

## Community Development Committee

April 21, 2022

A meeting of the Community Development Committee was held this date beginning at 3:09 p.m. both in person in Council Chambers at 80 Broad Street and over video conference call.

Notice of this meeting was sent out to the news media.

**Committee Members:** Councilmember Robert Mitchell, Chairman, Councilmember Jason Sakran (virtual), Vice Chair, Councilmember William Dudley Gregorie, Councilmember Ross Appel (virtual), and Councilmember Perry K. Waring. **Also Present:** Jennifer Cook, Andrea Derungs, Patrick Carlson, Geona Shaw Johnson, Matt Ojala, Chloe Stuber, Emily Beck, Rick Jerue, Julia Copeland, Amber Johnson, Maggie Skinker, Sharon Bohn, Sandy Gagne, Jeff Roberts, Robert Lewis, Patrick Head, Erika Harrison, Arthur Lawrence, Donna Jenkins, and Christopher Morgan.

The meeting opened with a moment of silence led by Councilmember Mitchell.

### Public Participation

- Robert Lewis said that he was present to answer any potential questions about the abandoned building certification Resolution for 11 ½ St. Philip St.

### Approval of Minutes

On a motion of Councilmember Gregorie, seconded by Councilmember Appel, the Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the January 20, 2022 meeting.

On a motion of Councilmember Gregorie, seconded by Councilmember Sakran, the Committee voted unanimously to take item D first.

### Old Business

1. **To Amend Part 4 (Accessory Uses) of Article 2 (Land Use Regulations) of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Charleston, by Modifying Section 54-214 (Accessory Dwelling Unit) Thereof to Clarify that the Affordability Requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units is limited to those receiving subsidy and to clarify the existing procedures and requirements for approval of accessory dwelling units.**

Mr. Ojala said the amended ordinance clarified the affordability requirements on ADUs. Currently, ADUs could only be rented to households at or below 80% AMI, and they were affordable in perpetuity. The amended ordinance would now provide two avenues: either the City would provide the subsidy for the development of the ADU with the requirement that it be affordable for at least 30 years, or there would be no subsidy for the construction and no affordability would be required. He noted they had done additional research since the last meeting to learn more about ADUs around the Country. A study from UC Berkeley found that for ADUs in Portland, Seattle, and Vancouver, 58% of homeowners reported renting to households below the market rate. A study from the Sacramento Council of Governments found that a majority of ADUs were rented to moderate and low income households with roughly 20% being rented to low and extremely low income households. A different study from the Southern

California Association of Governments showed results similar to Sacramento's. Mr. Ojala reminded the Committee that the department had been planning to launch a pilot program to support the development of affordable ADUs and had reserved \$200,000 to help approximately 10 households with the construction of ADUs.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if there was a category for households who didn't apply for the subsidy but still wanted to make the unit affordable. Mr. Ojala said there were no affordability requirements if a homeowner chose to build it without the subsidy. However, the homeowner could choose to rent it below market rate.

Councilmember Gregorie asked why they chose 30 years as the minimum. Mr. Ojala said 30 years was what they had typically done for housing developments in the City, it seemed like a reasonable length of time for a homeowner who wasn't expending their own capital to build the ADU, and it aligned with a typical mortgage.

Councilmember Mitchell asked if there was a stipulation for ADUs to not be Short Term Rentals (STR). Mr. Ojala confirmed the ordinance already stipulated that. Councilmember Gregorie said he thought another reason they chose 30 years was that the owners wouldn't be as attractive to the developers and questioned why they wouldn't increase it 40 years or more.

Mrs. Shaw Johnson said they had a number of people interested in ADUs, but the problem they encountered was people didn't want to build them if they had to be affordable in perpetuity. She said they could try 40 years, but it was a longer period than what was typically in place.

Councilmember Gregorie questioned if they could manipulate the subsidies to incentivize people to make them affordable for longer. Mrs. Shaw Johnson said they didn't have the flexibility to do that unless Council gave them more money. She mentioned they were using fee-in-lieu dollars for this instead of federal funding since federal funds would require further processes and requirements, which would delay the construction of units.

Councilmember Gregorie said, generally speaking, they needed to provide more funding to Housing and Community Development since the Department's funds were slowly being depleted, even with the fee-in-lieu dollars and federal funds. He said this was very important since they were facing an affordability crisis. Councilmember Mitchell agreed and said they should have done it long ago if they were serious about affordable housing.

