

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Special Meeting on Monday, October 7, 2019 at 3:12 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Councilmembers present were Dimple Ajmera, Ed Driggs, Larken Egleston, Julie Eiselt, LaWana Mayfield, Greg Phipps and Braxton Winston II.

ABSENT: Councilmembers Justin Harlow and James Mitchell

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmembers Tariq Bokhari and Matt Newton

* * * * *

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GROWTH SCENARIO WORK SESSION

Mayor Lyles said we want to be prepared for continued work around the Comprehensive Plan, so we wanted to take an hour or so to have in-depth discussion and I believe there will be time for Council's questions and observations about both the substance and the process that we are undergoing. We are now getting I can tell right off the printer because it is still warm, our 2040 Comprehensive Plan; it is hard to believe that it is 2019, and we are at the end of the year. We've had great plans that have resulted in some of the things you see around our City today, but how do we do it better and how do we do it more inclusively with ideas around equity and inclusion. We are looking forward from hearing from our Planning Staff today and we will start off with Taiwo.

Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Assistant City Manager said the way we have designed this is to actually engage in a dialogue format. I'm going to do a brief overview and then Gareth will walk you through the outcomes of Phase II and then she has a couple questions for you and then we have Jay Rankin, who is the Principle Planner for the project itself, who will walk us through the scenarios as well as the [inaudible] results. That will also generate some conversations, so I wouldn't want to leave questions to the end, because I think it allows you to get a whole lot of what we are talking.

Mayor Lyles said you are going to ask us questions today; that is prior table turner.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I'm sure you will have questions of your own. I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and we know it is going to be very busy and lone afternoon and evening for you, so in our appreciation for your support we have in front of you the Charlotte future 2040 cups with some candies that has some level of caffeine in there, but we appreciate you and to have those gifts for you. We do hope you enjoy that.

Councilmembers Tariq Bokhari and Matt Newton arrived at 3:15 p.m.

Before Gareth and Jay will come to talk to you I want to do a quick overview of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Mayor Lyles is right. It is now 2019; it was just about 12-months ago that you all give us the support with the Manager's recommendation to [inaudible] budgets that will allow us to go on a two-year plus Comprehensive Plan process. I'm happy to tell you that we are on track in terms of schedule. The first phase we talked about vision and values. During that period, we actually met face to face about 1,500 people and then over social media and via e-mails we had another 256,000 people that we connected with during that first phase.

The second phase is where we are talking about growth scenarios and that is why we are here tonight. That is where we started to play the growing better places growth game. We used that gave to engage about 1,800 plus people, but in addition to that we also had about 44,000 different people who engaged with us in one form or the other. In this presentation you are going to see a lot of numbers, and I don't want you to get hung up on those numbers, but what I would like for you to pay a lot of attention to will be the outcomes of the growth game as well as to listen closely to some of the things we are going to be sharing with you on the scenarios that we've developed. Hearing your feedback will be very important in terms of questions so this is not the last time we are

going to come before you before a preferred growth scenario is done. We definitely want to make sure that you weigh in on that process.

Garet Johnson is the Assistant Director and she has been managing the project for us for the last 12-months plus. She is going to come and walk us through the outcomes of Phase 2; however, Jay Rankins and [inaudible] are here from MIG. MIG was selected as our Consultant primarily because when we set out to do this work we knew that equity was going to be a very important subject for us going through this Comprehensive Plan. We wanted to select someone who could come along side us who has done this type of work before, so we are not in a trial and error type of thing. They did the Comprehensive Plan for Denver as well as San Antonio, and they also did the Center City 2020 Plan, and they are working on the Center City 2040 Plan right now. We feel we have some advantages in having them to stand alongside us and help us on this work. Based on their experience nationally but also based on their experience locally we truly believe we have come to a very critical junction in the project because this time next year we will be giving you a draft document.

So, as you weigh in on this today it gives you an idea of where we are headed. No conclusion has been reached by staff at all on any of the scenarios, but you are going to hear what is like trade-offs, you are going to hear some other words about things that we really truly need for a City that is growing like ours. We presented this to the Planning Commission this afternoon; it was a very robust conversation that we had with the Commissioners, and so we are very interested in sharing the same with you today. Tomorrow we are going to share this as well in this room with our community and then tomorrow evening at [inaudible] we will share that as well with our community and then on Wednesday we are going to be sharing it at Kennedy Middle School as well. It is really to make sure that we are hearing from everyone before we start to move too far from where we are now. If there are no questions, I will pass it on to Garet, but if there are questions I will take them and then Garet will come up to speak to you.

Councilmember Winston said just a point of information for the folks watching at home, I would like to ask the City Manager and the City Attorney to just explain what a Comprehensive Plan or a plan like this does from the policy perspective but also from a legal perspective.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said from a policy perspective, this is really the document that is the shared vision that really shows the shared vision of our community in terms of how we are going to grow physically speaking over the next 20-years but also where we put our priorities as well as capital investments over the next 20-years. So, in the next 20-years we said that we are going to have over 320,000 more people in Charlotte, about 200,000 plus jobs. Obviously, we need to determine where will that growth go and what will be the things that will be guiding us as we go into that future. This is really the policy document. From the legal standpoint though once you have your Comprehensive Plan in place then we can proceed with our Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), because that is really the ordinance that will help to implement that policy piece. While the Comprehensive Plan and the Policy piece that really paints a picture of that future that we want to go, it is the UDO and necessary regulations that will be the tool to help us implement those policies.

Councilmember Driggs said the UDO itself will supersede our Zoning Ordinance, all of the Area Plans, the overlays, the sidewalks, so those numerous policies and various ordinances that we have are all consolidated in the UDO and the old ones all go away. Is that right?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said the UDO will include the Zoning Ordinance, your Tree Ordinance, your Sidewalk, Stormwater regulations, about eight different ordinances and regulations so the UDO will be one document where you can actually have all of those regulations in one place.

Mr. Driggs said all those outdated area plans, everything else goes away?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said our separate area plans from the UDO, the area plans are just like your Comprehensive Plan except on a micro scale, so it is the policy focus. The intent is to retire as many area plans as possible, because quite a number of them are already outdated right now and having a City-wide plan, they also have a cohesive vision for our City. Part of the process will also develop some neighborhood profiles for different neighborhoods in our community, which will be more on a micro level while the Comprehensive Plan stays at that high level. There are some area plans, some of the policies in those area plans, even though they may be old, some of them could still be applicable, but other than apply them to one area of the City, they could actually be applicable citywide. So, one of the things that we find in our growth study was that there are certain policies and area plans that will actually be applied overall citywide rather than applicable [inaudible] so why would we retire some of them? We will have certain neighborhoods who have developed profiles for, that way we avoid having 60 area plans or 70 area plans and all these multiple area plans in our community.

