

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Strategy Session on Monday, June 7, 2021 at 5:07 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Pro-Tem Julie Eiselt presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Matt Newton, Greg Phipps, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston II.

**AUN:** Mayor Vi Lyles

\* \* \* \* \*

**Mayor Pro-Tem Julie Eiselt** welcomed everyone to June 7, 2021, City Council Strategy Session. I will mention that Mayor Vi Lyles will be joining us soon. She is wrapping up another call that she had to finish. So, she will be with us.

This meeting is being held as a virtual meeting in accordance with all of the laws that we have to follow, especially around an electronic meeting. The requirements also include notices and access that are being met electronically as well. You can view this on our Government Channel, the City's Facebook Page, or the City's YouTube Page.

Before we go forward I just want to recognize that in the past week or so we have lost two members of the Media that were formal with the Charlotte Observer and they were very beloved in the community and we just want to recognize first, the Photographer David Foster, who was a gifted and talented storyteller. He covered every major city event dated back to the 1990s. Everyone always enjoyed getting to see him when he was out in the community and he had a lot of friends and colleagues that are going to be missing him.

In addition, we also lost Sportswriter Rick Bonnell, who was one of the best Sports Journalists in the entire country and was highly respected and revered in the game of basketball, the NBA in particular. He provided the community with excellent coverage of our basketball team and did a tremendous job telling the stories of the players, staff, and the fans who were a part of the Hornets and the Bob Cats. So, we just wanted to acknowledge their passing and our condolences to their friends, family, and colleagues.

With that, we only have two items on the agenda this evening and we're going to flip the order so that Mayor Vi Lyles can be here to attend the conversation on the future 2040 Comprehensive Plan, the final recommendation for the plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **ITEM NO. 2: COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORT OUTS**

### **Budget and Effectiveness Committee**

**Councilmember Driggs** said the Budget and Effectiveness Committee met on June 3<sup>rd</sup>. The members are myself as Chair, Mayor Pro Tem Eiselt is Vice-Chair, Councilmembers Ajmera, Graham, and Johnson. On our agenda at that meeting was a discussion of our virtual meeting options. This pertained both to the option for Councilmembers to participate in Council Meetings as well as members of the public virtually.

Essentially, we were reminded of the environment in which we are in legally where we have been operating under a special State law that allowed us to conduct our virtual meetings the way we have been without any question or controversy. When the State of Emergency ends that law will be lifted and we will essentially revert to the rules that the Council has, the procedures that we have and the State laws that are in effect. State law on this subject is actually quite limited. So, a lot of the decision-making about this does come down to us. One of the things that we recognized in the meeting was at the moment we still have outstanding an action that we took that said that virtual participation in meetings was possible for Councilmembers without time limit or any other restriction indefinitely. That was fine during the emergency period and while the special law was in effect, but we need to be a little more thoughtful about it when it comes to the period after the State of Emergency is lifted. So, the action that we took in the meeting that was

approved four to one was to recommend to full Council that we sunset that action that we took regarding the unlimited virtual participation in meetings. That was a four-to-one vote.

We also voted three to two that we should consider broadening Rule 28, which is where the conditions for virtual participation in meetings are listed. So, we will probably at our next meeting bring to Council I think for a vote at that time those two recommendations from the committee. Also, a third recommendation which passed three to two, which was the members of the public should be allowed to participate virtually in our meetings regardless of whether we are.

So, those are the three things; sunset the action that we took before, which made virtual participation unlimited, consider broadening the conditions under which virtual participation is possible and then consider that the public may be allowed to participate virtually in our meetings regardless of what we decided about our own participation. I will just say personally on the subject that the resolution on this issue is not going to be just legal. In fact the legal situation is unclear perhaps, but in my mind not the most important thing. So, we all need to be thinking about is the significance of being here in person for our meetings, being available to face members of the public who come to the Chamber to see us. I think those are going to be the issues that we want to talk about when this does come up for a vote. I can tell you that my personal opinion is that I think we should be in person at Council Meetings and Committee Meetings, but again the Council will have the opportunity to consider that when we vote next week, it will be on the agenda.

I wanted to briefly report also Mayor Pro Tem on a special Committee that the Mayor appointed to consider the office of the City Clerk and its operations and essentially this was a group that consisted of myself, Councilmember Ajmera, and Councilmember Phipps. We were briefed there as well on some of the legal constraints and operational issues related to the Clerk's Office and the responsibilities of the Clerk, but in essence, as far as a decision by Council is concerned the gist of it was we are required by our own Statutes, by our own Ordinances to appoint, the Council is required to appoint the Clerk in Charlotte. Because you don't really want to have a separation of who appoints the Clerk and who reviews the Clerk, the Clerk's reviews should also be conducted by Council.

The thing that the Committee is recommending is that the Council will continue to conduct the performance evaluation of the City Clerk, but that the City Manager will provide us with a memo to guide us in that process so that we will get sort of briefed by the City Manager, who will have better over the sight of the operation of the Clerk's office and some of those issues that we just are unable to observe ourselves. That has been the issue. We've been called upon to review the City Clerk and I think that most of us felt that we really just didn't know enough about the operation of that office.

We also recommended that the City continue to explore enhancements to Public Records Management System which would benefit all departments. So, part of this discussion was with IT people and so on whether we have all the best technologies and we will continue to work with the City Clerk to consider whether any improvements in that area are indicated. Mr. Manager, I don't know if we need to vote on this or I think without objection we would sort of proceeding along those lines.

So, do I hear any objections? I'm not seeing any. Again, the idea is that we will review the Clerk but that we will get guidance from the Manager prior to that performance review. That's my report.

**Councilmember Johnson** said I wanted to clarify the report during the Committee Meeting we were going to look at Rule 28 as well as the Council Policies in general right?

Mr. Driggs said correctly. I mean the action we took said that we would broaden the terms of Rule 28 as they related to virtual participation in meetings. Right now we have an existing policy that says that virtual participation is possible in case of emergency or illness or some other circumstance like that and Councilmember Johnson, you had suggested and the majority of the Committee agreed with you that we should look at whether or not an expansion of those things is appropriate. We will by the way, also

pursue the other part of your motion, which is to consider some of our procedures. I think that would be a separate initiative on the Committee.

**Councilmember Phipps** said with regard to citizen participation in meetings what would be different if we couldn't do it virtually and the public has an opportunity to do it virtually. Would that be the same as live streaming it on Facebook or what would be different than what the public can do now?

Mr. Driggs said I think the public has the opportunity to observe our meetings now on Facebook and on YouTube, and the Government Channel. So, really the question is whether people that want to speak to us would need to be here in person to do that or whether we would have some sort of a WebEx environment that allowed them to appear in front of us virtually. I don't think we need to finalize the conversation on that subject, but the motion was made in Committee and approved three to two that we bring forward to the full Council the suggestion that members of the public could participate virtually. That's a thing that we will all talk about and decide as an agenda item at our next meeting.

### **Great Neighborhoods Committee**

**Councilmember Graham** said the Great Neighborhoods Committee consists of Braxton Winston is our Vice-Chair, Tariq Bokhari, Julie Eiselt, and Victoria Watlington as our Committee members. Basically, the update is that the Great Neighborhoods Committee did not meet in May, However, the Source of Income Ad Hoc Advisory Committee held their initial kick-off meeting on May 20th. As a reminder, the Source of Income Ad Hoc Advisory Committee is charged with developing recommendations, program enhancements, and process improvements that will increase the acceptance of all forms of rental subsidies, including the Housing Choice Voucher Program, the larger source of rental assistance in our community.

At the May meeting, the Ad Hoc committee identified five key areas for their work in the coming months as governed by the Committee charge. Their focal areas are five as I indicated. One data, the need for data to inform action items, recommendations, and metrics. Two, research to establish best practices to inform recommendation and metric setting to increase acceptance of vouchers and other rental assistance programs, and process to encourage private sector landlords to reconsider accepting vouchers, and to gain new landlord acceptance. Third, is landlord education to increase property owners' knowledge and awareness of Housing Choice Vouchers and other rental assistant programs to increase landlord participation. Fourth, communication strategy to help remove the statement of Voucher households. Then lastly five, to create benchmark criteria to evaluate outcomes of committee recommendations.

The Ad Hoc Committee will meet in the coming months through December 21<sup>st</sup> at which they will evaluate the outcome of their work and develop recommendations for the City Council's consideration. The Ad Hoc Committee will meet monthly on the third Thursday of each month at 10 a.m. The meetings can be viewed by the public via WebEx and the staff is also exploring the ability to live stream these meetings as well.

Additionally, periodical updates will be provided to the Council. The next meeting of the Source of Income Ad Hoc Advisory Committee is Thursday, June 17<sup>th</sup> at 10 a.m. and finally, the next meeting of the Great Neighborhoods committee is June 16<sup>th</sup> at 12 p.m.

### **Intergovernmental Relations Committee**

**Councilmember Bokhari** said I think the two probably most relevant things that everyone here will care about are one, the elections legislation and what is going on in Raleigh, and two the budget. Obviously, both of those impact Charlotte greatly. First, on the elections bill, you have gotten an update from Dana recently. Things have rolled out of the Senate just about. The House is taking things up now. The Senate version pretty simply runs it as all municipalities in North Carolina, Charlotte being one of those 43 that fall into this bucket that has Districts and are impacted by the Census delay will be pushed to 2022. That's this next cycle but in observation of several things including the fact that by design

these weren't meant to be even your elections, they've got their own unique cycle. So, you will see a filing period that starts either in December or January depending on which milestones we meet. A primary that's in March and a General that's in April which was the old second primary run-off. So, clearly, that is unprecedented stuff there, but we are in unprecedented times.

**Mayor Lyles arrived at 5:26 p.m.**

Mr. Bokhari said I would just say that my expectation is that we will see more edits and tweaks to this as we see it progress to the House in the next week or so. As it relates to the budget, I know the last update you all saw was the House and the Senate have had some challenges seeing eye to eye and coming up with their unified proposal. I think the reasoning for that is we have seen this stuff in the past but for now it is just more complicated and the dollar amounts are much larger.

I do believe though from what I hearing that as soon as tomorrow we may hear some announcement that the Senate and the House have found an agreement. Which is a very big deal and then it just comes to the question of the next steps which are complicated at that. The decision between what the General Assembly and ultimately what the Governor will sign. Obviously, as we know we are tracking, there is a laundry list of budget items and things like that that have a direct impact and implications on us.

So, Mr. Winston would you add anything to that?

**Councilmember Winston** said I think you hit the meat of it. There were just some other updates that we had about ongoing work that has not been completed at both Raleigh and Washington, DC around efforts to decrease the digital divide, deliberation around infrastructure packages, mass mandates at that airports, police recordings, and other items. So, there is a lot going on in Raleigh and DC that we are keeping an eye on but as I said Mr. Bokhari really hit the stuff that in the final count of legs or has been completed in the last week or so.

**Councilmember Driggs** said I should probably know this, but do any of those dates you just talked about coincide with dates for the 2022 election schedule?

Mr. Bokhari said well they do in fact Mr. Driggs and here are the two wild cards that I think that we as Charlotte citizens and elected officials should watch for. If everything stays in this bill the same, who gets a potential primary run-off from the Senate race because we are in the second primary run-off date. Which means we have no primary run-off, there's no percentage threshold. So, if somebody has a run-off, which we don't really have, whoever got the most goes forward, and our general election is on that date that normally is unutilized. However, if the Republicans or the Democrats or both in the primary race for Senate have a run-off or anything, but that's the one that is most substantial, they would also share that same ticket with us.

Now, I would say that the odds of that happening are a lot less likely now that they have ratcheted down from 40% to 30% in the last few years. So, that's wild card number one, because clearly us being in a random time in an even year is very difficult for us who normally are at the top of the ticket in these odd years. But, then two, one of the things they are considering in the House right now, given that this is a constitutional issue that we have to push the District levels that are subject to the redraws for the Census out, they have to do that, they have to. There is no requirement to do that for At-Large and Mayor. So, they are contemplating right now in the House if they add in giving us the authority to separate out District races that would happen next year at that time from At-large and Mayoral races that would happen now, which there would be no constitutional reason not to do that. The only reason we wouldn't would be because we decided essentially to delay them. So, I think that will be very interesting to watch over the next week.

Mr. Winston said Mr. Driggs, you didn't necessarily ask about this but, I think the important thing for us to look at with the calendar is our own schedule. This might be something you want to consider in Budget and Effectiveness that it is in fact a general election does, in

fact, sit right in the middle of our typical budget cycle in the middle of April. So, that can potentially just kind of from looking at things from a 10,000-foot view that might dictate how we go about doing our business over the next eight months. How do we set up that January Budget Retreat? Does that still happen in January? Does it need to happen ahead of time and how do we think about just our normal calendar because it's completely kind of blown up at this point and time with the way the schedule works

Mr. Driggs said we could be swearing in new people weeks before the adoption of the budget. Of course, the budget is co-capably handled by our Manager and the staff that I think we are all going to be fine with it, but that is an issue and Councilmember Bokhari before you count out run-off, remember old calamity Phipps over there, with his two very close elections.

Mr. Phipps said so what does this do to our potential bond referendums that we are considering? Do we have to start planning for those or what do we do?

Mr. Bokhari said the legislation exists and then there is a strategy that only the Manager and others can talk to. If we have no election on the books in Mecklenburg and that's where it stays. We would have to call and ask for a special one this year, which that just seems highly unlikely. I think the real more likely question is, is this something, and it will be better to discuss this once we know what makes it out of the House, is this something that now folks and the powers that be want to line up for the April General or the 2022 General, General. I don't know that anyone's contemplated that question.

I guess the punchline is if you are At-Large or Mayor start fundraising.

### **Safe Communities**

**Councilmember Egleston** said I'll be briefer than my colleague. We met last week and got updates on two big things, one of which has been well covered by our friends at the news media around street racing and aggressive driving. We know that's been a problem in all the more so since COVID (mild to severe respiratory infection caused by the coronavirus) with streets being more wide open for folks to take advantage of the opportunity to speed. Actually, the Observer is in the midst of doing a multipart piece right now that looks into a lot of the data around how unsafe our streets have gotten and how many people have lost their lives.

The good news on the CMPD (Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department) front was after several months of undercover work and building cases against folks, there were a seizure of 65 cars, numerous arrests, there are still some outstanding authorizations to seize cars if and when they are found. We were offered some anecdotal evidence from CMPD at that meeting that many of the folks who are leaders in this sort of underground car culture have said well we can't really play our games in Charlotte anymore because Charlotte's closed for business as it relates to street racing. Social media shared with us from one of the folks who organizes a lot of these meetups. So, that was really good news. Hopefully, it sends the signal to people who are breaking the law and endangering both themselves and others on our streets, but obviously still something we are going to have to continue to focus on, but that was a huge win. Again great work to CMPD.

Then we have an update on the Family Justice Center. The official ask of the City has changed from \$10 million to \$5 million. The committee members asked some questions that we are going to get a follow-up on at our next Committee meeting, but I think that the takeaway is we see the value in this potential partnership. There's just more information that is needed and more boxes that need to be checked before the City can sign on as a partner and help get this thing across the finish line. The values there, the commitment from the City to find a way to help with these efforts is there and we are going to get some more information back based on Committee member questions at our next meeting, which actually is not until September 7<sup>th</sup>. So, we can obviously schedule one in August if need be but right now we don't see that need and so it will be in September.

Mr. Phipps said I was wondering in view of the front line article that the Observer is doing on excessive speeding on the streets of Charlotte Mecklenburg, as a Committee do we see any benefit of bringing this up in a meeting to see what kind of action we can take because it looks like Law Enforcement is in dire straits in terms of resources to enforce speeding? I don't know if we want to look at technology to see what we can do to curve some of the excessive speeding we got. It's apart from just street racing. So, I was wondering what would be the appetite of the committee in wanting to do something like that.

Mr. Bokhari said I would be very open to it and in fact as I have been reading the Observer coverage and seeing a lot of the other stuff that is going on, I had the same thought. Which is that we do need to figure out what, obviously we know laws in Raleigh have tied our hands to some degree in terms of things like red light cameras and being able to even collect enough revenue to pay for a system like that, but I do think there's an opportunity for us to use technology because we know that we are not going to double our Police force. The highway patrol is not going to suddenly get a huge flood of new funding to be able to put more people out on I-485. That's really where they are needed. So, in that article yesterday of today, it actually said we need twice as many highway patrol people in Mecklenburg County as we have. That's not going to happen any time soon. So, in lieu of actually having the man and woman power out there being able to pull folks over, we have got to look for other alternatives. So, I do think that that is something we can bring up in the Committee and figure out what options exist, what the cost are, and if we need to work with the Intergovernmental Committee to try to lobby for a change in that legislation that sort of put us in a bind with our ability to use things like the red light cameras.

Mayor Pro Tem Julie Eiselt said I would also just add to that that we started that conversation a couple of years ago. I'm a big supporter of looking at technology to assist our officers. We are down 180 officers as it is. We want our officers to be doing the most important work. This is important, but if you have technology that can assist then I think it's something we should look at and so adding to the Intergovernmental work would also be talking to the School Board because I think the law still stands that the money would have to go to the schools, but if there was a way to get an agreement with CMS to say excess funds after we pay for the data and the equipment so that we are not collecting money on this at a net gain, but we off set our cost and the rest goes to the school board. There are cities in North Carolina that have had it. I don't know if they still do but I just want to say kudos to the Observer for that article. It was really in-depth. They covered the history of the problem, the legislation, and I thought they did a really good job at shining light on a really difficult problem that we have and CMPD needs help with.

**Councilmember Watlington** said I also support it; I know we have been talking about it for a while. You've said a couple of years I know we have been discussing it at least since last summer as long as we have been here. So, just for the purposes of getting it over there, I don't know if Madame Mayor you want to make that referral, or I'm happy to just move that we refer that to Committee.

### **Transportation, Planning, and Environment**

**Mayor Pro Tem Eiselt** said I Chair and my colleagues in Committee are Mr. Egleston, Vice-Chair, Mr. Driggs, Mr. Newton, and Mr. Winston. We had a very eventful action-packed meeting I guess in our last meeting. We had quite a few updates on just all of the different areas that work is being done in the area of Transportation and Planning in particular. The first presentation was from John Lewis, our Executive Director of CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System). He gave us an update on the Station Area Planning for the Silver Line. For the past 18 months, they have been working on the preliminary planning and design to develop the alignment for the Silver Line project.

