

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Business Meeting on Monday, October 12, 2020 at 5:09 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Tariq Bokhari, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, James Mitchell, Matt Newton, Victoria Watlington, and Braxton Winston II.

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mayor Lyles said welcome to the Charlotte City Council Business Meeting for October the 12th, I now call this meeting to order. Tonight's meeting is being held as a virtual meeting in accordance with the electronic meeting statute, the requirements of notice and access, and the minutes are being met electronically. The public and the media and anyone else that would like to view this meeting, you can do it on the Government channel, the City's Facebook page, or on the City's YouTube page.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

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

* * * * *

ACTION REVIEW

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

Councilmember Mitchell said Council on item number 24, it talks about Sewer Service Installation, and I know there's a six-million-dollar opportunity and it is going to the lowest bidder. My question for Ms. Charles is, in the past year we had gotten very creative on opportunities like this. So, I was wondering is there a workforce development initiative that could take place on this opportunity? The reason why I kind of inquired about it, is a large margin of six-million dollars. I just want to make sure there are some community benefits we can derive from this opportunity.

Mayor Lyles said so we'll have Ms. Charles come back at the end of the session and address your question, Mr. Mitchell. That's a good one. I wanted to just note that when we get to the motion, the staff has asked us to remove Item No. 31 and Item No. 40.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: ACTION REVIEW AGENDA OVERVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said we have three items under the Action Review, and we do not have a closed session for this evening. So, the Safe Charlotte Initiatives, I'll give you a brief update of where we are with that. We have the Silverline Public Meetings Report Out that Taiwo Jaiyeoba, will come in and present, and then there's a discussion about the City Council Meeting Calendar and details of the items that we have for the action review, tonight Mayor.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: SAFE CHARLOTTE INITIATIVES

Marcus Jones, City Manager said what we have right now is really trying to bring everybody up to speed on where we are in this process. If you will recall last week in this room, we spent time talking about the various committees and the work that was done in the committees around what we call Safe Charlotte, Safety and Accountability for everyone. I think the timeline is the best example of where we are tonight. So, again, the

fifth we had the recommendations that came out of the Strategy Session. I have Federico Rios in here tonight because there was a community input group meeting on Thursday that I would like for him to give you a little bit of a sense of what happened at that meeting, mainly because we're going to have a meeting tomorrow with input from the Community Input Group, but I wanted you to get a little bit of flavor of that tonight. Then all of that rolls into the 23rd of October where we will have a report that you will have in your briefing packet and then a public comment and hopefully a Council Action on the 26th. Before I go into a little bit of an update, I would like Federico to give you a flavor of last Thursday.

Federico Rios, Assistant Director, Office of Equity, Mobility and Immigrant Integration said we gathered the Community Input Group on short notice based on the request of the Council. We were able to get 14 individuals present for that call. Overwhelmingly, we received information from them stating that they were very, very much pleased with the recommendations that had been put forward. We're excited and cautiously optimistic to see those things potentially get voted through and that more than anything, they wanted to continue to be engaged. There was a deep desire to continue to see the process through, not only offer recommendations but ensure that their voice is heard throughout the implementation process and to connect with the county on the larger body of work related to treating violence as a public health crisis.

Councilmember Winston said I have followed up with a couple of the group members after and I just want to remind everybody and this was clear from conversations that I got even as we get through the implementation process, that this is just one step. We're going to have to continue to take steps to get to the end goal. I think we should do as much work as we can to keep this group engaged and really kind of critically look at what role this particular structure can play as we perpetually try to reimagine what our role in community safety looks like.

Mr. Jones said I totally agree, Mayor and members of the Council. I don't think we would be where we are right now without the help of the Community Input Group. They kept us accountable as well as gave us just tremendous ideas. So what I'll do is just very quickly talk about the recommendations from last week and then make sure that we are fine where we are right now with those recommendations. Then there are three issues that were still outstanding that I would like to get guidance from the Council. Our goal is, again, to have a report that can be approved by the Council that becomes the living, breathing document that holds us all accountable.

A lot of the feedback that I've heard up to this point is that while it looks like we're headed in the right direction, there's the whole concept of making sure that we can deliver upon what's in these recommendations. So just pretty quickly from last week, we talked about redirecting certain police calls to non-sworn units. We divided it into two areas. One would be those higher risk of mental health, and two would be those lower risk of mental health. So, I wanted to just go a little bit more in detail. So, for instance, those high-risk mental health calls go back to our Community Policing Crisis Response Team launched April 2019, eight Officers, six Clinicians responded to over 2,800 calls for service and approximately half were able to be referred to services. We diverted 62% of community members involved in these calls for service from jail or psychiatric hospitals. These issues were resolved on the scene. So, just a little bit of teaser as we go through. We'd like to be able to double the number of the clinicians that we have in terms of our Community Policing Crisis Response Team for those high-risk calls. In terms of those lower risk calls, we want to move away from just talking about a pilot but go right into a CAHOOTS like model where we are able to address those lower risk.

I'll give you some examples. So if we think about what has occurred, CAHOOTS has been around for 30 years. As we looked at some of the other cities that use that, we've seen CAHOOTS being able to handle about 15% of the call volume for the Eugene Police Department. In 2019 only 1% of the 24,000 calls they handled required police backup. So, again, we think we have an opportunity here as we move forward. We also wanted to focus on Officer time on their core roles. We have a total, average time currently spent on those priority 5 calls is about 66,882 staff hours per year. We believe that there's an opportunity there. Here's what we know, what we're dealing with going in.

We need some help with this assessment. So this is where we would bring in an outside assessor to help develop comprehensive recommendations around how we could convert some of these low-risk sworn duties to non-uniform units. Then in terms of recommendations for external analysis, we believe there are two pieces. One, is will engage the consultant to conduct the external analysis as we start to talk about police, civilian contacts, and police-calls for responses. That's not the universe of this, but those are the examples. Then also in terms of our youth programs, I think you will recall during the committee discussions, we went as far as to say, let's not start populating the FY22 budget with programs without being able to better evaluate what those programs do.

Lastly, training, recruitment, and residency, it's kind of interesting when we start to look at this, there are about 550 or so Officers who live within the City, which represents about 34% of the Officers. And currently outside of what we would do for any other city employee. We have a program that provides a 2,500 one-time stipend, if you will, to move into the City. We know we can do better, especially if we're able to concentrate on some of our Corridors of Opportunity. So we're working with Pam Whiteman and her team to develop an incentive program.

Lastly, in terms of what we discussed last week, we talked a great deal about this million dollars that would be set aside for violence prevention efforts from many of the grassroots organizations. Were smart enough to know that we should start off by having discussions with them. So, what we have planned, I believe this was Councilman Graham's recommendation is to have a summit and we were going to talk about Jumpstart Grants, and we'll talk about all of it during the summit and we'll get feedback before any of the funds are allocated. So, that leaves us with the three issues that will remain. I think based on where we are, we may be in a decent place, but I want to make sure that the Council gives us directions about the let the legislative authority that relates to some of the policy decisions. So, we talked about subpoena power requesting that. That is actually in the Intergovernmental Committee right now, expanding the role of the Civil Service Board to handle the appeals. That requires a legal review, and If I got the feedback correctly from last Monday, limiting the cash bail process would be something that would be considered or proposed to go before the CJAG to review. So, I didn't want to let two weeks go by and have some plan that's before you without making sure that we're in a good place, not only with the recommendations but how we would handle these last three. So, Mayor and Council, if there are any questions, I would answer those, and I think Chief Jennings is also in the building.

Mayor Lyles said Chief Jennings as well as Mr. Rios are here.

Councilmember Johnson said thank you for the presentation; Marcus, can you go back to the slide that talks about the response to mental health calls? So, for higher risk mental health calls, an Officer will go along with someone who's trained from the Crisis Response Team, is that correct? Is that an Officer and a social worker?

Mr. Jones said yes, that is correct.

Ms. Johnson said OK, so a social worker and a CIT officer correct?

Mr. Jones said the corresponding model. Yes.

Ms. Johnson said OK, and then the lower risk mental health calls, is officer responding, or is that just a social worker or mental health professional responding?

Mr. Jones said well, so Councilmember, Johnson, that's what we were going to work through with that. There are some models out there like Stars in CAHOOTS. Our goal is to see to what extent those can be calls that are diverted from an Office are going, to begin with.

Ms. Johnson said because the county has that 24-hour Crisis Line where the mental health professionals [inaudible] would be an option for us to support that or collaborate with the county to increase that capacity?

Mr. Jones said yes, that could be one of the options.

Ms. Johnson said ok. Then I also got an email from Chief Jennings I was really excited about. There's a Web site that the CMPD has where residents can voluntarily enroll in a program to flag their address if there's someone in their household who's in a vulnerable population, such as with a brain injury or mental illness or developmentally disabled or hearing loss or anything. How will that information tie into these calls?

Mr. Jones said so I may have to ask Chief Jennings to step in for that one.

Johnny Jennings, Chief Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department said so what she's referring to is the Safe Outcomes Program that we rolled out last week that on our website you can actually register a loved one who might have a certain response as far as Police when Police respond, whether it's a traumatic brain injury or mental health issues or just special needs for someone when the Police are responding. What that does, it allows us when we get a call for service at that address or with that individual, gives us the opportunity to let that Officer know, like there may be something to where an individual might need a special response from that Officer and that Officer will have that information prior to even arriving on the scene. So, there's a lot of great things that can be done with that, that is required to get the information out there to make sure that people know that they can register their loved ones and we just roll that out within the last couple of weeks

Mayor Lyles said I wanted to ask, could the Officers also flag those households if they've gone out and responded and they see that it would be helpful for them to actually know that in the future? Would that be possible or is it just a registration by the family's permission or the owner's permission?

Chief Jennings said yes, the Safe Outcomes are strictly a voluntary registration with the families of the individual that requires a special responsibility when it comes to the Police. Now, we do also have the ability that we had for several years that we can flag an address that will let an Officer be aware of certain situations that are there when they do a response. The issue with that is you're only flagging the address and sometimes as we know, people will move and you may be going to that address, but it may not be dealing with someone who might have been having a mental health crisis or any other type of situation.

Councilmember Eiselt said Chief, could you just repeat what the website is? If people want to look it up, how do they find it?

Chief Jennings said if somebody looks it up on CMPD.org on our main Web page, you can see a series of tabs on the lower right side. If you scroll down to that, you'll see Safe Outcomes. Once you click on Safe Outcomes you will be able to fill out a form basically that will give us all the information that we need and allow for their loved ones or anyone to be able to fill out anything that they feel like the Police need to know in the event that we have to respond or deal with this individual.

Ms. Johnson said well, I mean, just as a disability advocate, this is a dream come true. So, thank you, Chief for this program and thank your Officers. But I do have a question logistically how that will work if a call comes in and they registered with the Safe Outcomes, that will be flagged, and then will you all respond based on the information in the system and the type of call?

Chief Jennings said yes. So, it really doesn't matter what type of call it is when the Officer gets the call for service at his computer in the car, that document that was filled out, everything that Officer needs to know will pop up on their screen. So, they'll have it even prior to going to the call for service. So they'll have an opportunity to review it, see if there's a special response that's needed. Dispatchers can also look at it and see if it's a call for service that needs either our CPCRT or a Crisis Intervention Team Officer to take the response based on the call for service as well. So, we have a lot of different options and things that we can look at. I think it makes everyone safer to be able to have that information prior to going through and have an encounter with an individual that we need

to know. Obviously encourage everyone that that feels like there's a need we do vet those that feel like there's a need for a special response for Police based on an individual that Safe Outcomes is a good way to ensure that we do that.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Jones, I wanted to follow up on the three items that you said require legislative authority. Are there any questions about that or the direction that the Manager and staff are taking?

