

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for an Action Review on Monday, May 11, 2026, at 4:06 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Council members present were Dimple Ajmera, Danté Anderson, J.D. Mazuera Arias, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Lawana Mayfield, Joi Mayo, James Mitchell, Kimberly Owens, and Victoria Watlington.

* * * * *

Mayor Lyles said good afternoon, everyone. Thank you all for being a part of this meeting today and thank you for taking your time and energy around. I do want to say one thing. I've got a little bit of a change in my life, and I just want to make sure that all of you are aware, and I'm just so grateful for the number of people that have been so supportive of me making a decision that was probably the most difficult thing that I've ever had to do. If you saw my little girls, oh my gosh, you'd just know I was doing the right thing. So, thank you all, I really appreciate it. No, no, no stop, you're going to make me feel like I'm in church. So, I want to say thank you. I mean, it's just amazing, and I don't know that I'd ever stop loving this City like I do now. So, thank you so very much, but today that's not what you guys came for. You came for real work and real opportunities to talk with all of us that we are, in terms of our meetings and things. So, I want to say, I'm going to call our meeting to order.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: ACTION PREVIEW OVERVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so, thank you, Mayor, members of Council. We have two items in our action preview tonight. There'll be discussion about data centers, as well as an MPTA (Metropolitan Public Transportation Authority) transition update, and Mayor, if you'd like to we can go to the consent and wipe that out before we go into those two items.

Mayor Lyles said that's an excellent idea, thank you for making that possible for us. Let's go ahead.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 1: MAYOR AND COUNCIL CONSENT ITEM QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Marie Harris, Budget Director said thank you and good evening, Madam Mayor and Council. Marie Harris with Strategy and Budget, and I've had a chance to get a couple questions from a few of you, but I was wondering at this time was there any additional questions on any Consent items?

Councilmember Johnson said I'd like to pull Item No. 34, please.

Mayor Lyles said 34. Okay, so I don't have the full document for it, so we'll continue.

Councilmember Mayfield said I would like to pull Item No. 30 and 31 for separate vote and discussion.

Mayor Lyles said 30 and 31. So, again, let's go ahead and start out with Ms. Johnson, who I think was the first to request that.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 34: CATS HUMAN RESOURCES ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AND TRAINING ON-CALL SERVICES

Councilmember Johnson said I have a question about Item No. 34. In Item No. 34, the last paragraph refers to the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise, and in accordance

with U.S. DOT Interim Final Rule dated October 3, 2025, DBE (Disadvantaged Business Enterprise) goals cannot be established on contracts executed after October 3, 2025. I understand that due to the federal policies, but I want to know how does that affect our CBI (Charlotte Business INClusion) program?

Marie Harris, Budget Director said yes, ma'am, if I may? So, it does not affect our CBI, so that's a good point. This is a different program, the federal level, but for locally funded we still have an active CBI program in place, so it's separate.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thanks.

Ms. Harris said thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright, that completes you, Ms. Johnson?

Ms. Johnson said yes, thank you.

ITEM NO 30: WATER AND SANITARY SEWER SERVICE INSTALLATIONS

Councilmember Mayfield said mine is actually going to be Item No. 30 and 31 that I was pulling for a separate vote when the time came, but if we're moving forward now, Item No. 30, Water and Sanitary Sewer Service Installation. Tonight, this is a request to approve a contract in the amount of \$8,585,958.70. The challenge that I have is, even though this is new, and thank you, Marie, as well as Mr. Powers, for additional information with us moving this type of bid forward. Our CBI team identified a 10 percent goal. Our established goals really are the bare minimums. So, for a 10 percent minimum goal to be identified, yet the commitment is 4.26 percent, which is less than \$370,000, it's \$365,500, so we'll say \$366,000, out of an \$8.6 million contract, I have very clear concerns that community is understanding the opportunities that we have of not only protecting but growing our small businesses. When we read reports that consistently speak of small businesses being the backbone and that being the true job creator when our larger corporate partners are laying off hundreds of individuals at a time. To have again an \$8.6 million contract before us that has a commitment of less than \$367,000, much less \$400,000, to me honestly is extremely disrespectful to what we have said as a Council, and what we have told the community. When we move to vote, I would like this as a separate vote because I will be voting no against this. We must figure out how to do a much better job when a bare minimum has been identified, and that bare minimum was 10 percent. If you can't even commit to supporting and protecting our residents who are taxpayers here and who are small business owners, that's something we need to be taking into consideration as we seek to put out bids. I do realize that we had about five or so bids out there, one of them that did meet that 10 percent goal was also I believe around \$16 million more, that's ridiculous. It's hard for me to understand that out of almost \$9 million, the best you could do is say that there's opportunity for multiple small businesses that will equate to this amount.

The concerns are going to be the same for Item No. 31, Mayor, for State Utility Contractors. This one is an amendment. Tonight, we're being asked to support an amendment for \$4,317,453. What was committed for this scope of work, which is also, as we move forward and for community, for you to understand, with these type of projects the City will negotiate contract participation for design-build contracts after the scope of work is defined, which means you may have the opportunity to build upon it. The challenge that I have is, what is noted is that state utility contractors has committed \$136,125, which is the equivalent of 3.15 percent of the contract. Again, on a \$4,317,453 contract, and that minimum amount is split between multiple companies. When we are in a city that is quickly becoming unaffordable for many, that is also extremely disrespectful as far as I'm concerned, and what is the message that we're sending to these so-called partners?

Now, I do recognize that when this contract was originally approved, one of the partners, Stewart, was a minority-owned company. Well, they sold. So, as far as I'm concerned, that should've triggered an additional opportunity for conversation, because

you sold your business and it is no longer a MWSBE, whether that's Minority, Women, Small Business Enterprise. So, what that created was a reduction in the low participation that was already there. We want companies to grow. If you choose to scale and sell, we want you to have that ability, but not on the backs of our dollars. So, I again, for Item No. 30 and 31, and want to make sure that the record reflects it, that I will be a no with very specific reasoning, because if we do not take the opportunity to stand by the goals after many years of discussion, paying for reports to be done, paying for studies to be done, if our language is not going to support our small businesses, I think we're doing a disservice to all of our partners that go through our trainings, receive our certifications, and that step into this with a genuine desire of good faith. Thank you.

Marie Harris, Budget Director said Madam Mayor, if I may? Angela Charles will choke me if I don't bring out a point for contract, the ones she mentioned, Ms. Mayfield's points are valid for water and sewer service installations. However, just please note before they self-performed these, though, there was no goal, they got a waiver. So, this is a rolling ongoing, not just a brand new. So, they were trying to test the market, and this was an aspirational 10 percent goal, but just know at least we have some goal and we're working. So, CBI is working on a more calculated formula specific to these, but prior to this, they had no participation.

Mayor Lyles said I'm going to give the Manager an opportunity to talk about this.

Ms. Mayfield said just for clarification, so we're all on the same page, and I do appreciate that, Ms. Harris, because Mr. Powers and I had that conversation. Again, we had the opportunity to do something new, so we're either going to try to do it right or we're not. So, for staff to identify a 10 percent, we already know historically staff is very conservative with trying to identify the companies. If they were able to identify that there might be an opportunity, and 10 percent being the bare minimum, coming in at four percent, coming in with really what could be considered the salary of one employee in today's market in our City, I think we have an opportunity if we say we're going to break up these contracts to get more participation, that participation should not be pennies on the dollar where it actually costs the company more to want to do business with the City than it actually benefits them.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said thank you, Mayor, members of Council, and Councilmember Mayfield, thank you for your passion around this. I also want to give you credit for something that's very important and to this Council. Years ago, these projects were just low bid, but you've created these alternative methods like Construction Manager at Risk and Design-Build projects, and just on the docket tonight you have Animal Care & Control which has an 18 percent MBE (Minority Business Enterprise) and WSBE (Women Small Business Enterprise) goal, you have NASCAR Hall of Fame that has a 22 percent MBE and WSBE goal, you have the Remount Road/West Boulevard Intersection Improvements 20 percent MBE/WSBE goal, and 25 percent for the River District Firehouse 44, and without these different types of tools in the toolbox we may have had continuations of the conversations you had earlier. So, just some of your policies have changed the way that we're able to have participation, so thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright, thank you very much to explain that, and the opportunity that we can learn more about what we do on our own.

Councilmember Johnson said I'd like to piggyback off what Councilmember Mayfield is asking. Can we get a report of the CBI guidelines or contracts per department? Are we able to get that? Can you share that with us? The reason I ask is because I've heard from a contractor, specifically that has a contract with City Water, and I remember there was a minority company that won a bid and all bids were over budget, and the RFP (Request For Proposal) was rescinded, and this was a minority business that had won a contract that had never gone to a minority owner before. So, I asked at that time, I shared some concern and asked, how often does that happen. So, I'd like to just see by department how we're doing as far as meeting our CBI goals, if you can share that with Council, I think that would be helpful. Thank you.

ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 24 THROUGH 43 MAY BE CONSIDERED IN ONE MOTION EXCEPT FOR THOSE ITEMS REMOVED BY A COUNCIL MEMBER. ITEMS ARE REMOVED BY NOTIFYING THE CITY CLERK.

Motion was made by Councilmember Anderson, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, with the exception of Item No. 30 and Item No. 31 which were pulled for a separate vote, and Item No. 35 which was deferred.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 24: Animal Care and Control Adoption Center Project

Approve a contract amendment in the amount of \$7,315,090 with Albion General Contractors, Inc. for an early site package of the Animal Care and Control Adoption Center project.

Item No. 25: NASCAR Hall of Fame Improvement Project

(A) Approve a guaranteed maximum price not to exceed \$12,500,000 with Holder Construction Group LLC for Construction Manager at Risk services for the construction of the NASCAR Hall of Fame Improvement Project, and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate, execute, amend, and modify the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 26: Rea Road Widening

Authorize the City Manager to execute a contract in the amount of \$9,215,000 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder Sealand Contractors Corp for the Rea Road Widening (Interstate 485 to Williams Pond Lane) Project.

Summary of Bids

Sealand Contractors Corp.	\$ 9,215,000.00
Blythe Development Co.	\$ 9,532,963.00
Blythe Construction, Inc.	\$10,114,136.67

Item No. 27: Remount Road at West Boulevard Intersection Improvements

Approve a contract in the amount of \$1,286,501.70 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder Husky Construction Corp. for the Remount Road at West Boulevard Intersection Improvements Project.

Summary of Bids

Husky Construction Corp.	\$1,286,501.70
DOT Construction, Inc.	\$1,377,772.00
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$1,498,547.60
Sealand Contractors Corp.	\$1,795,000.00
Efficient Developments, LLC	\$1,885,587.00
Cardinal Civil Contracting, LLC	\$2,194,945.37

Item No. 28: River District Firehouse 44 Design-Build Project

Approve a guaranteed maximum price in the amount of \$17,635,415 with Samet Corporation for construction services for the River District Firehouse 44 Design-Build project.

Item No. 29: Charlotte Water On-Call Professional Engineering Services

(A) Approve contracts for on-call professional engineering services for a term of three years with the following: Black & Veatch International Company, Brown & Caldwell, Inc., CDM-Smith, Inc., CMTA, Inc., Garver, Gavel & Dorn Engineering, GHD, Hazen & Sawyer, P.C., HDR Engineering of the Carolinas, Highfill Infrastructure (SBE), Southeastern Consulting Engineers Inc. (SBE), Stantec, Sturgill Engineering PA, and

(B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for one, two-year term with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 32: Elvis Drive Storm Drainage Improvement Project

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,783,020.63 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder GS Construction, Inc. for the Elvis Drive Storm Drainage Improvement Project, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Summary of Bids

GS Construction, Inc.	\$2,783,020.63
GreenWater Development, Inc.	\$3,325,394.60
Eagle Wood, Inc.	\$3,375,562.69
United of Carolinas, Inc.	\$3,446,334.10
Hux Contracting, LLC	\$3,476,863.50
Zoladz Construction Co., Inc.	\$3,512,540.99
OnSite Development, LLC	\$3,535,103.55
Mountain Creek Contractors, Inc.	\$5,389,642.50

Item No. 33: Robert L. Smith Pond Water Quality Enhancement Project

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of \$2,047,717.96 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder J. D. Goodrum Co., Inc. for the Robert L. Smith Pond Water Quality Enhancement Project, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Summary of Bids

J.D. Goodrum Co., Inc.	\$2,047,717.96
Rushing Contracting Group, Inc.	\$2,059,269.35
Eagle Wood, Inc.	\$2,390,117.45

Item No. 34: CATS Human Resources, Organizational Development, and Training On-Call Services

(A) Approve contracts for human resources, organizational development, and training on-call services for a term of three years with the following: ApplePark Learning Solutions Inc., California Creative Solutions Inc., CPS HR Consulting, D. Wilson Agency LLC, DLT Consulting, Eagle Hill Consulting LLC, Educational Data Systems Inc., Federal Management Partners LLC, Fountainworks Inc., Goodwill Industries of the Southern Piedmont Inc., Growmetix LLC, Insight Strategies Inc., and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to four, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 36: Set a Public Hearing on Dilworth Methodist Church South Historic Landmark Designation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 22, 2026, to consider historic landmark designation for the property known as the "Dilworth Methodist Church South" (parcel identification number 121-053-01).

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 470-471.

Item No. 37: Set a Public Hearing on the Foard House Historic Landmark Designation

Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 22, 2026, to consider historic landmark designation for the property known as the "Foard House" (parcel identification number 107-172-19).

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 472-473.

IN REM REMEDY

Item No. 38: In Rem Remedy: 12024 Susanna Drive

Adopt Ordinance No. 1127-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at 12024 Susanna Drive (Neighborhood Profile Area X).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 051.

Item No. 39: In Rem Remedy: 1101 Vickery Drive

Adopt Ordinance No. 1128-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at 1101 Vickery Drive (Neighborhood Profile Area X).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 052.

Item No. 40: In Rem Remedy: 4621 Willard Street

Adopt Ordinance No. 1129-X authorizing the use of In Rem Remedy to demolish and remove the structure at 4621 Willard Street (Neighborhood Profile Area X).

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 053.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 41: Aviation Property Transactions – 7830 Douglas Drive

Acquisition of 39,509 square feet (0.907 acres) at 7830 Douglas Drive from Keith Douglas Cain Estate for \$343,000, and all relocation benefits in compliance with federal, state, or local regulations for Aviation Master Plan.

Item No. 42: Aviation Property Transactions – 7920 Steele Creek Road

Acquisition of 37,026 square feet (0.85 acres) at 7920 Steele Creek Road from Olympia & Wright LLC for \$445,000, and all relocation benefits in compliance with federal, state, or local regulations for EIS Mitigation Land South.

Item No. 43: Property Transactions – Arrowood Road and Forest Point Boulevard, Parcel # 2

Resolution of Condemnation of 334 square feet (0.008 acres) in sidewalk utility easement, 114 square feet (0.003 acres) in permanent shelter easement, and 400 square feet (0.009 acres) in temporary construction easement at 7901 Forest Point Boulevard from Faison-Arrowood Properties Limited Partnership for \$4,300 for Arrowood Road and Forest Point Boulevard.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 474-475.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 30: WATER AND SANITARY SEWER SERVICE INSTALLATIONS

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, and seconded by Councilmember Johnson to defer action to approve a contract in the amount of \$8,585,958.70 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder Fuller & Co. Construction, LLC for the installation of water and sanitary sewer service connections.
--

Councilmember Ajmera said [inaudible] from Charlotte Water [inaudible].

Marie Harris, Budget Director said yes, we do.

Ms. Ajmera said so, is this time sensitive or is it okay if we were to wait until the next business meeting?

Ms. Harris said it can wait a few more weeks.

Ms. Ajmera said okay.

pti:pk

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington

NAYS: Councilmember Driggs

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 31: WATER TRANSMISSION MAIN IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIR

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, and seconded by Councilmember Johnson to defer an action to approve a contract amendment for \$4,317,453 to State Utility Contractors, Inc. for additional Design-Build design and construction services for the Water Transmission Improvements and Repairs Project.

Marie Harris, Budget Director said so, it wouldn't be the end of the world, but it would delay the project.

Councilmember Anderson said that was going to be my question. Is there any kind of time sensitivity around this particular project? Could someone from Charlotte Water answer, would it cause a delay and how significant of a delay?

David Czerr, Charlotte Water Deputy Director said good evening, Mayor, members of Council. David Czerr, Deputy Director with Charlotte Water. It would cause a delay. We have this contractor already out doing other work for us, but if it's the Council's pleasure to defer it, we can keep them busy on some other work.

Councilmember Mayfield said so we've had this conversation, I would say earlier this year, regarding projects being brought before us that may be time sensitive. It creates a challenge if the expectation that everything that comes before us is supposed to be a yes. Council has three options, vote to approve, vote to deny, vote to defer. If there are questions or concerns, the fact that any project that comes before us, that doesn't even allow for a deferral in order to receive additional information, should be a concern. Yes, right now across the City we are having a number of water main breaks, a number of items community wise, including an elder that reached out to me earlier today that has had water running in front of their condo, but we also just approved, two Mondays ago, a list of partners that we have identified to help with addressing all the water-related concerns. We're also, unfortunately across the region looking at we're going to experience a drought.

I have great concern that a project is brought before us that says that there's no timeline for us to have a discussion about it when we just approved, two Mondays ago, multiple additional partners that's going to be helping us to address some of our water-related needs. So, to have this particular contract that was in the design phase to come in and say, well, unless we approve this \$4,317,453 tonight, they're not going to be able to move forward, and on top of that, you're offering out of that \$4,317,453 an additional \$136,125, which is not even the equivalent of our workforce salary that is needed in the City, and that amount is split between four different companies. My colleagues, continue to vote however you see fit. I think it's concerning that to say to defer this to get additional information that should be concerning, because we should never be in a position where the expectation is to automatically be a yes, because then you're telling me I only have two options, and that is either to vote yes or to vote no. Whereas, I am trying to say verses voting no, let's have a deferral to get a little bit more information. Now, if the question is that I need to make a motion to vote no, I will gladly do that versus a deferral, which would give time for conversation, but ultimately it takes six-plus votes. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

Ms. Anderson said thank you for your answer. Here's my perspective, Ms. Mayfield. I agree with you. I'm getting lots of calls as well about water main breaks and effectively down, broken areas within our system, and we did in fact just vote to delay something just previously. So, all of these projects are not necessarily time sensitive, but given our system and what's going on and the urgency, I'd like to see us advance this, so Charlotte Water can continue to upgrade the system and make sure that we don't have any additional breakages, especially during this time where we're experiencing a drought and could potentially be wasting water through a breakage on the street that can't be used by residents. So, I hope that we'd advance this particular project. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

Mayor Lyles said I wanted to have Ms. Charles, who has walked in on this. Could we have her address the concerns that we're having?

Angela Charles, Charlotte Water Director said good evening, Mayor, Council. Angela Charles, Director of Charlotte Water. I just came in because Deputy Directory Czerr, is correct. We are trying to increase capacity for water main repair due to the drought. We're trying to decrease our timeframe. So, I perfectly understand, Councilmember Mayfield, about the time to defer. We're just in a situation where we are trying to increase our contractor capacity.

Mayor Lyles said alright, thank you for your comments.

Councilmember Driggs said I think maybe the situation has come about because of the urgency of the situation. This went out on what, Thursday night, this agenda was published. So, did you try to get answers to your questions since then?

Ms. Mayfield said oh no, because I was on vacation. So, I came back [inaudible].

Mr. Driggs said alright, okay, I'm just saying there was an opportunity for people to read this and address questions to staff and try to get answers to those questions, and I believe if it's at all harmful to the project, especially in the current water environment, that we should move ahead with this and note your concerns, so that the staff may recognize situations where questions like that are going to arise in the future, and address them earlier. I hope we can approve this tonight.

Councilmember Johnson said I had a question about the dates. What's the date that this contract is supposed to begin?

Ms. Harris said it's upon approval, correct?

Mr. Czerr said yes.

Ms. Johnson said okay, so then if we'd wait another week, you're saying it delays the projects by a week or so.

Ms. Harris said it would be until your next Business Meeting, which is two weeks, three weeks.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and then my next question is, can we have the report that I asked for earlier from Mr. Jones before we make a decision if we decide to defer this, if we can have that information to consider prior to that? Thank you.

Ms. Charles said can I answer? Let me make sure I understand your question. You want the MWSBE percentage for Charlotte Water? In FY (Fiscal Year) 2025, it was \$65.7 million.

Ms. Johnson said I just wanted it for all of the departments, if we can get that. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said okay, thank you very much.

pti:pk

The vote was taken on the motion to defer and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Mazuera Arias, Johnson, Mayfield, and Mitchell

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Mayo, Owens, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Anderson, and seconded by Councilmember Driggs to approve a contract amendment for \$4,317,453 to State Utility Contractors, Inc. for additional Design-Build design and construction services for the Water Transmission Improvements and Repairs Project.

The vote was taken on the motion and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Mayo, Owens, and Watlington

NAYS: Councilmembers Mazuera Arias, Johnson, Mayfield, and Mitchell

Mayor Lyles said alright, thank you. I'm sure there'll be another opportunity to have this conversation, so I don't worry about it too much. I think we have to continue to figure out how it works and make it possible for us to do this.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: ACTION PREVIEW ITEMS

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so, thank you, Mayor and members of Council. Back to the agenda preview, two items tonight. We'll start off with the data centers update, and then a very important update also with the MPTA transition. So, with that said, I'd like to turn it over to Alyson Craig.

Alyson Craig, Deputy City Manager said thank you. Good evening, Mayor, Manager, members of Council. Alyson Craig, Deputy City Manager. At your April 27, 2026, meeting we talked about bringing more information about data centers to your May 11, 2026, meeting. I'm going to give you a presentation giving you just some detailed information about just our land use contexts, defining different types of data centers, giving you an inventory of what we have in Charlotte, talk about what zoning districts they're allowed in, some trends, some key areas of questions that I know that you've raised to us, also the community has raised, and then talk about next steps. I just want to mention that this has been a work involving a lot of different departments, and you'll see I've got a lot of people sitting here in the room to be able to answer questions. So, we've got Monica Holmes from Planning, David Czerr from Charlotte Water, Terrie Hagler-Gray from the Attorney's Office, Heather Bullock from the Office of Sustainability, and Nick Miles from I&T (Infrastructure and Technology), and there's also been other people involved as well, including Economic Development, as well as Duke Energy.

So, what I want to start with is what people are not talking about as much so. I know we're going to get into talking about water concerns, energy concerns, noise, but what I want to make sure everyone is really clear on is that, on December 11, 2024, Senate Bill 382, which became Session Law 2024-57, was a significant occurrence for all municipalities in the State of North Carolina. Basically, what this legislation did is it severely limits local zoning authority, and so it restricts our ability to reduce development density or to limit permitted land uses and it really restricts municipal planning authority. We are watching this right now, and have had some conversations that there's some interest in the short session to potentially make some changes to this, and we're hopeful to that, because I think it would enable us to have a lot more tools in our toolbox to be able to talk about emerging issues like this.

Okay, so wanted to first just level set on the different types of data centers, and this will become important when I talk a little bit about our ordinance because in our ordinance we define data centers with one definition, and there's a lot of different kinds of data centers, They're not all the same. In fact, there have been data centers in Charlotte for decades, you've probably walked by them, and have not ever even noticed that they were there. They range from facilities in a small server room serving one business to very large hyperscale campuses supporting cloud computing, AI, and other things. However, as scale increases, so does potential impacts to land use, infrastructure, power cooling, and community impacts.

So, starting with the server room, and going all the way through, an edge data center, enterprise data center, a colocation managed service, and a hyperscale facility, they really range from something that may be in a basement or in a single room to something that is a massive campus, and you can see the different types of electrical power available from each of these centers to run IT (Information Technology), to cool the equipment, and other critical infrastructure, and then I put some examples on the bottom. So, in the server room, this again, it's a small business owner. They've got a closet with IT equipment. An edge data center, this type is really important in urban environments, because it helps communicate to larger facilities that may be further away to make sure that your processing data quickly, like for if you're doing telesurgery or if you're doing banking, you need those things to be really quick versus when they're in the cloud it's okay if it takes 10, 15 seconds to download something. So, those edge data centers are important in our urban areas. An example of that is a current rezoning, the American Tower Rezoning 2025-120. The City of Charlotte, or a hospital, we all have enterprise types of data centers. They support our internal systems. You've got the sort of getting larger, the colocation ones. You've got a couple examples of those in permitting. Digital has one on North Myers Street, and then we have two hyperscale ones that are approved in Charlotte and I'm going to call them Moores Chapel or AREP (American Real Estate Partners) or PowerHouse are the two that are the larger ones we have.

So, this is our current inventory. I mentioned the one that's in the rezoning process; it has been deferred this month. The public hearing will not be until June 15, 2026. This one is proposing up to 40,000 square feet on 58 acres. Right now, we've got about one million square feet of single-user facilities. We've identified these looking in tax parcels. They are identified as a data center in their tax parcel ID, and again definition matters, and I'm going to say that a couple times. There's a lot of different smaller types that may still be in existence, but they're not showing up on our tax roll. There are three that are approved and in permitting. I mentioned the AREP, the PowerHouse one. This is up to 2.5 million square feet. It's in the ETJ (Extraterritorial Jurisdiction). The zoning that was approved in 2023 is I-2(CD). It's on 122-acre campus, and it's got about 1.25 million square feet total. Moores Chapel, this was up to three million square feet. It's also in the ETJ. Zoning is similar, I-2(CD), on 156 acres, and it was approved in 2025. Lastly, the Digital Realty, this one is a little smaller. This one is in permitting. It is allowed by-right. The zoning district is Urban Core. It's on 2.5 acres, a 40,000 square foot building.

So, right now, in the UDO (Unified Development Ordinance), and again I mentioned earlier where we are in terms of current legislation. Right now, data centers by the singular definition that we have, are allowed in eight different zoning districts, ranging from Commercial Districts to Office or Research Campus Districts, Manufacturing and Logistics, Innovation Mixed-Use, and Uptown Core. Again, those may look pretty much the same in those different districts, because all data centers, regardless of size, are treated the same under the UDO and allowed in those eight districts. There are no prescribed conditions as part of these, and they're subject to the general development standards of anything that's allowed in that particular district. This is an area where we would love to explore changes in the future. Prescribed conditions are very common in zoning districts, where like as an example you might have an outdoor storage yard, and it's allowed in certain districts, but when it's adjacent to residential it has some additional requirements, subject to.

This is a map of the existing and proposed data centers in Charlotte, and you're going to see different maps and different numbers of the total number of data centers, because again the definition matters, and some of these are small and they may not hit certain maps, but again, this is what we found in tax parcels IDs. So, you can see the green are data centers that are existing, the ones that are orange are ones that are approved and/or in permitting, and then the one in yellow is the one that is still going through the rezoning process.

There's been a lot of questions about proximity to residential zoning, and so here's a map showing all of the residential zoning districts in the City of Charlotte and locations of the data centers that we have. All of the data centers that have been approved and/or in permitting are within 500 feet of residential, and so that's something that again we would like to look at in the future.

So, wanted to hit on just some data center trends. So, AI is definitely driving this demand, and so the growth of AI is increasing the demand for these higher density GPU (Graphics Processing Unit) facilities. I've learned a lot about data centers in the last couple weeks, and GPU is a lot higher processing needs than CPU (Central Processing Unit), and so it requires then more centers, more facilities, more IT. Then, what's really important, and I mentioned this earlier with the edge facilities versus the hyperscale facilities, the distance from the user affects speed, and so there are some types of uses that need to be next to their users, because they need to have faster processing. In terms of water cooling and water needs arising, the AI workload significantly increases water use. Cooling demand is rising, including liquid-cooled designs. Power is a main constraint in terms of the future capacity, but also I would say in the City of Charlotte land is too, as you can see from the examples of the two larger hyperscale facilities that we have; those are really large campuses. They're 120, 150 acres, and it's hard to find large parcels of land that size zoned in this way for data centers. Great connections can take longer than construction, so there's a lot of work that the data center does with Duke Energy in terms of seeing what the power capabilities are, and then facilities are adapting. They may pursue different types of things, on-site generation, closed-loop systems are becoming more common, because there's a lot of pressure to be more environmental sensitive, and so this is an area just like technology and AI, it is quickly and rapidly adapting.