Councilmember Appel said he supported the ordinance as amended since it included both his and Councilmember Gregorie's perspectives. He hoped both would work and have the net effect of driving down prices and adding more housing units to the City. He said ADUs wouldn't solve the City's affordability issue, but it would move the needle in the right direction. As a result of this, he thought they would not only see units being built but businesses being created and a new development industry being formed.

Councilmember Mitchell said even outside of the ADU ordinance, they needed to focus on affordability and allowing people to live on the Peninsula.

Councilmember Sakran said he supported the ordinance and thought the dual track was the way to go. He asked if they had spoken with County Council or the Assessor's Office to determine if the ADUs

would be taxed at 4% or 6%. Mrs. Shaw Johnson said they had not checked with the Assessor's Office, but because it was an income producing unit, it would typically be assessed at the higher tax rate.

Councilmember Gregorie said it was a unique ordinance since it had built-in competition. He was interested to see whether the incentive or market approach would get more applicants.

On a motion of Councilmember Gregorie, seconded by Councilmember Sakran, the Committee voted unanimously to approve the item above.

### **New Business**

#### **1. Update on Homelessness Strategy (electronic presentation)**

Ms. Beck said the Mayor's Commission on Homelessness and Affordable Housing was formed in 2016 by the Mayors of Charleston, Summerville, Mt. Pleasant, and North Charleston. It was an advocacy group comprised of community members who wanted to assist those who were unhoused or at risk of becoming unhoused. It had four subcommittees: the Executive Committee, which focused on local advocacy; the Housing Subcommittee, which was putting on landlord and developer engagement events; the Integrated Services Subcommittee, which was working on setting up a Charleston branch of a national non-profit called Family Promise; and the Resources Subcommittee, which was fundraising for the Hope Center. In addition to the Mayor's Commission, the City was involved in many homelessness initiatives. One was the Current State of Homelessness, which brought together a bunch of providers to share about their organizations and provide updates on what resources were available. They also held an internal meeting that brought together Police and Parks to talk about areas of concern and provided warming centers during the colder months. They also worked with outside organizations addressing homelessness, like West Ashley Team Combatting Homelessness, Homeless Court, Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, Extending Branches, and Safety Net Assistance Network.

Ms. Beck mentioned that the City's Community Liaison and Homelessness Specialist, Taliah Rice, would provide an update at a future meeting about the work she was doing.

Councilmember Gregorie asked about the members and positions that made up the Commission.

Ms. Beck said the Chair was Robert Clement, the Vice-Chair was Jack Little, and other members included Jen Cameron, Pastor Eric from St. Matthew's, and Rev. Kylon Middleton.

Councilmember Gregorie asked who the treasurer was and Ms. Beck said there was not a treasurer.

Mrs. Shaw Johnson said the Commission did not manage funding and the Palmetto Project oversaw the funding. She also noted that mayors from the various municipalities each appointed six Commission members.

Councilmember Sakran asked if anyone from One80 Place was on the Commission. Mrs. Shaw Johnson said the Commission was comprised of individuals from the communities, not organizations, so One80 Place did not have representation on the Commission. However, she noted the City provided funds to One80 Place annually through CDBG funds.

Councilmember Gregorie said they had given \$3 million to help with the construction of One80 Place's building on Meeting Street. Mrs. Shaw Johnson clarified that it was actually \$6 million, \$3 million from bond funding and \$3 million from other settlement funds.

Mrs. Shaw Johnson said that City Council had recently authorized the addition of an outreach worker for her department and looked forward to continue to work with local partners in addressing community relationships between businesses and unsheltered persons throughout the King St. district. She said that the Hope Center, previously called the Navigation Center, at 529 Meeting St. will be ready for affiliated non-profit occupation in June of 2022. She also anticipated entering into several Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with multiple organizations that will be providing services on a rotating basis at the center in addition to the support provided by City staff and led by Director LaTosha Jenkins-Fludd.

Councilmember Mitchell asked for clarification about the lease terms. Mrs. Shaw Johnson said that they currently had a month-to-month agreement and intended to allow occupation for at least another year. The owners were interested in a long-term agreement and would be submitting applications to Corporation Counsel in the near future.