Mr. Winston said I guess a question or comment as it relates to the expanded Community Policing Crisis Response Team, I think the CPCRT was a bold investment and experiment, to be quite honest, that City Council and CMPD has taking on over the past couple of years. I'm glad that we're looking to expand it as we go forward on it, I would suggest that the City Council, CMPD and the public take this opportunity to kind of debrief on what has been our experience over the past couple of years after the events on Beatties Ford Road at the mass shooting this summer. This was something that came up in our discussions, the session that we had with Major Robinson over there in Metro Division.

After that, I had some folks that actually have been Clinicians with this program reach out to me, and we had a pretty good conversation. You know, while they were very encouraged by the steps that we're taking, what we have to understand is that, including CPCRT in our first responders' calls, is a massive change of culture to law enforcement officers. That can't just be done by inserting Clinicians or putting training into it. So, as we try to get the highest and best use of this, I think before we go there, I think we need to hear from the Clinicians, hear from the Officers, and honestly, a public forum so that we can understand what has been working well and what needs to be working better. I certainly believe that we have the ability to fix some of the things that aren't quite there yet with it and that this will be an important tool. I would encourage the manager and the Chief of Police to find a way that we as Council can learn a little bit more about what has and hasn't been happening. We can have that public dialogue to make the success moving forward.

Councilmember Newton said I just have a quick comment. I wanted to jump in and extend my gratitude to the Chief for the Safe Outcomes Program. As many of you know, this is an issue that's near and dear to me. I truly believe that this program, in conjunction with the CPCRT program CIT training, will truly save lives and improve our Department's relationship with the community. So thank you again. Thank you so much.

Mayor Lyles said okay, so the legislative authority items, I think you are asking, is that in the direction? Is there any objection to the way that the Manager has outlined the policy decisions that require legislative activity or any comment?

Councilmember Bokhari said I'm assuming that we're just asking for general feedback right now, and then this will be put in the broader context of the Intergovernmental discussion on the Legislative Agenda.

Mayor Lyles said yes. Is that the right direction that we're going to?

Mr. Bokhari said got it. Thank you very much.

Mayor Lyles said hearing none, Mr. Jones, I think you have gotten your answer there.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: LYNX SILVER LINE PUBLIC MEETINGS REPORT OUT

Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Assistant City Manager said I know I have John Lewis on virtually, but I also have Andy Mock with our Charlotte Area Transit System who will be making the presentation to you this afternoon. The reason for me in front of you is to try and make a connection. If you will recall that on July 20th, we came before you to update you on transit and transportation in Charlotte and also statewide. Today is really to build on that

presentation. Over the last two weeks of September to the three weeks, we've been engaging the community successfully. We had a survey that went out that we will be wrapping up this week.

We want to be able to walk you through that public process that we've gone through in the last few weeks. Remember, again, this is a 26-mile, 27 station light rail project going from Stallings in Union County through City, Mecklenburg all the way to Belmont and Gaston and want to be able to give you kind of a detailed presentation of what we've been doing with the community for the last few weeks. So, I'm going to turn it over to Andy who will do the presentation but John Lewis, and I will be available to answer any questions that you may have. Thank you.

Andy Mock, Senior Project Manager, LYNX Silverline Project said I've been with CATS for nearly 20 years, so very thankful to be working on this project after being able to deliver the Blue Line and Blue Line Extensions. I'm looking forward to delivering the Silverline project. So just to kind of step back to where we started this public engagement process in this early phase of a Silverline project, the first phase of this project is really about public engagement, stakeholder input, and alignment, refinement. What I mean by line refinement is, is narrowing down the LPA vision of a big fat purple line to really the project that we're going to put forward. A big part of that is stakeholder engagement. So, when we started this process, back in the March timeframe, we planned all these public meetings and we actually were able to hold two public meetings which were focused on educating the public on what is the Silver Line and how are we going to do this.

We got two meetings done and then the pandemic struck, and we had the punt and we had to pivot, and we pivoted to more of a community virtual kind of approach where we were meeting, we were doing online narrated videos of project staff, doing presentations and meeting with community groups. Anyone who would take our call, we would meet with them and give them an overview of the project and educate them on what is the project. So really, because the projects are big, Tai, kind of put his finger on it. This project is so massive. It's so big, it's 26 miles long and it's really hard for anyone to get their head around.

So, because of that, we kind of broke up the project into six, what we call focus areas. So, that's the way that we kind of structure all of our public engagement as the best way to actually get people's input. We broke these focus areas into six individual meetings that we had, that we just wrapped up, the last one on September 28th. In concert with the Federal Transit Administration, we also entered what's called early scoping. I'll talk a little more about that later. Each meeting had its own focus area and each presentation. They're all virtual and they're all available online. If you go to our YouTube channel, you can see the whole thing live, Q&A, the live presentation. So if you'd like to see kind of how it went down, you're welcome to go there and see that.

So this is our public engagement slide. One big takeaway here is the round two public engagement effort is still open through the federal early scoping process, and it's open till Wednesday. My plea and my request are for folks to take a look at it before Wednesday, and do the survey, review our material. I think it's really important to get all those comments on the record as we move forward into the next steps. There are lots of ways that you can we can engage with you, including emails. We receive a lot of emails, a lot of phone calls, or are constantly hopping and trying to answer people's questions and making responses to their comments.

So it's kind of a report out or some statistics that we received over the six public meetings we had. We've had 244 survey participants of the overall project survey, and that's the one we're really requesting people to kind of dig into because that really helps us through the early scoping process. One of the big things is the live virtual public meetings. We've had over 4,000 views of the live public meeting that includes the live question and answer process. It's been a big success and a lot of people have watched it multiple times. It really is a good way to kind of get an understanding of how that meeting went and what the live questions were.

We've also had 1500 online open house. That's an overview video that John Lewis and I gave, which is basically an overview of the project history, how we got here. It's a great starting place. We've also had 277 interactive map-survey participants. And those are more detailed surveys. Or you can kind of go into each particular focus area and play around live maps and figure out, you know, what's a priority to you. We've had 92 emails. And as far as live participants who actually participate in the live at that time, we've had, and focus area one, which is actually the highest that was from Belmont and to I-485, 166 live participants at the time, followed by 83 near the Airport to downtown. Focus area three, which is Center City has 79, focus area four, which was Independence Boulevard had 70. The second highest was the focus area five, that's everything from Monroe Road including the Town of Matthews to the current terminus and focus area six, which was Union County was the final one, and that's a 61.

As far as early scoping and how we were advertising this, really putting the word out is all through the month of September, myself and folks in the project team did live presentations on the Government Channel. We were on all the time doing our Q&A for what the project is and early scoping. We had 20,000 printed hanging rider alerts on buses and light rail. So, we were trying to really reach out to our current rider base, our current customers, to try to get them engaged. We had 40,000 direct mailers. So, we looked at every possible line that we had on the map and drew a half-mile outside of that and sent everyone a card, either the owners and the residents and so that about 40,000. So that was significant. But the payoff and when you get into the survey is that a lot of people really responded to getting a direct mailer to their home as far as engagement. So that was money well spent.

We had rider alerts, we had constant social-media rider alerts out to the neighborhood and the public media coverage. We had 54 reports or mentions and we did a special media day with folks who would come out and ask us questions. We had over a quarter million next doorposts for residents who were [inaudible] listeners. Our social media was big. We had 41,000 impressions. I mean, people who clicked on it or forwarded on to somebody, 763 engagement's, which are kind of the like or don't like, and 361 link clicks, which is another detail which I'm not 100% sure of. We had 277 views of our Ask CATS webinar, which was more of a detailed presentation that we gave to the public.

As far as the survey, and this is again the big way that we're receiving the engagement and we're presenting what we call Purpose and Need Statement. That's a technical kind of process that we go through with FTA when we go through an environmental process, 91% strongly agreed or agreed with our Purpose and Statement, which is a good sign that we're heading down a good road. Some of the project concerns we heard really a lot of folks are concerned about ridership and travel time really compete, creating a competitive travel mood. A lot of people want to make sure that we're serving neighborhoods and community facilities and services. Very understandable. Folks had cost and visual aesthetics on their mind. So we didn't want to make sure we're keeping those things in mind.

So, a little detail about the participants, 66 of the participants said they would use the Silverline monthly, weekly, or daily. So it looks like we're getting to some of our prime customers. The top three ways that the participants heard about it was the postcard, social media, or email. So, our efforts and our investment in those methods seem to have paid off. So just to kind of get into the weeds a little bit, and I won't go too deep into the details here because I know we don't have time. But just the big things are really resonating with people's first priorities for each one of the focus areas was either local connectivity, which is more of an access base. They of course want to be able to get to the station. That's what a lot of people are concerned about. So, in Focus Area one Belmont to I-485 primary thing they're focused on was, you know, local connectivity. They want to be able to get to the station and easy easily as well as travel time. They want a fast trip, and third was the cost. That is keeping down the cost of the overall project. Focus area, two, which was a little bit different. It flipped a little bit, and that's from I-485 to I-77. That's basically everything from the Airport to Center City. That primarily was travel time. So, a lot of people seem to be focused more about a fast trip to the Airport. That's where a lot of folks were thinking about. Our local connectivity, also important as it relates to

Wilkinson Boulevard to ensure that people can actually get to the stations. Very important and development. There's a lot of discussion about development and that corridor.

Councilmember Watlington said can you speak more about that?

Mr. Mock said in the question, there wasn't really an opportunity to kind of talk about what that meant. I think you could imagine what that means in different ways. I think that's something that we're going to want to get into because I think this focus area, too, is an area that really needs a little more conversation. On Focus Area three, that's more of the local connectivity and access with travel time and development, that's the Center City. Focus areas 4,5, and 6 all lead with local connectivity or access to the station. All consistently followed by travel time and then third with different levels of either development, other was, you know, we are digging into whatever actually meant. We got a lot of people who just dialed another other but didn't explain what it went, or we had a lot of people with their own little niche kind of concerns or priorities that were kind of wading through.

So those were kind of a high-level and our takeaway is that station access is what everyone is thinking about and in travel time. Those are the two big things as we're going through these alignment alternatives that are currently under discussion and we go through this process of evaluating each alignment versus another. We're going to be looking at these priorities in a way of determining which alignment we propose to move forward with. So, I will pause there before I get into the final back, the next steps, which is kind of like process moving forward.

Councilmember Eiselt said Andy, I have a question that Ms. Watlington brought up with regards to development, some of the feedback that I've heard from people that have engaged was around the opportunity for development. So, one of the questions I have is that when you get the feedback from the people that did engage, how are you prioritizing and how are you reporting back what they said? So, in other words, in the case of I think it's area 4 or 5. If we put a lot of money into infrastructure in the Monroe Road area recently and Monroe Road area, advocates want to know or have a definite feeling about some of the options that were offered that isn't going to take advantage of the new infrastructure that's been put in that area, that is attracting new businesses and new residents to the area. So I'd like to know, ultimately, when you decide on the alignment, what options did you decide on that were a direct impact of the feedback that residents did give you? Did you change your mind because of some of that? I think it's an important point when you've got parts of town that have worked hard and we have as a City put new infrastructure into that area, how are we matching that up with the development?

Secondly, we've talked a lot about the opportunity to capitalize on our transit lines as a way to also find new space for affordable housing. So, we've got a lot of space in that area where we have a lot of NOAHs, naturally occurring affordable housing, a lot of potentials to develop new areas in there with new housing. So the other point is that I'd like to make, I guess is at some point I'd like to know how that map, the alignment that you choose, how that priority of additional either improved NOAHS or affordable housing matches with the alignment that you ultimately choose. So, I don't know, for instance, what's the most important thing when you decide an alignment, you offer these choices to people and they'll tell you how you feel. Ultimately, how are you going to weigh those decisions and what input from residents and stakeholders were part of that determination?