One of the things that they highlighted was that they took away some important lessons from the Blue Line project that the importance of leveraging the investments in our transportation infrastructure to meet other goals that we have as such as housing and economic development. The current study is to develop the station area plans for seven

demonstration station areas, outline the infrastructure for all of those areas and develop a TOD (Transit Oriented Development) implementation plan. The scope of that study includes outreach and education to key stakeholders, development of housing strategies key station areas, you know what we want to see at those stations and what the specific deliverables will be.

So, like these other topic areas, I really encourage everybody to read this because I think a few of us didn't really realize that the station area planning was going on. So, that begs the question is if those stations are set in stone. So, as we go through this work everybody please take a look at it and bring your questions back to either Mr. Lewis or to the Committee for the next update on that.

The second presentation was on Beyond 77 and that is a corridor study that goes up I-77. The study area is 68 miles from Statesville to Rockhill and six miles on either side of it and the question is how do we strengthen the multimodal network that surrounds the entire interstate. So, the first phase of this study was a data collection phase. It started in January 2020. They did a lot of stakeholder engagement, public outreach, and they had responses from over 8,000 people. It shouldn't be a huge surprise, but the number one concern was traffic congestion.

January 2021 begins the process with the solution phase and looking at the data to come up with a number of different solutions. So, again there was quite a bit of public engagement around possible solutions and ideas for the corridors around I-77 in addition to I-77, and they received over 30 million clicks on the website providing feedback. So, that's an incredible amount of engagement. They came up with 170 potential solutions and various feedback and again please go to the beyond I-77 websites and read more about that, and what some of those solutions are. Then the pathway for that final recommendation will wrap up in the fall of this year, September 2021.

The team will finalize recommendations for phase three. We'll begin that process in June prior to the final recommendations in September. Then Connect Beyond is a little confusing. It's different than Beyond I-77. The Connect Beyond conversation started when CATS began to really revision their 2030 Plan and how they are going to deliver height capacity rail corridors to the entire community. They worked with Centralina Regional Council and they are looking beyond the typical planning boundaries to create a more connected transportation network. The Connect Beyond region actually consists of the two states. So that is South Carolina and North Carolina, and 12 Counties. It involves multiple transportation and planning organizations. Seventeen different Transit Agencies have all come together in a partnership and it's led by the Centralina Regional Council. CATS and the MTC (Metropolitan Transit Commission) to think about planning for a vibrant connected and inclusive vision for that entire region, which is a large region.

At this point, we are getting the stakeholders together. I am going to be representing the Council as a Chair of Transportation Planning on that, and I have been on the Connect Beyond initiative but that will start to get into a little bit deeper work. Again, the most important purpose of the plan is to create a vision for regional transit. So, across county lines and across State lines that can be supported by other counties in addition to Mecklenburg county, but also then that can go as a unified voice to talk about revenue sources to both of our states.

So, that was an update for all of that and the referrals that we still have in the TAPE (Transportation, Planning and Environment Committee) are the 2040 Comp Plan, the Unified Development Plan, Short-term Rentals. What are the options if the City is to regulate short-term rentals, our mobility committee recommendations, rezoning process improvements? Separate from the Com Plan and UDO, how do we improve the rezoning process for citizens and residents.

We were supposed to have a meeting on June 21<sup>st</sup> is the next scheduled meeting. That is the day of the Comp Plan vote and so the agenda for that day was supposed to just be an update on Center City Partners. We are talking about maybe moving that meeting because it is just that one update from Michael Smith, but it does conflict with the

dedication of the new Centene Campus, which a lot of Councilmembers will want to go to. So, if your that Committee or you want to attend please stay tuned and see when we will reschedule that briefing.

Mr. Phipps said you mentioned 30 million clicks. That is an awful lot of clicks. Are we sure about that?

Ms. Eiselt said I am only telling you what I have been told. They did report that, and we are all really kind of amazed at that when we asked more about it and they were very proud of that.

### **Workforce & Business Development**

**Councilmember Bokhari** said Vice Chair Malcolm Graham and members Dimple Ajmera, Renee Johnson, and Greg Phipps. We met today, we actually had a very informative update on the Strategic Employment Plan from Tracy Dodson and her staff. If you weren't able to be there with us highly encourage you to go, but it wasn't that long, but very important things were covered there to go back and watch it. The quick punch lines are this is a long-term multidecade plan that the core fundamental piece of it is jobs. It spans so much more than that, but jobs are ultimately the key and glue that hold it all together. This is really something that would serve to inform all other plans going forward because there's a job again fundamental to upward mobility. What we are trying to achieve a part and parcel with the infrastructure investments we need, where transportation is going to be, zoning, Charlotte Water, Storm Water. You list it, everything there fundamentally tracks back to the jobs and what our strategy is to put good-paying jobs with the needed amenities and wrap-around services across the entire City. So, the other thing that you will notice in that presentation and there is a deck as well that I want to make sure everyone gets.

Slide number 12 walks through what to expect and I think we have been through the creation of strategic plans. So, what to expect is very important. So, this is going to occur between now and the end of the year. It's been going on for over eight months now. So, the staff has been doing a lot of work to get us here, been talking to a lot of stakeholders, but this is the part where we are going to start getting engaged. You can see through this point which will lead us in and through queue three. There will be various work streams, Committees, Task Forces, places for us, the community, the job providers, those that have hiring programs. All these things to come in and start to put their view into the plan, but I think the magic here is we are creating it around a premise of the data, of the art of the possible, understanding what is that is possible versus not possible, and how it would work before we engage certain community groups that then can tell us and we can show them that data, and before we improve the plan. So, that ultimately we understand how it would be implemented based on what policies we'd approve.

That approval would start to line up around the end of Q4 and then implementation would begin in Q1 of next year. So, the way I visualize this and again, it's really hard to picture it today until you see the actual plan when it gets dropped, there are three main dimensions to this plan at its most simple form.

There are stakeholders, tools, and geographies. It's almost like a playbook and when you look at these three in the combination you can look across our entire City and you could say alright what tools do we have. We know we have recruiting tools and workforce programs and TIGS (Tax Increment Grants) and BIGs (Business investment grant), and all of these other things, and partners that do all of these things. We have stakeholder groups, existing businesses in town. New businesses, veterans, formerly incarcerated folks, disable MWSBEs (Minority, Women, Small Business Enterprise). We have that whole list and then we have geographies, the corridors, South Charlotte, North Charlotte, Silicon South End. As you know, everything is evolving So, yes I did drop that name in there.

So, if you look at those, this is the magic of this plan which is there's no one size fits to the entire community. It is much of a playbook that says, well this geography has these



stakeholders that need these tools, and then it becomes a very flexible plan for the entire City. I will leave you with the same note that I left in our Committee meeting today which is a call to action amongst all of us. Particularly the members of the press that are now with us. Which this is a community-wide effort. Everyone has to play a role in this. One of the reasons we've been able to announce USAA and Credit Karma, and Robin Hood and Better.com is because when they post the jobs people apply. We have that, we are beating other cities there. So, the call to action really simply is, if you go on Robinhood.com /careers, there's 34 jobs they just posted in Charlotte there. If you go to Better.com there's 20 jobs they've just recently posted there. Great technical jobs. USAA already has posted 38 jobs on USAA.careers. You know how URLs work. Credit Karma, 45 jobs. Lending Tree, who we expanded with before, over 60 jobs. Avid Exchange, who we expanded with, over 60 jobs as well. So, luckily that's when I went through, and Fran from Economic Development jumped in with something much more simple than that. The City has something call Charlotteopenforbusiness.com/job/connector. Very simple right. Doesn't get easier than that URL. All of those are there too and they directly map over there.

So, the call to action particularly for your guess, but for all of us is we'll keep getting these wins if people keep applying, and how our great talent applies is they know about the opportunity.

Mayor Pro Tem Eiselt said that's it for our Committee report outs and I'm going to turn it back over to the Mayor.

**Mayor Lyles** said thank you Ms. Eiselt for allowing me to fulfill a commitment to the US Conference of Mayors and guys it's really good to see everybody. Great to have you back in the building, but more importantly it's great to hear that more people are getting vaccinated and we are figuring out how to give people incentives to vaccinate based upon their age and interest. I look forward to talking more about the challenge that we've been asked to fulfill by both the Governor as well as the Federal Administration to figure out how Charlotte can actually implement incentives for people to get vaccinated and we are working through that. So, thank you for being here. Always remember that this is a time for us to take action and not pretend that everything is okay with COVID, it isn't. We need to do more and make sure that we get immunity in our own City.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **ITEM NO. 1: CHARLOTTE FUTURE 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – FINAL RECOMMENDED PLAN**

**Mayor Lyles** said I want to say that the next topic is not very familiar to everyone. I think actually if you talk about the clicks, I'm sure the 2040 Plan has enough clicks to last a long time. But tonight, we are going to continue our discussion of the Comprehensive Plan. I want to just take a couple of minutes because you are all here and watching. I want to say hello to Mr. Winston, Ms. Ajmera, I hope that you are doing well this evening. For all of us that are here that are let's just think about this Plan. We've gone through a lot of community engagement, we have gone through a lot of technical analysis and we have done a lot of work since this plan has been done, but what I think we should be most proud of is the engagement of the City Council. Whether or not this is something that we can work well around or how to get it done, I think every member of this Council actually has read the document at least once or twice, and that is a pretty significant task that has been accomplished.

We've taken a deep dive into a lot of the key areas and we have actually asked out staff to step up and do more community engagement to talk to people that have interest in this in a way that we probably did not even think about when we started this journey. It has happened and I want to say thanks to all of the folks that arranged meetings, had meetings, and continue to have these meetings. I want to say thanks to the Council Committees that have met and again engaged around the specific languages and the changes that we wanted to have.

So, we know that we are at the second draft and that second draft was released May 20th. It's had some time for the public to comment, but also for us to gather those comments, and for us to be able to talk about what's going on. I think you are all pretty much aware that the Charlotte Chapter of the Urban Land Institute, we often call them ULI, we never really address them as their full name, they had a process that has been continuing and will continue. They have worked with us to talk about how do we have more participation and development process to give us ideas on how community engagement can be very effective in this area. So, they are refining their report and their going to share it with us later this week. So, again this evening we are here to talk about the steps we have taken and where we need to begin.

So, I want to make a couple of things that I would say, I would hope that all of us could agree a Comprehensive Plan for a community is important, especially a community like Charlotte. I think the Manager said that we missed being the 14<sup>th</sup> largest City in the Country by about 3,000 people. So, yall keep counting, find those folks and we can maybe amend our Census Report. We are still 15<sup>th</sup>, but we are still the fastest-growing as indicated by the Workforce Development Report, the work that we are doing even in traffic congestion is a result of growth in this community. These are the things that we are trying to work with to make this Plan work for us so that we don't one day look up and say how did this happen.

So, our goal is to get to a June 21<sup>st</sup> Meeting where the actual plan will be on the agenda. Tonight, the staff is going to present to us where those changes have been made. I think that there are two categories of changes. The things that Council directed as well as those that the staff saw as technical changes and we will present to us tonight, but I wanted to say something else. We know that the Planning Commission will be having a meeting and I want to thank Sam, I think. You are here to listen and know what we are doing. The Planning Committee of the Planning Commission will be reviewing this and will make recommendations to this Council as well on how they see this Plan and what's going to move forward. More importantly, I think that as we go look at this we have learned a lot about what we have done well and a lot about what we would do differently. I believe that as we look through this and we start talking about that, the Manager is going to give us the staff and the team that's worked on this some ideas of what we can duplicate and what we shouldn't duplicate, and other ways to do it, but the most important thing that I believe for this Council that I've heard is that if we are going to move forward in this Plan, that the City Council needs to vote on how the Plan takes its next step and that the staff should prepare for all of us the ability, and I'm asking the Manager and the Staff to do this when we have the June 21<sup>st</sup> agenda item to be able to present the next step in a way that the Council can, just like we approve resolutions around our Capital investment Plan, our Compensation Plan, but to approve a resolution so that everybody is on the same page on the next step. That is the one lesson that I have learned in this process is that we have to have Council engagement and acceptance of how we move. Which is, I believe if it is correct, would be going into the Plan and the place type process.

So, actually having this Council understand what that means and how it takes place and moves that will make a big difference as we are moving forward. And each step along the way, the Council should be able to adopt the methodology, the calendar and the schedule, and the engagement that the staff would recommend and be able to be a part of it and feel very, very much engaged and close to the process. So, with that I'm going to turn it over to our Assistant Manager and Planning Director and ask him to review where we are. This material will be a part of the recommended plan based upon tonight we will move forward with that. I refer to it like I do the budget process and all of us understand that we are actually asking the staff to prepare a document that will be approved on the 21<sup>st</sup> of June and at that point, we will be able to make a final decision on this.

**Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Assistant City Manager/Planning Director** said tonight I'm going to share with you proposed changes that you voted on and that are reflected in the recommended draft Plan that is currently online. There are four new changes that the staff is bringing forward for your consideration into the next iteration of the Plan that I will share with you at the end. In between there, I would also like to address Councilmember

Johnson's question with regards to the deliverables and how we are addressing that going forward.

Tonight I have in the room with me my colleague Laura Harmon, who is actually managing Unified Development Ordinance. I also have online Deputy Planning Director Alyson Craig, as well as Alyssa Osborne, who is managing our Comprehensive Plan process. A few slides that I will share with you and Mayor I don't know how you want to go through them and then there will be comments.

Mayor Lyles said my suggestion would be to take the notes because I see that there is room for notes on here and we go through the first section where we talk about the straw vote discussions. Do that and then come back and ask a question if that's okay with the Council. Then we will start again when we talk about the comments that were received that the staff has received after the release of the Plan and do that. If we make our notes and get through the first section where the staff responds to this is what we suggested and this is the final recommendation.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said so starting from the beginning, one of the items that you wanted to be in the final recommended Plan is the preamble. I'll speak to this again when we are talking about the new items, but just so we are clear we have a preamble in the document that identifies what's aspirational, what is doable today. And not only that, throughout the document, we also have what we call icons or identifiers that will actually when you are reading the document it will show you something as aspirational or if we need a legislative process in the future to make that happen. We are going to amend that preamble but I will wait until I get there at the end when we are having conversations around new proposed changes that the staff is recommending we bring forward.

So, we have the preamble on the opening pages. The second item is where you wanted us to incorporate how public investments will benefit homeownership in the policy section. So, we have that as policy 1.7. What you will notice in each of the slides is that we also called out the specific Plan volume. In this case, it is the policy document itself. On page 71 of that Great Neighborhoods. This actually came out of Great Neighborhoods and you recommended that it goes in the recommended Plan. So, the Plan you have today reflects that.

The same thing goes for the number 8 voted item on sections regarding Storm Water. We also made those references on page 72 of the recommended Plan as well. Also making sure that there is a tie into the Tree Canopy Action Plan because in the Tree Canopy Action Plan we addressed the issue of Storm Water extensively in that document.

Here we struck out a few things again with regards to Storm Water. So, what was supposed to be 1.18 became 1.20 because there were additional languages added. This has to do with the 10-Minute Neighborhood development itself. How we align that with the existing Stormwater Master Plan and the updates in the future will also make sure that we are aligning those with any time we update the City Stormwater Master Plan.

Number 51 was to augment 10-Minute Neighborhoods. So, there were conversations around thinking into the future. It's going to be beyond just a brick and mortar in terms of where people go to grocery stores or they are delivered to you. So, while we amended the goal itself we created a new policy that will address that because again when you are looking at this it's not the goal that you implementing. At the end of the day, it is the policies that are being implemented. So, we included a new policy on integrating emerging technologies and future innovations in Planning Policy and infrastructure investment to facilitate the delivery of goods and services on page 70 of the recommended Plan.

The conversation around Anti-displacement they are the next two slides actually address that, one is about the formation of the Commission itself. That came out of the Great Neighborhood Committee. The language is that the Mayor and the Council should commission an Anti-Displacement Stakeholder Group. That group should be composed

of neighborhood leaders. Those who are actually threatened by housing displacement as well as private developers who actually work in this environment as well.

The next slide is really about what that Commission looks like. There was a conversation around developing recommendations during the implementation phase of the Comprehensive Plan and so we provided two languages that you all voted into the recommended Plan. One is to launch an Anti-displacement study that will recommend tools and strategies that will protect residence or vulnerable communities from being displaced and the second one was to continue to establish programs that will provide support for us to include affordable housing units when you remove single-family units in particular neighborhoods. So, we believe that those policies put us in place to be able to protect people who live in vulnerable communities from being displaced involuntarily.

The last one on Anti-displacement has to do with the landlords. As you know we are not able in this state to keep a registry of landlords but we actually have the ability to enforce how landlords really maintain their properties. So, we included this in the recommended draft to ensure that landlords, particularly those of affordable housing units, maintain a habitable premise as part of the State Landlord and Tenant Act.

We also had with regards to the economic analysis being performed prior to implementation of the plan. Policy 10.14 addresses that in terms of how we perform an economic impact analysis prior to implementation of the Comprehensive Plan and there's a lot more detail in the implementation strategy volume of the Plan addressing that.

This was a new one that came up, I believe on May 17, in terms of the Infrastructure Investment Commission proposed by Councilmember Ajmera. So, we developed a language around that to assist in the assessment of infrastructure throughout the City and develop strategies that balance equitable investments in areas most in need. Especially areas that have insufficient facilities, fast-growing areas, as well as areas that are targeted for growth. So, it's not just about infield development or also greenfield as well.

There was also a conversation around strengthening language around homeownership. That came out of Great Neighborhoods Committee as well, provided this language in there. We do have some of those programs today as the City through our Housing And Neighborhood Services Department. What the Comprehensive Plan does here is to strengthen rather than just say to promote. It's really about strengthening our next plan and access homeownership opportunities for residence. The next language on the same subject is to raise awareness of existing programs that we have in the City today, such as the Down Payment Assistance Program through the House Charlotte and Community Hero's programs.