Mr. Driggs said the intension though is to have something like we have right now for Transit Oriented, the TOD where we have as clearly specified a plan as possible and as little room for case to case kind of ad hoc decisions. Is that a reasonable statement?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said the Transit Oriented Development Ordinance, the only reason it applies to the Blue Line is because that is the only corridor where we have some transit supportive policies today. If we had those same policies for Silver Line or Gold Line the Transit Oriented Development Ordinance will apply. Think about a Transit Oriented Development Ordinance as your UDO but on a micro scale. When we now have a UDO, we will probably do the same thing because it ends the reason why we need to have a citywide plan first before we build our full UDO. So, you are very right.

Mayor Lyles said I wanted to follow-up; Mr. Winston asked about policy and legal. A lot of the policy issues are to give the entire community a reliable, predictable model of what we are trying to do. That is the most important things of the Comprehensive Plan that people can depend on it and then I believe the legal portion comes with what you adopt as a Council by ordinance to get those things done. That is a little bit more complicated because to go from here to there, the last plan when they couldn't do every street they just plopped down a number, and this is how we have some of the situations that we have now, because mapping wasn't available, you didn't have the automation opportunities so to be able to do that in today's time with today's technology is going to make a real difference I believe. So, that is a good thing.

Before we go to the next two questions, I know that many of you have seen already the text messages and the pings that you are getting on the news. We will have a closed session at 4:30 today in this room.

Councilmember Newton said we talk about our land use plans and when we look at these we see a lot of these are like 20 or 25-years old and maybe even older, and we talk about how they are out of date. With this Comprehensive Plan, to the extent that it may conflict with any of our land use plans, does this supersede those land use plans and at the same time how often? We say some of these land use plans need to be updated; will this be something that needs to be updated on a consistent basis, and if so how often?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said I assume what you mean by land use plans are area plan, so yes, this Comprehensive Plan eventually will be a fresh look at our City in terms of how we are planning on going forward into the future. Again, on a micro scale it is the area plan, but it will replace a lot of what we have and is the reason we are going to retire some area plans, or the most of them. The beauty of the Comprehensive Plan is that it is not a static document; it is dynamic. It is a living document, so we definitely have to make sure that we update this every three to five years, preferably five-years because that will help us to capture a lot of changes and trends quickly. Right now, if you were to update our 55 different area plans and takes you almost two-years to do that, by the time it is done you almost have to start again, and there are no resources to do that. But, where you have one Comprehensive Plan for the entire City we know we are focused on doing something

within every five-years. Why is it called the 2040 Plan? That does not mean we are going to wait until 2040 to have another one.

Mr. Newton said in our rezonings when we are making our rezoning decisions, we are going to start seeing this more often.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said we are going to start recognizing this.

Mr. Newton said I want to ask about the UDO, inasmuch as the UDO may conflict with this in the future when we adopt the new ordinance, of course that is going to take priority.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said the UDO will not conflict with this Comprehensive Plan because it is going to set policies in place and then the UDO will be defined based on the policies that we have in this Comprehensive Plan to help us implement it. There could be conflicts within those regulations and ordinances by themselves and that is the reason why we need to have a UDO.

Councilmember Mayfield said as we are getting into this and noted what the intent is and you know I ask the question quite often, impact versus intent. The previous Comprehensive Plan included the idea of what growth would look like. The language was out there many years ago, within a five-mile radius of uptown and what that looks like. What I'm wondering is was energy put into and is anywhere in this packet a snapshot of where we were with the previous Comprehensive Plan and where we are today, meaning there was not language that protected neighborhood integrity. So, it is one of those things where, oh, this is such a great community and then you come in and build 60-foot homes next to 40 or 35 and you change the complete character of communities.

We have created space for lots of displacement, the impact of gentrification; we have displaces businesses with new growth and development without a clear plan of protection to neighborhood integrity, and we are seeing it all over the nation, but when we have these plans if we are not going to look at the mistakes and one, acknowledge the mistakes in order to try to do it better. I'm wondering if before we even get into this mini booklet do we even address in there what was proposed, the actual impact of it and what are we doing to actually, not only make this a City for new people coming in, but to protect those who have been here.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said you won't find it in this five-point presentation, but the first things we did as part of our Comprehensive Plan was to release three deliverables. One of them was to audit policies, so we audited over 35 of our policies. Some of them associated with what you are saying. So, you are correct, but, the second thing we did was to do a growth factors report that really identified the challenges on the inequity we have between the crescent and the wedge and put numbers on those and how do we address those going forward. Then we also generated what we call an equity atlas as well. For the first phase it was clear from the community that we had that the vision of the community is to create a Charlotte that is authentic, equitable and that is integrated so that we don't repeat mistakes of the past.

The only Comprehensive Plan that was done similar to this was the done in 1975. Since then I think we had the Green Book which was in 1994, but in 2010 we had the Centers, Corridors and Wedges which was really innovative for its time, but obviously, wasn't comprehensive enough, so we acknowledge those, and that is really where you start from before you start building a new Comprehensive Plan. So, you are correct; we've looked at all of those. They will not be in this in this PowerPoint, because there is only so much time that we have [inaudible], but I can actually get those reports to you as well, so you can take a look at those.

Mayor Lyles said I think some of these questions will apply to certain sections of it, schedule, process, outcomes and things like that.

Garet Johnson, Planning said I've got several members of my team here today, both our staff team and our consultant team, and we are anxious to share some of the work

that we've been doing over the last several months. I think your questions and Taiwo's answers have kind of gone over some of my slides already, so I think I can go over them pretty quickly and make sure that we have plenty of time for you to ask us questions, engage in discussions with the team as well as with each other.

What I would like to do is very briefly go over our schedule and process and talk about the outcomes of Phase I, which wrapped up in the spring, give you an update on Phase II which we are well into now. We are just about to the end of it actually and then I'm going to stop and see if you have any questions or points of discussion that we need to cover there. Then I will hand it over to my colleague at MIG, Jay Rankins, and he will go over the meat of the presentation today. We really want to share with you the alternative growth scenarios that we've developed and talk about how those compare on different indicators, then stop again for some discussion and then wrap up with looking ahead, Phase III and Phase IV, as well the community meetings that Taiwo mentioned that are happening tomorrow and Wednesday. If you want to give me different direction to have discussion in different places that is fine.

Mayor Lyles said let's try on your schedule, and if we need to alter we will; let's get through a couple phases and see how it looks.

