

Submitted By	Agenda Item # and Questions	Answers/Considerations
<p>Please note the following items are being pulled from the <b>agenda 33 (deferred), 34 (deferred), 35 (deferred), and 36.</b>  <b>Property Transactions - Harrisburg Road Shared-Use Path Winterwood to Sam Dee, Parcels # 3 &amp; 4 (settled)</b></p> <p>Deferred to the March 9<sup>th</sup> Business meeting:                      33. Charlotte Water Property Transactions - Oakdale Road Buffer, Parcel # 20                      34. Property Transactions - CATS ADA Bus Stop Improvements Group 1, Parcel # 8                      35. Property Transactions - CATS ADA Bus Stop Improvements Group 1, Parcel # 15</p>		

<b>Consent Items</b>		
----------------------	--	--

<p>CM Owens and  CM Mazuera Arias</p>	<p><b>13. 2025 Urban Area Security Initiative Grant</b></p> <p>Could we have clarity on how funding for this would be/is affected by the impasse over DHS funding more broadly?</p> <p>What is this grant funding to be used toward? Please clarify that the funding Charlotte is receiving is not going toward any immigration enforcement.</p> <p>Can staff clarify how much of this grant funds equipment versus training? Specifically, what surveillance technologies are included? Will we be able to conduct civil liberties impact assessments before deploying intelligence-sharing technologies?</p> <p>This is federal funds, not city funds, correct?</p>	<p>The FY25 UASI Grant is on hold, pending the end of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) shutdown. The state has accepted the grant in anticipation of the shutdown ending. The Charlotte UASI is a sub recipient of the grant and the intent is to follow the state's lead.</p> <p>The DHS through the UASI program provides federal grants to enhance regional preparedness, security, and resilience in high-threat, high-density urban areas. It supports planning, equipment, training, and exercises to prevent and respond to terrorism and disasters. This grant dates back to 2003 and the Charlotte UASI which includes ten counties. The Charlotte Mecklenburg Emergency Management Office conducts two processes known as a Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA), and a Stakeholder Preparedness Report (SPR) to identify and report gaps to state and federal partners. The ten county emergency managers that make up the Charlotte UASI Working Group take a whole of government and all-hazard approach to federal funding. Meaning that projects strengthen the region's overall abilities to prepare and respond to major emergencies and disasters. Specific immigration enforcement activities do not fall within the scope of the grant. The grant does support local law enforcement agencies to address gaps identified through the THIRA and SPR.</p> <p>Correct. These are federal grant funds.</p>
---	---	---

<p>CM Mazuera Arias</p>	<p><b>15. Median Maintenance Services</b></p> <p>Do we track tree canopy equity in median investments, especially in heat-vulnerable neighborhoods?</p>	<p>The median maintenance contracts do not include tree planting or tree maintenance. The contracts are for mowing, weeding and mulching for the most part, as well as pruning low growing shrubs. Trees within medians are typically originally installed either by private developers as part of development requirements, or through City and NCDOT roadway capital projects.</p> <p>Once installed, median trees are maintained separately from the city's mowing and landscape contracts. Maintenance is</p>
-------------------------	---	---