Mr. Mock said great questions, a lot of great questions there. So we have a process that we run through our oversight and our steering our management team. It's a benefit and risk framework. It's basically the decision-making framework. All those things are mentioned in there are in that framework. Really, what this was boils down to is a bunch of series of trade-offs. So, each line has a trade-off. There's a benefit, but it might have a risk. Some of those things, if they match up, if you have a very high benefit alignment with very low risk and I mean risk, risk towards implementation, risk towards the cost, risk towards construction, and then you weigh that against the benefit. So part of the process now that we were receiving this public input, which is still open so that so we're still

receiving input on a daily basis. So, public input is part of that. So we're weighing through here and saying we've received a lot of public input that backs up this particular alignment for good reasons and weighing that against benefits and risks and the benefits we have identified for each alignment. There are three benefits that we have identified. One is light rail operations, basically consistent with travel time. We want reliable, fast, rapid transit. The second one is about equitable transferring and development. We want to make sure that we're developing in the right way around our stations consistent with City policies, and we want to make sure access is good; getting back to that local connectivity.

So, those three things are the way we look at the benefits of a particular alternative or option, and we weigh that against risks because we want to make sure we're putting forward a project that we can actually implement, build, operate and maintain. So, we look at these projects like we look at [inaudible] and say, okay, are we able to move forward with this project independently or are we dependent on something else happening? So, we don't want to be dependent on much. We also want to make sure that we're very mindful of operating and capital costs. Those are critical for us to weigh. So, if we put forward a project that we can't afford to build, it's really not that good of a plan, and three are environmental issues. So, this project, we will seek federal funds that will have to go through a robust environmental process. So, the weighing of those three benefits and those three risks is kind of how we're looking at these alternatives and then ultimately reporting that back up to our City management structure. So, those things are in kind of matrix or the in the metrics of that decision making.

Councilmember Driggs said I've told you before, I have concerns about methodology in a lot of this research. How many of the people that you got responses from are currently users of mass transit? As you said, 66% of them indicated that they would use it?

Mr. Mock said yes.

Mr. Driggs said what I'm getting at here is that, in fact, the numbers that you point to when you take the people who actively engaged, like did something as opposed to receiving a piece of mail, that number in relation to the 84,000 people or whatever we have in Charlotte is a percent or less. In fact, the number of people that showed up to the live meetings is closer to a tenth of a percent, and they're not chosen at random. So, the only thing I'm cautioning about here is trying to suggest that this research constitutes insight into the mix of the population in Charlotte. We're getting very isolated responses from people with agendas. It troubled me a bit that you mentioned that one group or two said cost. Were the people that participate in these things, told anything about what the likely cost was going to be?

Mr. Mock said no. We weren't talking about specific costs of like what one thing cost versus another. It was more of a priority question. What is your priority at a high level?

Mr. Driggs said right. I get that and, it's useful information, but I'm just very cautious about how much importance to assign to it, frankly, because it's in statistical terms, this is thin. It's not random. The other thing is, if you take people into a car showroom and you say, do you like that car? And I say, yeah, I love that car. Well, you know, what color would you like the best? Oh, I think blue would be nice. Then the other question is, would you buy that car? I don't know that that we have put that sort of tough test into this conversation to get a better feel for what kind of commitment of resources that the larger community would like to see. Now, in Denver, they had a referendum on a half-cent sales tax, if I remember. Right, and that passed. So, with marketing and so on, you may get the buy-in once people know, but it just disturbs me a bit that we're looking at this as if we had the benefit of broad community input, when in fact, this is just limited in terms of what it tells us about the community at large. I don't know, even with this new line and if you look at the ridership on the blue line, for example, what percentage of the total population actually rides on that and what percentage of the total population will use this line. So, I'm not trying to oppose the line. I just am a little nervous about getting a level of comfort from a presentation like this that isn't really supported by the kind of research that I think it would take to do it right

John Lewis, Director of Charlotte Area Transit said Councilmember Driggs, I think you brought up some really critical questions. The only thing I'd like to add to the conversation is let's remember, we're still in the design of that car, to use your analogy. We have not built the car yet and we're not at the point of offering it for sale. What we're trying to do, and this is the same process that we have followed with the South Corridor, or the Blueline, and the Blueline Extension. Quite frankly, considering the challenges with having public outreach, I'm astounded at the level of input that we have received. I just want to remember your questions are vitally important about the cost and the input from the community, but we're still in the very early stages of designing this corridor. There will be multiple opportunities for us to continue soliciting input from the community as we refine the corridors, as we bring back options to the Council and to other elected bodies, and as we continue on down this process before we get to a level of asking the community for their support of the project.

Mr. Driggs said, and I would just say it's much better that you're doing this work than not doing this work. So, I think it's the right thing to do. I guess my main point is we need to be careful about extrapolating whatever conclusions you draw from this data to the entire population because I don't think this is big enough in numbers or representative. Thank you.

Councilmember Egleston said a couple of quick things. One, I would agree the data is not representative of the entirety of the population in Charlotte, though I would say it is more valuable to know how many people close enough to practically ride the line on a regular basis are interested in it because certainly, someone who lives 7 miles from the closest stop is not our target demographic. So, they might like it in theory or they might like it because they think in general it will help relieve some congestion. But whether or not they would see themselves riding it, they probably wouldn't. So, I do think there's a logic in focusing on the geographic corridor along the line.

Two things that I know have been brought up before and I've advocated for one of them. So, I will not belabor the point. But just to underscore the importance that's been stated by, I think, many people on the Council of making sure that as we hone in on what the alignment is, we are very mindful of the opportunities to increase our Trail Greenway Bike Path network along with it. I think that's been one of the really nice cherries on top of the sundae with the Blueline is the Rail Trail with the bridge connection that we're going to makeover to 277 in the not too distant future. I think that will be even more of an amenity to people who live along that corridor. There's a big effort amongst some of the leadership in East Charlotte in particular, but there's dialogue now with neighborhood leaders in West Charlotte I know as well, not necessarily this Silverline corridor of West Charlotte, but I think throughout our community, people want to see better pedestrian infrastructure, better bicycle infrastructure, increasing and connecting our trail networks, an infrastructure project like this gives us the opportunity to do some of that in conjunction with the work for the rail. So, I know that is a priority as we look at these alignments. But just want to underscore that point, and I think we've said this before, but again, because it gets asked and I just want to clarify for the public, we don't envision this being a phase like the Blueline. Correct? This is something that we're looking at more as a single project, not a do part of it now, and do part of it in 10 years. Is that correct?

Mr. Lewis said Councilmember, our vision for this is to build the entire corridor at once. Of course, that will depend on the availability of federal, state, and local funding.

Mr. Egleston said understood. So, if theoretically, we determined that we had the funding to build half of it now and half of it later, like was done with the Blueline. Have we gotten so far in the process as to be able to say what the order of the phases might be? Or that's not something we've determined? I agree that we should be prioritizing if at all possible, doing. This is one project, not two.

Mr. Lewis said no, we have not gotten down to that level of definition in detail on this design work. We will design the entire corridor. I think the questions and the discussion that you are referring to will happen as we look to enter into the project development

phase discussions with the Federal Transit Administration and understanding how they score the entire project.

Councilmember Bokhari said so, you said a minute ago that this was the design phase, right, you are in the design of the car, so to speak. That makes sense. I would just encourage you guys learning from what we understood from the Blueline in the last decade of putting this in the context of we're designing something that is transit alone. I don't know that is necessary the right lens. If we look back at that Blueline, I think the impact that that has made on transit in the City compared to that of the impact it's made on economic development is a rounding error.

So, I would just encourage us to think of this as more than that, especially if we are getting feedback and things of that nature, because when we're getting to those impossible conversations of how is this going to be funded and things like that, it becomes a different problem statement to solve when we're looking at it in relation to the economic value and impact that's being created. Mr. Egleston, I won't bother you with trying to evolve, Mr. Driggs' analogy of the car. That perhaps I will. It's a car that we're trying to get them to say, are you going to buy it? But perhaps they're going to live in it. There you are. Is that good?

Mr. Driggs said I'm not going to beat the car analogy any further. I just want to say in response to the observation that only a certain segment of the population is a prospective user. The entire population is a prospective payer. So, you have its essence, two different value conversations. This ties into what Mr. Bokhari was saying, for the potential users, there's one sort of calculation on the costs and the benefits, but we also will need to make the case to the rest of the community that you have improved air quality, that you have relief of congestion on the road. As Mr. Bokhari points out that you've got economic development and so on. So, this is something that needs buy-in from the entire community. Again, I see us talking only to this rather limited self-selecting group. I'm just wondering what everybody else is going to say when they're asked the question. I don't prejudge what they'll say, but I just have no idea.

Mayor Lyles said I think that the way that I understand this is in some ways we have a prescription that we have to follow for the federal government that requires us to do a certain number of things. If we could just put that before the community at the same time. There's no logic to the process by which where do you get your full costing as opposed to getting the data required by the federal government for them to even consider forecasting. So, it's a difficult and complex issue. How it proceeds is difficult and even more complex because you're stacking revenue sources, you have to start with the federal government to even get to the place that you can talk to your own people about what you're trying to do. So, I appreciate the efforts that I think when you look at these next steps, many of those next steps are just requirements that we have to do and I would hope that we would continue to be out in the public as much as possible to talk about the vision for how do we move around the City more than you know, we know that these things are going to be choices that everyone will have to contribute to the lives in our county, actually.

We've been working on that, having conversations a lot more. The MTC, for example, has more than 6 ex-mayors that are non-voting members now. That, to me says that people are beginning to understand a number of the issues around it and they're trying to figure out what we've figured out perhaps. Has it been 20 years now? They're trying to figure how are they going to finance this and how are they going to make it happen? By sitting through these kinds of opportunities, I think it is valuable for the entire region. So, Andy, I don't know if you need anything else besides what's here.

Mr. Mock said Just one note. So this is a plug. It's especially for anyone who's watching, especially folks, citizens on the West Side to Mr. Driggs' comment. We have not received that many surveys from folks in the West Side and we would very much like some more input engagement from folks on the West Side. So please go to our website at www.ridetransit.org/linksilverline, and please do the survey.

Councilmember Watlington said to that end, I'm curious. I see you've done a lot of innovation digitally and it looks like it has paid great dividends. I hope you guys are rolling that into your process going forward. In particular for the focus area, two, I think if you're looking for more engagement in this demographic, you'll have to canvass the neighborhoods. So I'd love to see that and happy to help out.

Mr. Mock said thank you. We do intend to be at the West Boulevard Neighborhood Association on the 20th and we are seeking other ways to get some input. We're talking about some different strategies. So 100% open to dialogue about the best mechanism to do that. So, I'll wrapped up unless there are any other questions. This is really just the next steps, and this is really more about aligning refinement and Council engagement. So, focused neighborhood outreach per Ms. Watlington. That's going to be ongoing as we go through this process. We are coming back to TAP (Transportation and Planning Committee) John Howard and is coming back to TAP for an update on October 26th. He's the TOD (Transit Oriented Development) Project Manager getting to that economic development conversation. Then I'll be back to TAP on November 12th to give an update on the overall program.

We're anticipating some targeted Council outreach in December, January timeframe as we start to ramp up for the public meetings. Then we have around three public meetings. That's where we would anticipate presenting the refined-locally for an alternative for public input, public engagement before we go to the National Transit Commission in the February, March timeframe to get that adoption. Then we would anticipate coming back for a future Council presentation in the January, February timeframe.

Mayor Lyles said We really appreciate the work being done because this is going to be what this community will need, not today, but 20 years from now. So, thinking about it long term.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: CITY COUNCIL MEETING CALENDAR DISCUSSION

Mayor Lyles said the next thing is our City Council Meeting Calendar Discussion, and I believe that Councilmember Eiselt has spoken with almost all of the Councilmembers and she is going to give us a report.

Councilmember Eiselt said yeah, I've reached out to most all councilmembers by text or either speaking to everybody just to communicate that we are going to be having a virtual option for our Council Meetings going forward so, people can either come and have your table set up like this or you will be spaced according to the public health policies, or you could do it up in your office or you will have an option to be on WebEx at home.

Mayor Lyles said okay, that is resolved. I think we've talked about it a good bit and that is great to have closure.