Ms. Johnson said I think you have talked a little bit about the intent of the Comprehensive Plan; it really is a guide for our growth and development to help us with the physical structure of our community and what we want to be in 20-years as opposed to the Unified Development Ordinance, which is the legal requirement. The policy is the Comprehensive Plan that informs our regulations. The Comprehensive Plan is really meant to be a shared vision of our growth, and it will help guide those decisions that we make in the future, particularly around capital investments. The schedule for the Comprehensive Plan is a two-year schedule to develop the plan. We are about a year into it now, so we've divided into four phases, the first phase wrapped up on the spring. It really dealt with looking at our existing conditions, acknowledging our history of planning in the community and the outcome of that was establishing the Community Vision and Values. In Phase II, which we are in right now is really focused on looking at different ways that Charlotte can grow in the future and we are excited today to present three alternatives for growth in the future. After the holidays, probably starting in January we will start to get into Phase III of the Plan which is developing our policies and our strategies and our implementation. In Phase IV is really involve you in reviewing the Plan and going through review and adoption.

As Taiwo mentioned, Phase I really focused on developing three documents, our policy audit, our equity atlas and our growth factors report. When we were here in March, we had a series of community meetings, and we had a special session with you where we took the deep dive into those three documents and presented the information. Our consultants were in town at that time too, so we had a lot of meetings over the course of three or four days. In Phase I, we engaged over 1,500 people about 240 of those were at our community meetings in March and then we had about 650 that we engaged online and about another 700 at pop-up events, but really, we reached over 250,000 people through all of the different media that we use and probably a higher number than that because we don't count what we reached through some other media like radio, TV and those sorts of things.

The outcome of Phase I was establishing our vision and goals, and we have three overarching principles, and Taiwo mentioned those as well, authentic, equitable and integrated. We have five vision elements, which really are the elements of the plan. They've changed just slightly since we kicked off the plan last year. The vision elements are inclusive and diverse, livable and connected, healthy and sustainable, prosperous and innovative and regional. From those, we developed eight goals, and this vision and goals framework really guides the rest of the plan development.

We are in Phase II now; we've been in Phase II since April, and it has focused on establishing a growth scenario or looking at different ways that Charlotte can grow. We are doing scenario planning to do that and really scenario planning is just a tool to help

us make more informed decisions. We are using a computer model called Community VIS that has a lot of different inputs into it, particularly what are existing land uses, what development there might be in the pipeline that maybe you've already approved that hasn't been built yet, our transportation infrastructure, lots of different inputs and one of the key pieces of information is what the community thinks. In order to get that community input, we developed a board game that I think many of you got a chance to play or watch other people play over the summer. The game was called The Growing Better Place and More Equitable and Inclusive Charlotte, and the purpose of the game was to look at impacts or tradeoffs of growth and really gather community input in non-traditional way. It was summer, and sometimes people don't like to come out in the summer to public meetings, so we had the game, and we got some great input in the game, lots of great participation, and in fact we had over 1,800 people play the game. About 840 of those actually played the board game that came to different settings, whether that be at a regular meeting venue or a brewery or a church, played in a lot of different venues and about 1,000 people played the game online, but even more so we had a lot of people that were touched by the game and our outreach over the summer, about 44,000 people we estimate that we touched. What did all those people say? If you played the game or are familiar with it at all, remember that there would be strategy cards and that is what the picture is up there, one of the strategy cards. We had 15 different strategies that we put out there for really discussion to see what people thought about how these strategies and how we might accommodate growth in the future. I'll go through a little bit about what people said. The strategies that people really liked, whether they were playing in person or whether they were playing the game online, they felt a good strategy would be for us to invest in high-capacity transit, invest in another transit corridor. They also liked the idea of goods and services being brought closer to more neighborhoods. In terms of displacement, they liked the strategy that looked at reducing the pressure on existing neighborhoods and putting more of the high intensity residential or high intensity development in activity centers. Finally, they really like the idea of a strategy that talked to you, transportation choices, particularly investing in bike and pedestrian improvements.

In terms of a couple of strategies that people really liked when we were playing the board game in person but were kind of neutral about online, one was the activity centers. In the board game people really liked the idea of having multiple strong activity centers outside of uptown and in particular making sure that we had an activity center in each of the game geographies. There were five game geographies, north, south, east, west and central, and we wanted to make sure we had a strong activity center, at least one, in each of those geographies. Also, in person people liked the strategy that revolved around adding duplexes and triplexes within existing neighborhoods as long as the lots were adequately sized. Online people weren't as enthusiastic about that; it was sort of balanced between those that really thought it was a great idea and those that were neutral.

We had a couple of strategies that people really didn't favor whether it was online or in person. One was our accessory dwelling units. The way that strategy was worded was that we ask people about relaxing the strict development standards around these to make it easier to do accessory dwelling units within neighborhoods. I think there was a lot of confusion about what accessory dwelling units were and also a hesitancy to say well, let's relax the standards when we weren't clear what the standards were, because people do have concerns about accessory dwelling units and they wanted to make sure those concerns were still being addressed if we relaxed the standards.

The second strategy that people really didn't favor either online or in person was industrial development, in particular encouraging new industrial uses in other areas of the City. A lot of our industrial development, as you know, is on the west side of the City, so there was a thought that we really wanted to kind of share that wealth, but, that wasn't a strategy that people really gravitated towards, and with all of these strategies, just because people favored or didn't favor doesn't mean that that is the end of the conversation. It is really just the beginning of the conversation, one to give us some input about what people are thinking, what they might be confused about, what more information we need to bring to the table and really even tease out some other strategies.

The other piece of the game results had to deal with what people did on the board game. The board itself, people had tiles or chips that they moved around to show where growth should go and the type of growth that should go in different areas of our community. Overall the way people moved those chips around really enforced the way growth is already distributed today so that we are seeing some of the same patterns, like a lot of development along our transit lines. There was with the game kind of a census around having more intensification in the westside of the community and continuing that in the center city as well. Then people thought maybe the least development intensification should happen in the south area. A lot of people that played the game felt like the south was getting all the development and all the benefits of development and wanted that to be shared across the community.

In the east and the north, the chips were people were putting growth really tended to follow transit and activity centers. There was a lot of agreement around the neighborhood nodes and distributing those throughout the community. Neighborhood nodes are smaller walkable areas that provide goods and services to the immediate area, so very walkable, and this might be where you have smaller scale grocery or drug store, or small-scale retail or office.

