

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for Committee Discussions on Monday, October 6, 2025, at 6:19 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Council members present were Dimple Ajmera, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Lawana Mayfield, James Mitchell, Marjorie Molina, Edwin Peacock III, and Victoria Watlington.

ABSENT: Councilmember Danté Anderson

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmember Tiawana Brown

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said alright, thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. Okay, so this is the call to order and welcome. This Monday evening is a meeting for us to discuss the work that we've been doing in the committee setting. So, with that, I'd like to call this meeting to order. Let's begin to introduce ourselves.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: UPDATE FROM CITY COUNCIL WORK GROUP ON APPOINTMENTS TO THE METROPOLITAN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Mayor Lyles said so we have had this opportunity, but I thought that we might go ahead and have an update from the City Council work group on appointments to the Metropolitan Public Transportation Authority. I'll have the Chair recognize the membership.

Councilmember Mitchell said thank you Mayor and Council. Let me recognize the Three Musketeers who've been working feverishly on this great assignment that the Mayor gave us. Mr. Ed Driggs, District Seven and the one and only Councilmember LaWana Mayfield, At-Large. So, today Mayor and Council, we gave a great presentation to the Transportation Planning and Development. Through that feedback I think we've even made the process better based on some recommendations we've made. So, the work group, and we're going to start off with Kay and Liz. We're going to let the Interim City Attorney go through his presentation and then I will go through the work group recommendations.

Anthony Fox, Interim City Attorney said good afternoon, Mayor and members of Council. Liz is teeing up the presentation that will talk to you about the Transit Authority Board of Trustees Appointment overview. First of all, this composition of the Board of Trustees for the new Authority, should the referendum pass, will have 27 members appointed by the City, the County, six towns, the State, and State government leaders. The City has 12 of those 27 members. However, the City's appointments are regulated by a statute and the statute provides that three of those appointments are recommendations, two of the Business Alliance, one of the Foundation for the Carolinas. It's also an appointment requirement that one of the appointees must have small business experience. Then, the next condition that's imposed is one that was agreed to the by City and the County pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding that was entered into the other parties a while back. Under that agreement there was a commitment that one of the appointments for the City as well as one for the County would be an active CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System) user. The eligibility requirements that the Clerk and I will review for all applications are those that are set out on the screen. One, any applicant must be a resident of Mecklenburg County. Then two, it provides that no current elected officials may be appointed. The Statute and the Act specifically provide that no elected official may concurrently serve on the Board of Trustees of the new Authority. The new Authority membership on that Board will be a product of eventually identification but appointments and swearing in and that's not likely to occur until sometime in December 2025 before that final process will occur. The payback does not speak to any prerequisites other than what I've mentioned previously as to the appointment process or any criteria. The other last one was that no lobbyist can serve or be a member of the Authority or any family member of a lobbyist.

Now when you turn to experience and qualifications, the PAVE (Public Access to Valuable Equity) Act is specific as to what members of the Board of Trustees shall have by way of demonstrated experience or qualifications, and it requires that they must have demonstrated experience or qualifications in the areas that are set out there on the screen. Those areas include law, finance, engineering, public transportation, urban planning, logistics, government, architecture or economic development. The Act does not go into any definition of what constitutes law, finance, engineering and so that's going to be within the framework of this Body to decide as they review the applications. With regards to experience and qualifications, the most asked question in the discussion I've witnessed has been around public transportation and what constitutes demonstrated experience and qualifications in the area of public transportation. We can only, as the Courts would do, look to a definition of what public transportation is and there is a definition on the screen that provides that, "Public transportation is a system of trains, buses, etc., that is paid for or run by a government."

The Act does define public transportation system, and that definition is within the Act and I'll just call your attention to that definition. While it's fairly long, it does talk about things that may be expansive for your view of what public transportation is and things like high occupancy vehicles, micro transit, carpools or vanpools program, special transportation services that are often run by transit systems can certainly fall within that. Again, that's the only direction that the Act gives you for the use of those terms. The application process, your Clerk has developed an application process which aligns with the application process that this Body has used for Boards and Commissions, save the only exception is that there have been some provisions added to the application process that are dictated by the PAVE Act. Things like allowing the applicant to speak to their qualifications in one of the enumerated fields, to speak to their demonstrated experience in one of the enumerated fields. The window for applications is open now and it closes on the 13th of October 2025 and then the Council makes appointments on or by November 24 of 2025. I'll yield back to the Council member.

Mr. Mitchell said any questions for our Interim City Attorney? If there are none, Liz can you then prepare the work group recommendations, and we can share that with Council? Thank you, Liz. So, I'll just remind people of how we got here. Mayor Lyles appointed a work group in an email on September 26, 2025. She challenged us to devise a process so that Council could approve appointments by November 8, 2025. She asked me to be Chair, and I told her I need my sidekicks Councilmember Driggs and Mayfield, and the work group, we reported to the TPD (Transportation and Planning Department) today and got a lot of feedback from the Committee that I will share with you later on.

So, here's the framework for us. Applicants must reside in the Charlotte City limits. Stephanie Kelly, thank you so much. She's been notifying those applicants who only reside outside the City. They need to apply for the County. City Council, we have 12 appointees total. We're recommending two Mayoral appointments and seven Council appointments. One must have small business experience and one must be an active CATS user per the MOU (Memorandum of Understanding). Then we have some partners who are joining us as part of the appointment process. The Business Alliance will have two and Foundations of the Carolinas will have one. Councilmember Graham, you brought up a good point to make sure that we communicate with our partners, and I have made calls and asked that both of them would make their appointments prior to Council on November 10, 2025. October 13, 2025, as the Interim City Attorney mentioned, application closes, and the City Clerk will continue to coordinate with the County Clerk to identify any applicants that applied for both City and County. More recommendations. The work group was very clear on what expertise and talent that we're looking for based on the PAVE Act. As you can see, law, finance, engineering, public transportation, urban planning, logistics, government, architect and economic development. Part of our conversation then was, and I'll give Councilmember Mayfield a lot of credit, what would be our guiding principle? One thing with seven appointees, we have seven District reps. So, we would like District representation to be part of our guiding principles and definitely a transit rider and someone who uses it and more importantly the skills. Councilmember Driggs reminded us that this authority is like

setting up a corporation. So, let's make sure we have the right skill sets to manage an authority.

So, October 16, 2025, we will share all the applications that will be verified with the full Council and then here's the hard work. Let me thank our work group in advance. October 20, 2025, through October 31, 2025, we have allocated 52 hours to schedule interviews with applicants. Twenty-five minutes per applicant with a 20-minute Q&A questions, and five minutes for us to do the evaluation. We have reserved already room 278 and 280 here at the Government Center for the interviews to take place. Councilmember Johnson, you brought up a good point earlier today about transparency. So, we're going to set this up like a Committee meeting. So, it would be a virtual option for people to view the interview. We want to show flexibility. We know some can meet between 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. but then we need to set up some evening hours. So, when you look at our schedule, we have two evening days per week, October 20, 2025, through October 24, 2025, then October 27, 2025 through October 31, 2025. It is our goal that this work group will provide recommendations to the full Council on November 6, 2025, for you to have considerations. Then, November 10, 2025, we will have nominations at our Business Meeting with a November 24, 2025, final vote. At that particular time, we should know the Charlotte Regional Business Alliance as well as the Foundation for the Carolinas. Discussions? Any questions for the work group?

Councilmember Brown arrived at 6:31 p.m.

Councilmember Ajmera said so, before we vote would we know who is appointed by the Alliance and Foundation?

Mr. Mitchell said yes ma'am.

Ms. Ajmera said how about the Mayoral appointments?

Mr. Mitchell said yes.

Ms. Ajmera said so, we would know ahead of time?

Mr. Mitchell said ahead of time. So, I give the Committee credit because they said we want to make sure if there's gaps then that will help Council make the right appointments.

Ms. Ajmera said right, exactly. Would we know County Commissions' appointees, or no?

Mr. Mitchell said so, they don't appoint until December 3, 2025?

Stephanie Kelly, City Clerk said December 2, 2025.

Mr. Mitchell said December 2, 2025. So, we're going first. The County won't appoint until December 2, 2025.

Ms. Ajmera said got it. Well, theirs is outside of the City.

Mr. Mitchell said exactly.

Ms. Ajmera said okay.

Mr. Mitchell said that's the point Councilmember Mayfield brought up. On your desk Council members, you have as of today, 71 applicants that have already submitted applications and we think that they'll be probably up to about 90 when all is said and done by Monday.

Ms. Ajmera said that's all I have, thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said okay, I just had a question about the business appointments, process wise. Are those appointments going to happen through our process or are they just going to be something that they handle externally?

Mr. Mitchell said no they will handle their own process.

Ms. Watlington said okay. That's what I wanted to know.

Mr. Mitchell said Business Alliance and the Foundation of the Carolinas, yes ma'am.

Ms. Watlington said okay.

Ms. Ajmera said we will know before?

Mr. Mitchell said we will know before, who they selected, but they'll have their own process.

Ms. Ajmera said right.

Ms. Watlington said okay and I'm just curious, how is that recorded?

Mr. Mitchell said how is that recorded?

Ms. Watlington said I mean I can reasonably understand how ours will be made and recorded via the public record and the Counties and the legislatures and the Governors, but then for the private organizations, procedurally, where does that go?

Mr. Mitchell said so, I'm going to try to take a stab and Stephanie, you correct me. I think we will receive those nominations and then she will have it for the record those that were received from the Foundation and from the Business Alliance. Did I get that correct? Okay.

Ms. Watlington said thank you.

Ms. Ajmera said I just want to understand. So, do I understand this correctly? So, everyone will apply to the City and then the Alliance and the Foundation will have their application packages?

Mr. Mitchell said yes. So, the Alliance will have two appointees, the Foundation of the Carolinas will have one and they will have their own process separate from ours.

Ms. Ajmera said oh so okay. So, our process?

Mr. Mitchell said is just strictly for if you stay in Districts One through Seven.

Ms. Ajmera said got it.

Councilmember Molina just for clarification because I don't even know if I realized that. So, the Alliance will actually appoint from this list?

Mr. Mitchell said no.

Ms. Molina oh okay. I thought so.

Mr. Mitchell said no.

Ms. Molina said this list is just us?

Mr. Mitchell said just us, right.

Ms. Molina said the they have their own, separate and apart?

pti:mt

Mr. Mitchell said exactly.

Ms. Molina said okay.

Mayor Lyles said as well as the County and all of the other [inaudible].

Ms. Molina said okay, good.

Mr. Mitchell said so, let me reiterate that because that's a good point.

Ms. Molina said yes.

Mr. Mitchell said so, the Foundations of the Carolinas will appoint one and the Charlotte Regional Business Alliance will appoint two and they have their own process separate from ours.

Ms. Molina said okay.

Councilmember Mayfield said following up Councilmember Mitchell and so that we're all on the same page. What we have recognized is that we may have individuals that have applied and shown interest through all the bodies, through the State, through the County, through us, through the Alliance, through Foundation. Since they have, according to the PAVE Act these designated seats, that's why we're working with them to find out who their people are so if those names pop up on our ours, we know that they've already been identified. So, along with the ones that we have highlighted here that are outside of the City, Charlotte proper limits, that way we can make sure that we're looking at a clean sheet of individuals so that we don't make the mistake of identifying somebody that's already been identified in another space. That was also part of the conversation in Committee this morning regarding the Mayor's appointments. We want to know so that we can, one, be very transparent as well as very intentional about who is going to be the voices that are representing the City of Charlotte. So, even though they have their own process just like the State did and they just announce their people, we know that we shouldn't see those people's names pop up on our list.

Mr. Mitchell said let me add another note, and Councilmember Johnson brought this up. I think it was an excellent point. Starting tomorrow at 4:00 p.m. all names that have applied will be on our website.

Ms. Kelly said they're on there now.

Mr. Mitchell said oh, they're there now? Oh, so they're there now. So, if you go to apply for this Board, there's another button you can click, you can see all 71 names. So, going forward it will be updated every day at 4:00 p.m.

Councilmember Johnson said where can we find it?

Ms. Kelly said you can go to the City Clerk's website where you go to find out information about applying for advisory Boards and Commissions and click on that link, and there is an icon there, a button there that says, "A list of MPTA (Metropolitan Public Transportation Authority) applicants."

Mr. Mitchell said thank you Stephanie and thank you Councilmember Johnson.

Councilmember Graham said I want to thank the Steering Committee for the work they've done thus far. I think it's good work. A couple of questions just for clarification and one is to the attorney. We talked earlier today in reference to the Council having the ability to withdraw names once appointed if for whatever reason we want to take back a recommendation, a nominee that serves on the Board that we can, and that hypothetically if the Mayor made an appointment, we wanted to call back a member for reasons, we could, and to make the reappointment?

Mr. Fox said right.

Mr. Graham said does that also apply to the Alliance and the Foundation and those three appointments?

Mr. Fox said I think the termination might apply, but the ability to reappoint would still fall within them.

Mr. Graham said still on us.

Mr. Fox said I need to look at the Act specific for the termination. I don't think it limits termination to any particular group, it just gives the Council the ability to terminate because even though the process provides that all the names of those three parties come through the Council, but you must follow their recommendation.

Mr. Graham said that's fine.

Mr. Fox said that's the only thing it provides for.

Mr. Graham said yes, I just want to put that on record that we do have that ability, but they would have to make a reappointment for whatever reason, for cause, we decide that a particular member needs to be recalled we can do that, but that appointment body will make a subsequent reappointment to an individual. So, thank you.

Also, I want to thank you Mr. Chairman for moving so quickly in reference to reaching out to some of the other organizations that were making appointments. I think it's really really important that we kind of know their appointments so that we can fill gaps. So, I'm not sure if you've talked to our good friend Governor Stein yet, but it would be nice for him to follow suit so we can kind of know how the table's being set so we can fill in those gaps as well. So, thank you very much for moving on that so quickly. Then secondly while we have 70 applications, I know we've talked about this, that we want quality over quantity. So, 70 sounds good, but we need to make sure that those individuals really meet the tasks for service because this is going to be a lot of work the first year and a half, two years. It's going to be a lot of work and so we need to make sure people understand that this is not a fluff board. It's going to be a working board for the first two years setting up the administration of this organization. So, I love the numbers, but I hope that you and your Committee will really scrub down to separate the best from the rest and I think the interviewing process will alleviate that and hopefully Council members can come and be a part of that, because we all have different criteria, different things that are important to us in reference to selecting an individual member. I think the process makes sense. Thank you for your work and I look forward to supporting it.

Mr. Mitchell said thank you Councilmember Graham.

Mr. Fox said Councilmember Graham, if I can follow up with you. I found the specific language in PAVE Act as it relates to removal and it says, "Each member of the Board of Trustees may be removed with or without cause by the appointing authority." So, since we are the appointing authority for the 12 members, then we would have the ability to remove a member with or without cause.

Mr. Graham said then that hypothetically [inaudible] the Foundation that we recall, they would then reappoint a new member?

Mr. Fox said then they would reappoint.

Mr. Graham said thank you.

Ms. Johnson said earlier I thought that I heard you say that the Committee would do the interviewing and then you would present the top three candidates to full Council? No?

Mr. Mitchell said no.

Ms. Johnson said okay.

Mr. Mitchell said we have not set on a number yet, no.

Ms. Johnson said are we suggesting that this Committee will make the final recommendations? Or will at some point all of Council members be able to ask those questions? Because that was one of the concerns that was shared earlier, that we would want to be able to ask questions of candidates as well.

Mr. Mitchell said so, let me address the first part Councilmember Johnson. I don't think we've come to a number how many we would recommend. I think we're going to be a recommendation slate, but still Council has the ability like we do the normal process to vote for whoever they would like, but we at least want to let you all know we have vetted, and this is a slate that we think would make a good Authority.

Ms. Johnson said okay. So, in other processes, the work group would make the recommendation for the slate and then the full Council would interview the members of the slate?

Mr. Mitchell said not the full Council. The work group would be interviewing the candidates. Council is invited to attend the interview or to a point you brought up earlier, if we want an option to view it virtually.

Ms. Johnson said okay. I would want, if you want all want to interview the slate and then maybe recommend x number of people, three to five people and then they come before full Council. I mean this process was defined by a small group of individuals, not the Council. So, is there room to tweak? Yes, there's room to tweak the process. Okay.

Ms. Molina said so, you can advocate for anyone on this list that you want to.

Mr. Mitchell said exactly.

Ms. Molina said even if they say that they got people.

Mr. Mitchell said that's right. We're not taking away your ability.

Ms. Molina said if you've got people on here or someone you see, you can advocate for them.

Mr. Mitchell said right, exactly.

Ms. Johnson said right, thank you, but that wasn't my question, or the process suggested.

Ms. Molina said oh, okay.

Ms. Johnson said I think you all understand what I'm saying. I mean we've done it numerous times. We just followed the process for the City Attorney. So, there was a work group and then once there are identified leaders or on the top of the pack, then when is full Council going to have the opportunity to interview those individuals?

Mr. Mitchell said oh you want the full. I look at the work group. I don't think we factor in, let's say for example the seven names we bring back and then you want the entire Council to interview just the seven we're recommending?