Mrs. Shaw Johnson said that based on conversations with HUD and data collection throughout the pandemic, her office had identified the need for 2,213 housing units using an estimated \$9,941,602 to support the unsheltered community in Charleston.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if the proposed 2,213 units were part of the expected affordable housing threshold that anticipates an additional 16,000 affordable housing units in order to address housing disparity. Mrs. Shaw Johnson said that it was probably included in the estimate but her team was focused on the population that falls below the 30% AMI threshold.

## **2. Review of the Affordable Housing Dashboard (electronic presentation)**

Matt Ojala introduced a presentation that highlighted the need and proposed solutions for addressing the affordable housing gap. He said recent studies had determined that it was necessary to generate 16,351 affordable housing units by the year 2030 in order to eliminate affordability gaps. The online dashboard generated from this information will allow City affiliates to track and plan for targeted solutions in the future. By increasing transparency and education concerning development and project timelines, the public could stay informed about housing development in real time and help identify areas for improvement. The dashboard broke down community data into a variety of layers that could be examined individually.

Chloe Stuber continued the presentation by explaining the variety of information displayed by different properties whether they already existed, were in the proposal process, or existed in a committed, but uncertain, status. This data originated from EnerGov, City permitting and planning software, and created many communication benefits because any developer needed to submit an application with publically available information and status updates for City employees. At that point in time, there were 852 proposed affordable housing units in active development. Ms. Stuber finished the presentation by recommending explaining the navigation differences between the mobile and the desktop versions of the Dashboard.

Councilmember Gregorie clarified the type of affordable units included in their accounting and asked Ms. Stuber if her previous experience with reviewing North Charleston's zoning rules could be applied to examining affordability restrictions in the City of Charleston. She said it was a project she completed as a graduate student. Councilmember Gregorie said it was possible they would rely on her past expertise to examine current zoning restrictions in order to make affordability recommendations in the future. Councilmember Gregorie asked if it was possible to overlay the equity mapping system to the

Dashboard, particularly the map showing affordable housing, in order to sense existing problems and zoning restrictions that continue to create discriminatory impact and affordability. Ms. Stuber agreed and Councilmember Gregorie said he would connect with the head of the Planning Department in order to get a head start on this proposal.

Councilmember Waring asked if there was a program that incentivized private sector developers to create affordable units. Mr. Ojala said there were limited funds to offset multiple tax credits and it was necessary to look at other kinds of incentives and tools to create those partnerships.

Councilmember Gregorie said that previous experience with hotel developments created an ordinance that placed a mandate on hotels to provide fee-in-lieu of to the Planning Department. He said it was necessary to create a housing linkage for all developments but he wasn't sure if it had legal precedence. The question was how the City of Charleston potentially proceeds to tap those resources through potentially legislative action.

Councilmember Sakran said that he recently toured 85 and 86 Line St. which held 30 micro-housing units and discussed the potential for increased flexibility in regards to STR potential to make it financially feasible for a developer to build affordable units so the community can ultimately benefit.

Councilmember Gregorie acknowledged there was difficulty in navigating inclusionary zoning but recognized the presence of good suggestions in recent fair housing legislation.

Mrs. Shaw Johnson said it had been some time since the previous project update, but, to answer Councilmember Waring, there was already some Planned Unit Development (PUD) amendments in place that provided incentives that allowed for different affordability and density arrangements.

Councilmember Waring said that the recent changes to the 50 foot frontage lot requirements would allow for more affordability development on private lots. Concerning affordability, it was necessary to engage the private sector to a higher degree in order to resolve the discrepancy between public and nonprofit efforts.

Mrs. Shaw Johnson said there was several incentives in places which required a particular level of capital and zoning requirements.

Councilmember Gregorie suggested hosting a development and affordability workshop in order to educate interested members of the public concerning City efforts around this initiative. Ms. Shaw Johnson said that there were several workshops last year that discussed these topics and other incentives in order to better understand the challenges and opportunities facing the City as a whole.

### **3. Certification of Abandoned Building Site at 11.5 St. Philip Street**

Julia Copeland presented an abandoned building application where the owner, 11 ½ St. Philip St., pursuant to the Abandoned Building and Revitalization Act of 2013, is submitting information to City Council to prove that it was an abandoned building for the past five years and asked for the application to be accepted.