I believe this is the last one around the strengthening of language which regards homeownership and that is to create sustainable homeownership in vulnerable communities through partnership with banks and other financial agencies. On that page, you will also find references to CLT, the Land Trust opportunities to Land Bank as well. So, there are opportunities to be able to create sustainable homeownership in this community.

Then here we address some of the comments that came through with regards to the development industry. Whether they be Block Lengths and then we talked about the heights of uptown buildings there. Today the subdivision ordinance that you approve many years ago today actually has a maximum length of 1,000 feet. The Comprehensive Plan proposes up to 1,500 feet, but also adds the language with regards to the flexibility that blocks might be longer because specific site conditions make new streets and street connections invisible. So, we are going to look at different conditions such as topography, natural barriers, creeks, streams, and all of that. When we also heard about clearly defining what certain terms meant as such as mobility Hub/Micro mobility and those in the glossary in Volume Three. What we may do is to bring that glossary into Volume One so that people don't have to go in between to know what a particular term stands for.

This is probably the most popular policy in the entire Plan itself, policy 2.1. What we heard from you was to carry forward what we recommended in the recommended Plan and that's what we have in the recommended Plan today, which is to allow duplex and triplex housing units in all place types, but also make sure that we subject that to place types mapping, as well as standards within the Unified Development Ordinance such as lot size, setbacks, scale-height parking, and others. That other was really to be able to capture other things that maybe we don't have policies for today, but when it comes to the other things within the UDO that the policies can support, I will believe that it would help us to define that particular policy very well. So, that is what carried into the draft Plan that you have today.

This slide here with regard to industrial areas don't have to be concentrated around the Airport. I believe that this is one comment that came from the letter that we received from our development colleagues. What we said here is that we are going to make sure that we are consistent with what the Airport Area Masterplan actually says, which does not talk about concentrating industrial uses around the Airport. I know that there was a conversation going on right now between the Economic Development Department and the Planning Department to do a citywide industrial study. That would probably help us to be able to also have a more robust conversation around where industrial areas are throughout the City. Where the plan is concerned itself we want to make sure that we are in alignment with the Airport Masterplan and efforts.

Uptown Heights, there was a primary vote to eliminate reference to height restrictions, but that vote did not go through. There was a substitute motion to actually carry that into the UDO. So, remember that in the Comprehensive Plan itself references to height were never in the Policy Document, they were in the place types for the Regional Activity Center. So, what we are doing here is to remove the reference to 500 feet in the Comprehensive Plan itself. That conversation, just like we did for the Transit Orientated Development effort, that conversation can take place as we get into the Unified Development Ordinance. Notice that only applies to uptown. That if you are outside of uptown we believe that our neighborhood use to be able to have some benefits that come from buildings are in access of 20. You may really have that in Eastland Mall or wherever they may be, but that conversation can continue to be had as we go forward. However, that reference has been removed where it pertains to uptown.

Then I believe last time Councilmember Newton proposed three different policy suggestions with regards to workforce development. So, those three carry through into the draft that you have today in front of you from policy 8.14, 8.17, as well as 8.33. Which really again, are just about community benefits, and really focuses on workforce development throughout our City.

Then finally before we go into the new suggestions that we are proposing for consideration. This is what Councilmember Johnson had brought up, I believe at the May 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting and we tried to clarify here. Maybe we have a conversation about whether this clarification does justice to that question. Like we said earlier we are proposing that the final Plan be in three volumes, I would like to rather than the same Volume One, Volume Two, Volume Three would like to really refer to them by name. Plan Policy is really your first volume. Then the second one is the Implementation Strategy and the third one is Equitable Growth Framework and where you have your place types manual.

Like we said earlier, there are three adoption points in the overall Plan process. One is for this June of 2021 where you actually adopt the Plan Policy document itself. Because that Plan document is what drives what happens in the place types process. Without the adoption of that, it becomes difficult to move into the place types for a mapping process. That place types mapping would talk about seven months from the point of adoption of the Policy Plan into February of next year when you adopt it. You may adopt the Implementation Strategy Volume as well as the Equitable Growth Framework and Place Types Manual Volume at that time during the Place Types adoption in February of 2022. The UDO adoption itself would take place after the Place Types Mapping has been adopted by Council. Because again remember there is the policy, there is place type and then there is the regulation which is the Unified Development Ordinance. All of these

things, kind of feed one into the other. So, with the adoption of the policy this year allows us to launch into a seven-month Place Type Mapping effort with the community and Council. Then subsequently after that we are going to present to you what the Unified Development Ordinance looks like because it is those place types that translate into the respective zoning Districts. Like Mayor Lyles said on June 21, we will bring forward to you what that process looks like.

The next four slides are actually more of new ideas that the staff is bringing forward that we are suggesting being carried into the next draft of the Plan. For example, there has been a conversation and confusion around where you refer to Community Benefits Agreement versus where it's just benefits to the community. The Community Benefits Agreements are only referred to in the Plan five-time. They are only tied to potential tools where an agreement takes place between the community and the developer. If they come up with that agreement as to what should happen. Last week over a period of two days Urban Land Institute of Charlotte convened a panel of experts from Charlotte, Atlanta, as well as Raleigh to come together and really discuss what that looks like and there were about 45 different stakeholders that were engaged. Developers as well as members of the community benefit stakeholder's group. We are going to be presenting the findings to you. Hopefully, we will have those findings, but we are going to present those findings to you. It's a vision to be able to incorporate relevant findings into the Implementation Strategy of the Plan itself so that it doesn't just sit on the table or on a shelf somewhere. But in the meantime, though there are different areas in the Plan where when you see community benefits you automatically think it's talking about CBA, that is not necessarily true. So, what we are going to do in the plan is to make sure that we had to clarify language to distinguish between the Community Benefits Agreement as a tool and then reference policies, projects, and programs that would benefit the community. One of them is Policy 2.4 I believe. Which says that fourplexes can be built along arterials provided one of them is dedicated to the affordable housing unit. That's not a Community Benefits Agreement. That's the benefit to the community that fulfills an affordable housing goal.

There have been other references to different types of benefits that may accrue to the community that we believe that we need to clarify and redefine them, so, in the next draft, you are going to see a lot of that clarification being done so people are able to make the distinction between the two. So, that is what the staff is proposing that we bring forward to you.

I talked about modifying the preamble earlier on and that's really what we would like the last paragraph in the preamble to actually address the subject of what's next. What comes next after the Plan adoption. Our City staff will engage the community in mapping land-use policies within the Plan. The policy map will be adopted by Council to provide guidance on land-use and public investment decisions and the Zoning Districts within the Unified Development Ordinance. We are going to add that language into the preamble, but we want to make sure that you all are okay with us doing that. We believe it is important for people right from the onset or when they are getting into the Plan to know what comes next. So, that's going to happen on June 21. We are going to share with you what our timeline looks like going beyond June 21<sup>st</sup>.

We had a reference to the Tree Conservation fund in the Comprehensive Plan. There was a question as to what exactly does that mean. So, we are defining that extensively that's it's pretty much expanding what we have today. Whether that be to acquire or protect, or manage land for conservation of Tree Canopy within the City of Charlotte. We have the Tree Save payment in lieu fees right now that are collected during the City's Land Development and Permitting process. Then we deposit them to really be able to help us fund the Tree Canopy Preservation Plan. It's the same thing other than we are just expanding it. We are not necessarily creating another fund or something different that people expected to pay into, but really expanding where we can use that TCPP for over the life of the Plan and over the life of the Tree Canopy Action Plan.

The last slide on this really a language that was proposed to us by the development industry, but we believe it's the right language. That is that the City should lead the charge

to pass enabling legislation for State Tax Credits to facilitate and support the development of more affordable housing. I believe that is the last of the four slides.

Mayor Lyles said the next step in the agenda is to address any questions.

**Councilmember Phipps** said with regard to the Tree Canopy Action Plan, was this action plan ever formally adopted by Council?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said a very good question. No, the Tree Canopy Action Plan has not been, but what we have done simultaneously has been working on the Comprehensive Plan is to start that Tree Canopy Action Plan because we wanted some of the findings and recommendations in there to be carried into the Comprehensive Plan where appropriate. It's really a precursor to updating the Urban Forestry Master Plan in the future. So, you are still going to see that and that will come to you at some point in the future. It was based on meeting with several stakeholders in the community after we had the Tree Ordinance adopted about a year or so ago. We launched a Tree Canopy Action Plan to make sure that we were having a parallel effort rather than have the Comprehensive Plan take that on, on its own. It's really a precursor to what we are going to do with the Urban Forestry Mater Plan that will come to you at some point in the future.

Mr. Phipps said because I guess I wondering than in as much as that Plan wasn't adopted by Council the fact that it is about to be I guess adopted when we vote on it, I'm wondering if it would be beneficial for members of the Council to review a copy of that Action Plan just to see what's in it.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes, we have presented that on a couple of occasions to Transportation and the Planning and Development Committee as well as Council, but it is not finalized yet.

Mayor Lyles said so I think the question is can you distribute or email a copy of it out to all of the Council.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes, absolutely. Yes.

Mayor Lyles said I think that is what Mr. Phipps was referencing. The next item is an additional one for Strengthen those sections on Stormwater.

The next one is to augment 10-Minute Neighborhoods.

**Councilmember Bokhari** said so this will be like the third or fourth time I have said the same thing. So, I'm just too exhausted to say it, but I will say it one last time. We all voted yes that it was logical and non-controversial to say by 2040 we can imagine that people can get groceries or other amenities not by having to walk or ride a bike to them, but by just accessing them and siting things like Instacart, grocery delivery, other things like that. The same thing we voted on multiple times now, yet it says after a 10-minute walk or bike ride. Then it says not all neighborhoods are expected to include every essential amenity good or service, but every resident should have access within a half-mile walk or a two-mile bike or transit trip. So, that was added and then the new policy was added 1.16 if the future changes. Which we don't know now then we will go and analyses it. So, I'll ask one final time. It was real simple just say in the goal itself all Charlotte households should have access to essential amenities goods and services and if you have to say with a bike or a skateboard or roller blades then say or also other means of accessing them that aren't required physically.

So, I'm just bewildered in not understanding why the Planning Director continues to fight on something that is so universally excepted amongst this Council and not controversial among anyone but him?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I will respond to that.

Mr. Bokhari said no, that's okay.

**Councilmember Eiselt** said well I would like to know why it didn't get included.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said so, there were two questions that were brought up. Councilmember Driggs wanted us to define the intent and the purpose of a 10-Minute Neighborhood and Councilmember Bokhari said to augment 10-Minute Neighborhoods, not the goal. We've listened to the transcript multiple times. It's really about how do you include merging technology in how people access goods and services. We believe that eventually when you're going to develop and implement things it is not your goal that you implement. It's policies that you implement and the policies are actually stronger. So, while yes, we could put that in the goal it's actually stronger to have it as a policy. Since it's now saying that it is referring to the goal which really wasn't clear in the request earlier on it did not specify goals. That's why we developed a new policy language for this.

Mr. Bokhari said the goal is designed-

Mayor Lyles said, Mr. Bokhari.

Mr. Bokhari said if we are still going back and forth I prefer to have my time now. The goal is designed-

Mayor Lyles said I understand that but I think it would be nice and courteous-

Mr. Bokhari said well don't I still have the floor?

Mayor Lyles said I just want to make sure Mr. Driggs, Mr. Bokhari would like to have this opportunity to speak before you do. Thank you.

Mr. Bokhari said an apology for the frustration. I have just been having the same conversation over and over again for six months now. So, a goal is designed to be our North Star and our compass for all the policies we are going to go build. So, whether it was his concession to us to say I jammed in 1.6 the thought that we are going to go find this policy later or not is irrelevant to me. The fact that our North Star and our compass says 10-Minute Neighborhoods is designed by a half-mile walk, a two-mile bike ride or transit, a 10-mile walk, bike, or transit trip, has put into a corner that I don't care what policy you have said, your North Star says those are mechanisms by which the policy gets signed. This was the least controversial thing that I brought up. So, whether it belongs in policy or not, I can turn that around and argue 50 other points later in this that belong in policy deduction later on.

This point was don't back us in the corner with the goal that says you can either walk, ride a bike, or skateboard there. Say that just you have access to it and we will tease out the rest in policies. So, this is a prime example in the most simple fundamental terms of how goals have been completely misused in this approach.

**Councilmember Driggs** said so, I just wanted to say I think the critical difference here is that we continue to talk about a half-mile or two-mile and these things, and when we acknowledge the possibility of these other technologies but without the suggestion that our goal of a half-mile or two-mile could be modified by them. So, it is actually an important distinction and I think Mr. Bokhari is right if we were good futurists our goal is to ensure that people have this access and if it's possible to sit down at a computer and make a phone call and have stuff show up at your front door an hour later, then that priority is met. Now, there are other services that can't be delivered. They are not products. So, you could still talk about whether they should be accessible. I think I agree that this is not an adequate response to the point that we should be defining what we want to do in terms of how easy it is to get stuff. If it turns out that we are buying from Amazon, we are buying from food delivery services, and we actually rarely need to go to the store anymore, which is the direction in which we are headed then why can't we say that our goal is that these things will be accessible and maybe that services or other facilities. The concern I have been expressed about this anyway and if you read the fiscal impact study carefully you'll see that the consultants very clearly make the point in there the availability of these services is a function of actions of people outside of our control.



We can kind of say that we want to achieve this but, in my mind, that proviso is not a minor issue. So, I think the suggestion that we are going to be able to accomplish this and we are going to get people who apparated food store to put them in all of those locations and to everybody in all of those locations is going to want that food store there, but this particular thing where the intent and I think that generally accepted intent that our real goal is that these things are going to be accessible and not that there is a store within a two-mile walk and a half-mile and a such and such that. It's an example I think of overreach at this stage of our process where we are actually combining rules and this sort of Legislation around the plan with the goals of the Plan. The goals of the Plan are more qualitative in nature than more aspirational and then 800 feet for this, 1,500 feet for that. All of those are things that we should talk about later. My motion on that point since I'm speaking right now was that we take those numbers out. Instead, the reference to those numbers has been softened. It's not the same thing. I think the difficulty that a number of us have experienced with this plan is it is so hard to get anything that was put in front of us modified and it shouldn't be.

I think if ten people voted as they did to take those numbers out, I don't want to see those numbers. They shouldn't be in there. That this is kind of part of the difficulty of where we are right now. Of course, we know the big one is 2.1, but part of the difficulty of where we are right now is this Council is trying to do its job in the face of opposition. We are sort of struggling to get things that are put forward incorporated. So, I think this is an example. I'm going to limit myself for the moment because we are on this point, but I do have a general concern like that. I think there ought to be more scope for us to decide what we really want to do and not find ourselves getting into arguments all of the time about anything that we think about that might not be the same as what is put in front of us.

**Councilmember Winston** said can we advance the slides to 51 that we are talking about. So, I do think what the staff has brought up does speaks to the gist of Mr. Bokhari's suggestion that what was voted on. I would say that within a ten-minute walk and a half a mile walks, that again like I said last time we talked about, that does mean that you can walk from your door step the end of your driveway to pick up that Instacart order. I think what I hear Mr. Bokhari actually asking for is something that he's been fighting against on several different elements of this Plan. So, I'm really kind of confused. What I hear you asking for Mr. Bokhari is for us to make an aspirational goal to ensure that every person in Charlotte of the digital divide is bridged for them to be able to access these future technologies that you keep speaking of.

Now, I know that this is a passion that you and I both share, that we both work on together, but, I don't see how this would fit into an aspirational land-use plan over the next 20years, the next 30 years to make it a City policy to ensure within our growth strategies we are finding ways to pay for everybody to have access to broadband. Everybody to have a tool and everybody to have that training for the tool to use these future technologies. Also, I'm not totally sure how you are rationalizing and you're harping on this point over and over outside of trying to make some type of political argument where there is a rational way that we can create a policy to say hey, all citizens should buy into these business models. Everybody can walk into some supermarkets, like a Trader Joe or a Harris Teeter, or Food Line without paying a fee. When you do go into these Instacart or Uber Eats, or whatever it may be you have to pay an additional fee to use this product. So, I don't understand why you are still harping on the need to push businesses and business models that fit within some future policy guidelines that you have been trying to harp on for six months. It doesn't square with the stance you're taking the rest of this Plan and I don't see why you keep trying to beat Mr. Jaiyeoba and the rest of the Planning Department over the head because there is some idea that you like but that doesn't fit into our policy framework.

So, I think we should move on from this. It does capture what we voted on and it does it in an effective way that does do it in a way through policy that we can work on moving forward to get the gist of what you presented.

Ms. Eiselt said I guess the question I have for Mr. Bokhari is if the inclusion of saying all Charlotte households should have access to these amenities or to other amenities, and

if it's through Instacart or whatever then what would be the point in your mind of having a 10-Minute Neighborhood?

Mr. Bokhari said again I totally believe that we should have aspirational statements in here but ones that can stand the test of 20 years and allow us to build policy as things evolve. So, if we want as a group to say, 10-minutes is our goal, I never came up with that, but I don't have a problem with it, the goal should be based around us making land-use decisions, infrastructure decisions, and all that bake itself into yes, access to those could be an Instacart today, or something we have never heard of 10 or 15 years from now. The point is I don't want a hard code specifics that we think today of walking to the end of the driveway for those any more than I want a hard code the specifics of single-family zoning being something we understand.

The point is I want it to be at a level where it's the constitution and then Councils after us for 20 years aren't backed into a corner and that's why I believe in the aspirational nature of it. However, I don't want to go so deep into the examples. I love to give examples of Instacart because that's what we all know today. That isn't going to be the thing 15 years from now. So, we're designing the City in our land-use approaches and our infrastructure approaches to be able to accommodate that as it evolves. If you hard code in, in my opinion, things like you have to walk or ride a bike there, well that just doesn't make any more sense to me then you have to have a Barnes and Noble on every single corner because people are going need access to information and that's how they are going to get them. It's the same thing. I hope that answers your question.

Ms. Eiselt said I think it does. I see what I think about a 10-Minute Neighborhood and 15-minute neighborhood, whatever people think would have been the best thing. To me, it was more about community and it's more about having access to grocery stores. So, I think about conversations I've had on the NC first Commission even talking about the delivery. The last-minute delivery point of service delivery and how much more those trucks are using our roads now. So, part of this is about people having access to goods and services but part of this is also lessening miles traveled not only by the people but also by those delivery services too. Which is sort of part of the intent of the 10-Minutes Neighborhood.