Ms. Johnson said yes.

Mr. Mitchell said oh, I don't even think we factored that in.

Ms. Johnson said okay.

Ms. Mayfield said so James and Councilmember Johnson, I want to make sure that I think I'm hearing you, and James, Ed, we did actually talk about this but just briefly in discussion. As far as when that 52 hours that's been identified for the interviews, that is the time, because again we were trying to be respectful of people's jobs, family, whatever, for you to be a part of the interviewing process. My expectation was that that is an opportunity for full Council to be a part of the interview process to ask questions. I was not under the impression that we were going to bring you all back a slate. We've done the bulk by identifying here's the criteria that the PAVE Act identified. Here's the criteria that we've identified focusing on the City, having the conversation and negotiating instead of three and six for us to be able to have seven and two because we really only had nine seats, not really 12. So, how do we be as representative as possible in having seven seats? Now is the time where based on whether it's the morning, the afternoon or the evening or when someone can block out their whole day to be a part of all of them to actually do the interview process and score on your own, because this is just a snapshot. Each of these applications, and Stephanie correct me, is seven pages.

Ms. Kelly said plus a resume.

Ms. Mayfield said so, 70 plus as of today, potentially 100, seven pages each, what are some of the criteria on the front end to help streamline this process and then deciding as a body what attributes are we looking for and how do we try to identify for me, gender parity, ethnicity parity, age parity, demographic parity as well as someone that not only has some of the skills but also is a bus rider not just for when you're coming Uptown for entertainment purposes. Someone that actually utilizes it for your main form of transportation. So, I was thinking that here we presented the initial, but when it comes time for the actual interview process over that 52 hours that we've said we've committed to, mainly they've committed to 52 hours that's when all of Council gets to be a part and we do similar to what we recently did and do our own little scoring as far as, "Hey, is there someone that was a standout for your in District Four based on the skillset?" For the different Districts, because honestly if we agree with the type of who is our ideal representatives and the diversity of that ideal representative, that would help to lead the conversation, but if I didn't think that there was an expectation the three of us was going to narrow down 70 to 100 people and bring back to y'all, "Here's 20 that we think you should look at, pick seven." We did our part with this presentation, but now the next step is the actual interviewing which again we've committed up to 52 hours. We're going to make sure all the times are available, but that's when full Council gets to be a part of the interview process, and the way we broke it down, we get to actually have discussion about the individual and do our own little scoring, if that helps.

Mayor Lyles said I want to make sure. Ms. Mayfield is saying that any Council member can come into this process with having any kind of conversation that you want to have, a deeper conversation or if you just want to check off the boxes. So, I think that's really the date and time for the full Council to begin that.

Ms. Mayfield said over the 52 hours.

Mayor Lyles said 52 hours, right.

Ms. Ajmera said I wanted to make sure that I'm clear as to what this working group is doing. So, from what I understand, you are interviewing all the applicants that apply. I mean I know that Council members can attend if they want to, but the working group is interviewing all applicants. Is that correct?

Councilmember Driggs said I think our original intention as we talked about it was that we would identify the people that we thought were most likely to end up being finalists, but any member of Council who doesn't see a name they like on that list would then nominate someone else.

Ms. Ajmera said would add. Got it.

Mr. Driggs said I don't think we're going to interview every single person because there will be some who are obviously really not very competitive, but nobody's going to be excluded that another member of Council wants to move forward.

Ms. Ajmera said got it. Okay, so you will all provide us a list and enough time.

Mr. Driggs said right, and the time.

Ms. Ajmera said enough time that we can add if we want to add an individual.

Mr. Mitchell said so, and to take it a step further Ms. Ajmera, our goal, we're going to meet this week. So, our goal is to have that list ready by Friday so Council can see who is scheduled for interviews.

Ms. Ajmera said got it. How long is the interview slot per person?

Mr. Mitchell said so, 20 minutes for Q&A and then five minutes for us to do the evaluation. A total of 25.

Ms. Ajmera said so, I wanted to follow up on something that Councilmember Graham brought up, termination. So, I just want to make sure I understood this correctly. So, let's say in a hypothetical scenario, the City has 12 appointments total. Technically it's not 12 it's seven plus two by the Mayor. So, technically it's nine. So, let's say if we want to recall one by the Business Alliance for an example, would it go back to the Business Alliance or would it come the City?

Mr. Fox said the removal provision is only a paragraph long in the Act. So, it doesn't get into great specificity about removal, it just gives and confers upon the appointing authority their ability to remove. If you remove though, then you go back to how do you appoint. The appointing is specific under the PAVE Act in that the Alliance has the ability through our process to recommend a person or individuals for appointment and the Act provides that we must appoint those people as recommended by them.

Ms. Ajmera said so, we'd back to the appointment process? It'll go back to the Alliance?

Mr. Fox said right.

Ms. Ajmera said got it.

Ms. Watlington said that helps answers my question just for reference. I see it under 907c is where it says that. That it goes back to the appointing authority charged with the responsibility for making such appointments pursuant to section 905. So, yes, it'll go back to the Alliance, but it sounds like we could end up in a [inaudible] loop if we keep saying, "Nope, nope, nope," but that's neither here nor there. Two things. As it relates to this interviewing process, the sense that I got, and I know we've talked about it a few times, but I still feel like there's a couple of different versions floating around. I just want to make sure that every person who meets the basic requirements here lives and has filled out the application to speak to their qualifications as outlined here is entitled to an interview.

Ms. Ajmera said no.

Ms. Watlington said so, I struggle with that.

Mr. Mitchell said so, doc, let me see if we can meet you halfway. Our goal was trying to, and Councilmember Graham touched on it, try to go through all the application and try to pick out what we think is the quality of people serving on the Authority. We would show that list to the whole Council. If you see someone on the list who you think should be added, then you can send us an email and say, "I think John Doe needs to be added

as part of the interview process.” So, we’re not taking away opportunities, but the work group has agreed to kind of roll up our sleeves and kind of vet and make sure we have quality people moving forward.

Ms. Watlington said so, we will see all of the applications in their entirety [inaudible]?

Mr. Mitchell said yes, all seven pages and the resume, yes. You will still see those on November 10, 2025.

Ms. Watlington said okay. Okay, and then thank you for that clarification. Then the only other thing that I wanted to lift up because I think you’ve captured the items that were laid out in the Committee this morning. The only other one is one that I brought up earlier, I want to make sure that I raised. I have not seen it in here specifically, legal authority to give our appointments to a Mayoral seat. So, if the group is good to move forward, I can support, but I just want to lift up that I would not be surprised if that was challenged at some point simply because the specificity within which these appointments were made down to the business community. You have to make this appointment upon the recommendation of so and so. So, to give appointments away to another Body, I just think that we maybe have a risk there, but I’ve heard what the attorney said earlier today, but again, I think this is a little bit different than simply determining whether or not we’re going to whittle down a list through a subgroup or not. So, I just wanted to put that on the record.

Ms. Mayfield said can you clarify that last point? I’m hearing you say giving it to another Body.

Ms. Watlington said yes, sure.

Ms. Mayfield said Mayor, for the minutes, I just asked Dr. Watlington to clarify her last points of giving it to another Body. I want to make sure I’m understanding.

Ms. Watlington said yes. So, down here in the appointments. So, in 905 where it talks about the appointments and it says, “Twelve members appointed by the Governing Body of the largest municipality in the County that created that Authority,” which would be the City Council who’s the Governing Body of the largest municipality in the County, the City of Charlotte, “At least three of these appointments must be made upon the recommendation of an entity that represents business interests in the County.” So, we’ve already talked through that, but obviously the appointment itself is made by the raising of the Council’s hand based on a recommendation. “At least one of the remaining nine appointments by the Governing Body must be an individual that has experience owning or operating a small business as defined in subdivision one of the subsections,” and then it goes into the General Assembly. So, what I’m talking about here is where it says, 12 members appointed by the Governing Body with the business community even though they have the recommendation, the actual appointment is made by the Governing Body. So, when I hear that we are saying that we want to allocate two seats to be appointed by another Body, i.e. the Executive Office, the Mayor, that feels like a departure from what’s here. Again, I’m prepared to support, but I just am lifting up that this feels like a risk here.

Ms. Mayfield said so, for clarification and Attorney Fox you can help with this because my interpretation is that because we are a Council manager form of government, the Mayor is part of the Council. So, because our current Board appointment process gives the Mayor’s office, whoever the Mayor is, the Mayor’s office a third of the votes. So, that’s why it was three votes and us having six, but what we did was reach out and have a conversation with the Mayor to say, okay two, instead of what traditionally has been done with our Board process, of which she agreed to which gave us the ability to have seven seats instead of six seats.

Ms. Watlington said so, I would say to that, and I spoke to this a little bit this morning, the difference to me with that is that our other governing Boards or our other Boards and Commissions either having the by-laws of a nonprofit that you’ll have this seat, or

we ourselves are deciding what the composition of that Board is. So, that to me is clearly within our authority to decide where those seats come from, but it sits somewhere in a document, even on Boards like the Housing Authority that have appointments from different Bodies within their governing structure it says where those appointments come from. So, that's totally fine. In this case I'm saying if this is that document, I don't see it here, and as it relates to the Mayor being a member of Council, I think that the definitions in General Statute 160 would indicate that those are two different offices, but again, like I said, just risks.

Mr. Fox said what you're doing, you're parceling out the actual action of this Body. The action, be it two from the Mayor and seven from the Council, will be the Governing Body's action that will be forwarded on as well as the three from the authority. That will be the action of the Governing Body. I understand what you're looking at. You're looking at the power of the Mayor versus the power of the Council and you're looking at the rote language of this which talks about the Governing Body making appointments, but the Act also allows each of the appointing authorities to establish their appointing process consistent with what their practices are. The practice here has been from a traditional perspective to allow the Mayor to have some appointments. As I would see it though, if this action were to pass, the Mayor would appoint two people. Those two people would be joined in with the people appointed by this Council and that would represent the action of the Governing Body going forward.

Ms. Watlington said so, similar to what's in here with the business group, why wouldn't it follow the process the same way? I see where you're coming from, I'm just offering a suggestion. Could it be then just like where it says, "At least three of these appointments made upon the recommendation of an entity that represents business interests." So, obviously the official act is us raising our hand based on the recommendation, but just for consistency sake, could we follow that same process?

Mr. Fox said yes, I think the action would be at the point on November 24, 2025, when you would forward this on to the newly formed Transit Authority, that action would be that the City of Charlotte Governing Body appoints the following individuals. They'll be 12 of those people, three of which would have been the recommendation of the Chamber, two, if this passed, would be the recommendation of the Mayor and the remainder would be the recommendation of the Council.

Ms. Watlington said okay.

Councilmember Brown said it's been a lot going on. So, for the record, I don't support it at all. I'm a no, a big no. From all the information that I'm hearing from people reaching out to me, and I'll be advocating for no in November 2025 as well, so the PAVE Act shows that you get two appointments? Okay, I'm asking.

Mr. Mitchell said yes, I think, and correct me City Attorney, 27 positions have to be appointed and we have 12 and if we don't appoint our 12, they're still going to set up [inaudible].

Ms. Brown said Dr. Watlington is researching that for me since I just got [inaudible].

Mr. Mitchell said they still will set up an Authority.

Ms. Brown said okay, alright. Got that, no problem. So, for you Ms. Molina, I see your name is number one on the list. I love you and I think you're amazing and all of that, but this is a red flag for me.

Ms. Molina said are you asking me [inaudible].

Ms. Brown said no, I'm just making a statement. For me, it's a red flag. Some people have some concerns about that, and I would be less than the Council representative of the people if I didn't ask. So, with that being said, they've said, "Are you going to recuse yourself from the list or are you going to move forward with trying to be appointed?"

Ms. Molina said oh okay.

Ms. Brown said that's a question for you.

Ms. Molina said oh okay. So, first I'd like to speak to why I'm on the list. I think that makes the most sense. I'm currently the Vice Chair of Transportation Planning and Development for the City of Charlotte and I have a few years of knowledge base that can be absolutely beneficial to this Body. I have a day job. So, they're not even paying money to do this. This is literally me on my own accord saying I have four years of knowledge base where I've actually contributed to this conversation in a leadership role and I'm willing to offer my time to translate on this Body so that there can be continuity in that knowledge base.

Ms. Brown said [inaudible].

Ms. Molina said I could retire it and go home and spend that time making good money and spending it with my children which I'm tempted to do based on how this conversation goes. So, I have to recuse myself I believe because of what would be considered a conflict. In other words, I can't vote on myself, right? So, if I'm one of the people who are selected by this Body to move forward, then I would actually have to recuse myself which actually I've been weighing. The reason why I'm at the top of the list is because I was the last person to apply. Actually, they're in order by date. So, that's why I'm at the top because I just applied on October 5, 2025. One of the things that is a challenge for me is even in order to contribute my knowledge base, because of the overlap in time I have to give up my right to vote which is more important in some cases than it is for me to actually be on this Body.

Ms. Brown said right to vote in November 2025?

Ms. Molina said well no, the right to actually vote on the actual candidates once they're decided by the Steering Committee. So, the Steering Committee is going to bring us some suggestions and then we have a right to go and see those interviews if we choose when they go through the interview process. I can't even be a part of that because potentially I could actually be an interviewee. So, it's a risk for me because I risk losing my voice to offer my information, and I risk being a part of the process. I don't need any more titles. I got all the titles I can take. I got a lot of education. I think we've done great work over the last two terms. I'm very proud of that work, but I can also contribute to this Body because I actually currently sit in a leadership role and it'll be over on December 1, 2025 and the articles of incorporation for this Body won't even happen until weeks later. So, there's only about a week overlap from the time that the Council will make this decision and the time that I will no longer be a Council member. So, it's about a week or two lapse.

Ms. Brown said okay, alright. So, yes, this information is not for me it's for constituents.

Ms. Molina said no, I get it. [inaudible].

Ms. Brown said I'm just asking the questions from the constituents. So, your accolades, that's fine. You are a phenomenal Black woman. I don't deny that. That has nothing to do with the questions that the constituents are asking me to ask and that's why I'm asking them. I asked one for the Mayor and I asked one for you. I can understand why people would say no, though. It's been a lot of chatter this morning. It seems like a lot of confusion at this dais right now and so I can understand why some people are saying no, and me being one of them.

Ms. Molina said well I don't think they said no because of me. I think they said no because of the process.

Ms. Brown said I didn't say that.

Ms. Molina said oh okay.

pti:mt

Ms. Brown said I didn't say that.

Ms. Molina said I just wanted to make sure that that's clear.

Ms. Brown said that's not what said. I said the confusion.

Ms. Molina said okay.

Ms. Brown said I didn't say saying no because of you Molina, I'm just saying I'm speaking and whether people like it or not, I'm going to do that in the way that I want to do it because this is my voice. I have one of the 11 around this dais until December 1, 2025. So, I'm going to exercise my right to the fullest. So, that's all I have.

Ms. Molina said so I guess while we were talking about this, I want to make sure that I'm clear. I got the language. I spoke to Dr. Watlington today because there was some confusion in the language of what was actually said, and it said that a Council member cannot serve concurrently as they serve on this Board. So, there is no concurrent service in me assuming this volunteer role after being on Council. Like I said, it's one of those things where I may even still walk away from this and take my knowledge base home. It's a possibility, but I do have in both my public work and my private sector work something that would be extremely valuable from my years of work on the Council, and primarily of being Vice Chair of the actual Transportation Board for our City. There's always these narratives that just try to twist things and turn them into things that they're not. This isn't something that you're getting paid for. There's no pay for this. This is literally I'm saying, "Hey, we got this very important Board, and I understand it very intimately because I've been and intimate part, a very close part of the conversations, and I'm willing to continue that service." So, this is also a decision. It doesn't automatically qualify me. So, if that is the will of this Council or even another entity, then I'm willing to at this point, at this moment unless that changes, be considered for that. I'll leave that there.

Mayor Lyles said thank you.

Ms. Brown said your accolades are amazing. Again, the question was not a personal attack.

Ms. Molina said I understand.

Ms. Brown said the narratives that you said, I would have to come back on you with that.

Ms. Molina said it's not for you in particular.

Ms. Brown said okay.

Ms. Molina said so, don't take this as a shot.

Ms. Brown said okay.

Ms. Molina said this is something that, like you said, we had the conversation in Committee this morning and there were other colleagues around the table that had very similar concerns.

Ms. Brown said yes ma'am. Okay.

Ms. Molina said like, what would it mean? What did the language say? So, you're not the only one. I don't want to feel or make you feel as though I'm singling you out. I think it's a valid concern because I am sitting here with you, but the reason why I could potentially be also a good candidate to participate in this, is because I have been sitting here with you and I have been in leadership around the transportation conversation. So, being willing to translate that into this Board among other leaders, I think could be

valuable for the City and the continuity of information in our City and the region. So, that's why I put my name in the hat of course, but again, this is a selection process. I could apply for the County and not even have to go through this and they actually would select after I'm off the Council. So, it would even be much easier for me to say, "Hey, County, do this," but I think in all transparency, first I wanted to make sure that you knew that I was willing to offer myself in this level of continuity because that's important. In the spirit of transparency, I probably may even consider the County, but I don't know yet, but like I told Dr. Watlington, I think the strongest endorsement, it's like any job that you have, the strongest endorsement are the people that you've actually worked with. So, to say that I've stood among other people in the application process and if I, among these people, earn a right to sit in that seat and I'm properly qualified, and it's an endorsement of my colleagues, then I think that's more powerful.