There were some differences in the way people were mapping or placing their chips in the game. One is the boundary between the west area and central area. There was a lot of differences in how people were placing their chips, and I think a lot of that had to do with how we define these geographies. They were a little arbitrary in some respects and then a lot of people when we played the game thought the central was uptown, kind of within 277 or maybe a little bit outside of 277, when in fact the game geography had the central area really the whole area within Route 4. There was some confusion, and I think that led to some difference in where people were putting the different types of development. The second thing that there were some differences, depending on where people live who were playing the game, they tended to put more of the smaller scale neighborhood nodes where they lived and the larger activity centers outside of where they lived. I will stop and get your discussions on that piece and after that we will get into presenting the alternative growth scenarios.

Councilmember Phipps said in your dialogue with the community in terms of what they thought, I'm surprised and struck by the fact that I didn't see anything up there, because a lot of times when we go out in the community people want growth to slow down so that infrastructure can catch up, but in any of these game scenarios did anybody bring that up or did they presuppose what this scenario with the game that adequate infrastructure was already in place?

Ms. Johnson said one of the givens with the game was that you had to accommodate the projected growth so that was 325,000 more people and over 200,000 jobs so you had to accommodate that, and they had an opportunity in the game played that actually add infrastructure. So, that was part of the conversation that that would be needed, hence the support for a transit line. There was actually a lot of support for transit as well as bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, so that did come across a bit in the game.

Councilmember Egleston said to your point about how people wanted certain things near where they live and didn't want certain things near where they live; do we have a map that kind of shows the concentrations of where residents live that participated?

Ms. Johnson said yes, we do, and I actually have that slide. I think I shared that at the Transportation and Planning Committee, and I didn't put it in this time, but yeah, we do have to kind of show where the game was played. We have a zip code map of that, and I can provide that to you.

Mr. Egleston said would you say loosely that it was decently distributed?

Ms. Johnson said there were people that played the game in every geography. What was interesting was in the northern part of the community had more game plays and more

people playing the game. That didn't distinguish I don't believe between online or in person. It was lot from the north.

Mayor Lyles said it was all those UNC-Charlotte students getting extra credit.

Councilmember Driggs said what we are doing with this outreach is we are trying in effect to gage the sentiment of 870,000 people; so, statistically speaking it is not a random sample, and it is less than two percent of the population. How comfortable are we that the people that chose to participate really are representative of the larger community?

Ms. Johnson said one of the things that we've done since the beginning of the process is really track demographics, because what we are trying to do is make sure we are reaching all parts of the community. That is actually one of the slides that I didn't really get into, looking at particular race, age, income and making sure that we are touching all of those parts of the community. In the various phases, we've kind of tracked that and if we see a gap we try to go out and close that gap. For example, during the process we weren't getting a lot of input from the college students, and so we reached out and had a college game night where we got more participation. We also were under represented in terms of our Latino or Hispanic population, so we've done a lot of outreach in that area and hence one of our meetings tomorrow night will be at the Camino Center. We are trying to touch all parts of our community. Right now, with this part of the plan we are more concerned about reaching more people rather than having a statistically valid sample. When we get to the point where we maybe have a specific decision to be made that might be something that we really need to look into having that represented sample. I think you have that in your resident survey recently.

Mr. Driggs said an actual polling exercise or it could be a vote. It could be something that is put on the ballot at some point. I'm wondering also what the diversity of feedback was, so you say this is what we heard. Now, I'm assuming that what you actually heard was a pretty wide variety of opinion and that you were able to kind of distill from that a preponderance of some kind of opinion, right? But, to the extent that there was a wide diversity of opinion that would be a less valuable signal than a very uniform response.

Ms. Johnson said we've gotten much more data obviously than what I showed you around what the percentages were that said each. When we present the scenarios, I think we will show you a little bit about where there might have been more consensus or less consensus, so I think that will get to your question a little bit better.

Mayor Lyles said would that information be available online at some point that we could look at? I think the extremes like I don't ever want an activity center to I want to live in an activity center; I think those are probably yes or no usually that way, but, is there a data set that would be available to Councilmembers that wanted to dive more deeply into that?

Mr. Johnson said we have a data set like that, I don't know if it would be useful, but we would be more than happy to share that with you.

Mr. Driggs said one of the things we need to be thinking about as we proceed is to what extent are we making plans that digress from what the market does? If we are telling people who want to put industrial sites in these locations if we really want them to put them over here, what impact does that have on the vitality and productivity of our economy?

You can over engineer yourself and hurt yourself in terms of job creation and economics and I'm not sure that this process, like the people said they liked transit, of course they like transit. Do you feel like paying \$6 billion for it? Are you okay if your taxes go up by four cents because that is what we need in order to do it? So, I think we are laying a ground work, and I appreciate that, I'm just a little worry of establishing a platform that already points us in a very specific direction when some pretty major factors as far as I can tell have not yet been taken on board. That is just a statement, not a question.

Mr. Johnson said I think as you see the scenarios, one of the things that we looked at was market feasibility for each one of the scenarios and do some ratings on that. So, that might help with that and we are also undertaking a financial feasibility study, so that will also couple with that, but each one of the scenarios we've looked at exactly for that, because you could say this is wonderful this scenario does everything we want it to do, but can we afford it from a financial perspective? That has to be a big part of the decision.

Mr. Driggs said will the private investors that we are counting on to make a lot of this happen go along with it?

Ms. Johnson said exactly.

Councilmember Ajmera said I have a question about the non-favorable feedback that you had on one of the slides under game results. In terms of accessory-dwelling units and industrial development, that is not favored online or in person, when you talk about industrial development are you saying that it is not favored to have that distributed throughout the City?

Ms. Johnson said that was the strategy, because most of our industrial development is in a few places, a lot of it is on the westside, to in the future have it in other areas of the community also, and that was kind of the strategy and there wasn't a lot of favor for that strategy basically. That wasn't a strategy that was often chosen when we played the game; it was a strategy that mostly people gave a thumbs down to on the online game. That doesn't mean that is the end of that discussion.

Ms. Ajmera said it may not be the popular opinion, it is just that this is a smaller sample, but I think this is very important in terms of the quality of life for all residents. I want to see how does that reflect in the overall plan?

Ms. Johnson said I think that is one of the things that as we get into the policy development we've got to start looking at a little bit more, because that might have been another one where people just didn't understand maybe what some of the other implications because they may not have realized some of the things that go along with that industrial development. Again, more conversations around it as we move into the next phase.

Ms. Ajmera said this will eventually evolve into something that we can at least say what does that mean in terms of how are we distributing that industrial sites throughout the City and how does that reflect in the plan? I think it is great that we have these high-level objectives, but really the implementation, and how does it all fit? I know that is going to be a couple of months down the road, but when we are looking at a neighborhood or an area of the City, I would like to see an example where okay this is what it would look like. I would rather it is an activity center or there is an industrial site, whatever it is. I guess a real example of a neighborhood that you can take or an area plan that will align with this Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Johnson said I think from a broad level maybe it is really how the game results informed the scenarios, so we can start taking it to that next step. It is still kind of broad, it is down to the specifics.

