want to ask that of all conventions or just the RNC Contention?

Ms. Watlington said I think we can start here.

Mr. Jones said Ms. Watlington; I will try to encompass the questions you have and give you a little bit of a timeline that may help a little bit. If we go back to July of 2018 when this was approved and using the DNC in 2012 as the example, there is this expectation that certain things would start to be procured when the grant period opens up which is in that fall timeframe, September, October. A little bit about the liability insurance; Cleveland, who hosted the Convention in 2016 spent about \$9.5 million on insurance and this liability insurance that we have is really for private property. I think the other thing that is important is I don't want you to think that we actually have rushed this on. We didn't get the notice until March 23rd and basically you have 45-days to accept the grant. I mentioned on April 13th meeting I believe in my memo that we would ask you to vote on the grant on the 27th, so we were always under the assumption that we had to get this done by the end of April because that was a Business Meeting.

Ms. Watlington said I appreciate that, but I think to your point, the grant opened in October we started to see [inaudible] of COVID around January or February timeframe globally, so I'm not saying that you didn't make any effort; what I am saying is that I think to say now that we have to do this or we have to do that, I feel like or what I was trying to articulate is that we've created a situation of urgency [inaudible].

Mr. Jones said all I would suggest is that definitely not my recommendation, but you don't have to receive this grant, but we are still on the hook to have the event in some form or fashion whether it is virtual or whether it is something larger than that. I do know that some of the things that are required need a lead time, so in other words, if you are purchasing vehicles or equipment you can't do that in August. So, if we just stopped making purchases right now, no matter what the event would be and what fashion I think that would cause a problem, and Chief; if I am wrong just let me know.

Ms. Watlington said that is what I want to know. Intuitively, it sounds like you believe that, but what we don't know is what the actual lead times are. If that means we really got to understand more in-depth within the next two-weeks whether that is what it is. I would just like to see more detail in regard to what is on the critical path versus I don't want to say assuming, but presuming that we don't have any time to take a step back and really [inaudible]

Mr. Jones said the last thing I would say that using 2012 as the example, the resources that we need in terms of officers, that is really going to drive a lot of the cost that is related to this and as the Chief is saying, that is the main costs, and as we move forward how many we need would be dependent upon the Chief and his professional opinion and the scale of it. So, if you start to think about this with that being such a big driver and not necessarily the lead time as a truck, but that is some flexibility in how we work through this. Did I get that right Chief?

Chief Putney said yes sir.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Baker will get you some of the contractual questions addressed and I think the Chief and the Manager have addressed what they could tonight.

Councilmember Driggs said I wanted to say first, I think it is pretty obvious to everybody that there is a good chance that the Convention is going to have to be modified or possibly even canceled, so I think it is gratuitous to suggest there is an honesty issue here. We are all very upfront about it, we know what is going on and the Republican Party itself has made it very clear that they intend to comply with all applicable regulations and directives and in fact, they have no interest in trying to host a Convention that is not entirely safe, and I expect full cooperation from them on that. I think it was bound to happen that any agenda item that mentioned the Convention was going to give rise to a lot of discussion on Council and particularly in the context of the virus. But, a lot of what has been talked about tonight is outside of the scope of the particular agenda item that we have before us. It is really a very simple question so, Mr. Attorney can I just ask you to clarify again; does our acceptance of this grant place any additional burden upon us that is not already there as a result of the contracts we've entered into with the Republican Party?

Mr. Baker said no it does not.

Mr. Driggs said and would our denial of this grant in any way relieve us of any obligations that we have as a result of our contracts with the Republican Party?

Mr. Baker said no it would not.

Mr. Driggs said so, we have a very simple question here and that is that we have a grant that reimburses us if and when we incur any costs related to security at a Convention, whatever shape it might take. That is the question. If we incur these costs we can be reimbursed by the federal government or we can vote tonight not to. I think the idea that anybody would seriously entertain the thought of cutting off our noses to spite our face by turning this down is just unthinkable. I do understand a lot of the controversy and the emotion around the Convention etc., but to suggest that we might contemplate not accepting this grant is just beyond reason. So, I'm very hopeful that the great majority of us will get together and accept this grant and then go back to addressing a lot of the very valid questions that have been raised tonight in the proper form.

Mayor Lyles said that was the last Councilmember to be recognized and everyone has had a chance to speak. There was a motion by Mr. Bokhari and a second by Mr. Mitchell and hearing that everyone has had an opportunity to speak I'm going to call for a vote.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Bokhari, Driggs, Egleston, Eiselt, Graham, and Mitchell.

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Johnson, Newton, Watlington, and Winston.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 4.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 9: ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION, AND RESELL OF HOMEOWNERSHIP PROGRAM CONTRACTS

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Graham, to (A) Approve contracts in the amount of \$750,000 each for Single-family Acquisition, Rehabilitation, and Resell for Homeownership Programs for an initial term of one year to the following: Habitat for Humanity of the Charlotte Region, Red Cedar/Urban Trends, 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.