Ms. Brown said thank you for your full explanation. Thank you.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, thank you. A couple of questions. So, for the working group.

Mr. Mitchell said yes ma'am?

Ms. Ajmera said as part of your process will you be making recommendations for the Mayor as well as the Council appointments?

Mr. Mitchell said oh no [inaudible].

Ms. Ajmera said not for the Mayor appointments, just for the Council appointments? So, you'll be making seven recommendations?

Mr. Mitchell said yes.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, and just like any other Board, Council doesn't have to follow those recommendations? They can select whoever they like?

Mr. Mitchell said [inaudible].

Ms. Ajmera said okay. So, was there any conversation about recommendations for the two Mayoral spots?

Mr. Mitchell said no, there was not. I think we were trying to go by what's in the Advisory Handbook that the Mayor has one-third appointment and we don't have any feedback with the Mayor currently now. So, we were trying to model that same behavior.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. So, this question is for Mr. Fox. In anywhere in the PAVE Act does it say anything about the Authority's Board and possible compensation, or does it strictly say it's a volunteer role?

Mr. Fox said it doesn't say volunteer and it gives the Authority I believe the ability at some point to set compensation if they choose to. There's nothing in the Act that currently sets any compensation for any Board members.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, so Authority could choose to have a compensation?

Mr. Fox said yes, they could.

Ms. Ajmera said nothing prevents them from doing so?

Mayor Lyles said right.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, I think that needs to be a factor into consideration as we're making appointments. Well, that's all I have. I'm sure I'll have more questions. I'll come back to you Mr. Attorney. That's all I have, thank you.

Mr. Mitchell said so, Mayor and Council, here's what I will say. We're on a fast track to participating in, I think, something that is very important for our region and for our community. So, no, is this a perfect system? It's not, but I do think it's a system that will work, and it has the flexibility of getting the recommendation but also it doesn't take away your power to vote for someone you would like to be on the Authority. I said that to say that I hope that we can get everyone to agree that we need to move forward with the process so we can participate and make sure our 12 are part of the Authority.

Mayor Lyles said so, with that I do believe that we should have a motion and a vote so that we can move forward I think from the discussions that we've had today so that we codify this process.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Peacock to accept the work group process recommendation to make our appointments to the MPTA.
--

Ms. Johnson said maybe the news is different in District Four, I don't know, but we have a challenge guys with perception and with transparency, and I just think we should've worked overtime and double time to make sure that we were moving forward with the transparent process. Like I said earlier, the work group wasn't a Council directive, that came from the Mayor's office. The fact that we're pulling two of our appointees for the Mayor's office, and with all due respect, the gray area of a Council member and the overlapping time member, it's more of the same and people are tired. So, I won't be supporting this process. Again, I don't think that we've listened to the community enough even for the tags. So, I won't be supporting the process. Thank you.

Ms. Mayfield said I would just like to ask a clarifying question of Councilmember Johnson. Do you have a recommendation of something other?

Ms. Johnson said something other than us receiving an email that there was a work group, yes.

Ms. Mayfield said so, that's what I'm asking for right now. Do you have a recommendation of a process because right now based on the mandate from the North Carolina General Assembly, we have a very short window that we have to make our appointments. So, that's why I'm asking if you have a recommendation of what that would look like so that we can try to figure out how to move forward. Because one of the questions that I asked the Interim City Attorney is, because we thought about any potential scenarios, what if we don't get to the point of moving this conversation forward and we don't get to our seven, 12, whatever that number is and we don't get to our appointments? What happens then? That triggers a whole lot of other things based on the fact that North Carolina General Assembly sent back to us something that was very different than what we asked for. So, if there's a recommendation of a better way for this to be done, that's what I would love to hear.

Ms. Johnson said well I talked about before, I think that there should be a very open process. I've mentioned that before. Vetting the qualified candidates, putting them in categories and then you could pull from a lottery system. A random drawing.

Ms. Mayfield said okay, so I hear the concern as far as why were three people chosen to at least come back and bring a proposal, but the idea of saying, "Okay, between the 52 hours that gives everyone the opportunity to interview," I wish that there was a space for us to actually come together with here's our top five criteria that we're looking for, but let's have a real conversation. For our regular meetings and for majority of the meetings, multiple people run anywhere from 30 to 45 minutes late. We all went through something earlier this year, because someone just had a whole lot of time on their hands, to actually look into our attendance records to show that there were a number of people that were out. So, me and Mayor Lyles go back and forth everyday all day and at least two and three times on Sunday. So, when the idea of, "Okay, what are we going to

do?” So, we’re just making a recommendation right? Okay, the recommendation is supposed to come back to full Council, but there’s a reality that we must acknowledge that people don’t come to the regular meetings on time. You don’t come to the Committee meetings and I’m not saying you individually, collectively. We can’t be in on time at the meetings now, so this was in an effort to try to do a good thing. It was not done, in my personal opinion, this was not done with any malice or any disrespect. It was, “Hey, will a couple of y’all get together and start this process so that we can move it along?” “Sure I don’t have a life, so why not?” Let’s go ahead and spend a number of hours, but what the expectation really was that we have to have space for our colleagues. They’re going to commit to 52 hours and that way we have to make sure that everyone’s voice is at the table. I actually asked that question of, “Okay, well how do we actually try to streamline this if we’re going to have 70 to 100 people that apply? What are we looking for?” That’s a space for full Council to come around and I think that part didn’t get expressed. So, if there’s a different process where you think we can come together within the next 72 hours when this application closes on October 13, 2025, that’s what I would really like to hear because hell, I want to support it. If you don’t like this process, give me another process because it can’t just be, “I don’t like this.”

Ms. Watlington said [inaudible] just saw it today.

Ms. Johnson said even the three of you, the Council wasn’t asked. We didn’t all receive calls if we want to participate on this work group. So, again, I talk about the machine and how things are done. So, this is why people are frustrated and non-trusting of the process and when you talk about quality candidates, I hope that there’s going to be a fact base or some type of rubrics or some type of scoring before we allow certain Council members to say, “These aren’t quality,” because we know that there can be some level of bias, right?

Ms. Brown said yes.

Ms. Johnson said so, yes, we want to make a very fact-based decision before we eliminate individuals also I would think.

Ms. Mayfield said so, just for clarification does that mean that what you’re saying is you’re willing to help create this rubric that you’re recommending that we use?

Ms. Johnson said sure. We have a whole HR (Human Resources) department. I mean we can use very objective factors. It just seems predesigned on who’s going to be on the Committee.

Ms. Brown said I definitely don’t disagree with you, Councilmember Johnson.

Ms. Mayfield said well in a dream world, just for clarification, we would’ve had 11 appointments and that way everyone would have at least their one to speak to. So, the two At-Large were saying, “You know what, we’re going to get the seven Districts, we’ll try to reach out and have a conversation with you to see if there’s someone in the District that we know or if we have any inside,” but that’s what the hope of after this initial, “Hey, can we move forward?” Didn’t we have that conversation? At the end of the day, the great thing is the way this system is set up, it takes six votes. So, either six are going to move it forward or not, but we have to have some type of process before the General Assembly comes in and try to appoint all 11.

Mayor Lyles said we have a motion on the floor.

Ms. Brown said and you have a second.

Mayor Lyles said and we have a second.

Ms. Brown said yes ma’am.

Mayor Lyles said I understand there was a dialogue, but I think that right now we have [inaudible].

Ms. Watlington said discussion on the motion.

Ms. Mayfield said discussion on the motion.

Mayor Lyles said yes.

Ms. Mayfield said discussions.

Ms. Ajmera said I know Councilmember Mayfield asked for feedback on the process. I don't think we discussed this part, but what I would like the working group to do is help us with this person meets this criteria, finance. This person meets engineering, this person meets architecture, this person meets public transit experience versus giving us recommendations. You tell us. You're giving us the facts. To Councilmember Johnson's point, what we need is an objective process, fact based. You give us the facts, let the Council make a decision so that there is no preconceived notion of, "Oh, this person is going to get appointed." I think what we are looking for is facts. So, right now I have no idea from all of these people which one meets what. So, I think if we can have that instead of recommendations that would be helpful so that no one will feel like the deck was stacked against them or any candidate.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, and seconded by Councilmember Watlington, that provides the Council with expertise, fact based, that will tell us if that person meets criteria. Based on the facts the Council will make the ultimate decision, no recommendations provided.

Mr. Driggs said I understand what the concerns are. What you're suggesting defeats the purpose. We can spend very little time and do a tabulation on a spreadsheet and circulate it to you and say, "Okay guys, it's up to you." What's intended here is that thoughtful people, your colleagues, will look and will try to make a preliminary recommendation. You're going to get all the facts and then you're going to get little comments from us, just a recommendation. The goal is to try and help people zero in on where the strongest prospects are. It doesn't exclude anything, it doesn't limit your ability, but personally I don't see why you're better off not getting the benefit of the work, the hours and hours that we're going to spend. You can come to every single interview if you want, 50 hours, book the time, but otherwise we will have done that and we will have come back. There's a diverse group among the three of us and we will come back and just say, "This person in our mind is a rider, has the stature, satisfies Mr. Graham's priorities and so on," and then you can disagree with that. I don't see how you're better off not knowing that.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, so I think that's where the subjectivity is because we are trying to take the subjectivity out of this process. What might be the strongest candidate for you may not be the strongest candidate for Councilmember Johnson. What might be the strongest candidate for Dr. Watlington may not be the strongest candidate for me. So, we are trying to make this process as transparent, as objective as possible. So, I personally feel that if you give us the facts, I believe we are capable of making a decision. We're elected by the people, and I think we should be the ones making the decision. I get it that you're going to give us the recommendations and then we get to decide, but that's already stacked against us, and I just feel that's not the process that's fact based or that's not an objective process.

Mr. Driggs said so, no interviews, right? How does that work?

Ms. Ajmera said so, here, I'm going to break it down because I was just thinking about what Councilmember Johnson raised, and this is something that came to mind.

Councilmember Peacock said are you wanting this to be exactly like just a Business Advisory Committee where we have a lot of applications? That one seems to be a really popular one.

Mayor Lyles said she still has the floor Mr. Peacock.

Mr. Peacock said I'm just asking her a question. I'm trying to figure out her substitute motion.

Mayor Lyles said I know.

Mr. Peacock said I'm just trying to figure out, because I think what she's saying is she doesn't want any filter at all. You want all the applications to come straight through.

Ms. Ajmera said no, well this is what I'm asking. I would like the working group to give us the facts and then this Council will make the decision. So, right now we need the categories. Interviews, you can continue with it because the full Council can participate. You are not telling us not to participate, so I don't think that process is subjective because we can all participate. You give us the time and say, "Here are the times, these are the candidates that are coming. You are welcome to come and listen to them," which is fine, but I'm saying we're not taking that step out of the process. All we are saying is do not make recommendations, let Council make their own decisions based on the facts, based on the interviews everyone heard and listened to.

Mr. Driggs said so, what is the outcome of the interview process?

Ms. Watlington said so, point of order.

Mr. Driggs said so, a certain number of people will be involved in the interviews and what are they going to do, write down what, this is what they said we can provide, recordings of the interviews and then not opine any further? So, you can have a package that has all of the data, which is 500 pages, and you can have 50 hours' worth of recordings, each one of you, and then you can decide. I just don't understand why it isn't clear that if 100 people apply for this, they're going to be some people among those applicants who are not going to make it to the final seven, let's be clear. That's all I have to say. If that's what you want, it's easier for us, I'm fine.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, no I understand but I respectfully disagree. I personally think this process needs to be as objective, as fact based, as transparent as possible so that Council makes a decision without any recommendations because I just personally think that what might be important to the three of you may not be important to the others. They might think the strongest person might meet different criteria from different Districts. So, I think this keeps the process fact based.

Ms. Watlington said thank you Councilmember Ajmera for putting this on the table. I support your motion because I think you're exactly right. This, what we've gone through here and what we experienced in the Transportation Committee meeting this morning to me is an exact example of some of the things that Councilmember Johnson is talking about. We don't need you to explain to us the process. We understand what your intent is, what we're very clearly telling you is we don't want your recommendation without the facts for us to make our own recommendation first. So, to me that's very clear. I think regardless of whether we're all in the interviews or not, it makes sense. I mean sure, you can probably drop that in ChatGPT and say, "Read these people's applications and slot them in one of these categories," right? That can come ahead of the interviews, but I think it is very important that we don't start filtering people out on the front end. I just don't think that is a fair process and I don't think it's necessary at this point. So, I'll be supporting your substitute motion.

Mr. Graham said two things can be true, right? We need a process that filters through the applications. Councilmember Mitchell said earlier today that the Committee will divide up the applications by categories. He said that at the Transportation Committee

so we can know which applicant fits which category. That would be a benefit to the Council. It also would be a benefit to the Council if we give them the authority to interview and I'm not a member of the working group, but I think this is so important that I'm going to make myself available to attend if not all, at least 90 percent of the interviews. The reason why I'm doing that is because I think Ms. Ajmera's right. What may be important to Councilmember Mitchell may not be important to me and I even at the Committee meeting this morning laid out what's important to me.

Ms. Ajmera said yes.

Mr. Graham said these are three questions that need to be asked to satisfy me appointing someone. So, I think we can do that for sure and I think we can accommodate what Councilmember Ajmera and Watlington are suggesting, and Johnson, that maybe it's not seven recommendations, maybe it's 12 maybe it's 14, right? These are the set of applicants that meets the basic requirements through our interview process where every Council member has the opportunity to attend and ask their particular question to give the Council at least a body of folks to choose from. Right? So, it may not be seven, it may be 12, it may be 14, it may be 15 and then have the Council as we do through our normal application process choose from that list.

So, I think we can blend Councilmember Driggs and Mitchell, Mayfield, we can blend the two a little bit to get to where we want to go. This is really, really important guys and the legislation didn't do us any favor. I've said this before, because it imposes, I think, an impossible deadline that a lot of this has to be done by the end of the year if it passes. It's just a lot going on, but we have to do it. I think we have to be very thoughtful about how we do it, we have to be very strategic about how we do it. That's why I think Councilmember Mitchell, we need to have everybody place their cards on the table so we can fill in gaps where they exist and really give all our Council members more than a feeling that they are a part of the process and that we're not hiding anything or that this thing's already baked.

Mr. Mitchell said right.

Mr. Graham said so, hopefully there's a way that we can blend this and I think the substitute motion may accomplish that maybe Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Driggs.

Mayor Lyles said I would hope that the idea around how we use technology that we're going to have a process that, I think it was all of the people on this list, they had the opportunity to be interviewed if they come in and talk and discuss it and that maybe at this place that there's something that we actually have Council members have the ability to see it virtually or sign up for any part of this, because I know it can be a lot of work to get in and out of every place. I think that what you're saying is that everyone should have the opportunity to have this discussion and have it in a way, I believe, that is 20 minutes and five minutes and then you have fairness among everybody on this set for doing that.

Ms. Ajmera said Councilmember Graham made a suggestion so I wanted to ask a follow up question for clarification. So, Councilmember Graham I just want to understand. So, you would like recommendations from the Committee. Is that what you're asking for?

Mr. Graham said I think the Committee can give us recommendations. I think we have seven appointments. I think we can go more than seven recommendations, right? Then allow the Council to filter through 15, 16, I'm just throwing out a number based on those interviews, those criteria, and again if everyone thinks it's really important, that they would lean in and attend the meetings. That's the work, right? That's what we all signed up to do. That's the work.

Ms. Molina said wouldn't that require a friendly amendment making [inaudible]?

Ms. Ajmera said that's what I'm thinking. Like I'm trying to figure out how many recommendations that you are looking for Councilmember Graham? I'm trying to figure out a difference here. So, over here one side no recommendation, here they want to give seven recommendations. I'm trying to figure out what is it that you're looking for because ultimately, it's going to take the majority to move this forward.

Mr. Fox said if I can, I think the substitute will need clarification because I was talking with the Clerk and we're trying to understand what is accomplished in the substitute. So, I think it needs to have some meat on it. Is the substitute to adopt the recommendation of the Committee but for making recommendations and only providing objective criteria on the pool of candidates that are being presented? I don't know. You need to clarify that.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I think you nailed it. We are okay with what the Committee's doing in terms of the interview process. What we would like to do, at least for me, is no recommendations made to the Council. Council will make a decision on who they would like to appoint based on the facts that's been provided and the category that each candidate meets.