So, Duke Energy wasn't able to be with us this evening, but they have been in our meetings over the past couple weeks. So, data centers are growing, but they're not the primary driver of the current rate pressure. So, right now less than one percent of the current share of statewide peak electric demand comes from data centers; however, this is projected to grow to 10 percent by 2030. That doesn't necessarily mean that's 10 percent for Charlotte, that's 10 percent for all of North Carolina, and so there may be different areas where they find good sites. There is a threshold. So, with Duke, any project that's over 100 megawatts, they are required to pay a non-refundable impact fee, they're required to pay all of their upgrade costs, and so they do transmission studies, and figure out where upgrades are needed and they are responsible for providing those. This can be a benefit to the community, because you have the great infrastructure being updated and upgraded by someone else and not by Duke. They were quick to make sure that we were clear that recent rate increases are really tied to the growth and all the attraction that Charlotte is bringing. There's a lot of people moving to Charlotte, and that's really what is resulting in the recent rate increases and not as a result of data center growth.

So, we've had a lot of questions about water consumption, particularly in the drought conditions that we've been discussing recently. A smaller scale facility uses about 64,000 gallons a day, whereas the larger scale facilities like your hyperscale, etc., it really depends on the cooling method. So, open-loop or evaporative cooling uses a lot more water, whereas closed-loop reduces water consumption by as much as 70 percent, so it's a lot more sustainable. As a comparison, and some numbers you'll see in a minute. So, the total irrigation demand for all users is 11 million gallons per day, and so there is a lot of water consumption that occurs in our community by watering our lawns, and when we're talking about Stage 2 drought conditions, what we're trying to

accomplish there is we want to reduce water by 16 million gallons per day, and so of that, data centers use 0.4 percent.

So, we have two hyperscale data centers that have been approved. It's PowerHouse; their peak summer use is 1.2 million gallons per day. They are using reclaimed water and not drinking water, and of course demand is lower in cooler seasons because you don't need as much to cool the equipment. The Moores Chapel site, they're using domestic water only, about 35,000 gallons per day, because their cooling is by electric, it's not water based. So, Charlotte Water does a very detailed engineering review when these data centers come in. Again, from their perspective, like Duke Energy, developers are required to pay for required infrastructure improvements. We certainly prefer that you use reclaimed water or use closed-loop cooling systems. These are more sustainable. There's a lot of work that Charlotte Water does in updating its system-wide master plan every five years, accounting for growth, development, rising water demand, and trends.

Noise is something that, what we've learned is, really the data centers in the past tended to be noisier. It's often when there's on-site energy generation or when air cooling is used; however, there are cities that are considering noise and sound studies as part of permitting, and I think the 2023 rezoning that came through, I think there was a field trip that a group went and looked at a nearby hyperscale facility. They found no noise concerns, but in that rezoning process, there were still conditional notes that requires noise mitigation as part of that approved plan.

There's a lot of conversations about, are there jobs involved in data centers? What sort of impact or benefit does municipality get? I think what we've heard is that there's not a lot of people working in the facility. There are a lot of jobs that are created as part of the construction, but once the facility is up and running, it's really only 20 to 50 new jobs per data center. This past year, the data center contributed a little over a million dollars in 2025 tax revenue, but as they continue to grow and as we start to see a lot larger facilities, as an example, a hyperscale facility with about 2.5 million square feet in Charlotte could generate probably \$40 million in tax revenue annually. That's not to discount some of the concerns with water and infrastructure and noise and energy concerns, but they do tend to create limited direct impact on schools and roads compared to many other large development types.

So, next steps. So, again, state law limits some zoning changes, but the City still has tools to study impacts, strength and review, and consider a temporary moratorium. So, what we cannot do. We cannot change certain zoning criteria per Senate Bill 382. We cannot revise location, buffer, zoning standards, change the districts; again, this is limited by that law. What we can do is, we can coordinate an interdisciplinary staff team. As you can see, we already have that underway. We've been talking about what additional study and standards we could employ under current legislation, including requiring certain application materials, like a noise mitigation plan, an energy, water conservation plan, looking at other performance-based standards. Then lastly, we can consider a moratorium, and must comply with general statutes 160D-107, one of which has a required step to hold a properly notice public hearing and adopt an ordinance that meets statutory criteria.

There have been a number of cities that have passed moratoriums in recent, and so you can see a list of different municipalities here and the length of time that they have proposed. One of the things in the right column that I will mention is that there is some distinction in that many of these municipalities did not have a definition of a data center in their ordinance, whereas Charlotte does. So, there are some things we've been talking to the Attorney's Office about, what additional risk would that involve for Charlotte should we move forward with considering a moratorium? It's also worth noting that Chatham County was recently challenged in a lawsuit. Some of it relates to which projects would fall under the moratorium among some procedural issues, but there is one active lawsuit out there right now.

So, our recommendation is that we hold a public hearing for a moratorium. This could be done on May 26, 2026, if we meet certain noticing requirements. So, if the moratorium is more than 60 days, it requires a two-week notice period. This could potentially set Council up for action or decision on June 8, 2026, should you desire to do so. We also recommend that we refer this to the TPD (Transportation, Planning and Development) Committee to talk about next steps and recommended actions, and then continue with our interdisciplinary work to convene on policy and what these next steps look like. With that, I am available to answer any questions as are my colleagues over here.

Councilmember Anderson said thank you, staff, for this information and pulling it all together very, very quickly. This is a robust presentation and I appreciate it. One question I have before I get into it is, on slide five where you have basically gone through our inventory of data centers and the types of data centers, do you have a sense of what is the longest tenured data center in our community? Have any of these been around for 10 years, eight years, any temporal sense here?

Ms. Craig said so, the American Tower is proposed. Moores Chapel and PowerHouse are ones that were recently approved, so those are not in existence yet. The Digital Trade Street one, does anyone know?

Monica Holmes, Interim Planning Director said it's a replacement, so we can do research basically.

Ms. Craig said so, I mentioned that there was \$1.1 million in tax revenue for 2025, so there are some smaller ones, and when you look at the map there are some in existence as you can see on this map, but I don't know the earliest one, and we'd have to get back to you on that.

Ms. Anderson said okay, thank you for that. The other question that I have is, you mentioned that the General Assembly has limited some of our flexibility on this area. When we think about some of the technological advances that you brought up, specifically around cooling, and having what's called behind the meter strategies where they can create their power on site, either through solar or battery, etc., do we have the ability to bake that into our zoning language and then have that codified?

Ms. Craig said so, I would say that's not a yes or no answer. I think there are different levels of risk in terms of being in compliance with that senate bill. I would say things like changing zoning districts and adding buffers, it's pretty clear that that's not allowed. Starting to ask for things like a water conservation plan or an energy conservation plan as part of a complete application is probably easier to do and carries less risk, but not no risk.

Ms. Anderson said okay. So, as we move forward with their recommendations, and I fully support your recommendation that we hold a public hearing, and then take a vote on a moratorium, but as we do that I'd like for us, this advisory group here, to think about the types of guardrails we could bake into our policy, like behind-the-meter strategies, like having greenfield data centers that would require that versus having them retrofitted into existing buildings, because then that would tap on our municipal utility function. Also, having the restrictions around using recycled water or using liquid cooling for the chips and things of that nature, I think if we could tighten that up as much as we can in terms of the guardrails we can bake in for our residents, that would be a step in the right direction for us.

The last thing I want to say here is, you talked about the different types of data centers, and thank you for going through those different types, because depending on whether it's a hyperscale or just a server room, a very different pull on municipal utility. As we think about touching our policy and tighten it up with guardrails, I think we need to, City Attorney, redefine data centers in a more robust way, because our definition now is just one definition that covers five different types of data centers. The reality is, the growth of data centers is going to grow exponentially over the next 12 to 24 months just within the

U.S. So, I think our definition needs to be expounded upon. I thank you for this work. I certainly support the recommendation that we move forward with a public hearing, and then we take a vote on a moratorium while we do this work. Thank you so much, Madam Mayor.

Councilmember Watlington said thank you for the presentation, and thank you, Councilmember Ajmera, for bringing this last week. While I appreciate the information that was brought, certainly I would've been prepared, and was prepared to support a moratorium last week. It's important, because of how often and how quickly this industry is changing, that we move with the speed of progress. So, thank you for your leadership there. A couple quick things for me just going through here. I wanted to just real quick, on slide 14, the Moores Chapel data center, I was just curious. I noticed that it said that domestic water only was 35,000 GPD (Gallons Per Day), but the cooling is electric, it's not water based. What are they using domestic water for at 35,000 GPD?

David Czerr, Charlotte Water Deputy Director said good evening, David Czerr again with Charlotte Water. The water usage they will have is basically for staff and just domestic purposes.

Ms. Watlington said like lavatories, toilets, sinks.

Mr. Czerr said yes, exactly.

Ms. Watlington said 35,000, okay, thank you. Then, just a couple things that have jumped out at me. I see here on the system planning that Charlotte Water updates its system-wide master plan every five years. Just as we had this broader discussion around moving at the speed of progress, I would be very interested to understand what it would take to increase that frequency and make us more nimble, because we certainly know that five years is a long time in a growing city. So, would be very interested to know what help looks like to improve the planning tools.

Then, just a few things lifting up. Do we have a sense of our capacity versus the forecasted load for data centers? I see the information here for existing, but do we have any kind of assumptions built around where we think the tipping point would be?

Mr. Czerr said and you're speaking for water, correct?

Ms. Watlington said yes, and my same question is for Duke Energy, but they're not here. So, power as well.

Mr. Czerr said understood. Yes, so we build into this basin-wide water distribution system master plan. That includes forecasting out 30 years, that forecasting is based upon the UDO, and it's based upon the Comprehensive Plan. So, we use that information to develop the water demands, as well as for the respective towns within the community, and so I believe baked into that on an aggregate basis is the type of zoning and development that we would expect to see long term.

Ms. Watlington said so, I'd be curious to know load versus capacity, what do we anticipate the load to be as we think about the data center industry and what we think we might absorb as a community? I don't expect you to have this answer right now, but that's what I'd be interested in. Are we looking at the scale from edge centers to hyperscale centers? What do we think our community could reasonably even hold that wouldn't trigger additional increased capacity demand? Do you follow what I'm saying?

Mr. Czerr said yes, understood.

Ms. Watlington said okay. I'd like to understand that because that frames where our limits and our boundaries are. As it relates to the existing centers, again, I see some of the information here about what's been approved and I see some of the smaller existing centers. Have we any data that would give us forecasted versus the actuals from what's already here in terms of usage?

Mr. Czerr said the information that was provided for the smaller-scale data centers, I think that was a list of about 22 data centers, and that is the actual usage for all of them, about 64,000 gallons.

Ms. Watlington said and do we have the previous forecasted numbers, so that we can see if there's a gap between what they anticipated and what they actually used? I'm just trying to figure out how we can dial in that anticipated [inaudible].

Mr. Czerr said yes, most of these I will tell you is that same, it's domestic usage, and in a lot of cases when it's small-scale usage, some of these were 300 gallons a day, which is equivalent to a residential house basically. We don't necessarily have any initial forecasted numbers for them, but I will go back and check that.

Ms. Watlington said perfect, thank you for that, because I'd be curious just for the ones that went through a rezoning, if there was any, this is what we think it will take, just because if we need to adjust those assumptions, I think that would be helpful. As it relates to economic development, and I've had a short conversation with economic development staff about this, I'd be interested to know, given the infrastructure cost, how that's baked into our incentives if any when we're dealing with data centers. I just want to make sure that we are really receiving a net benefit overall when it comes to that shared partnership, and to that end, I'd be interested to know how we might incorporate a resource share, because certainly the City has data, we've got models to run, and we need GPUs. So, I'd love to understand how we might work with potential data centers to leverage some of their assets for that end.

Then lastly, I just want to think about zooming out to a regional perspective. We're talking about Charlotte and maybe Mecklenburg County when we think about the ETJ, but as we think about the strategy for the broader region, how are we working with surrounding counties to make sure that we're helping to guide development in those places where a data center might be a more appropriate play?

Ms. Craig said is that from the water perspective, or just in general?

Ms. Watlington said in general. When we look at all of our resources, at some point we've got to ask the question, does it make more sense to try to build within the City, or are we better served across the region to work with our surrounding counties to help them recruit jobs to help them forecast what might be of benefit to them. So, that's just one thing that I think we need to think about as well.

Ms. Craig said sure, and I think that's something that our group can take a closer look at. I mean, there are things like being near a wastewater treatment plant where you have access to reclaimed water or land or different incentives and things like that. So, certainly we can bring that to the group.

Ms. Watlington said awesome, thank you so much, I appreciate it.

Councilmember Ajmera said so first I just want to ensure that everyone knows this discussion is not about anti-AI or anti-technology or anti-goals. This is really about protections and putting guardrails in place. I appreciate the recommendation, finally, [inaudible] that you guys could see a pause. I wish this would have come in front of us a few months ago, because this conversation is not something that is new. If you go to that slide, where other cities and municipalities have taken the lead on this issue in February 2026, and we are the only municipality that has a definition of data center pre-moratorium, which means that our community is at risk right now, unlike other municipalities. So, it's taken this long for you all to recommend a pause, and I find that concerning, because when it comes to growth, when it comes to definition of data centers, we are leading, but when it comes to protecting our community, protecting our neighborhoods and protecting our health, we are being reactive. So, I'd really like us to be proactive in protection of our community and our health and our neighborhoods, because I want to acknowledge that this concern around data centers did not start overnight. Councilmember Mayfield questioned the long-term impacts back in 2023 in

sounding the alarm early, and then Councilmember Johnson continued those conversations last year and asked some questions. Then, my District Councilmember J.D. Mazuera Arias, as soon as he learned about data centers in Far East, where I live, he immediately started asking questions about what this could mean for nearby neighborhoods and residents. So, this concern has been building across multiple districts, multiple Council members for quite some time, and for me personally, when I started hearing from residents, families and experts, how much of this could continue moving forward by-right, because we do have definition of data centers, we seriously didn't consider a temporary pause until we put guardrails in place. Because I remember back during the retreat, I had asked the question, how long would it take for us to put some guardrails in place? The answer was [inaudible] six months. Do we know how long it will take now?

Ms. Craig said so, again, this really depends on the conversations with our attorneys and our partners. So, as a reminder, Senate Bill 382 came about in 2024. Conversations started occurring then, which very severely limited what staff could do, because if that was not in place, there's a lot of really smart people sitting at this table right now that would've had something in place already, could we actually put something in place. There is very significant legal risk in changing the UDO, and actually having a definition in the UDO does also increase our legal risk in moving forward in this way, and so that takes some time to really navigate. You can see that all the other municipalities that have done this do not have that, and so there is additional concern that that might be perceived as a downzoning, and so these are things that we have been working through. So, what will happen next is, over the course of let's say a couple months, we will look at what performance standards we might be able to incorporate, or requirements of an application, and really check that with the Attorney's Office. Meanwhile, we're also working to monitor what's happening with the short session. We have heard that there's a lot activity occurring right now and conversations about a compromise as it relates to Senate Bill 382, and really hoping that something gets resolved during this session, so that we have clear guidance as to what we can actually change in our ordinance to address some of these emerging issues like this and others.

Ms. Ajmera said so, I understand that the state law [inaudible] this UDO change as a downzoning, but the moratorium wouldn't, because that's what you're recommending now. So, the pause would have given us temporary protection, but I do want to get to the Attorney in terms of the legal risk. So, we, Ms. Leslie-Fite, we have talked a lot about the legal risks of taking action. Could you also speak to the risk of not acting if these projects continue moving forward under rules we may later decide are inadequate, as clearly stated in this presentation.

Andrea Leslie-Fite, City Attorney said thank you, Councilmember Ajmera for the question. So, when we talk about the risk that the City has with respect to not taking action, it has everything to do with public safety or public health concerns. There have been a lot of questions about what makes sense for this community [inaudible] the appropriate recommendation. There is always a balancing act. When we talk about what the City has the power to regulate, it really does have to fall within the City's release powers, and its ability to protect health and safety, and so this recommendation, as provided by the staff, would allow for the appropriate guardrail consideration and to ensure that not only the appropriate studies take place, but that those studies happen within the confines of the City's policy [inaudible].

Ms. Ajmera said so, what I hear you say, there is risk on both sides?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said correct.

Ms. Ajmera said whether we take an action or we don't take an action, there is risk, because we fail to protect the communities. So, I also want to say something beyond the maps and the zoning language for a moment. A few weeks ago, I listened to the story of a resident who lives in Far East near where I live, and he talked about how he's raising a child with autism, and he talked about the fear of constant 24-hour humming

noise from cooling systems and backup generators. Honestly as a parent, that stays with you. Because this conversation is no longer hypothetical, this is about our children, this is about our health, and this is about whether families can peacefully live in their homes. So, we have residents worried about the noise, air quality, water usage, traffic impacts, and whether their neighborhoods will drastically change, and those concerns do deserve respect. I know right now in your recommendation there is no specific ask in terms of the number of days for a moratorium. I would like to ensure that until we come up with the guardrails and protections in place, that the moratorium does exist during that period. So, we need to be very specific about how much time it's going to take for the planning to ensure that our community is protected and have a moratorium during that time. So, if we can get some guidance from the Planning Director, as to how long it's going to take?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said Ms. Ajmera, if I may quickly before batting it to you, Ms. Allen. With respect to the timing for any public hearing notice, there are two different tracks, and so I wanted to be really clear, anything that is 60 days or less would require at least seven-days' notice before the hearing, and anything 61 days or longer would require at least a once-a-week notice for two successive calendar weeks, and so typically no less than 10 days and no more than 25. So, as you consider that, think about that component, and I'll bat to Ms. Allen. I'm sorry, Ms. Holmes, I apologize.

Ms. Holmes said in looking at the calendar and knowing the legal language in which we're working within and we have to be actively doing work and coming up with solutions, we feel strongly that 150 days gives us the adequate time, and knowing your calendar, that gives us the adequate amount of time to be able to do the research, look at what potential options may be, get it back to you all. There's obviously an option always of extending it if it took more time, but we think 150 days is appropriate, and that gets us through the month of October 2026, and gives us enough time with the Council calendar to have something back in front of you.

Ms. Ajmera said I appreciate that timeline, Ms. Holmes. So, on slide 19, I know we have a whole public hearing for a moratorium. I just want to make sure that the motion is for a 150-day moratorium, because that gives you all to put some guardrails, because it is wild, wild west right now. I just wanted to make sure, I think on one of the slides you had mentioned, Ms. Craig, about \$40 million in property tax, but I know that these facilities also get tax incentives from the state under the state law, and I know that Governor Stein has asked state legislatures to eliminate those tax incentives, but currently it is costing our City. Do we know how much it is costing our City and how much our residents are subsidizing for these facilities?

Ms. Craig said I don't have those numbers, and again the ones that are actually existing are small, and so that would be something we'd have to look at for two very large ones that are approved and starting to come out of the ground. So, I don't have that information, but we can do some research on that.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I think it'd be important to also consider that, because currently they're not paying their fair share, because they are getting tax incentives, and some of our revenue comes from sales and use tax, so it is costing us and our residents having to subsidize that.

Lastly, so I know that my colleagues talked about some of the guardrails and protections. As you are looking at that, I just wanted to highlight some of the organizations that I would like them to be part of the stakeholder's groups, if we could convene a stakeholder's group. Action NC has been leading this, as well as CleanAire Carolina. Also, UNC (University of North Carolina) Professor Williams, who is an expert on data center, Craig Reynolds and a few others, but also someone from the industry, so that we have a balanced perspective as we are developing regulations to protect our communities.

Lastly, so, Ms. Leslie-Fite, if you can just talk about, so, I know that under this timeline, if we can go back to slide number 19. So, until June 8, 2026, there is no pause. So,

could you speak in terms of if projects continue moving forward during by-right, while we are taking an action on the pause, could they gain vested rights before Council has a chance to adopt a pause?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said I'm going to defer this question to Ms. Hagler-Gray.

Terrie Hagler-Gray, Senior Assistant City Attorney said sure. With respect to a moratoria, it's very specific in 160D-107 that there are certain projects that are exempt once the moratorium is in place. So, if there are approved rezonings, those would be exempt once the moratorium takes place. If there are applications in the pipeline that have not been approved, but have been submitted and completed prior to the moratorium, then they would have an opportunity to get what we call permit choice. So, they could proceed under the previous rules, or if Council were to adopt any new rules, they would have the choice about under which they proceed. So, before a moratorium, they could proceed by-right.

Ms. Ajmera said so, they could proceed by-right before June 8, 2026?

Ms. Hagler-Gray said yes.

Ms. Holmes said they have to clear Gateway.

Ms. Craig said they would have to have a complete application. So, they can't just turn in a form and [inaudible].

Ms. Ajmera said and the complete application, how long does it take generally?

Ms. Craig said it really depends. It's a matter of having, there's a full checklist and full construction plans and all of that, so it can't just be like a site plan and that's it.

Ms. Holmes said it would be very difficult, because you can't just fill out an application. You have to actually clear what we call Gateway, which is that full checklist.

Ms. Craig said detailed construction plans are not done overnight.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. So, what I'm hearing you say, it's highly unlikely before June 8, 2026, that by-right any of these hyperscale data centers could get approved, or allowed by-right?

Ms. Holmes said oh, it's highly unlikely. I mean never say never, but it would be very difficult. We have tried to do our research of anything that may be in development that we're unaware of, and we have not found one that is in development. Again, I don't want to say that. There could be something out there, but we believe that there is not a project out there that we do not know about.

Ms. Craig said we do get signaled, because in order for Duke Energy to move forward with some of the things that they do, they have to have a Zoning Verification Letter issued from the City, and so we don't have any of those currently.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. Well, that's all I have, Madam Mayor. I will make a motion after everyone is done speaking, so I'll hold that, but that's all I have. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said as the District Rep in District Four, just outside of 2023-030, the massive petition of 2.5 million square feet, for the record I do want to say I did vote against it, along with Councilmember Mayfield, however, it did pass. I will be holding a community meeting about this petition tomorrow, a virtual community meeting, just to share some additional details regarding the rezoning, so that residents are familiar with what's being proposed. Interestingly, when that petition went to hearing in 2023, we did not have a lot of community opposition. There was one person that led the opposition, and as stated, residents went on a field trip in Forest City to take a look at the rezoning, so that they could hear the noise. That was the primary concern back then

was the noise, and we did have specific language in the site plan to address the noise ordinance. I do have questions. Specifically, Ms. Craig, why are you recommending a moratorium?

Ms. Craig said this is something that we have been talking about. I think one of my greatest challenges is that it is hard to introduce changes into the ordinance right now, because of where we are with current state legislation. I think the community has been very vocal in some concerns that they have, and they would like to see things introduced into our process that provide them assurances that we would like to research to see if we could actually incorporate.

Ms. Johnson said so, assurances due to concerns, right, of potential impact?

Ms. Craig said or wanting to make sure that we are a sustainable city. As we talked about with Charlotte Water, are there possibilities to require a closed-loop system and we can do that in the rezoning process, or be able to do more with our reclaimed water system.

Ms. Johnson said so, my question is, if we know that there are potential concerns, enough to recommend a moratorium for future petitions, we as Council need that ability to incorporate guidelines on data centers that are existing and pending. If we are concerned about the impact on environment, and if we're concerned about the impact on our water, if we're concerned about the impact to our resident's utility bills, those same impacts are going to be felt from an existing or a pending petition, specifically a hypermassive data center of 2.5 million square feet.

So, I've asked the City Attorney, and I'm asking again, and I'm asking our state legislators and whomever, we have to take a look at what we as Council members can do for this petition, and I've said this. If someone came to us and wanted to build an asbestosis factory, we would say no due to our police power, I believe, I hope, due to our police power, because of our duty of care to our residents. So, I would just suggest, if possible, any moratorium that we enact, if we could include petitions for those by-right data centers and also for pending. We need to stop. We need to pause. We need to rescind. We need to halt until we know that there is no harm to our residents. I mean think of the tobacco industry 100 years ago. I just really think if we're going to pause this and take a thoughtful approach, if there's any way, Madam City Attorney, we need the ability to pause petitions and permits also. I do have some questions, as far as the presentation. Is there any information about the environmental impacts of data centers in the presentation?

Ms. Craig said we focused really on the key things that we have been hearing as it relates to energy, water and noise, but we've been working closely with the Office of Sustainability, and Heather's been involved in this workgroup. I don't know if there's anything that you want to add, Heather?

Heather Bolick, Energy and Sustainability Coordinator said no, I think that's exactly what it is, it's water, it's air pollution, or sound pollution, and energy usage, those are the key issues in terms of environment.

Ms. Johnson said okay, so the air pollution, and also can we get some information? I've heard that the temperatures around data centers increase by a certain percentage. If we can get that information as well, the environmental impact? Also, regarding power outages, are they increased surrounding data centers? I'll tell you, in District Four my power goes out a lot, most times when it storms. So, I'd like information on power outages as well. Employment, there was a number for employment, the number of employees near data centers. Can you tell me what kind of jobs those are?

Ms. Craig so, there's two different kinds of jobs as part of data centers, when it's under construction, and I think there's a lot more employed as part of that, but then when the actual data center is up and running steady state. So, anywhere from 20 to 50 typical new jobs per data center, salaries can range from \$50,000 to \$80,000 or so annual

salary for technicians that work there, and there may also be adjustments too. Some data centers have ancillary office uses, things like that. So, a lot of it depends on the actual type of data center, if it's standalone, if it's an enterprise, or if it's one that's got colocations, so there's multiple different companies that have IT there. So, it can range, but this is probably a good average.

Ms. Johnson said okay, so some of these are construction jobs?

Ms. Craig said these numbers are for steady state.

Ms. Johnson said okay. Can you go to the slide that shows the map of the existing data centers? Okay, thank you. Now, I see quite a bit in District Four. Is that the Research Park area?

Ms. Craig said yes.

Ms. Johnson said okay. I know you couldn't answer Councilmember Anderson's question, but can you give us information on those existing data centers with the square footages? I know I've sent you emails historically, so we may have that information. Also, I want to give a shout out to a District Four resident, Ms. Antoinette Mingo, who has been on this since day one, thank you. She was on this when she was the Chair of the District Four Coalition. So, go ahead and give her a hand. She's led the discussion on this, she's pushed back, and also her successor, Juan Euvín, who's the Chair of the District Four Coalition, we received information from him. I think you all have received information as far as the tax incentives. He did a calculation. I think there was a tax break of about \$12 million he calculated for this petition, this 2.5 million square foot. So, if you could get us confirmation of that number, if that sounds right? Thank you. Did you say that these existing data centers, the average was 500 feet near a residential area?

Ms. Craig said so, I was mentioning the ones that are in orange or yellow, the ones that are approved or proposed, are within 500 feet of residential. There are probably a mix of proximity in the existing ones, because again some of those are really small facilities that maybe have been there for decades.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and I'm almost finished, thank you. Slide 13, I want to understand the usage. Total irrigation demand for all users is 11 million MGD. What does MGD stand for?

Mr. Czerr said it's a million gallons per day.

Ms. Johnson said so, total irrigation demand from watering our lawns is 11 million gallons per day?

Mr. Czerr said correct.

Ms. Johnson said and that's Citywide, is that right?

Mr. Czerr said it's the City, County, and all of the towns that we serve.

Ms. Johnson said City, County, and all of the areas that we serve is 11 million gallons per day, correct?

Mr. Czerr said yes.

Ms. Johnson said can you go to the next slide? Maybe not the next slide, let's see, hold on. Maybe it's the slide before that. I've got to find it. It's the slide that talked about the large data center, and I believe, I've got to find it.