Councilmember Johnson said I just want to clarify what Ms. Eiselt said. I just want to clarify the virtual option is for closed meetings and all meetings and also ask if that can be updated in our policy, our rules, and procedures, Section 18 and section 28.

Ms. Eiselt said that was just for our in-person meetings, this was not to address closed session meetings, I think that would require a separate conversation at least with Councilmembers and I can't speak to codifying it. I thought this was really a procedure to get us through this pandemic and that would apply to the situation at hand.

Ms. Johnson said just based on what happened last week, I think for clarity and for Council and for procedure that we should have clarity [inaudible] and I think it would be appropriate to also update the Rules and Procedures. It already speaks to virtual meetings, but there is some language that can be modified. If I need to make a motion, I can do that.

Mayor Lyles said I don't know that anybody else has the material in front of them to know what we're trying to do, I think that we have struggled with how to actually communicate around this. I think that Ms. Eiselt has been great to reach out to everyone. Perhaps that could be the next conversation. Ms. Johnson, if you have to make a motion, I don't know that we have - that will require a unanimous vote of the Council because it would be taking an action on our Rules of Procedure to change them and because we haven't had that in advance in front of us, which is why the rule is unanimous on the same day for consideration. I think that has been beneficial, at least maybe not to Ms. Eiselt because of the time that she spent on it, but beneficial to reach out and see what the temperature is for the Council to do something like that before. But it's up to you if you like to make a motion, it would require unanimous approval to take action to change our procedures.

Ms. Johnson said even though the item is on the agenda, the calendar discussion?

Mayor Lyles said I think the calendar discussion is on the agenda, but I don't know that changing the rules of procedure. Mr. Baker, I'm not a lawyer, so I'm not going to try to answer that question.

Patrick Baker, City Attorney said so, what's on your agenda was the discussion about the calendar and you had that discussion, and I don't believe that there was anything in the agenda item that talked about a motion. But you've already said what you want to do going forward. I don't know that it's necessary to embed it into the procedures. You can if you want to. Keeping in mind that this is only for situations in which there was a state of emergency, which we're under right now. So, it would only apply to that. So, it will be what you just said is how it's going to be going forward. I don't want to speak for Ms. Johnson, but I think her concern was making sure that everyone understands exactly what it means going forward. I think that you all understand it now with the idea that there's still a closed session if you want to have a closed session discussion. But right now, closed sessions will be in-person and the regular meetings will be virtual. Well, you have the virtual option and that's where you are right now. Whether that's embedded into the policy or not, it's really your call.

Ms. Johnson said so, that's what I'd like to clarify, that closed sessions that we also have the link virtually for closed sessions because we did that for five months. So, we know the technology is there and also our Policy and our Rules of Procedure, they do give the option to meet virtually and it has that language, if you're sick or if there's an emergency. I'm proposing that we remove that language. So, if we need to put that on the future agenda, then we can. But I do want to clarify that the closed meetings are also an option to meet virtually, because just like today's agenda, if there were a closed session in the middle of the meeting, how could one realistically meet virtually taking safety precautions and then be present for a closed session and then not again afterward? And again, this virus doesn't respect the agenda, whether it's a closed session or not. So, I would like to clarify that closed session and all meetings that we have with the option to meet virtually. If we need to put it on the future agenda or to modify or codify the policy, then we can do that.

Mayor Lyles said okay. My understanding is we can do that, but I think you want to have a motion to make that motion. I actually had a conversation with Mr. Newton just this afternoon about the closed sessions and thought that it might be helpful to have a conversation much like you had over the weekend with the Ms. Eiselt because there are ways to deal with these closed sessions that may not require in-person or meetings. So, I just thought that it would be helpful but it's up to the Council to decide.

Councilmember Driggs said when we started going into virtual meetings, we didn't rewrite our rules. Right? I mean, we did that by a general consensus. In response to the situation, nobody raised the subject of a need to change our rules when we started that practice. Now it comes up that we're trying to consolidate this. The other thing is, I think we need to be very clear of what the intent is of this whole conversation, which was that as long as there was a COVID threat, we would continue to have WebEx meetings. But I think it's a whole different subject as to whether we picked that up permanently. I don't see a basis for that myself. I guess the council can decide, but the thing that we're

concerned about right now is while there is the COVID threat, whether or not we need to keep the WebEx option. My personal preference would be that the WebEx option is available only to someone who is living in a self-imposed stay at home situation, because if people can circulate freely and then have for health reasons, cannot participate in this meeting and fulfill their obligations to voters, I don't get that. I don't understand why a health concern applies to this meeting and doesn't apply to the other activities in which many of us are engaged. So, that's a view about that. I don't want to chime in on the closed session. I think we probably need to investigate whether that distinction should apply or not. But certainly, we should only be talking about the WebEx option for as long as the health threat subsists.

Councilmember Newton said yes, Madam Mayor. so, point of clarification here, Patrick. So, I'm trying to understand where we are in the process, given Ms. Johnston's comments, and given Mr. Driggs' comments because it was my understanding, we're not talking about changing procedures. Right. However, it is their current policy to operate in a virtual or at least to have the virtual option? Is that correct? I mean, I understand that correctly?

Mr. Barker said your Procedure, Rule 28 speaks to telephonic and electronic attendance at meetings and at Council Meetings, it's very limited in terms of participating electronically if it's necessary to achieve a quorum or your attendance is precluded due to weather, civil unrest, emergency, etc., and the meeting needs to be continued or to take action on the matters that cannot be delayed. So, it's very limited in terms of the types of things that you can do. What your Procedures don't really take into account is a pandemic. What you have been operating under since March or April was a combination of the state of emergency that the governor has and the statutory authority that the General Assembly provided to allow virtual meetings, which really wasn't taken into account in the way that it needs to be taken into account for this pandemic. So, you've got all the authority to do what it is that you are doing without making any changes to your procedures. If you don't want to make those changes and you've been making these incremental changes as things have changed a little bit and as you've been allowed to have more people in a room. That's why we're in the situation that we're in right now, as opposed to back in June and July when the limitation, I think, was 10 people in a room and there was no way to hold a meeting at all.

Mr. Newton said so as I understand it, so the Procedures broadly allow for what we're doing. It allowed for what we were doing before to Ms. Johnson's point is closed session meetings. Right. So, I'm just trying to understand where the line of demarcations, because I think the point, she's raised is that line, seems to exist between the closed and the open. So, where exactly, this gets back to the Mayor's point as to how many votes are needed to raise the issue altogether. Where exactly is that line? Is it strictly a policy-based decision that has been made separate from the procedure? That's what I think you're saying, right?

Mr. Baker said yes. This is a policy decision that you all have in terms of how you want to conduct your meeting. That's correct.

Mr. Newton said so when we say a procedure decision that sounded like something that needed a unanimous vote, whereas a policy decision, does that need a unanimous vote or that simply need the majority of what gets 6 votes?

Mr. Baker said well, I think this is the issue of when to have that discussion if you want to put it on the agenda since it's not on the current agenda, the Councilwoman could ask the manager to put it on an agenda going forward. Unless there was an objection by someone on the Council, it would come over to you on a future agenda. That just needs and can be done at this meeting and may have already been done at this meeting where a Councilmember simply asked to have an agenda item placed on a future agenda. Again, it would automatically show up on a future agenda unless there was an objection and then you would have a vote at that particular meeting.

Mr. Newton said that has me very confused then, because I thought the item on the agenda was calendaring and we've been having a conversation pertaining or underneath that item, of calendaring for virtual meetings. Right? I just don't understand, if that's what we're talking about here. That's what pertains to this item of calendaring, why the subset of virtual meetings being closed as opposed to open would not be on tonight's agenda?

Mayor Lyles said I haven't said that. I just said what I thought was a method of discussion. I did not say that you couldn't vote on it. If Ms. Johnson or you want to make a motion for the meetings to change and however, whatever your motion needs to contain, I would say under the pandemic that we have or under our existing procedures, as the City Attorney has said, you can certainly make that motion. All I was suggesting is that it seems to me that this has been a successful process that was followed by the Ms. Eiselt and it might be successful to have that same discussion about close sessions. I think a motion you can make a motion in order right now to do this.

Mr. Johnson said I'd like to make the motion, Mayor. I'd like to make the motion to continue to allow the virtual options for all meetings, including closed and special meetings, and also to update the Rule and Procedure Sections 18 and 28 to include the language that we have virtual meetings.

Mayor Lyles said now, that's where I have to ask the attorney when you're talking about changing the procedures permanently, I think that was not on the agenda. Everything that you said prior to that, it seems to me, is on the agenda. That's what Mr. Newton was referencing. I want to just make sure the motions in order, maybe you could divide those two things up and then that way could it would apply so there could be the discussion and the vote.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and I can make your motion to continue to allow the virtual office for all meetings, including closed and special meetings.

Mr. Baker said the state of emergency

Mayor Lyles said a state of emergency as the attorney said. For all meetings?

Ms. Johnson said no.

Mayor Lyles said for convenience? For whatever? I'm just trying to get where we are.

Ms. Johnson said I'm just removing the specificity at this point and mostly because of what happened last week. I think that was [inaudible]. I think that we have decided on 9/28/2020 that we were going to proceed until 10/12/2020, and then there seems to be some confusion. So, I think to make this less confusing for the Council and for the staff to send us the link when we request them, we need to make the motion that virtual meetings are allowed.

Motion was made by Councilmember Johnson, seconded by Councilmember Winston, to continue to allow virtual options for all meetings regular and closed and change the rules of procedure Section 18 and Section 28.
--

Councilmember Egleston said to make sure I'm understanding, we are now saying this is not COVID-related, that once there's agreement amongst the public health community that there's a vaccine, the pandemic is over, we want to continue the virtual option for any cause is that the motion?

Ms. Johnson said right now Broadway is closed until May 30th. We don't know how long we're going to have this discussion. I want to avoid this discussion, the discussion we had on 10/5/2020, the session we had on 9/28/2020. We can make the motion so indefinitely because we don't know how long the COVID restrictions right now, even though we're in phase 3, we have a record number in the county. I just think that we need to put this to bed. I think this is a way to put it to bed.

Mr. Egleston said I agree wholeheartedly that we don't know how long this tunnel is. But I would be uncomfortable with anything that's not tied to the fact that we are doing this because of a public health crisis, and we're not trying to change the rules permanently, because I think outside of these circumstances, having people be able to dial in virtually beyond the state of emergency or beyond a public health crisis just because they want to a year from now is problematic.

Councilmember Winston said I'd just like to point out the fact that if this pandemic had hit 3 years ago, at this point in time, there would be no opportunity to have a Public Forum that spoke to the constituents because the rules of the Council did not televise the Public Forum. They put it before the Business Meeting. If the pandemic had hit 3 years ago, the audience of people that were paying attention to Council business would have been severely diminished because it was not part of a policy that we utilize social media to stream our meetings and the various work of the City Council and our Committees. My point here is that I think we do need to have to discuss two policy discussions and decisions as this is being illustrated by the discussion that we're having today.

Yes, I do think that there is a consensus that we should continue to have a virtual meeting for all options, whether they be open or closed or special meetings during the pandemic, but I do think that we should also, it is within our rights to have that discussion on how do we modernize government. I would disagree with Mr. Driggs that there have been some of us that from the beginning that have said we need to figure out how to create structural changes, to do the work of government better. This is the opportunity to reimagine the way we interact with our work and with our constituents. So, now I think we should consider a virtual option indefinitely as we continue to consider governance issues. We know that, again, that this is a full-time job, but is expected that you're supposed to treat it part-time. So if we do want to have the best representative democracy that we can have, I think it is incumbent upon us to have both of these discussions and now's the time to do it.

Mr. Driggs said I think there's a black and white question here as to whether the thing that we already all agreed to, which is to continue the WebEx meetings going forward, was intended to extend past the end of the state of emergency or not. I think what the Ms. Eiselt thought and what the agenda formulation intended was that we would address that question. Mr. Winston, I would remind you that your argument that you should be allowed to participate via WebEx last week was based on health concerns. If those health concerns are removed through the end of the state of emergency, it's a whole different conversation. We can have that conversation about whether or not without an emergency, we ought to have WebEx meetings. But I would submit that that conversation is beyond the scope of tonight's agenda item and should call for a unanimous vote.

