The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, convened for an Action Review on Monday, June 8, 2026, at 5:08 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, Renee Johnson, Lawana Mayfield, Joi Mayo, James Mitchell, Kimberly Owens, and Victoria Watlington.

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmember Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham

* * * * * * *

Mayor Lyles said okay, I want to call to order the agenda for the City of Charlotte's run of show for our June 8, 2026, meeting, and I want to have introductions, so let's start with our clerk.

* * * * * * *

ACTION REVIEW

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

Mayor Lyles said thank you all for attending our session. I hope that you'll be able to work with us and make things happier for all of us in this place. So, let's go with this. We're now going to start off our meeting with the consent agenda items.

Marie Harris, Budget Director said thank you, and good evening, Mayor and Council members. As far as I'm aware there's no outstanding questions still on consent, but if there are please let me know at this time.

Councilmember Mayfield said I had some iPad issues over the weekend, so I'm trying to find the item, because I left my book upstairs. Tonight, we have an item where we have a hearing as well as a decision, and I had mentioned previously that I have concerns when we have hearings and decisions on the same night versus having the hearing, hearing from the community, and then having the discussion for whatever that item is. I'm double checking it.

Ms. Harris said Item No. 6 and 7, and that's in the chamber public hearing, not the consent, but yes ma'am, it's the public hearing items.

Ms. Mayfield said they're not in the consent, but I wanted to make sure to acknowledge that, that we need to have a conversation about having a public hearing the same night where item A is opening up the public hearing and item B being to approve whatever that project is without having enough time for discussion, and for the community to be engaged in the process.

Councilmember Driggs and Graham arrived at 5:11 p.m.

Mayor Lyles said alright, thank you. Mr. Driggs has come in, and Mr. Graham, I think I just didn't see you.

Malcolm Graham said no, I just came in too.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 2: CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 29 THROUGH 53 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 Ajmera, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 29: Bridge Maintenance and Repairs
Approve a contract in the amount of $3,172,838.50 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder Lee Construction Company of the Carolinas, Inc. for the Bridge Maintenance and Repairs project.

Summary of Bids
The City of Charlotte advertised an Invitation to bid twice; only one bid was received from Lee Construction Company of the Carolinas, Inc.

Item No. 30: North Carolina Department of Transportation Safety Project on Old Statesville Road
Adopt a resolution supporting a North Carolina Department of Transportation safety project on Old Statesville Road at Oak Drive to improve traffic safety in support of the city's Strategic Mobility Plan goals.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 516.

Item No. 31: North Carolina Department of Transportation Safety Project on South Tryon Street
Adopt a resolution supporting a North Carolina Department of Transportation safety project on South Tryon Street at Freeland Lane to improve traffic safety in support of the city's Strategic Mobility Plan goals.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 517.

Item No. 32: Arrowood Road at Whitehall Commons Center Drive Intersection Improvements
(A) Reject the low bid submitted by Cardinal Civil Contracting, LLC for the Arrowood Road at Whitehall Commons Center Drive Intersection Improvements project, and (B) Approve a contract in the amount of $1,255,340.57 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder DOT Construction, Inc. for the Arrowood Road at Whitehall Commons Center Drive Intersection Improvements project.

Summary of Bids

Cardinal Civil Contracting, LLC*	$1,254,304.18
DOT Construction Inc.	$1,255,340.57
Sealand Contractors Corp.	$1,295,000.00
United of Carolinas, Inc.	$1,522,351.60
Efficient Developments, LLC	$1,902,491.93

*The low bid from Cardinal Civil Contracting, LLC was found to be non-responsible/non-responsive for failure to meet the established WSBE goal and failure to satisfy the Good Faith Efforts requirements.

Item No. 33: Building Automation Maintenance and Repair Services
(A) Approve contracts for building automation maintenance and repair services for a term of three years with the following: Carolina Building Controls, LLC (SBE), Carrier Enterprise, 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. 34: Heavy Truck Cab-Chassis Repair Services
(A) Approve contracts for heavy truck cab-chassis repair services for a term of three years with the following: Cummins Inc., Excel Truck Group, MHC Kenworth, On-The-Go Fleet Services, Rush Truck Center, Superior Truck Service, TLG Peterbilt Charlotte, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to 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. 35: NASCAR Hall of Fame Improvement Project
(A) Approve a guaranteed maximum price not to exceed $6,035,000 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. 36: Overhead Bay Door Maintenance Services
(A) Approve contracts for overhead bay door maintenance services for a term of three years with the following: Carolina Door Specialties, DH Pace Company, Inc., and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for one, two-year term with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 37: Painting Services
(A) Approve contracts for painting services for a term of three years with the following: Blachaus Development Group, Charlotte Paint Company LLC (WBE), Reliable Restorations (MBE, SBE), Treadaway & Sons Painting & Wallcovering, Inc. (SBE), 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. 38: Pump and Motor Repair Services
(A) Approve contracts for pump and motor repair services for a term of three years with the following: Dixie Electro Mechanical Services (WBE), Electric Motor Shop, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for one, two-year term with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 39: Airport Door System Operation and Maintenance Services Contract Amendment
(A) Approve contract amendment #3 for $775,000 to the contract with ASSA ABLOY Entrance Systems US Inc. for door system operation and maintenance services at Airport facilities, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract and this amendment were approved.

Item No. 40: Airport Electric Power Services
(A) Approve service agreements with Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for electric power services for Airport Terminal Expansion East, Airport Terminal Expansion West, and Concourse A Expansion Phase Two for a term of ten years, then automatically converting to year-to-year, (B) Approve a service agreement with Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for electric power services for the Central Energy Plant for a term of five years, then automatically converting to year-to-year, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to amend the agreements consistent with the purpose for which the agreements were approved.

Item No. 41: Airport Facility Lease – 4818 Express Drive, Suite B
(A) Approve a lease with Airline Tech Reps LLC dba STS Line Maintenance for office and warehouse needs at the airport related to its aircraft maintenance services for a term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the lease for up to two, one-year terms and to amend the lease consistent with the purpose for which the lease was approved.

Item No. 42: Airport Facility Lease – 4710 Yorkmont Road
(A) Approve a lease with Sky Chefs Inc. dba LSG Sky Chefs for a term of three years for a catering facility at the Airport related to its airline support services, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to extend the lease for up to two, one-year terms and to amend the lease consistent with the purpose.

Item No. 43: Airport Federal Inspection Station Facility and Concourse D Renovations Change Order

Approve change order #2 for $9,963,650.52 to the contract with Messer Construction Co. for Construction Manager at Risk services for the Federal Inspection Station Facility and Concourse D Renovations project.

Item No. 44: Airport Fourth Parallel Runway South End-Around Taxiway Change Order
Approve change order #2 for $23,945,449.84 to the contract with Ames Construction, Inc. for the Fourth Parallel Runway South End-Around Taxiway project.

Item No. 45: Airport On-Call General Contractor Services
(A) Approve contracts for on-call general contractor services for a term of three years with the following: Ferlco LLC (SBE), Keach Construction, Inc., Kelby Construction, Inc., Queen Boss Construction, LLC (MBE), and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to one, two-year term with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Summary of Bids

Kelby Construction Inc.	$1,635.00
Keach Construction	$3,892.00
Solutions Construction, LLC dba Reliable Rest	$4,700.49
Full Source Construction	$5,379.00

Item No. 46: Airport Program Management Information System Support Services
(A) Approve a contract with HNTB North Carolina, P.C. for program management information system support services for a term of two years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to one, one-year term with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 47: Airport Runway Status Light Implementation Reimbursement Agreement
(A) Authorize the City Manager to execute a reimbursement agreement with the Federal Aviation Administration for runway status light implementation, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the agreement consistent with the purpose for which the agreement was approved.

Item No. 48: Set a Public Hearing on Northway Woods Phase One Area Voluntary Annexation
Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for June 22, 2026, for Northway Woods Phase One Area voluntary annexation petition.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 518-520.

Item No. 49: Resolution of Intent to Abandon a Portion of Pete Brown Road
(A) Adopt a Resolution of Intent to abandon a portion of Pete Brown Road, and (B) Set a public hearing for August 24, 2026.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 521-522.

Item No. 50: Resolution of Intent to Abandon a Portion of Weona Avenue
(A) Adopt a Resolution of Intent to abandon a portion of Weona Avenue, and (B) Set a public hearing for August 24, 2026.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 523-524.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Item No. 51: Aviation Property Transactions – 8518 and 8532 Douglas Drive
Acquisition of 58,980.24 square feet (1.354 acres) at 8518 and 8532 Douglas Drive from Mary M. Marshall for $545,000 for Steeleberry Acres.

Item No. 52: Property Transactions – Rutgers Avenue 4049, Parcel # 1
Resolution of Condemnation of 2,005 square feet (0.046 acres) in storm drainage easement and 1,090 square feet (0.025 acres) in temporary construction easement at 4050 and 4046 Rutgers Avenue from 40 Rutgers, LLC for $23,275 for Rutgers Avenue 4049.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 525.

Item No. 53: Property Transactions – Rutgers Avenue 4049, Parcel # 2
Resolution of Condemnation of 303 square feet (0.007 acres) in storm drainage easement and 75 square feet (0.002 acres) in temporary construction easement at 4100 Rutgers Avenue from Reginald Ray Vazquez for $2,475 for Rutgers Avenue 4049.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 526.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 3: ACTION PREVIEW OVERVIEW

Marcus Jones, City Manager said in the Action Preview tonight, we have two items that have really had a lot of work been done on them, and it's good to be able to be here tonight to move them forward. We will have the MPTA (Metropolitan Public Transportation Authority) Interlocal Agreement update, and we'll also have an update on red light cameras. So, Mayor, unless there's any questions.

Mayor Lyles said are there any questions for the Manager or any questions or concerns regarding those two items?

Mr. Jones said so, then Mayor, I'd like to turn it over to Councilmember Driggs for the introduction for our guests who are here tonight.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: ACTION PREVIEW ITEMS

Councilmember Driggs said so, colleagues, I just wanted to preface our discussion of the MPTA agreement by saying that the working group, consisting of myself, Councilmember Owens and Dr. Watlington, spent time walking along as these negotiations took place, ensuring that the Council received updates and was aware at all times of what kind of things were being discussed, and I think we've landed in a good place. That's the important thing. I will emphasize, for one, as you know there are phases to this plan. Forgive me if this is going to get repeated, I'll try to keep it short, but from July 1, 2026, to January 1, 2027, projected CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System) will continue to be operated by the City. The employees will continue to work for the City, but all of that is pursuant to an agreement with MPTA, because the PAVE (Projects for Advancing Vehicle-Infrastructure Enhancements) Act provides that as of July 1, 2026, coming up, CATS, Transit belongs to and is controlled by the MPTA.