Councilmember Eiselt said two questions on this, at what point are we involving the County and the School Board? To Ms. Ajmera's point, I think a complete Comprehensive Vision Plan ends up with maps that shows green space, shows schools, shows transit, shows development, that is really why we initially said hang on, we don't understand the UDO, because we don't understand how that all maps out and who gets to decide what place types look like. I don't know how we move forward without the vision from the County on the parks and on open space. When does that layer come in?

Ms. Johnson said some of that comes in now; we've been working with the County staff, Parks and Rec and other departments too, and their information is part of our growth model. We are working with them throughout the process, and Taiwo is working with

more the leadership end of things and is working to present information like this to the County Commission, so they can understand what we are doing as well.

One of the things that is very hopeful is that both Parks and Rec as well as CMS have been talking with us about the model and how we are doing our projections and using that same data set for their planning. That is coming a long way from where we are now. So, I'm hopeful that we will be much more in sync. Park and Rec is now doing their master plan and they are involved in our plan, we've involved in theirs so that we can coordinate and collaborate those pieces.

Ms. Eiselt said I would also like to make the input data available to the public. I go back to the Silver Line alignment, and I still haven't really seen the full set of data that said; economically I know it makes sense not to go through uptown with the Silver Line, but I still haven't seen the data that says people will use the Silver Line even though they are going to have to walk a block and a half to connect to the Blue Line, and it doesn't go through uptown, or that people are going to use the Silver Line to get to the Airport even though it doesn't really go to the Airport. I still think there is a big gulf between all the data that we collect and how it morphs into the policies that get made.

Ms. Johnson said you will probably be one that will be happy to see what we are going to do at the public meetings tomorrow night and Wednesday night. We are going to do brief presentations, much briefer than this, but we are really focused on looking at the data and information from this phase of the plan development process. We have a gallery of boards with a lot of data and information on them where we will staff at each one of the boards to be able to kind of one on one with people to help understand what that all means. That is one way we are sharing the data, the deeper dive data that I talked about earlier that is something that we can look at, does that make sense to put on our website.

Ms. Eiselt said in terms of when you show people on the boards, that is one-way data sharing. I would like to know what the responses are and how they come away from it, and say that makes sense to me, or it doesn't make sense, and this is what we would like to see. That is the kind of thing I just don't feel like we get feedback.

Ms. Johnson said we can share that, especially one of the things we will be doing over the next couple days and actually through the end of the month is gathering input on the scenarios, and we can assemble that and share that with you.

Mayor Lyles said I appreciate Garet; you are on point in answering the questions. If we have questions that require a yes or no or can we or can't we, we may need to write those down and reply and bring them back to the next briefing that we have. This is the beginning, this is not the end, so let's try to get the scenarios in and then we will get everyone's questions and see as far as we can get with the idea that we are going to try to get done by 4:30 p.m.

Jay Rankins, MIG said I have met most of you previously; we are really fortunate to be working with your staff on the Comprehensive Plan. I'm going to jump into the scenario planning piece of things, a couple of things I wanted to sort of caveat before we jump in and I can make this quick. One is that we are going through this process of really open-ended open conversation soliciting input with the vision and goals and then the game over the summer. We are now starting to funnel that down into a set of alternative scenarios, but these are different than I think you would normally think of alternatives in terms where you would say oh, there are three alternatives. I'm going to pick one of these, this is the best one for me or for our community. In fact, what we've tried to do is push the levers or pull the levers pretty far in one direction or the other to show what the tradeoffs are if went all in on one type of growth strategy. In reality, we are expecting that the community will tell us it is not all or nothing on any of these, that there are certain aspects of these scenarios that work well. There are certain aspects that don't, or they may work well in one geography and not another and that it is not a one size fits all solution for our community, so that is a real important piece.

The other thing I will point out is the scenarios are just the first step in that comprehensive look, at infrastructure and policy, and those unintended consequences of some of the strategies that we might try to implement. What we are going to look at over the next 26 minutes is a special application of different types of form, different ways that jobs can come to fruition, different types of housing choice and sort of the combination of those. What we will need to do is look at the infrastructure that is necessary to support that and policy to insure that like the Blue Line development, especially on the south end that there are certain things that we accomplished that we set out to do, there are also unintended consequences in that growth and development, displacement and gentrification and a lack of affordability, and so regardless of which strategy or piece of these strategies we embark upon, we are going to have to come up with a set of policies, some tough decision that go along with them to get out in front of some of those unintended consequences that hopefully we can anticipate to a great extent at this point.

We are using all the game results, so a lot of people just played online or played the first round of the game, so they are talking about that strategy level, but a lot of people did provide us really specific input on where they thought different types of growth and development were appropriate using the place pallet, so that included things like community activity centers and higher-density residential, industrial development, etc. What you see on the left is one example of one of those game boards where people put different pieces. In addition to just development types, they did put different infrastructure, and there was a cost associated with that. There was some discussion at that point of the cost of development, but that wasn't the focus at this stage of the game. That is something we are definitely going to have to bake in as we move forward, but then we translated that to these different scenarios and mapped it all out across here. We did a Business as Usual Scenario, and these are concept sketches at this point, so it is just a quick snapshot of what that growth scenario would look like. Business as Usual would be existing policies in place, existing market drivers where market is supporting different types of development and not where the most of that growth would go. It is that combination of centers and corridors for the most part. Going down, we looked at Strong Centers, so that said in addition to uptown and City center, we are going to look at things like Ballantyne, like SouthPark, like some of these other sorts of emerging centers and really go in on that and try to achieve at least, as Garet said, maybe one in each major geography or better distribution of those and really focus housing and job growth in those centers, meaning there is less pressure than on existing neighborhoods. I'll talk about some of the tradeoffs associated with that as we begin to model that using the community vis model.

Connected Corridors really focused on high capacity transit, both existing and proposed, and looked at what if we maybe don't go quite as intense as we would in that Strong Center scenario, but we spread kind of medium intensity development along those high capacity transit corridors to reduce trips to leverage the investment that we are trying to make in those corridors. Then lastly, and I will point out again, all of these were informed by game play where people were putting different game pieces and where we are seeing some differences as well as seeing consensus. One where we are seeing a lot of consensus was Neighborhood Nodes. People were distributing those pretty well across the community, so we looked at a Neighborhood Node Scenario. What would that take? If you are distributing all of that commercial development, retail, services, shops across the community on a really small scale at intersections, maybe on a block, a little main street, that detracts from the ability to do those community activity centers and large regional centers obviously. There is only so much clay that you can push around. So, we looked at what that would be, and basically, it sort of really detracted from those regional centers and community activity centers and focused on the neighborhood nodes, and I will go into each one for you.

