

**Follow-Up Items**  
**City Council Action Review and Business Meeting**  
**Monday, March 25, 2019**

Agenda Item	Requestor	Mayor and Council Questions	City Response	Staff Lead
Rules and Procedures	Lyles	Change Council's Rules and Procedures to adjust the rules to allow flexibility in public forum time limits when there are more than 10 speakers signed up.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Late 2018, the Budget and Effectiveness Committee recommended adjusting the City Council's Rules and Procedures to allow flexibility in the number of speakers and time limits when the speaker's list is over 10 people. The City Attorney's office will include this item at an upcoming Council meeting for consideration of whether to move forward.</li> </ul>	<b>City Attorney's Office</b>
NOAH	Lyles/Phipps	How are we tracking return on investment so we can assess whether city funding to support NOAHs should be higher or lower?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Return on investment will be evaluated based on the city's per unit investment and the amount of time it further extends the life of the housing units. Because we've only funded one NOAH development thus far, we will measure it against future requests, coupled with our extensive housing rehabilitation expertise and affordable housing underwriting knowledge, to determine the level of funding support needed for NOAHs.</li> </ul>	<b>Housing and Neighborhood Services</b>
NOAH	Phipps	Provide the last 5-10 years of nine percent deals that were recommended to the state and which got funded and for how much?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since 2007, City Council recommended 46 nine percent tax credit deals for a total of \$34.9 million, an average of \$17,393 per unit, to the state. Due to the competitive nature of these deals, the state awarded tax credits to 24 of these developments (2,007</li> </ul>	<b>Housing and Neighborhood Services</b>

Agenda Item	Requestor	Mayor and Council Questions	City Response	Staff Lead
			<p>units). Additional details are provided in the <u>attached</u> report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note: It is important to keep in mind the city only reviews nine percent development proposals seeking support from the city in addition to state tax credits. All other tax credit applications (those that are not requesting city support) are reviewed solely by the state.</li> </ul>	
LISC	Lyles	<p>A recent report released, states people are unable to find housing after 6-months and lose their vouchers. Work with the Apartment Association and Housing Authority to review the data around why this is occurring.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Housing Trust Fund (HTF) funded developments are required to accept housing choice (Section 8) vouchers. However, due to the strong rental market in Charlotte, voucher holders are challenged to find market rate/private landlords who are willing to accept vouchers.</li> <li>Current rental market dynamics allow market rate landlords to receive rents comparable to, and often higher than, voucher rents when they rent to non-voucher holders. Additionally, when market rate landlords rent to non-voucher tenants, they are not subject to the level of federal inspections required when accepting a Section 8 voucher. Therefore, in today's strong rental market, the majority of landlords are opting to rent to non-voucher holders to avoid the perceived "red tape" associated with subsidized housing. This is</li> </ul>	<b>Housing and Neighborhood Services</b>

Agenda Item	Requestor	Mayor and Council Questions	City Response	Staff Lead
			also a challenge in larger cities throughout the state.	
E-scooter Update	Egleston	Can staff include Gold Line on future presentation maps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, the map will be revised and clearly identify the Gold Line in future work associated with dynamic pricing.</li> </ul>	<b>CDOT</b>
E-scooter Update	Driggs	Do we have crash data on e-scooters?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, crash data is collected for multiple transportation modes. In 2017, there were 28,468 car-to-car crashes, 379 car-to-pedestrian crashes and 136 car-to-bicycle crashes. Based on the trend, similar numbers are expected for 2018. Since May of 2017, when e-scooters were permitted in Charlotte, there has been seven scooter-to-pedestrian crashes and 34 scooter-to-car crashes.</li> </ul>	<b>CDOT</b>
E-scooter Update	Phipps	Do we have data on who is riding e-scooters?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E-scooters have been in existence for about a year across the nation and in Charlotte. Currently, there are not many comprehensive reports on rider demographics.</li> <li>Recently, Populus released a report (link here: <a href="#">Populus report</a>) that assessed data from over 7,000 people in ten major U.S. cities such as Atlanta, Austin, Denver, and Washington D.C., regarding perceptions about e-scooters. The study finds that 70 percent of people have a positive perception on e-scooters. The study further breaks the analysis down by each of the ten cities. According to the study, public perception about e-scooters is highest</li> </ul>	<b>CDOT</b>

Agenda Item	Requestor	Mayor and Council Questions	City Response	Staff Lead
			<p>(most supportive of e-scooters) amongst those making less than \$50,000 per year and is lowest amongst those making over \$50,000 per year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1207 423 1785 699">• In addition, Lime compiled a detailed report on riders in San Francisco (link here: <a href="#">Lime report</a>). Lime found that 55 percent of e-scooter riders used an e-scooter to commute to/from work or school on their most recent e-scooter trip while another 21 percent used e-scooters for running errands.</li> <li data-bbox="1207 743 1764 951">• Lastly, at the end of each month, CDOT compiles a ridership report on e-scooters. Since last May, almost 875,000 trips have been made by e-scooters in Charlotte. The March report can be found here: <a href="#">CDOT Monthly Report</a>.</li> </ul>	