So, what we're doing is for six months, we have an arrangement, an agreement, which is this document you see, pursuant to which CATS will continue to be operated by City employees, will continue to be a City function, but pursuant to the terms of an agreement. After that, in Phase two, the intention is that the employees will move over to MPTA, that it will take responsibility for the operating of CATS, but there will be a lot of continuing involvement by the City, because a lot of the debt, for example that is secured by the assets, was issued by the City.

So, we're going to have a kind of a symbiotic relationship with the MPTA for a while. I will just note, and Ms. Owens, I hope you'll speak in a moment, but we looked in considerable detail at some I think critical issues for the Council, and one was in brief, and again we'll hear about it, but no employee of CATS will be worse off as a result of this. The simplest thing, there was a lot of conversation about indemnities and liabilities,

but there again the short upshot is that essentially no General Fund money will be used in order to pay for CATS, but nor will CATS benefit from any of the sales tax money. So, all the sales tax money will be used for transit, and no General Fund money will be used for transit. I think, amazingly, those were the biggest issues, although there was a lot of detail around them, and I do appreciate the work that our staff did, and the bunch of names, I'm not going to try and mention them all, but also our cooperation with MPTA. So, we got deep into a number of issues. They had concerns. We had concerns. I think the way it was all worked out is a credit to them and to us, and that's my brief synopsis. Councilmember Owens, would you care to comment?

Councilmember Owens said I'll just very briefly say, I too took away a deep and abiding respect for the people who worked on this, and the hours that went into really a proof of concept that was put out without the requisite timing to really accomplish it. These sorts of things, I think those of us who've been in the business community, as many of us have, can well appreciate that you don't want to rush something of this import, but because we are put in this situation, I think we did a phenomenal job under those circumstances, and I'm very pleased to cede the floor to Council and have you give us further walkthrough.

Mr. Driggs said so, actually before you start, one last remark. This is the last time we will all discuss this. This thing has to be effective on July 1, 2026, and right now we're on schedule to vote on it on June 22, 2026, next week is a Zoning Meeting. So, I just emphasize that, because if you have any concerns, or you think there's something we need to talk about some more, we have to do it before June 22, 2026. Otherwise, the PAVE Act becomes effective, all the transit belongs to, and the cash goes to the MPTA, and we have no basis for cooperation with them. So, we really need to get this done on June 22, 2026, and having said that, I'm pleased to hand over Catherine to you.

Catherine Clodfelter, Parker Poe Attorney said it really has been our pleasure to work with you all, and staff. I'm joined today, I want to note, by my colleagues Shalanna Pirtle and Scott Leo from the Parker Poe Charlotte Office. As Councilmember Driggs said, this is really your time to comment and weigh in. What I hope to do in a presentation is to give you some visuals, so that you can put into perspective, if you're a visual person, what Councilmember Driggs said about the phases, how this transition will roll out, and then focus on just four provisions that gives you I think some additional facts that you might be most focused on, from what I've understood of the conversations so far, before you talk to each other and with me.

Just a reminder, the last time I was here was May 7, 2026. We had before you a proposed draft that was in progress. There have been a number of changes since then. What you have as of today is a draft that the attorneys who've worked on it and staff would recommend for your approval, but of course it needs your comments. The changes that've been made since May 7, 2026, have also been provided to you in a summary form, and that's been added as an appendix, but there are a lot of those changes, so I want to walk you through on a high-level the ones that I think I've heard you express the most concern about, and then hear comments and question to any provision.

I'll start again with the visuals. So, this is really about a phased transition. Three phases, the first being what we're referring to as the transition period. What these visuals show you is basically who's doing what during Phase One. Well, of course CATS personnel are still City personnel. The City still maintains debts. All assets will be operating the system, which means there's risk that comes with operating the system. The operating revenue will still flow to be collected by the City, and then the City maintains the fund balance. The ones that you'll be most concerned with are of course the debt reserve that you need to have in order to maintain your ratings, and the operating reserve. There are other fund balances. There are many fund balances, and all of them to be maintained at this time. The MPTA, so again this is July 1, 2026, will take over policy and governance. That's similar to the relationship you had with the MTC (Metropolitan Transit Commission), but of course a much broader scope when the MPTA takes over. Sales tax revenue will begin to flow to the MPTA. That green arrow shows you that

some of the sales tax will flow back to the City, by back I mean forward to the City, to pay for CATS personnel, Debt Service, all assets, any of the money that's needed to pay for assets, operations, and to cover the legal risks that come up either before this agreement starts or during Phase One. Operation control is with the MPTA. The way that you are able to operate, while the MPTA has operational control, is through the Interlocal Cooperation Statute. This is a legal provision that local governments take advantage of all the time when needing to jointly undertake some kind of task. So, you will be able to jointly operate, with the City maintaining the operations and the MPTA maintaining control, the public transit. The MPTA is also responsible for all of the transition activities that need to happen in order for the transfer to occur. That's Phase One. That starts July 1, 2026, by statute, and will end, the goal timeline is January 1, 2027. What you should know is that if there are some services that have to be maintained by the City after January 1, 2027. We have created safety nets within the Interlocal Agreement to be able to address those issues, and timelines and schedules for determining what those are, so that you may enter into additional agreements as necessary with the MPTA for those kinds of services, back office services, that might need to remain with the City after January 1, 2027.

In Phase Two, you're in this sort of shared services period. Policy governance has of course remained with the MPTA. CATS personnel become MPTA personnel as of the first day of Phase Two. The sales tax revenue is still flowing to the MPTA. It flows to the City to the extent needed to pay your debt service, and to pay anything related to the encumbered assets. Operations now are with the MPTA. They retain transition activities. They are now paying for the legal risk of the system, and operating revenue unencumbered assets are now with the MPTA, and the fund balance transfers to the MPTA.

I'll take a moment just to give you a little detail on how all assets suddenly split into encumbered assets and unencumbered assets. What that means is, an unencumbered asset is something that still has some debt related or grant that couldn't transfer, and the City has to maintain it by law. Anything that's not covered by debt is going to go to the MPTA.

In Phase Three, you start the ongoing relationship of having the MPTA fully running the public transit system, paying off debts as they become prepayable, and then all of those encumbered assets that remain with the City during Phase Two are slowly starting to become unencumbered assets as the debt is paid off, and they will transfer to the MPTA.

I want to focus on four provisions, so you know where we landed when it comes to these four things that I believe we talked a good amount about over the last few months. Employees. Councilmember Driggs, I think, summarized it perfectly, as you want to see on the slides. In Phase One, the City is remaining the employer of record through Phase One. So, you will maintain the same consistent policies that you have in the past with respect to those employees. Hiring and other kinds of natural order events that occur in the fall will occur in conjunction with the MPTA's notice. In Phase Two, the MPTA is hiring all full-time CATS personnel as of day one, and here's the important parts, I think the most important, compensation and retirement benefits are no less than the base offered by the City at the time before CATS personnel transfer. You will note there is a difference in language for when it comes to benefits, comparable benefit plan cost. That does not mean that the MPTA is expecting to provide anything less than the current benefit plans. The issue there is, in order to have a benefit plan you have to negotiate with some third party, and so contractually what the MPTA can agree to do, is aim for the comparable cost, though it may look different just because of who the provider might end up being.

Let's also talk about how Phase One operations are going to happen while the City maintains operations and the MPTA has operational control. The MPTA is going to enter into any contracts that are related to the transition activities. The City, on the other hand, is going to enter into all operational contracts. Those operational contracts include things like capital projects you might be thinking of. Here's the process we are going to

go through in order to make sure that the City can move forward with an operational contract without it touching policy. This was a big item of discussion and concern. There are some operational contracts that the City will need to consider to approve that also might touch on policy aspects. A good number might not, but a few might. So, the process we have proposed is that the City will provide a list of contracts that need Council approval to the MPTA, say, here's our plan for the fall. The MPTA is going to identify those contracts on the list that they think there is some MPTA review needed, whether it be policy or otherwise. The City will seek Council approval for contracts where the MPTA has approved, or otherwise there's no approval from the MPTA needed. Here's the important part. In all cases, that MPTA review will not impact, impair, or negatively impact operations, meaning the timeline has to be worked out so that MPTA review happens before your scheduled time for review and approval.

Let's talk a little bit about legal risk. We've broken this out in Phase One, Phase Two, and Phase Three. I think the most important thing that should catch your eye is what it says at the bottom of each of those phases. In any case in any phase, there will be no CATS liability that falls to the City's General Fund. That's how it currently is now. You run a public enterprise that is the public transportation system. All the liabilities of that separate public enterprise stay with that separate public enterprise, and that's how it will be maintained through this agreement and in the future. Just to note for everybody, the words CATS liability continues to mean liabilities of the public transportation system even when the liabilities transfer to the MPTA. So, you will continue operating CATS in the fall, but the MPTA funds, so the CATS funds that you hold on hand, will be what pays that legal risk, and you are restricted from expanding beyond the current commitments you have. So, that would mean you're not taking on new debt or grants related to the assets of the MPTA. The MPTA is in Phase Two going to take on all operations, all legal risks they'll be paying for, and there will be a time, probably in the future always, where the City and the MPTA have to work together to determine where there might be shared risks or shared liabilities, properties that maybe the City owns and there is CATS infrastructure currently and vice versa, and you will have to work through how those shared liabilities and shared risks are addressed. Those are probably going to be addressed through separate agreements, and we've written a provision in the agreement to address that. Then in Phase Three, the MPTA is remaining fully responsible for CATS legal risk, which means the public transportation legal risk, all the final debt, grant, and asset transfer issues will be resolved, and again there's no impact to the General Fund.

The obligations in Phase One break down like this. The City is going to pay for CATS operations using the transit funds on hand, or the sales tax revenue that flows to the City, and the City is maintaining $100 million of operating reserve that you currently maintain. In terms of debt service obligations, the City is maintaining the $30 million debt reserve that you currently maintain, and the MPTA will transfer funds to the City for debt service as that's due. As long as you maintain debt service, you will maintain that debt reserve. Payment obligations are that the MPTA will provide to the City sufficient funds to pay operations without using operating reserves, meaning at all times you are able to pay those operating expenses as they come to you without needing to dip into the reserves that are there to protect the City's debt and bond ratings.