So, what the modeling process does, it is a certain type of modeling where we don't locate the jobs and the housing units in the model. What we say is using that place type pallet we are adjusting the entitlements at a micro scale. So, what if we allowed certain things to happen in different place; what would the market do to support that? There are other attraction factors built in the model such as existing infrastructure, some major planned infrastructure. We did look at and talk to a lot of different departments and agencies of

the County and City as far as the existing water, stormwater, waste water infrastructure and the ability to support and provide services there. That was modeled so based on what we allowed painting the different scenarios, then the community vis model itself said is where the jobs are going to go, this is where the housing units are going to go and when it filled up an area that was market supported, when we were allowing that, then we would go to a place that is less market supported. I will point out to you as we step through the scenarios how they stacked up based on their market support due to the question that was asked earlier.

The scenarios all have the same planning area, they all have the same amount of anticipated growth that I believe Taiwo and Garet hit on and the same available place types. Where they differ is which development types happen to what degree so, for instance the Strong Center has way more regional activity center mapped. Did that mean that a lot of development went there; I'll let you know that shortly. The location of that development, the different patterns associated with that, the intensities, the supporting infrastructure and conservation measures, but admittedly at this point we are dealing with 10-acre grid cells still at this high-level alternative stage so the nuisance of how a community activity center transitions to an existing neighborhood or where we need to add parks to better support our existing and future neighborhoods. We still need to do that work as we are developing a preferred scenario.

The Business as Usual set of graphics here, we have that concept sketch we've already showed you; jumping to the far right, there is the full scenario as it is mapped but what we did is we compared that to a kind of coloring in the City, a mapping of the City using what is on the ground today. What are the existing places that already exists and then we looked at where were there changes. The color you are seeing are the specks of blue and yellow, orange and red are basically where it is different from today. We are changing what is allowed and largely that is focused along the Blue Line. In this scenario a large focus over near the Airport and the River District. The Silver Line alignment as proposed heading eastward and some larger pockets of community activity center to the north. That is the Business as Usual. Some of the key takeaways when we modeled this, and we looked at a variety of indicators related to the community vision elements and the goals, had the highest amount of new housing close to goods and services, tied with the neighborhood nodes scenario. Basically, that mean that it has the most amount of new households close to a center of any scale the neighborhood center, community activity center, regional activity center suggesting that, and it is not always the case. There is not a one to one sort of alignment that says oh, I can afford to shop there. I have the skills, the training, the education to work there, but generally you would assume that there is a better live/work balance and that you have goods and services closer to home. So, that one scored pretty well; it also had the highest costs to serve public schools with infrastructure. Based on the development pattern that means a lot of single family detached housing, going towards the periphery meaning that we would need a lot of new schools in that Business as usual scenario. While we are getting intensification along some of our transit lines we are also seeing a lot of traditional single-family subdivision development towards the periphery. Highest share of auto trips in new development and high air quality impacts, in this Business as usual scenario, it will make more sense as we show the other three. Then highest percentage of new single-family detached housing which I already hit on.

The Strong Centers Scenario – A big focus on the Silver Line even though this is Strong Centers and not the Connected Corridors Scenario, you are seeing a lot of growth out by UNC-Charlotte, a larger multifamily, higher intensity residential pocket around a community activity center to the east and then a couple of community activity centers and regional activity centers to the south. When we look at that and what are some of the key takeaways, and we model that and look at these indicators, these different metrics; has the most new housing that is in the multifamily and mixed-use category. So, a very large percentage, I believe nearly around 75%, is multifamily or mixed-use, because we have so much single family today, that doesn't swing the Pendleton and say oh well, Charlotte is going to be all multifamily, it is going to be all apartments and condos. No, we still have the majority of housing being single family, even with a lot of new housing going to multifamily and mixed-use. Highest percent of development in existing activity centers so

what we've mapped as activity centers today, some of the existing policies, some of the investments, this actually shows the highest percentage there. Lower amount of new housing close to goods and services than the other scenarios. Lowest cost to serve public schools with infrastructure, and that is largely because we are focusing a lot population growth in some very concentrated areas. So, the ability to serve those areas with additional infrastructure, including schools, is going to be lower when you concentrate them. The issue with that is that we don't fully leverage existing and planned transit investment. We are really not going all in on that transit-oriented development, which we are definitely down that road as a community.

Second, the benefits and challenges related to most of that growth being concentrated such as yes, lower cost to serve those new residents, but are the existing neighborhoods really benefiting from that growth? Are we putting amenities and jobs close to home for people who are already in Charlotte if we are focusing them in just a few pockets?

The Connected Corridors Scenario does build on the Blue Line still, and you are seeing some growth, but a lot of that is happening to the north end along the extension. The entire Silver Line is really showcasing here; Independence Boulevard, you are seeing some multi-family residential showing up in the southwest portion of the community, which we saw some varying input there. We saw employment and industrial focus by some people who were playing the game, and other people were saying we need more housing, and they thought that might be an appropriate place for some kind of medium density multifamily, attached single-family housing.

So, how did that one perform: Most new housing close to existing and proposed transit; that makes sense, that was the guiding kind of principle of this scenario. The most new housing close to existing parks; that one was kind of interesting too. I see where we are going to be doing a deeper dive. The benefit of the metric, we looked to compared to existing parks, part of this approach is going to have to be talking to the County and figuring out how do we align this with future parks planning and design to support both existing and new residents? This is just an indicator; it is not the end all be all and understanding sort of our access in proximity to parks and recreation.

The lowest amount of new housing close to goods and services and I think largely that is because there is only certain capacity on the transit line and then we are feathering out to sort of a single family attached single-family product. So, you still have a lot of housing outside of those corridors. They are thin and there is only so much capacity within that quarter mile reach of transit that makes that attractive, and so you are seeing more housing further from the centers. Lowest air quality impacts; less residential development in existing activity centers, less than the strong centers, and then it tends to kind of score in the middle on the different indicator. There is no striking other than the fact that we have transit and the people who live along the transit will be able to utilize that and hopefully have fewer auto trips, have less impact on infrastructure. There are no other big striking things good or bad towards this particular scenario.