Ms. Craig said are you talking about the PowerHouse using 1.2 million?

Ms. Johnson said yes, 1.2 million gallons per day. One place, one site, am I understanding that? One site uses 1.2 million gallons per day, and areawide we're using 11 million gallons per day?

Mr. Czerr said yes, but there's a difference there. That 1.2 million gallons is of reclaimed water, which is highly treated wastewater effluent from the Mallard Creek facility, so it's not drinking water that they are using.

Ms. Johnson said so, they're the sole user of that water plant?

Mr. Czerr said the discharge would otherwise be going to the creek, but reclaimed water again is that highly treated effluent. We have a small distribution system, and UNC Charlotte will be using it for irrigation, and The Tradition Golf Course likewise uses it for irrigation.

Ms. Johnson said and can we require that process for all data centers?

Ms. Craig said not right now.

Ms. Johnson said not right now. We don't have the capacity to do that?

Ms. Craig said we can't add additional restrictions to applications, per the state law.

Ms. Johnson said is there any risk of that recycled water leaking?

Mr. Czerr said no.

Ms. Johnson said no.

Mr. Czerr said no. It could leak. There is not a risk from it leaking. The degree that it is treated too, I would categorize that as safe.

Ms. Johnson said safe.

Mr. Czerr said it's not fit for drinking.

Ms. Johnson said it's not fit for drinking, but it would be safe if it leaked, right? That's what you said?

Mr. Czerr said yes.

Ms. Johnson said okay, I think that's all my questions for now. Thank you.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said if I may respond quickly, Councilmember Johnson, to your earlier comments with respect to those applications that are vested, if you will. Senate Bill 382 is the downzoning statute that we are talking about that prohibits the City from limiting any sort of regulation on those data centers that already exist. When you talk about what are our avenues to potentially aid in that effort, the Senate Bill 587 that is pending before the General Assembly, is an opportunity to restore some of the police powers that cities are accustomed to with respect to zoning. Well, let me specifically call it the Session Law. I've used the term Senate Bill 382, but it is a statute now, and it's Session Law 2024-57, that limited cities' ability to utilize certain zoning tools that we would've ordinarily used in the past, and so the opportunity there is for the General Assembly perhaps to consider restoring that type of power to municipalities.

Ms. Johnson said thank you for that. Do we have any law that gives us a duty of care? Like I said, if someone proposed anything that we know is harmful, that's proven harmful, and we had approved it, surely we would rescind it. So, that's what I'm asking for. What ability do we have if we know this is enough for us to pause new applications for five months? If there is potential harm, and we know that, what can we as Council

do, and what's the risk if we do something? What is the risk if we were to do something else? Those are my questions.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said and so that's a landscape that is very layered, but what I will say is generally cities and local governments generally don't have a duty of care to individuals; however, your duty is to the masses by way of your regulations. In this instance, I think your staff is proposing an interdisciplinary conversation and exploratory set of processes that would look, not just at zoning, but some of your other mechanisms to address this question, and so as your staff comes forward with recommendations, there are opportunities. I will say this, when it comes to some of the environmental concerns, the City is not in this alone. There are other state and federal regulatory agencies that will play a part in the conversation. So, as your staff brings those stakeholders to the table, that's an opportunity to look at ways to mitigate it. I think the risks, I wouldn't say they're nonexistent, because the risks are always abounding, but the duty of this body is to certainly explore, do the due diligence, and this is part of the exercise that's happening now.

Ms. Johnson said thank you, and then residents can also reach out to their state representatives if there's some laws that need to be changed. Thank you.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said that's right. Thank you.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said thanks staff, for the presentation. We were talking about earlier the need for urgency for this, and I think it's crucial, because I want to thank Councilmember Mayfield, Johnson, Ajmera for leading on this, and I want to thank the City Attorney for picking up my phone call when I first brought this up in December 2025, when I learned about the rezoning that's happening in District Five in the Far East, The American Towers. Listen, I've got to be frank and honest. There's so much we don't know about data centers, but also there's so much we do know about data centers, that we should have acted on this way beforehand, especially since Councilmember Mayfield brought this up in 2023. We knew this was coming down the pipeline, and we really should stop reacting when things are happening. I mean, a perfect example is, we define data centers in our UDO, that's a direct consequence of us moving at the pace of growth in our City, because we want to grow, grow, grow, grow, that we are often superseding the concerns of the people that already live here, not the 157 people that are not yet here to come.

I also think, when we talk about the legal risks, as a governing body, we will always have legal risks, whether it is our men and women in uniform in the crossfires when they're on duty, whether it's our firefighters protecting our residents and being the first responders on scene, whether it is development, whether it is infrastructure, whether it's a bad construction project that went into disarray, we will always have a legal risk as a governing body, but there is more of a human risk in not acting now and protecting our residents. Legal risks should not take a precedent over human risks, especially when what we are considering right now with this moratorium is the right thing to do for the people.

I do want to ask, in slide, I don't know which slide this is, but the one that shows all the municipalities that are going through a moratorium. For Chatham County one, I want to ask a clarifying question, because I see the asterisk at the bottom there. Who were they challenged by? Were they challenged by the developer proposing a data center, which they profit off of, or was it challenged by our state legislatures in Raleigh?

Ms. Hagler-Gray said the lawsuit was filed by Eco TIP, which I believe is the data center itself, the developer.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said okay. The reason I say that is because just recently up in Raleigh, our state legislators are doing a bipartisan effort to roll back that regulation or that statute that they passed, which would give them tax credits, and they're considering that, so this is a bipartisan approach. Oftentimes, we need to be good faith partners with

Raleigh instead of being hesitant to partner with Raleigh when it comes to doing something like this.

The other thing is, I wanted to ask about, when we talk about guardrails as we consider a moratorium, Alyson if you may, who will have jurisdiction over these guardrails, City staff, independent third party, as we move forward? I'm asking more of a hypothetical question, when we move forward.

Ms. Craig said I mean, certainly there's going to be an interdisciplinary team from multiple departments weighing in on that of what we have control and authority over, but that also means that there are other stakeholders and those that we should be partnering with and getting their perspective. So, I think ultimately we have to make sure that we understand what we as a city can do, and what we can do in the UDO or in other ordinances that we have, but that doesn't mean that there aren't other people that will be part of the process to come up with solutions.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said and do you think we could consider, if there's appetite, for the frequency of visits from let's say, code enforcement, to these data centers to ensure they're not out of code or out of practice?

Ms. Craig said sure, I'd be happy to talk to Housing and Neighborhood Services about that.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said got it. I'm also pleased that we did not have a corporation who profits off of data centers telling us how good data centers are for our community, especially when they just recorded record profits, and continue to lobby to increase the costs of consumers. Did we talk about in this presentation the health impacts of data centers? I would like to see more information about the health impacts, and for the closed-loop water systems, did we make a difference between the open-looped water systems versus the closed ones? Did we see the pros and cons for each one?

Ms. Craig said so, the open uses a lot more water. So, the example that I was given about the closed-loop is that it's kind of like a radiator, you fill it up and if you're having to add water to it, there's probably a problem, and so the water continues to recycle through that, so it tends to be a much more sustainable way to run, and I think that's really what the trends are for data centers going forward, is to use that closed-loop system.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said thank you. The reason I bring that up is because the, what's it called, what's that data center type called that's going into East Charlotte? The Edge Data Center of American Tower that's going into East Charlotte is going to use a closed-loop water system, and I'm interested to learn more, because I've had two weeks to do my research on closed-loop water systems with data centers. Although they require less water, they do have a higher electricity demand, 10 percent to 40 percent more, they increase greenhouse emissions, and they require chemical adhesives, such as anti-corrosives and pH adjusters, which must be carefully managed to avoid environment harm if leaks occur, and in order to use closed-loop water systems, the waterways have to be discharged through evaporation. That is mineral discharge going into our air that increases air pollution, and so I would like to know a little bit more about closed-loop water systems because typically it is used as an argument to mislead the public that closed-loop water system data centers are better for the environment.

I will be in support of the recommendation staff will make of the motion that I'm sure will be on the floor for a moratorium, and I would like to be also more specific in ensuring that any pending petitions are also part of that moratorium, as well as making sure that we start working on policy that would restrict data centers near residential areas, because they just simply don't have a place in residential areas. Thank you.

Ms. Hagler-Gray said Madam Mayor, if I may, I just want to clarify something that the City Attorney said earlier and what I said, is that we are bound by state law, which is

North Carolina 160D-107, and it's very specific about what types of developments are exempt from moratoria. So, we want to make sure that we're in compliance with state law as you consider this moratorium.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said perfect, thank you so much.

Ms. Mayfield said staff, thank you for the presentation. I wish we had this conversation prior to today, because as you can hear there are a lot of questions and concerns. I want to get some clarifying information. When we think of whether it's a closed-loop or an internal recycling system, on what end are PFAS (per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances) being tracked? Is that on our end through the water, because if it's on our end it's already in the water before we see it. So, what is the mechanism to ensure the protection of our water quality?

Mr. Czerr said yes, that's a good question. So, first, I'd like to say that Charlotte Water does its own PFAS testing, and everything from the raw water in the lakes through drinking water through wastewater. If we have suspicion that one of our significant industrial users could have PFAS, we can build that into their permit for testing. We're not aware of that currently, though.

Ms. Mayfield said so, you say it can be built into the expectation of the water testing?

Mr. Czerr said correct, yes, for the private company.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you. For clarification, you also noted earlier that Duke Energy needs a Zoning Verification Letter. So, when we move forward this moratorium, would that Zoning Verification Letter also be on pause?

Mr. Craig said so, the Zoning Verification Letter is a request to check to see if the zoning is valid, and so in essence there would be no way to proceed forward if there was a moratorium in place. So, we could verify that the district is what it is, but they still would not be able to move forward with any type of construction plans.

Ms. Mayfield said so, for me for clarity, it makes more sense for it to clearly be stated that any Zoning Verification Letters will also be on pause, and I say that because even though it is not this particular situation, we are dealing with a project that permitting allowed to happen, even though that's on the county side, in a deed restricted area of our community, and clearcutting has already happened, construction is starting, and now everyone's throwing their hands up and saying, well, I don't know how that slipped through. If we're going to have a moratorium, it should be clearly explicit, so whoever's desk it runs across, whether it's someone who's been here for years or it's a trainee, they would clearly know that a Zoning Verification Letter should not be going out.

Ms. Craig said sure, and we do Zoning Verification Letters for lots of different reasons and for different things, but we can certainly make sure that any zoning verification requests for this use is clearly under the guidelines of a moratorium if it goes into place.

Ms. Mayfield said Manager, I would like for us to make sure, because again we're going through major conversations right now regarding a project that moved forward that should not have moved forward in the first place because there were deed restrictions in place.

So, we have created a fee-in-lieu on a number of particular projects, and this might be for our Attorney. Is there a way for us to have the ability to adjust the cost? Basically, can we create a service fee that's tied to the GPD? So, if we're going to have gallons per day, is there a way for us to have a service fee that's directly tied to that, for the simple fact that because of state statute, because individuals went, talked to the right people, figured out the right language that supersedes whatever we're trying to do on a municipal level, again we have three options, move to approve, move to deny, possibly move to defer. Like with one particular project, they received funds of tax dollars from a state that hasn't passed a budget in two years, but they found money to give tax

incentives to a company, and when that company then comes to us, it is almost a mandate that we're supposed to just approve whatever comes before us. Whatever language that we may have to create the space for us to do our job, which is to protect our residents to the best of our ability, would be helpful. So, is there a way, you can say it is or it isn't to not, but you can bring it back later for us to identify a cost of service when we are in the budget discussion, and we are talking about as part of water and sewer services are increased, but we're also recognizing that our state has created incentives for certain companies, which is putting a strain on our resources. We need to figure out a way for them to cover, basically, what is the cost of doing business in Charlotte versus the cost to the residents. Go ahead Attorney, let me know something.

Mr. Czerr said I can speak a bit to that, and we can certainly take a deeper dive, but first on the front end, any new customer pays a system development fee that is proportional to the amount of water that they would be using. So, a larger industry will pay a higher fee, and that's to cover a portion of the capital infrastructure cost that has been invested. The other thing that I can tell you is that our water rates and fees currently use a tiered system, so the more water volume you are using, you pay more per gallon for that, and that's designed to encourage conservation.

Ms. Mayfield said having that information would be helpful during this conversation as we're working on a moratorium. Also, Ms. Holmes, you may know the answer to this one. When we look at potential locations, not a lot we can do about the currently approved, but I'm trying to understand, do we have the ability to directly encourage, that if it is the development of a center, we're looking specifically in our industrial area? So, let's think of the fact that the airport has basically purchased the entire community behind it. That's going to be industrial warehouse space, which is more than a couple of hundred feet from the nearest residential, when we know that there are environmental impacts, the humming, the other things. Is there a way in our language that, through the UDO, we can identify the more desirable spaces for these types of buildings to be placed in our community?

Ms. Holmes said yes, I think there is, and I think that that's one of the things with the interdisciplinary team that we would want to explore, specifically in partnership with Charlotte Water, Duke Energy, to understand where there are, to your point, land use is appropriate, we have access to water that's maybe in the most efficient way, but we want to understand like the pros and cons of that strategy. Other cities are taking that approach where they're being strategic about saying we want them here. So, I think that is one of the strategies that with 382 we can take.

Ms. Mayfield said that is helpful to know, and I would, again Manager, like it to be noted that I share some of my colleagues' concern that when we have this team, that team needs to be made up of some community members. We have members in the community that have been following this for quite some time who are in the community who have family members who are already in community where centers are already identified and up and running. We have limited information based on what a data center was considered back in 2012 versus what it could be today. If we're going to have transparency, the community needs to be at the front end and not an afterthought to make sure we're taking all the considerations on the front end. I would like to see us move quicker, because again we're in 2026. We could've started this conversation more than two years ago, which would have at least given us some type of leeway when you look at all of our partners around the State that have moved forward. A lot of it, that legislation just happened in February 2026 and April 2026. We were already having this conversation, attempting to start it a couple of years ago. Imagine where we could be right now with having a better understanding if we did not just kick it down the road back then. Being a little bit more nimble to address the concerns of the community versus being so proactive to give business whatever they want, I think would be to the benefit of us. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

Councilmember Driggs said I agree that we need to study this, we need a framework, and I'm in support of the staff recommendation. I'm curious, the other communities that

don't have a definition, can they just do whatever they want without downzoning, or how does that work?

Ms. Hagler-Gray said I'll say that because they don't have a definition of data center, they are using their moratoria periods to research and create definitions, and to add a data center use to a UDO would obviously not be in violation of the downzoning law. So, they are able to add a data center use.

Mr. Driggs said it had some basis for considering data centers before, and now they introduced these regulations. Could that be interpreted as a downzoning of whatever they were using prior?

Ms. Hagler-Gray said so, we don't know the exact details of all the jurisdictions; it would depend on if they have existing data centers. So, that makes a difference.

Mr. Driggs said alright. I'm interested that there is nothing in the pipeline at all. With this boom going on and AI and data center demand everywhere and the projections of growth, why isn't there anything in the works that we should be thinking about?

Ms. Craig said I mean, I wouldn't say that there is absolutely nothing in the works. We're just saying that we haven't gotten a pre-submittal request or a Zoning Verification Letter, but there may be land transactions going on that we are unaware of.

Mr. Driggs said so, exactly when does the moratorium bite? There are different stages in this process. We have a moratorium, and that says that for this period of time we will not do what?

Ms. Craig said so, we will not be approving any new plans for new data centers.

Mr. Driggs said approving or accepting applications?

Ms. Craig said I would say accepting too.

Ms. Hagler-Gray said yes, I would say you have the discretion to craft it the way you'd like, but typically it would be not accepting applications or approving new data centers.

Mr. Driggs said right, if there's a data center under construction, and they're subject to site plan inspections, would anything that's currently underway get stopped?

Ms. Hagler-Gray said so, that's what I was referencing earlier, is that complete applications, they may be paused, but they would have the opportunity to resume once the moratorium expires, and get a choice as to whether they would like to proceed under the existing rules or whatever new rules the Council may adopt; that's per state statute.

Mr. Driggs said so, on the legal point, our ability to give land use permission cannot be changed according to state law, but can we come up with new policies about the kind of pollution impacts that you can make and so on, but they couldn't be part of the decision process about the land use? Is that the way that would work? Because those would then also be applicable to existing or other facilities, and we do have latitude to make policies like that. I think the critical thing is that the state should understand we do not intend to get really tricky about our compliance with state law. We're considering what policies are available to us, away from the approval of a rezoning, because there are other ways. I mean, you could tell somebody, sure, you can do your rezoning, but bear in mind, you may not make more than such and such hot water or pollution. So, I'll be interested to see how you want to bring that forward. I was wondering also, are we following discussions between Duke Power and the Utilities Commission, and that sort of larger power demand landscape?

Ms. Craig said so, we've had a couple conversations with Duke Energy, and I think as part of this process, if we go into a moratorium there would be a lot more detailed

conversations. They're an important stakeholder in the conversation, and they're not controlling City ordinances and rules, but they are a very important provider of data centers, and so we need to understand that context.

Mr. Driggs said so, there are also discussions going on between Duke Power and the Utilities Commission, and they're talking about various complicated arrangements for meeting future power needs, all of which could have implications for the public. So, I'm wondering how this might relate to that, if you could just think about that.

Ms. Craig said absolutely.

Mr. Driggs said alright, thank you.

Ms. Johnson said I just want to clarify, thank you. So, Councilmember Driggs made a point, and I think he said the same thing that I was asking, and there wasn't a confirmation of what he said. I think that's important. I know we can't change rezoning policies for petitions that have already been approved, but he said that we could create environmental policies that petitions already approved would have to comply with. Did you all hear him say that?

Mr. Driggs said so, I asked a question as to whether we had the latitude to create policies that might be applicable to existing as well as prospective facilities, trying to make it a separation between a land use decision and our exercise of our rights in terms of environmental regulation.

Ms. Johnson said thank you. Is that the case?

Ms. Hagler-Gray said I believe that's the sort of thing that the staff is recommending be studied during this moratorium period. It's difficult to say without knowing specifically what type policies we're talking about. It would really depend on the policy and how it's applied, but yes, Councilmember Johnson, it's something that I think this team would like to explore.

Ms. Johnson said great, thank you.

Councilmember Graham said I don't have much, because much has already been said in reference to the impact of data centers on our community. I think the action step that we're taking today, which is to thank the staff for their presentation and their recommendations moving forward, I support. Just one question, in reference to the General Assembly, and as Chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Committee, I would just like to get a lot more information in terms of where that pending legislation is at. At the end of the day, that's going to kind of determine what we can and what we can't do, because the State's going to have the last word certainly on what we can do. So, the conversation is great. I agree with everything that's been said around the table. I don't see our Government Affairs person here, but I think that's what we really need to be focusing on, even making sure that as that legislation is being written, that our input is there, because that's where at the end of the day, will decide what we can and what we can't do here in Charlotte and throughout the State. Thank you.

Councilmember Owens said I appreciate the opportunity to just very briefly address a couple of things. I was one of the people who voted to get more information on this before I was confident and comfortable making a decision, and I really do appreciate the engagement. I've also had a good opportunity to have some engagement with my residents and have tried to escalate and elevate some of their questions, many of which have been answered, a few of which have not, and I'll just put these into the conversation as well, as a good steward of their inquiries. One of the questions I had was around the generator backups and the underground storage tanks and risks to the water table. I didn't hear any of that addressed, but it's my understanding, and again this was transmitted by one of my constituents, was that particularly centers, that 2.5 million square feet, 3 million square foot, I mean that's a large center, to have to have a generator backup, and so for me that does suggest some diesel underground storage

tanks. So, if we could put that into the calculation of some of our expectations, I think that would be very helpful. In addition, I will say that Dr. Watlington spoke of moving at the speed of progress. A couple of things that I have heard about these data centers is that there is appetite to move these literally offshore, like into the ocean and/or into space, and I'm just wondering, as we look at 3.5 million square foot spaces and things, do we have any sense for what the timeline may be before even these are obsolete, if we now find different ways to do things better? I would caution us around those giant data centers, and the end use of that really not being foreseen. So, those are two things that I would put out.

Then, very briefly, I want to draw your attention, and just have a query on slide number, I believe it's 12, and there's a number here that I don't know what the genesis of it is. It gives a 100-plus, I guess that's megawatt threshold, whereby projects pay a nonrefundable impact fee and all upgrade costs. Who sets that? Is that statutory or is that Duke Energy?

Ms. Craig said Duke Energy.

Ms. Owens said okay. Is there appetite to have Duke Energy at the table to perhaps question whether that threshold is appropriate at this stage and time?

Ms. Craig said sure, that's certainly part of this conversation, because we've talked amongst ourselves too, is that I think we all can agree that the server closet is really small and has minimal impacts, and that the hyperscale facility has more significant impacts, but there's a continuum in between that we need to look at further, which is why wanting to bring forward the definitions and talk through that.

Ms. Owens said and to that point, and this is the last comment that I'll make, I am again very appreciative of the fact that I never want to overpromise and underperform in this community, and having folks understand what we were talking about when we were talking about a moratorium, because it could mean very different things, particularly when we have such a single definition of data center, but a reality of the myriad different types of data centers, and making sure that we actually are addressing the problem. So, I'm excited to support this. I'm excited to now feel as though I have been able to escalate some of the concerns by my constituents, and I look forward to working with all of you to get to a good place on this. So, thank you.

Councilmember Mitchell said just thank you for my colleagues, Johnson, Mayfield, J.D., and Ajmera for bringing this to our attention. Thank you to staff for making a recommendation I will be supporting to do the moratorium, and then have the hearing on June 8, 2026, and definitely referring this to TPD Committee, because I think what's very important is for us to update our definition of data centers. It's long overdue, and so I do think that conversation will be very helpful. Let me just make sure I'm clear on the recommendation. It'll be 150 days from June 8, 2026, that's when the clock will start ticking, correct?

Ms. Craig said assuming Council votes that evening, then yes.

Mr. Mitchell said okay, thank you, staff.

Ms. Craig said but we have certain noticing requirements in order to have the May 26, 2026, public hearing. We just need to make sure we hit those.

Mr. Mitchell said thank you, staff.

Motion was made by Councilmember Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to schedule a Public Hearing for a 150-day moratorium for the May 26, 2026, Business Meeting.
--

The following persons submitted written comments regarding this item pursuant to S.L. 2020-3, SB 704 to review comments in their entirety, contact the City Clerk's Office.

CUC100Executives, cuc10011c@gmail.com

C'Allah Reality Born-Bliz'ak, bornreality94@gmail.com

Roctevius Alexander, civcom3000@gmail.com

Ms. Ajmera said and lastly, I just want to recognize the City Attorney, they led on this issue, her and her team. They deserve a big hand. Thank you. I appreciate your help.

Mr. Jones said so, thank you, Mayor and members of Council. The last item that we have tonight on the agenda preview is the MPTA transition discussion, and that'll be led by our City Attorney, as well as Catherine Clodfelter from Parker Poe. I do want to just frame this a little bit, and start off by expressing my appreciation for members of the MPTA, as well as their officers. I do believe we have Minister Mack in the room, one of the members of the MPTA, so thank you. It's a partnership and it's very, very important to understand that you just can't cut the switch on tonight or July 1, 2026, or January 1, 2027, or maybe even July 1, 2027. You have three phases in this process, and each one is always designed to have the employee first. So, with that said, I'd like to turn it over to the City Attorney.

Mayor Lyles said alright, if we can start with our City Attorney, and then we can continue. Thank you. If we can kind of keep our noise so that we can all hear in this room. I know it's not exactly the best way. It's not a movie theatre, it's just a conference room. So, if we could do that, and have everybody understand what's going on. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said thank you, Madam Mayor and members of Council, good evening, and Mr. Manager. The establishment of the MPTA is a generational and transformational project that will impact transit operations in Charlotte for many years to come in the region. Today's presentation is a continuation of Council's March 2026 retreat discussion about how the Charlotte City Council and the MPTA will jointly undertake an orderly transition of the Charlotte Area Transit System as contemplated by the PAVE (Projects for Advancing Vehicle-Infrastructure Enhancements) Act. At this point, the City has secured the law firm of Parker Poe to assist with the transactional work needed to effectuate the transfer. As the City and the MPTA continue to facilitate the orderly transition, the trustees and the Council members will continue to explore the appropriate cadence and format for update between the parties. At this point, your City staff has worked diligently with the MPTA transition staff, led by Debra Campbell and Carolyn Flowers, to ensure that the PAVE Act requirements are achieved. As part of that orderly transition, there are a couple things that have to happen, and that is upholding CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System) obligations, including federal compliance and grant compliance, also supporting strong transit operations through an efficient transition, and lastly, but also importantly, it encourages the stability of the system, and that transit riders and our community can expect a strong system. So, with that, I would like to turn it over to Catherine Clodfelter, a partner with Parker Poe, to walk us through where we are as of today. Catherine, the floor is yours.

Catherine Clodfelter, Parker Poe Attorney said thank you. It's a pleasure to be back with you all. We were first together at a workshop a couple of months ago speaking at a high level of what transfers of assets of the City would normally look like or have looked like in other situations. Today, we're going to dive into a little bit more detail, and that is because we have a draft proposed agreement for the interlocal agreement that's required under the PAVE Act to transfer assets, liabilities to the MPTA. So, what I would like to do is just ground you all with the shared vision that we took away from our last meeting, and that is a commitment to orderly, smooth transition of the public transportation system. A collaborative transition is of course essential for supporting and retaining employees, maintaining uninterrupted transit service, and protecting the interest of the riders and encouraging growth. We are proceeding in this agreement with

the shared discretion that's afforded to the City and the MPTA under the PAVE Act to determine what that transfer looks like. Recall that this agreement we are talking about, the proposed draft that you all should've received in your packets, is required to be passed by July 1, 2026, by both the City and the MPTA.

Mr. Mitchell said I'm sorry to interrupt. So, staff can you all provide copies of this handout? I purposely did not bring one. Did ya'll pass them out today? I didn't get one. I'm sorry, but I think seven of us did not get a copy. Thank you. Ajmera, Mayo, Anderson, and Johnson, we don't have a copy, so can you just bear with us please, so we can follow along with you.

Ms. Clodfelter said absolutely, happy to make sure we're all on the same page.

Mr. Mitchell said I thought I was the only one. Councilmember Johnson, do you have a copy? Okay, staff can we provide? Thank you, Shawn. I'm sorry, Mayor, I just want to make sure. Thank you.

Ms. Clodfelter said absolutely. So, again, the reminder that the proposed agreement that you all are hearing and updated about today is required by the PAVE Act to be passed by July 1, 2026. The PAVE Act specifically requires certain things to be in this agreement. It requires the agreement to set out how transfer of ownership, personnel from the City to the MPTA, would occur and on what timeline to speak about the funds that will need to be paid back to the City once the flow starts to go to the MPTA in order to pay the City for the debt outstanding on the public transportation system, and talk about any interim agreements, use agreements, that are needed while those transfers happen. I will reinforce that what you have is not a final agreement, it is a proposed draft. We are at a place of needing input and needing to have this type of discussion. What my plan is, is to reground you a little bit in the basics of what we're doing and why, and then talk you through in summary where we are with the proposed provisions, and then tell you what the next steps are for receiving more input and how this will come back before you, because this will come back before you in a couple of different ways.

So, let's briefly touch base on the factors that are impacting this transfer. You'll recall that the City currently holds debt related to the public transportation system. That debt cannot transfer to the MPTA, and some of the assets that are serving as collateral won't be able to transfer to the MPTA until that debt is paid. In addition, there are federal and state grants that have certain requirements that must be met while they are outstanding. So, again, the thought is that a phased approach to this transfer, because some assets must remain with the City, debt must remain with the City, that that phased collaborative transition is what is going to help us meet the requirements of the PAVE Act. What this proposed draft seeks to do, first and foremost, is to satisfy all the requirements of the City and the MPTA under the PAVE Act. It sets out a timeline for transfer of all the assets, the liabilities, the operations, and the employees, and conditions that must be met for those transfers to happen, and I'll talk you through what those conditions are. The important thing to know is, again, we're relying on the need for a smooth transition to set some of those conditions. Also, this proposed agreement will determine between the parties how flow of funds needs to work, so that the City is able to pay off the debt for the assets as that debt becomes payable, and also still enable the City and the MPTA to address the liabilities that arise and the operational expenses. Importantly, as well, it will allow the MPTA to delegate operational control back to the City for some brief period of time at the very beginning, and that's once again to ensure operational continuity.