To Mr. Winston's point, food deserts. If you say everybody has access to Instacart then in theory there is no food desert anymore and we just know that's not the case. So, I just want to make sure I hear what you are saying but I want to make sure that the intent of the 10-Minute Neighborhood is what we focus on now. I think we have acknowledged that the Comp Plan is going to have to be revised and will be revised by future Councils as this technology develops. I don't have a problem with saying or even taking out the word emerging, integrate technologies. Those that exist now and recognize that is how people access it, but what's really the whole point of having a 10-Minute Neighborhood.

Mr. Bokhari said I don't disagree with what you just said. I think my point and the reason I'm harping on this one is because I think it's a point the majority of us actually agree on. So, it's not one of the more divisive ones. So, a Council 10 years from now could very well be in a situation where they negotiating with Amazon as Amazon is deciding which city to roll out its first floating refrigerated warehouse that navigates the top of this City with drones that then drop in 10-minutes groceries and traditional food deserts. Then they point back we have a goal that anticipated this 10 years ago saying 10-minute access and it isn't through bikes or walking, or transit. It's we want to go after that because it fits withing our goal. So, to me it was just super simple to say, the goal today isn't walking let alone 10 or 20 years from now. So, that was my hope that this was a simple one which was like, if you just take our walking and riding bikes and things, and say 10-minute access to the needed amenities of a community, I thought we had all agreed on this multiple times over that yeah, it's not a bad thing. It doesn't say you can't walk or ride your bike. It just says there may be other options and we don't want to put future Councils with their back in a corner.

Mayor Lyles said we are going to have to get those air rights pretty quickly if it's going to be in 10 years. So, I hope transportation floats.

Mr. Bokhari said it will most likely be in 10 years.

Mayor Lyles said I know but what I am asking is our transportation people start thinking about it because if everything going to come by that, right now we have the right-of-way. Our right-of-way doesn't extend the air rights and when we have these kinds of things happening.

Unknow said [inaudible]

Mayor Lyles said maybe that could be in our strategy session.

Mr. Phipps said I don't know if it was by coincidence today prior to coming here but there was a radio broadcast talking about how other European cities were adjusting to the pandemic and they mentioned, and I was quite surprised, they mentioned 15-minute neighborhoods. So, I don't know what extra five minutes came from. They talked about the same thing. They talked about being walkable, going places within any neighborhood within a 15-minute walk, or whatever. I see these emerging trends as a tool that in addition to that method of access, walking or whatever, or biking that we could still have these other emerging technologies, drones, Instacart, or whatever, they still can coexist with what we have here. So, I don't really see what this problem is. We recognize that things change and that's just another tool, a delivery, maybe even an expensive one for somebody but they do have those other alternatives. They can choose to bike, walk, or whatever. Take a scooter. So, I just thought it was interesting that they talked about these other European Cities and 15-minute neighborhoods as opposed to 10, and if you could probably listen to it maybe later on during this week or something. It was a pretty interesting discussion.

**Councilmember Johnson** said I think the broader issue, and I said last week, that this feels like Groundhog Day because I listened to Taiwo and he said that he listened to the transcript numerous times before developing this policy. So, it feels like, I don't know if you listened to the transcript numerous times because there was a lack of understanding, or if there is a reason that you would be looking for ways not to write what we asked. That's how it feels and it's not partisanship and it's not a race. It transcends among numerous Councilmembers. There are several issues.

So, I'm sorry. You do a great job, and this is a great Plan, but there are other issues. If there was a consensus among Council on an easy issue then these are the kind of things when there not implemented it causes the reputation of our Council that we have some type of dysfunction or disarray when we are simply trying to get the peoples work done. So, I would just ask if there was an understanding of Mr. Jones or Taiwo if there are items that we have discussed because we worked on this plan as a Council for 20 or 30 hours. I know I have an issue that I had to go sit back and listen to a meeting just to ensure that what I thought was said was said. It's not fair as a Council. So, my question is if we agreed on something and it's not as we agreed that we all should be concerned as a Council.

Mayor Lyles said so Ms. Johnson do you have a specific that you would like to have addressed by Mr. Jones or by Taiwo.

Ms. Johnson said we can talk about it later but I think Mr. Bokhari's point is a good point.

Mayor Lyles said I understand that. I just wondered if you want to talk about it now.

**Councilmember Graham** said I'm trying really hard to follow this and we have spent about 20 minutes on it. Probably longer than that, right. Maybe it does merit time. I listened to my colleague and I read what is on paper and I'm not sure there is a difference between the two others than a play on words.

Mayor Lyles said I think it's that what Ms. Johnson said it kind of transcends how you perceive and the proception of how those words.

Mr. Graham said we could go throughout the whole document and do that, right. So, I would hope that we would really try to focus on the broad scope of the Plan versus getting stuck on wordsmithing and that may be important to others so, I don't want to discount that. But the details of it, I think if we apply the KISS principle, which is kind of keep it simple and not to overthink what we are trying to do we may advance this. But again, every man and woman has their own train of thought.

Mayor Lyles said okay.

**Marcus Jones, City Manager** said to Councilmember Bokhari's question as well as Councilmember Johnson's question, I believe some of the confusion and I have the transcript in front of me from two different meetings, you sat in these meetings with me and it is not always crystal clear. So, I can painstakingly read through what happened in each incident if that would be helpful.

**Councilmember Egleston** said can I propose a different course?

Mayor Lyles said I don't think that he was finished yet. I think that he was just saying that is a choice.

Mr. Egleston said I just don't want him to launch into reading of transcripts.

Mayor Lyles said I don't think he was planning on doing that.

Mr. Jones said I was planning on doing that.

Mayor Lyles said okay. I read it completely wrong. I didn't catch it. Okay, go ahead.

Mr. Jones said and I can see where this conflict is. So, on 5/10 in proposing the adjustment, this is Councilmember Bokhari's comments quote, "augment 10-Minute Neighborhoods to not only consider things like brick and mortar, grocery stores, and rather the means by which Charlotteans would get their amenities by 2040. That could be delivered via Instacart or Drone or whatever. It's not baking and codifying into this plan the fact by 2040 it will require a 10-minute walk to brick and mortar grocery store and things like that. It's clean up of the language in 10-Minute Neighborhoods." Then in 5/24, there was a bit of back and forth which Councilmember Bokhari said "Bokhari on augmented 10-minute on 5/21 vote was to change the goal number one of 10-Minute Neighborhoods to verify simply say access to the amenity is the goal not necessarily a walk or a bike ride or trip there. A very simple ask that was crystal clear and what was changed added language about, so again it was a what happen, why didn't I get what I asked." So we reverted back I believe to 5/10 which is what I read just now.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said so we just went back to where the struggle was but again that does not mean that we can't change anything. We are just discussing where the trouble was not the conversation.

Mr. Bokhari said I think to respond to him who directly read my own transcript back to me sounds like exactly what I've been repeating over and over and over again. Even, let's play devil's advocate, and the reason why I've chosen this one to die on this hill is cause I'm literally, you guys could talk about all the rest, I give up on the rest of that, is because this is the simplest one. This is the one we majority agree on.

This is what was said. You read the transcripts yourself and just playing devil's advocate, even if what I said was unclear which sounded crystal clear to me, wouldn't somebody call me? I'm a Councilmember, one of the 11 here. Wouldn't someone call and say what exactly did you mean by that Councilmember Bokhari. Nobody. Nothing because they don't care. They want to jam something through that they designed in the beginning and that's it. If they can do that on something so simple as this that's why I can't trust anything else in here. More importantly, that's we as a community can't trust the actual big step coming up. The UDO.

Mr. Egleston said is a path forward for this and potentially if there are others that we go down this path with, if there was general agreement with what Mr. Bokhari said and it sounds to me I think there's a lot there. His sticking point is that in the transcript you read it said to modify the goal to reflect and he doesn't feel that the goal was modified. He feels like there was a new policy added. Can we move to the next thing, allow him to write what he thinks would be reflective of what he thinks we voted on, and allow us to make that decision as a Council again. Not refine the language by all arguing it out right here. It was his motion. Let him write the language and let us decide if that is reflective of what we voted on however many weeks ago cause otherwise, we could keep arguing about the motives of how it got here but if we are actually trying to modify this in a way that satisfies his intent and our vote we need new language to decide on. Can we allow him to write it and we come back to it in an hour?

Mayor Lyles said that is up to the Council. I think that the question is – Okay, who wants to run the meeting? Just tell me. I'm backing up. Y'all decide.

Mr. Egleston said I'm just trying to figure it out. I'm open to suggestions. I just feel like if we are going to change the language, we need a new language to weigh and if we are not going to change the language then it probably does merit just moving on.

Mayor Lyles said I think the question that I would as you is we got a lot of things on this list and we are going to wordsmith and ask for a change I don't know that there is the idea of what we mean all being the same thing. Then I think then that I would say to Mr. Winston do you want to write something up and then do you want to write something up Mr. Phipps, Ms. Johnson, Ms. Watlington, anybody. Let's just figure this out. We have to at some point understand. I didn't hear disagreement. What I heard I thought was Mr. Bokhari saying it's not written for 2040. It's not written for 2020. But I also know that all of us have said while this is a 2040 Comp Plan, it would be adjusted in five years. We know that plans have to be reviewed more frequently. That's how we ended up where we are now with a plan that's 75 years old because nobody talked about what is the next step. So, I guess what I am saying is that I don't know how we get to that point if we are going to do that this time if we're going to do it with everyone that we have already taken a straw vote on. I'm not really sure what the disposition-

Mr. Egleston said the first four I think we all felt like were reflective of what we had asked for and so, I would hope that that would be one of one or one of two or three that we might say well that's not exactly what we were hoping to get out of the vote that we took. The others no one had any comments on. We just said yes, that's what we were looking for, thank you. But again, we either have to modify the language or we can just note that Mr. Bokhari's frustrations and move to the next one.

Mr. Driggs said I think the reason this conversation is going on for so long is because Mr. Bokhari was absolutely clear about what he wanted and what this says is not what he said. If you doubt that look at page 15 where I said remove block lengths provisions for industrial sites. That was the motion. The numbers are still in there. The sensitivity on this is just the idea that there is this resistance in certain places. There are things we actually talk about and decide are then modified before they get back to us. They should come back to us exactly. At this point, the book itself is a great piece of work and most of it is not controversial.

It's valuable and we will adopt it in some form or another, but at some point, we have been allowed to put our own imprint on it. We have to be allowed as a group here to kind of go through this thing and say it's wonderful, yes, but and not have every single time that we might have an issue with anything that's in here. It's such a huge plan and this is such a monumental undertaking. We can't be working in an environment where we as the elected representatives of the people who have ultimate responsibility for this feel that we are not able to put forward modifications to this plan and just have them implemented. We are past the stage right now where we should be debating or arguing about this thing with the staff. We should be talking to each other and we should decide as a group and the majority of us should decide as a group but when the majority of us has spoken I would hope to see exactly what we said to show up.

I just think these are just examples. The reason this is such a long conversation is because I think there is a feeling on the part of some of us that is representative of kind of how this has happened up until this point. Particularly those of us who are not in favor of us proceeding immediately as the thing is right now. The truth is we are divided about this. We aren't divided about whether or not we need a plan or whether or not we should adopt this plan. We are divided into a couple of points. We need to have the freedom among ourselves to work out how we resolve those issues. Preferable not to proceed on the basis of being deeply divided to adopt a plan that is going to inform the development of this City for 20 years.

**Councilmember Ajmera** said may I suggest that we just see where the majority of the Council is on this. If the majority says it's fine, the new policy, the new language reflects what goes in the motion, then we don't need to debate this and spend another hour or two. I think we are not going to solve this today. We are going to solve this no matter how many hours of debate we are going to have on this. I think we have spent enough time. If the majority of the Council agrees that this language addresses it then we can put this to bed and move to the next one.

Mr. Driggs is absolutely right the Council should be discussing this at this point. So, if we can just figure out where everyone is at I have heard from some of them where they don't think this language reflects what was the motion, but I don't think I have heard from everyone in terms of their support. So, I think if we could just get feel on that if we have six people who support it we can move on the next.

Mr. Jones said Mayor and members of Council I think that Ms. Eiselt questions the question here is the intent to remove the concept of a 10-Minute Neighborhood from the goal? That I don't know. I think that if that's the intent then I think that's very different than the words that are here but I'm not sure that that is the intent to remove language related to a 10-Minute Neighborhood.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Newton to amend the language to say not all neighborhoods are expected to include every essential amenity, goods, or services, but every resident should have access to those amenities, goods, and services.

Mr. Winston said absolutely not. This would be a horrible change of language because it doesn't put any parameters with this. You could have a 90-minute bus ride if you have to transfer to get to those things like a lot of people on The Plaza that used to go to the Giant Penny, ride the #23 bus, or the #3 bus and go through the Charlotte Transportation Center to get there because they didn't have any supermarkets that were accessible to them. Under that language that would be okay and that would basically again to Mr. Jones's point eliminate the kind of idea around 10-Minute Neighborhoods. To answer Mr. Bokhari's question from earlier, the reason why the staff does not call you to clarify what you mean after you make an actual policy decision is because of transparency. That is your job to be clear and when you start to, this is the danger of the wordsmith, right. If you just try to make it up at the dais and you don't put it into actual planning policy speak and legal speak then it doesn't necessarily make sense.

It is the Councilmember's job if they have policy positions and policy language to engage our staff. The particular department where we want policy changes to occur and with our lawyers to make sure that language will actually get us to what we want to do. In this case Mr. Bokhari and whoever else on Council that wants to make whatever changes that they want, they did not do that work. They did not go to the Planning Staff. They did not engage with the Planning staff and the Legal Department to change that language. If we do that now like Mr. Egleston is suggesting, we are going to mess this up. That is what we have been doing over the past several weeks as opposed to doing the work to presenting your ideas in actual policy language. You put out these fantastical, political ideas and try to make it a popularity contest and that is dangerous. So, I hope my Council colleagues reject Mr. Egleston's motion because if we continue to do that, we are all in trouble.

Ms. Johnson said we can look at this motion or what we can do since we have already voted, we feel we have already voted on this issue, maybe as we are going through the changes, if there are any policies that we feel as the motion maker may have been misunderstood maybe Taiwo and the staff can go back and take a look at it and we can discuss it and maybe we could table those issues so that we can move on.

Mayor Lyles said I'm not quite sure if we have the schedule for release to the public again next week. I really think the idea was to take the information that you have today and while it's not something that we necessarily have to change because actually if you want to change it and you want to have the language ready for it, you could make a change on the 21<sup>st</sup> to any item. You could work with the staff and the lawyers to get it all right and do that.

This was the idea. As you said we have spent 30, 40, 50 hours of this, and if you look at 40 hours of this, I don't know. Whatever but who counts? I think the issue have been that the staff just like in the budget you have to give the staff something to prepare and this is what we voted and supported. Anyone of the Council could at the time that it is on the agenda say I'd like to amend this, this, and this. You have the time to do it.

What the staff was trying to do today was to show you the reaction to the straw votes and then the recommendations that they would put out to the public that would be ready for everyone to vote on, on the 21<sup>st</sup>. We could go through every one of these, but as Mr. Bokhari said things are going to be other places and acknowledge that there are going to be other places that everybody doesn't agree with.

Mr. Bokhari said I withdraw.

Mayor Lyles said it was Mr. Egleston's motion.

Mr. Egleston said I was just trying to help us move along.

Mayor Lyles said I understand that Mr. Egleston but it happens like that sometimes.

**Councilmember Newton** said I don't know if the motion has been withdrawn. If that's the case then I guess we can move on. I completely understand where Councilmember Winston was coming from. I think he's right in that scenario that he mentioned. Certainly, that wouldn't constitute a 10-Minute Neighborhood. At the same time, I do think that we could have both. We can uphold the spirit of what's in front of us with this document right now and at the same time include the possibility for other types of technologies that we can not even contemplate today emerging later.

I think that's what Councilmember Bokhari was getting at, which is expanding the scope of this. Not excluding what's in here right now, but just expanding the scope. Then my next question to Councilmember Winston's point would have been, I don't know if this is relevant, but it would have been so when do we get those details? I do think at some point you do need to lock in some details. We have been saying from the very beginning that this is an aspirational document even though we have been told time and time again that there is policy within it. So, I have come to accept both scenarios here. Having said that to the extent that maybe what was proposed by Councilmember Egleston was aspirational in nature, but there would need to be some time for sort of some more specifics involved. I would have thought that would have been the UDO. I think that's what we have been saying from the get-go. I am ready to move forward if there is a motion or not a motion. I am ready to move forward with no motion.

Mayor Lyles said who made the second to Mr. Egleston's motion?

Mr. Egleston said Mr. Newton did.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Newton did you just withdraw your second?

Mr. Newton said I will withdraw my second.

Mr. Egleston said I just want us to modify the language or move on to the next thing.

Mayor Lyles said I think that what I would suggest again, this document is coming to us on June 21<sup>st</sup> for a vote. Any person can make an amendment at that time and should be vetted with your lawyers, Teri and Patrick and with your colleagues. I think Mr. Driggs is right. This is again a situation where if you want to change you have got to talk to the people around the table.

Councilmember Egleston, I withdrew his motion and encourage anybody who wants to change the language and bring it forth to a vote later.

Mayor Lyles said that will be on the 21<sup>st</sup>. I am going to be very specific about this. This is going to be on the agenda and if you want to change the item on anyone, you can say page whatever and point whatever, you can say I am going to request this amendment. That will be a long Council meeting as well. We thought this would have been pretty short because we would have a chance to walk through the staff changes and then everybody would know where they stood. I think that is Mr. Graham's point. We always have to try to pull ourselves in a place that we get to keep going.

Mayor Lyles said the next page is page four, which is the Anti-displacement Commission. Are there any questions?

Mr. Egleston said a couple and it's kind of on both slide seven and slide eight because they are both Ant-displacement Commission. Apologies, I have answered one of them. We also need to reference the Infrastructure Investment Commission just for comparison's sake.