I believe that's it from me. What is contained in the appendix are the differences between the May 7, 2026, draft, and the current draft. I'm happy to go into explanation and detail into any of those, but I want to make sure that you all have the time to discuss and give comments, so I'll stop there.

Mayor Lyles said I want to say thank you for what you've been doing, and I want to say thank you to a number of people that've been taking this time and making it work, our own Ed, and I think about all of the Mayors in the north towns and what they've done, the County Commissioners, we've done this well, and if we continue to do this as well as you've outlined it, I think we're going to be okay. So, I want to open questions if there are any other comments.

Councilmember Anderson said thank you for the presentation, appreciate the update. Just a couple questions. You mentioned that the employees that are transferring over, they won't be worse off, as it relates to pay and benefits. What about any perspective on career pathing? Has the MPTA thought about adopting similar career pathings? Has that discussion happened at all?

Ms. Clodfelter said that is not a discussion that we have had. The MPTA of course will be responsible for all their personnel policies they adopted, but that's not something that the City has weighed in on in this agreement.

Ms. Anderson said okay. Just really interesting as we are in this in between space where we're both operating. It's a joint combination between the MPTA and the City. It would just be interesting to hear their perspective on that. I know they're going to be working on this over the break in July 2026, so when we come back, perhaps we'll get an update on that.

Then, as you talk about the legal risk, and I appreciate that on slide eight, and I also appreciate the fact that there's no CATS liability that falls on the City's General Fund, but what about, for example, I'm just going to pick something that's really, really sort of out there, but what about like a SEAR (Special Event Assessment Rating) Level 5 event that, heaven forbid, happens on our lines within Phase One or Phase Two, who would be the lead on that? Would it be the City sort of facilitating an extraordinary event and doing all the public relations, or would that fall on the MPTA or some combination of both?

Ms. Clodfelter said the best way to answer that I think is to recognize that the City and the MPTA are starting a relationship with this agreement and all future agreements, and there are so many of those types of issues that you will want to develop policies about, communication about, and coordination about. This agreement does not address that type of situation.

Ms. Anderson said gotcha. I think that's something we should think about, because this is the legal framework for risk, and this is absolutely needed, but when we think about risk mitigation, and just over the last five years the events that have happened on the light rail or with the trains and bearings and things of that nature, just an overall risk mitigation from an operational perspective, I think we need to have some conversations around that and keep that top of mind.

Councilmember Johnson said Councilmember Anderson I loved your question. So, we did say that the employees wouldn't be harmed, but if an employee works for the City, there's lots of opportunity for advancement, just being an internal employee. So, I think if we could think about the employees that are being transferred, if they have some type of priority for hiring in the City, if they would apply for a City job, maybe the first two years or something like that, if we could think about that. Because while they might not be harmed currently, where they would be harmed is not having the same opportunity or the same priority as an internal applicant would with the City. So, for career advancement, if we could consider those quasi employees or something, so that when they apply for a City job they have some type of priority, just my suggestion.

Councilmember Graham said I just wanted to thank Ed and Kimberly for kind of scrubbing the work for us. I had an opportunity to attend two or three of the sessions that were held internally, and certainly I think this is where we need to be for sure. So, I certainly support where we're at. Lastly, the word that keeps coming up over and over again is relationship, relationship with the new Authority, and I think we should be very intentional about establishing a strong foundation working relationship with the Authority, because again this is beginning of a marathon, not a sprint. There will be more of these types of conversations in terms of how we interact with them. So, I think this is a really good first start and we're grounded in great legal advice. So, thank you for the work.

Councilmember Mayfield said I also want to thank the committee members for all of your work on this and staff. I had a chance to sit with staff and Councilmember Owens earlier, and Councilmember Anderson. We actually had the conversation about risk mitigation earlier and thinking what would that look like, and Councilmember Johnson, I appreciate the question that you asked. Mr. Manager, because understanding that once the MPTA is fully set up, all of CATS will be under that Authority. The only role that Council will have from that point forward is our appointment of seven members. So, we and future Councils have to be very intentional. So, I think we have an opportunity prior to that first two years, and some have two years, some have four, to think about what the qualifications are that we want to have in appointments, whether it's a reappointment and/or appointing a new. Manager Jones, thinking about what Councilmember Johnson just mentioned, for the employees, the challenge that I can see is our retirement system. So, if MPTA is now its own entity, pretty much a governing board like we are, if an employee were to transfer back into the City, do they lose their seniorship? So, you're vested after five years or seven years, or whatever, within the City, you're vested when you're with CATS and you have a retirement system. Would they be starting over new, or would they roll in?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so, I'll make sure I'm correct with this, and I'll ask Catherine. Clearly, you lose nothing when you go from the City to the MPTA. You're asking a question that I don't think has been posed to me. So, if they came back, Catherine, what's the impact?

Ms. Clodfelter said so, the MPTA will become a member of the local government employment retirement system maintained by the state. So, you probably already have some shared agreements that employees who are transferring from other local governments will step into those same retirement benefits. It would be same if they're coming from an LGERS (Local Governmental Employees' Retirement System) Unit.

Ms. Mayfield said so, and my apologies for not thinking about that question when we were together earlier, but just wanted to make sure that, again say they've been working with CATS for 17 years, and they have an opportunity to come work with the City, does that 17 get accounted for, for their 30 years, or making sure that they don't have to start all over, and I think that will fall more on our end than on the MPTA's end. Since again, once it's a separate authority, even though the employees would have access to the retirement system, just thinking about how we would do transition.

Mr. Driggs said just wanted to comment, the Chair, David Howard, of MPTA came to TPD (Transportation, Planning and Development), and I think almost all of us were there, but it was interesting to note that, particularly based on his experience as a member of Council, albeit a few years ago, I think he responded very well to some pointed questions that you asked, and I think your observation is very much on target. This is a beginning of a relationship, and it's important for us to get off on the right foot. We need to recognize it's a partnership. This is not an arm's length transaction, and therefore, we're going to have to proceed on the basis of an element of trust. They need to trust us, we need to trust them, and we need to look forward to advancing the interests of Charlotte together. The other thing we talked about with Mr. Howard was a program of ongoing visits, reports, engagement. So, we haven't worked out the details of that yet, but he acknowledged that there would be regular occurring kind of briefings to us by members of their board, so that we can stay informed about what they're doing. Thank you.

Mr. Marcus Jones said I echo what Councilmember Driggs said, and I just want to make sure that I'm also putting it into the record. The relationship with the officers of the MPTA and the staff and the Council is so important, and this isn't easy, but we need to start off looking at this as a partnership and not a negotiation, because we'll be together for a long time. So, I'm just really appreciative of how Council has handled this, as well as staff, and I look forward to in two weeks moving this forward.

Mayor Lyles said alright. Any other comments or questions? Hearing none, thank you very much. I do think that we're doing a really great job, and I think Mr. Howard is just a

great person and really wants to make this work, and I think it will. Let's just all keep our fingers crossed, okay, alright.

Mr. Driggs said thank you, Catherine.

Mayor Lyles said thanks, Catherine.

Mr. Marcus Jones said okay, so the last item that we have on the agenda preview is an update on red light cameras, and before I turn this over to the Chair of our Safety Committee, Councilmember Anderson, again, this is something that had an opportunity to come through the Committee. I do believe after a bunch of fits and starts over the years, we're at a very good place to move forward with the red light cameras.

Ms. Anderson said I just want to give a brief introduction. First of all, as many of you may recall, the Mayor issued a policy referral to the Safety Committee back in late March 2026, posing a question of whether the City should reinstate a red light camera program. First, I want to acknowledge my Safety Committee members. We have (CM) Councilmember Ajmera, CM Mitchell, CM Graham, and CM Driggs, who are on the Committee, and they do great work with me. I thank you for serving on this committee with me. The Committee got right to work on this referral, and we voted this particular item out of committee in May 2026, and as you're going to hear from Mr. Jones here, staff are prepared to move forward with a red light camera pilot program. This effort is responsive to the concerns that we all, all Council members, have heard across our community. It directly aligns with our commitment to our Vision Zero policy addressing traffic fatalities and serious injuries throughout the City streets, with an emphasis on the City's high-injury network intersections. So, Mr. Jones is going to walk you through a lot of the work that has come out of Committee, and then we'll have a Q&A session. So, there you are, Mr. Jones, thank you.

Charlie Jones, Deputy Director of CDOT said thank you for the introduction, Councilmember Anderson. I'm Charlie Jones, Deputy Director for the Charlotte Department of Transportation. I'll jump right into it. Just a quick refresh on the policy referral. It began as a referral from Mayor Lyles on March 25, 2026. We provided a high-level overview at the April 6, 2026, Committee meeting, and then went into additional details at the May 11, 2026, Committee meeting. Much of what we went over at that meeting is included in these slides that we'll get to here in a minute. At that Committee meeting, there were two recommendations that were forwarded for Council consideration. Establish a red light camera program for a period of one year as a pilot, and then coordinate with the Intergovernmental Relations team to explore a local act authorizing a program with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. So, tonight's discussion is really around those two items.

Just a recap of the existing legislation and ordinances around these programs. So, a lot of what the programs are governed by is at the state statute level, and we also have local ordinances that are on the books from our previous red light camera program. So, with the assistance from the City Attorney's Office, we found two avenues to reinstate a red light camera program, and since the April 2026, Committee meeting, we actually learned that we have a local act that would allow us to increase our fines from our current ordinance limit of $50 to $75, should Council so choose.

During the Committee meetings, there were several questions about advanced warning, insurance points. So, what we wanted to do tonight was review the statutory requirements for red light camera programs, and some of the details regarding those programs in North Carolina. So, camera-equipped locations must have advanced warning signs, citations are issued to the registered owner of the vehicle, and the statute requires that we provide provisions so that if someone's car is stolen or if someone lends their car to somebody and they weren't the driver, there has to be a process in place where that driver can fill out some paperwork and basically say I was not driving that car, and they can assign that responsibility to whomever was driving their vehicle. Photographic citations are noncriminal violations. So, no points are assigned to your driver's license for a red light camera citation, and no insurance points

can be assigned to the driver, and that's at the state statute level. We also have to establish a nonjudicial administrative hearing process, so if someone would like to challenge the citation, there's an administrative process that they can go through to challenge those citations.