Councilmember Graham said I tend to agree with my colleague from the Plaza. I think the easy vote tonight is to continue virtual opportunities for members if they choose to take advantage of them until the public health crisis is over. I mean, I think there are 11 votes for that right now. I think it's a bridge too far to suggest that there should be a permanent option, especially if we are honest with ourselves and doing self-assessment. I think notwithstanding the public health crisis as an operating team, I think we will be a lot more effective and efficient if we had the luxury of group meetings and interaction in the hallways and in talking about issues and doing a lot of the homework before the meeting so that we wouldn't have these 7, 8, and 9-hour meetings like we're going to have tonight.

So, I prepared to vote to extend this to the end of the public health crisis when that is to be defined by the health department. But I think it's a bridge too far for me to have this type of discussion about our rules relating to virtual meeting as an option because I believe is based on this Council and my experience that would not be effective or efficient of us doing the business for the City.

Mr. Baker said at the risk of confusing you further, you don't have the option to change the rules once the state of emergency goes away. The ability to be in a virtual meeting that we're in right now is based on the state law that's tied to the state of emergency. So,

if you want to make changes about how you do these meetings, that's going to require additional changes at the state law. When the state of emergency is over, you're going to go back to the way it used to be in terms of how the meetings are run, absent more legislation.

Mayor Lyles said I think that's Ms. Johnson's motion, was to change to indefinite without consideration, I believe, of that law, so I don't know.

Councilmember Watlington said now, I'm confused. So, the reason I ask this question is because we know that there are other counties and other municipalities that have virtual options from time to time. Hoke County for instance. I guess I'm trying to reconcile the two. This time last year before the pandemic, no change to the existing state legislation, if the previous Council had voted to change Rules of Procedure to allow for virtual meetings, you're saying that there's a state statute that prevents that? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Baker said there are two competing issues, how this body participates and then how the public participates. What the General Assembly did was they created a mechanism whereby the public could participate virtually and you could still do the work that you do. So, individually as a Council, you can make your own rules in terms of how you individually, in a situation where someone's sick and in this case, with Charlotte, to make a quorum happen, you can have those limited options if you so choose.

Ms. Watlington said okay, it sounds like the motion that Ms. Johnson has made is fine as it relates to Council. The issue that you're bringing up is how it relates to how the public participates in the meeting.

Mr. Baker said yes, the whole virtual aspect of it from public participation. Yes.

Mayor Lyles said I think that's what was so confusing because we referenced the adoption last time of virtual meetings and that schedule was for the public, it wasn't a discussion around what we were doing. That vote, I think it was 26th or something. I can't remember something like that. That's when we were approving the calendar that the clerk brings to inform the public of how to interact with us. So, now we're on how to interact with each other, which we usually set at the beginning of the term, and handle butt under the pandemic we've gone to virtual meetings and the Ms. Eiselt's discussion with the Council was to allow virtual in the building or in wherever we have social distancing.

Mr. Newton said so to that last point, I guess you confuse me a little bit there, but I guess we are where we are. I think that Ms. Johnson makes a very valid point that we have operated with closed session meetings that were virtual at least amongst us. That's something that we have been able to accomplish in the past. I would hate to require them to somehow eliminate a virtual option requiring a Councilmember to be present who was not comfortable with being present and therefore deprived that Councilmember of their voice. I think probably more importantly, the voice of their constituents in the conversation. I'll say this, too. So, I think that Mr. Egleston makes a very good point too, about having some sort of definitive time period for particularly if it's tied to the crisis in which we are currently engaged in.

So, I understand some of the discomfort moving forward with the original motion. I don't know if there's going to be a second for this, but I would offer a substitute motion whereby if Ms. Johnson's motion, with the exception or I guess, with the difference being that it is tied to the tenure of the public health crisis, at least for the time being. So, I guess what I'm saying is substitute motion, whereby virtual meetings from the standpoint of us as Councilmembers, whereby we can interact if we so feel, if we're comfortable enough or so inclined, interact in a virtual way on both the public and the closed through the tenure of the public health crisis that we're currently in.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Newton, seconded by Councilmember Graham to allow virtual option for regular and closed sessions for as long as the public health crisis is enforced.

The Motion was not voted on.

Ms. Watlington said so, then my question is upon what basis? I know we were saying the public health decision or whatever, but we've had several different public health opinions and different phases and whatnot. So, help me understand it. Mr. Newton, what do you have in mind as definitive versus kind of exactly where we are today? Help me understand the difference in what you're saying.

Mr. Newton said could you repeat that question, please?

Ms. Watlington said I just want to know, how are you anticipating us to determine when the public health need is over because we're in a situation right now where some feel like it's sufficiently over and others don't. That's my question.

Mayor Lyles said I think that what we're talking about as the Governor gives you a number of people that can be in a room with social distance and various regulations that used to be 10, then was 25, and now it's 50 and outside and a 10000-foot football stadium it's 7%. So, those are the rules that we have been operating under.

Ms. Watlington said I understand. But that's why I'm asking my question.

Mr. Newton said so, if I could respond to that, Madam Mayor. You make a really great point Ms. Watlington. So, I'm of the opinion that I do not want you to force any of you as my colleagues, and I would hope that you would want to force me to be in an environment where I'm not comfortable because I'm afraid that I could catch what amounts to a deadly illness. So, I'm with you.

I do question whether or not those types of mandates or those types of procedures that have been issued from whether it be the top, maybe you know, the federal government, state government stature and whether that is kind of uphold that spirit of us respecting the comfort level of our colleagues, I just can't really reconcile the idea of us eliminating an option if one of our colleagues is uncomfortable and depriving that person of an option to go virtual, depriving that person the voice in the media, as I was mentioning a second ago, depriving the voice of your constituents. I just feel like that's undemocratic.

So, I don't know exactly where we put that point. I think you make a very good point in that right. I wouldn't say, it's very vague to say a public health crisis. I wouldn't tie that specifically to any governmental mandate. So much as our own decision making in our own mandate, as a governing party ourselves. Does that make sense? To the extent that it doesn't make sense, I will rescind my motion.

Mayor Lyles said your motion wasn't confusing. You said until a public health crisis is over and including closed sessions.

Mr. Newton said so, I'm not asking that it be tied to any governmental mandate or any sort of state-federal policies here so much as our own decision making in when we feel most comfortable to have that be when we feel comfortable.

Mayor Lyles said would you measure that by a vote Mr. Newton?

Mr. Newton said I think that that would be our consensus.

Mayor Lyles said yes, that's what I'm saying. You're it would be our decision and it would be by vote.

Mr. Newton said until we as a governing body decide that the public health crisis is over.

Mayor Lyles said that Mr. Newton says that we should have options that were outlined virtual in building in space until we change our minds about changing those ideas. So, that everyone would be comfortable, but I don't think that's a part of the motion. The motion is till we us as a council to change our minds. So that is a motion for the meetings.

Mr. Newton said Including the virtual option for closed meetings.

Councilmember Bokhari said I look at the agenda each Monday wondering, oh, this looks like a simple agenda that will get through easily. It always surprises me whatever pops up. I am so confused because I was under the impression that because of the pandemic and the Governor's order, given the fact that we have to have certain visibility and viewership capabilities of the general public, whether it's a public forum where they interact or how they see us interact, that we were now for the first time ever allowed to use WebEx and have the abilities that we have during it and a gray area entered when the Governor switched to this last phase where we could decide which way to go with that, we could keep doing it or we could not do it. We started because of a lot of history and other things to gravitate towards the social distance, towards using all of the protocols in place so we could get back together and start figuring out how to work together again. There were some issues there. So, Ms. Eiselt went to work talking to everyone and figured out some kind of general consensus of how everyone could do the things they're comfortable with or not. None of that required a vote. I'm just confused at what Ms. Eiselt has done and what this motion is and what the actual difference is because I feel like we've achieved all the same things, yet we're still fighting against each other and debating on what the right motion or counter motion is. So, does anyone have an answer as it relates to - so closed session is the only specific items we are talking about right now.

Mayor Lyles said guys you really have to go with a motion. You can't just say well, let's just whatever.

Mr. Bokhari said I guess where I was confused was what Ms. Eiselt did, didn't require a motion.

Ms. Eiselt said let's back up. I want to clarify. So, based on what happened last week, we knew which Councilmembers felt that they wanted to have a WebEx link for our meetings because of the health concerns of the pandemic. So, when this came onto the agenda for this week and we were going to decide if we would be allowed virtual meetings, participation in meetings or not, I called Ms. Johnson and I called Councilmembers that I wasn't sure where they were going to land because, in everything we do, we try to get six votes. So, when it was clear we had six or seven votes to say, yes, let's give a virtual option to meet online to be able to meet online during this pandemic if you have concerns about being in the building. Then I texted the rest of you said, hey, based on that, we're going to go ahead. I actually thought we were going to vote tonight, but nobody said, no, no, no, I don't want to do that. I want the option to vote against it. So, that's why we didn't vote, because everybody was in agreement that we would go ahead, including people who said I'd rather us have a space in the building for everybody to meet individually. So, we got to this unanimous place ahead of actually being here and meeting online and that's the goal.

That's what's been missing with this process and the pandemic makes it difficult. But these are conversations that we should be having amongst ourselves. If you have concerns about these things, we need to call each other. But now we've spent all this time here on this issue once again on something that was not on the agenda when we should be having conversations. We can't do it live. Then we've got to call each other because the public is listening to all of this and they see a group that can't come to a decision to save our lives. It's just, we're we've got to serve the public to our highest and best effort. That means that we've got to do work during the week.

If people feel that there's a reason, we should have closed sessions online, I personally am against it. I'm open to hearing why we should be able to do that. Mr. Winston, I can see you smiling or laughing, and please chime in. This is really frustrating to try to get anything done and move on. So, feel free to share. But I wish we would talk more offline

to each other if we can't do it in person or outside, pick up the phone and call each other so we don't always get to this point.

Mr. Driggs said if we have an objective benchmark like the end of the emergency or as suggested by the Attorney, then, it is not tantamount to just saying indefinitely, regardless of the status as recognized by health authorities and otherwise we could just carry on meeting virtually. So, I think we need to be very careful about Mr. Newton's motion because that's tantamount to the thing that was being suggested before. We need to have a hard test related to health as to when we're going to stop the current decision, not excluding the possibility of future conversations about a change in policy.

Mr. Egleston said two brief points. One, as far as I'm aware, none of us have any real public health expertise. So, to me, the Council deciding versus when Gibi Harris or our State Health Director decides is a bit silly and a bit arrogant because none of us have an ounce of expertise in this area compared to either of them. To me, it should be tied to a Public Health Director making a decision for our state or for our county. The reason and again, I think we need to underscore for the public, the entire Council has now agreed that as long as this pandemic is going on, there should be a virtual option for the public meetings that this Council has for any Councilmember that has concerns about their health. I think there is a material difference between that, which is a meeting that's broadcast on television, broadcast on Facebook, accessible to anybody who wants to watch it and a closed session, which is not because there are other people that live in every single Councilmember that's currently serving home. Our spouses, or significant others, our children, whoever might be over at any given time, is not a member of the City Council. To have a WebEx going on a closed session to me is very different than a public meeting. There are opportunities that can be afforded to any Councilmember who doesn't want to attend the closed session in-person to have on one phone calls or in-person meetings or whatever with whatever staff member is presenting to the Council in that closed session. But to me, broadcasting a closed session is opening a mighty big can of worms. So, for that reason, I'll be voting no. But I want to reiterate that we have agreed unanimously that public meetings should have a virtual option for anyone who's concerned during this pandemic.

Mr. Graham and again, I don't want to add any more confusion, but the motion that I second was when Mr. Newton said that the timeline for determining when this thing was over was at the discretion of the public health officials, not the City Council. That was my second.