Councilmember Graham said I am pleased tonight that we have an opportunity to approve contracts for the acquisition, rehabilitation, and resell of the homeownership program. This program is consistent with the Council's approved policy framework that allows us to work with two of our affordable housing partners to preserve existing single-family homes and create affordable homeownership. This is a new program with a goal of acquiring, rehabilitating, and reselling 12 homes to create affordable homeownership and I hope the Council will pass it and move it forward.

Councilmember Winston said I love this, and I hope to give the new market pressures which are probably going to see some downward pressure on the price of homes that we form as aggressive as the game plan here to acquire, rehabilitate and resell homes. If there is a chance to expand it, I believe that this was a pilot or this was a pilot that is being expanded but this is going to be extremely important in the short to mid-term to try and stabilize our most home insecure folks. So, any place where we can add to this let's do it.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 10: AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT REQUESTS

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Graham, to (A) Approve \$18,918,600 in Housing Trust Fund and Naturally Occurring Affordable housing Fund allocations for the following multifamily rental affordable housing developments: Connelly Creek Apartments, \$1,965,600, in Council District 3, Dillehay Courts Phase I, \$2,000,000, in Council District 1, Evoke Living at Arrowood, \$2,000,000, in Council District 3, Johnson Oehler Seniors, \$2,000,000, in Council District 4, Mineral Springs Commons, \$803,000, in Council District 4, Vibrant Eastway Park, \$2,000,000, in Council District 1, The Park Seniors Apartments, \$1,950,000, in Council District 2, Statesville Avenue Shelter, \$800,000, in Council District 1, Windsor Park, \$1,400,000 (Housing Trust Fund) and \$4,000,000 (Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing), in Council District 1, and (B) Authorize the City Manager and staff to continue working with the developer for the New Brookhill development and Local Initiatives Support Corporation to determine the viability of the proposed New Brookhill development.

Hannah-Marie Warfle, 1543 Tippah Park Court said I am speaking on behalf of the Homeless Services Network. I am a Social Worker at the Salvation Army Women's Shelter on Sprat Street, but we are right next to Statesville Avenue, and in this agenda item there is a request to approve \$800,000 for a new shelter building on Statesville Avenue for the Men's Shelter. The Men's Shelter has a location on North Tryon Street and they also have a location on Statesville Avenue. So, this would be allocating some money for a new building. With the new building at this location, the Shelter will be able to provide more shelter beds and the facility will be of much better quality, which is excellent for homeless residents of the Shelter. There will be safe and professional workspace for social workers which is not something that they have right now, not something they have very much of right now. When you put residents and social workers in the same space a lot more services become accessible to the clients, and this new building is going to be providing that kind of workspace for social workers. Beds at the current Statesville Avenue Shelter, but with this new building there will be

some more space and a few more beds does make a difference because even though it may not be solving all of the street population homeless issue right now, every person who gets one of those beds is really thankful for it and they also have safety, the dignity of living indoors and like I said before they have more access to services, which is excellent. The Statesville Avenue Shelter right now has beds put aside for medical that are called medical beds and they are set aside for medically fragile homeless individuals, so this is a very important service that the Shelter provides. Providing a new building would be an excellent way to continue this vital service of taking care of some of our more medically fragile services.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Warfle; we have a three-minute limit on this time. I think you certainly made your point, and so thank you very much for staying with us and watching this time. I want you to know how much we appreciate the Homeless Services Network and I also want to say in addition to the Statesville Avenue Shelter, we are also looking at the second project that I believe Ervin Ministries have on their agenda, which is the property that is going to have what we call Naturally Affordable Housing in Windsor Park. I have spoken with Kathy [inaudible] recently, and the third thing that they would like to have is another Moor Place, and we are looking at that to figure out how we can make some of that work. We really care deeply about our community and our residents and the City's support for the Capital fund and the services that you provide along with the County to make sure that we can house folks. We think that that partnership works well, if we can help you build and you can help people move in and move out, we really certainly appreciate it.

Ms. Warfle said thank you so much for that; we really appreciate that you care and I'm so glad that you are a partner to us because it is tough just in general, but when we have a partner it makes it a lot easier for us service providers like myself.

Councilmember Graham said I just want to make a comment about all the proposals. It is really a great package of proposals that is in front of the Council tonight including helping Charlotte's homeless residents, which we just got through talking about. This naturally preserving affordable housing, the construction of new affordable units all of which are greatly needed in our City now and as we go through this post-COVID-19 period. The staff and LISC did a great job in terms of evaluating all of the applications, but we still have an opportunity to work with Brookhill to try to get that over the finish line and at the end of the day there will be 1,055 new affordable housing units and 194 Shelter beds to the City's already existing affordable housing supply. I think we are moving in the right direction, and I'm really excited about this and I hope the Council will support it.