Looking at red light camera programs across the country, there's approximately 350 communities that have active programs, and what we looked at were the programs that were more successful, in that they were reducing serious and fatal injury collisions in their communities, and we found those programs had these common elements. They align with the Vision Zero goals using data to select and identify locations. They prioritize their high-injury network intersections. They use crash type frequency and severity to guide the deployment. So, the crash types we tend to look at for these are angle and left turn different roadway collisions. Angles, we all know as T-bone crashes. Left turn different roadways, you're turning off the side street at the intersection. So, red light cameras are very effective at reducing those types of collisions. Then, the other thing is just an elevated number of overall collisions. Final best practice that we found amongst the peer cities and other cities we looked at was data transparency and frequent reporting.

So, the Committee asked us what would a program look like? How would we pick locations? So, we started with just that high-level, identifying all the intersections in the City with fatal collisions. So, we identified 39 intersections within the City that had had fatal collisions in the past five years. We then added additional data to get that down to a list of about 10, and we looked at a higher percentage of angle and left turn different roadway collisions, pedestrian and bicycle collisions at the intersections, and then a higher number of overall collisions. We came up with a candidate list that I'll say is an example of what a program might look like. These 10 locations had 1,841 collisions over five years, 26 fatal and serious injury collisions, 220 angle and left turn different roadway collisions, and then 24 pedestrian and/or bicycle collisions. I'll read through the list of locations with the caveat that this is a preliminary list to see what 10 locations may look like. As we move forward with a program, this list may change. We want to make sure we're using the most current data and have a good handle on we're putting the cameras at the right locations. So, I don't want anybody to get too excited and say, we're going to get a camera at this location. The data may point us to a different location, and that's part of the whole goal of using our high-injury network, is to follow the data and use the cameras. The 10 locations we identified for this are Graham Street and Norris Avenue, University City Boulevard and I-85 Northbound ramp, Steele Creek Road and Westinghouse, North Tryon Street and University City Boulevard, Central Avenue and Sharon Amity, W.T. Harris and North Tryon, South Tryon Street and Arrowood Road, South Mint Street and West Boulevard, Central Avenue and Kilborne, and 36th and The Plaza. One other reason why we don't want to set this list in stone just yet, there may be projects coming soon to some of these locations, or projects in development, and we don't want to have a vendor install equipment that we end up taking out because of a roadway improvement project. So, we want to make sure we've isolated locations that we're not going to have improvements that would disrupt a camera location.

One of the things we covered was engineering countermeasures. Why can't we just build safer intersections? So, we look at countermeasures that are common nationwide, and a lot of those are low cost, LED signal indications, signal timing adjustments, and reflective backplates. If you're not sure what a reflective backplate is, I brought my little handy dandy visual aid, and it's basically a thing that goes around the signal head to raise the visibility of the signal to the motorist. One thing here in Charlotte we've done a great job, most of signals already have LED signal indications. That's a brighter light that you can see better. All of our signal timing is done based on industry standard, and it's done across the entire system, and then we have reflective backplates at many of our signals, and that's one of the first things we look at, at intersections when we do have a fatal crash or some type of other crash pattern. High-cost improvements are what we mainly think of as dedicated turn lanes, full intersection reconstruction and/or site distance improvements. Those projects tend to cost more than half a million dollars or more, and can take multiple years for planning, right-of-way acquisition, and a lot of

things that don't immediately address safety issues while the planning and construction are going on.

So, based on that, we looked at a financial analysis for 10 intersections, and assumed, based on feedback from several vendors, that approximately $5,000 per month per intersection would be our program cost, so the annual program cost would be $600,000. We used the $75 citation amount as just a benchmark, and assumed 500 citations per month per location, based on peer city research. It would result in $4.5 million of annual revenue. Of that, $4.05 million would go to CMS (Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools), that's their required disbursement from civil citations, and then the City's share would be $450,000. That leaves around $150,000 gap in revenue versus program costs. So, I mentioned $150,000 gap. Whenever we start looking at safety benefits, a lot of those high-cost projects we're not going do an intersection reconstruction for $150,000. We're looking at millions of dollars. So, we wanted to see what the safety benefit of red light cameras would be. So, annual crashes at those 10 intersections without treatment, we expect to see around 1,600 collisions, 1.6 [inaudible] serious injury fatal collisions annually, and then 44 angle and left turn different roadway collisions annually. With the red light camera program, based on industry research and tools from the Federal Highway Administration, looking at about a 25 percent to 30 percent reduction in total collisions at those intersections, less than one serious injury or fatal collision. It's hard to get to zero, because there's so many factors that go into a fatal collision, but it does take it by almost half, and then 27 angle and left turn different roadway collisions versus 44. Those angle and left turn different roadway collisions tend to be your most serious and violent collisions that result in serious injuries.

Gets us to the program funding. So, the pilot program would be a City-funded program using existing statutory approvals. The City would pay all the program expenses upfront, and distribute 90 percent of each citation to Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. The City would retain 10 percent of each citation for program expenses. Looking at the future, ideally, we would have an interlocal program, but that requires General Assembly action. In that instance, the City would provide all the revenue to Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, and then we would invoice them for our program costs and be reimbursed after the fact.

So, next steps. Establish a pilot program. Staff will develop an RFP (Request For Proposal) just like the program vendor. Council would be asked to approve the contract at a future business meeting. The goal is to have a pilot program begin by early 2027, and then at a future date we would introduce an ordinance amendment to increase fines, and that would be at a future business meeting, and that would increase the fine from $50 to $75. I'll open it up for any questions or feedback.

Ms. Anderson said if I can just add one more point. Thank you, Mr. Jones. When we discussed this in committee, we had Ms. Debbie Smith come and join us, and she mentioned that the funds that are needed for this particular pilot program are already baked into the Vision Zero program. So, there are funds that are already available to execute this pilot program within Vision Zero today. Thank you.

Mr. Charlie Jones said correct, yes.

Councilmember Ajmera said Mr. Jones, thank you so much for bringing this with a very quick turnaround. I appreciate the work that your team has done. Also, I appreciate Debbie Smith and her team for a quick turnaround on this. A couple of questions that I have. Did we explore an idea that was floated by Councilmember Owens about having these cameras rotating across the City, so that we can get more benefit for just 10 cameras?

Mr. Charlie Jones said that's something we could put into the RFP. We're not entirely sure what the different contractor's construction looks like. If it's permanent that takes quite a bit of construction to actually install the camera. It may be a challenge to move them. There may be vendors out there that have a less permanent camera system. So, that's something we can definitely explore during the RFP process.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I would like us to explore that option, because I was looking at the high-injury network, if you go to slide number seven, where you've got 39 intersections with fatal collisions, and if we only have 10 for 39 intersections, we've got to be more creative with our solutions. So, I support Councilmember Owens' idea, I think that was brilliant, where we can get more benefit. Then, also, she had suggested having sort of like a sign that says that there is a red light camera. Just the sign will prevent people from running red lights. Have you explored that idea?

Mr. Charlie Jones said not completely. We don't want to get too many signs before we've got the program up and running, but that is something we'll also consider.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I think I would like to see both of those ideas being implemented, because how can we save more lives with this pilot program? When I look at this red light camera, I don't look at just the cameras. This is really a public safety issue. We have seen how many lives that's been lost recently to red light running. There have been a few young lives that's been taken, and we are talking about pedestrians, we're also talking about cyclists, and we're also talking about car drivers that follow the rules, and they get hit by someone who chooses to run a red light. So, this is a serious issue. This is a public safety issue that we need to invest in. So, certainly this is something I will support.

So, this pilot program, it is for a year, and I appreciate that there will be some clear metrics on a dashboard, if we can have public facing dashboard, so that people can see the performance metrics. They can also see outcomes, and also more transparent reporting. So, people know this is not a money grabbing program. This is certainly about public safety and eliminating traffic fatalities, especially major crashes on our intersections. So, that's all I have. Thank you so much.

Councilmember Mayo said so just wondering if later you can talk a little more about this nonjudicial administration kind of process. Just wondering who would be standing that up? Would there be a cost associated with that? Has that already been baked into the budget that you've already outlined?

Mr. Charlie Jones said our previous program relied on City staff to do that. So, the vendor would provide that to City staff, so it would likely be City staff that would provide that service. As far as the cost, it would really just be the cost of doing business. We wouldn't have to pay an outside group to do that.

Ms. Mayo said okay, thank you. Just wondering if we can have potentially Mr. Manager think of some stipulations. As a former teacher, I'm excited that CMS will be getting some of these funds, but wondering if we can be thoughtful of if we could influence maybe how some of those are going to be used. I know that we are providing a million dollars for some workforce housing for CMS. Are there other instances where we can think through this potential, I forgot where the slide was, it talked about how many millions of dollars that they'll be getting from this. So, yeah, $4.05 million is a good amount of money for us to think through. I think we have some common goals with CMS to think through how do we support our workforce. I would be interested in maybe seeing if there's some stipulations if CMS would at all be interested in that. So, how do they help not only their teachers, but bus drivers, custodial staff, all of the people who allow us to have a robust community, but yeah, I'd be interested in that. Not sure of the logistics, but I know you can negotiate that for us. Thank you, sir.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you for the presentation. So, we're anticipating that this will start by early 2027. Why do we need a year and a half to get this pilot up?

Mr. Charlie Jones said so, that would be approximately six to seven months, kind of nebulous I know, but we do have to go through the procurement process. There is going to be a period of developing the contract, negotiating the contract, and additionally whatever vendor we select will have to install and provide the equipment. So, we wanted to make sure we didn't set an unrealistic goal. We've all experienced part shortages, and difficulty getting things. So, we would hate to say we're going to stand

this up in September 2026, and the vendor can't get the equipment. So, we really need to go through that procurement process, and then work with the vendor to get the equipment installed.

Ms. Mayfield said okay, and when we go back to slide 10, where we're looking at the financial analysis for the intersections, I want to make sure that I can explain it if someone asks. When we're saying the total estimated expenses, what are we actually calculating? So, we're saying approximately $5,000 per month per intersection. We're saying that we think that's going to be the cost at each intersection for having a light there?

Mr. Charlie Jones said yes. So, based on feedback we've received from vendors, most vendors offer turnkey solutions now. So, you pay them $5,000 a month per location, and they will operate a red light camera at that location and issue the citations and do all the back office parts of doing a red light camera program.