May first question would be how are we defining the difference between neighborhood leaders and community organizers? That to me seems like two ways of saying the same thing. Then also, and I think this is on Council so I'm not putting it on anybody else, I don't know that in our ask we were specific but I think we might need to be around the fact that the strategies that are created are going to need to be tailored to the specific areas that they are seeking to mitigate the potential negative impacts. So, in the same way, that in the Economic Development Committee, Corridors of Opportunity, each of those Corridors of Opportunity has not one strategy that they're all sharing but a tailored strategy for their specific need, their specific opportunity, and challenges. So, I think we need to find a way to say that the strategies that we are seeking are going to be specific and tailored to the areas that we're seeking to implement them.

Just as a point of comparison, I guess my third and final question or point would be that the Infrastructure Investment Commission that we contemplate on slide 11 does not necessarily try to call out who would constitute this group but we do on the Anti-displacement Commission. So, just for consistency's sake, I feel like we either need to flesh out who's going to be on the Infrastructure Investment Committee or we need to take out some of the specificity of who is going to be on the Anti-displacement Commission. I'm open to feedback on any of those three points.

Mayor Lyles said wait a minute. I got two. Geographic specificity and compositions should be consistent between infrastructure and displacement and the detail

Mr. Egleston said and then I guess my first point could be mute if we were removing some of the languages about who's going to be on this Anti-displacement Commission, but if we are not and we are instead flushing out who's going to be on the Infrastructure Investment Commission then I'm just wondering some of this to me seems redundant. Neighborhood leaders and Community Organizers and Housing Advocates and residents. I don't know that the difference is I guess between a Neighborhood Leader and a Community Organizer is. Again if we are taking some of that out, it might not matter. Mayor Lyles said I don't remember who spoke to that issue or the detail and we don't have to ask. I think Mr. Egleston's point is to include something around geographic specificity for noting that not all of Charlotte is alike. Then do you want to be that detailed in the appointment process? At some point, as we go to the follow-up in the next steps



we're going to have to define these things and they are going to have to come back to the Council for an appointment. So, I think that the intent here is to say we want to make sure everyone in the community has the opportunity to participate. I think that the charge being written for these will cover those points, Mr. Egleston.

Mr. Graham said I get his point, but a lot of these things are implied, right. These things will incur. So, I'm not sure that every step of the way we have to set that vision that answers the question as we do it. So, we have the UDO coming. A lot of these things will be flushed out in more specific details, but if we try to flush it as we go along the way we going to have a 20, 30, 40-hour conversation on every topic. I think that's what we are from my perspective, that we are trying to write the Plan and implement the strategies to policies at the same time. I think that's is where some of the frustration is at least from my part is coming and I am willing to trust the process, trust the individuals in the room, and certainly trust the Planning staff and the Director to kind of lead us in the right direction and Council asserting its authority when necessary and at the appropriate time.

**Councilmember Watlington** said my comment specific to this really speaks to the broader point that I have been trying to make. I'm looking at slide 20 and it talks about the three parts. I know we going to hear what the specific next steps are, but I think it's important as we think about the Anti-Displacement and the Infrastructure Commissions, and Councilmember Newton has brought this up before. I want to understand the timing very specifically between when that work is complete and when we move to the next step because what I don't see here is how we are going to ensure that we haven't already completed or drafted the bulk of the UDO without taking these recommendations into consideration on the front end. That is not yet clear to me. That one is a sticking point for me. I want to make sure that the work that's done is input into the UDO because I know you said that this will be done during the UDO Councilmember Graham. I would expect this to be done before the UDO because the UDO should reflect what the recommendations are that come out of that. So, that is going to be extremely important to me to understand. That's what I would like to understand before we move forward in regard to the Plan.

Mayor Lyles said I am not quite sure where we landed.

Ms. Eiselt said so, that was my comment on number 19 as well. More or less I think that's what your getting to Ms. Watlington, is it the straw vote was for the commission to be appointed to develop recommendations for the implementation phase of the Plan. That doesn't seem to be what the final recommendation is. Do you read that the same way?

Ms. Watlington said correctly. That's my concern. I see a launch, but I don't expect the start times to be the same time. I expect one to follow the other.

Ms. Eiselt said I guess this gets back to what we are talking about. If you can't do it then you just got to say it. You can't do it, it isn't working into the Plan, because it is just so nuanced, but it makes it sound like continuing established programs to provide support for the inclusion of affordable housing units when single-family units are removed particularly in neighborhoods. So, that is sort of Expo factor work, when what the vote was for was to develop some recommendations that could be part of the implementation. Not the response.

Mr. Jones said let me see if I could be helpful here. So, a number of the items that we are talking about with the Anti-displacement or recommendations out of the Great Neighborhoods Committee word for word. The other piece of this to Councilmember Watlington's question, I believe at some point in what Taiwo presented tonight there is this opportunity, the Mayor said the same thing, she used the word resolution. I think we haven't had the preamble to make sure that we add to that what the next steps are in this process so that there is a great deal of clarity from place type mapping to that informing the UDO, but to lay out days, dates, and time so the Council will know what the next X months are. I hope that addresses a piece of your question.

Ms. Watlington said a follow-up question to that. Before the 21<sup>st</sup> are we going to see that?

Mr. Jones said my understanding is, yes. So, as a part of the preamble, we would add, Taiwo if I have this right, a piece that maps out the next step in terms of the process. Even including what I would call the July look-back to see what the process was and what improvements we can have. Also, there is a series of steps that get you to the UDO and I believe what you are saying is you want to see that before you vote on the 21<sup>st</sup>?

Ms. Watlington said correct.

Mr. Jones said that is something that the Mayor used the word resolution.

Mayor Lyles said yes, I should have said preamble. Excuse me

Mr. Jones said there's an adjustment to the preamble that would lay that out also, yes.

Mr. Driggs said, Councilmember Graham, to your point, one of the difficulties that some of us have is that there is a difficult mixture of what I would call big picture and aspirational stuff with a lot of detail stuff. So, when we look at the detailed stuff, it sort of suggests to us that we need to be at that level of detail and I think to Ms. Watlington's point what is difficult here is the sequence of events. Like what is the progression from the formulation of a vision for the City and some of the methods we intend to use, what is the progression from there to policy making and detail and then to the writing of the UDO?

I think what we are hearing Mr. Jaiyeoba, is the Plan is going to happen then and the UDO is going to happen then, and we are trying to understand the flow when a whole bunch of things that we didn't expect to see until later are already in here. Because the effect of putting them here is limiting on later and makes us think about things in greater detail now that we really want to address later. So, that's why some of this stuff comes up about the wording because of the unevenness of the level of detail and policy making or rule making that's already in this document.

I think especially when you get to parts two and three. Are we going to go through parts two and three and then do the UDO? I wonder if there is an extra layer there that we don't even really need. Maybe we should start talking about the rules. In that sense, we would have total clarity about what we mean. Now we will have the black letter language about what the ordinance is. So, there won't be any kind of differences in terms of what we really mean by this or that. I think we have the building blocks. I think we have a generally accepted intent for example to liberalize land use. To liberalize land use in order to bring the cost of housing down. That's the thing that I think we could agree on. Then you get into kind of more detailed questions about the tree policy. We haven't even seen it yet as was pointed out.

Can we kind of complete or come together at one level and then work some more on understanding exactly what these things mean? That's what I have struggled with frankly. It's like I'm inclined to say sure, let's just do this. No, the harm done and then we will see. But I don't want to kind of have the conversation about some of the questions that are not yet answered in here from the standpoint of having kind of prejudged the context. I'd like to have those questions come up and feel that we are kind of free to consider them not having voted on something that actually limits our choices.

So, I think a lot of what you are hearing has to do with that. I'm very interested to hear the sequence. Exactly what the sequence is and the timeline, the map, the UDO, the economic impact analysis so that we can kind of anticipate what we will know at each point and time as we finalize a stage in this process. I guess that is my general comment. So, let's get that timeline. I'm hoping that we are clear that we will actually vote on phases two and three if we decide that we really need volumes two and three and that given how much work has already been done on the UDO and the plans we can't just proceed to those. We could save ourselves a lot of time because we are going to have the same conversation on phases two and three that we are having now and then we are going to have it again when we see the UDO.

So, I just want to put out there the possibility or think about what would it take to just get this to the point where hopefully a large majority of us can agree on it. I think that message would be much better than having a six to five contentious vote and then think about just getting to work on the language. The actual ordinance because at that point there won't be any question about do you mean this or do you mean that? We won't have well; we realize that may not be possible. Sorry but I just want to finish one last point. Mr. Manager, you said, are we hearing that the intention is to abolish the concept of 10-Minute Neighborhoods, and I would say no. I don't think that was suggested, right by anything Mr. Bokhari said. I do have a feeling that that concept is probably unworkable. So, I have a personal concern that suggesting to people what we can achieve that is not representative. But on the other hand, I have noticed in our conversation that there is not necessarily a majority view around this, so I'm not going to talk about it anymore. I made the point. I didn't sense enough traction on that point to the kind of take a lot of people's time. On some of these other issues, you are hearing more meaningful points of view that don't necessarily align. So, anyway if we could just come together around a kind of uplifting statement of what it is we want to do and then get to work on doing it quickly I think that would be the best thing.

Mayor Lyles said we are on nine, which is Anti-displacement and this came out of the Council Committee and it ensures landlords, particularly affordable maintain habitable premises.

Ms. Johnson said I have a question about the goal. We know that we are going to have more rental properties in the future. So, is there any kind of database where renters can track landlords or property managers or some type of oversight in the City for landlords?

Ms. Eiselt said that's against state law.

Ms. Johnsons said so it's against state law for the City to do that?

Ms. Eiselt said you can't register landlords.

Ms. Johnson said as landlords, we can't register as landlords, but what I mean is oversight as far as excessive complaints, excessive fees, or unethical practices? Maybe it's not something that we as the City could do. Is there an agency that could keep track? I mean when people move here and they are renting, there are property management companies and landlords that are really taking advantage of folks. So, is there any type of oversight or any goals for us to be able to or someone to be able to monitor that in the future?

Mayor Lyles said I'm going to ask Mr. Baker if he could do some research around that. We have tried a couple of things like registering landlords particularly in areas where the rentals are in vulnerable areas and it has not been able to happen. I don't know the answer to the question. Do you know the answer immediately or would you like to get us some information?

**Patrick Baker, City Attorney** said I would be happy to get back with Ms. Johnson and the rest of the Council. I've got some thoughts in terms of my personal experience in this. It is very limited as Ms. Eiselt said in terms of what cities can actually do in that regard, I'd like to get you a more comprehensive answer if I could.

Ms. Johnson said could I follow up if it's not something that we and the City could actually manage, is there an organization, an entrepreneur, or private sector organization that we could work with to provide, subsidize or do something because it is a need in our City.

Mr. Baker said I will add that too to that response.

Ms. Eiselt said I will just respond to Ms. Johnson that we looked at this in the Community Safety Committee a couple of years ago when the State took away CMPDs requirement that landlords register. There were tools possibly to work with CMPD to that because of the way they issue citations to be able to recategorize it in terms of the number of it. I would suggest that it would be something that the Community Safety Committee would

take up to maybe work with CMPD to log that differently. I can't remember exactly what they are allowed to do or not do, but there was a citation issue, they would issue a citation but didn't ramp up if they had 10 citations already. So, it is probably a good thing to handle in Committee and explore that a little bit more.

Ms. Johnson said right even for maintenance issues so we can avoid another Lake Arbor.

Ms. Eiselt said we did go through all of that and it just would probably be a refresher in a committee meeting.

Mayor Lyles said we will get a legal idea around it.

Mr. Winston said I just have one comment. To Ms. Eiselt's point, that is absolutely correct. We did a deep dive and we made changes to the minimum housing standards. That's something that the Council did on our own, but it also coincided as Ms. Eiselt also mentioned with some supreme court cases that changed our ability to do things around hotels and motels. I think it is in relation to the minimum housing standards. I think there were some things when we made those changes that we did say we wanted to revisit. So, if we do go back to deal with it in the Committee I think we should look back to the vote on that and kind of see what the Council's thought process was around that so we could have that continuity of work around it.

Mayor Lyles said we will include that in the background information. The next item is the Economic Analysis.

Mr. Driggs said to further what I said before, the sequence. Like when exactly do we get that? There going to be things in there that could actually change our thinking about some pretty fundamental tenants in here. So, we need to make sure that we have that result before we lock in some of the other goals.

Mayor Lyles said I really hope that everybody realizes that we are stepping out here to try to do something we haven't done in 75 years and if we are not ready to do an assessment, it's kind of like you don't wait until everything is done and then go back and say we need to go back to step one or two to do it. I hope we'll have rolling opportunities to say this is working and this isn't. I really believe that this community is going to grow so fast and so much is going on that we have to be as quick and nibble as we should be as a Council and a governing body. So, think that you are right. It's like when and how do we make sure that we adjust it and I would hope that we consider that in our steps going forward, Mr. Jones.

Ms. Watlington said I just wanted to also acknowledge this one. Just like the Anti-displacement piece, I would want to see the Economic Impact Analysis like Councilmember Driggs just mentioned ahead of moving into some of the decisions when comes to the regulations. Just like the Feasibility Analysis as well. Because while I absolutely appreciate rolling updates, I do think it is incumbent upon us to forecast so that we know what to expect and we can get an assessment of feasibility.

Mayor Lyles said that makes a lot of sense to figure out what the target is and how are we meeting it.

Ms. Watlington said exactly right. I think we set some targets in that. The next item is 11, which is Infrastructure Investment Commission. I think that we have had Mr. Egleston address and this has a lot more context for the work and not the appointments. Whereas the other one had a lot more work around the appointments I think.

Ms. Eiselt said I have a question on this one and it relates to, I asked Emily if she could look up what we had said regarding that 50% plus of our CIP dollars going into infrastructure in disadvantaged neighborhoods and it just seems, I guess and Emily confirmed we did not vote on that as a straw vote. I thought we had and that's why I was confused why it wasn't in here, but it seems like that conflicts with this again of having an Infrastructure Investment Commission. I personally don't feel like that 50% number makes

sense to me because it's kind of an obituary number but if we are talking about economic mobility then let's help people move economically and not just be investing in specific geographic places which could limit us if you have a company that moves to Charlotte and wants to invest in a certain place but they are providing the kind of jobs that we want to have. Then it would seem to me that Investment Commission hopefully would have set a guideline that said they could do that and were not as caught up with where that investment goes as we are what they are providing. So, it is more of a statement, it is not a question, but I don't know if other Councilmembers also thought we had discussed that 50% number.

Mr. Driggs said I agree with Ms. Eiselt. I had expressed concern about the 50% number. I don't think we should have a quota. I mean you could look at this as sort of like increasing our Corridor investment to 50% and given that we are putting 25% of CIP (Capital Investment Plan) into affordable housing at present we have some kind of peculiar implications in terms of our ability to do the other things, Business Investment Grants, and other things that we do with our capital dollars. So, I actually like the language here that says that we have an Infrastructure Advisory Council and we should give them the latitude to sort of interpret our policy and decide what that actually means and reconcile our priorities. In my mind, there could even be a question about the legality of establishing a quota like this. If you think about our Business Inclusion Policies and things like that, for us to just sort of say this much money is going to be spent in those places. The people in other places could well ask without regard to the kind of need and the relative needs or the traffic situation in my neighborhood. So, I'm hoping we go with the Infrastructure Investment Commission.

Last quick comment on that. Again with reference to the fiscal impact study, it comments there on the fact that we actually need be more intentional about choosing our capital investments. So, if you look at the commentary that they added in their assessment that the outlook for capital, they did suggest. So, I am just saying let's be intentional and let's let the capital prioritization be informed by our Plan, but 50% is a very odd provision.

Ms. Ajmera said the language reflects the motion that I had made. It talks about equitable investments in areas that are most in need. Also, I think 50% is a good number to have. As we know there are parts of our City that have been left behind. So, until and unless we make a commitment to uplift some of these parts of our City, I'm not sure if we can truly make progress. So, I would like to continue to see that number as well as I'm very pleased with the language that I have seen here. So, thank you to the Planning Department and Taiwo.

Mayor Lyles said I think that while the number 50% is in there, it is not a quota. It's really aspirational.

Ms. Eiselt said it's not. It is a number.

Mayor Lyles said well that's what aspirational numbers are. It is a number but why wouldn't it be 50%? How do you know what it should be? Should it be 75%?

Ms. Eiselt well how do you define those neighborhoods?

Mayor Lyles said to me I think the question is, this is where I am, you can see this stuff around the City. I mean obviously, we wouldn't be talking about the Opportunity Corridors if we didn't know there was a need for infrastructures. So, I think it's disingenuous perhaps 50%, but it's disingenuous to say well how do we know where it is going to go or where it's needed most.

If you tore down people's homes, and the thing about this is this kind of goes to one of the developers that talked to me about this, you wouldn't need this if we actually had housing in places where infrastructure followed housing. But the infrastructure didn't follow housing until it was in the 1960s and 70s and 80s. So, people that lived here before then, lived by creeks that are dangerous often. They live where there's no tree canopy often. I just think that there is a sense of a commitment that needs to be made. I don't

know if the number 50 is the right number, but I could suggest in many ways and in parts of the City 50% wouldn't be enough. I shouldn't have said that Julie about [inaudible], but I don't really have any idea for you to say to me well it's just a number. It means a lot to people, people in this City. Sometimes we kind of be flippant and we used these words a little bit, but I tell you people watch us, and to be flippant about everything is just not really good.

Ms. Eiselt said I wasn't being been flippant at all. I'm very serious about it.

Mr. Jones said I asked our Budget Director, Ryan Bergman to see what our investments have been in the past as well as what our investments would be over these next four bond cycles that still have not been approved but are a part of the outlook, the 2022 Calendar year, 2024, 2026, and 2028.

Defining what a vulnerable neighborhood is, is probably the first thing that we need to do, right because absent that, you revert back to terminology. What the crescent in the wedge, or things of that nature. So, I think we have this great opportunity to define what a vulnerable neighborhood is and I believe Wake County has an index vulnerability index and it has a bunch of measures in it. I think you would love that. So, let's just say that is very important upfront. We took a look back at the four bond cycles for the Big Ideas. Again because I can't define what vulnerable is. It's a little bit dangerous to go back and look at this in terms of let's say the crescent in the wedge.