Mr. Fox said okay. This is important work for this Board because it's going to set the future of this Authority. You might want to then allow the Committee to put it in buckets, maybe most qualified, qualified or least qualified in terms of categories but not rankings and still allow you as a Council to select from within that coupling of the candidates that you want to do. Obviously, that will include how those candidates otherwise qualify in the areas that they qualify in. Whether this is a candidate for law, these are five candidates from law, I don't know, you need to figure out that structure.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I hear what you're saying. So, I think that's where we have to define what most qualified means versus least qualified versus in the middle to make sure that a decision is fact based again, and then it's objective. So, there's a lot that needs to be worked out still. I don't want to say anything else. I'm good.

Mr. Driggs said I'll just say you will get all the data. Everybody will have all the data, right? You can read or not read the recommendations. They're not binding.

Mayor Lyles said there's no recommendations.

Mr. Driggs said the idea is simply to provide assistance in reducing a large number, rather than having 11 people look at 100 applications, that's all.

Ms. Johnson said [inaudible] recommendation? So, the application deadline is October 13, 2025, right?

Mr. Mitchell said Monday, yes.

Ms. Johnson said that's a week from today.

Mr. Mitchell said yes.

Ms. Johnson said you're asking us to really get down in the weeds and work out some process. Can we defer this vote for another week and then we work out the bugs and a process and then we can vote on it next week? I don't know if we leave the substitute motion hanging or how this works.

Mayor Lyles said I think we have a substitute motion on the floor.

Ms. Johnson said you know we want to be somewhere in the middle but you're asking for details today that I think we're taking a lot of time with that.

Mayor Lyles said I think that the attorney was suggesting a process that was not necessarily detailed, it was just defining buckets and whatever. That's what I heard him say.

Ms. Johnson said if the application process is not even over until next Monday, we can't do anything before then.

Ms. Ajmera said oh, right.

Mayor Lyles said that is correct.

Ms. Ajmera said that's true.

Ms. Molina said a point of clarification. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear. It sounded in my opinion that you two were attempting to try to come to a consensus, and I think based on what I heard and maybe it was interpretive that you landed somewhere close to the same thing. You said that there was an ability to bring forward more than just seven and it not just be solely a recommendation by the three members of the Board and you are asking for transparency in how those recommendations are being qualified, right? I agree with Councilmember Graham. I believe both things absolutely can be true at the same time, and I don't think we put a stipulation on that number. There may be between now and next week 20 people, 30 people who are qualified and I think if that means in this 52 hour window where they're 20 minute increments and then it's over a certain amount of time as well, then anyone of us that are interested and available to this process can be a part. It's going to be streamed online. So, it's going to be available online for the public consumption. Any Council member can actually be in the room. All of the names are already online, and I get it. I live in the same world as you guys do. I understand the need for transparency, and we are bleeding when it comes to transparency and operation. So, any opportunity that we can get to allow our Trustees to say, "Hey, we want you to know what's going on." So, your point is not lost on me and I'm struggling with how to make sure that what you're asking, which is absolutely valid in my mind, how do we achieve what you would like to do and even taking the friendly amendment suggestion from Councilmember Graham and saying, "We could do both." I believe we could do both and I'd like to even make a friendly ask to you that you summate that. Say, "Look, there's no amount," right? If at the end of this process they come up with based on these qualifications that they're 30 members, and I'm just being hypothetical, but not putting a limit on what that looks like and we have criterion that we have to pay attention to. So, I think you, like I said, make a valid point in suggesting criterion if they're going to make a suggestion to us. There's no limit on the amount. It's all available to us. Again, it's streamed online. Any one of the Council members that are you know, available to go to these meetings can. Is that something that sounds correct Councilmember Mitchell? Help me. In my mind, and maybe I'm hearing it differently, but it sounds like the two of them are almost there.

Mr. Graham said I'm not sure we're going to solve this around the table tonight. I think Councilmember Johnson makes a good point that we have another week. Councilmember Mitchell, I know you put a lot of work into it and so I'm just asking maybe that we use this next week to really refine what you hear tonight and to culminate some of that so that we can all be on the same fitting on next Monday. I think there's a way for me, you, Dimple, Victoria to come together and put something together that makes sense for everybody.

Ms. Ajmera said yes.

Mr. Graham said I think fairness to the Council, we're just hearing this tonight, and so if we can put some furniture polish on it to make sure that everyone's comfortable with it and use this week to kind of talk and kind of negotiate with one another to a point where we're all satisfied, I think would be a couple of days well worth spent.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I was just going to suggest that Councilmember Graham, you read my mind. I really like the idea that Mr. Fox suggested where we come up with some

criteria as most qualified, qualified, least qualified like buckets. That will help, that would be fact based, objective and as transparent as possible without putting the subjectivity of recommendations into the process. So, if the working group can consider that and bring back the process next Monday, that would be helpful.

Mr. Fox said it sounds like there is some appetite for a deferral. You have two motions.

Mayor Lyles said yes, that's what I was going to say. We have two motions.

Mr. Fox said you have two motions on the floor. You need to withdraw.

Mayor Lyles said so, we'll have to withdraw the motion to put something on the floor?

Mr. Fox said the maker of the motion of Councilmember Ajmera and Ms. Watlington, you agreed to withdraw and then you want to make a substitute motion to defer?

Ms. Ajmera said yes. So, I will withdraw my substitute motion.

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, and seconded by Councilmember Watlington, to defer the process on Appointments to the Metropolitan Public Transportation Authority to be finalized on October 13, 2025.
--

Mayor Lyles said that feedback would go to the group that's working on this? Okay, alright. Is everybody clear on that?

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I just want to make sure that whatever the process is, it takes into consideration objectivity, fact based, as transparent as possible. So, we're taking this objectivity out of this process from the Committee.

Mayor Lyles said okay.

Ms. Ajmera said alright, that's all I have.

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

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: HOUSING TRUST FUND RECOMMENDATIONS

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to recuse Councilmember Watlington from the discussion and the vote on October 27, 2025.

Councilmember Mayfield said so thank you everyone. We are going to try to be very brief because we want to be respectful of time. So, I am turning this right over to our Director, Ms. Rebecca Hefner.

Rebecca Hefner, HNS Director said thank you and good evening, Mayor, members of Council. I'm Rebecca Hefner, the Director of Housing and Neighborhood Services. I have with me this evening Warren Wooten the Assistant Director for Affordable Housing and I just want to also acknowledge in the room quite a few of our Affordable Housing Development partners who are here tonight. None of this work happens without them and they have been working hard to bring us proposals that are responsive to your investment priorities and your affordable housing funding policy. So, I'm glad so many of the are able to join us tonight. If anyone happens to go back and see any of the Housing Safety and Community Committee meeting, you will find that it is entirely possible for me to talk at double speed. I went through this very quickly in Committee and I'll try to

move just as quickly but maybe not talk quite so fast. So, tonight we're going to review the staff recommendations for Affordable Housing Development support requests that were received in response to the most recent Housing Trust Fund request for proposals. This is the second funding cycle following the expansion of the Housing Bond and City Council's adoption of the Affordable Housing Funding Policy. So, previously in April 2025, we brought forward to you the first round of recommendations. In this round you received a total of eight proposals totaling just under \$20 million in investment asks. There are proposals in here for multi-family rental development, homeownership and supportive housing. Last Thursday, on October 2, 2025, there was a memo and report in your Council packets summarizing the proposals received and, in addition, you will receive the full booklet. We refer to it as the HTF (Housing Trust Fund) booklet, but you'll get a spiral bound booklet with detailed information about every proposal. That will come out to you the week before Council action and then the vote is scheduled currently for October 27, 2025. The recommended investments will be on the Council's Business agenda for consideration.

As a reminder, in the most recent Housing Funding Policy you adopted, you were really focused not just on creating units and counting units, but on a set of goals for affordable housing and those goals are economic mobility, neighborhood affordability and residential stability. So, as staff evaluate proposals and as we work with our development partners to bring forward to you the best proposals, we're really looking through this lens. We want residents to have access to safe, quality, and affordable housing, to have access to diverse housing options across many neighborhoods and to have access to services that contribute to economic mobility. We're going to look at this a couple different ways. I know some of you like the visual version and so this is where you are right now on the Housing Bond Investment goals. So, as part of the Funding Policy you allocated specific dollar amounts as goals for each investment category. That's represented here across the bottom, rental housing production, home ownership, etc., and the dark green within there, it represents what has already been allocated to date. So, you'll see that in the first round you allocated funds across rental housing production, homeownership, rental housing preservation, and anti-displacement. We'll talk a little bit about how we're activating the rest of the bond as well, but I just want to make a note also.

So, the winter round which was the April 2025 investments that you all voted on, that's the round that typically tax credit projects are brought forward for consideration because it's aligned with the State's tax credit schedule. So, within that \$13.9 million in rental housing production, there were several tax credit developments. One, you approved two, nine percent projects. One of them was with Home Funds, one of them was with Housing Trust Fund and that did receive tax credits from the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency. So, that's moving forward and then the four percent deals are in the queue for allocation of four percent bond and tax credits in early 2026. So, everything that you approved previously is moving forward. Just a couple of notes about the different ways that staff are working to activate the \$100 million Housing Bond. So, in many years past, the Housing Trust Fund RFP (Request for Proposal) was the primary way to activate the bond, but with so many different types of investments now that you all are making, there are actually many different ways to activate the bond depending on the investment category. So, that may be the Housing Trust Fund RFP, that may be we also have a rolling RFP for homeownership, we have different programs like the House Charlotte program, the small landlord retrofit program and HVAC (Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning) pilots under housing rehab and emergency repair for example. You'll see a request for proposal that's coming forward also at the October 27, 2025 meeting for your consideration.

So, there are a lot of different components to the bond and a lot of different ways to activate your investments. So, just to put it in context that the Housing Trust Fund recommendations as part of the RFP are just one piece of the way that we work to activate those investments for you. Within that RFP, as a reminder, the Housing Trust Fund provides gap financing for affordable housing developments. This fund is replenished on a biennial basis via a bond referendum. We also included our federal allocations within the Housing Development Fund. In this particular round, we're not

recommending any awards with federal funds. It's all Housing Trust Fund bond money, but you have seen those in the past. The proposals also are evaluated for alignment with, again, the Affordable Housing Funding Policy.

Within that policy you all have identified five specific investment priorities. So, we actually work with our partners to propose and share in those proposals how they address your priorities. So, that's priority populations, specifically homebuyers, lower wage workers, households at risk for displacement, and vulnerable populations. We take a look at location priorities working with our partners to incentivize locations where investment increases housing choice. We're also looking for strong proposals around resident services. How are we able to link housing and services to really create those stronger outcomes to really meet the Affordable Housing Funding Policy goals? We evaluate partnerships and leverage and then we look for innovation. The schedule, just where we are today. We started with the release of the request for proposals in June 2025. The proposal submission deadline was the end of July 2025. We had a brief Committee discussion earlier today and then tonight we're of course talking altogether in full Council. Then City Council approval is scheduled for October 27, 2025. So, there's a little bit more time in here than usual. We want to make sure that you all have an opportunity to ask questions and get additional information, if needed, but that vote is scheduled currently for October 27, 2025. Just as a reminder, the next RFP cycle, we just start right up again. So, that RFP will be released likely in November 2025 or early December 2025, and you'll see those applications next April 2026. As a reminder those in that winter round will include the tax credits again.

So, the summary of the development proposals that were received, here you can see on the screen, you had eight proposals total. Three of those in the rental housing production category requesting just \$9.86 million or so. You had three proposals in the homeownership category, \$3.8 million, and two proposals in support of housing totaling \$6.25 million. Overall, you can see by category what type of funding is currently available in the bond. You have committed \$31.389 million and change to date, leaving \$68.6 million available. The total funding request is just under \$20 million, and so we don't leave anyone hanging, I'll go straight to the point which is that tonight staff are recommending approval of all eight of these proposals.

So, we're going to start with rental housing production. The rental housing production includes new multi-family. It also includes mixed-use and mixed-income, missing middle production, and tonight you're going to see three proposals totaling \$9.86 million in investment requests. Two of the developments have actually been previously funded and are seeing additional investment, but I'll share more details about those requests as we go along.

The first development is Kendall Crossing. This is a four percent tax credit senior. So, age restricted affordable housing that's brought forward by the Paces Foundation. This is located in District Three. You may recognize this. It was deferred in the first Housing Trust Fund round in April 2025. One of the things about a highly competitive round like what you had in April 2025 was that we had an opportunity to really fine tune some of the proposals. So, the ones that were deferred did some work to come back with even stronger proposals and Kendall Crossing did just that. They brought us back a proposal that's much better aligned with your investment priorities and so today, staff are recommending this. I'll also note this occurred in the last round, but one of the things that your staff does is work very hard to make sure that you're getting the best deal you can. So, the original asks on this one was \$6 million and your team has negotiated the ask down already to just under \$5 million.

So, Kendall Crossing, if you can imagine this, it's near the interchange of Moores Chapel Road and I-485. So, this is an area where you don't have a lot of affordable housing investment. The site has an overall location score of 21.5. It's directly adjacent to a shopping center with a grocery store and a pharmacy. This particular site is not directly adjacent to a bus route. It is in a planned micro mobility zone. So, if that work proceeds, it will be in that zone, but it is not on a bus route.

The Paces Foundation, they are a tax credit developer based in Georgia, but they've partnered locally with us previously. They developed The Legacy at Carr Heights. That was a partnership with the West Charlotte Land Trust. They are in good standing. One of the things that we do when we receive applications is check with our asset management team and make sure that our partners are in good standing and doing the things that they've committed to. So, we're excited to see them proposing another development here in Charlotte. I will say they were very responsive to the feedback as it relates to your investment priorities. So, in terms of priority populations, Kendall Crossing is serving seniors. You'll see on here they're also capping their rents at 70 percent AMI (Average Median Income) out of their total 100 proposed units and then they have come back with a great partnership and resident services that they've proposed. So, they're going to be partnering with Roof Above. They reserved 10 units within the community for Roof's Above's Link program.

The Link program connects seniors with safe, affordable and sustainable housing, in particular seniors who rely on disability or social security income. So, some of the more vulnerable seniors who are on fixed incomes and within Kendall Crossing, the resident services will be provided by Roof Above and will be tailored to the needs of seniors including case management, benefit enrollment, and connection to healthcare and transportation resources. So, I want to say we've heard from several of you and from community members about some of the long-term affordability in tax credit developments for seniors. So, I want to go ahead and address that. NCHFA (North Carolina Housing Finance Agency) and the tax credit program, we refer to it as LIHTC (Low-Income Housing Tax Credit) for short. They're specifically designed to manage and moderate rent increases but that doesn't mean that rents are capped. Housing doesn't have fixed expenses and so rent goes up, but through the program, the tax credit program and NCHFA and then through your deed restrictions, the amount that rent increases, goes up, is managed and moderated each year. What we know is that for particularly vulnerable seniors, especially those on fixed incomes, the best practice and the best strategy is exactly what's been proposed here, to work with programs that help pair rental subsidies with deeply affordable units and just as a reminder this is a really important partnership because your Housing Bond dollars cannot be used for rental subsidies. The Affordable Housing Bond is a Capital Investment Bond and rental subsidies are not an eligible use. So, these types of partnerships are really important.

Just a couple of other notes about Kendall Crossing. They're working hard to use efficient building systems that can help reduce utility burdens over time. Some of the things they have planned for the development are a dog park, urban , and then to accommodate some of the resident services, an onsite health exam room. Alright. So, that's Kendall Crossing.

The next two rental housing proposals are ones that you have seen before that are coming back in for additional investment. Council you have been typically very conservative about additional investment, the exception being during the pandemic when you had ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) dollars that you dedicated to projects that had large and unexpected funding gaps. So, I'll walk you through why staff are excited about the continued investment in these two projects.

The first is River District. This is proposed by Laurel Street Residential. Of course you're familiar with the River District. The master planned community, mixed-use community that's under way by Crescent. So, there are nearly 5,000 residences planned out at the River District. The first model homes out there are coming online now. The River District Apartments is a development that you originally approved in 2021, and it was early. There was nothing out there, it was just a concept, and you funded it early on purpose with the specific goal of ensuring that some of the first housing out in the River District would be affordable housing. So, with this additional support, Laurel Street expects that they would be able to close financing in November 2025 and actually start construction in December 2025. So, they are just about ready. They have a funding gap now of \$900,000 primarily because a lot has changed since your initial approval in 2021.

This project was funded with that ARPA investment in 2023. An additional \$2.3 million was deployed to this project and to others to support developments that had funding gaps coming out of the pandemic and River District has an additional gap now of \$900,000. There's two pieces to this gap. Four hundred thousand of that gap is a commitment from LISC (Local Initiatives Support Corporation) that they weren't quite able to meet the full commitment and then an additional \$500,000 overall funding gap. I just want to note on all of the slides and in the summary report that you received where we've indicated investment per unit, that reflects the total investments. So, previous investment plus what's currently asked, if applicable. So, it does reflect the all in amount. In this case the all in overall City investment with this addition would be \$6.7 million, putting the cost at just over \$7,000 per unit. So, you'll also note on here this is not a tax credit development. Being in a brand-new master planned community, the location is not eligible under the North Carolina guidelines for tax credits. So, it does require that higher level of support. We knew that going in. I'll note also that as part of coming back in for additional funding, staff were able to work with Laurel Street to negotiate an increase in the affordability period. It was originally approved at 30 years, and Laurel Street has committed to a 99-year affordability period, which as a reminder is the longest affordability allowed under North Carolina law.