Mayor Lyles said the question is, are you withdrawing your second effort?

Mr. Graham said If it's tied to the Council making the decision, then I withdraw the second.

Substitute Motion was made by Councilmember Bokhari, seconded by Councilmember Egleston to approve continue with options for virtual attendance for by Councilmembers as well as physical attendance for all public regular meetings and not closed session meetings until the point of which the State Health and Human Services Department and/or the Mecklenburg County Health Department deem that we have entered a general public safe state post this pandemic period and phase we are in.

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

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

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Johnston, Mitchell, Newton, Watlington, and Winston.

The Substitute Motion was not approved.

Mayor Lyles asked the City Clerk to read the original motion.

Stephanie Kelly, City Clerk said a motion was to continue virtual options for all meetings, regular and closed and to change the Rules of Procedure, Sections 18 and 28 to reflect those changes.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Johnson is that your motion?

Ms. Johnson said yes.

Mayor Lyles said is the motion in order Mr. Attorney?

Mr. Baker said yes.

Mr. Graham said clarification Madam Mayor; so, we're voting to basically codify this change into our procedures.

Mayor Lyles said yes. Is that correct Mr. Baker.

Mr. Baker said yes. As I understand the motion, yes.

Mayor Lyles said is to change our procedures.

Mr. Graham said five years from now, this policy of another council that changes will allow meetings to be any purpose?

Mayor Lyles said yes sir.

Mr. Graham said no, any purpose. I don't feel like coming to work today. So, I take it at home.

Mayor Lyles said I thought that you said there was a separation between the procedures changes and the motion to do it indefinitely.

Mr. Baker said the question here now is whether or not was this on the agenda for you to vote because there was nothing on your agenda about changing the procedures. This is a Council issue, but your policies speak to by unanimous consent you can vote on something that's not actually on the agenda. What's on the agenda is a discussion about how you're going to handle your virtual meetings.

Ms. Watlington said I thought Julie said she thought we were going to vote.

Mr. Baker said that was when everybody agreed.

Mayor Lyles said that was when everybody agreed on something. Now we are in a different motion. I thought Ms. Johnson was breaking them into two; continue meetings indefinitely virtually with choices and I through the procedure was a different so, thought it was appropriate for her to ask to continue the meetings indefinitely because that is the meeting on the agenda. What I don't have is the procedures, so just help me out here.

Mr. Baker said ultimately, that's going to be your call. If you're comfortable having this conversation, you can have that. You can go ahead and do the vote. That's not a state law issue.

Mayor Lyles said my issue is that we are I don't believe we should change our procedures without having a discussion and wording in front of us about what they are. So, I would rule that the first portion of Mr. Johnson's motion is to continue to have options for meetings virtually and indefinitely is the motion that she made.

The second part, I would say, requires us to have the document, all of us in front of us, and knowing what it means. So, Ms. Johnson, are you okay with that?

Ms. Johnson said I mean, if that's what you're ruling, that's fine.

Mr. Winston said so what do we agreeing on to what the unanimous conversation that we all agreed to have today?

Ms. Eiselt said to clarify I thought we were voting on it? I did not. That wouldn't have been right because I didn't think we had a unanimous agreement. I thought we had a clear majority that would have voted in favor of virtual meetings. I thought we could vote. I thought we were voting on that tonight. So, that's my fault if procedurally we could not vote on that. Then when we talked to the agenda review at 3:00 and I said there's a clear majority of people that want virtual meetings, then it was just decided, well, let's just say that then we don't have to vote on it.

Mr. Winston said because what I agreed to was the idea that we will vote tonight on having a virtual meeting option. Everybody should have a WebEx link, is what I agreed to. What that means is what we are getting to the details. So, if we all agree to have this discussion, I don't understand how Ms. Johnson's version of that is out of line.

Ms. Eiselt said she want to codify it.

Mayor Lyles said she want to codify it in the procedures.

Mr. Winston said we agreed to have a vote tonight. So, we already have unanimous consent to have a vote on this. I'm reading Ms. Eiselt's text message to me right now, on what we all agreed to have on the agenda tonight.

Mr. Driggs said I didn't agree to that.

Ms. Eiselt said I thought we were going to have a vote. When we talked about the agenda review at 3:00 p.m., I was told we didn't need to vote. We could just agree that we would have virtual meetings. I thought we were actually going to vote and when it was seven or eight council members that said, yeah, I would just as soon have virtual meetings, then that's what I was saying to you, that we will vote tonight. Everybody seems to be in favor of it. What I was told then later is that we don't need to vote. What I didn't know is procedurally we could not vote.

Mr. Baker said you could vote if you wanted to.

Mayor Lyles said I thought you said that I had to rule whether or not changing our procedures.

Mr. Baker said I'm sorry, I'm speaking to what Mr. Eiselt just said.

Ms. Eiselt said we could have voted.

Mr. Baker said You could have if you chose. But, based on what I heard and what I was told at 3:00 p.m. was you had a unanimous agreement to do virtual meetings through the end of the state of emergency. My response was, if that's what you've all agreed to and you can vote, you cannot vote, you don't have to vote if everyone's in agreement on that going forward.

Ms. Eiselt said there's a difference between everybody unanimous agreement as if it was a vote and anybody saying, no, no, no, that's not what I want to do. I'm sorry for that nuance, but nobody said no, I want to vote against it. So, what I conveyed was that there's a clear majority that wants to do this, and so I was told that then we didn't need to actually take a vote if that's what everybody wants to do.

Mayor Lyles said I think we have a motion on the floor from Mr. Johnson now which says have virtual meetings indefinitely, including closed sessions. So, that is the first part of the motion that we can rule on. We can do the procedural question in a second motion about changing it and for what purpose or my suggestion would be that we send it to the Intergovernmental Committee that talks about effective government so there could be a discussion about it, but that would again be my referral idea. But we have a motion from

Ms. Johnson that we will have options for virtual for all public meetings of the Council including closed sessions indefinitely. That was seconded by Mr. Winston.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Winston, Watlington, Newton, Mitchell, Johnson, Ajmera, and Eiselt

NAYS: Councilmembers Graham, Egleston, Driggs, and Bokhara.

Mayor Lyles said indefinitely means until we vote to change it. The rules that we have before we go back to our procedural rules, so the motion passes, does that make sense?

Ms. Johnson said wait what did you just add on [inaudible]

Mayor Lyles said until we are out from under the rules by which we have had these meetings that are this way. That is what the number and the health rules. Then you would have to change it, so is indefinitely meaning – because we have Rules of Procedure that the Council also vote on.

Mr. Johnson said yeah, but you just said this is -

Ms. Eiselt said we just voted to have these indefinitely.

Mr. Egleston said don't worry, this will be overruled because it is a legal sense.

Mr. Driggs said we are going to have to have this conversation again and we are [inaudible]

Mayor Lyles said I would suggest that we refer the procedural review of the calendar. We will be voting on a calendar in December, the first meeting of December. We set the new calendar up. I would like to suggest that we turn this over to the Effective Government Committee, for a recommendation, and that might get to more of this explanation of what indefinitely means or pandemic. That would be ready for the Council vote on the formal calendar, the Organizational Meeting in December.

Ms. Johnson said so could we put instead it going to a Committee could we put the rest of the Rules and Procedure on a future meeting, a future agenda that will allow everyone to take a look at the Rules of Procedure?

Mayor Lyles said that's a different issue for me. I thought we were trying to figure out how to be virtual in our meetings. But if we want to look at all of the Rules and Procedures, I would not have that requirement considering what we have on our agenda from the committees and budget coming up. But that's up to the Council as the council wants to change the Rules and Procedures or have a review of them. That's up to the Council, but I doubt seriously if they'll be ready by December.

Ms. Johnson said okay, we can talk off-line, or we can look at this in the future. We've spent enough time on this.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Driggs, if you look at that section on meetings for a December recommendation prior to December, when we have the Council - These things can change every December that there's an election, guys. So, it's okay. It's not a big deal, really. December happens every year.

Mr. Mitchell said let's talk about something we all can agree on. We need to go out there and tell citizens about the upcoming City bonds. So, we have \$102.7 million for street bonds and for citizens, what's important is that \$8 million dollars resurface we have allocated under that. We had a \$44.5 million neighborhood improvement bonds. Something that's dear to a lot of our hearts is an additional \$14.5 million investment in that corridor and something this councilman is passionate about is \$50 million for house

and bond. Early voting begins on October 15th. So, please, Council, let's really get our constituent out here, entertain a question they have. But we need to continue to be successful with our bonds to move our City forward. Thank you for this opportunity.

Mayor Lyles said Mr. Jones do we have any other items?

Mr. Jones said that is it.

Mayor Lyles said I have one item that I wanted to bring up. I've also asked that the Budget and Effectiveness Committee take on another task. The question is, what should be the city's approach to maintain the financial stability of the Charlotte Fire Department retirement system? The charge to the committee is to review the changes proposed by the Charlotte Firefighters Retirement Board to include the proposed changes to purchase the cost of prior military service and the board's recommendation to increase the employer contribution in the upcoming budget. So that can be both a budget but a policy decision.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 6: CLOSED SESSION (AS NECESSARY)

No closed session occurred.

* * * * *

AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

ITEM NO. 8: CHARLOTTE FIRE PREVENTION MONTH PROCLAMATION

Councilmember Bokhari read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, the City of Charlotte, North Carolina is committed to ensuring the safety and security of all those living in and visiting Charlotte; and

WHEREAS, fire is a serious public safety concern both locally and nationally, and homes are the locations where people are at greatest risk from fire; and

WHEREAS, two of every five home fires start in the kitchen, with 31% of these fires resulting from unattended cooking; and

WHEREAS, Charlotte's residents should stay in the kitchen when frying food on the stovetop, keep a three-foot kid-free zone around cooking areas and keep anything that can catch fire away from stovetops; and

WHEREAS, Charlotte residents should test their smoke alarms monthly; and

WHEREAS, Charlotte residents who have planned and practiced a home fire escape plan with everyone in the household, including visitors, are more prepared and will therefore be more likely to survive a fire; and

WHEREAS, the 2020 Fire Prevention Week theme TM, "Serve Up Fire Safety in the Kitchen!!" effectively serves to remind us to stay alert and use caution when cooking to reduce the risk of kitchen fires.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim October 2020, as

"CHARLOTTE FIRE PREVENTION MONTH"

throughout this city, and I urge all the people of Charlotte by checking their kitchens for fire hazards and using safe cooking practices during Fire Prevention Week 2020, and to support the many public safety activities and efforts of Charlotte's fire and emergency services.

Mr. Bokhari said, and I am pleased and honored to present this to Senior Fire Instructor Amy Ray.

Amy Ray, Senior Fire Instructure said on behalf of Chief Johnson and the entire Charlotte Fire Department, thank you very much, we very much appreciate this recognition and proclamation to the citizens of Charlotte, and we hope that every one of you goes home tonight and check your smoke alarm, take advantage of this as well as the citizens. We very much appreciate that and hope you stay safe. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said Thank you very much for being here. And, you know, fires are devastating, as the resolution said, and there are so many ways to prevent them. Having a smoke detector, having an extinguisher, especially in the kitchen. So, thank you very much for being here this evening.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 9: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVORS' DAY PROCLAMATION

Councilmember Graham read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, domestic violence is a serious crime that is a willful and systematic pattern of power and control perpetrated by one intimate partner against another. It affects people of every age, race, socio-economic status, religion, nationality, sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity as more than half of transgender people have experienced some form of intimate partner violence; and

WHEREAS, domestic violence manifests in many forms, including physical, sexual, verbal, emotional, psychological, financial, technological abuse, stalking, and coercive control; and

WHEREAS, domestic violence is widespread and accounts for significant loss of life, including 12 lives taken in Mecklenburg County in 2020, to date. It affects over ten million Americans each year; and

WHEREAS, 1 in 4 women and 1 in 9 men have experienced severe physical violence, sexual violence, and/or stalking committed by an intimate partner and given the thousands of domestic violence incidents reported every year in Mecklenburg County, our community is home to a powerful number of survivors; and

WHEREAS, children who are exposed to domestic violence are at greater risk for developing physical and mental health problems, entering abusive relationships as adults, or replicating abusive behaviors as adults, and survivors of domestic violence often experience trauma that can last a lifetime and span generations; and

WHEREAS, domestic violence costs the nation billions of dollars annually in medical expenses, police, court costs, shelters, foster care, sick leave, absenteeism, and non-productivity; and

WHEREAS, a coordinated effort can help slow this epidemic in our community and bring relief to its victims. Our community offers a continuum of care to support and empower victims and survivors as they seek out safety, hope, and healing. This continuum of care includes nonprofit, for-profit, and public partners together with survivor-led grassroots organizations; and

WHEREAS, communities nationwide recognize Domestic Violence Awareness Month in October and this month would provide an excellent opportunity for citizens to learn about preventing domestic violence, to show support for the organizations and individuals who provide critical advocacy, services, and assistance to victims and to help raise awareness of these services in an effort to extend a lifeline to survivors; and

WHEREAS, a Domestic Violence Survivors Day would create a unique opportunity to recognize, honor, and celebrate the courage of victims and survivors in Mecklenburg County as survivors are a testament to the resilience of the human spirit.