Submitted By	Agenda Item # and Questions	Answers/Considerations
		<p>performed by City in-house staff and ISA-certified tree contractors under our tree maintenance programs.</p> <p>The city’s Median Renovation Program includes funding (approximately \$250,000 annually) for plant replacements and median refreshes. With more than 1,000 medians citywide, these funds are distributed across the entire system based on identified conditions and maintenance needs.</p> <p>With respect to tree canopy equity, overall canopy coverage is tracked comprehensively across the city—not specifically broken out by medians. Canopy data includes all public and private trees within an area.</p> <p>While median-specific canopy is not tracked independently, equity considerations are being incorporated into our broader street tree planning and planting strategies. The city is beginning to evaluate canopy coverage and heat-vulnerability data when prioritizing tree planting initiatives, particularly in higher-heat and lower-canopy neighborhoods.</p>
CM Owens	<p><b>21. Wi-Fi Services on Transit Vehicles</b></p> <p>Please clarify what “access control and content management” means in the context of this WI-FI access. Could a rider for example report ICE presence from their cell phone while riding buses or would there be the ability of CATS or the MPTA to restrict access in their discretion by instructing Kajeet as our contractor?</p>	<p>Public Wi-Fi is offered as a convenience to enhance rider experience and access to information. It is not a guaranteed service and may be modified, filtered, monitored, or discontinued at the City’s/CATS’ discretion. Part of the intent is to filter for passenger environment concerns such as access by minors, and to minimize cybersecurity risk. Riders will be able to access web and mobile app-based content, but CATS may throttle bandwidth speeds to ensure that all riders have access to the internet and that one/few riders are not monopolizing the bandwidth that would otherwise be available to all riders on the vehicle. CATS will follow all Federal and State guidelines.</p>
CM Mazuera Arias	<p><b>28. SEAP+ Implementation Consulting Services</b></p> <p>We estimate \$200k annually in consulting. How many of these professional consultants based locally? How much of this funding is directed toward implementation in historically heat-burdened neighborhoods which are typically Black and brown low-income neighborhoods?</p> <p>Do we have measurable interim impacts before 2030?</p>	<p>Five of these six consultants have key staff based locally. These contracts are on-call, meaning as-needed. The city has not fully delineated how the contracts will be used. However, staff anticipates using these contracts to complete Greenprints (environmental justice blueprints) for the remaining Corridors of Opportunity and do some initial implementation work including a sustainable housing initiative.</p> <p>The services included in these contracts are SEAP-specific, and therefore, support sustainability and energy initiatives. However, the Office of Sustainability is developing a Street Tree Project aimed at increasing tree canopy coverage in Charlotte’s priority neighborhood—areas with higher urban heat and lower tree canopy, and communities. This program is paid for using Pay-As-You Go funds.</p> <p><b>Measurable Impacts</b> - some examples include:</p>

Submitted By	Agenda Item # and Questions	Answers/Considerations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contracted services will support our program Power Down the Crown which has a goal of 10% reduction in EUI (Energy Utilization Intensity) in benchmarked buildings across the city.</li> <li>Number of Greenprints Completed</li> <li>Number of homes enrolled in Sustainable Housing Initiative</li> </ul>
<b>Public Hearing Items</b>		
<p>CM Mazuera Arias</p>	<p><b>4. Public Hearing and Decision on the R. Kent and Gertrude N. Blair House Historic Landmark Designation</b></p> <p>Do we have data on cumulative deferred taxes across all historic designations? How do we ensure preservation policy does not unintentionally privilege wealthier property owners?</p> <p>Can staff walk us through how we prioritize landmark designations citywide? Specifically, what percentage of our designated historic landmarks represent Black, Latino, immigrant, or working-class histories versus traditionally preserved properties in higher-incomes areas?</p>	<p>Historic landmark designations are administered by Mecklenburg County. Data on cumulative deferred taxes and representation of black, Latino, immigrant, or working-class histories across the county's 383 designated historic landmarks is not readily available, but staff can compile the data and provide it to Council.</p> <p>Anyone can nominate a property for consideration, and all nominated properties are considered for designation. However, the county only moves forward with nominations after contacting the property owner to assess their interest in proceeding. Properties like the Blair House (tonight's hearing) are typically self-nominated by the property owner and, in those instances, they bear the cost of retaining a historic consultant to conduct the necessary research and prepare the statutorily-required designation report (the current average cost for such work is \$4,000-\$5,000).</p> <p>Staff is always proactively looking for other properties that represent all aspects of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County's history and diverse citizenry. For properties where a significant historical narrative is represented but cost of the designation process may be a deterrent to the property owner, Mecklenburg County's Historic Landmark Department will either conduct the research and prepare the report internally or use our small discretionary budget to hire an outside consultant on behalf of the property owner.</p>
<b>Business Items</b>		
<p>CM Owens</p>	<p><b>7. Initial Finding Resolution for an Installment Financing Contract for Equipment and Facilities</b></p> <p>Per the 10<sup>th</sup> Whereas clause wherein a detailed description of the impediments attendant to the general obligation bond financing or revenue bond financing options is provided, can someone help me understand if there is appetite or history of attempt to work something into the legislative agenda to loosen the reins on the</p>	<p>This action involves the first of two steps for the City's planned public facilities debt issuance through an Installment Financing Contract, using Certificates of Participation (COPs).</p> <p>The city has two primary options for financing long-term capital assets within the General Governmental Capital Improvement Program (CIP):</p> <p>General Obligation (GO) Bonds – These are backed by the Full Faith and Credit of the City, which includes a pledge to raise property taxes as needed to meet debt service obligations. Under the North Carolina Constitution, issuing GO Bonds requires voter approval through a public referendum, typically</p>