Councilmember Winston said I will be voting to support this, although as I have stated in the past, I still have a lot of concerns about how we are making our decisions, specifically around housing, given our new situations. For instance, our approach to affordable housing we have not adjusted when we should use common sense to understand because of what is happening to the job market our area medium income (AMI) will [inaudible] so, how do these deals really actually line up with our new realities? For instance, a 60% unit takes into consideration about a \$70,000 plus AMI. If those AMIs are going down how affordable will those rents actually be at the current structure? We know that in the best of times last year as we were dealing with our Contention Center and construction there, we knew that HVAC ((heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) companies were going out of business so that was driving construction costs up. We don't understand yet how the market is going to respond as it relates to small businesses and the ability to see some of these projects to fruition. We also have not adjusted our priorities on how we spend these dollars. While all of these are excellent projects, all in all, our most immediate need is supportive and transitional housing. We do deal with that in the Dillehay Courts Phase I, the Statesville Avenue Shelter and the Windsor Park deal, but again, I just don't know, given our new reality, this definitely lines up with the framework that we created many years ago, but I don't know if this is the wisest and most effective and efficient spend for our housing dollars in our current conditions.

Mayor Lyles said I want to say just a few things, and it is great because in 2018 when we talked about doing \$50 million for affordable housing a number of people on the Council questioned whether or not we had the ability. And then we built a framework and we had to really work hard to get partnerships and we did more in the private sector that matched and gave us opportunities that really aren't available in a number of communities, and now we've referred to our Committee that framework to say, as we talk about the Charlotte Recovery Efforts, how should we do housing and the things that Mr. Winston talked about adjustments for, it shows that we are ready to be flexible and nimble as we can. The thing that I want to say most importantly, is to the 69% of the Charlotte voters that supported the \$50 million. We couldn't have done this without you. You helped us lift up people that were homeless, people that were living on the edge, and the possibilities that you gave us and entrusted us to do I will forever be grateful for as Mayor.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 11: KNIGHT FOUNDATION GRANT: NORTH END SMART DISTRICT

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to (A) Authorize the City Manager to accept a grant from the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation for the North End Smart District, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9780-X appropriating \$60,000 from the Knight Foundation for the North End Smart District in the Neighborhood Grant Fund.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 5.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 12: AIRPORT 2020 BOND ANTICIPATION NOTES

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Graham, and carried unanimously to (A) Approve an initial finding resolution and authorize the Chief Financial Officer to make appropriate application to the Local Government Commission for issuance of revenue bond anticipation notes not to exceed \$300,000,000 and (B) Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing on May 11, 2020 for this financing as required by Internal Revenue Service regulations.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 521-524.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: CHARLOTTE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION FUNDING

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Watlington, and carried unanimously to (A) Accept Surface Transportation Block Grant-Direct Attributable funds in the amount of \$329,489 from the Federal Highway Administration for additional planning funds as identified in the Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization's annual Unified Planning Work Program, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9781-X appropriating \$329,489 to the General Grants Fund.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 6.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 14: MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT FOR THE IDLEWILD ROAD/MONROE ROAD INTERSECTION PROJECT

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Newton, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute a Municipal Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation to accept Surface Transportation Block Grant funds for the Idlewild Road/Monroe Road Intersection project, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9782-X appropriating \$4,240,000 from the North Carolina Department of Transportation for the Idlewild Road/Monroe Road Intersection project.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 525-525.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 7.

* * * * *

ITEM NO.15: MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT FOR THE I-85 NORTH BRIDGE PROJECT

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to negotiate and execute a Municipal Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation for the I-85 North Bridge project, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9783-X appropriating \$3,753,632 from the North Carolina Department of Transportation for the I-85 North Bridge project.

The resolution is recorded in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 526-526.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 8.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT FOR THE WEST MALLARD CREEK CHURCH ROAD MULTI-USE PATH PROJECT

Motion was made by Councilmember Watlington, seconded by Councilmember Egleston, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute a Municipal Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation to accept Surface Transportation Block Grant funds for the West Mallard Creek Church Road Multi-Use Path project, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9784-X appropriating \$600,000 from the North Carolina Department of Transportation for the West Mallard Creek Church Multi-Use Path project.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 50, at Page(s) 527-527E.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 9.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: APPROPRIATE PRIVATE DEVELOPER FUNDS

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to (A) Approve developer agreements with 100 West 3rd, LLC; 4100 Meadow Oak, LLC; Verdad Real Estate; and Arboretum Retail, LLC for traffic signal modifications, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9785-ZX appropriating \$82,240 in private developer funds for road modifications and traffic signal installations and improvements.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 10.

ITEM NO. 18: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL TOPICS

There were no Mayor and City Council Topics.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.



Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk, MMC, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 2 Hours, 42 Minutes
Minutes Completed: May 20, 2018