Ms. Mayfield said so, Manager, I would like to make a recommendation. We have a strong relationship with National League of Cities. We also have a number of partners through National League of Cities that actually do this work. I think it would be in the City's best interest for us to utilize some of those relationships, because contractually we might be able to identify a reduced cost based on the work, as well as the expertise. It's an opportunity for us to really utilize that long-term partnership that we have with National League of Cities, and looking at who our potential partners are, because I seem to have remembered at more than one conference having representatives share, and some of them didn't necessarily look at what our out of pocket costs. There are some companies out there that actually have cost sharing. So, there might be a way to look at the revenue if there's a way to help protect. Because the other thing that I don't think we ever really talk about is, along with injury and loss of life when these accidents happen, the debris that's left on highways, left on streets from the accident, the vehicles that aren't picked up immediately that trigger other accidents. So, I'm salty right now, because an accident happened on 485 on Saturday morning, and whatever debris that blew off from the vehicle blew out my front tire, but more importantly it blew out tires of 18-wheelers that were coming up behind me. So, once you made it up past Exit 3, there were at least three other vehicles that were sitting off to the side. We drive around and there are bumpers and other things that we constantly see. In my dream world, along with catching those that run lights, because people have been acting like a red light is a suggestion, not an actual command to stop lately, and it is disheartening to see. In my dream world, those cameras might actually catch some of these people that keep opening up their car door, and putting their whole bag of garbage out on the street as well. I don't know if we have the technology to capture that, because we have a beautiful, clean city. It is not as clean as it once was, but that is due to the individuals riding around our city and thinking that the street should be their trash can. Thank you.

Ms. Owens said so thank you, Mr. Jones. I appreciate the opportunity to ask a couple of questions. So, I note in slide seven I just need to be able to speak to my district about this, that we've got eight locations that are along the high-injury network, but we are not going to get any of these in this immediate pilot. I'm assuming that is because while we have eight discrete locations that have had identified fatalities, the totality of fatalities is not such that those were prioritized. Can you confirm that?

Mr. Charlie Jones said without diving deeper into the data, that's probably what happened. These are intersections that had fatal collisions. What we're looking at more specifically for red light cameras is angle and left turn different roadway collisions. So, those intersections in your district may have had a fatal collision at the intersection, but it may not have been one that's readily addressable by red light cameras.

Ms. Owens said excellent, thank you. I've had a lot of interest in these out of my constituents, and I just want to be very clear with them that this is a pilot that you described as being fluid. Is that correct? So, as you have stood those up, there is the potential that some of those could be moved to other locations?

Mr. Charlie Jones said not only that, but the list of 10 is just a preliminary list. As we start working through the RFP process and analyzing the most recent crash data, there may be a location in District Six that rises to the surface.

Ms. Owens said okay, thank you, I appreciate that. Just another question that I had. I have not done a pilot before. This is my first opportunity to see that, and so what is the normal cadence that we can appreciate? I know you said that there would be some transparency, but how will we know if it working? Is there a routine time that you come back and report to us, or what does that look like?

Mr. Charlie Jones said ideally, we would have a dashboard for red light camera violations and the collision data at those intersections, and with crash data you tend to not want to compare weekly numbers, but I think at the conclusion of a year-long pilot, we could have some, this is working or we need to rethink this approach.

Ms. Owens said okay, and if you know, just one follow-up question, and this may be for the City Attorney as well. Is there an intention to have the cameras run for a period of time before we go after the piece with the General Assembly? So, are you needing to or wanting to show some efficacy of the cameras before we go and ask the question, and do you know what that time would be that you would go to the General Assembly?

Mr. Charlie Jones said so, the intent was really, we understood Council's desire to stand something up. We know the state legislature is busy, they're in short session, and so the opportunity to get something before the state, that window is very tight, and so the earliest opportunity I think we could have the delegation work on something would be later this year when they go back into session. So, it could be more than a year before we actually get to that Interlocal Agreement, if the state legislature agrees with that approach.

Ms. Owens said okay, I appreciate that. I think I just wanted to also put out into the room, I would like for us to stay on top of the things that we want to add to our legislative agenda. I think sometimes we get to those meetings and there's, oh gosh, we said this here or there. I think this is really one that provides a wonderful opportunity for us to work in partnership with our General Assembly and get them on board with this, because I think it imminently makes sense and it affirms a court ruling to that effect. So, thank you, Mr. Jones.

Ms. Johnson said I just wanted some history, if we could. So, it's my understanding at some point we had red light cameras in Charlotte. I know I think it was 2020 or 2021 when I was on the Safety Committee. I know Councilmember Egleston was the Chair. I don't remember who the Vice Chair was. It might have been Councilmember Ajmera or Watlington, I can't remember, but we talked about this, and there was a barrier into implementing it. Can you give us a little history? What's changed? Are we more progressive now? Did something happen with the law, or what happened?

Mr. Charlie Jones said one of the biggest changes has been the willingness to spend City funds to fund a program to reduce serious injury and fatal collisions. In the past, when we had a red light camera program, there was no capital program for Vision Zero. The funding wasn't there, and it would've required General Fund dollars to run the program. Thanks to you all and the voters approving bond packages where we have Vision Zero funds, I think what's changed is the calculus on a relatively small investment. I know $150,000 isn't relatively small, but from a road construction and building things, it is a lower amount. So, to have that Vision Zero funding that's available that we can stand up a program that can potentially reduce or eliminate fatal and serious injury collisions, that's really what's changed, and favorable court rulings allowing cities to partner with the school boards to basically turn the program into a net neutral for everybody involved. Those rulings came out in, I believe 2022, 2023, timeframe. So, there's been kind of a growing shift in the way we view safety, and then of course the favorable court rulings.

Ms. Johnson said thank you. So, the money has to go to CMS?

Mr. Charlie Jones said yes.

Ms. Johnson said okay. Are there any reports of how many cars are currently running the lights? Have we done any preliminary reporting?

Mr. Charlie Jones said no.

Ms. Johnson said okay, and the reason I ask is, if it's $5,000 a month, and the tickets are $75, there's a minimum that we have to make in order for it to make sense. I think it's like 66 cars. I'm sure we'll meet that, but I was just wondering if we had any preliminary numbers, okay, and how will the public be notified?

Mr. Charlie Jones so, of course, we'll have signs posted at the intersections. We will of course use our social media presence. We'll rely heavily on our media partners. So, this would be one of those campaigns where there's a push to notify motorists throughout the City, hey, this program's coming. I know in the past when we stood up our speed camera program, there was a two- to three-week grace period where citations were mailed at no charge, just to let people know, hey, this is here, in two weeks you're going to have to pay if you continue this behavior. So, there's different ways to get that message out, but we will definitely use city corporate communications and other partners to get that message to the public.

Ms. Johnson said okay. If we could really get this word out, because this is a change of behavior. Some people, if you say, what do you do at a yellow light, people speed up. So, it really, really is a change of behavior, so if we could get that information out, maybe post it at the DMV (Department of Motor Vehicles) and just really begin to change that behavior. I also like the idea of capturing people who are littering. Is that an option?

Mr. Charlie Jones said not that I'm aware of at this time.

Ms. Johnson said well, if it is, can you research if that's an option?

Mr. Charlie Jones said I will definitely look into that.

Ms. Johnson said okay, alright, thank you. That's all I have.

Ms. Owens said just to that point, my apologies, I forgot the question that I had. I know that we've seen that some vendors are doing both the noise cameras and the red light cameras. Could you speak to that in the same vein of the question that was just raised?

Mr. Charlie Jones said so, one of the vendors that we've been in discussions with actually has the noise camera systems as part of their suite of tools. I believe CMPD (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department) is currently working through that, and the Attorney's Office are working through those issues. There could be the potential should the legislature grant us authority to that, where there would be economies of scale by having a vendor that can provide all those different camera enforcement solutions. There are cities, such as Alexandria and Washington D.C., that have a whole host of noise, stop sign running cameras, red light running cameras, and they tend to use the same vendor that provides all those services.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said thank you, Mr. Jones, for the presentation. I want to first start off by thanking the Public Safety Committee. Thank you so much for taking this on, and especially Sustain Charlotte and their advocacy efforts. Personally, to me, because I have gotten the opportunity to visit families across Charlotte and visit those that have been impacted by traffic violence, since I've been sworn in, such as [inaudible], who is a young bicyclist and is now paralyzed due to traffic violence, such as red light passings and traffic violence. Just most recently, in my district, which continues to be the district with the most traffic fatalities, one of Manolo's Bakery's employees, Angelica Chicas, a young, young lady, who started to work there two months ago, died this past weekend, attempting to turn onto North Sharon Amity off of Central Avenue.

So, this is extremely important, and of course as I mentioned earlier during my term, my friend Lance Sotelo, who I went to college with, who passed away in Plaza and North 36th Street, and as well as myself, I got in a car accident a few weeks ago. So, this is extremely important, and I'm so glad we as a city and all of our colleagues are taking a proactive approach in addressing this. I have a few questions. So, financial concerns led to sunsetting the program the first time in 2006. What financial protections, risk mitigations would we be leveraging to ensure that this pilot is a success, and we don't find ourselves in that situation again?

Mr. Charlie Jones said so, I think at the end of the pilot, should the cost escalate beyond where you, as Council, aren't comfortable and we, as the capital program managers, realize that maybe there's a higher and better use for those dollars than funding this program, especially if we don't see the reductions in collisions and reduction in fatal and serious injury collisions. I think that's when that metric comes into play.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said thank you. So, the citations that we'll expect to generate revenue, how do you expect the City to see those funds be transparently tracked, reinvested, and reported to the public? So, what mechanism do we expect to use to kind of see where those taxpayer dollars are going to?

Mr. Charlie Jones said so, as far as the program, we will be paying for the program. We'll receive an invoice from the vendor every month, and we can show what we're paying on those invoices, and then as far as CMS's share, I'm sure there's a way monthly we could have a report of what's been sent to CMS.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said yes, thank you, Mr. Jones. To my colleagues, I think that should also be essential and part of the Interlocal Agreement that we will potentially be a part of, is making sure that we have that data transparency and reporting transparency. The other thing I would add to staff is, as I've been contributing to the revamping of the Vision Zero data dashboard, thank you so much for the work that you all are currently doing, and thank you Councilmember Ajmera for bringing that up earlier. I think implementing that into this dashboard I think will also be crucial moving forward.

Mr. Driggs said I too am a survivor of traffic violence, some of you may remember having had an encounter with a car. I was lucky, I had a dislocated shoulder and got banged up pretty good, and made a huge dent in the car. So, for one, Ms. Mayo, I really like your suggestion. I'd like to explore that a little bit. This is a proposal that yields $4 million a year to CMS and costs us money. So, I wonder if we could have a friendly conversation with them and maybe talk about having the proceeds committed to a fund of theirs, the purposes of which we would agree on with them. I mean, we can't interfere with their conduct of their business, I get that, but before we actually commit to this, if we just say, hey, we would like to feel good about what will happen at CMS if we do this as part of our deliberation.