You might remember this visual from the workshop. At the time I showed it to you last time, we had not yet gotten a good picture of what some of the milestones would be in the transfer. I think I can give you some more detail as to where we are in the proposed draft. That first big dot point, I will call those sort of a point in time or a milestone. That first big point in time is the July 1, 2026, requirement to have an agreement passed. Leading up to that time, in the green background, that's the MPTA being set up. That will continue through July 1, 2026, and for a while. Now, once we hit July 1, 2026, Phase 1 of this proposed agreement with start. Again, that's where the MPTA receiving

operational control under the PAVE Act is going to delegate that back to the City for a very brief period of time during Phase 1, ownership of the assets will remain with the City as will debt as required by law. We will then move towards Phase 2, and the intent is for Phase 2 to start January 1, 2027. So, six months is what we contemplate for Phase 1. When Phase 2 starts, on the same day employees all transfer from the City to the MPTA, operational control all transfers back to the MPTA from the delegation that was made to the City. At that time, some assets that aren't covered by debt or other grant funding obligations will transfer, and we will be in what's known as Phase 2 for a very brief period of time as well. The intent behind another brief phase is because there are most likely some back-office services that the City may need to continue to provide to the MPTA in order to be able to ensure there's operational continuity. Now, if that occurs, we are contemplating that the latest that the City would still be providing those kinds of back-office services would be July 1, 2027. So, Phase 2, if it is a period of time at all, will be again brief and we contemplate six months. We have now the benefit of professional input for the MPTA's transition experts to be able to better identify those time periods. So, that Phase 2 ending is the third point in time that you see there.

We next then turn to Phase 3, which is when what you're really looking at is the MPTA paying off all the debt that the City holds, and assets beginning to transfer as that debt is paid. We have three small points in time there, just to represent the three pieces of debt that first come out into maturity, be able to be prepaid first, and then a fourth just noting the final debt either paid or refinanced, it would at least come off City books and move to the MPTA. If you are wanting to see it more on a date timeline and see the dates associated, these are the dates that are contemplated.

What I think might be helpful is for me to give you a very brief in summary form walkthrough of what the phases will look like again. Again, this is just a summary. The agreement that you have, the proposed draft, goes through in more detail, but to summarize, again if you think back to we will be in Phase 1 we contemplate from July 1, 2026, through January 1, 2027. The City is still owning assets. The MPTA and the City are agreeing to a joint operation of the public transportation of the system with the City holding operational control and authority, delegated back from the MPTA. The MPTA is the policy body, and so at that point in time, they will be providing budget approval, approval of the FTA (Federal Transit Administration) requirement safety plan, and a long-term governance oversight.

The contracting would be performed by the City, and I'll take the moment to say, you will note different places in this proposed draft where you see brackets or the word placeholder. That's to tell you that discussions are still in progress to really better flesh out what some of these provisions will need to look like. So, the provision that is in progress right now is to present to you all for further discussion and consideration, is a discussion of what, if any, input into contracting the MPTA needs to have from July 1, 2026, to January 1, 2027, that brief period of time, because there are policy implications to the contracts.

Still in Phase 1, July 1, 2026, to January 1, 2027, all state tax revenues are going to start flowing to the MPTA as of that date. We contemplate currently in the draft that they flow to the City for this period of time. There is another placeholder, and a lot of the flow of funds provisions, simply because the MPTA is still being set up, and there's still an ongoing discussion of the structure of how the MPTA will hold funds ongoing. Liability will be paid by the Public Enterprise Funds. So, that will be consistent with the budget that everyone is also considering and will be approved before July 1, 2026. Again, there will need to be established coordination, and there currently is practically established coordination between the Executive Committee and the Committee with the City, and that will need to remain in Phase 1 as well.

So, before we enter Phase 2, there are certain things that need to occur for that smooth transition to continue, and I will say, we are calling these gates, ya'll can also call them milestones, but the important thing to remember is that those are contemplated being in place to protect the operations, the smooth transfer. One of the main ones is that the MPTA is able to receive the transfer of CATS personnel on the first day of that Phase 1,

and as it's currently contemplated, what we are expecting on day one is that CATS personnel are informed, that they have salary or hourly wages, bonus opportunities and retirement and health and wealth or benefits, that are no less than the base salary or the current wages, bonus opportunities, retirement and health and wealth or benefits provided by the City, that their service be counted for vesting, eligibility, and accrual purposes, except where it would be doubled dipping of course, and that benefit plans will waive or cause to be waived preexisting condition exclusions and activity at work requirements. That's what's currently in the draft and it's there of course with the emphasis, we heard you loud and clear, to protect the employees in the transition.

Again, another gate for Phase 2, that the assets that are encumbered or unencumbered need to be determined, so that they can start being transferred from the City to the MPTA. So, we will determine, during this phase before January 1, 2027, what assets are not collateral for debt, and that can be transferred. Contract assignment will also be prepared, what contracts can be assigned and which would remain with the City based on the assets. Equally important for the flow of funds is that the MPTA have the capability, the capacity and the infrastructure to direct funds for debt service payments back to the City once all of the operations transfer to the MPTA.

Another in-progress discussion is what reserve the City will keep, so that the City is able to pay off any of the liabilities that are incurred from, it's really the October 1, 2026, through the January 1, 2027, operating period. We contemplate of course the capability of continued requirements with grant agreements, and that the MPTA is ready to take on all of the operation functions, and that includes receiving approvals from federal and state authorities. Once those conditions have been met, then Phase 2 starts, and again we contemplate that being January 1, 2027. Day one, operations and employees transfer. The governance and policy, which has been with the MPTA, remains with the MPTA. There is going to be the need, and this will be long term, to have coordination between the City and the MPTA when it comes to transit infrastructure planning. So, we hope to have those conversations and work out what that looks like long term. That'll be something new to get used to at the City at that point in time. Once again, flow of revenue, the funds will come back to the City for debt service payments, and there's just a note that work in progress is to determine exactly what the structure of how the MPTA holds funds looks like.

Fund balance will transfer to the MPTA as this point in time, and liabilities will start to be all paid now through the funds, the operating and capital, that the MPTA is holding, because all of those funds remain with the MPTA.

There are gates for entering Phase 3. If you remember Phase 3 is just going back to assets coming out of being encumbered by debt, and moving from the City to the MPTA. So, we will transfer assets and contracts through Phase 3.

Those are the phases. Phase 3 will probably take a little bit of time. I want to tell you some of the provisions, and these are just a few, that I think you might be most interested in that occur throughout the entire agreement. This is a public enterprise. So, the City should expect there to be no General Fund liability. You will not continue the Maintenance of Effort payments that you've been making. You should expect that grant compliance be maintained throughout the life of the agreement certainly when the grants are there. The parties will need to coordinate with each other to make sure each other have the information necessary for auditing, etc., and there are probably going to be some additional agreements that come before you. Some of those will be required by statute to have Council approval, things like leases, and some of those might be better determined at the discretion and for a designee, things like the services that are required after January 1, 2027. Those would need to be any additional agreements that didn't come before you would need to be consistent with what you all have approved on July 1, 2026, and then a final big placeholder for something that remains in progress are the indemnification provisions that the City will expect when performing some of the services for the MPTA after July 1, 2026.

This is where I tell you next steps, all the additional times this will come before you. You will be receiving by email information about staff availability for office hours. This is in parallel to how the MPTA Board is also being able to provide input. So, you will hear from staff, times that you can provide input, comments, questions. You will also be receiving in your Thursday packets updates as this agreement progresses. We do have on the calendar a placeholder for an additional discussion on June 1, 2026, at the Transportation, Planning and Development Committee, and we also have a placeholder for additional discussion on the June 8, 2026, Action Review. Following that, this will need to be determined before July 1, 2026, so we contemplate that you consider adopting the proposed agreement on the June 22, 2026, date.

Mr. Jones said so, Mayor and members of Council. So, thank you so much for the presentation. We started an hour earlier today with two agenda items. I would like to make a suggestion, is that we have the chamber filled right now with the expectation of a public hearing on the budget, and a discussion about I-77 South on managed lanes. I would hope, Catherine, that you would be available to stay a bit later, and that we could come back and have any questions for her after we deal with those two issues, in which we have a packed chamber for.

Mr. Driggs said I just wanted to say the working group that was established, consisting of myself and Dr. Watlington and Ms. Owens, met today to go over in detail the draft contract with an eye towards identifying issues for the benefit of the Council. We did not express opinions or participate in policy. What we're doing is looking at it and trying to lay it out for the Council as accessibly as possible, because it's complicated and there are a lot of questions that need to be answered. On Wednesday, the bi-weekly meeting will take place between MPTA and the City, and so before the end of the week, you'll have a staff report on what was discussed at that meeting and also our comments for your benefit of what we saw in the agreement, things that we need to think about. My concern is that's a tight schedule. This is a big deal, it's an important agreement, and we don't have any latitude to go past July 1, 2026, without breaking the requirements of the PAVE Act. So, we're trying to make sure everybody can keep up and knows exactly what's going on. Thank you.

The meeting was recessed at 6:31 p.m. to move to the Meeting Chamber for the regularly scheduled Business Meeting.

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina reconvened for a Business Meeting on Monday, May 11, 2026, at 6:41 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Vi Lyles presiding. Council members present were Dimple Ajmera, Danté Anderson, J.D. Mazuera Arias, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Lawana Mayfield, Joi Mayo, James Mitchell, Kimberly Owens, and Victoria Watlington.

Mayor Lyles said good evening, everyone. Hi, I'm Vi Lyles, and I am so proud to see this room so full and so ready. This is a wonderful experience, because it's so much to have you come in and be a part of this work that we try to do to make everyone feel good and safe and make it possible for everyone to have a part of what we're doing in this great city that we have. So, I want to call this meeting to order. I want to say good evening and thank you for joining us here in person, and we also have people watching online, for our May 11, 2026, Business Meeting. Let's begin with introductions.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Mayor Lyles said so, I really would say thank you. We have a few special guests that we have today, and I hope that they would be happy enough to be recognized. Where is our DA, District Attorney? Where are you? Also, someone that I know well, Jennifer Roberts. Where are you, Jennifer? So, thank you again. Oh, Woodson, where are you? Usually, you see Woodson at another kind of event; she's always busy doing something, I can tell you that now. Tonight, we're going to try to follow up our recognitions, as well as do some business, and so now I'm going to turn it over to our community leader, who is Victoria Watlington, to have that presentation.

ITEM NO. 6: NAVY WEEK

Councilmember Watlington said we'd like to give a special thanks to U.S. Navy Captain Wade Smith, is he in the building? If so, please stand. It doesn't look like he's with us tonight either. Okay, well, so that you'll know, Captain Smith is a native of Matthews and a graduate of North Carolina State University. We also want to thank all of the Navy Sailors who were here in Charlotte during Navy Week, participating in various service projects and community projects. We thank you for your service to your community, and of course, from a grateful nation to our country.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 7: PUBLIC WORKS WEEK

Councilmember Mayfield read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, public works professionals focus on infrastructure, facilities, and services that are of vital importance to sustainable and resilient communities and to public health, high quality of life, and wellbeing of the people of Charlotte; and

WHEREAS, these infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals, who are engineers, managers, and employees at all levels of government and the private sectors, who are responsible for rebuilding, improving, and protecting our nation's transportation, water supply, water treatment, and solid waste systems, public buildings and other structures and facilities essential for our citizens; and

WHEREAS, it is in the public interest for the citizens, civic leaders, and children in Charlotte to gain knowledge of and maintain an ongoing interest and understanding of the importance of public works and public works programs in their respective communities; and

WHEREAS, the year 2026 marks the 66th Annual National Public Works Week, sponsored by the American Public Works Association:

NOW, THEREFORE, I Mayor, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim May 17, 2026, to May 23, 2026, as

“NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK”

in Charlotte, and commend its observance to all citizens.

Mayor, do you know, do we have any public works employees? Well, I see some sitting around the room.

Mayor Lyles said we definitely see a few. Thank you guys for what you do. Thank you very much. I think we're going to go back and ask Ms. Watlington, while the person is not here, we need to understand that they are going to be a part of what our City's doing, so we'll go ahead and ask Ms. Watlington to do this.

ITEM NO. 6: NAVY WEEK

Councilmember Watlington read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, the United States Navy was founded on October 13, 1775, and the Department of the Navy was established on April 30, 1798; and

WHEREAS, the Navy’s mission is to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready naval forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas; and

WHEREAS, the United States Navy has announced May 4, 2026, through May 10, 2026, as Navy Week in Charlotte, North Carolina, returning after 20 years and bringing sailors to directly and meaningfully engage with the community; and

WHEREAS, the Navy Week Program has served as the Navy’s principal outreach effort in areas of the nation without a significant Navy presence, with over 300 Navy Week’s held in 95 different U.S. cities; and

WHEREAS, Charlotte is a leading city that has a rich connection to Navy history and heritage with thousands of Veteran residents living in Charlotte-Mecklenburg area, one of which is sitting at this dais; and

WHEREAS, Navy Week showcases a lineup of service projects, performances, demonstrations, and community engagement opportunities designed to inspire, educate, and strengthen the bond between the Navy and the people of Charlotte; and

WHEREAS, currently there are approximately 341,000 sailors serving actively in the U.S. Navy in addition to 59,000 Reserve personnel who also exemplify courage and selflessness to protect our nation:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Vi Alexander Lyles, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim May 4, 2026, through May 10, 2026, as

“Navy Week”

in Charlotte, and commend its observance to all people.

Mayor Lyles said so, if we have any Navy folks out there, stand up please, please if you’re Navy. Alright. Thank you so much for all of that service, and thank you for this proclamation for all of them. So, now we’re going to go ahead and begin our meeting, and we start our meeting with an invocation.

* * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Councilmember Mitchell gave the Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by all.

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM NO. 8: PUBLIC HEARING AND DECISION ON SUMITOMO MITSUI BANKING CORPORATION BUSINESS INVESTMENT GRANT

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Lisa Rudisill, 7101 Londontowne Drive said honorable Council members. I appreciate the opportunity to talk today. I’m Lisa Rudisill, a Charlotte native whose people came to this area in 1760; I’m almost that old. The Rudisill Gold Mine is the main reason that we’ve had the second largest banking center in the United States here, but things have

changed too much here in Charlotte in the years that I've seen. Over the past two decades, banks and other corporations have come here from across the United States. From Bank of America, we have added Wells Fargo, which is one of our tallest skyscrapers downtown; Truist/SunTrust, U.S. Bank, Chase, you can go on and on with it, actually all this is overwhelming our locals, our banks, our citizens, and just the people here. Sumitomo Masatomo from the 1500s was from a family of Samurai warriors who became a Monk and then started a business. From this, grew Sumitomo Corporation Headquartered in Tokyo, Japan, one of the largest and diversified businesses in the world. They already own land on our Catawba River, the source of drinking and electricity for over a million people just in the Charlotte area, and I don't want to say this, but I'm going to, p.s., the Catawba out by I-85 now smells because we have new sewage treatment plant out there. Do we want a foreign company to have a big stake here that's from the other side of the world, from Japan? Do we want their profit dollars to go to that country? They say they will bring 1,200 good paying jobs here.

Mayor Lyles said Ms. Rudisill, everyone gets two minutes of conversation.

Ms. Rudisill said I'm sorry, I thought it was three.

Mayor Lyles said no, when you have a crowd like this you have to have two.

Ms. Rudisill said oh, I didn't know that.

Mayor Lyles said so, if you can provide the information to the clerk, then we'll go ahead and proceed to the next item.

Ms. Rudisill said I just wanted to end by saying, Mayor Lyles, that you've done a wonderful job.

Mayor Lyles said thank you so very much. I'll tell someone about that.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to (A) Close the public hearing, and (B) Approve the City's Business Investment Grant to Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation for a total amount not to exceed \$852,036 over 10 years.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 9: PUBLIC HEARING ON MUNICIPAL SERVICE DISTRICT 5 BOUNDARY EXPANSION

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

Jason Davies, 9423 Glenwater Drive said good evening. I'm speaking on behalf of the Welwyn neighborhood, which is part of the District that'll be moved from District Four into District Five here as University City Partners takes over our area. We understand that there is a proposal underway to both move the northern border that is going to be covered by University City Partners to include our neighborhood, and a millage increase as well. For the last several years, since our neighborhood was created in the late 1980s, we've paid into another group called UPOA (University Property Owners Association). These fees that we pay them for the maintenance of the lake up by J.W. Clay up there, amount to something on the order of \$800 a month for our HOA (Homeowner Association). We're only a 30-person HOA, it's rather extensive, and now we're going to be asked to, as we move into District Five, pay for the same services again through a millage hike. We're not opposed to being great partners with the City, we have been for years. When the greenway was being expanded into the University City area and the Barton Creek Extension was being done there by the County, we ceded land out of our neighborhood directly to the County, so that they could just immediately begin construction. We wholeheartedly approve of anything that's going to

improve our community, and the efforts of University City Partners are very, very much appreciated. What we would like is some commitments from University City Partners and the District to help us negotiate an exit from the UPOA agreements, the UPOA covenants that've existed since the 1980s, and then some commitments around simple things like making sure our green spaces up there are going to be maintained. I know that's important to University City Partners as well, so we have every faith that that will be executed too.

I've held my remarks here very short as we have a lot to get through tonight obviously, but I have registered with the Clerk of Courts an extended version of these remarks, and I would invite you all to read those. We're available to chat at any time. Our HOA has been around for 30-plus years, and we are here to communicate with you. Thank you very much.

Mayor Lyles said thank you very much. We really appreciate people coming down and expressing themselves. I believe that's Ms. Johnson's District, so thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said on the agenda item. So, I want to be clear that this is the MSD (Municipal Service District) District Five, it's District Four City Council District. It's just the MSD, that's their number, District Five, correct?

Mr. Davies said correct.

Ms. Johnson said also, thank you, Mr. Davies, for coming out. I have also asked Mr. Stanley, the Executive Director of University City Partners, I'm looking for a granular street map, so we know as residents which streets will be impacted, so I am waiting on that information, working closely with Keith Stanley, and I will certainly bring your concerns to his attention. Thank you for coming out.

Mayor Lyles said alright.

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 10: PUBLIC HEARING ON MUNICIPAL SERVICE DISTRICT 5 MILLAGE RATE INCREASE

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 11: PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2027 OPERATING BUDGET AND FISCAL YEARS 2027-2031 CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

We're getting ready to open the public hearing, and so I want to make a few notes on that. When we have this, the City Manager's proposed fiscal recommendations, operating the budget, and fiscal years for this year for the Capital Investment Plan. Before we get started, I want to say thank you for every one of you that are participating

tonight, and I really want us to be able to listen to you and get your feedback on our budget. After tonight, your feedback will be considered as Council discusses any potential changes to the proposed budget on the next Monday, which is at 2:00 p.m. at 267. Tonight is us hearing directly from you, and then the discussions will take place on Monday. So, I want to thank you, thank you to the clerk who's got to do everything for everybody to get this done.

Jennifer Diesa, 751 Ashmore Drive said good evening, Mayor Lyles, members of City Council and City leadership. My name is Jennifer Diesa, I live in District Five, and I'm speaking tonight on behalf of the community that supports Charlotte-Mecklenburg Animal Care and Control. I'm also a volunteer, advocate, and board member who has seen firsthand both the challenges and the incredible impact this department has on the animals and the people of Charlotte-Mecklenburg. Not only are we thrilled to be realigned to a division within General Services, I also want to sincerely thank you for recognizing the growing needs of Animal Care and Control and for including critical resources in the Proposed Fiscal Year 2027 Budget. Your support sends a strong message that animal welfare, public safety, and compassionate community services matter in Charlotte. We especially want to express our gratitude for the proposed additional veterinarian, also the proposed foster coordinator and a volunteer coordinator. These positions are not just administration additions, they are lifesaving resources. The veterinarian helps provide desperately needed medical care to injured, neglected, and sick animals, and the proposed foster and volunteer coordinator strengthens the network of community members who step forward every day to help save lives, reduce overcrowding, and support adoptions. We also were incredibly encouraged by the continued investment in the future Satellite Adoption Center on South Tryon Street. This facility represents hope for a more modern, humane, and efficient system that better serves animals, staff, volunteers, and our community. Dedicated space for dogs, cats, and small pets will improve care, reduce stress on the animals, and expand adoption opportunities across our region. Charlotte continues to grow rapidly, and with that growth comes increased demand on shelter services. These investments are necessary, responsible, and long overdue, and we want City Council to know we're a strong community behind it.

Annalise Eberhard, 1714 Choyce Avenue said hello, my name is Annalise Eberhard, and I'm a resident of District Three. I'm also a volunteer and a foster with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Animal Care and Control. As a volunteer, I choose to show up to support some of our community's most vulnerable pets. On difficult days, I can put on my grossest clothes, walk into the shelter, and still be greeted with wagging tails and slobbery kisses. I choose to help train new volunteers, I choose to exercise animals, and I choose to advocate for them, but when the emotional weight of this work becomes overwhelming, I can also choose to step away for my own mental health. Our staff do not have that option. As Charlotte continues to grow, and more families struggle with affordable housing and financial instability, the shelter increasingly reflects those challenges. Pets are often caught in the middle of housing transitions, economic hardships, and crisis situations. Even on the hardest of days, staff continue showing up. I have seen employees stay hours after closing to unload vans, process incoming animals, clean kennels, and care for pets that need immediate attention. They are compassionate, resilient, and deeply committed, but they are also exhausted. As our foster and volunteer programs continue to expand, we are grateful for the proposed additional staffing positions for this upcoming fiscal year budget. These positions are not luxuries, they are essential supports for workers carrying an enormous responsibility every day, and while we eagerly await the new remote facility to be completed, our staff, volunteers, fosters, and animals still need continued investment and enrichment resources, medical care, outreach services, and community clinics. Thank you for your continued support for both the people and the animals who depend on these services.

Terri White, 3500 Shamrock Drive said good evening. You know I have comments about Charlotte Museum of History, but I will just email those, because tonight I'm not just representing Charlotte Museum of History, but the broader arts and culture sector of Charlotte. I am here to challenge the idea that public funding of the arts is frivolous, or worse, should only be increased or considered when all other social ills have been

remedied and our City has a robust budget surplus. History tells us that that perfect moment never materializes, and in fact shows us that the arts and culture sector are often a part of the solution. The Harlem Renaissance flourished during an era marked by some of the worst racial violence and economic instability of our nation. During the great depression, the federal government invested in artists, writers, theatres, musicians, and the public art spaces through the WPA (Works Progress Administration), with the understanding that culture is key to America's recovery and identity. During World War II, it was our sector that traveled the world to strengthen morale with our troops and to spread our democratic values. After September 11th, museums, libraries, and memorials forced us all to make good on our collective promise that we would never forget, including here in this very building. The arts should not become an afterthought when challenges arise. History again has shown us that they matter more during difficult times than ever and are qualitatively and quantitatively a part of the solution. Your arts and culture sector is ready to stand forth and be more than just cool stock photos on City marketing. We are ready to continue shaping the quality of life, economic development, tourism, education, and our civic identity. Charlotte has the opportunity to be brave and innovative. We are more than ready. Are you?

Kass Ottley, 1015 Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road said hello. Good evening, City Council. On average, 157 people move to Charlotte-Mecklenburg every day, and with that we have to factor in the added amount of trash, water usage, new roads, transportation, and infrastructure wear and tear. City workers are the ones that fill the gap, pick up the trash, pick up the slack, and make sure that Charlotte is working. I know that most folks don't think about it when they turn on their water or they put their trash outside, but we need them to understand that City workers work in all extreme weather, cold, heat, storms, to make sure this City works. Each year, police automatically get a 10 percent raise, with fire close behind. City workers are always dead last every year. When City workers receive a four percent raise, most of them only receive about two percent of that raise, I'm not sure if everybody knows that, due to performance reviews. So, while other workers in the City are climbing the economic ladder, a lot of our workers are unfairly being left behind, and when they get those performance reviews, a lot of times they are by supervisors that have never driven with them, never ridden with them, and never been in the vehicle with them, and that's unfair. So, City workers absolutely deserve more than a four percent raise. We are excited about the twenty-five percent minimum wage moving up, but a four percent raise is just not enough. City workers are essential to the work that police and fire do, because if there is not water, fire department cannot do their job. So, we would like our workers to be recognized. We would like them to get a 10 percent raise. We would like them to be able to thrive and be able to move up the economic ladder like everyone else in this City. I'd like to thank all of you for your time. Thank you.

Dominic Harris, 3016 Polk and White Road said alright, good evening, everybody. Thank ya'll for coming out. I know I'm glad to be here just to let ya'll hear what I've got on my mind. So, the \$25 an hour, I'd like to appreciate ya'll for that, we finally got that. We tried to get that last year, but this year that's good. You've got workers coming in making more than any job that I know of starting, so I think that's great for the guys coming through the door. For the people that were here, when we saw that 10 percent come out for the police, we was like alright. Saw the seven percent come out for the fire, alright. We saw that four percent come out for us, heads were down. Now, we just didn't think it was enough, not to represent us and the work that we were doing. I mean, we worked for the past year, we like to get rewarded just as well as anybody else. We want to be respected as much as you guys say we are, and just looking at those guys getting more than us, everybody getting more than us, we don't feel that respect. Then, we've got to fight for it on top of that. So, it's four percent, but then we've got to fight for it by proving to a manager, that might not like us, that, hey, I deserve that other percent on top of that. So, I mean it's tough for us. We're getting maybe four percent. It's not four percent automatic, it's maybe four percent. We'd like to see 10 percent. I know I'd like to see 10 percent. If I saw that 10 percent in my check, I know my wife would be happy, she's up there. Well, that's really all I've got to say. If ya'll guys can do better, we want you guys to go in there and think about it, talk about it, and just put some respect on it, put some respect on our checks.

Laura Belcher, 3815 Latrobe Drive said good evening, Mayor, City Council, and City Manager. I'm Laura Belcher. I am the President and CEO (Chief Executive Officer) of Habitat Charlotte Region, and I am thrilled that we have a great partnership with the City of Charlotte in bringing affordable homeownership to this community through Housing Trust Fund dollars and other investments. I want to thank each of you for your partnership, and want to acknowledge and thank Mayor Lyles for your partnership and work over the years. Tonight, I'm here to express strong support for the City Manager's proposal of \$125 million Housing Bond placed on the November 2026 ballot, and encourage long-term strategic approach and housing investment in Charlotte. As in the past, this bond proposal is more than a funding request, it is a clear signal that Charlotte is serious about protecting residents from displacement, expanding housing affordability, and responding to the true scale of our need. At a time when housing costs continue to outpace wages, the level of investment is not only appropriate, it is responsible and it is necessary. I also want to emphasize the importance of steady, predictable growth in the bond funding over time. Affordable housing developments work best when cities can make reliable, long-term commitments, and consistent bond strategy allows developers and lenders and nonprofit partners to plan, to manage cost, and to bring projects to market more efficiently. Housing projects take years to plan, and sustained investment enables developers, especially mission-driven nonprofits, to be intentional and strategic in the way that we can meet the Council's goals. With strategic planning and continued growth in investments in housing, we can align housing investments with transit and infrastructure, we can preserve existing affordable housing minimizing displacement, we can ensure new developments, reach families across the community, and we can create the time and flexibility needed to explore innovation and new housing solutions. In short, this \$125 million bond is a smart investment in Charlotte's future, and its impact will be strongest if sustained and increased over time. Thank you all.