Finally, Neighborhood Nodes Scenario, again, this is very distributed pattern of neighborhood nodes and neighborhood centers. With this scenario and an important caveat, and this is market driven, in order to support a small node, even if it is just an intersection or block, you need rooftops. You need spending power, buying power to do that and even traffic, some trips around there. The assumption in this three-way scenario is that there isn't a ton of change in one place, but there is a little change kind of everywhere, because we need to allow some additional density, whether that is the additional duplexes and triplexes, which is what was in the model here, or it could be ADUs. It could be corners are allowed to do multiplexes; there is a lot of different approaches to that, but this idea that you need more people nearby to support those local amenities. So, while you don't get big eight-story, 12-story, 20-story development you are getting a little bit of change in a lot of different places. So, a result in the highest amount of new housing close to goods and services, which makes sense. We are distributing those neighborhood centers across the entire community. It does have the highest costs to serve public schools with infrastructure, because again, you are distributing housing as well throughout the entire community. So, we are having to fill gaps, beef up the capacity

of existing schools which can be a high costs or replace them. Most additional infrastructure required because most of our neighborhood streets weren't designed to support traffic coming to these neighborhood nodes and neighborhood centers. The least new development in existing activity centers, making sense I think and then, the most balance mix of new housing types so, it has a lot of single family detached, some single family attached, the highest number of any scenario and then the multifamily as well.

Does the scenario further our vision and goals? It is one of the things we are going to be asking the community over the next several days and over the next month with the online activities as well. When you look back at the vision elements, inclusive and diverse, livable and connected, health and sustainable, prosperous and innovative, regional as well as the goals associated with those. How are we stacking up? Again, no one of these scenarios does it well across the board. There are different aspects of each set that perform well and what we want to know from folks is what aspect to do, which aspects can we actually kind of do an a la carte, we have a buffet menu and we can pick and choose, and which things don't actually go together and we are going to have to figure out what are tradeoffs associated with those as well as which geographies, and if you think about sort of what does this mean for neighborhoods, what does this mean for me or you living in your neighborhood. If you are near a Strong Center or living in a Strong Center it is great. You have these new amenities; you have a lot of new investment. If you are not in one of those centers it might not feel that great. It may feel that these five or six geographies are getting a lot of investment, a lot of attention, and what about me? So, that is one of the tradeoffs there. If you are near one of those Connected Corridors in the Connected Corridor Scenario it could be great; you have transit access. You are on what is kind of new fancy area, but if you've been there for a long time as a business or resident, there is a chance that housing prices are increasing. You may have pressure where you might not be able to afford where you have lived for a long time and so are there policies put in place to help mitigate that or circumvent that and kind of get ahead of that. If you are not near one of those corridors unless we supplement that with some really nice kind of transit connectivity, walking, biking kind of connectivity to those corridors you may feel left out again.

Then finally on our last piece with the Neighborhood Nodes what would that be? It would be the least dramatic change overall as I said, but the most change close to home and as a community it might be the most expensive, but it might be the thing that helps us realize a character that we are trying to achieve, and it might be a good option for places that aren't seeing that transit investment or a large regional center sort of close to there. So, again we see this as an opportunity to explore all of these different growth strategies and hopefully come up with some combination of those that the community is supportive of and we can test further as we develop a Preferred Scenario and couple that with really important policy discussions and then move forward into the rest of the planning process, which I have two slides at the very end in my 30-seconds.

Mayor Lyles said I think the best thing about your slide is that Council doesn't adopt this until September 2020 and you have until April 2021. So, we've got lots of time to come back and circle around.

Mr. Egleston said two, you started to answer one of them, which was how are you defining single-family housing and went on to say single-family detached and single-family attached, like townhouses, duplex, triplex, you are considering that as single family and not multifamily.

Mr. Rankin said correct.

Mr. Egleston said how are you using the term mixed-use? One thing that didn't make sense to me on Strong Centers, you said most new housing is multifamily and mixed-use and then you said –

Mr. Rankin said it would be vertically mixed-use so, meaning that there could be retail or office on the ground floor and then residential up above.

Mr. Egleston said that is how I use the term as well but then it says lower amount of new housing close to goods and services. To me that seems in conflict if you are saying there is more of a mixed-use development pattern and yet people are not building near goods and services. The goods and services to me are incorporated in the mixed-use.

Mr. Rankin said yes, it is over all of those so not all of those goods and services are going into the ground floor of mixed-use development. A lot of that has to be distributed throughout the community and probably the biggest take away is that there only so much capacity for residential above those goods and services and in that center and so, not everyone can be or wants to be in that center. It is more of a distribution issue.

Mr. Egleston said [inaudible] Strong Centers they would be near it, but for a majority of people who are not in the Strong Centers that would be less disbursed.

Mr. Rankin said exactly.

Mr. Driggs said are we thinking about how property values are impacted by all of this? There are implications in terms of the way you've distributed housing and laying things out. We saw that the Blue Line, for example, resulted in bonanza for property owners along that route. Is that a factor in here?

Mr. Rankin said in the existing modeling, land costs are a factor in terms of thinking about market support and market feasibility. It will need to be a follow-up as we refine a preferred scenario and then take that from a draft to a final state, thinking about the implications for the cost of property, the cost of land in different areas and income levels in those different areas and whatnot.

Mr. Driggs said I'm just thinking I own a house; what is going to happen to the value of my house? Are we thinking about that?

Mr. Rankin said we have not thought about that yet.

Mr. Driggs said this is going to move a lot of wealth around is my point and that is not yet in the plan, right?

Mr. Rankin said that has not yet been part of the conversation.

Mr. Driggs said we can anticipate public response; that is something that we should start thinking about early because that will guide a lot of the reaction we get.

Mr. Phipps said will this plan once it is developed provide the flexibility that we have as a Council? Is this going to be etched in stone, or will there still be room, that caveat clause of reasonable and in the public interest?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said no, like I said earlier, it is not going to be a static document; it is going to be a living document that Council will definitely have the ability to revise and update it periodically. Usually, I would say for a Comprehensive Plan you want to do that every five-years.

Mr. Phipps said so, it would depend on how disciplined we are as a Council to implement the plan as intended.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said that might be the most critical part of this plan, the implementation of it. So, in this next phase as we develop the policy we are also going to be discussing how that implementation is going to be laid out and really making sure that we hold ourselves accountable. When I say ourselves I mean the City as a whole in terms of how this is going to happen.