The past thing by the way, I remember the discussions about that, and the feeling was that we did not appreciate the fact that we couldn't cover our cost, that was an issue, but also the narrative at that time was that the reduction in those side impact collisions was offset by a lot of rear-end collisions, more rear-end collisions, and so at the time it seemed like the net advantage wasn't necessarily that great, and then if you look at the reduction in fatalities in relation to the cost, even though you don't talk about human life in money terms, there are possibly other ways you could spend $600,000 and save more lives than this. So, I just put that out there. Personally, I think this is something we should do. We should pursue the opportunity with the General Assembly to get full cost recovery, and bear in mind too that this is a pilot. If we like the way this goes out, the goal will be to leverage it, expand it, and at that point the money that CMS gets is even bigger. So, maybe you and I can talk about that, or we'll see what the constraints might be in terms of trying to partner with CMS. Thank you.

Ms. Anderson said thank you colleagues for this really great robust discussion. I think from the tone of this conversation we're in a pretty good place, and I like all the added dimensions that you all have brought to the table on this. I think at the bottom line and

conclusion, we're saying this is 10 intersections out of 39 intersections within our high-injury network, which is approximately 25 percent of intersections within high injury. So, that's a pretty good number to have within a one-year pilot, that could potentially yield the benefits that we see here. The other thing I've heard, a recurring theme around data and being data driven, and Mr. Jones, we'll have to vote on this as a Council, but if successful and if we move forward, I think a part of our RFP process should be around, when you think about these turnkey companies that can provide reporting, how can that be resident facing to the public, but also then potentially fit into our ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) system, so it can be a part of our reporting suite for municipal activities and operations as well. Since we're upgrading our ERP system, I think those are salient questions you can ask through the RFP process.

Lastly, we've talked about the dollars and how much that could potentially generate for CMS. Again, if it's 25 percent of the intersections, just back of the envelope calculation, four times that $4 million, I mean that's looking like, if it's city-wide it could be $16 million, or north of that that CMS could get if this is a successful pilot. Now, we do have to, of course City Manager and City Attorney, look at the constraints of the law within the General Assembly and the statutes, but I think some really good perspectives, CM Mayo and CM Driggs on that. So, more to come, of course. This is the first action review, and it will be back in front of us to potentially take an action.

James Mitchell said thank you, Council. Mr. Jones, thank you. Let's head down now to start our City Council Meeting.

Motion was made by Councilmember Watlington, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

* * * * * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for a Business Meeting on Monday, June 8, 2026, at 6:38 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 afternoon. Thank you for your presence. Thank you for attending the Charlotte City Council Meeting. I want to call this meeting to order, and appreciate what you are doing to help us understand what's important in our community. I want to begin, though, with a call to order. We're going to have introductions.

* * * * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

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

* * * * * * *

Mayor Lyles said before we begin, I'd like to take a moment to recognize our City Attorney, Andrea Leslie-Fite. Attorney Leslie-Fite has been recently honored by the

North Carolina Bar Association as a recipient of its Legal Legends of Color Award. This really prestigious award recognizes attorneys of color whose leadership, service, and achievements have made an undeniable impact on the legal profession, and whose accomplishments may have helped pave the way for future generations. Throughout her service to the City of Charlotte, Attorney Leslie-Fite has provided exceptional legal counsel, thoughtful leadership, and a steadfast commitment to public service. Her professionalism, integrity, and dedication have earned the respect of colleagues across our organization. So, on behalf of the City Council, congratulations on this well-deserved honor, and we are grateful for your service, and proud to celebrate this remarkable achievement that you have made and helped us be a part of something really special in this community.

Andrea Leslie-Fite, City Attorney said thank you, Madam Mayor.

Mayor Lyles said do you want to say a few words?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said just thank you. I'm deeply honored and surprised, I didn't expect that, but thank you.

Mayor Lyles said well, thank you very much. How long have you been with us now?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said seven months.

* * * * * * *

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM NO. 6: PUBLIC HEARING AND DECISION ON AVERITT EXPRESS, INC. BUSINESS INVESTMENT GRANT

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell to (A) Close the public hearing and (B) Approve the City's Business Investment Grant to Averitt Express, Inc. for a total amount not to exceed $2,898,710 over five years.

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

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

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 7: PUBLIC HEARING AND DECISION ON THE CAPITAL GROUP COMPANIES, INC. BUSINESS INVESTMENT GRANT

Mayor Lyles declared the hearing open.

There being no speakers, either for or against, a motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera to (A) Close the public hearing, and (B) Approve the City's Business Investment Grant to The Capital Group Companies, Inc. for a total amount not to exceed $1,038,565 over five years.

Councilmember Mayfield said so I mentioned it earlier, but I do have a concern when we have a public hearing and decision on the same evening. We had started this

conversation back on February 23, 2026, is we went into closed session, which we need to do when we're having discussions of potential investment, but to have it have a public hearing today in June 2026, that gives little to no time for community to actually know that we're having a discussion, and actually come down for the public hearing to understand why we will be making this type of investment, the total amount for the investment, because even with the last one, we didn't identify that this part B is asking for us to approve the Business Investment Grant for a total amount not to exceed $1,038,565 over five years. We also don't discuss the reality that when we approve these grants, it is noted that if the company were not to meet the anticipated goals, that they would need to return any and all funds, but also that taxes that are due from the Capital Group Companies must be paid before the grant payment is made. So, I think there's an opportunity for us to not rush certain conversations, because we're in June 2026. Council had this conversation in February 2026. To have on any business agenda opening a hearing and approving the grant basically in a single motion is concerning, so just as with the last one I will be voting against this one as well.

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

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

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

* * * * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 8: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Mayor Lyles said City Manager do you have any updates for Council this meeting?

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I do not.

Councilmember Owens said so, if I may, Mayor, I need to have a little bit of clarity on when this is appropriate, that I would like to revisit an issue with respect to the Mayoral selection process. I know that it is not on the agenda that we had discussed with Council today, that if we were to make a tweak to that, I'd like to put forward a motion that we modify the approach so that we can have a virtual participant. I think it's come to our attention that some people, because we chose a date, and then went out with the date, we haven't had that opportunity.

Andrea Leslie-Fite, City Attorney said pursuant to your Rules of Procedure, since this item is not on the agenda, at the conclusion of the agenda, there can be a motion to add it to the agenda, and Council would need to vote on whether this topic can be added to tonight's agenda for a discussion. Absent a unanimous vote, it would need to be added to a future agenda.

Ms. Owens said okay, I withdraw that, because I know I can't get to unanimity. I had discussed it with your office, and they thought that we could have a vote on it, but that's fine as that differs from your advice. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said alright, thank you, Ms. Kimberly

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 9: FISCAL YEAR 2027 OPERATING BUDGET AND FISCAL YEARS 2027-2031 CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN

Mayor Lyles said this represents our most important policy document that we make. I would like to first and almost always say that I'd like to commend the Council on the diligence in this process to get to tonight's vote. The Manager has proposed to us a very

solid plan for each of you to review, and then you brought forward your ideas for adjustments on May 18, 2026 meeting, and then reviewed and discussed each option on June 1, 2026, with the Straw Votes meeting. You've collaborated and done a lot of time and work with this. These are tough decisions to be made, and we all understand that, but we have to continue to move forward, because the citizens declare that we have to work hard together and do this collaboratively. So, I hope that we will be able to make the adoption for the budget this year tonight, and that would be great. So, I just want to make sure that that's where we are, Mr. Jones.

Motion was made by Councilmember Graham, and seconded by Councilmember Anderson to adopt the Fiscal Year (FY) 2027 Appropriations and Tax Levy Ordinance, the FY 2027 Compensation and Benefits Recommendations, and other items related to the Annual Budget Ordinance 1138-X adoption: (A) The FY 2027 Operating Appropriations and Tax Levy Ordinance, (B) The FY 2027-2031 Capital Investment Plan, (C) The FY 2027 General Solid Waste Fee, (D) The FY 2027 Storm Water Services Fees, (E) The FY 2027 Transit Operating Budget, FY 2027 Transit Debt Service Budget, and FY 2027-2031 Transit Capital Investment Plan which was approved by the Metropolitan Transit Commission on April 22, 2026, (F) The FY 2027 Charlotte Water Rates, (G) The FY 2027 Compensation and Benefits Plan and associated Human Resources contracts, (H) Outside Agency and Municipal Service District contracts, (I) Municipal Service District 5 Boundary Expansion, (J) Internal Service Funds Financial Plans Resolution, and (K) Other budget items.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Mayo and carried unanimously to recuse Councilmember Mayo from voting on Item G.

Councilmember Graham said thank you members of Council. First, let me start off by thanking the Manager's Office, the Budget Office, all the Finance team, and the department heads for their participation in preparing the budget. I think this process started in early January 2026, and here we are six months later getting ready to pass what I think is a very challenging budget that reflects the needs of the citizens. Let me also thank the citizens for their participation in the surveys that we sent out earlier this year, the workshops, the public hearings and providing their feedback on this year's operating budget. I just wanted to share with the Council that the budget development process includes input from the community, City departments, the Mayor and Council. We had three Budget Workshops and Governance Meetings, February 5, 2026; March 5, 2026; April 6, 2026; and two Budget Workshops on February 23, 2026, and March 23, 2026, as well. The Fiscal 2027 Budget is structurally balanced with a two-year lens that preserves core services, advanced public safety, advanced and transformational mobility, and maintain reserves. The tax increase all goes to public safety, which is $1.89 property tax increase dedicated to enhancing public safety. Some of those items basically is an increase for fire employees, it adds 35 cars to the police take-home vehicle program, promotes recruitment and retention of [inaudible] and fire, police, and the public safety pay plan across the board, pay increases. It provides funding to advance and complete Animal Care and Control satellite adoption for the Center Project. Invests in small business and neighborhoods with $600,000 for business direct organizations and mainstream programs, supporting our Corridors of Opportunities; $500,000, these are again budget highlights to expand youth internships at the City, with $1.5 million committed to expanding road-to-hire program which is a great program that the City's investing in. It matches the historic 2024 Transportation and Neighborhood Bonds at $300 million, which includes $60 million for Strategic Investment Areas, $22 million for Vision Zero, $50 million for sidewalks, $10 million for bicycle facilities, $2 million for new orphan roads program, and $100 million to deliver seven mobility projects by 2030. In addition, the budget also includes 2027 General Fund for Financial Partners, Carolina Youth, Community Culinary School, Crisis Assistance, Housing Collaborative, Parent-Child, Roof Above, etc. Obviously, there's always more projects than funds, and there were several projects that we were not able to fund. The Greater Enrichment Program, For The Struggle, Hearts For The Invisible,

Just Do It Movement, as well as others are not included in this Fiscal 2027 Budget. The committee, the Council has agreed to revisit our process for how we review financial partners moving forward, and so we will take that into consideration as we move forward to distinguish and to discern how we will work with and improve the process, or amend the process if necessary for nonprofit organizations seeking support from the City.