On a motion of Councilmember Gregorie, seconded by Councilmember Waring, the Committee voted unanimously to approve the certification of abandoned building site at 11 ½ St. Philip St.

#### **4. Requests for additional TIF funding-Lowline Housing, LP**

Mrs. Shaw Johnson said that two years ago, Councilmembers approved the Lowline Affordable Housing Project and allocated \$1.5 million to a developer who only required \$1 million at that time. With increasing supply chain demand and price disruptions, the developer requested the final \$500,000 which was previously approved to be allocated towards that project. Ms. Shaw Johnson confirmed with the City of Charleston Deputy CFO, Matt Frohlich, that the money was still available and asked for the Committee to approve the request in order to move it to Ways & Means for final authorization.

On a motion of Councilmember Waring, seconded by Councilmember Gregorie, the Committee unanimously approved the request for additional TIF funding to be allocated to Lowline Housing, LP.

#### **5. Discussion: Amend Chapter 54 of the Code of the City of Charleston (Zoning Ordinance) Article 2-Land Use Regulations, Part 15-Workforce Housing Districts and Opportunity Zones: And Article 3-Site Regulations, Part 4-Off Street Parking Requirements: Small Efficiency Dwelling Unit (Micro-Unit)**

Christopher Morgan said that this amendment originated from the private sector, was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission, and already had a public hearing before City Council. He said it was an ordinance that would create a definition for small efficiency dwelling units in order to create more housing in the City and would have some attached regulations that referenced off-street parking and invited the applicant to explain more background information concerning this ordinance.

Jeff Roberts of JJR Development introduced his associates, Patrick Head and Erika Harrison, and spoke about the Comprehensive City Plan which was ratified in October 2021 which allowed his team to create price approachable development proposals that catered to individuals who fell within certain affordability parameters and were looking to live within walking distance of shopping and employment centers.

Ms. Harrison said that her past work with developers had highlighted the discrepancy between those who expressed interest in providing affordable housing and those who acted on that awareness. By working to provide affordable options, you create a more connected community with more vested residents. Reducing transportation footprints helps facilitate people-dependent communities and that only happens when a variety of housing options is available.

Mr. Roberts said that this policy required multiple sources of consideration and can take advantage of smaller sites in key areas throughout the City that will provide affordable housing opportunities for single individuals that did not require a vehicle in order to maintain community accessibility.

Councilmember Waring asked Mr. Roberts what would happen if more than his anticipated 30% of potential residents had a personal vehicle. Mr. Roberts said that they would be restricted in their lease agreements to prevent accessing a building affiliated parking space. As a result, they could make arrangements to park it elsewhere or not use a car at all.

Councilmember Gregorie asked what would happen to an applicant's chances if they had a car and there were more residents with cars than available parking spots already associated with the building. Mr.

Roberts said that, statistically, this type of unit would naturally attract and accommodate individuals that did not have a car in the first place.

Councilmember Gregorie asked if there were any safeguards that could be introduced to developer contracts that held them responsible for accommodating an increased population without accommodating their vehicles. Mr. Roberts said it sounded like a legal question and could be addressed by developing in certain areas with parking garage proximity.

Councilmember Appel said that it was important to review how zoning issues and regulations create adverse effects on affordable housing quality and availability. By enforcing minimum parking requirements, especially on the peninsula, it was hindering the private development approach to provide affordable housing units. By amending some of the regulations, the City could facilitate increased affordable options without investing any public funds. If there were issues from unauthorized parking in adjacent regions where associated parking is limited, Councilmember Appel suggested that the City intensify parking enforcement tactics in order to bring it under control. By focusing on enforcement and not relying on zoning arguments, development fees, and regulations, the City can finally begin to close the affordability gap.

Councilmember Sakran said that the property on 85 and 86 Line St. had the ability to host a vertical parking solution that could hold up to 29 personal vehicles. He said it was crucial to continue exploring alternative options and offerings because Charleston, and its citizens, lived in a very car-centric reality. Assuming that the majority of applicants would not have a car in the first place disincentived an entire group of people, in need of affordable housing, before they even applied.

Councilmember Waring said that he approved Councilmember Appel's idea about increased parking enforcement and asked the Legal Department if they could allow for warnings to be conveyed through the developer for new applicants about that potential enforcement.