Another piece of River District that I think is really important to note is that they have kept their commitment to three-bedroom units. So, 16 percent of the units are three bedrooms and that's really important to serve families and it's getting harder and harder. A lot of your new developments proposed have very few, if any three-bedroom units. So, Laurel Street has kept that commitment in here. So, staff recommends approval of this to advance the previously funded development, especially being so close to ability to close and it will ensure affordability out in the River District as originally intended by City Council.

The next one, you'll have to cast your mind even further back because River District was approved in 2021, Weddington Road Apartments was originally approved in 2016. So, another one. Many of you have seen this one before. The original award in 2016 was a little over \$3 million and the Weddington Road Apartments was actually delayed for quite some time by litigation. That litigation was eventually resolved. I'm sure that DreamKey would be happy to share with you some of the challenges of those years, but I think what's important to note is that that was resolved. They are trying to now advance this development, and it is consistent with the plans and the place types for this area.

So, Weddington Road Apartments is a four percent tax credit, and you may recall this came in in the last round, the first Housing Trust Fund round earlier this year. Staff recommended a deferral at that time. It came in at about \$4.5 million of investment ask which came to \$90,000 per unit when you did the all in math. So, we recommended deferral. We asked you for some time to work with the developer on options to lower the cost. So, DreamKey was able to modify some of the financials. They reduced the current ask to just under \$4 million. One way they've done that is also to increase their sponsor loan which means that they're actually putting more of their own money into the development, and it is now at an ask of \$84,000 per unit. So, I wanted to say, yes, that is expensive, and it would be one of the highest per unit investments you've made, but a couple of really important things to note about Weddington Road Apartments. So, this is located in District Seven. There's no other affordable housing nearby. You'll note in the location summary, the diversity score is 10. That's 10 out of 10 meaning this is going to be some of the only affordable housing anywhere around. So, if you're familiar with Weddington Road, right now this is a vacant grassy lot. I was able to go by and confirm that DreamKey is taking good care of it. It is nicely mowed, it looks lovely. So, it's across the street from Socrates Academy. It's just about a mile south of the new 485 interchange at Weddington. You have nearby shopping at Weddington and McKee. There's a YMCA (Young Men's Christian Association) branch there, it's close by to Beatty Park, but \$84,000 a unit.

This site is not located within a qualified census tract. So, when you think about tax credits, a qualified census track means that it qualifies for the basis boost in tax credits

and Warren was helping me with this earlier and looked it up. If you receive the basis boost, you get 30 percent higher dollar amounts in tax credit. So, without that basis boost it's a lot more expensive. One of the challenges that you've all have noted in the past with the tax credit is that the way it's designed and the locations that receive that basis boost are often lower income areas. So, it's designed to incentivize putting more affordable housing in areas that already have more affordable housing. So, this is what it costs to develop affordable housing outside of that qualified census tract.

I will also say a couple of things. DreamKey has been very committed to this development. Originally it was 72 units. They've brought it back in at 85. So, they're putting additional units out there and you see the unit mix. They have capped the incomes at 60 percent AMI and of course including the 20 percent at the 30 percent AMI. So, this is a deeply affordable development in an area with very little affordable housing. Same as I mentioned with River District, they've kept their commitment to three-bedroom units. So, in this case 19 percent of their units are three bedrooms. One thing to note, because I know this came up last time, DreamKey has not completed a new round of community engagement yet. We did extend the deadline for a community engagement meeting. That will be conducted prior to the vote, and we'll provide any substantial feedback to you at that time, but staff recommends approval to advance this previously funded development. You have about \$1.4 million I think it is, already in cost in this for the land acquisition, but DreamKey has indicated that if we're unable to find a solution here, they're likely to not be able to use this site. That funding would eventually, if the land is sold, come back to the Housing Trust Fund, but this is really for you all to discuss and probably wrestle with a little bit. Dispersion is part of your overall goal for affordable housing, and this is what it costs to do so.

Alright, I'm going to shift gears. We're going to move into homeownership. Just as a reminder, the \$25 million overall committed to homeownership in the current Housing Trust Fund Bond. We have three proposals for you tonight. The first again is one you've seen before. So, Aveline at Newell Townhomes. This is a DreamKey partners homeownership development. It is part of your Faith in Housing Initiative. It's been proposed in partnership with Newell Presbyterian Church on land they own. This was approved just in the last Housing Trust Fund round in April 2025. They're also seeing additional funds. You approved them at \$2.43 million and they're asking for an additional \$702,000. This is one that arose based on the timing that occurs with the way we bring you Housing Trust Fund recommendations.

So, when the proposals come in to us, they have been through sketch plan review with Planning, but not full Planning review. So, in this case, when DreamKey went through full Planning review, they identified some changes that needed to be made in stormwater mitigation and in sidewalk improvements. Those would have a material impact on the cost, specifically they needed to shift some of the stormwater mitigation onto the site and would've lost some of the 54 units. So, they're requesting an additional \$702,000 to keep the original 54 units as designed, and again, this is 54 units at 80 percent AMI. All in, the investment per unit is \$58,000. So, it's a little bit higher than average but it's still feasible. You do have capacity in your homeownership investment category for it and again, this is a Faith in Housing partnership that you all supported and so staff recommends approval of these additional funds as well.

Alright, so everything else is net new. So, starting with Ellington Townhomes. This is another DreamKey partners proposal. It's part of a master planned mixed income community in Grier Heights that DreamKey is actually constructing already some of it on land owned by Mecklenburg County. You may recall from the last round, Wheatley Seniors which is a senior tax credit that DreamKey proposed in the last Housing Trust Fund round. You deferred that, and DreamKey has been working hard to make some changes to that proposal. It's looking like a really strong proposal, and they plan to put it back in for consideration in the next Housing Trust Fund round, but that's also part of this same masterplan development. So, this is a site located in Grier Heights. So, when you think about Grier Heights, it's actually on the backside of Randolph Hills Apartments. It's just down the street from the CMPD (Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department) Providence Division at Wendover and Ellington. If you go out there, you'll

see they're already moving dirt. So, the infrastructure for the whole masterplan community is already underway. They got that started with some City investment, \$1.3 million in CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) that Council awarded to DreamKey as part of the FY (Fiscal Year) 2025 budget process. So, that work is already underway.

Again, this is County-owned land that the County is going to convey approximately three and a half acres in fee simple for these for sale units. The rental units are intended to be a ground lease. This is 35 total units capped at 70 percent AMI, 30 years of affordability. One thing you'll note about Ellington is a very strong site score, there's bus access, shopping center, a grocery store, credit union, medical facilities and good access to jobs. A very active neighborhood change score. So, think about Grier Heights, over 80 percent of the homes there, the single-family homes are currently renter occupied. Folks in that community are facing a lot of displacement pressures. DreamKey has been working closely with Crossroads Community Development Corporation to create affordable homeownership opportunities, both scattered within Grier Heights and then also in this neighborhood. If you're looking for a home in Grier Heights now, your median sales price is going to be almost \$500,000. So, affordable homeownership is in great need there. In addition to the housing, the site plan includes multipurpose green space, an internal trail network and greenway connection and a playground. So, part of the broader community out there in that location.

Alright, your last homeownership proposal is Unity Oaks. This is a proposal from Habitat For Humanity of the Charlotte region. This is actually a mixed income development. So, 71 total townhomes are proposed. This is also in the Newell area, also District Four and actually not too far from Aveline at Newell. This is off Grier Road and W.T. Harris. So, across from CPCC's (Central Piedmont Community College) Cato Campus, also very near the Reedy Creek Nature Preserve. One exciting thing about this is it's really bringing together several organizations who are partnering to create affordable housing and to create it sustainably for the long term. So, this is Habitat For Humanity, the Merancas Foundation and True Homes. Habitat is seeking Housing Trust Fund investment for 31 of the 71 townhomes out in the mixed income development. One of the things you'll note about the Habitat model is they are able to serve down to 60 percent AMI through their program. So, it's a little bit divided up between 60 percent, 70 percent and 80 percent and then of course there's 40 market rate units, but just note that all of the calculations here are only based on the affordable units. The Merancas Foundation purchased this land as part of their land bank efforts, and they'll donate it to Habitat upon land development approval. Then, in addition to the purchase and donation of the land, they're really designing this partnership in a way that ensures long term affordability. So, it's not often that you see 99 years of affordability on a homeownership development. So, this is how they've proposed for that to work. Ninety-nine-year restriction that these would be owner occupied and that subsequent buyers would be at or below 80 percent AMI. Habitat maintains a right of first purchase for 45 years and they've designed the deed restrictions so that it includes a shared appreciation clause. So, the longer a homeowner stays there the more shared equity they will be able to generate from that future sale. I want to just note one other thing about Habitat. You're familiar with their model and the work that they do to get residents ready for homeownership, but they've really been working recently to prioritize public sector employees, and they have a program called Money Matters that's a financial literacy course that they've been offering to employees, specifically at the Charlotte Douglas Airport and Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools. So, just one other way that Habitat is working to support and achieve your housing priorities.

Alright, shifting gears, we're going to talk about two proposals for supportive housing and shelter capacity. This category as a reminder, includes both single use and scattered site permanent supportive housing, transitional housing and emergency shelter capacity. You have \$9 million allocated in your bond for this category. You have not received any proposals or made any investments yet in this category. Tonight I'll share with you two proposals that have come in seeking a total of \$6.25 million in investment.

The first proposal is the Dream Center Campus. This is transitional housing that's been proposed by the Charlotte Mecklenburg Dream Center which is a nonprofit. This is located in District Two. You can see in this rendering, the Dream Center actually is a multi-phased development on a 13 acre campus. Their plan is to create 32 transitional homes. So, to do a little bit of math here. So, each of those homes has six bedrooms and six bathrooms. So, individual units creating a total of 192 rooms. So, that's the whole plan. This proposal is just for phase one. We'll talk a little bit about that, but the development is a partnership between again the Dream Center, which is a nonprofit, and True Homes, who is their development partner. This is a site located off of Freedom Drive just north of the intersection of Toddville and Freedom. It's surrounded primarily by single-family neighborhoods but also there are several churches nearby. This proposal is again for phase one and that includes eight units. So, again it's not as easy to do all of the math and investment per unit, but here we're referencing it as unit or room because there are 48 total rooms in these eight homes. In addition to the housing units, and you can see some it here. The campus is intended to include a 20,000 square foot clubhouse with a variety of services for the residents. In addition, I think there's a three year plan for this and future phases include a playground, recreational facilities, and additional open greenspace.

So, one of the ways that this really meets your investment priorities is serving priority populations. So, this is 48 rooms but it's transitional housing that's dedicated to individuals and families experiencing homelessness and that includes chronically homeless, unaccompanied young adults, displaced families and individuals in reentry. One of the strengths of this proposal is the resident services and the partnerships that they have formed. So, they're intending to provide wraparound services including mental health and addiction recovery, There's also going to be a teaching kitchen, gardens and farms and a woodworking area. The goal is to teach a variety of job and life skills. They're partnering with Charlotte Works to provide workforce development opportunities. They have some specific employment partners including Noble Food and Pursuit, Precision Plumbing and Interstate Electric. They're also proposing daycare services onsite and telehealth services that will be available onsite through a partnership with Atrium Health. So, the other component of this is that True Homes is proposing to build these homes at cost. So, just another way to keep this affordable. So, this is another one where the community engagement deadline has been extended. So, we'll provide any substantial feedback that we get prior again to your vote on October 27, 2025.

This is the last one I'll share. So, we're in the home stretch here. The last proposal here is the Mecklenburg County Hotel Conversion. This is intended to be a non-congregate shelter and Mecklenburg County has submitted this as a partnership opportunity to the City. So, a couple of things to note. You all and the community have been talking about this actually for a couple of years. Originally the Mecklenburg County continuum of care identified an urgent need for non-congregate shelter and they worked together to develop this conceptual plan for property acquisition and shelter operations. In 2024 this conceptual idea came forward to the Housing Safety and Community Committee. At that time the Committee reviewed the concept and asked for staff to come back when there was a more tangible plan for both the site and the shelter operations, and there is that now. I would also note that in May 2025, so a couple of months ago, Shawn Heath provided an update to Housing Safety and Community Committee on this concept. At that time, Committee expressed support for a project funding request to be presented to full Council once a specific site was identified and a more specific cost was determined. So, that time is now and the need really continues to be urgent.

So, Mecklenburg County has what they call a one number. So, the number of people who are engaged in the homelessness system is currently at 2,586 and it's on the rise. This continues to be an urgent need and when this was shared with you in May 2025, there were a couple of key aspects. One that there would be a City-County collaboration to fund the acquisition and renovation of an existing building. Two, the private sector has committed to fund the first three years of operating cost for the shelter itself, and three, a qualified and experienced service provider would be selected through a national search to operate the shelter. So, this is the proposal that is now before you.

Mecklenburg County identified a site. They have negotiated a purchase sale agreement and they're currently in the due diligence phase. This is located off of Banner Elk Drive near Beatties Ford and Sunset. The ask here is for \$4.25 million which is half of the capital cost. So, the total project cost is estimated at \$8.5 million and \$5.5 million of that is for acquisition and \$3 million is for rehabilitation. We did have a question about this earlier in Committee, so I want to share a couple of the things that are included in that renovation budget.

So, this is a hotel with 62 rooms and again, just to clarify again, the language is a little bit confusing when it comes to shelter and transitional housing. This is 62 rooms and it's non-congregate shelter meaning it's serving residents in those individual rooms and also offers an opportunity for families to stay together within the shelter. The renovation budget includes items such as additional costs for safety and security, additional lighting, the renovation in this case construction of some of the communal spaces like a kitchen and a cafeteria, rooms for counseling, rooms for onsite healthcare, space for staff. Some of the exterior improvements, cameras, lighting and access to the site. So, there is quite a bit involved in that renovation scope.

So, again Mecklenburg County would maintain ownership of the building. They would assume the responsibility for ongoing property maintenance. The plan here is a 62 room non-congregate shelter and the key piece of this is that it is onsite access to health and mental health services, especially for individuals with severe and persistent mental illness. So, this concept is directly connected to the conversations that you all have been having about public safety and quality of life. One of the important things about this proposal and what we think of as mission critical. One of the reasons that staff supports this is that some of the shelter capacity would be reserved for direct referrals from the City and County's street outreach partners. So, we're often working through our street outreach partners with unhoused individuals who are not always willing to go to a shelter, but one of the things that we know from talking with them is that one of the primary factors that they note is that they would be more likely to go to shelter services if it were in a non-congregate setting. So, we think this is a proposal that meets quite a few of those needs.

I will note that the private fundraising for the shelter operations is underway. An RFI (Request for Information) was put out earlier this year just to see would there be capacity from partners, experienced and qualified partners to do this, would there be interests and two responses were received. So, the next step would be to solicit for a provider through a full request for proposal.

So, that's eight proposals. It did take a while but I'm going to just say it was a lot quicker than the first round. We had a lot more proposals than that last time. So, again, two things. One is that it's not the tax credit round so there are fewer proposals typically in this round, but also there's a lot of uncertainty and there's uncertainty in the housing market. Our partners are facing uncertainty. We're facing uncertainty so it makes sense that there would be a smaller number of proposals. In summary, again, you have three proposals in for rental housing production, three proposals in for homeownership, and two for supportive housing and shelter capacity. You can see here the cost per unit comparing all of those proposals.

Just as a reminder, when you think about the AMI breakdown and the rent and sales price ranges, we want to make sure that you can see what those actual rent ranges would be. Again, very difficult to find housing at these rates throughout Charlotte and just a note here again, three of these are coming back in for additional support so that 226 of the units here are representing developments that you've funded previously. So, just to take a look at where you are with your Housing Trust Fund balance, again, after the earlier round of investments, you have about \$68.6 million out of the \$100 million bond remaining with these eight developments totaling just under \$20 million. If these were approved, your Housing Trust Fund ending balance would be about \$48.6 million. So, thinking about where we are in the bond cycle, that's about half the bond remaining and about the midway point. This is just another way of looking at it by investment category. So, one thing to think about is, if these recommendations were approved,

what would your next round look like? So, it's important to take a look there and in rental housing, you would have a little over \$11 million remaining which is close to the amount that you recommended for approval last time. You would have a little over \$14 million in homeownership, \$3.5 million in rental housing preservation, and \$2.75 in support of housing and shelter capacity. Then in the other categories, looking across housing rehabilitation and emergency repair, site acquisition and the Innovation Fund, you're looking at \$16.8 million remaining. Again, if these recommendations were to be approved. As a reminder, when we're talking about the Housing Development Fund following Council approval, there's also financial closings, design and permitting. So, many of the developments can take quite some time after Council approval to actually come online. So, just that reminder. That is your full presentation for tonight, and I would be happy to answer questions, and I also have Warren here to help me with some of the more details that you may be interested to know.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you Rebecca. So, unfortunately for our Committee, because of the conversations that we had today, we only had about 10 minutes to actually go through. So, this is the first time that even the Committee members are seeing the full presentation, but I would start off with a good bit of the conversation. If we can go back on the slides, the County hotel conversion piece is a concern. We had a couple of more questions. One, we love the idea of partnering with the County. The idea of cost per bed at \$137,097 or the breakdown of the investment per bed of \$68,548 for a space that's already a hotel and in Committee we didn't have the details of, "Okay this is including security, lighting, communal space." It was also a question regarding us splitting this cost down the middle as far as also one of our partners in the corporate community contributing to this. That was a question. A question I have as previously in this market as we move forward, when we come to multi-family, and we can go back towards the end where we had the breakdown that we just reviewed.