This is a good budget, it's not a perfect budget, but it reflects the values of our community, and investments in public safety and investments in housing, neighborhood development, core services that our community demands of us, and I just refer the budget to you, and thank the Manager and staff for its preparation.

Councilmember Johnson said I'm honored to sit on the Council tonight and to vote in favor of a balanced FY2027 Budget that makes historic investments in Charlotte's future while heavily prioritizing our frontline workers. By securing a full 10 percent pay parity for both CMPD and CFD (Charlotte Fire Department) Firefighters, we are proving that public safety is our top priority. Lifting our City employees to a $25 per hour minimum respects the dignity of those who keep our City moving, and I'm incredibly grateful that we fought to restore funding to organizations, but also we must acknowledge the real strain that this budget puts on our local taxpayers and grassroot partners. While a property tax increase is necessary to build a safer city, it's painful to see vital community organizations left out, and I look forward to improving our policies so that we can take a more equitable approach. I'm honored to sit here tonight, and I look forward to supporting the budget. Thank you.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said thank you, colleagues; and thank you, Chair Graham, for the work you and the committee put into this; and to staff. I will be supporting the budget tonight. There's a lot of great things that are included in this budget including $600,000 to Business District Organizations across the Queen City, that includes organizations in our main corridors across the City, such as Charlotte East in District Five, Historic West End Partners, and other organizations that will be included in this programming, and mainstream programming as well, and also very proud of the efforts that Councilmember Graham, Mayor Pro Tem Mitchell, and some other colleagues on this dais, it was a collective effort, to include funding for a new International Relations Manager position for the City of Charlotte. As the 14th largest city in this country, for us to be the only one not to have a dedicated office or department for International Relations is really an opportunity gap, particularly when it comes to the multibillion dollar Transit Mobility Plan that will put a lot of folks to work, but we saw in one of our recent reports that there's going to be a workforce gap there. I mean, I could get political and say why there's a workforce gap in construction for obvious reasons, but, I think this will help us identify those opportunities as well as encourage more foreign direct investment that really are going to bring jobs and help us compete with our other peer cities and make us a world-class city.

As my colleagues already have iterated, it is not a perfect budget. I think that it's one of the natural consequences of not raising the property tax for six years, and we have to do this as we are continuing to grow as a city, edging now a million residents, as well as some disappointments in terms of some really good grassroots organizations, such as For The Struggle, Prospera, and other organizations that weren't included in this budget, which I think I'm encouraged and looking forward to improving our Financial Partners process, and really proud of what we did two weeks ago, or I believe it was last week, I don't know, it feels like a year already, when it came to pay parity for our frontline workers, it's essential. We need our men and women in blue uniforms, as much as we also need our firefighters. They are typically the first ones on the scene when it comes to the public safety issues that arise in the City. So, I look forward to supporting this budget. As always, I think we can always improve and be better. So, thank you.

Councilmember Mayfield said thank you, Chairman Graham and the entire Committee that represent our Budget Committee, as well as Manager Jones for presenting us another balanced budget. I have been an extremely vocal advocate for our fire department. I appreciate the fact that in our budget we have kept the funding for our

burn center. There are other items in the budget that I have concerns about. Unfortunately, I think about, even though we have had a number of meetings, we have a very short window where we have those meetings and we spent a lot of time on Financial Partners, which is 0.01 percent of the total budget. We had around $6 million in financial requests that came in this year. We had less than a million that was actually available for allocation. I appreciate those that are here advocating for For The Struggle. We also have the opportunity individually to donate and support. One of the challenges that we have talked about for years in creating a system is, one, an organization is going to be able to come and apply for Financial Partners, we decided either between five to seven years. If this administration did teach anything, don't rely on government, because government's got limitations in funding. One of the biggest challenges for a lot of our nonprofits is there was a lot of federal money that was available that has been eliminated under this administration.

The other challenge is Council approved a process for staff to adhere to. So, if we've got to have a conversation about our process with how scoring is done, this is the second budget year where I said, if we're not going to stick to the process then stop making staff go through it and just pick out the organizations that you want to fund. At the end of the day, we have a responsibility with limited funds to try to figure out how to invest the best way that we can. If you have a score from 100, and we had scores as low as in the 30s, and what staff did, I support. They picked from the money we had, if we were to fund at full capacity, we were able to fund seven projects. If we had additional monies, then we would've been able to do more. For me, it was very difficult to have an organization that scored a 96, to skip everyone that was 96 down to 89, skip everything in between to jump to another organization, no matter how much I might like the organization personally. Greater Enrichment does amazing work, they didn't show up to the meeting. It was one mandatory piece and the meeting was online. No, I'm not going to support later a conversation about having our Interim Mayor discussion online, because you're not phoning that in. If you can't make the time to get here, I'm not understanding why you put an application in. That's a whole separate piece for me.

I also have concerns when we think about our water and sewer. Yes, Charlotte is the lowest when we're looking at impact, but the individual impact. So, if we move forward with the proposal that we have currently in the budget, because again, we spent a lot of time on a small piece of the budget, we didn't go into breaking down the actual increase, and the way that works out, for Solid Waste fee residential curbside, currently that's $120.30. What's proposed is a 13.51 percent increase, which would take to $136.55. If we look at water and sewer, and we say what the average user rate is. I don't know what that average rate is based off of when we have townhomes, as well as single-family homes, but what we have noted is currently it's $921.60. The proposal is a 5.74 percent increase. Stormwater, $129.84. The proposal is an additional 4.44 percent increase. So, when we look at over the years, the City has not passed a property tax, even though I had recommended that we at least had real conversation about incremental, so that we wouldn't have a large tax, which now we're looking at a 6.95 percent increase at one time, but we have consistently, because it's baked into the model, when we look at solid waste, water, and sewer, that that has been a consistent increase.

We have to recognize that we have residents in our community right now that have experienced layoffs, and those layoffs are not they're out of work for three/four weeks. People have been out of work for a year or more. They are not bouncing back in. Our big partners, the banks, have been laying off, and when they lay off, they lay off hundreds at a time. With some of the corporate investments that we have made, and those companies lay off, there's not a transition plan that's getting these people back into the workforce at the pay that they were making. So, you have someone that was earning $27, $28 an hour in a field for 15, 20-plus years, now being offered $18 to $20 an hour. That's a considerable cut to their cost of living so I have a challenge.

I'm still praying on the fact of whether or not I can raise my hand for the budget, because we have the full budget, and we don't break the budget out. We have some clear line items throughout the budget that give me concern, because I own that in our

last budget I did not speak up to some fees that were going to be instituted regarding Uptown parking. I had an individual conversation with the Mayor, but I did not bring it to full Council, and I did not speak to it out loud. That has caused tremendous challenge. That has caused challenges for our workers, whether they're in hospitality or they work at one of our event spaces, that once had access the parking after 6:00 p.m. That is no longer the case. You also have a two-hour limit. We were just talking over this weekend, people came to visit. You can't even extend your parking for four hours. You need to physically leave wherever you are and try to find another parking space. Council approved these parking spaces years ago when we approved developments in Uptown. When we approved multi-family developments, we negotiated parking that we then turned around through a budget request through Center City Partners to move access to those parking spaces to be listed under Park It and have a fee to have constant turnover. That's fine for the people who come in and visit, but are we creating obstacles for our own residents to enjoy their Uptown, because it's not accessible.

We're working on a better transportation system. We will soon have the funds, and I pray that MPTA does the right thing, because it will soon be out of our hands to create a more robust public transportation system, but the majority of us drive, and if I have to drive in Uptown, this is one of the last places that I'm going to try to have a meeting, because I'm not paying $25 to park, because ya'll don't pay me enough for that. So, I want us to be transparent in our budget. We have some really great investments in our budget. We have some really good opportunities in our budget, but I also want us to be cognizant of when we vote, it is not just the impact that we're paying in taxes, our community is feeling this impact and our most vulnerable, as well as our workforce is feeling the impact of a 6.95 percent increase, a 13.51 percent, a 5.74 percent, a 4.44 percent. It might not sound like $5.76 additional is a lot, but $16.25 is a meal. So, going from $921.60 to $974.00, $52.40, that's not only a meal, that's a meal and a bill for some people. So, I want us to try to figure out how to really look at the impact of our decisions as we move forward and we go through this budget cycle, or figure out a way for us to try to have more budget conversation and not get stuck on just the Financial Partners, which are important, but that's 0.01 percent of the entire budget. When we're looking at the impact of our fees and the residents, residential versus corporate, impact to those fees, I want us to try to be more intentional with how we move forward.

I appreciate, Manager, us not being redirected and sticking at the $125 million for the Housing Trust Fund. I had great concern of an additional 16 cents being added to try to get to the $200 million for a one-time bond allocation, and what that financial impact can look like, but I think we also need to figure out how we can start preparing now on how to help our residents that, when that tax bill comes out, that $650 a year from the county is not enough; we talked about this previously. We need to look at what is the real impact of that new tax rate, and is that going to cause displacement or hardship, because if I bought my home 20 years ago for under $100,000, and that house is now valued at $600,000, $700,000, this new tax bill is giving me an over $2,000 tax bill, we need to make sure that we figure out a way to help those residents the same way we help our development community when it comes to allowing them to take those taxes to turn into subsidy. Attorney Leslie-Fite, what could the language look like, and will we have the legal ability to look at a subsidy for our residents that potentially will face hardship?

Councilmember Driggs said so as a retired finance professional, Mr. Manager, I want to commend you on the outstanding preparation and presentation of your budget as usual. I expect you will win the usual award, and that matters a lot. I mean, it's a very professional look for us, and I think it reflects well on all of us. You also did a great job, I think, of taking on board the input that you got, diverse sources of input, identifying where there was priority, and incorporating that into your budget. I appreciate the fact that first responders are getting an increase, because it's good that that's one thing on which we can all agree. We need to take care of those people, safety is a big priority for us, and we need to invest there.