City Council Supported 9% LIHTC Developments

#**	Development Name	Tax Credits Approved by State	Year	# Units	Council District	HTF Funding
1	Kohler Avenue (McNeel Apts.)	Yes	2007	48	2	\$ 1,338,317
2	Cherry Gardens Seniors	Yes	2007	42	1	\$ 1,050,000
3	Townhomes of Ashbrook	No	2008	150	5	\$ -
4	Statesville Ave. The Alexander	Yes	2008	96	2	\$ 2,400,000
5	Gables Phase II - Seniors	Yes	2009	72	4	\$ 1,512,000
6	Steel Creek Seniors	Yes	2009	120	3	\$ 1,370,434
7	Savanna Woods	No	2009	83	1	\$ -
8	915 Caldwell	No	2009	100	1	\$ -
9	Westinghouse Apartments	No	2010	90	3	\$ -
10	Willow Oak Run	Yes	2010	85	3	\$ 685,000
11	Arrowood Station Senior	No	2010	105	3	\$ -
12	Boulevard Seniors	Yes	2011	110	3	\$ 1,000,000
13	Westinghouse Seniors	Yes	2011	86	3	\$ 1,764,273
14	Wesley Heights Senior Apts.	No	2011	40	2	\$ -
15	Boulevard Phase II	Yes	2012	74	3	\$ 500,000
16	Catawba Seniors/Dannelly	Yes	2012	62	2	\$ 760,000
17	Wesley Heights Senior Apts.	No	2012	40	2	\$ -
18	Westerly Oaks Senior Apts.	No	2012	84	3	\$ -
19	Boulevard Phase III	Yes	2013	150	3	\$ 3,500,000
20	Sardis Trace Senior	Yes	2013	78	6	\$ 600,000
21	Hall House	No	2013	151	1	\$ -
22	Park And Marsh/The Landing	Yes	2014	92	1	\$ 1,380,000
23	Cinnamon Point Senior Apts.	No	2014	64	3	\$ -
24	Weddington Road	No	2014	70	7	\$ -
25	Whitehall Crossing	Yes	2015	96	3	\$ 1,440,000
26	Rodden Square Seniors	Yes	2015	98	2	\$ 1,200,000
27	Baxter Street (reapplied in 2016)	No	2015	30	1	\$ -
28	Magnolia Gardens (reapplied in 2016)	No	2015	81	2	\$ -
29	Tall Oaks Redevelopment	No	2015	81	1	\$ 1,215,000
30	Tuckaseegee Seniors (reapplied in 2016)	No	2015	70	3	\$ -
**	Baxter Street	Yes	2016	30	1	\$ 1,450,000
**	Magnolia Gardens	Yes	2016	82	2	\$ 1,400,000
**	Tuckaseegee Seniors	Yes	2016	104	3	\$ 2,392,000
31	Catawba II (reapplied in 2017)	No	2016	39	2	\$ -
32	Rosewood Commons	Yes	2017	85	2	\$ 1,425,000
**	Catawba II	No	2017	39	2	\$ -
33	Bingham Seniors (reapplied in 2018)	No	2017	60	1	\$ -
34	Gibbon Terrace	No	2017	96	2	\$ -
35	Nevin Road (reapplied in 2018)	No	2017	68	2	\$ -
36	North Chase Seniors	No	2017	69	4	\$ -
37	Northlake Seniors (reapplied in 2018)	No	2017	70	2	\$ -
38	Old Concord Apts	No	2017	78	4	\$ -
39	Samuel Street Apts	No	2017	43	2	\$ -
**	Bingham Park	Yes	2018	60	1	\$ 775,000
40	Abbingdon Oaks*	No	2018	96	2	\$ -
41	Guardian Angel Villa	Yes	2018	81	3	\$ 1,750,000
42	Nolley Court	Yes	2018	103	6	\$ 2,100,000
43	Rivergate Greene	Yes	2018	72	3	\$ 1,900,000
44	Mineral Springs	No	2018	90	4	\$ -
**	Nevin Road	No	2018	46	2	\$ -
**	Northlake Seniors	No	2018	70	2	\$ -
45	Sugar Creek Greene	No	2018	72	2	\$ -
46	The Park Seniors	No	2018	80	2	\$ -
<b>Total***</b>				<b>2,007</b>		<b>\$34,907,024</b>

\*Council approved Housing Locational Policy waiver; no HTF support requested

\*\*Projects that were unsuccessful in securing tax credits, and subsequently reapplied in subsequent years, are counted once. For example, the Baxter Street development applied for tax credits/HTF support in 2015 but, due to the competitive nature of 9% deals, it was not awarded tax credits by the state. The development subsequently reapplied in 2016. While both applications are included in this report, the project is counted only once.

\*\*\*Total number of units represents approved projects only