You have \$784 million in the Big Ideas, and Ryan my apologies, you just did this analysis today so please bear with us. It's just a thumbnail sketch. So, if you take our affordable housing which some would suggest maybe you shouldn't. If you take our affordable housing adjust for that and then you take some programmatic areas such as sidewalks, traffic signals, resurfacing, we have about \$500 million. Then if you look at that \$500 million, about \$345 million went to vulnerable neighborhoods depending on the definition. I would say if you just take a look at the Big Ideas which had its own flaws, you could reasonably say that 50% of that investment went into the crescent as oppose to these undefined vulnerable neighborhoods. So, I just don't think we are so far off looking back. Looking forward again you look at the \$792 million four bond cycles, and again you'd have to define it, but right off the top, there's \$200 million that's related to affordable housing. Affordable housing, for the most part, we will leave that alone. My point is we're not so far off with a quick look, but I will just put that there as the Council is discussing this tonight.

Ms. Ajmera said Mr. Jones addressed what I was going to ask. Considering the Neighborhood Investment Plan and Corridors of Opportunity, we already do 50% today. So, I'm trying to, if we could get a history on the last five years as to what has been the investments in areas along the Corridors of Opportunity for the past five years, then also for the budget that we will be adopting soon. I think that would help because I am under the impression that we already do 50% now.

Ms. Watlington said thank you Mr. Jones for that background. I think that is the crux of what a lot of us have been saying, right. The goal or the policy, the component that's in this document is really what you said. You had to have some sort of assumptions to go and do that assessment and those are the things that we should be capturing. We know we want to invest in infrastructure in neighborhoods that are vulnerable based on these criteria, right. Consistent with Mecklenburg County, whatever, but what we have in the Plan is the output that, until you just said that many sitting around the dais didn't know what the building blocks were. So, it's that that when Councilmember Driggs says the inconsistency or the unevenness in it that is the struggle. If we are going to put numbers in, and I didn't receive what you said as flippant. I think what you were saying is that we have established a number and we don't know where the number came from but the building blocks that got to that number is what I think we all can agree on.

So, as we think about making modifications to this Plan. Let's figure out how to really hit that part because that's what guides the analysis. If we say we know that the goal is to invest appropriately in vulnerable neighborhoods, alright well let's define vulnerable like

you said, we've got a benchmark for that. Then we can say, well what has been invested? We can take a look back and do everything that you did, but when we put the end, in the beginning, is where we keep running into issues.

Mr. Newton said I would agree with that. I'm just thrilled that we are just beyond the point of asking the question of whether we should have an Infrastructure Commission at all. I remember that conversation. We have 33 Boards and Commissions if I'm not wrong about that. I think we may have as many as 37 because some are inactive, but not a single one for infrastructure. So, I think that is an accomplishment in its own right. Having said that, at the same time I really do see this Commission working harmoniously with this 50% number to the City Managers point. I think you made a really fantastic point. We need to flesh out this policy. We need to define it. That's the work of the Commission. In so doing it's not necessarily confined to any one location. Certainly, we want to see more investment in our Corridors of Opportunity, but it does not necessarily have to be defined to that either. That's up to the Commission to do that hard work to make those decisions and we'll I guess come back to the recommendations for that. I'm on board with those proposals and I think that they work in harmony with one another.

Mr. Bokhari said I would just add that I think the macro problem that this issue brings up is that this is the tail wagging the dog in a lot of cases. In this case, a side from the question that has already been asked, what analysis has gone in to say 50%, an awful round number that is certainly not aspirational, is the one to be codified into this now? But who's been engaged in budget, in engineering, in Charlotte Water and Stormwater? All of the places that actually build all of these plans up and how do we get to infrastructure spend and CIP spend? The same thing goes on slide 19 that we are going to get to in a minute with saying bringing in workforce development, and things like that. These other plans and other parts of our staff, have to at least be consulted if not the Strategic Employment Plan from Economic Development is the one that feeds this Plan and tells it what to do. What we have got is something that is far beyond the Land Use Plan that didn't consult these other departments and put these measures in, then that my friend is the tail wagging the dog.

Mayor Lyles said I'm going to say that equitable doesn't mean equal. So, 50% is a number that divides something in half. I hope that when we are defining vulnerable neighborhoods we look at need because that will actually define what the number should be. It's not just because 50% over five years. It is 50% over the time that this City started growing and didn't bring everybody along with it. Now, for whatever reason, that may happen. Maybe it was a lot of things. Maybe you just didn't have the ability or maybe you didn't give the opportunity or maybe there wasn't a school for you to go to, but I would say that we've got to figure this out. Not as a number without defining what the need is and then looking at equity instead equal 50%. That's how I would see this.

The next item is the straw vote on strengthening language around homeownership. Any questions about that?

The next item is slide 14, Strengthen language around homeownership again. It is different, but is there anything on slide #13?

The next one is 15, which is adjustments around, a number of these are around Block Lengths, consider changes in recommended industry inquiry. Then establish industrial criteria and consultation.

Mr. Driggs said I have already made the point about the discrepancy. I think that is clear, but we also added to establish industrial criterion in consultation with industry representatives. I'm reading this and I don't see any acknowledgment of the vote that we took on that one which I believe passed.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I can speak to that. I am sorry, I think that was a mistake where we were playing around with the slides. We had two slides but on this one, we had indicated that we had industrial developers on the Ordinance Advisory Committee that were actually working with John Morris of Beacon, who are actually going to be working with

us on this, because they are familiar with the existence of division ordinances with regard to industrial. We included that in there, but somehow because we were switching slides. That's why, so I apologize for that.

Mayor Lyles said so there is a method to do that?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes.

Mr. Driggs said thank you Mr. Jaiyeoba. I just want to stress the importance of that in my mind. We need to try to get onto partnership terms with developers and not have this thing move forward in an atmosphere of confrontation.

Mayor Lyles said the next one is slides 16, 42 in the policy section, change "all lots" to "place types." In policy 2.1, change "all lots" to "place types". Any questions about that?

Ms. Watlington said I don't want this to pass and people be under the impression that there is not discussion going on around this language. We have had some discussions. There's a lot of it happening and I know that the Planning Commission is going to review some language that we have submitted. So, we look forward to what that outcome is. But I don't want to give the public the impression that there is no conversation going on here. There is more to come.

Mr. Bokhari said yeah, we are once again while the Council did straw vote some things through, I think we are still very much to Victoria's point in the discussion here. I will repeat, it is still the best negotiation kind of middle ground concession for us to come to with a simple statement to say that we are going aggressively increase density while reducing sprawl, keeping diversity, and have housing types, affordability throughout the entire community with a special focus on our most vulnerable community. That simply enough doesn't prohibit any of us from the things that we are passionate about keeping it nor make any of us want that stuff gone, gone.

I will tell you I am open, and I will repeat it the same way I did last time we met. My vote even, though there are things I hate scatted throughout this is still there for a yes, if that's important to anyone at this point. If you remove the Community Benefits Agreement, capital letters from the whole plan, and say community engagement and then you take this and make sure it doesn't say single-family zoning anywhere in it because we have to figure that out. That's the work that needs to be done.

So, my hope is Mr. Manager, we can come to a conclusion that that wording is taken out but doesn't back us into a corner that says that's not something we could consider. It just doesn't give anyone a stamp of approval to go do it without coming back to us. Or make the community think that we figured it out and that is indeed the best answer. Once again I am just putting that out there. I hope to negotiate.

Ms. Johnson said I just want to say that I sit here tonight as a representative for District 4 and as a voice to share the position of many of my constituents. I also bring a unique perspective as a former real estate agent with over a decade of experience and a current and passionate proponent for affordable housing and equity in our City. For the record, I do not support the status quo. As we all know the status quo only allows the current development of these units on corner lots. This is not what I am proposing. I believe that diverse housing types are appropriate for many areas in our City. However, there are also many areas where it is not. Those of us who oppose are simply seeking a solution that will provide flexibility options for the protection of established neighborhoods and a more sophisticated approach to future development.

Please take a look at this map I gave it to a couple of people. As you can see there are limited areas. Only 33% where these units can be built. This approach will decrease homeownership in certain areas, expedite gentrification, further increase the inequities and challenges to upward mobility and widen the wealth gap in our City. All of this without any guarantee of affordable housing for those with the greatest needs.



Mayor Lyles said the next item is slide 17, Industrial Areas and the Airport.

Ms. Watlington said I just wanted to say that I am glad to see the linkage between the Airport's Master Plan and efforts in the Comp Plan. I know that was something I spoke with the Airport Director about, here recently. I wanted to make sure that those two were working in conjunction with each other because they have done a lot of work over there. I am excited about the Plan at the Airport and what it can do to help make that area a destination and bring more amenities to the Northwest community. So, thank you for that adjustment and I look forward to what comes out of that.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said just so you know Ms. Gentry and I spoke extensively today about that as well. I think the connection, that will be very important for us to make is the work that ED is going to be doing starting industrial centers, industrial areas in terms of the capacity for the City. So, we are working with them and I suggested today that we should bring the Airport into that conversation as well. So, hopefully, we will have a consultant that will land back on that, but yes Ms. Gentry and I spoke about that today.

Ms. Watlington said awesome. Thank you.

Mr. Phipps said in relation to this particular item I really do applaud the effort to entertain the idea of some dispersing of some of these industrial areas. I would hope that as a Council we would courage when those types of opportunities come up that we don't more or less get boiled down into some of the disadvantages of not putting some of these places, instead of concentrating them at the Airport, that we would have some sites around that we can accommodate our workforce so you don't have to get in a car in the University City and drive all the way to the Airport. That maybe they could have a hub that they can go to. So, I know on several occasions we have explored opportunities and said no because we had a protest of air quality and all sort of different objections to maybe have industrial or light manufacturing in certain areas. So, I applaud this effort and I think we should have some dispersing and I look forward to seeing if we have the appetite to follow through on this. Thanks.

Mayor Lyles said the next item is the vote on Center City Heights.

Ms. Ajmera said the new language does reflect the motion that was passed where we are going to be discussing this at a later date when the UDO is being discussed. I see the language around the specificity, and the number has been removed, and that is great. I know we had gotten a lot of emails about this. So, this does address the concern with more density in the uptown area, while we continue to work on that in our UDO process.

Mr. Driggs said for one I think the goal when we had the straw votes was not to have a number. Now there is a number. A side from that the concern I have about building heights is if you have a situation where the market suggests that a building should be 30 stories high in market economics, and we say, we don't want a 30 story building there because it casts a shadow or it's a bad neighbor. Okay, then we can limit it. But if we say, sure you can put a building there of 30 stories provided you kick in X to our affordable housing, we need to be a little careful that the bonuses system we have truly represents a bonus. Meaning that it's an incentive and it's not a fine that you have to pay in order to build the building that you think is right at that location. I think this could be a little tricky legally. At the moment I'm concerned that 20 stories is arbitrary and that is the kind of thing that we should be talking about later and at this point just state our goal of having incentives that's available to people if they build and they contribute to this fund and not treat it a sort of a tax or a penalty. Because it could be construed as mandatory inclusionary zoning.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said what we voted on was specific to Uptown Regional Activity Center, not the entire Regional Activity Center as a place type. In the Plan on what you commented on, the Regional Activity Center as a place type that had two different provisions. One is that in areas that our Regional Activity Center, let's say River District or even in Ballantyne or Eastland Mall, or any other, you can build as tall as you want to, but once you hit that 20 story level whether those benefits to the communities. There are certain benefits today that will come whether that be the Plaza or even traffic, demand management that the

developer has to even provide without any community stepping forward. There could be some others like we have had with our Transit Oriented Development successfully over the last year or two.

The second part was Uptown Regional Activity Center. I believe that that's where you'll vote for. I think that folks who are concerned about the fact that if you say 30 stories, which was what we said, 30 stories or more or 500 feet, that you are limiting that. So, we took that reference out based on the alternative motion to discuss it as part of the Unified Development Ordinance. That's a conversation we had with the development industry too last week with regards to that. They understand that we are keeping the Regional Activity Center outside of uptown to that degree.

We have had our conversation with economic development colleagues as well as of this morning. With reference to uptown that's where we are removing that 500 feet reference. So, that way we can have that conversation. That's really what we are responding to during your vote. So, Regional Activity Center is not just limited to uptown. The 20 stories you see in there is not uptown. It is areas outside of uptown.

Mr. Driggs said the 20 stories is new or not new?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said It was there before. It's not new, it was there before.

Mr. Driggs said alright. I would just comment if you had a five-story limit you said you can build more than five stories if you put money into our Housing Trust Fund. That might be regarded as extortion. So, that's why I think it is critical that we have a reason for where we draw the line. The cross over from your freedom to build and then your obligation if you want to do more than that to help us out on our housing front.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said if you recall during our Transit Oriented Development conversation with you, we had [inaudible] economics did some [inaudible] and did some economic analysis with regards to bonus heights and we came up with different options. Whether you provide units of affordable housing or you pay in lieu fees, I think it is a contribution towards CBI (Charlotte Business INClusion) or how you get minority contractors. It's the same process we are going to go here with when we get into the market analysis that will help us to determine our point. Does it make sense for the business and whether those bonuses, you will eventually see what they have before that becomes implemented?

Mr. Driggs said alright, thank you.

Mr. Bokhari said for those keeping score at home, this is yet another example of a whole bunch of things that were irrelevant to the actual question, which the answer was we all sit around this room and said unless you understand what capping height either uptown or outside of uptown means, don't codify it in the Plan. Then when you do let's discuss it and then we will do it. And what do we get back? Another example of fancy footwork and eight answers that have nothing to do with what we actually discussed and I'm assuming some of us will have to go back to the actual meeting minutes and go prove our points again in the next week of which I think several of us are just far too tired to do anymore.

The broader point that I think can't be lost on us here is the double standard and contradiction that exist in this Plan. Which is if we are a growing City so rapidly growing that we must at all cost have density. So much to the point that we must put it in this Plan before we even understand it now. But we are only going to do that with duplexes and triplexes and single-family lots. We don't value density where it actually matters in large tall buildings uptown or in Regional Activity Centers, or else where and if people want that, 30 stories, think about that, 30 stories is not that significant and if we are growing this way, if you want to go over 30, you've got to pay to play and mess with some of our other incentive programs by which we will extract value from you. Rather than us actually cherishing density as its own outcome.

Ms. Watlington said on this one in particular because I seconded it, really what I want is a sense of affirmation that everybody is still good on this one because I heard

Councilmember Ajmera say that the numbers were removed, but I see them here. I see the parenthesis it says outside of uptown, but I think there's enough, I don't want to say confusion, I just want to make sure that everybody wants this. So, I move to keep the recommended language as is.

Mayor Lyles said it will come as it is written here in the June 21<sup>st</sup> write-up that we have unless someone changes it on the 21<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Watlington said okay, thanks.

Ms. Ajmera said may I follow up on this? The language where the numbers are specifically is for outside of uptown and the conversation we had on May 17<sup>th</sup> was specifically for uptown. So, the new language does not tie us to any specific number that we had specifically talked about on May 17<sup>th</sup>. I guess the number there could be confusing, but it has nothing to do with the uptown discussion that we have had.

Ms. Watlington said to that point where did the addition come from? If what we were talking about was specific to uptown and I see that in the Uptown Regional Activity Center buildings that exceed 30 stories should be developed with community benefits was axed out, were in the conversation or in the motion did we talking about apply 20 stories to the other Regional Activity Centers?

Ms. Ajmera said I understand that was already there Ms. Watlington.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes, it was already there.

Ms. Watlington said so you underlined the whole thing?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes. I just underlined everything, but we crossed out every reference to uptown.

Mayor Lyles said okay, let's go to 19, recommend language to support the City's employment goals.

Mr. Bokhari said I already made the point earlier I won't belabor it. The Strategic Employment Plan should connect and inform the Comp Plan, not the other way around. The other piece that goes kind of along with that is, why employment goals there at the top and Workforce Development goals be tied to CBAs (Community Benefits Agreements)? One, we don't understand CBAs and how they work and two, that is the job of the Economic Development Department and the Strategic Employment Plan, which they have been working on for months. So, I guess this stuff magically appears. It's going to pass but I just wanted to be on the record that it's ridiculous that one Department is defining every Department's policy right now.

Mayor Lyles said item 20, separated the plan into three parts.

Ms. Johnson said I don't know if I need to make a motion and I will, but it looks like it's been updated. I want to clarify that it is clear that Council wishes to vote before each volume is implemented. Volumes, one, two, and three. Is that clear Taiwo or Mr. Jones?

Mayor Lyles said to separate the plan into three parts?

Ms. Johnson said yes.

Mr. Jones said I may Emily to help here. I'm not sure that the Council ever took an action on this other than saying that the Council wanted the ability to vote on all three parts, all three volumes, all three whatever we want to call them. We said it is absolutely your prerogative to do that.

Ms. Johnson said I watched the meeting again and in four hours and three seconds, there were five of us I believe we had to watch it, but in four hours and three seconds we did

talk about it. If we need a motion I'd like to make a motion then to codify that if that's okay Madame Mayor if you could call for a motion that I'd like to make a motion that Council vote to approve each volume respectably.

Motion was made by Councilmember Johnson, seconded by Councilmember Bokhari, to that the Council vote to approve each volume respectively.

Mayor Lyles said each volume would be the Plan Policy, which we are talking about now, and Implementation Strategy, third Equitable Framework, and Place Types Manual.

Ms. Watlington said help me understand. Volume three, Equitable Growth and Framework and Place Type Manual, we've got that in front of us now. We would approve that and then when we get down into 2022 the final place types adoption, we would approve that. So, whatever discrepancies or learnings we made in between, we would just, alright got it.

Mr. Driggs said I agree with the motion and this ties into the timeline thing. So, as we talk about this at what points in time will the Council be expected to make a final determination about parts two and three and there will be a vote on those occasions? I think that is what we want to clarify.

Ms. Ajmera said I have a question on the motion. How is different than what is being recommended here in the Plan?

Mr. Bokhari said there's no implementation vote point for us in the Planning Directors prior.

Mayor Lyles said in our last meeting there was no vote. You know how we took the straw votes that you can see on your slide that says, 10-1 or 9-2. We did not vote on this. So, this is a motion that would make it like the other 17 or 18 slides that we have already discussed.