Holly Savoy, 4523 Givens Way said good evening, Mayor and Council members. My name is Dr. Holly Savoy, and I'm the Executive Director of Charlotte Trans Health. I'm also a resident of District One, and working closely with transgender and gender diverse individuals navigating housing and healthcare systems across our City. We recently worked with a client, an older transgender woman, who came to us after being exposed to unsafe housing conditions and facing eviction when she tried to advocate for herself. At that point, her health was declining and she had nowhere to turn. Through coordinated support, she was able to access affirming healthcare, stabilize her health, and begin rebuilding her life. Today, she describes that support as lifesaving. Her experience is not unique. We regularly encounter situations where housing instability, discrimination, and gaps in provider knowledge make it harder for people to access care and feel safe in the systems meant to support them. These are not abstract issues; they affect our clients, our neighbors, our friends, and our family members, and those impacts are felt especially deeply by black transgender women and members of immigrant communities already facing disproportionate barriers to safety and housing stability. When housing systems aren't accessible, neither is care. Housing is often the front door to stability, to healthcare, and to mental health support, but the good news is there are actionable solutions. Charlotte Trans Health, alongside many of our community partners already doing this work on the ground, have a model that works, training providers and organizations in practical evidence-based affirming practices that translate into real world change. With targeted support from the City, we can expand this work within housing systems, providing ongoing education and capacity building for shelters and housing programs. So, today, we are asking the City to dedicate funding toward regular sustained training for housing providers on nondiscrimination and affirming practices. When we invest in equipping our systems to serve everyone, we make Charlotte safer and stronger for all of us. So, thank you for your time and commitment to Charlotte.

O'Shauna Hunter, 3617 Moorhen Drive said good evening, hello everyone, Mayor, Council members, and City staff. My name is O'Shauna Hunter, and I'm speaking tonight on behalf of OneMECK, which is a coalition of community members committed to advancing equity and affordability in housing across Mecklenburg County. Our members include leaders with experience in affordable housing development,

homelessness response, legal services, housing stability, and community development. Collectively, we work alongside organizations who are working everyday to address the affordable housing crisis here in Charlotte. I am here today to strongly urge Council to increase the Housing Trust Fund to \$200 million. From both a system and implementation perspective, the current funding level is not sufficient to meet the scale of need. Charlotte currently has nearly 2,500 residents experiencing homelessness, more than 110,000 cost-burdened residents and renters, and a shortage of nearly 40,000 affordable housing homes. The last bond increase from \$50 million to \$100 million created important new opportunities, especially around anti-displacement and supportive housing along with homeownership, but once the funds were divided across multiple priorities, there was still not enough capacity to fund many strong affordable housing developments and critical programs. This has real consequences. When Charlotte cannot fully fund rental production and the services needed to address homelessness and housing instability, the impact is felt for generations. I've seen what happens when our community comes together to meet the need. This is a manageable investment. Increasing the Housing Trust Fund an additional \$100 million would increase Charlotte's overall debt by only 1.5 percent, while significantly increasing and strengthening our ability to preserve housing stability and economic diversity across our City. We urge Council to increase a \$200 million Housing Trust Fund in the upcoming budget. Thank you.

Mark Wilson, 6638 Wicked Oak Lane said good evening, Council. I'm Mark Wilson, Secretary for Charlotte Firefighters Association, Local 660. I spoke here in January 2026, about the important needs of the firefighters. I've been in meetings with many of you since then explaining the importance of these needs. You echoed the importance of these needs. If the budget does not get adjusted to meet the need of pay parity, lower healthcare costs, and modified duty positions, then the trust between this City and its citizens has been violated. The voters put their trust and faith in you to ensure their safety. During the budget meetings, many of you stressed the return on investment. The investment in the fire department has been low, and that low return has come calling. The below regional and national average pay we receive is hurting recruitment and retention. A Charlotte Firefighter's career is supposed to be at least 25 years. The City is losing their investment of training, equipment, and knowledge of the firefighter when they leave, because they can no longer support their families or afford healthcare coverage. This City has campaigns all over the City preaching fairness, equity and justice, however, these are ignored when it comes to the firefighters. The true raise for over 80 percent of the fire department out of the proposed budget is really two percent. The other five percent of the proposed seven percent was already set for a November 2026 date when firefighters would get their annual step increase. The step increase is an annual adjustment to move the firefighter closer to their fair market value of the position. Firefighters work for less than their market value for years until they reach this top step, which is the true market value. This process is built on the idea of more experienced the firefighter is the more value they have. The more the firefighter has invested themselves in the City the more the City receives in return, return on investment. That two percent raise is quickly washed away by the increase of healthcare costs. Firefighters are forced to resign from the department and are even terminated when they can no longer ride the firetruck after they are injured on the job. These firefighters perform essential and critical jobs off the truck while healing. The need to the firefighters are an investment that the City needs to make, and the return is the continuation of over 140 years of proven bravery and safety for the City of Charlotte. Thank you.

Frankie Clark, 3515 Central Avenue said good evening, Mayor and all of our distinguished Council. My name is Frankie Clark, and I'm a member of Action North Carolina, and even though you mainly hear from our Political Director, Robert Dawkins, we senior members, and I'm 80, we have a part in Action North Carolina. I just wanted to stop by tonight to spend a couple of minutes addressing the issues Robert keeps in front of you. This Action North Carolina is a partner organization to the Redress Movement; this is the third People's Budget. We do this every year to ensure organizations big and small, that work on issues facing low- and moderate-income communities, have their issues addressed. We have spent the last few months knocking

on doors, talking to residents at churches, bus stops, wherever we can, and in grocery stores to address these issues. Now, this year, we present you with the People's Budget calling for an increase in same Housing Trust Fund, more money for displacement caused by the new mobility plan and transportation tax that's costing people, legal eviction assistance for residents who are facing unfair evictions, improvements to CATS bus service for those riders with disabilities. Please listen to the speakers that come behind me, because it's important that we address these issues for the low and moderate incomes. It's important that you pay attention to the People's Budget; it includes a whole lot of organizations that have come together that do a good service for Charlotte. Now, listen here Charlotte, this is your time to shine.

Mayor Lyles said before we go to Shannon, I'd like to recognize a former Council member here, Tiawana Brown, wave to everybody please. Who else, Braxton. Braxton's up there.

Shannon Binns, 1711 Commonwealth Avenue said thank you, Mayor and Council members. First, I want to say that Sustain Charlotte strongly supports The People's Budget. It reflects community priorities around housing, transportation, and equity, and we appreciate the leadership behind it. I know you'll be discussing I-77 later tonight, which also has a massive impact on our budget now and in the future. Over the past several weeks, our coalition has worked in good faith with several members of Council. We provided detailed written feedback, including specific word edits, to strengthen the proposed resolution, yet none of those recommendations are reflected in the current draft before you tonight. Instead, the resolution keeps the analysis in the hands of NC-DOT (North Carolina Department of Transportation); it refocuses on refining the current proposal, rather than evaluating fundamentally different solutions, and does not ensure that this analysis will occur before the RFP is issued. In other words, this resolution reflects what NC-DOT is already doing, and keeps the project moving forward toward a predetermined outcome, that toll lanes will be built, rather than determining whether that is the right solution at all. So, we need to be clear, we cannot support this resolution in its current form. That said, it is not too late. If this Council adds an independent study that fairly evaluates a full range of toll lane alternatives, including nonhighway options in clear timing, so that this is done before the RFP is issued, then this will be something the community can stand behind, and I want to close on what's possible. I brought each of you printed copies of three designs concepts for 77, developed by local professional design firms. These show what it could look like to repair and reconnect communities along this corridor. These designs were developed at no cost to taxpayers, local or state, and I'm sharing them because you deserve to see what's possible before making this decision. Those same teams will present Thursday at 1:00 p.m. in this building. To the Board of County Commissioners, I hope you will attend. This is a moment for leadership, and we hope you will rise to the occasion. Thank you.

Shemika Robinson, 704 Louise Avenue said hey, everybody. My name is Shemika Robinson. Thank you Council members and Mayor for hearing me out. I'm the Vice President of National Federation for the Blind at the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Chapter. We're the biggest chapter in North and South Carolina. I'm here to talk about paratransit and transportation. Right now, with paratransit we pay the highest for people with disabilities and our seniors, yet, still we get less and are treated like second-class citizens. We're never approached or asked anything with transit or any transparency with STS (Speech-to-Speech). We're here to just tell you to throw us a bone or give us something in your budget. With the morale of the staff and the low morale of the staff, and with that and them being stressed out, we get the blunt of that stress. We're here to just ask you Council people please. I know you've got the Light Rail, and I know the tragedy, but we're over here, your seniors and your disability, the most vulnerable, asking for you to please remember us. Even with the MPTA, we're asking for you please to think about us over here at transit. We need operators. We need new buses. I'm tired of being stuck on 85, coming from dialysis in 90-degree weather with buses that do not work or just breaking down, and sitting there with that driver for an hour waiting for somebody to come, because you put the maintenance crew with the regular, and we don't have our own maintenance crew, so we have to wait for them to do the regular buses first before they'll give us priority. I had to come here today for a whole

hour. I live in University area. A couple of weeks ago, I was on the bus for four hours. I'm over here with one leg. County please, think about us. One day, you're going to be here. One day, you're going to be a senior, and then to think that you were in a leadership position where you could've done something.

Ted Fillette, 220 Wonderwood Drive said hello, Mayor and members of Council. I'm Ted Fillette, and I'm here speaking on the Housing Trust Fund amount for The People's Budget. We recommend a \$200 million Trust Fund effort in the November 2026 referendum. When the Council adopted the policy in 2024 to target the different types of housing methods, it allocated \$35 million for new construction of rental housing, which is \$15 million less than what was available when we had a \$50 million bond, and there was so many other good forms of housing included in the allocation system, but nevertheless it reduced the amount available for the new construction. As a result of this, in the 2025 spring cycle of Trust Fund awards, some meritorious proposals for new construction were passed over, and that year Wake and Durham Counties together received about four times as many tax credit awards as we got in Mecklenburg; we only had one in Charlotte. In April of 2026, meritorious rental new construction proposals in Charlotte were passed over again. One of them was a really outstanding site right on the border of Eastover and Grier Heights. It would have provided 150 new units of affordable housing, 103 two bedrooms, 27 three bedrooms. We don't need to lose these opportunities. We don't need to have competition between new construction of rental, homeownership, good NOAH (Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing) preservation. What we need is a bigger pot of money, so that you can do all of these different strategies that are successful. Go for \$200 million. Thank you.

Dr. Kymberly Byrd, 115 Razades Way said good evening. My name is Kymberly Byrd, and I serve on the board of Springclean. Springclean builds pathways to green economy careers while diverting material from landfills. We do this by repurposing donated textile materials, providing community awareness about sustainability, and offering flexible jobs that pay good wages. We foresee a future where nothing goes to waste, and everyone has opportunities to earn money while creating positive impact on the planet. Springclean is in a period of growth and grew 300 percent over the last year. Our move to Camp North End, located in the Corridor of Opportunity, has allowed us to magnify our impact. We were able to partner with Renaissance West STEAM Academy in another Corridor of Opportunity. At the academy, we operate an after-school program that uses sustainable fashion as a way to enhance core academic skills. Our programs align with local government goals of workforce development. We have created more than 80 roles in the past seven years, contractors, internships, and more recently full-time rolls, as part of NCWorks. Springclean has two funding requests. The first is a financial partner request to expand our operations at Camp North End. The second is a People's Budget request to fund internships and apprenticeships. We're eager to partner with the Mayor's Office of Youth Opportunities in this effort. Thank you so much for your time.

Bobby Drakeford, 1914 Brunswick Avenue said good evening, Mayor, City Council and staff. Thank you for allowing us to speak. I'm here as an advocate for The People's Budget, in particular to address some of the needs that we have with displacement in the housing arena very much related to the expansion of the transit tax knowing the impact it will have with the examples we see throughout the City that we've referenced many times as lessons we've learned from the Green Line or Blue Line. We believe very much it requires a specific allocation of funds not subject to annual approval dedicated to that particular geography that we know will be impacted. So, the request is to exceed the allocated funding amount with dedicated funds for particular geographies and a variety of housing measures that would include homeownership, land banking, and affordable housing for rental as well. That's my request. I was here last year to speak on topics like this, including a request to learn a lot more about opportunity corridors, and I'm speaking as an individual because I'm curious about the components of it and how it compares to other areas, in particular the components of it, and I'm not sure where to go with that request again this year, but thank you for your time.

Carol Hardison, 500 A Spratt Street said good evening, Madam Mayor, members of City Council. Madam Mayor, thank you for your decades of dedicated service. I'm Carol Hardison with Crisis Assistance Ministry, and I'm here tonight in support of The People's Budget. At Crisis Assistance, everyday we see the impact of a lack of affordable housing combined with a lack of living wages has on individuals and families forced to choose between rent and food, medicine or utilities, and we see the impact of mass displacement, when no matter how hard a family works to afford stable housing, it can be taken away on a moments notice. We support the \$200 million Housing bond. Despite emergency federal stimulus funding, pouring millions into rental assistance to stabilize the economy for several years, eviction filings in this City have surged with a record breaking 52,625 filings last fiscal year alone. That's moms, dads, and their kids faced with eviction, over 52,000. The lesson is clear. Financial assistance alone doesn't create housing stability, that's why the public-private partnership we have with the City and Crisis Assistance Ministry is so much appreciated and so important. Your public funds target the City's priorities, and we combine them with philanthropic dollars and other public dollars to ensure individualized services, budget assessments, targeted support services, connections to wraparound services, not just short-term crisis management, and access to legal representation helps stop unlawful evictions and ensure tenants understand their rights. Your investment in this work pays enormous dividends for families who would otherwise have no voice in the process. In summary, as Mr. Fillette said, we appreciate your support, a large funding for affordable housing would be much appreciated, and you guys work day in and day out tirelessly, it is appreciated. Thank you.

Jessica Moreno, 3601 Central Avenue said hey, my name is Jessica Moreno. I'm a housing organizer with Action NC, and part of The People's Budget Coalition. I'm going to talk about how Charlotte is growing rapidly. We all know that. About 157 everyday move to Charlotte and about 181 people if we're counting new births. Growth is coming whether we are prepared or not for it, but the question is, will Charlotte remain a city where working people can afford to stay, or a city only for those with the highest incomes? Under the joint program, A Home For All, the County already invested \$1.2 million, but the City has not made its smaller commitment of \$200K. I'm here asking for the City to invest that money to avert unlawful evictions. Last year, over 52,000 tenants in Mecklenburg County faced eviction filings. We know landlords, about 80 percent, have lawyers, only four percent of tenants do. When tenants receive legal support, they win, and so we're asking for a fighting chance for the families, for the children, who if we don't provide the support, they're going to end up living with multiple families in a household, living in cars, living on the streets. If we can provide this money to help our community that's what we should do. I mean, we're going to help seniors, families, and the people that are working here and should be able to live here. Charlotte says it values affordable housing, safety and opportunity. Preventing unnecessary evictions is all three. Our City needs to be compassionate and responsible, and I urge you to include this in investment in the budget. Thank you.

Judith Brown, 405 Alpha Street said greetings and good evening, City of Charlotte Council members, City Manager, and good evening, my dear Madam Mayor. My name is Judith Brown. I am a disabled resident of Charlotte, a mother of two sons on autism, and the Executive Director of Project 70Forward, a nonprofit committed to the support of people with disabilities. Through my work, I engage directly with individuals and families with disabilities across all of the districts, and I see firsthand the barriers that continue to limit access, independence and opportunity. This is not just a disability issue, it is a Charlotte issue, because when residents with disabilities are excluded, our entire city is less strong, less connected, and less just. This is why I'm proud to endorse The People's Budget. We are asking the City of Charlotte to remove physical and systemic accessibility barriers throughout the City, invest in fully accessible infrastructure in the modes of transportation, expand the construction and the number of, not only affordable, but accessible, homes to be added to our housing stock, and ensure that people with disabilities continue to be included in the decisionmaking process, because true accessibility means nothing about us without all of us. Charlotte has the opportunity to lead, to become a world-class city where everyone, regardless of ability, can live, work, and thrive with dignity. I urge you to support policies and funding decisions that

reflect that vision. Thank you for your time. I thank you, my sons thank you, and we thank you for your commitment to building a more inclusive Charlotte.

Greg Jerrell, 2910 Parkway Avenue said good evening, Council and Madam Mayor, Revered Greg Jerrell. At The Redress Movement that I organize with, we think that the highest aim of our work is not always to be oppositional, but rather something that we call co-governance with elected bodies, that is that we work together as partners. In a political world that's full of friction, that I think could fairly be described as full contact conflict, it can be refreshing not to feel like we have to come stand up here and scream all the time, and you probably don't want to be screamed at. There are plenty of people that do need to be screamed at, but we can aim that elsewhere. So, that's what The People's Budget Coalition works for each year, that is that we want to together in that coalition do the work of research to present to you well-informed proposals. We listen to grassroots communities, to grassroots residents, to grassroots nonprofits and organizations, we solicit support from several thousand Charlotte residents, and then we discuss and test proposals with staff and elected officials year-round, so that we can present to you a complete package of strong proposals. In our work, we're doing what we hear from you that you want, that is an active and engaged and informed citizenry. You've heard from our people tonight, from nearly a dozen of them, and we're asking you now to listen and to vote with us, that is to take action for the things that we have proposed to you. I brought with me the names of going on now 1,500 folks from around Charlotte who have signed on in support of The People's Budget. I've got the first half of these cards for you, and we want you to support a \$200 million Housing Trust Fund bond, a \$25 minimum wage for our City workers, a \$200,000 fund to prevent unnecessary evictions, better transit equity for disabled riders. Support The People's Budget tonight. Thank you.

Stephanie Vander Lugt, 2435 Rozzelles Ferry Road said good evening, Mayor and Council members. I am Reverend Stephanie Vander Lugt. I'm the Co-Founder and Executive Director of Kinship Plot, which is a community-based organization developing affordable housing on underutilized church-owned land. I am here alongside The People's Budget Coalition in strong support of funding the Housing Trust Fund at \$200 million. Kinship Plot has directly benefited from the City's investment in the Faith In Housing initiative funded by the last HTF (Housing Trust Fund) bond, and as part of that cohort currently, we have received critical technical assistance, and early support that has helped move us from vision to viability. It has bridged real gaps in knowledge, relationships, and capacity, especially for organizations like ours rooted in the community and working in partnership with houses of worship, and still I want to be honest that it only scratches the surface. We are currently advancing a 24-unit affordable housing development on underutilized church-owned land, serving households earning 40 percent to 70 percent of the Area Median Income, and we've completed predevelopment, and we are ready to move forward, but the path ahead is very steep, and the cost of building deeply affordable housing is simply beyond what small community-based developers can carry alone, and yet organizations like ours are essential to meeting the need, and we're close to the community that we are designing and building with, and our partnership with the church brings trust, stability, and long-term commitment to the work. We are not driven by profit. We are driven by a vision of a stronger, more connected community, and right now groups like ours are asked to compete with large, well-capitalized developers. Without deeper public investment, many community-rooted projects will not make it across the finish line. So, if the City wants more local developers, more faith-based partnerships, and more housing that truly reflects our neighborhoods, then the City must partner with us at scale. Expanding the Housing Trust Fund is not just about more units, it's about who gets to build, who benefits, and how we shape Charlotte's future together. Thank you.

Suzanne Canali, 601 East 5th Street, Suite 400 said good evening. My name is Suzanne Canali, and I am the Chief Legal Officer of Safe Alliance. I am here to request that you restore funding for Safe Alliance to the Fiscal Year 2027 Budget. Through Safe Alliance's Victim Assistance Court Program and our 24/7 help line, we provide critical services to survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking that help to reduce repeat violence. Without connection to Safe Alliance services, many

survivors return to dangerous situations, because they have nowhere else to turn. The tools Safe Alliance provide are often the only barriers between escalating violence and homicide after police leave the scene. Safe Alliance is part of a community response to violence. We work closely with law enforcement, our elected District Attorney, Spencer Merriweather, and his office, as well as other key community partners. Together, we ensure survivors are connected to protection, justice, advocacy, and support immediately and effectively. Safe Alliance's services directly support the City's priorities. Our work increases community safety, preventing repeat calls and escalation of violence and reduces homelessness by increasing family stability. Domestic violence is a leading cause of family homelessness, and our office helps individuals obtain Domestic Violence Protective Orders that help them stay in their homes or provide alternative housing, gain economic mobility, and secure temporary custody to keep children safe. Our Greater Charlotte Help Line is available 24 hours a day and is an access point for survivors. They can get immediate access to safety planning, emergency housing, and access to legal advocacy. Without Safe Alliance, victims are far more likely to be left without protection and support during the most dangerous, vulnerable moments of their life. A loss of funding is a loss that will be felt across our community through increased violence, destabilized families, and preventable tragedies that ripple far beyond one household. Thank you.

Laura Lawrence, 601 East 5th Street, Suite 400 said good evening, Mayor Lyles, City Council and City staff. I am Laura Lawrence. I'm the President and CEO of Safe Alliance, and for over 20 years the City has partnered with Safe Alliance to ensure that survivors have the lifesaving-skills and support they need to live a violence-free life. One in three women and one in four men will experience intimate partner violence in their lifetime. Cutting funding will not reduce cost, it will increase them. The City will pay more through more repeat police calls, more emergency room visits, more homelessness, and greater strains on our courts, and our law enforcement. The human cost is even greater. Traumatized children, families living in fear and in danger, increased danger to our officers, and lives lost to preventable violence. CMPD (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department) has already reported an increase in domestic violence-related homicides this year. Domestic violence cases are often where escalating homicide risk shows up first long before it turns lethal. Police can respond in the moment, but arrests alone do not create accountability. As a former prosecutor myself, I can say clearly, cases are many times won or lost based on sustained survivor engagement. These cases often take years, and without ongoing support, survivors disengage. When this happens, cases collapse, victims and children remain in danger, and dangerous offenders return and remain in our community. This is why the Victim Assistance Court Program matters. VACP provides long-term legal advocacy, court accompaniment, protective orders, and access to pro bono attorneys. Thank you very much.

Audra Toussaint, 601 East 5th Street, Suite 400 said good evening. My name is Audra Toussaint, and I am a survivor of domestic violence. I'm here with my daughter today, standing right in front of Spencer Merriweather, and we are alive because of the support services that I received from Safe Alliance and Victims Assistance. I ended a violent relationship in 2014, but things only intensified as they often do. I filed for my first restraining order and paid a lawyer to represent me, because I didn't know about the free legal services that Safe Alliance provides victims. Throughout that year, I lived in constant fear. I was afraid that I would not get a renewal of my order, so I called the Greater Charlotte Hope Line. They encouraged me to file it, so I did, and I got a two-year renewal. That phone call saved my life. My abuser violated that order 14 times over the next decade. I met a Safe Alliance court advocate at a hearing for those violations in 2016. Her support helped me face him in court. Safe Alliance provides ongoing advocacy as survivors move through complex systems that can otherwise feel overwhelming. The court system is daunting and difficult to navigate. I found out about their legal advocacy with the Victims Assistance Court Program in 2018. I have been represented by a Safe Alliance lawyer at five renewal hearings, and I was granted a renewal every time. I'm not sure that I would have or could have kept going without them. I have seen countless women give up and it's heartbreaking. Having a court advocate in criminal court and free legal representation in Domestic Violence Court is a

gamechanger for victims that are trying to navigate the system. When survivors remain connected from the Hope Line through the court resolution, outcomes are stronger. Calling 911 was only the beginning of my journey to becoming a survivor. Victims need to have the support to follow through sometimes for years, like me. That's where Safe Alliance comes in. Partnering with law enforcement to help victims get protection and services they need, they save countless lives in our community like my daughter, Kinsey, and myself.

Craig Varnum, 601 East 5th Street, Suite 400 said thank you, Mayor. Good evening, my name is Craig Varnum. I retired from the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department last year, and prior to that I had the honor to serve as the Domestic Violence Unit Supervisor for about five years. I'm also a current board member for Safe Alliance, and I'm here tonight to strongly urge you to continue funding Safe Alliance in Fiscal Year 2027. During my time with the Domestic Violence Unit, I had the incredible honor and privilege to meet, to work with, to get to know, and to be inspired by the incredible people, the staff, the employees, the volunteers and the survivors with Safe Alliance, and to see firsthand the incredible transformational and lifesaving work that they provide. I also got to be on the ground floor of bringing a Family Justice Center to this community. Many people in this room were part of that movement. Mr. Jones, you were gracious enough to join us on a visit to Nashville to see that they built their Family Justice Center. For those that don't know, it's a one-stop shop for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, human trafficking, and elder abuse. It puts all of the services and resources that a victim needs in one place. Mr. Jones saw that firsthand. District Attorney, Spencer Merriweather saw that firsthand, and we as a collective community over the last nine years are about to make that a reality as the Umbrella Center will open next year. As such, funding for Safe Alliance has never been more critical. As you heard from Audra and from Laura and from Suzie and from the other survivors that you'll hear from tonight, not only does that lifesaving work help our victims become survivors and ultimately thrivers, it also makes our police officers and our community safer. As it turns out, men that abuse women, particularly men that strangle women, are some of the most violent human beings on planet earth. A man who strangles a woman is 80 percent more likely to kill her, and up to 90 percent of convicted cop killers have a history of strangling women. So, when we hold the most violent abusers accountable, we make our community safer, we make our police officers safer. Funding for Safe Alliance is funding for our community, for our police officers, and for the entire community.

La Reishia Poore, 601 East 5th Street, Suite 400 said my name is La Reishia Poore, and I will say thank you to Mayor Lyles and the Council for this opportunity. I'm standing here to represent the hope that Safe Alliance presented to me. As a survivor of domestic violence, I'm able to lift my head up high, and know that the resources helped me, knowing that I've been an advocate before I lived in shame, not knowing that a phone call could save my life, a police officer coming to my home and helping me, a SANE (Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner) Nurse and an advocate coming to the actual hospital room, as my very own mother had to listen to this horrific story of what happened to me here in Charlotte, North Carolina. I want to let you know that these funds present hope, and the hope that is needed from Safe Alliance, it cannot go away. Right now, I work in the detention center right here in Charlotte, North Carolina, teaching domestic violence awareness and intervention and prevention to the ladies who are currently incarcerated for reactive aggression due to being fed up from the domestic violence that has been presented to them. This is the opportunity for us to stand and let people know that if it doesn't happen to you, it doesn't mean it doesn't impact you. The whole City is impacted by the increase of domestic violence, and because of that we have some work to do. We have the work to do in front of us, and we cannot sit down, we cannot shy back, we cannot stop the movement of the awareness of domestic violence. So, I'm here to stand before you as presenting hope, that I have came out of the situation of domestic violence strong, that I can empower other women and other men to know that there is more on the other side. I am a recipient of great services that need to continue on, not just for me, but for people who are scared to stand up and to talk about the domestic violence that's happening in Charlotte, North Carolina.

Jamilah Espinosa, 601 East 5th Street, Suite 400 said alright, good evening, Mayor, City Council members, and City Manager. My name is Jamilah Espinosa, and I respectfully ask that the City continue funding Safe Alliance in Fiscal Year 2027, because this work remains essential to the safety and stability of our community. For more than 100 years, yes 100 years, Safe Alliance has helped Charlotte respond to violence by building systems that protect survivors, like Audra and La Reishia, strengthen accountability, and support public safety. This is not duplicate work, this is the work that happens after that 911 call, when the long-term safety outcome is actually determined. If community safety is truly one of this City's priorities, and I believe it is, then we cannot weaken one of the systems specifically designed to interrupt escalating violence before it becomes more lethal, more widespread, and more costly to contain. For more than 20 years, the City of Charlotte has been a critical partner through direct financial support. That investment reflects a shared understanding that domestic violence and sexual violence response is not peripheral, it is a core public safety infrastructure. Because of this partnership, Charlotte has built a coordinated response that includes 24/7 crisis intervention, immediate legal protection, as Audra explained, and long-term core advocacy, housing stabilization, and close alignment with law enforcement, as Mr. Varnum explained, and the District Attorney's Office. The bottom line is that cutting Safe Alliance does not reduce the cost of violence, it just transfers it. Charlotte will pay for it later, through more repeated calls, more overwhelmed emergency systems, more failed prosecutions, and more housing instability. We ask that you do not allow that to happen. Safe Alliance is a critical part of our community, and we ask that you consider it as such through your actions. Thank you.

