



**Budget, Governance, and Intergovernmental Relations Council
Committee Meeting Summary**

**Monday, November 17, 2025
Room 267 at 3:00 pm**

COMMITTEE AGENDA TOPIC

Agenda Overview

- I. Policy Referral: Legislation on Quality of Life/Public Safety Issues
- II. Policy Referral: Financial Stewardship – Requirements for Grantees

COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Committee Members Present: Dimple Ajmera (chair), Tiawana Brown, Lawana Mayfield, James Mitchell, and Edwin Peacock were present.

Staff Resources: Shawn Heath, City Manager's Office
Andrea Leslie-Fite, City Attorney

DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

Summary

The committee meeting opened with introductions of council members, city staff, and community attendees. Chair Dimple Amira explained that the agenda shifted due to escalating federal Border Patrol activity in Charlotte, which has reportedly involved racial profiling, detentions without cause, and harassment of residents, including U.S. citizens. She emphasized that these actions were reportedly creating fear and instability in the community.

The City Attorney presented a detailed legal analysis of what actions Charlotte can and cannot take under state and federal law. Key points included:

- City facilities have protocols requiring judicial warrants for access to restricted areas; public areas remain open.
- The city cannot restrict access to public records but must protect confidential information as required by law.
- CMPD does not participate in federal immigration enforcement and cannot assist with civil (administrative) ICE warrants; it may respond only to criminal matters or to verify and document federal activity to maintain public safety.
- The city may collect data and track civil rights impacts if legally authorized, though such records may be public.
- Emergency funding to nonprofits is possible if it serves a clear public purpose and follows strict financial rules.
- State law (House Bill 318) limits local authority and requires certain cooperation with ICE by sheriffs and jails.

- The city cannot single out federal agencies for property restrictions or distribute signage to private owners that could be seen as impeding enforcement.

Committee members discussed the importance of community education, transparency, and mutual support. CMPD confirmed it can respond to calls where residents are unsure if individuals are legitimate federal agents or impersonators. Councilmember Mayfield highlighted legal limits on city authority under North Carolina law, clarified residents' rights. Councilmember Brown reinforced this concern and called for clear information to reduce chaos and fear within the community.

Funding options for community organizations supporting impacted community members were examined, weighing the standard process for funding non-profit organizations—which can take 30–60 days—against an accelerated pathway similar to emergency measures used during the pandemic, with appropriate legal and procedural safeguards. Staff explained that even accelerated funding would require identifying eligible organizations, ensuring non-discriminatory access, and possibly reallocating existing city resources, meaning immediate deployment of funds would be challenging. Committee members emphasized balancing urgency in supporting the community with adherence to legal, procedural, and budgetary constraints.

Policy Referral: Legislation on Quality of Life/Public Safety Issues

Committee members shifted focused to the City of Charlotte's 2026 state legislative agenda, particularly regarding public safety and the broader justice system. Shawn Heath, with the City Manager's Office, emphasized that the criminal justice ecosystem functions effectively only when all components—police, district attorneys, public defenders, and courts—are adequately resourced. Notably, assistant public defender positions in Mecklenburg County have remained static since 2002, despite a 60 percent population increase and a 40 percent rise in cases, creating strain on the system. The discussion highlighted several priority areas for potential state advocacy: increasing resources for the DA's office, public defenders, and courts; evaluating magistrate qualifications and starting pay; enhancing mental health services in public safety and detention settings; considering enhanced sentencing for chronic repeat offenders, including certain misdemeanors; and providing local jurisdictions with additional tools for addressing quality-of-life offenses.

The conversation also covered juvenile detention. While the city does not have statutory responsibility for juvenile detention, stakeholders advocated for reestablishing a local facility to improve access to family, schools, legal resources, and supportive services. The prior facility at Jail North closed approximately three years ago due to staffing and operational challenges. Potential solutions discussed included public-private partnerships or repurposing unused Mecklenburg County-owned property to provide a cost-effective facility. Council members emphasized that advocacy should clarify jurisdictional responsibilities, distinguishing between city, county, and state roles. They also noted the importance of educating the public on the justice system, including workflows for misdemeanors versus felonies, and the disproportionate impact of a small group of juveniles on overall juvenile crime rates. Staff advised the feedback provided by committee members would be included in the proposed State Legislative agenda which would be discussed at the January 2026 committee meeting.

Policy Referral: Financial Stewardship – Requirements for Grantees (*deferred due to time*)

The final topic for the day, Policy Referral: Financial Stewardship – Requirements for Grantees, was deferred to a later meeting due to time.

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.