Ms. Copeland said that would need to be reviewed but it was possible to suggest that educating and warning potential tenants about the consequences of unauthorized parking could be introduced to the conversations with developers but could not be mandated that they all express that same message.

Mr. Roberts said that his team, and other like-minded developers, would be happy to disclose that reality to applicants and tenants and communicate the reality of parking accessibility to interested occupants.

Councilmember Gregorie said that, in addition, there could be suggestions for alternative parking options and allow for applicants to fully consider all of their options.

Mr. Lawrence said that his experience showed that while developers are following parking restrictions, single family homes are increasingly being rented out to multiple groups of people who all bring a vehicle and create more crowding issues, especially in the Medical District, and it was important to address this issue from every housing angle in order to not facilitate a one-sided solution.

Councilmember Sakran asked Mr. Roberts if the vehicle carousel component would solve the parking density issue.

Ms. Harrison said that people who were interested in renting these micro-units typically had a very shrewd awareness of navigating the downtown peninsula without a vehicle.

Mr. Roberts said that even though it was possible to install a vehicle carousal structure, it was not the most efficient way to park the most amount of cars in that space. It was more economically and density feasible to create structured garage parking that was interwoven into a mixed-use zoning district.

Councilmember Gregorie said that housing authorities have been pursuing micro-housing units for years and even though most applicants didn't bring a car, it was important to remember that the central City of Charleston is only eight square miles and these specific developments were helpful in alleviating the burden of transportation and parking demands.

On a motion of Councilmember Gregorie, seconded by Councilmember Appel, the Committee voted unanimously to approve the ordinance as written, with the addition of the discussed parking disclosure recommendations.

#### **6. Ordinance to repeal and replace Chapter 16: Human Relations; Article II: Fair Housing Practices of the City of Charleston Code of Ordinances**

Councilmember Gregorie said that the discussion about the proposed Fair Housing Draft Law protected all citizens and intended to facilitate an active discussion to help advance this ordinance to a more actionable stage. He said that the City of Charleston was applying to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in order to find the drafted City Fair Housing Ordinance to be substantially equivalent to the national ordinance. In conjunction with the Charleston Urban League, this would give additional enforcement power, that will be primarily paid for by HUD, to get the necessary infrastructure in place. After consulting with the Legal Department, they found that there is a line in the ordinance about gifts that needs to be removed, and Councilmember Gregorie suggested they also replace any reference to Human Affairs and Racial Conciliation Commission (HARCC) with Human Affairs Commission. The HUD consideration process will take up to three years, which gives the City plenty of time to assemble a commission, appoint a director and organize the necessary infrastructure to accommodate the anticipated funding.

Councilmember Appel said that it was important to enforce fair housing ordinance guidelines as robustly as they enforce short-term rental registration. He supported HARCC having a role in advising and providing feedback for these issues but hesitated to grant an appointed board of citizens broad enforcement powers. Councilmember Gregorie said that HUD will ensure that kind of overstep does not take place.

Councilmember Sakran asked Councilmember Gregorie to what extent would HARCC have certain abilities to execute and initiate some of the outlined responsibilities in the proposed ordinance. Councilmember Gregorie said that if this ordinance was found substantially equivalent to the federal law, the commission would have the responsibility to find and identify the necessary expertise to make things happen. There will be a role for them, but it would be clearly defined and coordinated with the Legal Department and affiliated community partners.

Councilmember Mitchell said that his work enforcing fair housing in Berkley, Dorchester and Charleston counties gave him almost three decades of experience in understanding the distribution of powers and Councilmember Gregorie's experience working for HUD in Washington D.C. and Columbia, SC gave him extensive experience managing larger projects and budgets than the City currently manages.

Councilmember Gregorie said that these types of enforcement decisions will not be made in isolation and will utilize coordinated efforts across multiple groups and City departments.

Councilmember Appel asked for clarification about the nature of the motion. Councilmember Gregorie said that the proposal was to remove an item that discussed gifts and replace references to HARCC with Human Affairs Commission.

Councilmember Appel asked if the Human Affairs Commission existed and Councilmember Gregorie said that HARCC would serve as the Human Affairs Commission. Councilmember Appel said that he did not approve of a citizen's commission being granted subpoena powers and predicted that replacing any references to HARCC with a Human Affairs Commission that did not exist, would lead to conflicts at the next City Council meeting.