Kenny Robinson, 6203 Rockshire Drive said thank you, Madam Mayor, City Council. Ya'll know who I am. I've got my stuff written down that I was going to say, but when I walked in here, it was so full I couldn't even get in here. When I walked in here and I saw all these red shirts, I said, man, this is a shame. I'm here to talk about what I'm here to talk about for the people that I represent, but to see firefighters in here asking for money, something isn't right. Ya'll have to do something about that. So, I'm here to talk about affordable housing and request an additional \$25 million in the Housing Trust Fund, simply because organizations like mine are being left out of the Housing Trust Fund having to compete with major established developers. You know who they are. Time and time again they get the money, we get left out. I've been trying to build this project for three years now. I can't raise \$102 million. I'm trying to raise \$2 million and can't do that. So, we need some additional Housing Trust Fund money that targets small emerging developers like us and others. Now, when it comes to The People's Budget, I am in support of that, and I would ask that the City Council and the County and the City Manager do a revision to public safety, and put a portion in there for prevention, because there has to be a preventative measure. Nonprofits like ours are doing the work each and every day. We are preventing crimes from happening. I can assure you that some of the nonprofit organizations that's doing the work, if it wasn't for us, there would be more crime. There would be more devastating crime, so look at that when you go back, and I'm asking to the City Manager, sharpen that pencil, and if you don't do anything else, find some money for these firefighters, find some money for Safe Alliance, find some money for [inaudible] \$4.5 billion, you can make something shake for some of these smaller organizations. I've seen the Financial Partners, it's almost a shame, you're talking about 0.0001 percent for Financial Partners. Thank you.

Derrick Davis, 9303 Dewey Drive said hello, City Council. I wanted to dispute the four percent, and that's for the same 10 percent the police are getting. I understand the sacrifice that comes with the police jobs, but police aren't the only ones that have died in the line of duty. Robert Taylor was killed on duty while working for Solid Waste. Ethan Riveria was murdered while on duty for CATS as a bus driver. As much as we need law enforcement, they can't be everywhere all the time. That's why we have the 2nd Amendment. We need to think past the kneejerk reaction of throwing money into law enforcement. It doesn't guarantee safety. It only insults citizen's intelligence as a lame attempt to appease and pacify. Safety comes from healthy, thriving economies, and a 10 percent raise all around City workers would do that. Safety comes from mental health. The Light Rail incident, the assailant's mother was complaining that she could not get mental health for her son. So, we need to be able to see past the smoke and the

mirrors and to understand that we have to invest in the community in order for the community to be safe. Thank you for my time.

Adam Ullmann, 4408 Pebblebrook Drive said good evening, Council. My name is Adam Ullmann, and I'm a Charlotte Firefighter. I'm not here representing the fire department nor the union.

Mayor Lyles said if you guys could let him be heard, please. Thank you.

Mr. Ullmann said I'm not here representing the fire department nor the union. I'm here representing myself and my family. I want to share a few facts that you may or may not know. The statement that all City employees are now making \$25 is not true. Even with a seven percent raise, firefighters will still be making under \$25 an hour. We work roughly 900 more hours a year than a standard 40-hour employee. That's more than 22 extra work weeks. After four years, firefighters stop receiving raises unless they promote, and to do that we are required to complete 23 days of unpaid training. To reach the rank of captain, it's another 28 days unpaid. In just a few years, that's over 50 days of unpaid work. If we take a sick day or a vacation in the same month, we work overtime, we lose our overtime pay in the same month. More than 90 percent of firefighters work a second job. Last year, I personally worked an additional 1,500 hours, putting me over 80 hours a week to make ends meet. We're told new trucks and equipment are part of our compensation, they're not. That's like saying City Council isn't getting paid because these chambers got new microphones. That's essential to do our jobs. We clean our stations. We maintain our grounds. We do landscaping. No other City department does that. Firefighters are even buying cleaning supplies out-of-pocket, because our budget has been frozen since February 2026. Sometimes front-line trucks aren't responding to your emergencies, because they're waiting on repairs that aren't funded. This forces us to respond with reserve units that are less broken. You guys promised pay parity, that promise has not been kept. We're asking you one thing, keep your word, take care of the people who take care of the City.

Brantley Stallings, 925 Standen Place Court, Pineville said good evening, Council. My name is Brantley Stallings, and I'm a 16-year veteran with the Charlotte Fire Department, and I'm the Public Safety Chair of the Pay Plan Committee for the Charlotte Fire Department. I'm speaking tonight to ask that you look at the budget for Fiscal Year 2027 and maintain pay parity with CMPD, and not to freeze both sides of the pay plan. This will be the second time, since I've been on, that the steps have been frozen. This is the time when individuals need to progress through the pay plan, especially since insurance premiums and deductibles are increasing in the upcoming budget year. It will only cost \$4 million more to fund the fire department 10 percent out of a \$4 billion budget. This upcoming budget will create an eight percent separation between police and fire, not including 2.5 percent that CMPD receives for shift differential. With the new City minimum being \$25 an hour, it will take our newly hired firefighters four years to accomplish this \$25 minimum hour that you have set, whereas new hire CMPD will currently start at \$31 an hour. We're only looking for fair and equitable treatment. Thank you for your time tonight.

Meredith Barbee, 221 Union Street, North Concord said good evening, Mayor and Council members. My name is Meredith Barbee, and my husband is a Charlotte Firefighter. I'm here tonight asking you to maintain pay parity between Charlotte Firefighters and Police Officers because in 2023 this Council voted to do so, and I'm asking you to honor that commitment now. As a prosecutor myself, I understand the value of police, and I'm glad that Council also takes that seriously, but both professions are vital, and the reality is that these jobs are not financially equivalent outside of base pay. Firefighters work roughly 2,700 hours per year compared with about 2,184 for police. So, even when pay is equal, firefighters are working more hours for the same salary. CMPD also has more opportunities for off-duty employment through the department, starting at \$46 per hour. Those opportunities are much more limited for firefighters and often mean working additional 12- to 24-hour shifts elsewhere for half that rate or less. At the same time, we ask firefighters to work 24-hour shifts, we ask them to give up entire days at a time, that means all of Christmas Eve, all of

Thanksgiving, their child's birthday, an entire day in the life of their family from wake up to bedtime. We have four children, and on shift days, I manage our household alone, while also working full time in public service. We depend on friends, family and neighbors to make it work. Tonight, instead of being here with me, my husband is at our children's practices, that's the family side of a 24-hour shift. The physical side is that many times firefighters are not sleeping during those shifts, they are running calls throughout the day and night. My husband sometimes comes home and spends much of his recovery day catching up on sleep before he can fully engage with our family again. When pay parity disappears that was promised, firefighters notice, their families notice, recruitment and retention notice. If parity was the right decision in 2023, it's still the right decision now. Please, keep fire and police equal in this budget, as you promised. Thank you.

Maggie Commins, 1148 Dilworth Crescent Row said Mayor Lyles, City Manager Jones, and members of the City Council, I have to start by saying I'm humbled to be here with all these people here and all the wonderful things that they are saying and advocating for. I'm a professor of Political Science at Queens University of Charlotte, and the Chair of the Charlotte International Cabinet. As you know, the cabinet is tasked with advising the Mayor and City Council on issues affecting the international community. During my term, the CIC (Charlotte International Cabinet) is focusing on two primary areas, community integration and international business. We're currently working on two white papers that we will be presenting to you all by early fall. These white papers will include some historical context for the city's international affairs, data illuminating how much Charlotte has changed, indeed been transformed in the past two decades, in terms of the share of the foreign-born population and also the amount of foreign direct investment we are attracting in a comparison of the City of Charlotte resources with those that are allocated to our peer cities. I want to thank the City Manager for including funding for an International Relations Manager in the proposed FY2027 Budget. Expanding City infrastructure and support to International Affairs is something for which the CIC has consistently advocated. We truly appreciate the progress indicated by this proposed position. We recognize that funds are constrained and that your decisions are difficult. The funding is included under the Elevates Engagement strategic priority, and we are grateful that you are committing resources to this goal. In addition to expanding engagement, as my colleague Satoshi Watanabe who's going to speak after me will explain, we have important opportunities to enhance our attractiveness to foreign direct investment. As my colleague Dina Nshisso will explain, she's also going to speak after me, the City's population has transformed over the past two decades. Our large and growing foreign-born population seeks enhanced engagement with the City. We are proud of our status as a welcoming city. Thank you.

Braxton Winston, P O Box 32101 said good evening, Mayor, Manager, and Council. Council members, I stand before you this evening to encourage you to look at this FY2027 Budget as a unique opportunity. The budget is the annual opportunity for the City Council to update its priorities and visions on the work needed to run, build, and grow our city. If the 11 of you work together in the coming days and weeks to go beyond the numbers, you have the ability to do what few, if any, other Councils have had the opportunity to do, and that is to set the agenda for the next Mayor of the City of Charlotte. In our system, it is the Mayor's job to work with the Manager and the community to implement and achieve the vision set by you, the Council. While you have a lot of work to do on many issues before you, none is more in your control than the budget, and approving one that explicitly sets the expectations that you have for the next Mayor of Charlotte. If you are able to define your expectations in a clear and bold fashion, then you can choose the person who you believe will most be willing and equipped to carry out your vision. Don't choose the next Mayor based on who will or who won't run next year, or whether they are currently on Council or not, please choose the next Mayor based on who will implement and carry out the vision of the City Council in a way that pleases this City Council. The FY2027 Budget is the best way to set those parameters, and therefore the agenda of the next Mayor of Charlotte. Thank you.

Connie Proctor, 2222 Selwyn Avenue said good evening, my name is Connie Proctor, current Chair of the Bicycle Advisory Committee. As I have heard many of you say, the

budget is a reflection of your values and priorities. Currently, it is leaving people on bicycles behind. To invite people to cycle, we need a safe connected bicycle network, a network that allows people to choose something other than a car to run to the store, to drop off their kids at school, to grab a cup of coffee, a network that allows children and older adults to move on their own to ride to activities and visit friends, a network that reduces cars on the street. We can build that network, we just have to invest accordingly. When I come to the CMGC (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center) by bike, I use the County's greenway infrastructure until I have to cross 277. Then I am forced onto a narrow sidewalk on 3rd Street, directly beside four lanes of fast-moving cars. I often pass people walking. I apologize because we should not be forced into a five-foot space while people in cars are given 50. This is a clear gap in the network, a gap that keeps people from riding. As currently proposed, the shared bicycle funding does not grow proportionately with the other mobility funding, and while high-injury network and SIA (Strategy Investment Area) projects improve specific areas and intersections, they are not the nimble tool that can bridge the gaps. That is where the bicycle program funding is most useful. If the budget is a reflection of our values and priorities, it does not currently prioritize bicycle mobility. It leaves the funding for filling the gaps behind. We, the members of the Bicycle Advisory Committee, ask that you adjust the budget to dedicate \$20 million per bond cycle to bicycle facilities, because a cycle lane is not the same as a cycle network. Thank you.

Jessica Lefkowitz, 820 Dobson Drive said hello, everyone. I'm glad to be here. My name is Jessica Lefkowitz. I am the Founder and Executive Director of Hearts For The Invisible. We are the lead homeless street outreach in Mecklenburg County. Some of my community partners that spoke before me mentioned a few disturbing numbers, one of which is the 52,000 households that have evictions filed against them. I want to also put some other numbers into perspective as to what happens to these families once they get evicted. In our very, very small street outreach program, over the last three years we have had over 400 children come through our program. That means children that were sleeping in a place not meant for human habitation. I am in firm support of the Housing Trust Fund increase, as well as The People's Budget. We need more supportive services. We need more help going out to these families, and I also want to make mention to the increase in public safety. We all know why there's a big draw or big concerns about public safety, but I also think it's very, very important to mention that there should be an increase in supportive services in Uptown and on the trains to combat that. We need street outreach programs working with CMPD (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department) to help these people. The jails are full. We heard the Sheriff say that, the jails are full, so we cannot arrest our way out of homelessness, we can't arrest our way out of poverty, so that's all I've got.

Satoshi Watanabe, 4223 Old Course Drive said thank you. My name is Satoshi Watanabe. I'm a member of Charlotte International Cabinet, and I'm currently leading its international business subcommittee. I'm here today to express my strong support for a proposed International Relations Manager position in the budget, and also recommend additional investment for economic development. Since last fall, our subcommittee has been developing a white paper on how to attract more foreign-owned businesses that will create more jobs and support long-term economic growth. Through this work, we have found that Charlotte has tremendous untapped potential. Today, foreign-owned businesses account for only three to four percent of employment in the Charlotte region, compared to roughly five to seven percent in peer markets, such as Atlanta, Dallas and Raleigh Durham. Closing even [inaudible] gap could translate into tens of thousands of additional jobs over time. Our research also shows that Charlotte already has many of the right ingredients for success including competitive costs, strong infrastructure, high quality of life, leading financial services [inaudible], but at the same time, our benchmarking suggests that peer cities are investing more aggressively in international business development. In our white paper we have identified a long list of opportunities and recommendations to attract more foreign-owned businesses. Some focus on increasing Charlotte's effectiveness and others focus on promoting Charlotte's attractiveness more effectively, but those opportunities cannot be fully realized without dedicated resources and financial investment, that's why I'm very excited about the

proposed International Relations Manager position, but I believe this can be viewed as only a first step moving towards additional resources. Thank you so much.

Kahlisemon Ortiz, 1917 Taylor Avenue said good evening, Council members, City leadership. My name is Kahlisemon Ortiz. I'm proud to stand here today as a Charlotte Water employee speaking not only for myself, but for many of the hardworking men and women who keep this City functioning every single day. Charlotte Water is one of the only three true 24-hour operational departments within the City of Charlotte. While most residents are asleep, our crews are responding to water main breaks, sewer overflows, emergency shutoffs, infrastructure failures, and public health hazards. We also do complete on-calls. We work through storms, holidays, overnight emergencies, dangerous field conditions, because water's not optional, it's essential. What many people may not realize is that Charlotte Fire ISO (Insurance Services Office) certification, which directly impacts emergency preparedness, rating and insurance calls from residents, depend heavily on the reliability and the performance of Charlotte Water infrastructure and personnel. Without adequate water pressure, hydrant maintenance, transmission systems and emergency response from Charlotte Water employees, that certification cannot be maintained. Simply put, if Charlotte Water fails, critical public safety system fails with it. Yet, despite the fact that our work directly supports public safety every single day, Charlotte Water employees are excluded from the same level of compensation recognition provided to other public safety supporting departments. According to the City Manager's proposed Fiscal Year 2027 Budget presentation, police personnel are receiving a 10 percent pay increase and the fire personnel are receiving a seven percent increase through the Public Safety Pay Plan. Charlotte Water employees, however, are instead being told that portions of our increase are tied to performance review structures, meaning many employees may never even receive the full advertised percentage increase. We're asking for fairness and recognition of the role we play in protecting this City. Charlotte Water employees operate heavy equipment, enter hazardous environments, respond to emergencies at all hours, and maintain the infrastructure that supports hospitals, fire suppression systems, schools, businesses, and every home in Charlotte. Public safety does not begin when the truck arrives, public safety begins when the hydrant works, public safety begins when the clean water flows, and public safety begins when the sewer system functions properly during emergencies. This is Charlotte Water, and I thank ya'll for listening.

Kani Adon Bermudez-Bey, 318 West Corporation Street said revolutionary love, Mayor, Council members, City leadership, beautiful community. My name's Kani Adon Bey. I'm a community volunteer prevention organizer for North Carolinians against gun violence, and I'm a proud Charlotte native who grew up in Steele Creek. So, gun violence is deeply personal to me. I lost three neighborhood friends, Nate Rodriguez, [inaudible], and Anthony White to gun violence, along with countless others. I've been shot at, have been robbed at gunpoint. I've witnessed gun violence firsthand in my own community. Steele Creek knows this pain, and I no longer what us to normalize it, because this violence is not who we are. That's why I want to thank the City for its \$1.2 million annual investment in Alternatives to Violence. This investment is producing real results, this is some good news here. In southwest Charlotte, Alternatives to Violence has helped reduce violent crime by 25 percent to 28 percent since their founding in 2023. In Beatties Ford corridor, ATV (Alternatives to Violence) continues to create safer communities. In this corridor alone violence interruptors successfully prevented at least six potentially deadly conflicts, definitely some claps for that, that's not easy, it's not easy, not easy work at all, it's hard work, and it's heart work. This is exactly what proactive public safety looks like. ATV workers are saving lives, building trust, and creating opportunities that they deserve a livable wage of at least \$24 an hour. Now we must expand that work to bring ATV into Steele Creek where I grew up, where communities like mine urgently need these investments and interventions. We know prevention is cheaper than tragedy. One homicide costs society approximately \$625,000, while a single gunshot wound is \$330,000. Preventing violence saves lives and taxpayer dollars. Thank you so much. Power to the people.

Kelsey Joseph, 2022 Sage Park Drive said Council and City Manager, thank you for your time. My name is Kelsey Joseph. I've spoken to many of you throughout the years.

There are so many important initiatives represented here tonight, many of which are intersectional. I don't have a robust speech prepared, I just want to share my support for the proposed Animal Care and Control budget items, which include critical staff positions and operational funds. With a growing population and increasing housing insecurity in our City, this work serving our neighbors is ever more important. For the last five days, I've been in Utah at a national conference presenting on the profound work we're doing to keep pets and people together here in Charlotte, that's because of the strong shelter staff, shelter volunteers, and City staff partnerships we've built. As you vote on the budget, I hope you'll keep this momentum going, and approve the requested staff positions and operational funds. Thank you.

Jose Alvarez, 4938 Central Avenue said Madam Mayor, members of the Council, Mr. City Manager, and staff, good evening, and thank you for the opportunity to speak. First of all, happy 31 days of business month. My name is Jose Alvarez, and I am the State Vice President for Prospera North Carolina based here in Charlotte. For the past nine years, Prospera has been proud to serve this community through its free entrepreneurial assistance program, which offers bilingual support and helps approximately 1,100 established and aspiring small business owners, both Latino and non-Latino in North Carolina every year, of which 70 percent are Charlotte region residents. For the past few years, the City of Charlotte has partnered with Prospera to help City residents become financially independent through entrepreneurship focusing particularly on underserved areas. In fact, our statewide headquarters recently moved to District Five inside the Albermarle Road Central Avenue corridor. As a local resident myself, I have witnessed this Council's service and commitment to serve the City's residents, in addition to the trust and vital task you have given the City Manager to make sure the resident's tax dollars are put to efficient and valuable use. I want to thank you and Marcus for that. However, I'm here to express my concern about our program not being recommended for funding under the Financial Partner Program in the next Fiscal Year. On behalf of our staff and volunteers, I respectfully request the City's reconsideration. Our program focuses on serving everyone, everyone, to reach financial independence and prosperity by empowering them to be responsible and successful small business owners, especially now that we're even more intentionally serving the Corridors of Opportunity. Again, we serve both Latinos and non-Latinos, that is why our program is bilingual, so that everyone has access to it. Thank you very much.

Evan Schultheis, 1001 Brookrun Drive said esteemed City Councillors. Exactly one year ago, I spoke before Council about the deaths of cyclists Bill Yoder and Aleki Langi on the streets of Charlotte. They were then followed by Paul Rucker in University City, Officer Gabriel Stainback in Cornelius, and a little over a month ago, Nyomi Summers, who was barely eight years old, and these are just the deaths. The debilitating injuries go unreported and unheard. None of them had protected facilities along their regular travel routes. As gas prices continue to increase, we will soon be seeing far more bicycles on our roads, and therefore many more deaths due to their poor design. This budget commits an additional \$2 million to bicycle infrastructure in Charlotte, but this infrastructure is not enough and it is failing us. This \$2 million is also, like many other budgetary items, an overall decrease in spending disguised as an increase. As the bicycle facilities budget drops from six percent to three percent of C-DOT (Charlotte Department of Transportation) spending. Furthermore, C-DOT's 2022 Road Design Manual is only a recommendation, not policy, and only recommends protected bicycle facilities on boulevards, while failing to include narrower travel lanes, fixed concrete barriers, neckdowns, and other infrastructure that keeps pedestrians and cyclists alive. I therefore ask the City to maintain the current percentage of bicycle spending in the bond cycle at six percent, that being \$20 million. I furthermore request that the City update its Road Design Manual to include narrower vehicle lanes, neckdowns, raised crosswalks, fixed not breakaway bollards and poles, and to make separation with concrete barriers the standard for protected bike facilities, rather than the broken flexi-posts we see all over the road. Our city needs to commit to connecting and protecting our sporadic bicycle infrastructure. Thank you.

Dina Lemba Nshisso, 4235 Amherst Villa Court said good evening, Council. My name is Dina Lemba Nshisso, a resident of District Three. I serve as a community

health practitioner at a local nonprofit, language access advocate, and a member of the Charlotte International Cabinet. I'm here today to urge the City Council to consider establishing a dedicated office of International Affairs. Within the International Cabinet, we are actively exploring how such an office is a mechanical necessity for both the economic development and successful community integration of our City. The census reflects our reality. Charlotte is a global city. In 2015, immigrants made up 15 percent of our population. Today, that number has grown to 20 percent. In the last decade alone, our foreign-born population increased by 44 percent compared to under five percent for U.S. born residents. Immigrants are not just part of Charlotte's fabric, they are also drivers of our growth. As my fellow Charlotte International Cabinet member and community researcher Lennin noted in his research, people move to Charlotte to work, start businesses, and build families. The Office of International Affairs will formalize our global connections and maximize our economic prowess. It ensures that all Charlotteans, regardless of origin, have the resources to achieve upward mobility. Thank you for including funding for an International Affairs Officer in the FY2027 Budget, this is a vital step. I ask you to consider further funding to support two staff members currently managing this workload. Adding one or two additional staff members will ensure Charlotte remains competitive on the global stage. Thank you.

Joselyn Ramirez, 16603 Kettlewell Lane said good evening, Mayor, Council members, and community leaders. My name is Joselyn Ramirez. I'm a resident of Charlotte and one of the Co-Leaders of the Charlotte Region of the North Carolina Moms Demand Action Chapter. I am here because violence prevention and community safety are deeply important to me and to the future of our City. Like many families across Charlotte, I have seen the impact that gun violence and instability can have on individuals, families and neighborhoods, that is why I strongly support secure gun storage and continued investment in Alternatives to Violence. Alternatives to Violence has demonstrated proven success since its launch. That progress reflects the power of community violence intervention and the importance of investing in strategies that build trust, interrupt cycles of violence, and create safer neighborhoods. We all deserve to feel and be safe. However, this work requires sustained investment in the people doing it. I urge the City to ensure that Alternatives to Violence workers receive a livable wage. These workers are the frontlines everyday helping to prevent gun violence before it happens, mentoring youth, and supporting families in crisis. Their compensation should reflect both the value and the demands of this lifesaving work. I also encourage the City to prioritize expansion efforts. We should invest in programs that are already producing measurable results, rather than delaying support until problems worsen. Expanding secure gun storage and proven violence intervention strategies will help protect more communities across Charlotte. Charlotte has a real opportunity to strengthen public safety by sustaining and expanding Alternatives to Violence. Fund the workers, grow the infrastructure, and invest in what works. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Mayor Lyles said thank you all, and I'm really appreciative of all of the time that you've spent and all of the wisdom that you've given to us. I just want to have as a reminder that the City Council will convene for budget adjustment discussions on May 18, 2026, then budget straw votes will take place on June 1, 2026, and Council will consider adoption of the FY2027 Budget on June 8, 2026. So, thank you again. I want to say that it's really important that we all understand and have the opportunity to share the information that's necessary for us to do this great work.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Mayfield, and carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

* * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 12: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Marcus Jones, City Manager said thank you, Mayor, members of Council. I guess another little bit of a gut check to make sure we have resolved all the issues from 267 earlier today. I'd like to move I-77 South resolution to the next item, but I wanted to make sure whether or not we need a Manager's Report if there needs to be any other discussions related to the MPTA presentation that was made earlier tonight, and if we don't, we're going to let Ms. Clodfelter leave, but if there are more questions, she will stay back until after we do the I-77 South. So, you do want her to stay?

Councilmember Johnson said I just have a question, and I don't know if we can ask that quickly, or she can stay?

Mr. Jones said whatever the Council's desire is. I would just say one question can be 10 different questions.

Councilmember Watlington said I'm not going to ask her a single thing. She's been waiting for two hours. I don't mind if Renee asks her.

Ms. Johnson said thank you. It was just a quick question. During the TPD meeting, we talked about having the MPTA members report to Council during this interim period, so I wanted to know when we're going to discuss that, and it's kind of the details of the agreement. So, there might be another opportunity to discuss the details of the agreement, so you just tell us.

Mr. Jones said yes, I think in the earlier outline of the different touches that Council will have with the agreement, there are additional touches this month, there's June 1, 2026, there's another touch before June 22, 2026, so multiple touches, as well as a packet that goes out Thursday also.

Ms. Johnson said as long as we have an opportunity to discuss that. Councilmember Graham led that discussion, and we did talk about that during Committee, so I think we just need the opportunity to get into the weeds a little bit. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Jones said okay. So, with that said, Mayor and Council, that's my Manager's Report.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: I-77 RESOLUTION

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Anderson to consider the proposed resolution.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Mazuera Arias, and seconded by Councilmember Watlington to amend paragraph two of the resolution, under the resolve section. The Charlotte City Council respectfully requests that an independent third-party re-evaluation and alternative analysis of the I-77 South corridor take place, including multimodal, nonhighway, and transportation demand management strategies, and encourages that any draft RFP for a toll lane development be paused until the findings are presented to Council and the public.

Councilmember Owens said so I appreciate the ability to speak on this. In my representation of my district, I've committed to not only identifying problems, but to trying to offer a means to resolve them, and that was the energy and curiosity that I brought to my very first drafts of this resolution many weeks ago, and through engagement with the City Attorney and many of my colleagues, the resolution has evolved in some really positive ways, not least of which the one that was just offered by Councilmember Mazuera Arias. I intend this resolution to cause a true third-party evaluation of alternatives, and to explore more than just what murals we should paint on

the supports of an elevated toll lane. In addition, through its provisions, I seek acknowledgement of current and historical community harm of the I-77 corridor. I seek to provide real acknowledgement of the true costs of this project. I hear it described as a \$600 million project, but we all know it's a \$4 billion project, and the billions are not coming out of some developers kindness or large ask. These dollars are coming out of our pockets for fifty years. I'll be gone, but my kids and my grandkids are going to be paying for the decisions that we make here today, and this is a big decision with generational impact. With that said, I support the resolution as a first step in this Council's accountability to the people in the region.

We've come far from the early days when we were told that the project was entirely out of our hands, that the project was out of CRTPO's (Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization) hands, and that our citizens needed to simply do their best on their own to engage with the NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) process, and elevate what they had perceived as the burdens of the project. With this resolution, I find that we're being honest, that we cannot and should not absolve ourselves of the taint of decisions that affect the lives and livelihoods of our residents and the pockets and prosperity of our descendants. We need to lead on this. We need to challenge the narrative that NC-DOT knows best when it comes to engagement with our region. No one on this dais made the decisions that originally prioritized growth and progress over people when these roads originally tore through black neighborhoods, but that doesn't absolve us of responsibility now to mitigate the damaging practices in the name of growth, efficiency, and economic development. We've seen that the rising tide doesn't always lift all boats, especially those boats that've been drydocked by years of neglect. I support this resolution, but I want to be clear that it does not pass the buck on our responsibility as a Council and as a community to expect more out of our State with regard to this project and others. We are the citizens, we are the taxpayers, and we want decisions made that reflect the values we place on neighborhoods, on connections, and on the prosperity of people, not just on maximization of throughput and on cutting commute times. I will continue to expect better out of this project and encourage our citizens to stay focused and intentional in advocating for what serves the region now and on assessing whether the burdens we ask of our children and grandchildren are worth it.