Ms. Watlington said she wants to know how the motion is different than what's in blue writing here.

Mayor Lyles said than what's in the writing here?

Ms. Watlington said yes.

Mayor Lyles said, Mr. Driggs. I thought it was the same as what's in writing here.

Mr. Driggs said I think there is some ambiguity here. It says there are three adoption points in the overall process and that's followed by two adoption points reading the blue writing here. So, I think the motion is for the sake of clarity. I don't see any harm in passing it. Arguably that is what it says because it says down below Council could defer the adoption of Implementation Strategy two and Growth Framework three to the place types mapping adoption in 2022. I don't know that we necessarily want to have those two votes coincide with the mapping adoption. So, if we could just be clear that what we are saying is two and three will get adopted as a result of a Council vote whenever the time comes. I think that's the essence of the motion.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Ajmera, Ms. Watlington just pointed out instead of saying the staff proposes to deliver the final plan in the three volumes, it would be and Council will vote on each of these plans separately.

Ms. Ajmera said I would like to hear from our Planning Director, Mr. Jaiyeoba.

Mayor Lyles said for the question or just in general?

Ms. Ajmera said yes, regarding this motion that's been made.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes, that is consistent with our response there.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, that's what I'm thinking. I just don't know what's the difference.

Mayor Lyles said the difference is that it does not state, it says the staff proposes to deliver the final plan in three volumes. This is part of what I was saying that we should have on the 21<sup>st</sup> to tell the Council when they will vote and do the actions that will be taken. So, I don't think it is inconsistent with what we've been talking about on the 21<sup>st</sup> saying this is what we are going to vote on and the Council adopting a Plan so that we are all on the same page. I think that is putting it, I think Ms. Johnson used the word "codifying it".

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

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

NAYS: Councilmember Winston.

Mayor Lyles said the next item comments that were received after the release and you'll have to help me because these are not things -

Mr. Jaiyeoba said the next four items did not receive any straw votes. They are more like the staff responding to some of what we heard from you and also from the community. That means development industry as well whether they had to do with well you need to make a distinction between CBAs and community benefits or you tell us what's next in the process or it could be define what tree conservation fund is in additional language with regards to the state tax credit. So, those are just four items that we wanted to bring in front of you for consideration for adoption at least into the final draft, or if you feel that they should not go in the document or should not be considered. We did not want to surprise you eventually when the document comes out and then you see some of these things. But these are the four key things that we heard that we are responding to. So, they are more like the staff coming forward with this proposal to you.

Mayor Lyles said so, these would be things that would be incorporated because the staff found rationale and reason to make these actions to clarify the document moving forward. So, the first one is that clarifying language in the Plan to distinguish between the Community Benefits Agreement as a tool in reference policies, projects, and programs that may benefit the community and allow fourplexes on all lots fronting arterials for the single-family detached dwellings are permitted when key city priorities are advanced.

Mr. Egleston said just to make sure I am understanding this correctly Mr. Jaiyeoba, does this mean that in different parts of the Plan there will be references to Community Benefits Agreements in capital letters and also things that would be beneficial to the community but not in a capital letter formal sense of the CBA?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said that's it.

Mr. Egleston said so both of those will still be in different parts of the Plan?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes, so I had a conversation with Councilmembers Egleston and Eiselt on this one. That also came up in our conversation with both team members of the Community Benefits Coalition and the development as well, development industries, we need to have that clarification as to when you are talking about CBA's as a formal tool or we are just talking about benefits to the community. So, you are going to see that distinction made in the document. COPS (Certificates of Participation) with CBA and loose language with it.

Ms. Johnson said is there a reason that you are using the same terminology that means two different things? Right now we understand that, but in 10 years the Council may not understand that and again it could be over-selling to the public. Why don't we just call it resident or neighborhood agreement? We all obviously support the concept of the

agreement. We have talked about, developers have contributed \$100,000 to Sugar Creek in my area and \$3 million right outside of my area. So, I certainly support developers contributing. Why are calling it something that it's not? I don't understand the branding or that logic. Can you help me with that?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said first of all in 10 years I would hope that the Comprehensive Plan would have been updated or revised. Different things could be the case at that point in time. It's the same way we use the phrase development agreement when the City is involved in a development where if we have a property or money, we call it development agreement. In this case, it's the community not the City and that's why it is important to make that distinction. Whether we call it anything else, it is important to make the distinction that this is an agreement between the community and the developer rather than between the City and the developer. That is why we are making this, and a community could be a business community, it could be a residential community, but once you start putting other things like neighborhoods it's easy for people to think people leaving that space rather than do business there. So, and again this is not a unique terminology to Charlotte. This is actually a national group called the Community Benefits agreement Organization. This pretty much takes place in almost every major city that I am aware of with and that same phrase, Community Benefits Agreement. Now, we could choose to call it something else if it's the pleasure of the Council, but I am just saying that it's not unique to Charlotte.

Ms. Johnson said in North Carolina could you explain from a legislative perspective, what the Community Benefits Agreement is and the jurisdiction surrounding that?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I know there was a memo from the Attorney's office. I don't know to ask anyone to speak to that.

Ms. Johnson said I just mean if you could describe the Community Benefits Agreement from a state level?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I do know that it is legal if it happens between the community and the developers. We do it today. The only difference today is that it goes like I just described. It goes through a rezoning process, but what about projects that don't have to go through a rezoning process. So, there's nothing that says we cannot do it. The only reason that it becomes illegal is if the City becomes the agent in that community conversation when we don't have any property or interest in the process.

Ms. Johnson said right. So, this is a City Plan. So, I am just saying why not use another word so there is no confusion? When we talk about keeping it simple it just seems like it would be much simpler to call it the resident development agreement or something else, something great and branded that it is what it is. The fact that there is a legal informal and binding document at the state level that says the City cannot be involved with, right. It's called a Community Benefits Agreement, it seems like we would stay away from that language. I just don't understand the logic and again the concept of the community gaining benefits from development, I absolutely support it. I think we all do. I just don't understand the reason we would call it, again it's like calling something inclusionary zoning and we have an Inclusionary Zoning Committee when inclusionary zoning is not legal for the City. From a City perspective, from a branding perspective, from a deliverable perspective, seems like we would want to call it something else. I know we said we are going to be very clear. The language even says we are going to be very clear in describing what it is, but that's this current Council. That's the current community. It just seems like we would want to have simpler language for a 20-year plan, that's all. I know I'm not alone in thinking that. I'm not going to make a motion or anything. We've discussed this numerous times. I just don't understand the logic and I don't know what I'm missing.

Mr. Driggs said I think the point about clarity on this was there's a certain legal intricacy here and Mr. Baker excuse me if I try to address this. An agreement is a contract between two parties. Normally a contract involves consideration being given. So, there might be a developer that agrees with a community. Fine, I will build a fence and I do all of these things and then the community says, okay, we are not going to oppose your rezoning. That would be a quid pro quo type of agreement.

The City cannot enforce that agreement. So, we have the standing to involve ourselves to the extent that we are a party to the agreement with the developer and we incorporate into that agreement our priority of certain consideration for the neighbors. At that point, if the developer doesn't do what he said, we have the standing to say, hey you have breached our contract. But we have to have a part of that contract. So, that agreement probably exists in conjunction with a TIF (Tax Increment Financing), TIG, some sort of infrastructure funding commitment like we had a Ballantyne. I'm just concerned about the way this is spelled out and that's why the language said to clarify. We are not being completely clear about what people can expect from this tool of the community because this tool of the Community Benefits Agreement does not oblige a developer to do anything. It's something that they will enter into if they perceive that it is in their own interest to have that relationship with the neighbors.

As we get away further and further from conditional rezoning and from the Council hearing process, the leverage the community has to hope that the developer will be motivated diminishes. At least now the way we work today they have the leverage of saying we are going to oppose and then the developer has to worry about whether or not. So, you will get a thing where the developer says, I will put in the fence. That's the thing that troubles me about this. Sure we can do them and I would vote for the Plan even with that in there, but somewhere we are going to come up against the harsh reality that the developers are not obliged to enter in these agreements that we have no standing to enforce any agreement that the developer does enter into and that the real relevance of Community Benefits Agreements as far as we're concerned is probably only in those cases where we have a stake in the transaction.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said good points, Councilmember Driggs. That's why we wanted to engage the Urban Land Institute in the process to kind of spell out that detail. I did listen to the summary of their two-day engagement last week. They had 15 developers representing different spectrums of the development industry and 15 members of the Community Benefits Group out there. I believe they interviewed three of the Councilmembers here as well.

One of the reasons a Comprehensive Plan was deliberate in limiting conversations around the CBA is to give that group the opportunity to flesh out what some of those details may be. Within the next several days we will be able to share their findings with you. Our goal is that the relevant findings in there, from what was shared last week were actually very, very helpful. It seems to me like both members of the development industry and the community feel that that's a very important tool. But we need to understand exactly how it's going to be implemented, how it's going to be defined, and all of that. We believe that by deferring Volume Two, the Implementation Strategy to a later date, that's where you may be able to find some of those findings. So, whatever you choose to call it at the end of the day, there seems to be a consensus among different groups that were engaged that they do want members of the community to participate in the development process. How that happens is going to be presented to you once we receive those findings from them.

Mr. Driggs said I guess the goal of achieving harmony between a developer and the developers' neighbors, but I'm not sure who the person is, the legal person that we are talking about when we talk about the neighbors. We haven't really defined who can demand to be included in the CBA process. Is it with everybody within 500 feet? I mean in rezoning we have these things where we have to give notices within a certain radius and we use to have a thing where there was a protest petition.

But in this document, the people who have that standing are not well defined and in many cases, I don't think there exists what I would call a legal person who can be a party to the agreement. It might be an HOA (Homeowner Association) in some cases. In others, there might not be an HOA. Now you have got an unconsolidated, unincorporated group of people that live around a location and so, the clarity question for me was really mainly about just defining who it is that's going to be other parties to the CBA. I will just put that out there. I'm not asking for an answer right now. Thanks.

Ms. Johnson said I went to thesauruses.com and if we called it something else, if we called it a Community Prosperity Arrangement or Community improvement Arrangement, like a CPA or a CIA, would that be the same thing? Would it solve the same problem or would we have the same outcome?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said well, I will leave that to your discretion. We are proposing it to be called the Community Benefits Agreement. That is the best practice we know. Charlotte again is not unique to that. It's done in any other city that you will look at that we compete with. They do have references to it as the Community Benefits Agreement. Now, we may choose to call it something else, but I will leave that to you all.

I think at the end of the day the outcome is that communities, neighborhoods, and whatever we call it will want to participate in the development process and to ensure that there is some benefits that they can come to some agreement with like Councilmember Driggs said, it's a fence, or maybe you call it a Plaza or whatever it is just to come to some form of agreement as to what are the needs for things in that community that a developer will be able to do without necessarily having to have a financial broadening on their development as well.

So, again there are different examples. I think from [inaudible] probably, I think last week there was almost 50 different examples of what a Community Benefit could be from something that is a very low scale to something that is very high scale. So, as long as the outcome is that it really doesn't matter to me what we decide to brand it. I just believe that the term CBA is very well used and very well known across the development landscape.

Mr. Winston said I was just going to say again to reiterate a point to Ms. Johnson. We can change the name. We could call it Christmas Gift instead of Community Benefits Agreement, but what Mr. Jaiyeoba is referring to is that this document, this agreement, this policy refers to state contract law and we can call it whatever we want. But if somebody wants to challenge it in a court of law there are certain legal steps that prove that something is actually something that can be dealt with. So, that's why we don't change policy by going to thesaurus.com or we go and work with the staff, our Legal Department, and our Planning Department, in this case, to create a new policy idea to bring to the table if that is what we actually want to do.

We would get in very much trouble if we think that we are going to change policy or evade legal statutes simply by changing the name. Again, you put lipstick on a pig it doesn't make that something else. It's still a pig. So, let's just be careful on the way we are doing things by trying to change policy by going to thesaurus.com.

Mr. Bokhari said I think Ms. Johnson is on to the crux of the very debate we have been having on CBAs for multiple months. I think Councilman Winston is articulating right now the fancy footwork that we have been given every time we ask this exact same question. If everyone is indeed saying what the Planning Director just said, which is, ooh yeah, we could change it and call it whatever you want. Why wouldn't they have done that months ago? We wouldn't be debating this anymore. I've said crisply month over a month if you change it to say Benefits to the Community, you have my vote. Yet, no one moves there and other people other than me are asking that question.

The crux of it is this, if Councilman Winston with his argument he just made is, well you can call it whatever you want, we can't get around the legal challenges of somebody saying, well this is exactly what you're doing. You can call it something else, but you're trying to bypass the law. That is the crux of this. They want it to be CBAs because they have ulterior motives to make it CBAs. They know they are illegal. So, they try to say but it's not that, but it is. Listen to what they are doing, not what they are saying.

What they are doing is keeping the language in here, talking to us with answers that take 45 minutes to give back to us, but has nothing to do with, yes, we are all for community benefits in this room. But a very small group of them, two of which we have been hearing from directly on this want these particular capital CBAs in here that are highly disputed



and then there is a group of activists nationwide that are pushing them when we just want what is best for Charlotte here.

So, if you want to know why, look at what they are doing, not what they are saying. They're keeping it in there and saying we can change it to anything. If you can change it to anything you have avoided this whole disaster and dumpster fire for the last several months and have already done it.

Ms. Johnson said I just don't see why everyone doesn't have the same question. It's just bizarre to me, and we can work this out behind the scenes, but I just want a clear answer. If we called this something else we would have the same outcome? Is that correct?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said as long as you define the outcome, yes.

Ms. Johnson said and there is also a CBA process that's a formal legal binding process that Raleigh says that we as the City cannot implement, correct? I wish we would use visual aids, but CBA capital letters is illegal for the City of Charlotte to be a part of, correct?

Ms. Eiselt said unless we have public land or dollars.

Ms. Johnson said the City of Charlotte. We know that the concept of a community negotiation is not illegal or if it's between the developer and the residents. We know that, but the City of Charlotte cannot be involved in developing CBAs?

Mr. Driggs said it can impose one on other parties. It could be a party to one if it was in our interest to do so. Correct me if I'm wrong lawyers, but we cannot inflict that agreement on a developer and a community and inquire a developer to enter into.

Ms. Eiselt said that we are not a party to.

Ms. Johnson said okay, I just want to make sure that we are all clear on that. So, I don't understand why we would want to pass a Plan that lists something that we know that it's not our Councilmembers, my fellow Councilmembers. Again, I am not opposed. I think my constituents know how hard I fight for residents and communities, that I am not against improvements. So, I like the term CIA or CPA, but we will get back to you on that.

Mayor Lyles said the next one is 22 and it's the preamble. I think we have talked about this which is added the policy that will be adopted by Council to provide guidance and I think that this one is to continue with the Plan. Is this the preamble we were talking about?

Mr. Jones said I think we will have to expand it a little bit more than what you have here.

Mayor Lyles said so it will be expanded to represent a prior decision. Alright, the next one is Tree Conservation Fund. Any questions aside from we are going to get a copy of the draft and I would assume that means, has that been in a Committee or has it been an advisory group? Has it been on your Committee Julie?

Ms. Eiselt said no.

Mayor Lyles said so I think we probably need to get a referral in there pretty quickly. The next item is strengthening affordable housing, lead the charge to facilitate the legislation for state tax credits, and spur the development of more affordable housing along with our other strategies. It's just another strategy to lobby the state for that.

Mr. Graham said could you say that one more time? I just want to make sure.

Mr. Winston said I have one comment about that.

Mayor Lyles said this is leading the charge to pass enabling legislation for state tax credits to facilitate and spur the development of more affordable housing. The state doesn't do tax credit right now is my understanding. So, we have the federal tax credits that they get,

and they put in their agency for financing and that is what supplies it. They do not have a separate. I think and that is my understanding.

Mr. Graham said so we are not taking out any language relating to affordable housing? We are just adding?

Mayor Lyles said adding. It's another tool.

Mr. Graham said okay, I just wanted to make sure.

Mayor Lyles said I do want you to know that I have asked the federal level to also look into some of the locational restrictions they have for the use of those federal tax credits and to try to modify those so that you are able to build more affordable housing as well.

Mr. Winston said I'm completely for this final recommendation around the state tax credits. The way I read this and the implications of this, this would put a standing item on our state legislative agenda being that it would say that we should lead on this and that it doesn't exist. That would be something that we would lobby our delegates for every time until we actually got that. That's the mandate that I'm reading into this should we pass it. Should I be incorrect?

Mayor Lyles said I agree that whatever it is we need to be doing it. As soon as we get something and some research that writes it or does the research into it. I think we need to figure out what we are asking for specifically. I do think that if Council approves that it's kind of like our Subpoena Power, we just keep on working at it.

Mr. Phipps said I had a general question about the responses to certain submissions by the industry. I was made aware that a lot of responses came back, and they didn't consider them to be real responses was that we are supposed to be the Council. Planning was supposed to be asking Council to direct them to do something. We've got pages of some of these responses. My question is how would all of the Councilmembers know what to direct you to do if they didn't have these particular documents in front of them? Did Planning go in and answer these questions because all I see is that you are going to ask us to direct you to answer these questions? I am trying to get a clarification.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I don't know which one you are referring to.

Mr. Phipps well I know that we have probably received it in the hundreds of packets responses that we have gotten.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said there was a five-page memo. That was the first one.

Mr. Phipps said this might have been a five-page memo.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said that's the most recent one we received from the development industry. So, Manager Jones and I went through the responses with them on Tuesday afternoon last week. Some of those responses are actually reflected in a couple of those new proposed languages here today. One regarding clarification. One regarding Tree Conservation Fund. I think the other one on this strengthens affordable housing to lead the charge, those three are examples that came from the development industry.

The others were more focused on place types manual. Some of the comments there are with regards to whether it's a Community Center or a Neighborhood Center and how we define that. So, we walked through some of those with them, and I think I sent a summary to you all of what we discussed. If you go back and take a look at the summary, maybe there are certain aspects that you feel that Taiwo, we didn't talk about this. I will be glad to discuss that. But one of the things that we clearly mentioned to them especially with regards to CBA was, let's wait until the ULA work is done and then we will make sure that will reflect the relevant findings in the implementation strategy. They wanted us to get back together after that. So, again I think it is an ongoing conversation with the community that we will continue to have.