Mr. Jerue said that in the time it takes to get the HUD approval it was possible to form a separate Human Affairs Commission for this express purpose.

Councilmember Gregorie said that he agreed with Councilmember Appel and would be willing to leave HARCC as the affiliated Commission in the proposed ordinance.

Councilmember Waring asked if Councilmember Appel's main issue with the ordinance was HARCC being granted any enforcement powers, which Councilmember Appel confirmed.

Councilmember Gregorie said the Commission would need to be able to determine if a complaint had standing and then passed on to the appropriate authorities for consideration and enforcement.

Councilmember Appel read aloud that, according to section 8, subsection A of the proposed ordinance,

"In conducting an investigation the HARCC shall have access at all reasonable time to premises, records, documents, individuals, and other evidence or possible sources of evidence and may examine, record, and copy the materials and take the record and testimony or statements of persons who are reasonably necessary for the furtherance of the investigation provided that HARCC first complies with the provisions of the State Constitution relating to unreasonable searches and seizures, the HARCC may issue subpoenas to compel its access."

Councilmember Appel said that while he was not anti-enforcement or anti-housing, he did not approve of, and questioned the legality of, giving a citizen's commission subpoena powers. He suggested that the City establish a professional department affiliated with the commission that will embody those powers.

Councilmember Gregorie said that HARCC had the same legal power as any other established City commission and would have to work in conjunction with the Legal Department in all things. As a complaint-driven body, HARCC would pass along each complaint to the appropriate authority or partner. He asked Councilmember Appel if that authority should be the Legal Department.

Councilmember Appel said that all ordinances should be enforced by the same body, and the proposed ordinance listed powers fall under legislative, executive, and judicial jurisdictions which could make this commission potentially more powerful than a body like City Council.

Councilmember Sakran said that he would vote to pass this ordinance as long as there was additional conversations about the language contained in the ordinance that clarified HARCC's role to the public and other Councilmembers.

Councilmember Waring asked Councilmember Appel where the appropriate subpoena power should be vested. Councilmember Appel said that since subpoenas are typically issued through a court process, a lawyer working for the City with these issues could potentially address this question. He suggested that the Legal Department analyze the ordinance draft language in order to ensure complete legal compliance in coordinating complaints and their affiliated responses.

Councilmember Waring asked where that complaint process should be directed. Councilmember Appel said he supported having a specific member of the Legal Department address these concerns so that a citizen's group is not tasked with bringing cases and enforcing City law.

Councilmember Gregorie said the ordinance already established a position funded by the City of Charleston to manage HARCC and report directly to the Mayor, but he would support establishing a more direct link to the Legal Department and replacing HARCC, in the ordinance, with another entity. Removing anything else from the ordinance would not make it substantially equivalent to the federal law and it would not, ultimately, be approved.

Councilmember Sakran said it was important the HARRC stayed within the ordinance but it was important to outline their responsibilities and powers.

Councilmember Gregorie said that HARCC's only power was to investigate claims and complaints in order to make the appropriate recommendations to the proper authority.

Mrs. Shaw Johnson and Ms. Copeland both said that the language contained in the ordinance was approved and was in practice by several authoritative bodies in Columbia, SC.

Councilmember Gregorie said that it was important to mirror the federal version of this law to ensure it was approved and the only discussion should be to consider where to place the appropriate commission recommendations.

Councilmember Waring asked Ms. Copeland who enforces federal law in the City of Charleston. She said that under the current Fair Housing Ordinance, the City's Legal Department could address inappropriate behavior by filing an injunction in circuit court or issue a ticket for a misdemeanor.

Councilmember Gregorie said that HARCC was an administrative body that would be coordinating with the appropriate departments, but he would support changing the ordinance language from focusing on HARCC to the appropriate Legal Department team.

Councilmember Appel said he supported enforcement mechanisms but wanted to see the final language distancing HARCC from any enforcement authority before seeing it on a City Council agenda.

Councilmember Gregorie said that the language in the proposed ordinance mirrored the federal version of this law. He said that they could take out references to HAARC in order to move the consideration process forward.

On a motion of Councilmember Waring, seconded by Councilmember Gregorie, the Committee voted to approve the ordinance with the recommended amendments.

Having no further business, the Committee adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

Patrick Carlson  
Clerk of Council's Office