So, we in Committee didn't even have a chance to go through all of this, but let's just look at the reality of, right now I have seniors at Rodden Square Apartments. Those apartments are apartments that we help fund. It is a senior community. Because those are LIHTC deals, North Carolina Finance Housing Agency has an escalation clause in their paperwork. The federal government says 30 percent AMI, you can earn up to \$26,000. I have a senior who brings home \$987 a month. You're not even bringing home \$12,000 a year. Your 30 percent should be \$291. Her rent has gone up to \$475 plus the out of state company because it's some developer out of South Carolina that owns this building, you've now added a fee for processing. So, that's an additional \$7.95. You bring home \$987. So, if we're going to sit up here and tell the community 30 percent of AMI, but if what you're doing is the national numbers of up to \$26,000, but we have residents who are not receiving additional subsidies, who are living only on the income that they bring in. If their 30 percent is not what their rent is based on because if we truly build diverse price point housing, then there will be a balance of 30, 50, 80 up to market rate. There's a problem because in a very short period of time we are going to have a number elders who are about to be homeless in our community because of our pricing model. Mainly because of the limitations that we have in our pricing model based on LIHTC and others. Now we have some proposals in here where they're coming back for additional funds, and I do want my fellow members of Committee to be able to share their concerns regarding coming back because we've already given money, and in one or two cases, we may have already given money twice and now here's the third time. For me, of course I'm going to say, "Yay, I'm finally happy. The River District is finally happening, we put a lot of work into that on the front end." I'm going to have to check with the attorney's office because there was supposed to be a for sale component at diverse price point as well, and it looks like what's coming out there right now is starting like \$500, \$600, \$700 and up. Yet the challenges that came up is, how can we do something different? Because \$589 seems great unless you're that elder that's bringing home less than \$1000 a month and we're taking almost half of your monthly income which is leaving you very little to eat. Which, you know, people like to do on a regular basis, and/or get your medication and/or possibly pay for transportation. So, those are some of the but challenges, I know my colleagues both Councilmember Johnson as well as Councilmember Ajmera had concerns regarding the additional funding as well as others. So, I definitely want to give Councilmember Johnson and afterwards

Councilmember Ajmera a moment to share because again, this is the first time we got to see the full presentation, but I'm going to backtrack. Thank you, Manager. Thank you, Manager, thank you staff for bringing it to Committee. We have to look at doing something very different than what we've been doing.

Mayor Lyles said [inaudible].

Ms. Mayfield said it creates a lot of challenges, and the community doesn't understand that.

Councilmember Johnson said she's absolutely right. I mean we know this. SSI (Supplemental Security Income) amount I think is \$900 a month. So, yeah, the 30 percent AML, I don't know if the State will allow us to do something differently, but people are hurting. I mean I say that I don't know where people are supposed to live. I say that all of the time. I met someone who was just placed in low-income housing, and he had been on a wait list for 14 years. So, I just don't know what we're going to do if we're not building or really, really increasing our inventory. I appreciate the opportunity to go to Boston because we learned that Boston had inclusionary zoning of up to 20 percent. So, imagine if 20 percent of all of this explosive growth was required to be affordable, we could really put a dent into the deficit. Thank you for the presentation, Rebecca. I wanted to know who is the provider or do we know yet, of the Dream Center? The provider that's going to be providing the supportive services. Has that provider been identified?

Ms. Hefner said yes. So, that is a development in partnership with Noble Food and Pursuit. It's Jim Noble's nonprofit.

Warren Wooten, HNS, Assistant Director said the Dream Center is itself its own 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization who does have staff that is currently providing homeless services and case management to the population. So, they will be providing some of their own services.

Ms. Johnson said so, the Dream Center is a 501(c)(3), is that what you said?

Mr. Wooten said correct. They've been operating for a number of years here in Charlotte. They actually used to be the arms behind King's Kitchen, so the staff that were working there. That was part of Dream Center's operation. They do feeding programs and case management for currently homeless individuals.

Ms. Hefner said they're currently operating in community space in the Thomasboro-Hoskins neighborhood. So, this proposal provides both the transitional housing, but also the dedicated space for those resident services.

Ms. Johnson said Hoskins Park Ministries, do you know?

Ms. Hefner said no.

Ms. Johnson said okay. So, then you mentioned DreamKey and a transitional housing project. What project was that?

Ms. Hefner said the Dream Center is the transitional housing development. The Charlotte Mecklenburg Dream Center is the nonprofit and they're also partnering out there with True Homes, but that's separate and distinct from the other proposals that have come in from DreamKey partners. DreamKey partners is the developer of Weddington Road Apartments, Ellington Townhomes and Aveline at Newell, I think. Did I get all the DreamKey developments?

Ms. Johnson said okay. It was Mecklenburg County that's going to be looking for a provider?

Ms. Hefner said yes. So, the non-congregate shelter and again, there's a commitment from the private sector to fund the first three years of shelter operations which are estimated to be between \$9 million and \$10 million. So, that private sector fundraising is currently underway. When Mecklenburg County is able to acquire and renovate the building, they will have a time estimate for when the shelter could become operational, and an RFP will be put out at that time. Previously a request for information was sent out to solicit both interest and make sure that the budget they had identified was appropriate.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and we talked earlier about the cost, the total cost for this shelter. You said \$8 million?

Ms. Hefner said yes, so \$8.5 million is the total capital cost. That's \$5.5 million acquisition cost for the building and the site and then a \$3 million renovation budget to convert the currently 62 room hotels into non-congregate shelter including the upgrades to the rooms and then all the other components to operate a shelter.

Ms. Johnson said okay. Of that \$8.5 million, the City is going to pay \$4 million?

Ms. Hefner said the County has requested \$4.25 million which is half of the capital cost.

Ms. Johnson said then I heard United Way earlier. Is United Way putting up any of the upfront capital cost?

Ms. Hefner said so, this was originally proposed as part of the A Home For All Initiative, and United Way was leading the private sector fundraising.

Ms. Johnson said oh, so this is the Home For All Project?

Ms. Hefner said initially it was a part of that conversation and that's why United Way has taken the lead to date on the private sector fundraising, but this is a Mecklenburg County proposal.

Ms. Johnson said okay. I appreciate the homeownership as I said in District Four. I wanted to ask you. You said that Grier Heights, the average price is \$500,000.

Ms. Hefner said so, the median sales price in that area is nearly \$500,000 right now.

Ms. Johnson said now are those for new homes or has the market increased for existing homes to that point?

Ms. Hefner said that's the median price for all sales.

Ms. Johnson said so, let me ask you. Do we have programs? Because we know \$500,000 is gentrifying the neighborhood. Do we have anti-displacement dollars? Because that's what's happening when the taxes are increasing for those folks who have been there for a long time. This is a great presentation for affordable housing, but what's happening, folks are being displaced because of you know, gentrification. So, specifically she said Grier Heights was \$500,000. What tools do we have for residents who would be struggling because of the tax increase?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said thank you Councilmember Johnson. So, many things that the City has are related to what the City can do, and which is permissible by State law. So, there are senior and disabled tax relief programs. There's some pilots that we've done over the past few years like the Homes Program, but we can give you a list of what we have been doing and what's available based on what the State allows.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and I know it's off subject today, but when you said Grier Heights \$500,000, you know, folks are hurting. So, not just for me, if we make sure the residents know what services are available because again, we know that we have fixed

incomes, individuals who are not earning a lot of money. So, minimum wage is still \$7.25, and we just need to know what resources are available.

Ms. Hefner said in that vein Councilmember Johnson, I would just highlight that the Mecklenburg County Homes Program is open, and it provides property tax relief to current home owners and then we're also excited about things like the new ADU (Affordable Dwelling Units) program that offers financing for homeowners to build ADUs which is an interesting opportunity for existing homeowners to be able to actually get additional income if they have space available. So, there are a lot of things actually that are built into your Housing Bond that are anti-displacement initiatives. It's just that when we bring forward the proposals from the RFP it's typically new construction or rental preservation.

Ms. Johnson said so, we always talk about we can't build our way out of the housing crisis, but if we continue to do what we're doing, we're just never going to get out of it. I don't know where people are supposed to live. I say that all the time. I talked to Councilmember Graham about this the other night. We know that there's a population of folks that live in motels and hotels and now those are being developed. So, is there an overlay or we're going to protect people? I mean I heard you say the 2,586 individuals who are homeless, but that's not counting the ones who are living in their cars. I mean it's a problem. I think if we can, we really needed to talk about the anti-displacement. If Grier Heights is \$500,000 and we know that, what are we doing? So, thank you.

Ms. Mayfield said so, again we ran out of time. So, personally from the Committee conversations and discussions of which we definitely want to hear from Councilmember Ajmera, I personally have concerns about us. Okay we're just going to present this Committee without a lot of this conversation, would've been able to be held in Committee and just for full transparency, the idea of reconcentrating poverty is something that I never wanted. I never want us to see a development that just has 30 in it or even 30 and 50. We need the diversity because also that's going to make it much more sustainable. When we're talking about potential good partners, and when we're looking at a business that has created havoc in parts of our community, a business that has targeted specifically African-American businesses and yes I'm talking about Noble, on Freedom Drive where when we did development and we identified our Corridors of Opportunity, the only African-American owned business that was actually left and able to maintain on the Freedom Drive Corridor when all of that development happened was run out because of this one business man. Even though City wrote a contract that clearly identified some language and now we fast forward a few years and you get to present something that is ultimately at the end of the day it's going to benefit you and your family, it's a business deal, but the most vulnerable are the people who will be living in this space. If I'm already saying we're having challenges where we have elders and we have others in our community who honestly are in fear and don't share everything that's going on in their living conditions because of fear of truly being homeless. If we have multiple news articles, multiple complaints, and we know that this is a challenge and we're comfortable, then coming back and say, "Oh, but we're going to fund you to do this," and have the most vulnerable be dependent on you, we're failing. Councilmember Ajmera had something.

Councilmember Ajmera said so a lot has been said about some of the conversations we had at the Committee level. Rebecca gave an overview at the beginning of the Committee meeting about the Home Program. We are in unprecedented times with government shutdown and some of our federal funding challenges. Our resources are limited. We need to be very thoughtful about how we allocate our additional Housing Trust resources because Councilmember Johnson is right. Where are we going to keep people that need affordable housing if we start paying \$70,000 and \$80,000 per unit? We need to be very careful about spending \$70,000, \$80,000 per unit when we build affordable housing. That means we are going to have less to build more affordable housing. Some of this proposal that I've just seen, \$70,000 plus, \$80,000 plus per unit and the proposal that Councilmember Mayfield raised where you get for \$68,548 you get one bed. We need to understand that when we are out in the communities, people often ask about, "Where is all this affordable housing? I don't see anything. I'm applying,

I'm not able to get any housing." Because if we build more and more and housing prices per units continue to rise, that means we are delivering less. That means we are helping less families. That means our dollar doesn't stretch as far. So, we need to go back and start having some really tough conversations with some of these proposals. I appreciate the work of our Affordable Housing developers because they have to work with the limited amount of resources that they have, but at the same time, we are getting questions from residents where there is a very limited amount of affordable housing and we need to address that. So, when I see a proposal where it's \$70,000, \$80,000 per unit and they have come to us not once but twice, maybe three times that is a concern. I think at some point staff; you need to draw a hard line. We cannot go back to Council; we approved once or twice. This cost per unit is way too high and at the end of the day, our performance is evaluated on the number of units, number of families that we are able to support, number of children that we are able to support. So, the less families that we support, less children that we support we have nothing to show for. A few weeks ago, I was on a campaign trail and I talked to a single mom, her two children that go to CMS (Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools). She shared her experience. She had applied to eight different housing, and she hasn't been able to get any housing opportunity. They are living in a motel with two children going to CMS, no stability whatsoever when it comes to housing. So, if we continue to pay so much more per unit, we are going to fail some these residents that depend on us to produce more, produce more housing. It breaks my heart when I see young children that we are not able to support, like there are families we are not able to support. It's just heartbreaking when you see children that's just living in cars.

Ms. Johnson said it's happening everywhere and then when they are getting evicted, we're harming them because they're in places they can't afford.

Ms. Ajmera said I just want to follow through on one question. So, I just wanted to make sure I understand this correctly. So, on the Dream Center campus, which nonprofit you mentioned?

Ms. Hefner said it's the Charlotte Mecklenburg Dream Center.

Ms. Ajmera said so, that's Jim Noble? Is that the one?

Ms. Hefner said no that's a separate nonprofit.

Ms. Ajmera said so which nonprofit is the one that Councilmember Mayfield.

Ms. Hefner said Dream Center campus and Warren, feel free to answer again for me here.

Mr. Wooten said sure. So, Jim Noble was one of the founding influences behind the Dream Center. He's not the executive director. He's not on staff there. He's just a supporter of that organization. It's run by an executive director who has a staff that works with this population.

Ms. Ajmera said got it.

Ms. Hefner said Noble Food and Pursuit along with Precision Plumbing and Interstate Electric are some of the employment partners that are part of the campus.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. You talked about United Way. To answer Councilmember Johnson's question that they were leading private sector fundraising, how much did they raise?

Ms. Hefner said so, there are not commitments to date. They've been working closely with Charlotte Executive Leadership Council and the Foundation for the Carolinas. I think there's a little bit of, the private sector is interested to see will there be a hotel, how will these conversations go with the County acquisition before firm commitments are

made. Private sector partners haven't indicated an interest and a willingness to partner for those first three years of shelter operations.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. So, there are no private sector dollars raised as of right now?

Ms. Hefner said no commitments yet to date.

Ms. Ajmera said okay.

Ms. Hefner said I'm going to look at Shawn to just confirm.

Shawn Heath, Assistant City Manager said I think the way you characterized it is accurate. [inaudible] that that would be a necessary [inaudible] any City funding that is authorized [inaudible].

Ms. Ajmera said that is always the case. Yes, we always are asked to put the seed money, which is fine, but if you're not getting any private sector commitment, I mean we're paying \$68,000 per bed and you see some of this other housing. Even housing opportunities that are \$40,000, \$50,000. It's difficult for me to make sense of \$68,000 per bed when there is no private sector match.

Ms. Hefner said so, one thing I just want to put in context is that one of the things we do is line all of the proposals up together and they're not necessarily apples to apples comparisons, right? You know, you invest as a Council in a wide range of housing types across the entire spectrum from supporting the unhoused, anti-displacement, all the way through to homeownership and all of those activities cost different amounts and they cost different amounts in different places. So, even \$84,000 is not outside of the realm of what you might invest in say, down payment assistance or other types of programs. Then when you look at things like supportive housing and shelter, often times those activities can be more expensive. So, I acknowledge certainly the concern that you're raising. I just want to note that they're not always apples to apples comparison. Some of the projects might be more deeply affordable than others. So, one of the things that staff does in evaluation is look at the investment per unit per year along with the affordability to determine if it's kind of within the parameters and within the range of feasibility and also look at those valuated against what's available in each category.

Ms. Ajmera said so, Rebecca, I understand it's not an apple-to-apple comparison because a lot depends on the location, other financing, whether that's LIHTC, whether that's other money that [inaudible] involved. Like when it's Faith in Housing we know that faith communities are putting up land. So, that's why the cost per unit would go down. I get all that. So, we used to look at leverage. How much are we leveraging other financing? I don't see that on here. Like, for this hotel conversion it's great because we need to expand the capacity, but what is the other source other than the County? I remember when we did, in the middle of the pandemic, when we had a deal with Roof Above, the per bed cost was a lot lower than this because there were other sources that were involved. So, we need to look at it that way as well and we need to look at how are we leveraging other sources.

Ms. Hefner said the leverage is not on the slides today, but it is evaluated, and it's included in your more detailed packet in that HTF booklet. So, we'll make sure that you get all of that.

Mr. Jones said thank you Mayor, members of Council. I'll try to do my best explanation of this City-County opportunity. So, as you know your \$100 million in the HTF you set aside about \$9 million for supportive housing and shelter capacity. So, whatever your projects are, there's an opportunity of \$9 million for these types of projects. What Rebecca said is true. Based on the type of service level, it's difficult to take one look at a cost per unit. What's interesting about this one, if we go back to a Home For All which had some bold concepts about homelessness in 2025 and we're almost in 2026, and this started back during the pandemic, you achieved one of the goals by getting your Housing Trust Fund up to \$100 million. This non-congregate shelter is very different and

Shawn if I'm way off let me know, okay. It's not designed to just have someone live there forever. This is designed so that it is short term, giving opportunities for individuals to have opportunities to maybe at one point have homeownership. When this began, the concept was \$7 million from the City, \$7 million from the County, \$9 million from the private sector. So, the County went out and acquired a piece of property, and it appears that this public sector contribution, instead of being \$14 million would be \$8.5 million. The private sector in their fundraising needed to see something before they would really go deeply into this. Again, this something is not exactly what we have seen here in Charlotte as it relates to a non-congregate shelter. Again, when I started doing this decades ago, it was SRO, single room occupancy, but it's not called that either because the concept is people will be there over a shorter period of time to find other avenues for getting to a better condition as it relates to housing.