On this resolution, I don't want to oversell its reach or undersell the need for continued involvement of this Council and the project. We're not done, but this is a step and an ongoing need for true leadership and advocacy for the communities we serve. I believe our residents deserve more than murals of strong black success stories of the past. They deserve municipal action that enables strong black success stories of the future. My hope is through this resolution we can enable those protections to be afforded on this generational project, and can send our message to NC-DOT of what we want for Charlotte. I humbly ask for your support of this resolution and for independent assessment of the project and a fulsome assessment of the true environmental impacts.

Mayor Lyles said so, before we do this, I wanted to make sure that you had the opportunity to make the remarks that you've been making, and so now I would like to go to the people that we have ready who have signed up to speak on this item.

Cole Garde, 355 West Martin Luther King Boulevard said Mayor Lyles, Council members, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. Einstein once said insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. Tonight, I ask you to consider if that applies to this project. The interstate highway system is nearly 70 years old. For decades, a city expanded their highways assuming one more lane would solve the congestion, and sometimes it helped, but very briefly. Houston, LA, Phoenix, and our beloved Atlanta to our south, are all examples that we've all experienced that expanding highways don't work. These cities followed that model and built sprawling car-dependent communities that are now disconnected, underfunded, and in a debt spiral. We know this history. The question is whether Charlotte will repeat it? Many people call Charlotte a big/little city. That may be true today, but it won't be for long. We are all aware of the explosive growth this region is experiencing and our response to it will define us for generations. To this point, our response has been smart. Job growth

and housing development have tracked along deliberately planned corridors, and we've been building a city, not just to commute, that is placemaking and it's working. These toll lanes threaten to reverse that progress. NC-DOT themselves does not project that these lanes will meaningfully solve congestion, and what highway expansions reliably do produce is induced demand. More lanes attract more cars, more sprawl, and more strain on infrastructure budgets that are already not built to scale. The numbers bear this out. Over the last 30 years, construction inflation has averaged 4.4 percent annually, while NC-DOT's total budget for the state has only grown 3.9 percent annually. In that same time period, if this project lasts for 100 years, as it's projected, the events for replacement costs could reach upwards of \$287 billion. The lanes would need to generate \$5.7 billion annually just to pay for themselves when that timeframe comes, not accounting for any maintenance in the 50 years that we control it. For reference, I-77 North lanes have only generated \$370 million since 2019. Sprawl also erodes the tax base when workers flee to neighboring areas. I ask you to consider all these topics in the budget, and this unrealistic debt spiral we'll contain with this project. Thank you.

Raki McGregor, 1813 Washington Avenue said Madam Mayor, Council, City Manager Jones, and staff, thank you for this opportunity. The Black Political Caucus has consistently stated that our request is to rescind this vote, because we do not have a solution that reduces I-77 congestion; that is understood. The admission of this by NC-DOT has been given, but the trust of the community by NC-DOT has been broken, and when trust is broken you should provide grace. However, when trust is repeatedly is broken, you should create distance, and what we're saying is, last week, a week ago today, we sat in the Transportation, Planning and Development meeting, the Committee meeting, and we listened to a presentation from NC-DOT and C-DOT that presented at the same time to our City Council, our esteemed City Council, the same time that they presented to us. Councilman Driggs, why would that be acceptable? Why would it be acceptable that you represent us, and you hear about it the same time that we hear about it? How do you prepare? How do you know what questions to formulate? That's not what we're talking about here. This is not partnership, this is not transparency, and this is not respect, and we demand respect for our City Council. Rescission is what we're looking for, rescission is what we've asked for the last three months, and rescission is still what we ask for. Last words from me are, growth is not progress, it's the same thing as velocity without direction, and in the words of Mr. Bob Brown of Highpoint, I want to share with you all that, "You can't go wrong doing right." Thank you very much.

Libba Moore, 4302 Randolph Road said good evening, Mayor, Council members, and Charlotte community. My name is Libba Moore. I'm a documentary filmmaker, community organizer, and proud Queen City native. With an average of 157 people moving to Charlotte region every day, we know that our infrastructure is congested, particularly along the 11 mile I-77 corridor between Charlotte and the South Carolina border. NC-DOT has proposed to add express lanes in order to manage congestion by providing reliable travel times, but before committing \$600 million in taxpayer dollars to kick this off, we must take a step back to evaluate alternatives that align with our community needs, growth and environmental goals. We must ask how can the current corridor be designed with sustainability and accessibility in mind? How do we incorporate reliable public transit, protected bike infrastructure, walkability, and regional connectivity into this design? There are two events that I'm inviting you to attend this month. First, on Wednesday, May 20, 2026, Charlotte Thrives, an organization I lead, will host a community activation session at the Pauline Tea-Bar Apothecary. We invite neighbors that will be directly impacted by this project, City Council members, I-77 commuters, traffic engineers, and the Charlotte public, to speak and to imagine what is possible for this corridor. We also host a community bike ride Sunday, May 31, 2026. We will ride to parks and greenways that will be impacted by this project, and have conversations about why these green spaces matter. My focus is to capture the stories, history, and journey of this project, because I am dedicating my energy to filming the reality that NC-DOT can absolutely create a micro engineered plan that is designed with the community in mind. Please pause this project, so we can fully evaluate the most ethical and responsible path, or should I say road ahead. Thank you.

Jaclyn Didier, 615 Walnut Avenue said good evening, Mayor, Manager, and City Council. I am here because I care deeply about the future of our communities and the long-term impact of the proposed I-77 expansion. Like many residents, I understand that safety and congestion must obviously be addressed, but pretending that adding more lanes is some groundbreaking solution in 2026 ignores decades of transportation research and the failures we have already watched play out in other cities. Quite frankly, the way NC-DOT has handled this entire process has been infuriating. Residents have spent months showing up, asking questions, attending meetings, and trying to engage in good faith, only to be met with vague answers, rushed timelines, and surveys that they'll carefully design to collect approval, rather than actual feedback. The engagement center seems more like damage control than meaningful public engagement, because the people there often have no authority to answer hard questions or address any real concerns. Meanwhile major decisions keep moving forward quietly and quickly before the public has a genuine opportunity to respond. That is not transparency and is certainly not community partnership. NC-DOT is claiming the expansion for safety is for safety purposes, not traffic purposes. NC-DOT's own data shows the corridor experience is approximately five crashes every day with crash rates nearly three times higher than the statewide average of urban interstates, but many of those crashes are tied to dangerous weaving, short merge distances, bottlenecks, and outdated interchange design, not a lack of lanes. Study after study has shown that highway expansion in urban areas leads to increased demand, meaning new lanes will quickly fill with more traffic. So, while communities lose affordable housing, green space and long-established neighborhoods, the promise of congestion relief, and safer driving often disappears within a few years, and somehow the community's expected to absorb these impacts, once again, historically black neighborhoods. We keep hearing promises about replacement housing and community benefits, but Charlotte residents have heard these promises before. The displacement happens immediately. The benefits somehow never arrive with the same urgency. Charlotte deserves better than repeating outdated planning decisions that other cities are now spending billions of dollars trying to reverse. We need targeted safety improvements, smarter interchange designs, and better traffic management, investment and [inaudible] transportation, and planning that values people over vehicle volume and money. I urge you to stop treating the public opposition as something to manage and start treating it as something worth listening to. After all, you work for us.

Councilmember Watlington said I want to be direct tonight, because we're clearly having a direct conversation. Ya'll came here for action, and a resolution is only action if it's backed by something real. So, I want to tell you what real looks like to me. We all know that the modeling infrastructure that has been built across multiple decades and multiple cycles is what got us here, and that's not a criticism, it's the reality of how regional models work, but it means we owe to this community to understand exactly what those current tools can and cannot do before we commission an alternatives analysis and call it done.

The community asked for independent analysis for this project, and I support that ask. I want to tell you all that independent analysis actually requires more than just saying, yes, check, we did it right. It requires more than just hiring someone to check that math. It means documenting every assumption that was baked into the model, every data source, how old it is, and what it was designed to measure. Every place where the methodology hasn't kept pace with how the City actually moves, and then specifying what a better tool would look like, one design from the start, to weigh land use, equity, displacement, mobility, and our other community priorities at the same time; that's what an optimization model does, and that's the work that I've been helping to convene.

I've been in discussions with researchers at UNC Charlotte. I'm talking about faculty and transportation engineering, spacial analysis, public policy, with access to our US-DOT Designated University Transportation Center, which wouldn't you know it, sits right on the campus of University of North Carolina at Charlotte. So, we're lucky, and they're going to conduct exactly that independent evaluation. The feasibility work has been done to scope this effort, the team's been identified, but the work has not started,

because Charlotte's participation through funding has not yet been decided, and that decision comes to this Council next month through the budget process, as you all are well aware. So, for me, what happens tonight determines whether it gets there alive, and that's why I'm supporting this resolution with the modification that Councilmember Mazuera Arias just gave us.

I'll be bringing this work before the Transportation Committee in early June 2026 before the budget vote, so this Council can see exactly what we're being asked to fund and why it matters. So, I'm asking my colleagues tonight to signal that they're willing to have that conversation, and I'm asking the public watching tonight to hold us to it. I do want to be precise about what this work delivers and when, because I also, like Councilmember Owens, don't want to overpromise to the community. Within the first three months, we get a fully documented inventory of every assumption and known limitation in the current model, not a new a model, not a final answer, but an independent record of exactly what the current tool can and cannot tell us, including whether it's equipped to properly evaluate alternatives to this project, and that document will exist before the full RFP is issued and before a developer is selected, that matters.

In months two through four, we get specifics for short-term improvements, specific technical specifications. Those are changes that are implementable within our existing software that raise the quality of every analysis the City runs going forward, better data input, more current land use information, improved performance measures. These are real upgrades that help us make better decisions on 77 and on every transportation question that comes after it. The full benchmarking, the peer-reviewed evaluation of whether our model adequately handles induced demand, land use feedback, and equity, comes in months five through eight, and the forward-scoping for our next generation model that can actually do these things comes after that. So, I'm not telling you that the new model will be ready before the final RFP goes out next spring. It won't be. What I am telling you is that independent peer-reviewed documentation of this model's limitations will be in this Council's hands before a developer is selected, and that matters, and this work doesn't just help us on 77. The improvements it produces mean that Charlotte makes better transportation and land use decisions sooner on every corridor, every rezoning, every transit question that comes before this Council. We can close a gap that exists regardless of what happens to this project on funding. There is interest from independent community partners. There's a pathway to NC-DOT's own university research program this summer; that's a research grant program, and I will offer to NC-DOT, as I have before, as you're a genuine partner in this work, we hope to see that that's reflected in the grant cycle this time. The City's participation is a decision that's in our hands over the next month, and a resolution without commitment to have that funding conversation is a statement. The community came here, I think, for more than a statement.

So, here's what I'm asking tonight. Number one, that we pass this resolution that means something, that we signal to our constituents and each other that we're willing to have the funding conversation in June 2026, and that we commit that the independent findings from this evaluation will be formally considered by this body before this project is awarded. So, that is the path that I think you all can hold us to, and I hope that we choose to take it. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said would like to ask questions about the resolution. I wanted to know, and I don't know who's going to answer, but what action are we taking through the resolution that responds to the opposition? I mean, I know that we're asking NC-DOT for some timelines, but what action do we feel that this takes in response? Anyone?

Ms. Owens said City Attorney, want to answer that? Do you want me to answer it?

Ms. Johnson said I will say this about Dr. Watlington. You know I love Dr. Watlington. I miss sitting beside you. If I wasn't in the corner, I'd give you a hug, but I wanted to say this. The people have asked us to act, and I believe we must listen. If not us, then who? If not now, then when? This is not simply about pausing the process. A pause keeps us

moving down the same path. I believe that we need to start over and get this right. The original approval relied heavily on information and assumptions from 2007, or some time before. Since that time, our City, technology, transportation patterns, and planning strategies have changed dramatically. We cannot continue making decisions of this magnitude using outdated analysis. We must also acknowledge the real concern about displacement and the impact expanded highways have on established neighborhoods and communities. Widening highways and adding toll lanes often invite more traffic over time, not less. We should be exploring all options, including smarter traffic management, modern GPS routing technology, regional connectivity improvements, transit solutions and strategies that reduce congestion without unnecessarily displacing residents.

Leadership means having the courage to revisit decisions when new information, new technology, and community concerns demand it. Our responsibility is not to defend outdated assumptions. Our responsibility is to the people that we serve. There is a motion to work collaboratively with UNC Charlotte to fully analyze options and impacts moving forward. I support that effort. Actually, it's obvious to me, but I also believe the current approval should be rescinded, so that the process can begin again with updated data, transparency, innovation, and meaningful public engagement. The residents have made it clear from all sides, all parties, so many stakeholders. They want us to re-evaluate this project carefully and thoughtfully; I agree. For that reason, I make a substitute motion to rescind our approval of the I-77 project.

Andrea Leslie-Fite, City Attorney said according to Robert's Rules, only one substitute motion can be on the floor at a time.

Ms. Johnson said okay, well that's fine, I put it out there. There is a pathway. We can deny one of the substitute motions and hear my motion.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said yes, ma'am.

Ms. Johnson said so, it's the political will. Thank you.

Councilmember Mayfield said Attorney, question for you, a couple. So, initially as a member of the Transportation and Planning Committee, a commitment that I made to community members, specifically at a recent meeting, is that I was going to motion for Committee to move to full Council the discussion around rescission. What I want to understand is, as we're having this discussion right now regarding a resolution, if we were to have the votes to have our representative from Council to go back to CRTPO to rescind our vote, what would that do? This was approved back in October 2024. The challenge we have, or the opportunity, is a number of towns, including the County as well as Huntersville and a couple of others, did not vote in support of this initial P3 (Public-Private Partnership) partnership, but because of the weighted vote, our vote carried the conversation forward. So, I want to know where we potentially would be, one, since my colleague's going to be doing an additional amendment once we get through this first amended version, where would that potentially leave us?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said thank you, Councilmember Mayfield. The first step would be to obviously direct your representative, which you have the power to do as a body, but the CRTPO, Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization, is a multijurisdictional body that has its own agenda process, and it would require that body to add the question of rescission back to its agenda. That would occur pursuant to their rules of procedure and their body. Once the item would be added to the agenda, and that is pursuant to their choice as a body, if it's added to the agenda, then there would need to be a motion to rescind the P3 approval from October 2024, and it would need to be seconded, and then the majority would have to support that. Charlotte does hold a super voting block, but it is not the majority voting block, I believe it makes up 41 percent, and so it would require other jurisdictions to support that same motion. So, there is a path forward, but it is a piece in the process.

Ms. Mayfield said and again, my initial plan was to have this discussion in Committee, but we had so many other items. What I did motion for was for the Committee to be able

to have an additional conversation, but now we're here with the resolution. What I'm also wondering, now that we know what that step is, I believe that that's two separate conversations, so I want to clarify that. I historically am not a fan of resolutions under Mayor Foxx. My understanding of a resolution, there's no power or authority. It is a feel good. I shared via email that I'm personally not a fan of it, because I feel like it gives community an idea of a win that's not actually there. The win would be whether or not we have six-plus votes around this dais to direct our representative to go and start the conversation and to work with our towns and partners to make sure that there's enough votes, but also understanding what a rescission could look like, because I'm not really sure how this resolution, even with the amended language to clarify, what would be our actual enforcement of this resolution. If you can speak to that, that would be helpful.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said so, the resolution is a non-binding document, but what it does do is that it codifies this body's position on all of these topics that you've outlined herein. I won't go through them verbatim, but there are key asks, for instance the request for the targeted reevaluation and design, that puts on the record, not only for your community, but also for any other bodies that may review it, including the Federal Highway Administration with respect to Council's position on this question. Obviously, you speak to the direction to the CRTPO representative. You speak to the need for alternative design considerations. All of those pieces are building blocks in the review process, and they're key as the Federal Highway Administration considers them.

The other key ask, that I would have to highlight, Councilmember Johnson, you asked about what sort of actions would take place. In addition to what Dr. Watlington highlighted, you have made a very direct ask that any sort of public hearings and communication about this happens within your municipal border, and that's key because sometimes that doesn't happen. So, by codifying that in this request, you are bringing awareness to this topic, you are placing everyone on notice, and that is your expectation. So, it does build the runway if you will for future discussions should that be necessary at an appropriate time, but again to answer the question directly, this is a non-binding document, and your power lies within the confines of what I've already described with respect to your direction.

Ms. Mayfield said so, can I interpret that if this Council were to identify the votes to direct our representative to go back when we look at this language to codify it, that would further strengthen the opportunity for us to have a conversation that truly could benefit community, because there has been a number of questions that have come up. So, if the resolution just codifies the language, but there's no actual clawbacks or protections, the real clawback or protection would be whether or not this Council identifies six-plus members, to have our representative go back to CRTPO to make a motion of rescission, whether or not that gets a second, and then if there's enough of the town votes that support that, just like with us, whatever their majority is, then that would be in alignment or supporting what we are discussing tonight in this resolution?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said that is correct, Councilmember Mayfield.

Ms. Mayfield said the last piece that I have is, I want to thank both Councilmember Driggs and Dr. Watlington for the work that you've been doing at UNC Charlotte. I shared earlier I do have a concern when we're looking at our budget, and of course the study takes funding. Well, we love to highlight the fact that we have these public-private partnerships. I think this is the perfect opportunity for our partner at Foundation For The Carolinas to step in. This study potentially could be around \$150,000, \$200,000; that's not a lot in comparison. Yet, when we listened to over 40 members of our community come in and share with us about budget concerns and thoughts, that \$200,000 could very well cover a number of positions and/or raises. Whereas, if we work with Foundation For The Carolinas in partnership with our top university, that may be an opportunity for us to do both, as well as it gives us an opportunity as the local government to step out of that particular piece of it where we're not funding it but our partners are. Then we can focus on the policy language of it through, one, the potential rescission if we can get six-plus to direct our representative, but also in support of the resolution.

If I am hearing you correctly, Attorney Leslie-Fite, this would be two items. If we get the support for the amendment to move the resolution forward, we know that there's going to be another friendly amendment that's going to come in to add, based on what was shared by Councilmember Johnson, because she wanted to add a friendly amendment, but we need to get through the first amendment before we can have an additional one. I want to make sure that that is the right path versus the initial path that I was thinking, and that is through Committee, for us to direct through TPD Committee, our representative to take it to full Council that we want a rescission.

I want to make sure that we have the opportunity for those that want to vote, for our representative to go back to CRTPO and clearly give him direction of what that expectation is, that that doesn't get lost in the conversation, and what I had planned on motioning we're now here, so I want to make sure that we're doing this in the right way.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said that's a really important question, Councilmember Mayfield. Procedurally, the motion that is on the floor, the substitute motion by Councilmember Mazuera Arias, is the motion, and so if that passes, the edits as proposed, that would pass this resolution as edited. So, there would not be another motion to come forward as a substitute motion. So, if that passes, this will be the resolution.

Ms. Watlington said point of order, though. We can do more than one motion on an agenda item, correct? Like the resolution is done, but if Councilmember Johnson wants to make another motion related to this agenda item, that's okay, correct?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said so, the item, and I'm going to be really technical, is it's listed as I-77 resolution. What I will tell you, though, is that the agenda belongs to the body, right, and so the discussion about whether or not it expands beyond the resolution is something for this body to own at this point. I will tell you if this were a special meeting, I would be telling you that it would need to be very narrowly tailored, and so it wouldn't even be a substitute motion, it would be another motion on the same.

Ms. Mayfield said and that's where I wanted the clarification, because again when the initial thought was in Committee, I was going to make a motion in Committee, hopefully got the support, we moved it to full Council, we either get the six-plus or not to have our representative go back and rescind, but tonight this particular conversation is only about the resolution. What we're discussing right now is the amendment that was made by my colleague to codify that particular language, but that's two separate conversations, as far as a rescission and this resolution discussion.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said two separate conversations.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you for the clarification.

Councilmember Ajmera said yes, so let me pause here. I just want to make sure I'm understanding this correctly. So, Ms. Leslie-Fite, since we have a motion and a substitute motion on I-77 resolution, we cannot have another separate motion, is that correct? I'm referring to the motion that Councilmember Johnson raised.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said it is not a substitute motion on top of Councilmember Mazuera Arias' motion. It would be a separate motion.

Ms. Ajmera said could she still make a separate motion if this were to not get approved?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said yes.

Ms. Ajmera said okay.

Ms. Watlington said but if it were to get approved.

Ms. Ajmera said if it were to get approved, then she wouldn't get another opportunity.

Ms. Watlington said well, that's what I'm trying to understand. Is there a limit in our rules of procedure on the number of motions that can be done on a particular item?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said there is not. What I would encourage Council to consider is the concurrence of the motions, how do they fit together, the actions that are being requested, and so that's the only pause I have or caution I would give. Your rules of procedure are silent on that topic.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, so I just want to make sure. So, since we do have a substitute motion, that's the one we have to entertain now, and then go back to the original motion.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said you only go back to the original motion if the substitute motion fails.

Ms. Ajmera said I got it, yes, okay. Well, some of my questions were addressed in terms of the action that the community wants us to take. Could you speak to the independent analysis and how that is being addressed in the resolution? I know Dr. Watlington sort of walked us through what that means, but if you could just explain that from the legal perspective.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said so, that is related to paragraph two of your resolve section of the proposed resolution, and consistent with Councilmember Mazuera Arias' edit, it would be Charlotte City Council's request that there be an independent targeted re-evaluation and design analysis of the project that will drive the decision making. What I will say is that can be expounded upon certainly with your subject matter experts on your staff who can dig into that a little bit more, certainly also in conjunction with the experts that Dr. Watlington has highlighted tonight, but that is just the general direction, remembering that you all are the policymaking body, and you're asking at a high level and it will be drilled down upon based on direction that you give.

Ms. Ajmera said so, to follow up on that, I think when we are giving directions on independent analysis, I think it has to be very detailed in terms of what we are looking for. I know that's something Dr. Watlington, you're working on, but is that something that will come back, or would that just be part of this substitute motion? It will be coming back during the budget discussion, is that right?

Ms. Watlington said yes.

Ms. Ajmera said okay. Well, that's all I have. I appreciate the work that Councilmember Owens, Mayo, Watlington, and Mitchell have done to come to this point. I know there are multiple drafts, and I had an opportunity to weigh in on some of them, but mostly I appreciate the heavy lifting that was done by Councilmember Owens, your legal expertise. Thank you. That's all I have.

Councilmember Mayo said so overall, I think Council has worked really hard on this resolution. Thank you so much my colleagues for this. I think that it's really important, like Councilmember Watlington talked about, having an independent third-party re-evaluation and thinking through the alternative analysis of I-77. We don't want to just be thinking about highways, but also other multimodal options. So, thinking through when we talk about those bridges. We'll be getting more details hopefully on Thursday with the chart that Council has asked for to provide details about how that will be integrated with multimodal. So, there are a lot of options that could potentially benefit residents, but we want to make sure that we're thinking through how we can think through alternatives. Is this the best option? I don't know, and that's partly why the work that Councilmember Watlington will be providing us is so imperative. We need to have that homework done before we can really go to the community and say that this is the best option. So, I'm proud of the work that we've done with that. We're going to continue at it, so I think NC-DOT knows that we're not going anywhere and we're going to continue to ask those hard questions and hold them accountable for the residents in our area.

Councilmember Graham said the end is in the beginning, and early October 2025, I started getting phone calls from residents who were concerned that surveyors were showing up in their yards unannounced, many phone calls. Then, I went to the initial press conference that NC-DOT had. I was the only Council member there.

Ms. Mayo said oh.

Mr. Graham said you were not a Council member then.

Ms. Mayo said oh, sorry, okay.

Mr. Graham said you were a candidate.

Ms. Mayo said sorry.

Mr. Graham said Councilmember Mayo was there as well when they had the initial announcement that these plans were available for public conversation and presentation. I reviewed them. My colleague reviewed them very quickly, and I came to the conclusion that they were dead on arrival, that they just did not meet the moment. I went to a meeting at Johnson C. Smith where they had their first public presentation, and you really had to be a traffic engineer to understand what was happening in the room, and I made that point clear that night. It did not meet the moment for public engagement. I had breakfast with the project engineer to discuss my concerns, and he listened and was very forthright, and we had a great conversation. We agree he has a job to do. I have a job to do, and I told him that, which was to advocate for my constituents and people of color. We had a meeting in December 2025, to talk about this issue on the 15th floor, and most of the folks up there were there. We zoomed in Ed, remember, and Mayo was there, and we talked about the project, about our concerns about engagement, our concerns about history, our concerns about the drawings. I invited them to participate in my town hall meeting and they gracefully accepted it, and then we talked about history. Not only did I invite them, but I invited Tom Hanchett, a local historian, to talk about the history of the construction itself, and how black and brown communities were displaced, divided, separated, and taken advantage of, and that history was important. You can't do anything to the highway until you acknowledge the history, and there was pushback on that.

The end is in the beginning, so here we are. Despite what I think is good work that they've done in March 2026 and April 2026, to try to recorrect and level set and reintroduce this project to the community, there is significant distrust of the process and the impact for this community. They've done good work, and not only that they have done some good work, this Council has done some good work, because what the community asked us to do was to use our influence to get a better result.

The Mayor called the Secretary of Transportation. I called him as well. I served with Josh Stein for eight years as a State Senator, and said, we got a problem, Houston. We got two problems actually. We got a highway that needs to be fixed, and we got an engagement process that is just poor. Two things can be true at the same time. The Secretary came, met with all of us, met with residents in the community. We kicked it to Ed's Committee for further evaluation and constant contact. They hired a public relations firm to reset the engagement. They started the Engagement Center, and they opened it a lot sooner than they wanted to because they had to. They have established a Community Advisory Committee of residents.

Unknown said [inaudible], not yet.

Mr. Graham said it's in the process.

Unknown said right, [inaudible].

Mr. Graham said well, my turn, thank you. They are establishing a Community Advisory Committee to get input from residents to work alongside them. So, they're trying, but the end is in the beginning.

So, I'm going to support the resolution, and Councilmember Mayfield, I'll support anything that comes before this dais. We'll see what happens, but here's the thing. Mother's Day was yesterday, went to dinner, had to go 77 South, and was stuck in traffic. Coming back, had to go 77 North; there was an accident, stuck in traffic. We have to reset, pause, rescind, whatever, to make sure that there's a level playing field for community understanding. Right now, there is lack of trust, lack of understanding, lack of support, and lack of confidence, notwithstanding the work that has been done in the month of March 2026 and April 2026, and as a community, we cannot just throw NC-DOT under the bus, because there are several other community projects that we need them. NC-160 widening, state line to I-45; NC-49 widening construction on Mallard Creek Church Road; Extension to Back Creek Church Road, your District, Councilmember Johnson; Oakdale/Sunset Roundabout, my District; Idaho Drive Interchange. The point I'm trying to make is this. We can tell our partners that we disagree, and we can strongly do that for sure, but we cannot throw away the partnership or the relationship, because a majority of the roads throughout the City are state roads that we need their help and their support. So, I'm going to support the resolution. I'm going to listen more on Thursday when they make another presentation. Motions could be made then, I would imagine. So, I think that's where we are, or it could be made tonight. In reference to my colleague, Dr. Watlington's arrangement, I'm willing to listen. The devil's in the details, and so I think I said enough, but I think that we are where we need to be for tonight.