Councilmember Newton said the language we are using as alternative plans, and what I'm hearing is these plans aren't necessarily absolute though. So, in as much as we are soliciting feedback on these plans, we could very well find ourselves in a position where

we conclude that there is a hybrid plan that is most appropriate for our needs. I just think it is important that that be communicated particularly moving forward in any informational sessions with the community that we have that these aren't just alternatives, so to speak as these are something we can conceptualize that can then be incorporated into something that truly is maybe the alternative plan, some of the best points of the four, including maybe even Business as Usual. The other thing is we are talking about this Comprehensive Plan not being static, I would assume that when we do update this every five-years we aren't going to have to go through this entire process again, right? Because this is very time consuming, and I think it means we would have to start on it immediately after adoption.

Mr. Rankin said some communities choose to do it every 10-years; typically, it is every 15 to 20-years for a full revamp. So, that three to five-year period that we see most often for an update, like the vision and goals are really strong. You are making sure there is no big changes there and you are tweaking to your point. You are absolutely right about the first point, but we will add a slide because we know we are not always here to verbalize and communicate. We are not intending that someone choose one of these, and I'll add a slide so when this is communicated to the community and gets put online that we don't lose that idea.

Councilmember Winston said I've heard a lot of comments about economic feasibility, and one of my frustrations when we talk about this out in public we can talk about a raw number, but it doesn't really get compared to a baseline in terms of how money gets spent. So, are we going to identify the baseline? Does that happen the Bbusiness as usual, and how are we accounting for not just the direct dollar amounts that it costs, for instance, to build the road, but we are saying that the effects on the environment and those kind of opportunity costs that might be able to be quantified, will those be part of the kind of economic analysis?

Mr. Rankin said two parts to the answer; one, we have additional indicators that don't even show up in your packet. If you looked at the last couple pages of your packet there is some more detail in there. We have even more indicators than that which we can share and will as we move forward, and those include environmental impacts and some of those things, but we will also be embarking upon a physical impact study, and that is just kicking off. Right now, it is focused on the financial side of that, but we can look at other ways to use some of the [inaudible] from the modeling to quantify some of those. It would relate to taxation and infrastructure and all those things for sure and then we can look at can we expand that into these other aspects of equity.

Mr. Winston said again, are we going to be able to identify a baseline? It is one thing to say this will cost \$1 trillion; the plan that we come up is going to cost a trillion dollars, but business as usual will be \$999 billion.

Mr. Rankin said yes, there will be a comparison.

Mayor Lyles said a couple of things I want to say and if there are not questions, if there are just comments that you can go with. One of the things that I'm really concerned about is some of our longer terms on efforts around how do we look at sustainability and climate change and the impact that we are having in this. What are the changes in our demographics going to be? Like all of us may be doing it now, but there might be completely in 20-years a change and who lives here and how and based upon how many jobs and what we are doing here. The other thing that I want Council to know is that Taiwo had sent me an outline of the parks and open spaces in terms of a draft. I forwarded that to the County Commission, and this past week I got a call from the Parks Commission Chair to ask for a meeting, and that would be with more than I think we would probably just with the Council Transportation and Planning Committee to do that.

The other thing that I am really concerned about is how we are looked at as a City from the outside as well. What is our region talking about; what are the people that are looking at economic development in the future and the recruiters? I just really want us to be able to continue to have the right types of jobs for the people in our City, but at the same time

if we are planning a City without understanding what their criteria, so it is kind of for me looking at things that what are the other models? Almost everyone can say I can move a tile around, but if you say what City did you really love that you would move to and what you would love to live in can you really create that. So, some other models and not to forget our seniors. The eight to 80, we've talked about that a lot and I'm trying to figure out how does all of this come together. We can have a number of people move the tiles around, but at some point, this Council has to be really aware of what the future looks like and a certain level of detail as well as what the changes are going to be. I don't know how we look at corridors and wedges and all of that, but I just think about the changes in automobiles and transportation and how we do that. At some point, I understand we are looking at this way but that is not going to be static either, and I would like to have somebody that really understands some long-term trends in demographics as well as in our population. All of those kinds of things as a part of this. Thank you and we will continue to work on it and you will be back in how many weeks?

Mr. Jaiyeoba said we will be back as you need us, but we will be working on creating the Preferred Scenario, so between December of this year and September 2020 we will begin to work on the policy piece.

Mr. Rankin said we will be back with the Preferred Scenario to share with you all along with some [inaudible] policies for discussion in the spring most likely.

Mayor Lyles said please keep the Council Committee informed all along the way so that we can get monthly reports back; that would be a big help.

Mr. Jaiyeoba said this is a standing item in the TAP Committee, so we will continue to do that.

Mr. Newton said one more question, with the pop-ups here, I'm seeing that we've got three Community Workshops coming up; I know that these were in selected locations for a reason. I kind of use this as a new topic entirely separate the workshops before the questions being asked before. My question is, are these three enough; what kind of notification we are given, and are the pop-ups going to be similar to these Community Workshops? So, maybe that fills any potential void there.

Ms. Johnson said definitely three meetings is not enough to reach the whole community. We are probably out three or four times a week in different venues trying to get that out. We have these three meetings and we have Creative Mornings on Friday, we have Biketoberfest on Sunday; we have the neighborhood block party on Saturday. So, it is on and on. These are just kind of touch points, the bigger meetings, and actually we reach more people at those pop-ups and online, but some people do like to have the formal presentation and all the information kind of a one-stop. They are all important; these were chosen because we did westside and eastside last time, so this is more northeast and southwest. So, we are trying to get all over the community.

Ms. Mayfield said you identified a number of different ways; it would also probably helpful to reach out to your Council, because I know three weekends ago at Camp North End a vibe call quest was presented as an all-day festival. I don't remember seeing anyone out with this conversation; there may have been. I know we had different City staff that were out there at different times, but there is so many different community events that is happening where you are having very targeted community outreach from a community level, and if we want to really look at having the voices at the table, specifically a Charlotte resident, because more than anything else what I'm hearing are the natives are feeling left out of these conversations. We are creating [inaudible]. I was in Portland this past weekend and even though they sold Texas the theme of Keep Portland Weird, it is not. With all the things that made it such a unique and creative and authentic place, it is just about gone. If we don't pay attention, we are going to end up a City with no true identity.

Mayor Lyles said that you for the work you are doing. We will see you in the Spring if not before then with some updates. With that this part of our meeting on the Comprehensive 2040 Plan is concluded.

CLOSED SESSION

Motion was made by Councilmember Egleston, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to go into closed session to discuss a personnel matter pursuant to G.S. 143-318.11(a)(1) and (6).

The meeting was recessed to go into closed session at 4:35 p.m. in Room 267.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at the conclusion of the closed session at 5:32 p.m.



Stephanie C. Kelly, City Clerk, MMC NCCMC

Length of Meeting: 2 Hours, 20 Minutes
Minutes Completed: October 10, 2019