I will be mindful to say that adopting the Plan is not the end of the process. Where we still have opportunities to engage. There are communities where you adopt the Plan and within one year, you've got five different amendments to the Plan. Again, the hindsight is always perfect, right. As you move forward and as you look at your Plan and as you look at things changing, the reason is a living document, is that you can revisit that Plan, and have a one, two-page amendment to it. I think we have only had five within the first year.

So, it is very important to keep that in mind that as we go forward there are things that you will discuss that we will be listening to and be mindful of such as what you are hearing from the community or from the development industry that we have to keep in mind for future updates to the Plan.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, my question is on slide number 23. The one before this. I can hold my question until this slide and questions are over.

Ms. Eiselt said I think we are moving on so go ahead with your question.

Ms. Ajmera said I just want to make sure Mr. Jaiyeoba; so, nothing has changed. All you are doing is just providing the definition of what the Tree Conservation Fund is. Is that correct?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes. Because someone sees Tree Conservation Fund, they think that means we are creating another bucket but what we are saying is that it's really what you have today with your (TCPP) Tree Canopy Preservation program, just expanding the usage of that.

Ms. Ajmera said I'm sorry, expanding what?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said expanding the use of that and then consolidating your Tree Canopy mitigation and the payment and lieu fees into one fund. Then that results in streamlining the permitting process. So, it's not a new thing as much as it's what you have today that we are leveraging.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. So, currently, the TCPP can only be used to acquire land to preserve and protect our Tree Canopy. So, are we expanding the use here to do more with that fund?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said especially for the management of it, yes.

Ms. Ajmera said when you say management, tell me more because I'm concerned. We don't have enough TCPP fund. So, if you're going to expand the use here, how would that affect the amount or the acreage that we currently buy? What impact would it have on our acquisition of properties?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said at this point I don't know if Alyson Craig is still on. I will refer to her on this particular subject.

**Alyson Craig, Planning Design & Development** said so I think really what this is doing is to allow additional flexibility in how the funds are used. So, I don't think that it's allowing us to acquire more properties, but it's allowing us to be able to have more flexibility in how we apply those funds to whether it's acquiring different properties or planting more trees, things like that.

Ms. Ajmera said that's where I have more concerns because the intent of TCPP was to acquire more acreage so that we can preserve and protect our Tree Canopy as developers are paying into this fund. So, if you are going to start using this fund for something else and provide more flexibility, I'm concerned that there not going to be able to save as much acreage that we are currently doing. So, I just need more clarity on this. How would that impact our acquisition and the acreage that we are buying currently?

Ms. Craig said that's [inaudible] Tim Porter, who is our Chief Urban Forester. We are happy to talk to you more about it. Those are policies and ordinance language that are still under development right now. So, we can certainly talk with you more about that and create some different directions on that.

Ms. Ajmera said I guess I don't want us to then put this in the language because then this sets in stone. If the flexibility's coming at the cost of less acreage then I don't support this. So, I just want to make that very clear. The intent of this TCPP was to acquire land. That's why developers pay into it. So, if you're going to take this fund and start using it for something else, whatever it is then that's a problem.

When it comes to tree planting some of those dollars, I know we had provided \$50,000 more to Tree Charlotte. That came from I think the General Account. That didn't come from TCPP. So, I just need to understand before I can say yes to this.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Ajmera we are going to send this to the TAP (Transportation Action Plan ) Commissions. So, it's going to go to Committee for review and we are going to get a copy out to everyone. So, I think that we have got some time to look into it a little bit more. You don't have to say yes right now. But I think if we can get that out and then get it into committee pretty quickly.

Ms. Ajmera said I just want to make sure if it's part of the 2040 Plan I am not comfortable with it because I just don't know what impact it's going to have. It looks like flexibility means less acreage we are buying. So, I just want to make sure and put it out there because if I see that, I don't know if I can support the Plan.

Mr. Jones said Councilmember Ajmera I do believe that with Tree Charlotte, maybe two years ago we found some flexibility in the fund because for years Tree Charlotte wanted to use some of those dollars for Tree Planning. Taiwo I think I have this right. I want to say maybe it had been a quart of million dollars, but the concept was the tree planting had to be on, I don't know if it was public property, but it was a property that was clearly earmarked. So, we will get you more information. So, my assumption is this is going into a document that the Council will receive next week.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said yes it is in the Tree Canopy Action Plan that we are going send to the Council for a recommendation from the Tree Canopy Action Plan. It does not necessarily have to reside in the Comprehensive Plan, but I wanted to respond to the developer's question about what that means. That's why I'm bringing it forward today.

Ms. Ajmera said but I understand that this is going into the other document, not necessarily in the 2040 Plan. Is that correct?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said it doesn't have to, yes. But we will still have to make sure that there is a connection. Just like the plan has a relationship with SEAP (Strategic Energy Action Plan) or a 2030 Transit System Plan, were referring to certain documents also that can be a companion document to this one. So, we just wanted to make sure that we make the distinction when you see a Tree Conservation Fund in the Plan. The reference to that is not necessarily creating a new fund. But it resides primarily in the Tree Canopy Action Plan.

Ms. Ajmera said and that's fine. I guess what I struggle with right now, we are already losing our tree canopy at a very fast pace. If we provide more flexibility out of this fund, we are going to lose more acreage. Currently, we are losing, I think three football fields of tree canopy every week. If you're going to take these funds now all of the sudden and correct flexibility, we have to figure out a way, first of all, to increase our acreage, not decrease and that's what flexibility would do. I have real concerns around this. Even if it's part of the Tree Canopy Action Plan and eventually it will all go into this entire process, but we got to fix this one. We are trying to increase our tree canopy, not decrease it.

Mayor Lyles said I think we ought to have the Urban Forest people make an appointment to talk with you about this in more detail and so that we have complete information. Can we make that arrangement Ms. Jackson to go ahead and have that conversation so that

there is an understanding and then Ms. Ajmera's questions, if she has more, we can be actually more informed about what we are talking about? That would be more important to do.

Ms. Ajmera is that suitable to set something up like that?

Ms. Ajmera said yes.

Mr. Phipps said was this Tree Canopy Preservation Program formally approved by the Council?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said the TCPP, I believe so, yes. That was definitely prior to my time. I believe so.

Mayor Lyles said I think we adopted that a while back, the Tree Save Program. I think most of us are familiar with it. It hasn't added up to be what I think, again it's one of those, I'm not sure how much it's added to be and accomplished.

Ms. Johnson said I want to thank Taiwo and the staff. I know that it's a hard job. I know that it's hard to manage this growth. It's almost unrealistic. So, I want to challenge my colleagues to think about something.

We keep hearing that over 200,000 new residents will move to Charlotte in the next 20 years. Well, I want you to imagine if the number was one million. Today I was in a Committee meeting and one of the staff members said that the population is estimated to reach two million by 2030. So, I don't know which number is correct, but I do want to know how could we manage that growth and what are we willing to compromise for that growth. Is it public safety and record numbers of homicides because our Police force is understaffed by almost 200 officers? Is it overcrowding of schools when 70% of our at-risk students aren't college-ready or reading at grade level? Is it a lack of public safety due to a lack of transportation options or a lack of road infrastructure and sidewalks? What is it that will make us say enough? Are we willing to compromise our neighborhoods or lose three football fields of tree canopy every week or to put multi-family units on every square inch of our available lots? Will we continue to ignore that lower-income residents are forced to live in hotels and motels, or do we actually have a real live Tent City on our streets?

Once the eviction moratorium is lifted and temporary housing subsidy expires we may see that again. I really want to understand from a planning perspective how a city can accommodate unrestrained growth. We know there is little opportunity to annex. What's next? Rezoning petition for tree houses. What is our goal?

Mayor Lyles said I actually think that's not a bad idea.

Mr. Winston said don't give them any ideas.

Ms. Johnson said what is our goal? Is our goal to have the badge of honor in one of the largest cities in the nation while compromising the quality of life for current residence? I challenge our colleagues to decide which badge of honor they are pursuing. Is it to serve one of the biggest cities or one of the best? I moved to Charlotte six years ago because Charlotte is a beautiful city. It's got good character, a small town, and it's a big city. So, there is this mix that's thriving and it has lots of character, but we have to be intentional and maintaining that.

I say we be bold and taking steps to maintain quality over quantity. Perhaps by focusing on sprawl rather than density and working with our continuous Counties to develop reciprocal plans that benefit our City, their cities, and especially our residence.

Mr. Bokhari said two final points for me. One, back to the theme of the things designed to confuse us and fancy footwork. The ULI thing I hope all of you participated in it. I did. I had a lovely conversation with two people they assigned to me. I'm assuming they assigned them strategically because we did have a good conversation. Then I watched

their recap on five o'clock on Friday. I was just astounded by how little information of relevance that we got. It was interesting. It was basically what we should have had from our Planning staff three years ago happen. There was no outcomes. The only outcome or analysis they provided was that they are sure we need to hire them for multiple more phases so that they can then give us that information.

So, I am not saying there aren't some really smart people there. There definitely were, but I simply asked one question to try to help us here tonight. I think it's the crux of the question we have to be asking. Which is why do we need to codify these tactical policy level items in the Plan now? Why can't we do the work and put them in later? All these other things are great and how I feel about it. My emotional state level of that, thanks, but why do we have to do that now? I put that in the chat and the response that was given back to that was because you guys are so brave.

So, if that is what we just paid for I just want you to say, and I'm not trying to bash ULI, it's a great organization, they do a lot of great work, their guidance back right now is irrelevant to what we are doing. It is fancy footwork if they keep saying, well CBAs, wait till the ULI stuff comes. We are getting no help from ULI on CBAs. Just to be crystal clear. That brings me to the final point which is I hope you see the double standards. I have already brought your attention to one of them of height is bad with density, but single-family plots are good for density. The other crux of the double standard in this plan that's all over it is if it is something that certain one or two people that have designed it like, they need it in there, but I'll tell you in five years we can update it. Cause if that's wrong that is fine. Like we had that example earlier today with well when we figure out how Instacart, which is here today works, then we will add that five years from now. If it's something like, ooh we don't know how single-family zoning abolishment will work or we don't know how Community Benefits Agreement will work or whatever, the point is we must keep them in now. We must. Well, why can't we add them in five years if this is such a living document once they actually do the work and figure it out? The answer to that is very simple. A very small number of people have personal aspirations themselves that they don't want to do the work. They want the credit for in here now and damned be the results for the City of Charlotte that happen for it. That's why the people who are fighting here right now against this and they don't share the same party, sex, color, or multiple other things have unified in this strange manner because we are not excepting that right now. When we get to those other points a year from now with the UDO, we'll probably disagree then. But we are in agreement on this now and I hope that sends this community a real strong message, that if this squeaks by with six votes in what they are doing, that is a definite loss.

Mr. Egleston said I will be real brief. One, to point out that aside from the party affiliation the group that is likely to vote yes on this shares the same diversity that the group is likely to vote against it. But for having the public in its midst, but I also just want to push back on the idea it sounded like a point that was being made earlier implied that we are deciding whether Charlotte is going continue to grow exponentially or not. It is growing exponentially. It's going to continue to grow exponentially and we are now deciding whether or not we're going to adjust the way that we accommodate that growth and accommodate those people. They are coming one way or the other. So, we can't stop that. We're not building a wall around Charlotte. So, we have to adjust the way we think about it if we are going to accommodate those people and give them the opportunity to live a fruitful life in our community.

Mr. Graham said I just want to make sure that folks who are watching that that's a minority opinion, right. I mean that's the minority, you know. One, two, three, four, five, six. Whether it is six votes or 11 votes I think everyone around this dais has a strategic best interest of the City of Charlotte in mind. If you don't agree with that opinion you've expressed it tonight. You have expressed it two weeks ago. You expressed it two months ago. We get it, but it is still a minority opinion. The City is growing. We have a plan in place that I support. I support it not because I have a relationship with the Planning Director or I have a relationship with the Mayor or the Manager. I support it because I believe it is in the best interest of the City and that we have an opportunity to build a framework that works for the City. A vision that works for the City and I trust the process.

I trust the people who are leading the process and I don't have any doubts about that. Is this a perfect document? Hell no, it's not. We've made some mistakes before Madame Mayor. We built a coliseum on Tyvola Road and then came back and built another one uptown. That was in the Plan. I voted to move it.

So, there will be mistakes along the way. Expensive mistake, but it doesn't mean that we don't strive to be great or we try to think about what tools and policies that we don't have today that may be illegal today that we may need tomorrow. I don't have a problem with that. I don't think the citizens of Charlotte have a problem with that. You've got a problem with that. I respect that, but again that's a minority opinion. Again, I think if we pass this thing with six votes no one is going to give a damn the day after it passes. They want to know what are we going to do to build a better community. That's what matters.

Ms. Watlington said I just want to say a couple of things. I understand where both sides are coming from. I do think that we've got to fundamentally decide what is our competitive advantage. I've said it many times before. We keep saying well the people are coming regardless. I don't necessarily know that to be true. In the sense of people are going to make decisions about where they would prefer to live based on what each city offers. At some point for the same reason people are leaving all of the 14 cities that are larger than us, we have to make sure that they are not leaving Charlotte for the same reasons.

So, I do think that we need to be critical about what we are putting in this plan because it's critical to who we will be 20 years from now. I don't think that it is a given. I believe that there are certainly people around this dais that all of us want what's best for the City and frankly I find it a little disrespectful to dismiss peoples opinions because they are in the minority because when we talk about what people in this community want to hear and what they want to see, they have already expressed that they don't feel heard. So, how many of us does it have to be before somebody takes what we are saying seriously. The minority is not just to be dragged along with whatever the majority says. The point in having a diversity of opinion is to get better plans. Not to win, but to have the best Plan that we can possibly have. I will point out as several have before, I don't think that it is a coincidence that five of seven District Reps who are accountable to these communities directly are all saying the same thing. Our Districts are completely different in some aspects and my District, in particular, the largest in landmass is the most diverse District in this City. I can tell you from Steel Creek to Pawtucket to South End to West boulevard, they all have different needs. What we can agree on is a lot of the fundamental values and that was what the intention of this Plan was to be.

We've all said it before if we would stick to the values and our principles we could have passed this plan months ago because we don't differ there. We are not having a difference of values. We are having a difference of implementation. That's the piece that we have got to correct. What we are saying is that if we are going to talk about the details let's make sure we have some data to back it up. I want to trust the process but I need to know what that process is going to be because when I look back and ask for information that justifies the decision that have been made, I'm not finding something that is compelling and that's concerning to me. To your point mistakes are going to be made, we know that. That doesn't absolve us of our responsibility to forecast and to try to minimize that risk.

I would just ask everybody around whether you are in the minority or the majority to please consider what else you personally can do to try to make this the best Plan for all of our residence. Not the ones that will be here 20 years from now. The people that we represent today.

Mr. Driggs said just briefly I agree with you that it is a matter of naked power politics you guys could win, okay.

Mr. Graham said [inaudible]

Mr. Driggs said sir I'm speaking, yes, but wouldn't it better is all I've said and I'm saying it again wouldn't it be better if we were able to achieve a larger majority and project a little more consensus to our constituents and not sort of taking on board a great difference of

opinion in the community? My feeling about this is that we don't need to do that. We can pass this Plan in such a way that just about everybody agrees, wow this was a good day for Charlotte.

That's the only point in my mind. I just think it would be preferable. So, yeah the majority could do it, but there is a lot of writing if you look at it about what the significance is of the minority in the majority rule environment. It is not intended that the majority is simply walked all over by the people who have bigger numbers. So, let's try to come together on this thing is all I'm saying. If we can't then your right, the current majority wins.

Mr. Graham said Madame Mayor just one point. The point I was trying to make is at some point we have to vote and I don't think that it's fair for someone to disparage the majority opinion of this Council. That's the point. So, I get what you are saying, right. But at some point, we have to vote and I don't want the vote no matter what it is to be frowned upon because ooh my god, it only passed by six votes. So, something might be wrong with it. No, it passed by six votes because the majority members of the Council believed in it and we can agree that we disagree, but we all agree that we want to move the City forward. So, it's not stomping on the minority it's just stating the obvious. At some point, we have to raise our hands and vote. When that vote occurs the community has to have some confidence in it. If you're disparaging the vote before it even occurs then I think that is a disservice as well.

Mr. Driggs said I'm not disparaging the majority. I'm just asking you don't you think it would be better if we were able to achieve an eight or nine-vote majority, instead of being so deeply divided. That is all I'm asking.

Mr. Graham said this Council has been deeply divided since we took office a year and a half ago on a number of issues.

Mayor Lyles said it's always tough to sit and listen to disparaging remarks about individuals. It's something that this Council has been doing more frequently than I would like to acknowledge. There was a time that this Council laughed.

Ms. Ajmera said Mayor I can't hear you.

Mayor Lyles said I am saying it is very difficult to listen to the disparaging remarks. They extend beyond this issue but this issue has made them very real and very ugly. I believe that we can be better than this than what we have been doing no matter how heated the debate or no matter how difficult the subject, what I have heard in this room in the last two months has been really pretty remarkably I think lacking in respect of each other. For whatever part we each individually play in that I think that we all really need to think about it.

I've been particularly sensitive to the people that work with us every day to try to do their very best. You say well people have the right to choose where to live. They also have the right to choose where to work. Charlotte's reputation has always been one of being a great employer and a place that people sought out. When we get applications for things, for people in significant positions, we have always gotten really quality applications. But if the Board of Directors starts talking about people that work for them or the citizens that are being disparaged, or each other I think we have all got to think about it differently because there is nothing like the reputational risk that you can lose. Once you lose your reputational risk, you lose your reputation. What do they say, it's like somebody that complains, complaints seven-time and you get one complement.

The ratio of the ability for us to complain and disparage each other has been running I think towards the sevens. So, I think that it is time to really adjourn. Larken, thank you for making the motion. I would encourage us all to reflect on our part that we play in this work that makes a difference. You can be disagreeable without attacking people and I think that is what we all ought to be striving for again.


\* \* \* \* \*



### ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:16 p.m.

  
Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk, MMC, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 4 Hours, 09 Minutes  
Minutes Completed: August 17, 2021