NOW, THEREFORE, WE, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of the City of Charlotte, and George Dunlap, Chair of the Mecklenburg Board of County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim October 2020 and October 15, respectively, as

**"DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH" &
"DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVORS DAY"**

in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County and commend its observance to all citizens.

Mayor Lyles said We will make sure that that proclamation is distributed to the appropriate agencies and the many events that are taking place during this month that we really fight domestic violence, wearing purple and making sure that people know that there are havens that they can go to safely.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 10: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' DAY PROCLAMATION

Councilmember Watlington said Indigenous Peoples' Day is a holiday that celebrates and honors Native American People and commemorates their history and culture. It is celebrated across the United States on the second Monday in October. In 2018 North Carolina Governor, Roy Cooper proclaimed the second Monday in October as Indigenous Peoples' Day in North Carolina. Cooper's Proclamation states American Indians who have inhabited this land since long before their first contact with English settlers share their knowledge of the land and its resources and have continued to play a vital role in the development of our local communities, the State of North Carolina and the nation. Governor Cooper noted our state has enjoyed a positive relationship with the Indigenous People of North Carolina and continue to grow in our shared progress. We honor and respect the heritage and the many cultural and economic contributions of our American Indian Tribes and people. The Mint Museum joins North Carolina celebration of Indigenous Peoples' Day and embraces the idea of acknowledging the historic sacrifices of Indigenous People and their contribution to the United States. The Museum is proud of its relationship with the Metrolina Native American Association in presenting cultural history, heritage, dance, storytelling and music during Native American Heritage month.

Ms. Watlington read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, throughout the centuries, American Indians have shared their knowledge of land and resources while continuing to play a role in the development of the City of Charlotte, the State of North Carolina, and the nation; and

WHEREAS, North Carolina is home to more than 122,000 American Indians and has eight historic tribes legally recognized by the state of North Carolina: Coharie, Eastern Band of Cherokee, Haliwa-Saponi, Lumbee, Meherrin, Occaneechi Band of Saponi, Sappony, and Waccamaw-Siouan; and

WHEREAS, the City of Charlotte enjoys a positive relationship with American Indian citizens, recognizes and encourages the acknowledgment of historic contributions and sacrifices of Indigenous People, and respects the cultural and economic contributions that American Indians have made; and

WHEREAS, the City of Charlotte promotes the closing of the equity gap for Indigenous Peoples through policies and practices that reflect the experiences of Indigenous Peoples, ensure greater access and opportunity, and honor the nation's indigenous roots, history, and contributions; and

WHEREAS, Indigenous Peoples' Day was proposed in 1977 by a delegation of Native Nations to the United Nations-sponsored International Conference on Discrimination Against Indigenous Populations in the Americas:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim October 12, 2020, as

“INDIGENOUS PEOPLES’ DAY”

in Charlotte and commend its observance to all citizens.

Mayor Lyles said We have one more recognition that I like to make, it's pretty difficult because of this one's close to many of us. But I wanted to just recognize the loss in the passing of Judy Williams, who is a co-founder of Mothers of Murdered Offspring. I'm sad to say that she passed of lung cancer this past Saturday. She founded Mothers of Murdered Offspring after her goddaughter, Shana Hawke was brutally raped and murdered by a serial killer in 1993, along with D. Sumpter who Shana's mother, and Dave Howard, one of our fellow colleagues and the City Council and currently working with Governor Cooper's office in transportation.

They decided the best way to work through that grief was to help others who have been through something similar. Mothers of Murdered Offspring focuses on preventing violence, helping families of homicide victims through grief and substance abuse awareness. Their slogan ever so fitting is in the Madness, Stop the Sadness. Now Ms. Judy, who is also called Judge Judy, after [inaudible] Gary and Dave, her son, made a celebration to have her sworn in as a Judge in Mecklenburg County before she became too ill to see the expression of appreciation that this City has for her. She was an amazing woman who took her grief in a way to comfort others, a way to give what would have been completely naturally to be consumed by her own pain, she gave that away. She had a mighty heart. She was a humanitarian with love and endurance.

All of us think about her family today and may she rest in love. Mothers of Murdered Offspring staff is all volunteer. Lisa Crawford helped Ms. Judy in the last several years and I would say this, we're coming to that time of year, the end of the year, that we begin to review where we are and where others aren't. Perhaps you would consider a financial contribution to Mothers of Murdered Offspring because it's always needed. They're always out there doing the memorials for people. Think about it, honoring Ms. Judy and all that she's done for this community. Please support the organization that she founded and take the time to donate so that other people can step up and fill her shoes to make sure that her legacy lives on. So, with that to Dave and the entire family, we say we're going to miss her, but we're not going to forget her. So, thank you very much for this moment to recognize Judy Williams, founder of Mother of Murdered Offspring.

With that we will continue the meeting. It sometimes tails what goes on in our community against sometimes what we spend our time talking about. If we really focused on the greatest needs of our constituents that's outside of this building. It's outside of what we do procedurally. It's about what we get to do to make an impact. So, as we are elected officials in this City and looking forward to having a plan around community safety, around the stopping of domestic violence, about building communities and corridors that everyone would be proud to live in. I think sometimes it does take a moment for us to step back and think about the people that we represent and how much they give, and what they get about doing just by going out every day and doing it.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Lyles said I think Councilmember Mitchell had a question about Item No. 24. Mr. Jones do we have a response?

Angela Charles, Assistant City Manager said we do have an apprenticeship component to this particular contract. The contract is State Utilities has agreed to partner with Charlotte Water with two apprentices. Then after their apprenticeship period is done, those two individuals will have the opportunity to be employed by the contractor or be employed through the City's pipeline program

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, with the exceptions of Item No. 31 which was pulled by staff and Item No. 40 which was deferred to October 26th, 2020.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 18: Construct Margaret Wallace Road Sidewalk

Approve a contract in the amount of \$981,975.50 to the lowest responsive bidder Husky Construction Corp. for the Margaret Wallace Road (Campbell Creek - Old Gate Drive) Sidewalk.

Summary of Bids

Husky Construction Corp.	\$ 981,975.50
Armen Construction	\$ 1,134,404.70
Little Mountain Builders of Catawba, Inc.	\$ 1,243,598.95
Dot Construction	\$ 1,301,370.06
United Construction Company, Inc.	\$ 1,697,135.00

Item No. 19: Demolition and Environmental Services

Approve a unit price contract for demolition and environmental services for a term of five years with the following companies: Contaminant Control Inc., Double D Construction Services, Inc., Hepaco, LLC, Jones Grading & Fencing, Inc. (MBE, SBE), W.C. Black and Sons, Inc. (SBE); and, D.H. Griffin Wrecking Co., Inc.

Item No. 20: Stream and Wetland Project Site Identification and Prioritization

(A) Approve a unit price contract with Wildlands Engineering, Inc. for planning services for Stream and Wetland Project Site Prioritization for an initial term of five years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 21: Franklin Water Treatment Plant Fire Alarm System Replacement

Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,787,666 to the lowest responsive bidder The Harper Corporation - General Contractors for the Franklin Water Treatment Plant Fire Alarm System Replacement project.

Summary of Bids

The Harper Corporation (only bid received)	\$ 3,544,200.00
--	-----------------

Item No. 22: Laboratory Microbiology Supplies

(A) Approve the purchase of laboratory microbiology supplies, by the sole source exemption, (B) Approve a contract with IDEXX Distribution, Inc. for the purchase of laboratory microbiology supplies for the term of five years, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 23: McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Grit System Upgrades Change Order

Approve change order #2 for \$620,723.99 to The Harper Corporation - General Contractors for the McAlpine Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Grit System Upgrades project.

Item No. 24: Water and Sanitary Sewer Service Installations

Approve a contract in the amount of \$6,421,019 to the lowest responsive bidder State Utility Contractors, Inc. for the Water and Sanitary Sewer Service Installations project.

Summary of Bids

State Utility Contractors, Inc. (only bid received) \$ 6,421,019.00

Item No. 25: Water Service Line Copper Tubing

(A) Approve a unit price contract to the lowest responsive bidder Morsco Supply, LLC for the purchase of water service line copper tubing for a term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two additional, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Summary of Bids

* The Complete Summary of Bids is available in the City Clerk's Office

Item No. 26: CATS Detroit Bus Engine Parts

(A) Approve a unit price contract with Clarke Power Services for the purchase of Original Equipment Manufacturer Detroit bus engine parts for an initial term of three years in the amount of \$1,290,000. (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 27: Hitachi Rail Signaling and Transportation Systems Parts and Repair Services

(A) Approve the purchase of parts and repair services for CATS Light Rail Vehicles and Wayside Equipment, by the sole source exemption, and (B) Approve a contract for up to \$1,750,000 with Hitachi Rail STS for the purchase of parts and repair services for a term of five years, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 28: Assumption of Purchase and Sale Agreement - 5745 Central Avenue

(A) Accept the assignment from C4 Investments, LLC of its rights and obligations under that certain Purchase and Sale Agreement entered into by and between C4 Investments, LLC and Wilora Lake Partners, L.P. (the "Agreement") for property located at 5745 Central Avenue and having Mecklenburg County Parcel Identification Number 103-041-08 (the "Property"), and (B) Approve the purchase of the Property in an amount not to exceed \$2,870,000, and authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to execute all instruments necessary to Purchase the property in conformity herewith.

Item No. 29: Refund of Property Taxes

(A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the refund of property taxes assessed through clerical or assessment error in the amount of \$83,333.10.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page(s) 77-79.

Item No. 30: Meeting Minutes

Approve the titles, motions, and votes reflected in the Clerk's record as the minutes of September 08, 2020, Strategy Session, and September 14, 2020, Business Meeting.

IN REM REMEDY

Item No. 32: In Rem Remedy: 4810 Lamont Drive

Adopt Ordinance No. 9901-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at 4810 Lamont Drive (Neighborhood Profile Area 393).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 331.

Item No. 33: In Rem Remedy: 8335 Old Dowd Road

Adopt an Ordinance No. 9902-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at 8335 Old Dowd Road (Neighborhood Profile Area 83).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 332.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 34: Property Transactions - Idlewild/Monroe Intersection - Phase I, Parcel #18

Acquisition of 206 square feet. (0.004 acres) Temporary Construction Easement, 29 square feet. (0.000 acres) Utility Easement, 1,048 square feet. (0.024 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 1,048 square feet (0.024 acres) Sanitary Sewer and Waterline Easement at 4006 Connection Point Boulevard from VW Rebound 2 LLC for \$10,925 for Idlewild/Monroe Intersection - Phase I, Parcel #18.