Councilmember Anderson said I echo the sentiments that I've heard around the dais. First, I want to thank Councilmember Owens and Councilmember Watlington for the work. This original resolution was about seven or eight pages, nine pages. I was very vocal about the fact that I thought it was too long, if you have to use that many words to say something. We want it to be very concise and be very honest with the public about how we're going to fight and stand up for you. So, I appreciate the revision, City Attorney. Mine is, I've highlighted it, and read over it a million times this weekend.

I think, a couple of things. One is, I think the areas around section eight, the municipal engagement and public participation, the statements around all traffic and revenue study updates, environmental review documents and mitigation plans before their finalization will come to Council and we'll have an opportunity to have a say so in that, I think that's critically important. In section nine, the milestone commitments where we lay out one through four is also critically important, and I think this document does codify our position around how we're going to continue to fight for community. The one thing I do know, having served as Vice Chair of the Transportation Committee under Ed a couple terms back, is this work is very complicated and sometimes we've seen some of our partners sort of advance without input from us, but I want to commend this Council because the steps that NC-DOT has taken as of late are unprecedented. They don't stand up community engagement centers. The Secretary of Transportation doesn't come to community and listen to Council members and then go listen to community members. The work that we have done in fighting for our residents, I'm proud of that work, as we have to continue, it's nowhere near done or complete, but I'm proud of the fact that we have stood up and we fought for our community and it's being codified here in this resolution.

So, I'm going to support the resolution, because I think this is how we continue to maximize and get the best for our community. The conversation on Thursday, where we come back and we look at these interchanges, I think is critically important. NC-DOT said what they presented to us several days back is feasible, but there's extra steps to be made. So, we know that what was presented is actually feasible, which is a good thing from a multi-mobility and pedestrian perspective in a variety of those interchanges that are in various districts, so it's peppered throughout several districts along that corridor. I also think that the work that Dr. Watlington laid out is also critically important too, and it helps set us up for success for this one, but other projects outside and

beyond this one, and I think that's another tool we need as we are becoming a world-class city. So, I'm proud of my colleagues. Thank you for fighting and standing up in community. I think we're going to have to continue to do this, but thank you for this resolution, and this is just one step in the process, so let's keep going and let's keep fighting for community. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

Ms. Johnson said so I always get the reputation of being anti-growth or anti-establishment; this is not that. I think my suggestion or my motion is not far from you all. We're saying the same thing. I appreciate the hard work and the details and the milestones, that's great, but Councilmember Graham, I would argue that our citizens don't elect us to use our influence. They elect us to use our power, and our power is stopping this, it's stopping this. We can stop it and utilize all these milestones and the funding, I think that's a great idea. I think we should incorporate a third-party objective review on many of our large initiatives. So, I think we're saying the same thing. I'd simply say, if you think of rock, paper, scissors, you all are saying paper and I'm saying scissors. We just need to cut it and start over. I don't think that that's so much to ask, and another thing, I told someone when I was talking about this earlier, I'm afraid for District Four. I hope that NC-DOT does not see this as unfriendly. I need citizens to expect our state representatives and NC-DOT to still accrue projects in our District. I don't think saying no should be a termination or a suspension of a partnership. It's our job to represent our citizens and this is what our citizens are saying. So, I need District Four citizens and all citizens to make sure that we're holding our state representatives and NC-DOT accountable to projects that we need. We need improvements in District Four based on this growth. We need widening of Mallard Creek, and because I'm the District Rep and I'm saying what citizens are begging us to say, should not affect future projects, but I do think that we're saying pretty much the same thing. We can incorporate these milestones. Absolutely, my motion would include Dr. Watlington's suggestion. I think we do need that objective third party, and I'm simply saying, instead of pausing, why not stop. Pausing is a finite period of time, we know that there's this predetermined outcome, and I'm saying stop it and let's start over. So, that's it, my motion would include Dr. Watlington's third-party evaluation. We could even include all these milestones. Thank you for your hard work, I think they're great. I'm simply saying, let's not be rushed, let's not be pushed. Instead of pausing it, we stop it, and we can still incorporate these other suggestions. Thank you.

Ms. Anderson said just a point of information. Can the City Attorney or the Clerk, can you read what the substitute motion is, so we know exactly what we're voting on?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said we were committing to going back to listen to the audio, but I will read what I have, Councilmember Mazuera Arias, and if you would correct us. It would amend paragraph two under the resolve section. The Charlotte City Council respectfully requests that an independent third-party re-evaluation and alternative analysis of the I-77 South corridor take place, including multimodal, nonhighway, and transportation demand management strategies, and encourages that any draft RFP for a toll lane development be paused until the findings are presented to Council and the public. Is that correct, Councilmember Mazuera Arias?

Mr. Mazuera Arias said that is correct.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said thank you, sir.

Councilmember Driggs said so, does that have the effect of passing a resolution, or have we just modified the language?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said that is the edit. That is the substitute motion on the floor. It would amend.

Mr. Driggs said edit. I get that, but what I'm saying is if we go in favor of that, have we passed the resolution?

Ms. Ajmera said yes, that's right.

pti:pk

Ms. Leslie-Fite said yes, sir, that is a vote. If you vote with that substitution, it would pass the resolution.

Mr. Driggs said it passes the resolution.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said yes, sir.

Mr. Driggs said okay.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said with the addition.

Mr. Driggs said with the amended language, understood, okay.

The vote was taken on the substitute motion and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington

NAYS: Councilmember Johnson

Motion was made by Councilmember Johnson, and seconded by Councilmember Watlington to direct the CRTPO representative to rescind the approval of the P3.

Ms. Johnson said and I would also say, during the Committee meeting, the Committee recommended that I-77 come before full Council, because I didn't want to limit the discussion just to the resolution.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said Councilmember Johnson, you did specifically call that out during the Committee. I was simply going to say, let me answer the question first, yes, I do believe that a vote could transpire. What I would ask, though, is for clarification in reading the two actions together, because if there's a rescission of the P3, we would need clarity and direction for staff as to what does this mean with respect to the resolution. Your resolution that just passed was for the Charlotte City Council to request a pause for due diligence, a targeted re-evaluation, and design analysis with community benefit considerations related to the project. So, again, just making sure that there is consistency with those two actions is the question that we would need direction for.

Ms. Ajmera said I have a question, so I just want to make sure. So, we just passed the resolution, so would this motion undo what we did with the resolution?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said yes.

Ms. Ajmera said if you could just speak to that.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said the motion to rescind the P3 would rescind the support.

Ms. Ajmera said so would undo the resolution?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said the resolution was a nonbinding document; however, you are requesting a pause in your resolution. So, perhaps they could be read concurrently. The question would be for really this body, are you asking for rescission of the P3, as well as all of these actions that are included in the resolution, which could include all of the items that you have listed here.

Ms. Watlington said I'm sorry, I'll second it for the purpose of these questions. So, if this motion fails, we still have the resolution, but the resolution is not binding, so should the Council want to take up this question again in the future, are we free to do that?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said you are, you are free to do that, and specifically that's called out in your direction to your CRTPO representative and for further action.

Ms. Watlington said okay, thank you.

Ms. Ajmera said so I know that as part of the resolution, the language is to do independent analysis, and once independent analysis results come back, that would be in the phased approach, if the independent analysis says that here are the alternatives, and if that doesn't align with NC-DOT, we could make a motion to rescind at any time, correct?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said yes, you could make a motion to rescind your support of the P3, and again just for the record, that sets the action in motion for the CRTPO body to ultimately make the decision with respect to the P3. It is a piece of the process.

Ms. Ajmera said I get it, that we only control 41 percent, but that doesn't mean that that action will ultimately succeed, because we do need another entity's support, I get that. I just want to make sure that option will be there at a future time.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said you do have that in a future time, and I want to be clear, I'm not saying that to dissuade, I'm saying that to be very clear about what this body's vote effectuates.

Ms. Ajmera said got it, thank you.

Ms. Mayfield said so clarification for our Attorney, which I asked all this at the beginning. Now, does the motion need to be a direction to our representative to rescind the vote, or is this motion to be interpreted that Council is now voting to rescind the vote that our representative presented on our behalf? I want to be clear what we're talking about right now. Are we telling our representative to go back to CRTPO and rescind the vote, because that's a whole separate conversation, which you've already noted, that they still have to actually identify if they're going to bring it up in meeting, identify they have all of that. So, if Council were to support a rescission tonight, what does that do as far as the next conversation regarding CRTPO? Are we directing our representative with this vote for our representative to go back and say, Charlotte City Council has rescinded, we need to try to figure out how to get this on the books for a meeting?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said when this body adopted the resolution in support of the P3 in October 2024, it was again by way of a resolution, and so anytime you undo something that you've already done, typically you would use the same mechanism. So, this body would need to adopt a resolution to that effect, which we can draft, we can craft that, but I'm just saying, again that would set it in motion to direct the representative, and what we would do is, I would craft that language consistent in form to the original resolution from 2024, and it sets it in motion.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

Ms. Watlington said I apologize, Madam Attorney, I know you probably answered this question before, but I'm going to ask it a couple more times, and then we'll see if it sticks. This resolution, this formally codified our position as a Council, and there's some requests in here. Go with me, this project is on the STIP (State Transportation Improvement Plan) and unless it is removed from the STIP, it is on the STIP, right?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said that's correct, and the STIP is the State Transportation Improvement Plan.

Ms. Watlington said yes, and those projects are prioritized based on need when you look at congestion, safety incidents, etc., etc., correct?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said that's correct.

Ms. Watlington said okay, so that is not going to change, the facts of the need are not going to change. May I ask the Deputy a question, is that permissible?

Liz Babson, Deputy City Manager said good evening. Deputy City Manager, Liz Babson. It's a pleasure to be with you this evening.

Ms. Watlington said okay, I want to just make sure that I'm thinking about this right. This project is on the State Transportation Improvement Plan for this area?

Ms. Babson said yes.

Ms. Watlington said and can you just tell me briefly how those projects find their way onto the STIP? Just what does that mean if they're on the STIP with a certain priority?

Ms. Babson said so, the status of this project is that it is funded on the State Transportation Improvement Program, and as you described it gets there through a prioritization process that includes looking at a number of factors, like traffic and congestion and crashes.

Ms. Watlington said okay, and so the funding for the project and the existence of the need for the project are two separate things, is that correct? Let me just ask my question more directly. Right now, the reason that a P3 is needed is because the project costs more than what NC-DOT can afford?

Ms. Babson said yes, a P3 is a path to funding that provides an opportunity to deliver the project sooner.

Ms. Watlington said okay. So, if the path of funding changes the project, unless it is removed off the STIP, stays on the STIP, correct?

Ms. Babson said say that one more time.

Ms. Watlington said yes, sure. So, at this point this project is set to be funded through a P3, but the project's existence on the STIP is not directly tied to funding. If the funding goes away, the project doesn't leave. There are a bunch of projects that are on the STIP right now that are unfunded, correct?

Ms. Babson said no, there are identified future needs, and they will move up the list as funding becomes available.

Ms. Watlington said but is that list the STIP or is it a different list?

Ms. Babson said yes, it is on the State Transportation Improvement Program.

Ms. Watlington said so, the project exists on the STIP regardless of whether it has funding.

Ms. Babson said I wouldn't word it that way.

Ms. Watlington said okay, then tell me.

Ms. Babson said projects on the STIP are funded, and as funding becomes available, there is a list of projects that are identified for future funding. So, it's almost like a prioritized list, and so there are projects that are included in those future years. The STIP is updated every two years, and so as we move through that process, those projects get funded.

Ms. Watlington said so, where was this project before the P3 was approved?

Ms. Babson said it was a funded project. It started on the STIP, I believe, in 2014 and moved through the process.

pti:pk

Ms. Watlington said so, if we were in 2020, this project is on the STIP, but it's unfunded.

Ms. Babson said I don't have that information in front of me, so I can't be that specific.

Ms. Watlington said does Felix have it.

Mr. Driggs said so, I can answer that. As a CRTPO member, I'm in a position to answer that question.

Ms. Watlington said one second, I respect that you may have the answer, but NC-DOT is here. I don't know, are you all in a position to answer that question? Okay, can one of ya'll come down here?

Ms. Babson said thank you, I was going to phone a friend.

Ms. Watlington said sorry about that, Liz.

Ms. Babson said that's okay, I am not an expert on the STIP.

Ms. Watlington said they were super quiet too; they were not trying to help you. I'm just kidding. Thank you, sir. Can you state your name for the record?

Brett Canipe, Deputy Chief Engineer said yes, hey, my name is Brett Canipe with NC-DOT.

Ms. Watlington said hi, nice to see you, Brett. Can you help me understand where the projects sit as they go through the funding? If a project is identified, but it doesn't have funding yet, is it part of the STIP or no?

Mr. Canipe said so, generally speaking, if a project is identified in the last five years of our STIP, it is not necessarily identified for funding at that point, but as projects reach the earliest five years of the STIP, then they can be identified for funding at that time.

Ms. Watlington said okay. If the funding vote is rescinded all the way through CRTPO, this project doesn't fall off the STIP. Is that a true statement?

Mr. Canipe said I don't believe that's true.

Ms. Watlington said okay, tell me what happens to it?

Mr. Canipe said if you're speaking about removing the project from the MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan)?

Ms. Watlington said no, I'm saying if the funding model is changed or pooled, that is different than removing the project from the STIP, or it's the same?

Mr. Canipe said specifically, approval for the P3. So, what we identified at that time on that vote was that the P3 delivery alternative was the alternative that we had to be able to move the project forward.

Ms. Watlington said and if that vote had been no, where would that project be today?

Mr. Canipe said in order to move forward, we've said that it would have to be done with the P3 simply because the project itself is too expensive to deliver with another method. So, in order for the project to be fully removed, it would have to be removed from the MTP and then it would have to be removed from the STIP.

Ms. Watlington said so, that's what I understood.

Mr. Canipe said as long as it's on the STIP, then it would still be funded.

Ms. Watlington said okay, I'm sorry, am I the only one that's confused?

Ms. Ajmera said yes, me too, I'm confused.

Ms. Watlington said okay, I'm going to try to do it again.

Mr. Canipe said okay.

Ms. Watlington said we've got a STIP, what's on it?

Mr. Canipe said a lot of projects.

Ms. Watlington said a lot of projects. We don't have as much money as we have projects, so there's a certain amount of projects on that STIP that don't have funding, right?

Mr. Canipe said that's true; they roll into the funded category as funds are available, as Liz described, in that first five years.

Ms. Watlington said okay. I know that it means something to remove a project off the STIP, but deciding whether or not to vote for a funding model that enables a project to be moved forward is different than taking that project off the STIP?

Mr. Canipe said yes, if that's a question, then yes, that's true.

Ms. Watlington said okay, that's the question, and now I'm trying to remember why I asked the question in the first place.

Ms. Ajmera said so, would her motion be removed from the STIP?

Ms. Watlington said no, it does not.

Ms. Ajmera said okay, I'm thinking you want to confirm that.

Ms. Watlington said that's what we just confirmed. Rescinding support for a particular funding model does not remove a project off the STIP?

Mr. Canipe said that's correct.

Ms. Watlington said okay, so the reason I asked that question is because there are a number of requests that are held within the resolution that pertain to the project, and what I'm trying to ascertain is, if the project moves back to an unfunded project, because it doesn't have the private dollars, does all work on the project stop, or would these things still be able to happen? Because if they can, then it's not in contradiction to each other.

Mr. Canipe said I do think that's something that we would have to work out, but since we've identified the fact that we don't have the ability to fund the project with any other mechanism, I don't know that it would make complete sense to keep moving forward with a project that didn't have a future.

Ms. Watlington said sure, now that makes sense. So, it would probably take a little bit closer look to see specifically what we've asked for here. Certainly, the NEPA items, I would imagine would pause, because we would need some kind of design associated with that, and design costs money, and if the project's not funded then we wouldn't be able to do that at that time, am I thinking about that right?

Mr. Canipe said maybe I didn't understand that clearly, that question.

Ms. Watlington said sure. Okay, so number four it talks about NEPA and alternatives and design considerations, and it requests that the project's NEPA review include a

particular number of things, right? Alright, if the project's not funded, would these activities be happening?

Mr. Canipe said no.

Ms. Watlington said alright, so that one goes away, and I won't walk through each one of these, but I think we need to understand what can continue to move forward, even if the project is not funded, just because we know it's on the STIP and some point we would like to see it funded versus what would stop, and that to me would determine whether or not a resolution is in contradiction. That said, as I understand it, this resolution is not binding anyway, so whatever we ask in here is subject to NC-DOT saying yes, we'll do it.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said that's correct, their concurrence, yes.

Ms. Watlington said okay, so thank you. I'm done Madam Mayor, thank you.

Ms. Anderson said I want to try and ask a question in a simplified way than my colleague here. Really, I think the question is, what is the probability that this project will stay on the STIP if CRTPO rescinds its support of it? Is it a low probability, is it a high probability that it would drop off the STIP? I think that's the real question.

Mr. Canipe said yes, I mean I would hate to speculate on probabilities, but what I could say is that we're obligated to follow the law, and we do follow STI (Strategic Transportation Investments) legislation and the federal code that tells us all how to proceed through this process, and we've done that to date. I think we would be obligated to continue to do that up until the point in time where, if there was a removal of the project from the MTP and the STIP, that would change course, but as of now, we're on this course that's followed this process that's in state and federal law.

Ms. Anderson said got you, and then can you also just expound upon the alignment of the MTP and the STIP, and the risk of having a lack of alignment with those two?

Mr. Canipe said sure. The MTP is another requirement of the federal code that sets up the need for organizations like CRTPO, and it states that the MTP, the MTIP (Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program) and the STIP, State Transportation Improvement Plan, that those two plans have to match from a fiscal constraint as well as an air quality constraint, and so when those two plans do not align, as of now they do, because the MTIP's adopted, the STIP's adopted, so we're in federal conformity, we're in conformity with air quality model. If this project were to be removed, then you have a deficit to that air quality model, and so that model would have to be reworked, and then the question of what happens with federal funding while all that's going on, it's not something that we really had to deal with at this level. I think, certainly, there's a question as to whether or not what happens to availability of federal funds if the two documents don't match, but I can't say sitting here today for sure exactly what that looks like because we haven't gone through it.

Ms. Anderson said okay. Is there any risk exposure for the great state of North Carolina as it relates to federal funding or federal projects if the MTP and the STIP are not aligned?

Mr. Canipe said I think there could be. Again, it's not a situation that we've found ourselves in, because we've always been able to work through these things. We've worked through very difficult projects with all of our partners, including the City of Charlotte. I think what's really at risk is the things that have been talked about here tonight, the congestion; the need to solve a problem, as Councilmember Graham indicated; the need to solve a safety concern. So, I think those are the things that would be at risk if this project were taken away. I think the funding itself, the conformity requirements, I think we'd have to work through that because we don't know exactly what that looks like sitting here today.

Ms. Anderson said okay. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

Mr. Driggs said I wanted to try and clarify from my own experience on CRTPO. We were briefed by NC-DOT, and Brett wave your arms if this is wrong, that unless we were able to move forward with a P3, there was no possibility of realizing the project, and they told us at that time they would stop working on it. So, if they didn't think that a funding model that could cause the project to be, they would just stop working on it. Now, at that point, the issue of what list it stays on is really mute. What you would expect is, and you talked about funded and so on, I want to clarify funded means that \$600 million was committed by the state and is being held, that's funded. It's insufficiently funded, so that's why the P3 question came up, but unless CRTPO had agreed to move ahead with a P3, they would've stopped working on this thing, because they would've said it has no future and I'm not going to waste my time. Then, my expectation would be, that when you went from P8, which is where we are now in the sequence of STIP planning cycles, it would get dropped, and the \$600 million would be reassigned.

So, one thing that was made clear to us the whole time we discussed this was, we need to find a way to move forward, because this has been on the books for 10 years, and it's been sitting there while it got more and more expensive and it was further and further out of reach for state funding, and that's why they said they came to us. They have to get federal approval from CRTPO in order to pursue a STIP. So, the question was put to us, we worked on it for several months, we put in a whole bunch of requirements, and on that basis, they still worked on it. None of this happens. If there is no P3, NC-DOT is not going to see any basis for engaging in discussions about any of these things, and it's not coming back by the way either, just to be clear about that. You can't sort of stop this, kill it, and then expect to restart in a couple of years. The \$600 million is gone, the developer community will see that happen and is not going to be motivated to kind of partner with us. So, you need to be clear about what it would mean to rescind. This is not just buying you an open-ended period of time to think about it. We will not be in this position again anytime soon, if that happens.

Mayor Lyles said alright, Ms. Johnson, and I'm going to look at the clock, and I think that if we can, it's probably time for some people to get home, like me, but Ms. Johnson, if you'll go ahead and help us wrap this up.

Ms. Johnson said thank you. I don't think we're that far apart. I want to make it clear, I'm not asking for it to be removed from STIP. I think we're both saying the same thing. We're removing our support until further independent analysis and changes and community outreach are done to our satisfaction. My motion simply has teeth, where the other one is nonbinding. I'm not saying that we're removing this indefinitely. If it helps to put a timeframe on it, a year, or whatever that would be if it helps you all to get there, then we can do that. What I'm saying is, not that we're pausing it, and if it doesn't meet our satisfaction, then we're going to rescind it. Let's rescind it now. Yesterday was Mother's Day. We know as mothers if there's real consequences, there's actions. So, if we say we're rescinding our approval until these things are done. The other way is, we're saying this and making these suggestions, and then if it's not done then we'll rescind it. Why not just rescind it first, not make that commitment. We know that it's not moving forward, but we want to see, I think these are great suggestions, and Dr. Watlington, again I think that's necessary. So, I think that these two actions can run concurrently in my opinion.

Do I have to change my motion? No, I think I'm saying the same thing. If you need a timeframe. If we say we will commit that we'll follow up within a year or six months or we'll revisit. I'm simply saying we rescind our approval for the P3 and then we still want to work through this. NC-DOT, I know we need improvement. I know it's our responsibility as Council members. We do need improvement, and I want to partner with NC-DOT. I'm not trying to sever a relationship. I'm trying to, meet the call of our constituents, but also take some action and make sure that these actions, they happen, there's teeth to the resolution.

Mayor Lyles said alright, so we have a motion on the floor. All in favor. Oh, can you address the motion for us Billie?

Billie Tynes, Deputy City Clerk said the motion was made by Ms. Johnson, seconded by Ms. Watlington. The motion was to rescind the approval of the P3.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said and to be clear, that would be to direct your representative.

Ms. Johnson said yes.

Councilmember Mitchell said Mayor and Council, I'm going to be very brief, but I think this is, people say a moment of leadership for our community, and so there was a commitment I made in the month of April 2026, about supporting a rescind. I'm more educated now, I'm more informed now, and I don't know if rescinding a P3 is in the best interest of the work we did on the resolution. So, I just want to say to the public and to my colleagues, who I guess I will see on Sunday at Black Political Caucus Meeting, I cannot support a rescind tonight. Thank you.

Ms. Watlington said yes. I just wanted to speak very quickly too. I also made a commitment and I intend to honor it tonight. That said, I see that likely this is not going to pass. I do understand what Councilmember Johnson is saying, and I hope, I will say I hope, because this is not binding, I hope that NC-DOT has heard us tonight, and as we think about the schedule or the project going forward, that we can expect to see a real response in terms of adjustments to the timeline, so that we don't have to come back here and have this conversation a couple months down the road. So, with that, I will honor my commitment tonight, and I'll also continue to support the resolution.

The vote was taken on the motion to rescind and recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Mazuera Arias, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, and Watlington

NAYS: Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Mitchell, and Owens

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 450-453.

* * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 14: 2026 WATER SEWER REVENUE BONDS AND CONSTRUCTION PERIOD FINANCING

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt bond orders and resolutions authorizing and approving issuance of Water Sewer Revenue Bonds and Revenue Bond Anticipation Notes and calling for the execution and delivery of various documents necessary to complete the sale, (B) Provide for the issuance of Water Sewer Revenue Bonds in an amount not to exceed \$570,000,000 to refund outstanding 2024 Bond Anticipation Notes and callable Water and Sewer Refunding Revenue Bonds series 2015 and 2018, (C) Provide for the issuance of Water Sewer Construction Period Financing in an amount not to exceed \$530,000,000, (D) Provide for the issuance of additional Water Sewer Revenue Bonds for optional redemption to refund all or a portion of the city's outstanding Water and Sewer System Refunding Revenue Bonds for approximately \$633,000,000 Series 2018, Series 2019, and series 2020 through tender and purchase of such bonds, and (E) Adopt Budget Ordinance No. 1126-X appropriating \$1,203,000,000 in revenue bond proceeds to the Charlotte Water Revenue Bond Debt Service Fund.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 454-469.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 049-050.

* * * * *

NOMINATIONS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

ITEM NO. 15: NOMINATIONS TO THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a partial term recommended by the Black Chamber of Commerce beginning upon appointment and ending April 28, 2027:

- Darlene Whitfield, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens and Watlington.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to appoint Darlene Whitfield by acclamation.

Ms. Whitfield was appointed.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Certified SBE-Hispanic Contractors Association beginning April 29, 2026, and ending April 28, 2029.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Charlotte Regional Business Alliance beginning April 29, 2026, and ending April 28, 2029.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the LGBT+ Chamber of Commerce beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2029:

- John Castano Gallego, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to appoint John Castano Gallego by acclamation.

Mr. Castano Gallego was reappointed.

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the National Association of Women Business Owners beginning April 29, 2026, and ending April 28, 2029:

- Nicole Reina, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens and Watlington.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to appoint Nicole Reina by acclamation.

Ms. Reina was appointed.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Metrolina Minority Contractors Association beginning April 29, 2026, and ending April 28, 2029.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Metrolina Native American Association beginning April 29, 2026, and ending April 28, 2029.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE BUSINESS INCLUSION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Carolinas Association of General Contractors beginning in March 1, 2026, and ending February 28, 2029.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Hispanic Contractors Association of the Carolinas beginning March 1, 2026, and ending February 28, 2029.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the LGBT+ Chamber of Commerce beginning March 1, 2026, and ending February 28, 2029:

- Eric Norman, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens and Watlington.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to appoint Eric Norman by acclamation.

Mr. Norman was appointed.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a three-year term recommended by the Metrolina Native American Association beginning March 1, 2026, and ending February 28, 2029.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE INTERNATIONAL CABINET

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2029:

- Joseph Hoff, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens and Watlington.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to appoint Joseph Hoff by acclamation.

Mr. Hoff was reappointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 18: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a Financial Expert category representative for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2027.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 19: NOMINATIONS TO THE CIVIL SERVICE BOARD

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three-year term beginning May 15, 2026, and ending May 15, 2029:

- Barbara Ratliff, nominated by Councilmember Johnson
- Sam Smith, Jr., nominated by Councilmember Mayo
- Joshua Loyd, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Mayfield, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to appoint Joshua Loyd by acclamation.

Mr. Loyd was reappointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 20: NOMINATIONS TO THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2029:

- Sean Sullivan, nominated by Councilmember Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to appoint Sean Sullivan by acclamation.

Mr. Sullivan was reappointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: NOMINATIONS TO THE HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending July 16, 2027:

- Sekiya Billman, nominated by Councilmember Ajmera, Anderson, Graham, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to appoint Sekiya Billman by acclamation.

Sekiya Billman was appointed.

The following nominations were made for one appointment for a three year term beginning July 17, 2026, and ending July 17, 2029:

- Charlie Miller, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Driggs, Graham, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington.
- Dr. Blanche Penn, nominated by Councilmember Johnson.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to appoint Charlie Miller by acclamation.

Mr. Miller was reappointed.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 22: NOMINATIONS TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD MATCHING GRANTS FUND

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a Non-Profit Sector Representative for a two-year term beginning April 16, 2026, and ending April 15, 2028.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ITEM NO. 23: NOMINATIONS TO THE PASSENGER VEHICLE FOR HIRE BOARD

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a Company Operating Certificate Licenses category representative for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2028.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a Representative of Persons with Disabilities for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2026, and a three-year term beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2029.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:23 p.m.


Billie Tynes, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 6 hours, 7 minutes
Minutes completed: June 9, 2026