Submitted By	Agenda Item # and Questions	Answers/Considerations
	<p>types/amounts of expenditures that must be subject to a special election? This concept of additional municipal control is obviously something that has broader ramifications, but I would be interested in a primer on how and where we can push the bounds of greater municipal autonomy as it appears from this clause that the time and cost of the special election are what are compelling a decision to go with the financing and refinancing rather than to put into a bond.</p>	<p>scheduled during county-wide elections alongside local, state, and federal contests.</p> <p>Installment Financings (such as COPs) – These do not require a public referendum and can be approved by City Council. This flexibility is one reason the City has not pursued legislative changes to alter the constitutional requirements for GO Bonds.</p> <p>It’s important to note that all debt issuances by the city, and by all local governments in North Carolin, must also receive approval from the Local Government Commission (LGC), which is chaired by the State Treasurer.</p>
<p>CM Mayfield,  CM Owens,</p>	<p><b>8. Lease of City-Owned Property on Northerly Road</b></p> <p>What revenues have been generated at this point in totality?</p> <p>How much annually comes into the city under this contract (25% of what number)?</p>	<p>The city receives 25% of revenues generated from Envision Charlotte, the nonprofit operating on the Statesville Avenue landfill, where they conduct circulareconomy activities such as composting operations, wood reuse and repurposing.</p> <p>Since revenue generation began in 2023, the City has received \$1,500 for the first half of 2023, \$2,250 for the second half of 2023, \$2,250 for the first half of 2024, and \$4,500 for the second half of 2024, all of which have been deposited in the City’s financial system. Two additional payments—\$4,500 for the first half of 2025 and \$4,500 for the second half of 2025—have been issued and are pending receipt.</p> <p>Payments are submitted biannually with required performance reports, reflecting the structure of this favorable lease arrangement that supports the nonprofit’s mission while generating ongoing revenue for the City on a very challenged, limited use site.</p>
<p>CM Mazuera Arias</p>	<p><b>8. Lease of City-Owned Property on Northerly Road</b></p> <p>How many living-wage jobs are created onsite, and are there local hire commitments for residents in adjacent neighborhoods?</p>	<p>The lease for this property does not speak to any employment opportunities or job-related commitments required of the lessee.</p>
<p>CM Owens and</p>	<p><b>10. Interlocal Agreement for Continuation of Risk Management Services</b></p> <p>What, if any differences will there be between the way risk management services have been historically provided to CATS vs. how they are envisaged to be</p>	<p>While the public transportation system is operated by CATS, a department of the City of Charlotte, the level of Risk Management services will not change. Should the public transportation system transition from CATS to the MPTA during the term of this agreement, fiscal year (FY) 2027, it is possible the MPTA may need an expansion of services, such as workers’ compensation policies that are not included under CATS’ existing coverage.</p>

Submitted By	Agenda Item # and Questions	Answers/Considerations
CM Mazuera Arias	<p>provided to MPTA under this interlocal agreement? Is this truly a continuation or is there any expansion or contraction of services?</p> <p>As CATS transitions to MPTA under the PAVE Act, what governance guardrails ensure continued City oversight on equity, fare policy, and service levels?</p>	<p>Having this agreement in place now ensures continuity of Risk Management services, should the public transportation system transition from CATS to the MPTA during fiscal year 2027. It also provides assurances to insurance underwriters that coverage will remain uninterrupted.</p> <p>Once the public transportation system transitions from CATS to the MPTA, the MPTA may request to utilize the City’s Risk Management services long-term, which would require additional agreements beyond FY 2027.</p> <p>The continuation of risk management services for the benefit of CATS and the MPTA will not change any existing governance structure. As a city department, CATS remains subject to review and oversight through City Council, MTC, and the FTA.</p> <p>In addition, the City will continue to have operational control of CATS as a City department until an agreed-upon transfer date is established to shift operational control to the MPTA. During that transition period, existing governance guardrails—such as established CATS policies, City Council oversight, and federal regulations—would continue to apply in the areas of equity, fare policy, and service levels. As examples, CATS has a Fare Policy, a Transit Service Guidelines Policy, and a Travel Markets Policy that establish rules and priorities in these areas. Federal regulations from the FTA also would continue to apply to CATS. Those regulations include a requirement that CATS perform a detailed equity analysis for certain proposed changes to fares and service changes.</p>