Item No. 35: Property Transactions - Morris Field Bridge Replacement, Parcel #2

Acquisition of 3,048 square feet (0.07 acres) Utility Easement, 538 square feet (0.012 acres) Storm Drainage Easement, 2,941 square feet (0.068 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 4001 Morris Field Drive from RLF II East LLC for \$10,500 for Morris Field Bridge Replacement, Parcel #2.

Item No. 36: Property Transactions - Pineville Matthews Road/Alexander Road Sidewalk, Parcel #16

Resolution of Condemnation of 36 square feet (0.001 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 131 square feet. (0.003 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 7833 Deerfield Manor Drive from JPO Deerfield LP for \$350 for Pineville Matthews Road/Alexander Road Sidewalk, Parcel #16.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page (s) 80.

Item No. 37: Property Transactions - Providence Road Sidewalk Improvement (Greentree Drive - Knob Oak Lane), Parcel #8

Acquisition of 986 square feet (0.023 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 1601 Rutledge Avenue from Richard M Coe Jr and Susan B Coe for \$11,275 for Providence Road Sidewalk Improvement (Greentree Drive - Knob Oak Lane), Parcel #8.

Item No. 38: Property Transactions - Providence Road Sidewalk Improvement (Greentree Drive - Knob Oak Lane), Parcel #14

Resolution of Condemnation of 3,025 square feet (0.069 acre) Fee Simple, 2,561 square feet (0.059 acres) Temporary Construction Easement, at 1600 Cavendish Court from Anna Valdman for \$64,125 for Providence Road Sidewalk Improvement (Greentree Drive - Knob Oak Lane), Parcel #14.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page (s) 81.

Item No. 39: Property Transactions - Providence Road Sidewalk Improvement (Greentree Drive - Knob Oak Lane), Parcel #18

Resolution of Condemnation of 1,379 square feet (0.031 acre) 1,849 square feet (0.042 acres) Temporary Construction from Toby W Peltier for \$33,625 for Providence Road Sidewalk Improvement (Greentree Drive - Knob Oak Lane), Parcel #18

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 51, at Page (s) 82.

Item No. 41: Property Transactions - Stevens Creek Tank Phase II, Parcel #14

Acquisition of 31,257 square feet (0.718 acres) Sanitary Sewer Easement, 45,188 square feet (1.037 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 6000 Joli Cheval Lane from Paris Family LLC for \$39,075 for Stevens Creek Tank Phase II, Parcel #14.

Item No. 42: Property Transactions - Stevens Creek Tank Phase II, Parcel #16, 19, and 20

Acquisition of 17,895 square feet (0.411 acres) Sanitary Sewer Easement, 25,835 square feet. (0.593 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at Joli Cheval Lane, 11903 Stoney Meadow Drive from Cheval Property Owners Association Inc for \$23,075 for Stevens Creek Tank Phase II, Parcel #16, 19, and 20.

Item No. 43: Property Transactions - Stevens Creek Tank Phase II, Parcel #18

Acquisition of 30,707 square feet (0.705 acres) Sanitary Sewer Easement, 46,077 square feet (1.058 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 2417 Bain Farm Road from Stevens Creek Associates LLC for \$28,125 for Stevens Creek Tank Phase II, Parcel #18.

Item No. 44: Property Transactions - Tryon Street - 36th Street Streetscape, Parcel #8

Acquisition of 43 square feet (0.001 acres) Utility Easement, 1,979 square feet (0.045 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 2,840 square feet. (0.065 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 136 East 36th Street from Noda Project #1 LLC for \$15,096 for Tryon Street - 36th Street Streetscape, Parcel #8.

Item No. 45: Property Transactions - Tryon Street - 36th Street Streetscape, Parcel #12

Acquisition of 158 square feet (0.004 acres) Storm Drainage Easement, 196 square feet (0.004 acres) Sidewalk Utility Easement, 1,497 square feet (0.034 acres) Temporary Construction Easement at 3101 North Tryon Street from Mustafa Al-Asfar and Khalid Al-Asfar for \$21,000 for Tryon Street - 36th Street Streetscape, Parcel #12.

PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM NO. 11: PUBLIC HEARING ON A RESOLUTION TO CLOSE A PORTION OF NORTH MYERS STREET

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

ITEM NO. 12: PUBLIC HEARING ON I-485 AND ARROWOOD ROAD AREA VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Eiselt, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

**ITEM NO. 13: PUBLIC HEARING ON NORTHLAKE CENTRE PARKWAY
NORTHEAST AREA VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION**

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 14: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Marcus Jones, Assistant City Manager said I have my 30-day memo for you. Before that, I just wanted to bring up one item to get guidance from the Council as we talked about the CARES (Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security Act) funds last Monday, we also discussed that there may be opportunities to redeploy the funds within some of the existing areas. So, I do have some additional news as it relates to CMS Hotspots.

Based on The CMS Foundation being able to raise more money as well as more collection from the private sector and an unexpected, initially, when this started a state contribution, the \$1 million dollars that you've set aside for those hot spots, they really need only about half a million of it. However, there is an opportunity and I believe it still falls within the umbrella, but I would not move forward with this without having this discussion with you. It is specifically the school system that has a need for iPads for approximately 1200 pre-K students in Mecklenburg County. So, if we just had the \$500,000 that was deployed for the hot spots, that would cover what was initially presented to you. If you want to use the entire \$1 million, which I would recommend, there's an opportunity for 1200 iPads for pre-K students that would go to CMS schools.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to award \$1 million to purchase 1200 iPads for pre-K students.

Councilmember Eiselt said I'm thrilled to hear that the campaign is going so well and the community is stepping up to help bridge this really difficult divide for our school children. But the pre-K children go back to school, correct? They're going back, I think, going back full time?

Mr. Jones said yes.

Ms. Eiselt said so what is the need for the iPads?

Mr. Jones said there was, and Shawn Heath may have to bail me out for missing this, but they have a gap. Without this, there would have to be some additional fundraising or some additional contribution from the private sector to meet the need for about 1200 pre-K students that are going back.

Mayor Lyles said Is this the Mecklenburg pre-K program that's funded by the county along with donations and contributions?

Mr. Jones said yes.

Ms. Eiselt said the only reason I ask is yes, Shawn if you could give us a little better explanation of that because that sounds like a need that would have been there even without the pandemic. Is that right? Then just the other thing is, have there been any other

requests that have not been put forward that we would want to hold back just a little bit of that \$500,000? I had an opportunity to talk to [inaudible] about the situation with Hispanic students. So, I know we've got to get this money spent, but is there any reason just say hold back \$100,000 to find out, just flush out the need for some of the structural problems with having children get some assistance online?

Mr. Jones said as you may recall, last week there was \$2 million dollars set aside for the YMCA.

Ms. Eiselt said oh. Right. Okay.

Mr. Jones said down to \$1,750,000. So, that is a quarter of a million dollars that we still can deploy for issues related to the digital divide.

Ms. Eiselt said That's right. okay, okay.

Mr. Jones said may I make sure that I didn't misspeak with Shawn?

Shawn Heath, Special Assistant to the City Manager said I was actually in transit Ms. Eiselt as you were asking your question, I'm sorry to ask you to repeat again.

Ms. Eiselt said sure. I just wanted to know, because my understanding is the pre-K kids are going back full time. So, is this a need for iPads in the classroom and is that something that would have been needed even without the pandemic?

Mr. Heath said It's a mixed bag. There are pre-K students in the classroom, some parents have elected to go down the path towards remote learning. I think there's also a desire to be proactive, given the likelihood that there could be some pre-K programs that are forced to enter into temporary closure scenarios rather than be in a situation where the community is scrambling to try and get technology in the hands of pre-K students. This seemed like a compelling opportunity to take care of that on the front end.

Ms. Eiselt said so, this request came from CMS.

Mr. Heath said yes, this was the high priority request from CMS Foundation in light of the fact that there was not a need for the full \$1 million dollars associated with the hot spots that Manager Jones mentioned.

Councilmember Driggs said I will support the Manager's recommendation, I just want to caution us not to get ourselves identified as a funding source for CMS. There are people that ask why we can't help. It's not our lane and there are other elected officials, many of them, who are responsible for the schools. So, I would hate to kind of have this broadened into a dialogue about what other needs they have that we might be able to meet.

Councilmember Bokhari said I'll also support this in your recommendation. But I would also add that I feel like the strategy is fluid. I would prefer to have a better understanding of the holistic problem that we are attacking. Clearly, the COVID impacts clearly the digital divide, clearly Pre-K. I mean like for us to have talked about for several weeks, one problem, that problem was always hazy to me. That problem ratcheted down and now we've got another opportunity. I just feel like there's plenty of noble causes out there, half a million boxes and a small amount of money. So, I'll support it. But I think we need to get a little more tight on, like, the holistic strategy of what we're trying to accomplish here.

Councilmember Johnston said I would also agree with that Mr. Driggs and Mr. Bokhari, I know that initially you were told there were 16,000 students that didn't have access to the Internet, and we found that that number is less. Now, we know that pre-K students are going back to school. So, I support the digital divide. But I'd like to know if the individuals in Tent City. Have we resolve that problem, do all of those individuals who might be able to look for jobs? Do they have access to the Internet? So, I just know that there are needs and I don't mean to extend this problem or the discussion, but I just want us to ensure that we are looking at the City's needs holistically if we have money that we

need to spend. There are needs, I think, that might be greater than four or five-year-old's getting an iPad. That's just my thought.

Mr. Jones said just a little bit more clarification. So, I did have the conversation with Sonja Gantt, who has led effort, as well as Michael Marsicano with Shawn, and Ryan Bergman, our Budget Director on Friday, and Sonja presenting tomorrow. It would have been a presentation of just a half a million dollars. I ask, but she did say there was this additional need. So, I don't believe, that you have to vote on this tonight. I just wanted to make sure that you understood that there's this other opportunity out there. But tomorrow, the approval would have been just a half a million dollars of City funds. I didn't want you to be caught blindsided, which you thought could be a million was only a half.

Mayor Lyles said we have a motion on the floor, and I've heard support. I've heard some questions that we can learn from and do more, but I think we still have a motion on the floor and a second. Is there any comment.

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

* * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 15: GRANT FOR SINGLE-FAMILY AFFORDABLE HOUSING REHABILITATION AND PRESERVATION

Mayor Lyles said I have to say thank you to the Lowe's Offices here. I like it when I hear their commercials and they say in the Charlotte area. The City applied over 18 months ago through the Lowe's Foundation for a grant to support our home rehab program. They have approved the grant and the amount of \$1.3 million from their foundation for the Safe Home Rehab Program.

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Graham, and carried unanimously to (A) Accept a grant in the amount of \$1,333,333 from the Lowe's Foundation for the Safe Home Rehabilitation Program, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 9898-X appropriating \$1,333,333 from the Lowe's Foundation in the Neighborhood Development Grants Fund.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 328.

Councilmember Graham said Good program Madam Mayor. Funds will be well used in our community and Lowe's has helped us before, so this is yet another opportunity to work with them.

Mayor Lyles said so, I think that they saw this program for the housing along Beatties Ford Road Corridor as a way to keep people in their homes and perhaps avoid some of the gentrifications that we're seeing along that corridor, close to the Five Points area.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR THE CATS COVID-19 RESPONSE

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to (A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,267,638 with Gillig for Bus Operator Protective Barriers for an initial term of one year (B) Authorize the City Manager to execute any necessary contracts and agreements related to Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act funding allocated to the Charlotte Area Transit System through the Federal Transit Administration, and (C) Adopt a Budget Ordinance No. 9899-X appropriating \$55,295,092 from the CARES Act in the CATS COVID Stimulus Fund.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 63, at Page(s) 329.

**ITEM NO. 17: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FY2020 EDWARD BYRNE
MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT**

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, to Authorize the Mayor to accept a four-year, FY 2020 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant in the amount of \$544,607 from the U.S. Department of Justice.

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

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

NAYS: Councilmember Winston.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:44 p.m.



Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk, MMC, NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 2 Hours, 35 Minutes
Minutes Completed: November 2, 2020