Ms. Ajmera said what is \$14 million? I just want to make sure I understood.

Mr. Jones said so again, years ago this concept, before anybody located a piece of property or a hotel to have a conversion, the concept was a belief that this may be \$14 million to find it, purchase it, renovate it, but fortunately it's a lot less because the County has found the property, purchased the property and the upfit with everything that Rebecca said earlier, instead of being \$14 million, appears to be \$8.5 million. When we started off again in this journey, the three-year carry from the private sector was \$9 million. So, the \$9 million investment from the private sector and the \$14 million investment from the public sector. Now the public sector's investment is closer to \$8.5 million.

Ms. Ajmera said so, what's the private sector's investment?

Mr. Jones said so, again as we started off, and it'll be whatever it takes to carry this for three years and the estimate early on was \$9 million. So, I don't know what it will be, but the commitment is to fund the operations for those first three years.

Ms. Ajmera said so, the first three years of operations? That's the County's funding.

Mr. Jones said that would be the private sector.

Ms. Ajmera said the private sector will fund the operations for the first three years?

Mr. Jones said absolutely.

Ms. Ajmera said so, once we put in \$4.2 million and the other half is paid by the County, the operations will be paid by the private sector. Do we know what that amount is?

Mr. Jones said we don't know what the amount is for the three years. What was estimated, this private sector's investment would be that \$9 million.

Ms. Ajmera said right, but we don't know how much the operations would cost for the first three years.

Mr. Jones said yes, I don't know if it would be \$12 million, I don't know if it would be \$6 million, but that's the commitment from the private sector.

Ms. Hefner said one thing I'll offer is that the reason that a RFI was published earlier this year was to confirm the estimates that were made and based on the responses to the RFI, that \$9 million could potentially cover three years of operating. So, we don't have an exact number, but our partners have been thoughtful about making sure along the way that the original estimates are reasonable.

Councilmember Graham said so, I want to thank the Committee and the staff first for bringing this to us. I think affordable housing continues to be our top priority and the way the Committee initially set this up with \$100 million, talking about production, ownership and supportive housing was the right thing to do. I think Rebecca took the words right

out of my mouth, which is all things are different, right? Different location, different housing spec, different costs. I support the River District project that's up there, but it's the River District so it's going to cost more, I would suspect. I really want to draw our attention to the supportive housing, the shelter capacity. A lot of those conversations with a Home For All started when we had people living in tents in Uptown Charlotte, rat infested tents in Uptown Charlotte. When the City and the County and the private sector came together to produce the study, a Home For All. So, we said that were going to make this our top priority to ensure that people had safe, clean housing who needed in an emergency situation. We are in an emergency situation for our community for this type of housing, which is different from your typical affordable housing. It's emergency housing, it's needed housing. When we try to, and I'll use the word really, really loosely, run people from Beatties Ford Road, we have to run them to services. We have to run them to housing. We have to run them to resources. Our capacity space throughout the City is limited. This helps with that and it comes with a cost that I think we have to pay. We have to be respectful of the taxpayer's dollars, that we're not overpaying, but it comes with a cost. So, I would hope that we would respect that our corporate community, when asked, has come forward to support us. Years ago when the Mayor asked them to match \$50 million they did. They made a commitment to be a part of the Home For All and said that they would work with the City and the County. I think they will. So, I think what's before us, and I'll talk specifically to Meck County Hotel and we'll talk about the other one later, because I hear you. This relationship with the County for housing and wraparound services is something that we've been talking about doing for years and I think we have to go ahead and write the check to support people who are literally living on the street and need some place temporary to go until we find a permanent solution. This starts a really new dialogue with the County about how we can work together, and we've been saying that we wanted to do that for years as well. So, I think that's a good really first step. I support this. It's in District Two. The County's going to be the property manager, it's going to be maintained appropriately and they're going to provide the type of service internally that I think our citizens need and deserve. So, I think we should do this. The other one is very interesting as well. It's in District Two. I asked the question too who was the developer? Who's kind of doing the day to day operations of this? So, could you answer that question one more time for me?

Mr. Wooten said so, this is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization called the Dream Center.

Mr. Graham said okay.

Mr. Wooten said it's run by a professional staff that has case managers and they're already providing services to homeless men and women in our community. This would become a permanent campus for them where they'd be able to provide supportive services from the site and also the build out that you saw on the slide.

Ms. Mayfield said [inaudible]. So, full transparency, we're going to say who is it and we're also going to say who that [inaudible] is and recognize the impact that you have had in community. So, it is part of the Noble Foundation for the minutes.

Mr. Graham said okay, point taken. Putting that aside for a second, not permanently, this is what we need because part of it goes directly to the issue that we've been dealing with for the last four or five weeks which is public safety. We have to have a facility to host and house individuals who need help, and this provides that. Certainly, I'm willing to ask some tougher questions Councilmember Mayfield. I hear you, but in terms of the transitional housing that is needed in this community, the shelters that's needed in this community, how do we get people off the streets into safe, clean, affordable housing? This is different from affordable housing. This is shelter housing to increase our capacity. It's needed. It's a public safety initiative. It's a housing initiative and it's helping people. Councilmember Johnson, when you said sleeping in the cars, some of these people are sleeping in the cars, and we get an opportunity to congregate them in that shelter and process them out to a long-term solution and if we have to have people transition in a campus environment with wraparound service already there, I think it's the price worth paying. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said so, I wanted to just say that when we talk about this campus site, it's absolutely one of the most things, and I think Ms. Ajmera talked about children, and they're ways that we can do this that this community voted for the \$100 million and they've never turned us down in terms of what we are trying to do and accomplish. I think the campus idea, being able to actually have a safe place to live, have your kids be able to get off of a school bus or whatever at a certain place, we have got to address the issues of homelessness. If we walk out of here tonight and you go a certain distance, people will be sleeping, and they'll be looking for some place to be and I think it's time for us to really be serious about what we're doing to help those folks and do other things as well. I mean, we shouldn't be just one thing. We need to be supportive to a number of people that need this kind of assistance.

Councilmember Molina said there's been a lot said around the dais, and I think there's been some great points. The one thing that I've said my entire time serving is that I've always believed that government is an access organization, and we intend to inform outcomes, and I think outcomes are based on a number of different things. If this is temporary shelter opportunity for three years where we have multiple stakeholders, because we need the whole community. My mind says we need the resources of Mecklenburg County because the resources within Mecklenburg County, they have different funding, and they have a different funding mechanism to be able to do more than what we can for mental health services for an example. Access to human services and that type of funding. So, I think it's unique to have a conversation where we have now Mecklenburg County at the table. I get hit hard because of, uniquely, because of relationships in the private sector, but there is no such thing as affordable anything unless we bring the private sector to the table. They have to be stakeholders in every single conversation that we have. They have to be willing to provide the jobs to the residents that are continuing to come to our City, our region because they don't have to. We hope that they remain willing to continue to partner with us in this endeavor because it's a problem that we all hold. I mean crime ends up on all of our doorsteps. So, we either get in on the front end or we're on the receiving end of what becomes crime as a result of people in need. So, it is all of our challenge, and I am always heartened when I see a diversity of stakeholders as a part of our solutions. So, Mecklenburg County as actually listed as a developer, I think is unique even listing for Mecklenburg County in our partners. One of the things I endeavored to do when I was initially elected was I looked at our budget as opposed to their budget and what they have as far as allocation is concerned and Mecklenburg County, actually this is elite for them because the largest portion of their allocation is for educational purposes. Central Piedmont is one of their largest stakeholders, you know, CMS is one of their larger stakeholders, and then their health and human services and then they do have economic development money and they're saying, "We want to bring that to bear in addition to this." So, like I said, that's one of many.

I also want to make sure that as a single mother, I've been a single mother for quite a few years with two children and that can mean different things for different people. I remember when I first, and this is a personal story, when I first went through the beginning of my story, I went to Mecklenburg County, and I had a bachelor's degree and I remember checking that I had a bachelor's degree in their application. I remember being told that, "Wow, that's not something we see often," you know as far as people who need resources, and I remember the first time they tried to send me to classes. They sent me to a GED (General Education Development) class and they told me I had to sit there and I remember thinking, and I told the woman in the class, I went to like three other classes for services and I remember the lady telling me, "Well this is a part of what we do," and I was like, "Well ma'am I have a bachelor's degree and I'm a project manager and you know, I have all of these things." There's a point to this. What I'm saying is I don't like to make these decisions in a monolith because we meet humans at different intervals of their lives and some humans need very temporary resources that get them right back on track, something like this. Like a mother who is in a detriment but maybe she's not completely low on her resources, may need something temporary so that she can stabilize. Or we have humans who are completely homeless. We have families in CMS that have absolutely nowhere to go. That is a completely and totally different signal for help. So, I challenge because I know that we have over 13,000 areas

of need and I know that we don't have money. Our need out matches our money and so I'm always on the side of where we can help, I think we should.

I think we should stretch our dollar as far as our dollar will go and I think that we should take our dollars to be of assistance and I think it'll be an incremental help. We're taking stabs at a really big issue, like a really huge issue. So, I just think that I'm afraid to make someone believe that affecting total outcomes with my language. When I speak in definition and I say definitively that this can be resolved, we don't have enough money to resolve the issue and I think making sure that we set that expectation and tell people \$100 million is a lot of money, but it is not enough money to even close to resolve the amount of need in our growing region. So, I just wanted to make sure that I was clear in saying that these are temporary resources I think, notwithstanding the amounts that may differ based on location and a number of different other things. I like the idea of incremental resources. I like the idea that we're going to meet humans in different places and we'll have other opportunities for permanent situations, but I think temporary situations are also important because there are people out there. I can speak from personal experience, who experience difficulties and they're very resilient. Someone like me, I can't say single mother the same way that someone who doesn't have the education and experience that I have. So, I'm not even going to pretend that just because I say that, that I embody their experience. Does that make sense? It means something temporary and different for me as opposed to someone else. So, that's why I shared that portion of my story to say being completely cognizant of the fact that we're going to meet humans at different places, sometimes temporary sources are very, very necessary and then maybe getting them from an outcome perspective. I think the outcome is are we intending to see somebody through to where they have a different outcome or are we just saying, "You know what, we put them in something. Yay." That's kind of the way things are handled most of the time. It's like oh we pat ourselves on the back, something's done, you know, but that's not with the outcome in mind. So, I digress because I'm rambling, but I said all that to say that the idea of transitional, the idea of temporary is a gap. It's a gap that is not always recognized as a solution but it's a part of a solution. I've always said if you grow an inch, you've grown. It doesn't mean you haven't grown. If I intend to grow a meter, I've got to grow an inch first, right, and I've got to give myself a pat on the back if I make it an inch understanding that I intend to land at a meter. So, analogously, I think the idea of some temporary solutions that are a part of our portfolio of offerings.

Mayor Lyles said I do want to remind the Council that we still have a Committee discussion, a portion of us, and as well we have a closed session that we have to do too.

Ms. Mayfield said we didn't get that. I didn't see a memo about that.

Ms. Johnson said we didn't Mayor.

Ms. Mayfield said we didn't a memo about that, seriously. The other side, Mayor, for this, hopefully soon we will be able to present something because luckily, we're having conversations with the County regarding us doing something, to me, turning this whole conversation around housing upside down and on its head, and how we really can do some work together. I highlighted the Mecklenburg County Hotel conversion because that's where the energy in Committee on the conversation was without having the full details. Yes, corporate community needs to be at the table because this is an all hands on deck. That other piece, I'm not touching. I'm just going to say now, there's no version of any alternative universe where I'm going to support putting our most vulnerable in any connection with something that long term can hurt you even more. I am not doing that, yet the County and the City are getting ready to start some very real conversations. What we also need to think about and have clear understanding on is if we're supporting anything, whether we're trying to push for a Home For All or whatever it is, if it is not going to accept families meaning that mother and father and child, that mother with a son and a daughter because what we're doing currently is splitting. We're seeing that the young men cannot go with their parent and their female sibling. You're not sending your child to a homeless shelter by themselves. It is unsafe. So, you have

couples that the women can only go here, men can go there. So, unless we're going to clearly have the language identified where families get to stay together, get to be unified, get access to the services that they need, that is what I would consider supporting. Other than that, the millions that we have put into this, we can be doing it better between the City and County because we'll have more control when we pull some of those LIHTCs out of it.

Mr. Jones said so, thank you Mayor, members of Council. I really appreciate what Councilmember Mayfield said earlier. There had been some discussion last time we went through these rounds that we didn't go to Committee first but having the Committee, having the opportunity to discuss this I think is extremely important. We have a Business meeting next week. So, on October 13, 2025, if we need to bring this back again so that you don't have to not talk about it before October 27, 2025. So, I think this has created some flexibility for good discussions and for the staff to be able to give you feedback on some of the questions, but again, there's an opportunity for us to discuss this next week too.

Mayor Lyles said okay. Does everyone feel comfortable that we will continue this discussion in the Committee?

Ms. Mayfield said I don't care if three of us show up, we're good.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 1: COUNCIL COMMITTEE DISCUSSIONS

Mayor Lyles said alright, I'll ask anyone that would like to share additional information.

Councilmember Driggs said so, it's late and therefore I'm going to take the other topic that we had in Committee today and compress it. Basically, following the deferral of the vote on the community area plans until November 2025 by 60 days. The Committee discussed today where we are and how we want to proceed. Just wanted the Council to know that work is being done on that. The staff briefed us today on how we got to where we are. They went again over all the outreach that had been done. They mentioned that we will receive packages with all the comments and with the staff reaction to all the comments. So, you will see that and they did talk in particular about work engagement they've had with the Cherry and Steeleberry Acres Neighborhoods. Those discussions will continue and I would just like to say again, we're keeping it brief tonight, but in the next two weeks, if you can bring forward any new input that you want to provide to the staff and if we can conclude our Council comment period in two weeks' time so that they have time then to act on whatever they hear and to engage with whichever residents need to be discussed, we will try to target that date that we establish before this Council dissolves in order to get those plans adopted. I repeat again, these do not modify the UDO (Unified Development Ordinance), they're just an attempt in all those different 14 areas to somewhat fine tune the plan, and be responsive to concerns that we're hearing from people that the one size fits all plan is not responsive for them. So, that's kind of where we are. I think for now I'll leave it at that. I'll mention that the members of our Committee are myself, Ms. Molina, Mr. Graham, Ms. Johnson and Ms. Watlington. So, that's what I have to say about that.

Councilmember Johnson said one of the things I'd like to see, when we had the webinars, they were very successful. We had really good attendance. I think that what I would like to see for the plans that affect or impact District Four, if we could have a webinar where I could be present, I think would be great for Council members to participate in these webinars to hear what changes are proposed and to have the residents participate as well because the problem is we didn't delay it simply to delay it. Residents want to ensure that they're being heard, and we gave an example of the Cherry Neighborhood where individuals had been involved since the very beginning, and those changes weren't being incorporated, and that's not the only neighborhood. So, what I would like to do, I'd like to hear from the residents with staff on the line. I would like to ensure that, District Four residents and the three plans that encompass

District Four, I would like a webinar or some type of meeting. I think webinars are a great forum. It worked with the presentation of the plans. We had over 100 participants. So, I think it's a good format, and I think it's a good idea if the other Council members could, I mean it's up to you all but participate and hear from the residents then you would know why we advocated to delay the vote.

Mr. Driggs said I don't question that we did delay it, but I think the staff did explain to us today in some detail the amount of engagement they'd had with residents in Cherry and some pretty significant changes they made, which in their opinion were accepted as being responsive by the residents. If you think that was a misstatement, but that's what they told us, and they showed us how they had dialed back the intensity of the industrial type of development that was contemplated in a fairly large area there. So, I would just say again, what I'd like to ask colleagues, all of us to do is just, as members of this body and for the benefit of the staff, just get whatever it is that you think needs to be resolved or needs to be done in to them in the next two weeks. Then if we have to by a Council vote then we will tell them what they need to do, but I'm hoping that we can just sort of bring this process down. There has been an enormous amount of outreach and that's one thing, hundreds and hundreds of different efforts by the staff to connect and to hear a thousand responses that came in, and I think the suggestion that the staff hasn't done enough work to try to connect with the public is unfair to the staff, frankly. The public has to do something on its own in order to engage and they did in the case of Cherry and the staff talked to them.

Ms. Johnson said the numbers were over 2,500 comments and only, I don't remember what the number was, but a small percentage was incorporated.

Mr. Driggs said you can see every single comment and you can decide if any of those comments deserved a different reaction from the one they got and in the next two weeks if you would, please bring that forward.

Ms. Johnson said Mr. Jones, I've expressed what I'd like to see for District Four. Thank you.

Mr. Driggs said okay, that's it.

Councilmember Graham said the Jobs and Economic Development Committee had a really eventful meeting today, and I want to try to go through a lot of information in a relatively short period of time given the time allotment that we have. The first major item on the agenda was the Bank of America stadium modernization ground lease update. One, as you know the \$650 million investment in Bank of America stadium that we approved a year ago, over the last year the City Attorney's Office, the Panthers Finance Department has been working to dot I's and cross T's on the agreement itself. They have finally come to a conclusion where all of the elements of the agreement that the Council wanted has been signed off on by both the Panthers as well as our City Attorney. I really want to thank him, Attorney Fox and his staff, for the work they've done over the last year to get us to this point. The Finance Department has been heavily engaged in ensuring that financially we are doing all the right things per the agreement. Everything that the Council has asked for in the original agreement has been signed off by the Carolina Panthers including the 27 percent minority women's development goal.

At today's meeting, the president of the Panthers was in attendance with her staff, Kristi Coleman which I think demonstrates a willingness to partner with the City, be a part of what we're doing. In short, we are ready now to present the final draft of that contract for Council for their approval so we can send it to the local Government Commission in Raleigh. Beginning on September 13, and September 27, as a two-vote process that we have to vote. This is not the first time you are hearing this. We heard it about two weeks ago. So, we're ready now to formalize the document so that we can prepare it, sending it on to Raleigh to being releasing the funds to begin construction on the stadium itself. That's item number one. Item number two was executing a lease with CATS for a lot that the Panthers will need to stage construction. So, our second item was we discussed that, which is again this is not new news for the Council. We've talked about

this before. We're bringing this forward for a formal vote for the Council, but again, this is really dotting I's and crossing T's. Again, a lease agreement for the CATS lots for the Panthers to stage construction related activities. The third item, which is something I think was really good news. The Panthers announced again that they will be constructing a 4,400 seat capacity performance venue on the northwest side of the stadium on Graham Street. It's approximately two acres. The Council approved the building of such a facility with the rezoning that we approved in April 2025. It should be noted that there is no public funding for the construction or the operation, no incremental land added to the ground lease for the stadium or the fieldhouse activation of the stadium and its concept shared with the Council in 2024. So, we did talk about this in general, now we're talking very specifically about what it is, a performance center, where it's located. Again, no Council funding, no Council lease arrangement for the land. They will use the existing parking that's in close proximity to the facility itself. Again, multi-facet local benefits, jobs, hospitality and tourism, supporting more tax revenue, supports Uptown vibrancy and fills a void in the local venue inventory. Now that's a short explanation for a lot of work that we did for the last year from the Attorney's Office. Again, we heard this two weeks ago, you're hearing it again tonight. This was voted out of the Committee with a five-zero vote in favor to move it on to the Council for your consideration.

Anthony Fox, Interim City Attorney said Councilmember Graham, I think you stated September 17? Was it September or October?

Mr. Graham said October, you're absolutely right, October.

Mr. Fox said October 17, 2025, and October 27, 2025?

Mr. Graham said yes. Next week and then October 27, 2025.

Mr. Fox said okay.

Mr. Graham said for Council to take their first initial vote and then their last vote on October 27, 2025. So, I'll pause to see if any Committee members want to chime in in reference to it. So that's the Panthers. I think we're in a good place with them. I mean Kristi, President Coleman and I have been talking frequently, and they are really excited about what's about to happen over there. Again, Mr. Fox came in and provided a lot of energy in reference to the negotiations. So, I want to thank you personally for that.

The second item was we identified several funding requests that came before the Council in reference to the Historic Excelsior Club. The second item was for Do Greater as well as the Spangler Market. They both came to us seeking funding from our ARPA dollars and they requested funding, that we, again with a five-zero vote supported \$1.5 million for restoration of the Historic Excelsior Club, \$500,000 for the Statesville Grocery Store, the Spangler Market and then another \$750,000 for Do Greater Charlotte. This would exhaust our ARPA dollars, but the Committee recommended with a five-zero vote that we move this along to Council for consideration. As you know the Historic Excelsior Club, Beatties Ford Road rich in history, legacy and tradition. We're not investing in the Club, we're investing in the revitalization of the historic Beatties Ford Road Corridor along with the other investments we've already made on the Corridor on the corner of Beatties Ford Road and Lasalle. This investment is on the Beatties Ford Road and Oaklawn and hopefully in 2026 they'll be an additional investment at the Five Point near Johnson C. Smith University. I should mention that the County as well will put in the \$1.5 million for the Historic Excelsior Club.

The Statesville Grocery Store, again, addresses a food desert on that side of town. It was presented to the Committee today. The County also is a partner. I think the County is going to put in \$1.5 million to support the grocery store. Our investment will be \$500,000. The Committee heard a presentation today from staff and again voted five-zero to advance this to the Council for more consideration. Then lastly Do Greater was seeking a \$750,000 investment to finish their construction project. They have a number of community partners already invested with them and as you know they already have

one site. This will be their Uptown location and again, this was our second time hearing this particular presentation in reference to seeking our investment. So, the Committee advanced all three with a favorable outcome. Again, the Historic Excelsior Club, \$1.5 million, County will match that as well with \$1.5 million. The Statesville Grocery Store, \$500,000 from the City. The County will put in \$1.5 million and then Do Greater, which is a \$750,000 commitment that we signed off on. I'll pause to see if my Committee members have any other questions.

Councilmember Ajmera said so, how about the Institute because that's on the slide?

Mr. Graham said yes. So, we deferred that conversation. That conversation more than likely will be picked up next year. This probably was our last ED (Economic Development) Committee meeting of the year and we have to talk about that in reference to recent emails we received from our federal authorities, etc. We just have to look at that with clearer eyes.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. I know you mentioned ARPA funding source for all three, but I see on slide number 13, you have PAYGO (Pay-As-You-Go). So, how much was it ARPA and how much was it from PAYGO for the Excelsior Club and Spangler's Market? It could be part of the follow up report.

Mr. Graham said the Manager will take that.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so, you had a little bit over \$2 million left for ARPA and in the Corridors, there was a million dollars that are associated with these types of projects, these P3 projects, public-private partnerships. So, you pull the million dollars from the Corridors for these types of projects, plus a little bit over \$2 million would cover these three projects.

Ms. Ajmera said so, I guess how much of it will come from PAYGO? That's what I'm asking.

Mr. Jones said \$1 million.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, and the remaining is from ARPA. So, we exhausted ARPA dollars?

Mr. Jones said yes.

Ms. Ajmera said so, there is nothing left for if there is another ask?

Mayor Lyles said no ARPA. Okay.

Mr. Graham said okay. The third item, Vice Chairman, you want to take that one?

Councilmember Mitchell said I'm going to do it with my colleague. This was a Molina and Mitchell amendment. We went to Seattle, what, four years ago?

Councilmember Molina said it's been two, three.

Mr. Mitchell said three years ago and we saw Ike make a presentation of Kiosk. So, Councilmember Molina and I got excited. When we came back, we said, "We need to do this in our Corridors and in our MSD (Municipal Service District). So, it's no cost to the City and I think Councilmember Driggs you asked a great question. What's the annual revenue we can expect and they're like \$972,000 about \$17 million over a 20 year period time. City Manager, thank you for being creative and calling the pilot. So, thank you Mr. Chair for pushing this through and I think this is going to be great for our Corridors and for our Municipal Service District.

Ms. Ajmera said so, we get revenue from this?

Mr. Mitchell said yes.

Ms. Ajmera said with no cost?

Mr. Mitchell said no cost.

Ms. Johnson said I hate to drag this out, but what is it?

Ms. Ajmera said it's Kiosk, like this.

Mr. Mitchell said they display directions.

Mayor Lyles said directions, restaurants.

Ms. Ajmera said gas.

Ms. Molina said it even has an internet connection. It has advertisements, all of that.

Mr. Mitchell said right.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, there's a lot of ads on here.

Mr. Graham said I guess when we have our formal vote on this, they'll be a lot more information and it'll be a lot slower presentation.

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

Mr. Mitchell said hello, no cost to us.

Ms. Ajmera said there will be some sort of restrictions on certain content, right?

Mr. Mitchell said yes, they control the content.

Mayor Lyles said yes, they have.

Ms. Ajmera said okay.

Mayor Lyles said there are restrictions.

Councilmember Mayfield said so for clarification, one thank you Committee Chair, Vice Chair and members for going through this. I think somewhere along the long, conversations start to blur. So, I do have sadness about the fact that once we do this what we have left in ARPA is completed, yet at the same time I'm happy to hear that because I think County had already allocated all their ARPA a while ago. Chairman, you can have staff or someone follow up with me later. We started the conversation regarding Do Greater back in 2023. For whatever reason, we're now in 2025, but during that time the new opportunity with Excelsior, because I believe I asked staff at your last meeting, there was some money that we put in with the last buyer, I think it was like \$250,000 or so. Did we get that money back?

Mr. Jones said yes.

Ms. Mayfield said so, that \$250,000 is going towards this \$1.5 million ask or we're saying this \$1.5 million ask is coming out of PAYGO and ARPA? Where's that \$250,000 that we originally put?

Mr. Jones said yes, I believe, Councilmember Mayfield, that that \$250,000 came out of just the General Funding and went back to the General Fund last fiscal year, but I can give you an accounting of where it went.

Ms. Mayfield said that would be helpful if we took that out of General Fund for that conversation. Either way, if we got the money back, where is the money when we're looking at this? I'm hoping also Mr. Manager, now that we have leadership in the Economic Development Department that we don't find ourselves in this type of position again where conversations are started and there's not a clear trail and a timeline from your office down of expectations and moving things forward, because now we have these three conversations and hearing about Spangler's Market, that was the first time that I've heard anything about it. So, for them to even be considered in this conversation when we've had these other two big pieces that have been out there for a number of years that we've been working with or working around on some level is a little bit challenging, versus let's support staff creating an actual process where there's a timeline of movement, and if there's challenges then we know this is put to the side while they work on it so that we're not caught unaware, or something new is brought to the table when we have an outstanding conversation that should have been identified and moved forward one way or another. I am happy and excited that for those of us that had the chance to go to Boston and hear what some of the things that they're doing knowing that we had some amazing opportunities right here on the ground to support to make transformational change, I am happy to hear that out of Committee it was unanimous to move it forward, and I do look forward to all of us supporting the funding request for not only Do Greater and the work that Mr. McNealy is doing, but also for the Excelsior and the Corridor work that Mr. Kennedy is doing.

Mr. Graham said then lastly and quickly, we did take up the referral that the Mayor sent to us. Obviously, we were exhausted with time, but each Committee member gave our perspective in how we need to lean into the utilization of small businesses, especially in light of the email we received over the weekend. Our ED Director indicated that he is almost done with the small business report, and I think we'll have further conversations about that moving forward. Thank you.

Mr. Mitchell said I want to ask Mr. Chair, Councilmember Driggs a question, TPD. I remember the last time we had conversation about the Area Plan. One thing that I think was a sticking point for a lot of us was we had 2,500 comments. Did you all have any kind of conversation about qualifying for the process of them going to the plan, because I think that there was discussion? We had a lot of comments, only 14 made it to the plan. So, did you all talk about justifying or process how a comment goes through the process to get to the Area Plan?

Mr. Driggs said the staff talked to us. It's 2,500 right? So, they talked to us in broad terms about how they basically sorted the comments. Some of the comments were just observations and some of them were not really actionable because they were things like we've got to stop the growth in Charlotte entirely. Then they had a shorter list of the ones that they responded to by saying, "Okay, we have done this." They made changes that affected I think about six or seven percent of the land area of Charlotte, actual modifications and the key benefit of all this is we will have Area Plans for the entire City whereas right now, some high percentage of the City only has 20 and 30 year old plans that were adopted.

Mr. Mitchell said okay.

Mr. Driggs said so, I think the best thing is you will receive from the staff, they're going to circulate electronically, everything, all the comments. You can scan them, look at them, you can see the staff responses and as I said, if in the next two weeks we could get feedback from Council to the extent that there is something that's been left out or requires further attention and the staff is also actively engaging not only in these two conversations, but in other engagement with residents on specific issues that have been raised.

Mr. Mitchell said thank you Mayor, thank you Mr. Chair.

Ms. Mayfield said for our Housing report out, which we will gladly send an email out to everyone, thankfully staff just gave us an update. We are actually looking better than

was anticipated as far as the federal government. They are talking about not funding Home, but that isn't going to hurt us as much based on where we are in the community. The other great opportunity is we actually received \$283 million more than what was anticipated for some of our funds, which puts us in a really good position. We wanted to make sure that regardless of what happens financially in the government, we will be able to continue to help our community and our partners. So, we are taking that very seriously.

Then the last piece is we had our quality of life update, of which that one is our policy referral for community safety. The partnerships that we have, which is also we can make sure that staff sends that out to share it with everyone, but it is the Sequential Intercept Model through Charlotte Mecklenburg. So, yet, another partnership with the County. So, we are actually doing a lot more with the County today than in previous years, but it was really a great breakdown of the models going back to 2015 to where we are today and learning that it takes all of us at the end of the day, but of course Dr. Watlington was really excited when she got to see the breakdowns since you know she and Ed love numbers and charts. So, this right here is really a great way of looking at law enforcement, emergency services, initial detention, court hearings, jail and courts even though there's challenges around eliminating cash bail, reentry and community corrections. Some of this actually ties right into some of the housing requests, we just needed a little bit more clarification on it. Those were the recommendations regarding our policy referral. Nothing actually needed to be referred out to come to Committee, everything was just basically an update. That is your condensed version of the report.

Mayor Lyles said I thought the police officers were really, really helpful in the discussion and the Captain that was on the end really did a good job. So, I just wanted to say that. So, now I think this is our last report, Ms. Ajmera, before we go into closed session.

Ms. Ajmera said yes. Okay. So, we had three items for our BGIR (Budget, Governance, and Intergovernmental Relations) Committee. First, we got a report from an internal audit. Ms. Adams walked us through the audits. That's been completed. A status of each audit and what's in plan as well as we provided feedback to Ms. Adams about what we have heard from constituents. Councilmember Johnson had sent this request over to me from District Four residents about a need for putting RFP out there for external auditors because we have been using the same audit team for an external audit for a while. That's just the standard business practice. So, we will be getting a follow up report on that. Several constituents are interested in providing sort of community input in our audit process. So, we discussed that to see what other cities are doing to engage community in our internal audit process. So, there will be some discussion on that, our follow up report.

Our second item we had was the quality-of-life referral and public safety issues which really focuses on what tools and legislative support that we need to strengthen our public safety, because we know the conversation is not just about policing. It's about trust, accountability across all levels, across the entire system. So, DA (District Attorney), courts, mental health and there were several items that were discussed including supporting our law enforcement. All of these items to be included in our legislative agenda or some sort of letter. We discussed collaborating with our Housing and Safety Committee, but we know that the District Attorney's office is getting ten additional district attorneys. It's just a drop in the ocean. We know to operate at full capacity we will need at least 144 prosecutors to get to where we need to be.

We also talked about investment in mental health. We talked about strengthening qualifications for magistrates to ensure that they have the training and qualifications because they are the first line of defense for a lot of judicial decisions. We also talked about reestablishing local juvenile centers. We know that we lost that facility during COVID. So, our youth are being transported away, away from the support system like family, schools. So, that would also be part of our request so that State can invest in reopening a facility that provides wraparound services for juvenile. In closing, it was just all about how we can work across various other agencies, especially General Assembly, the County, the DA's office, our judicial system to put together a comprehensive

package. So, more to come on that, but the Committee asked staff to pull together a summit similar to the Housing Summit we had done a few years ago that will bring together all the parties, all stakeholders that I mentioned, and then we will discuss a shared ecosystem of public safety. So, more details to come on that and we will share with full Council. I and Councilmember Watlington plan on meeting next week to discuss what that looks like along with Councilmember Graham. Last but not the least, we had a policy referral on financial stewardship thanks to the Mayor. So, you know, the Committee worked on financial policy for at least as long as I remember. So, we're trying to adopt that process for all nonprofits. So, whether you apply through financial partners or other departments, there should be one policy across all departments. So, staff is going to gather information. They are going to bring it to us for recommendations. So, more to come on that, but just stay on the lookout for financial stewardship. That's all I have.

Ms. Johnson said you mentioned 144 was the full staffing for the District Attorney's Office. How many do they have now?

Ms. Ajmera said so, I'll tell you. I have it written down. So, currently they are operating at 84.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you.

ITEM NO. 4: CLOSED SESSION (AS NECESSARY)

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, and carried unanimously to go into closed session pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 143-318.11(a)(6) to consider the qualifications, competence, performance character, fitness and conditions of employment or conditions of initial employment of an individual public officer or employee or perspective public officer or employee.

The meeting was recessed at 10:09 p.m. to go into closed session.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at the conclusion of the closed session at 10:15 p.m.



Ariel Smith, Lead City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 3 Hours, 50 Minutes
Minutes completed: November 11, 2025