I do have two concerns. One of them is, in my view as a retired finance professional, I believe that we are stretching our capacity to spend and to borrow. We had to dip into a

couple of reserve funds in order to accommodate some changes in the budget. So, I believe our cushion is thinner than it was in the past, it concerns me. I hate to think we end up in a place where we can't manage without another tax increase.

The second thing is the tax increase itself. This is not just a partisan issue. The fact is, that tax increase for a lot of low-income households that matter the most to us hurts, and there are many people on both sides of the aisle who are fundamentally opposed to a tax increase, and I think I have an obligation to them not to support this budget, even while I express my appreciation for its qualities. Thank you.

Councilmember Owens said I appreciate the opportunity, and I won't belabor points that've already been mentioned by my fellow Council members. One of the things that I want to commend the City Manager and the Budget team on is the raise of the minimum pay to $25 an hour. I think that sends a message to communities and to our corporate community that we're trying to lead by example, and I appreciate that immensely. I'm hopeful that we also, and this is something I'd love to take up with the City Attorney, is whether we can also adopt a responsible contract partner plan that really looks at things beyond wage and hour requirements that we know we're limited to, but that we can build on that leadership that we're trying to show with the way that we engage our contractors. So, I look forward to opportunity and to engage in that.

Another point that I will mention, and while I have deep and abiding respect for Chair Mayfield, I really am disappointed that we didn't get to $200 million on the Housing Trust Fund. I think that housing is such an essential component of ones lived experience in Charlotte, and I am disappointed, but am thankful that we got to the additional $25 million, I do appreciate that.

The third item that I'm deeply thankful for, and I think that this reflects Chief Patterson's well-articulated three priorities, is that we have been able to fund take-home vehicles for CMPD, the 10 percent raise that's already been addressed, but also the dashcams. For me, those are things again that do feed into that narrative that Chief Patterson really wants to focus on recruitment and retention of officers. We as a community have had a lot of focus on public safety, and I think an appropriate focus on her priorities is definitely something I'm proud that we were able to deliver.

Then, I'll say that another more creative item of the budget that sort of came up and we discussed and it still needs to be scoped within committee, but the funding that's made available for a transit model that was brought to us by Dr. Watlington. I'm excited that we can potentially go forward with some ideation around what that can look like, but I will caution, and this will come up in my comments later on data centers, that a whole lot of the energy that is in this space is paradoxically for some in the AI space, and it is around optimization models that computers can run that we cannot. So, there is always that push/pull between our different priorities, and we'll discuss that when we discuss the moratorium.

Then, finally on the Financial Partners, I will second the comments of Councilmember Mayfield, and I do want to take a moment to explain how I personally approached nonprofit funding in this year's budget. This is my first budget to go through, but I know that many residents care deeply about fairness, transparency, and how we divide public dollars. This year, as I understood it, the City required every nonprofit partner to go through the same standardized application and scoring process, after of course as was said, a mandatory financial partner meeting. I am personally happy that that meeting had a virtual option, because I think any meeting that we have that enables folks to participate virtually can address accessibility issues, and particularly when we schedule things without adequate notice, perhaps there are times when people cannot attend. So, I'm appreciative that we made that possibility available then.

This year, the City required every nonprofit partner to go through the same application process, and that included our long-time partners, our new applicants, and folks like Safe Alliance, that have historically been funded through the Crime Reduction PAYGO (Pay-As-You-Go) dollars. We did this to create a clear and consistent, transparent

record of how each organization aligns with City priorities, demonstrates impact, and manages public funds. The scoring rubric was applied equally to all applicants, and some organizations scored very well, others did not meet the threshold for funding. As a Council member, I believe it's important that we respect the process that we asked staff to run, and that means honoring the scores, even when we personally admire the mission of an organization. At the same time, I want to be very clear of why I continue to support funding for Safe Alliance. Their work is directly applied and tied to violent crime reduction and victim services, core public service functions that the City has historically supported through our Crime Reduction PAYGO Budget. Domestic violence is one of the highest volume violent crime categories of CMPD, and Safe Alliance is a critical part of that response system that keeps survivors safe. So, while they participate in the process, for transparency, their funding source differs from that for the Financial Partners, and so that is the distinction that I personally made, and I owe it to District Six to explain that process, and I hope that I've done so. I am proud to support this budget, and I appreciate the leadership that was evidenced by its creation. Thank you.

Councilmember Anderson said thank you, City Manager, for presenting us a balanced budget that really leans in and underscores our priorities as a city and as a Council. I'm excited about this budget this year, although we do have a tax increase. As you all know, the City of Charlotte is steadfast on not increasing taxes if we do not have to, which is why we have a multi-year track record of not increasing the tax rate for our residents. This year, we're in a different position due to a variety of different things going on, but our City is growing, and I hope that you see when you look at this budget, that we are investing in the things that really and truly matter for our City. Housing is increased to $125 million in Housing Trust Fund, you see pay parity for our first responders, which was number one in their book to have pay parity across the board, as well as a $25 minimum for our own City employees. Then you see investments that we're making as it relates to infrastructure, and understanding that as a city, one of our main goals is to provide good and accurate services to you all, to the residents of Charlotte, and there is some increase in investment in those spaces, but Charlotte is growing, we are growing as a city, and our approach to services is becoming more nuanced as the footprints grow and expand our City bounds.

So, I'll leave it at that. I'm not going to say too much more. My colleagues have said a lot. I will be supporting this budget this year, and I look forward to us advancing our journey of becoming a world-class city and advancing on that list of being top 15, number 14 in the country.

Councilmember Mayo said I won't speak long. Just want to pretty much agree with my colleagues on many of their points regarding this year's budget. You can really see that priority really was for public safety and thinking about our employees, which I think is so important, that we're able to retain great employees that we have at the City. As we know, the public sector and the private sector, you know there's a huge difference, and they could go other places and I'm sure make much more money and not have to deal with headaches from us Council members. So, just really want to just thank them for their time and their effort, and I hope that this budget really reflects the respect that we have for them.

Councilmember Watlington said I won't rehash the points that my colleagues already made. Many of you are familiar with the highlights of the budget. Certainly, I was pleased to initiate the motion for pay parity, and I'm so happy to stand with my colleagues to have supported that. At the end of the day, there are a lot of great things in this budget, but I'll repeat what I've been saying for years. We need to take a much deeper dive into our budget, because we are growing rapidly and our needs are accelerating, and we understand that while we're making investments in the future, which we absolutely have to, we want to make sure that as the number one fastest growing city in the nation, that our current residents are not just paying it forward, but are seeing dividends today that improve our quality of life. So, that's what my focus is as we go into this year and into this next budget cycle, is how do we make sure that our dollars are, not only going for future residents, but are impacting and improving the lives of current residents, whether that's pay parity for our first responders or that's workforce

development investments or that's smart infrastructure investments that help us to relieve congestion and overages on the systems today. So, I will be supporting the budget tonight, and I hope that as we continue to sharpen our pencils going forward, that we roll up our sleeves and do a deeper dive. Thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said I agree with some of the comments that's been made by my colleagues. I agree with Chairman Graham, this budget is not a perfect budget, because of the higher tax increase in this year's budget. I've heard from a number of residents, especially who live on a fixed income, our senior citizens, citizens with special needs; they have expressed concerns about being displaced. I think we need to look at our incentives to see whether we are subsidizing large organizations, large corporations on the back of working people, and how much is it costing our community? I agree with Councilmember Mayfield, our most vulnerable are feeling the impact. I talked with some of my neighbors in East Charlotte in Far East who are struggling with trying to keep up with the property tax bill, on top of the sales tax increase that's going in effect on July 1, 2026, on top of the number of fee increases from water and solid waste, and I know it's not going to stop here. I certainly appreciate that the County Manager proposed the budget without any property tax increase, and I would have liked to see further reduction in a property tax increase, but I also appreciate the work that the Budget staff has done to increase our employees' minimum wage to $25 per hour. That shows that we lead by an example. We need to take care of our own.

I also appreciate how we made significant investments in public safety, especially our police and fire as we are trying to recruit and retain our officers and our firefighters. I often hear from our community where Priority 2 calls are not meeting the benchmark that it should. So, when someone calls 911, the response time should meet the benchmark. Unfortunately, our Priority 2 calls, when it comes to CMPD, are not meeting that benchmark. I hope with this increase, we are able to meet that benchmark, because that is certainly our core services that we must provide. I came into this budget process with two priorities. Support the people who serve our City, which is our employees, and protect the people who pay for our City, which is our taxpayers, and we've come a long way. I think during the budget adjustment process we did ask the City Manager and the Budget staff to go back and look at all of these adjustments without any additional tax increase, which you have done that, so thanks to you Marie and the entire budget team, and Mr. Jones, for your leadership on not introducing additional tax on all of these adjustments that the Council proposed.

We did strengthen firefighter compensation, to Councilmember Watlington's point; we invested in public safety, to Councilmember Danté's point; and we maintained our commitment to neighborhoods and mobility. Throughout this process, every single Council member never stopped asking how we can do more while asking taxpayers for less, and I think that's responsible government, because every dollar in this budget belongs to the people of Charlotte before it belongs to the government.

So, with that I will be supporting this budget, but I look forward to doing a more deeper dive as we discuss next year's Fiscal Year budget process, because we will need to make sure that we are taking our most vulnerable population very seriously, and we are reviewing our subsidies and how much it is costing our communities, that we are not introducing subsidies to large corporations on the back of the very people we are trying to protect. That's all I have. Thank you.

Councilmember Mitchell said I'm not going to belabor. I think you've heard from our colleagues who shared why this budget was so important to them, and we truly know the impact it has on our citizens. So, I am just going to highlight, first, I'm going to start off by saying thank you to City Manager and to the Budget team. To Councilmember Ajmera's point, we challenged you more than one time to go back to sharpen your pencil so we can make sure we have the minimum impact we can have to our citizens. So, to that I say thank you. To our CMPD and fire department, I think this reflects our priorities by giving you the 10 percent raise for both departments. City Manager Jones, thank you for sending a message to our City employees that a minimum we're going to

raise $25 to continue to lead and hopefully other corporations will follow what the City of Charlotte is doing.

I have to thank my colleagues. We put some new this year with Business District Organization, Councilmember Graham, Councilmember J.D., Councilmember Mayo, and Councilmember Anderson. This started with a meeting we had with our Business District Organization to really challenge us to say, we can be more impactful if there's additional funding for us. So, to my colleagues, this Council, $600,000 will be going to our Business District Organization.

Charlotte is growing fast, 14th largest city, and I do think it's time that we invest more in our international relationships than we currently have, and so I'm proud to say I will be supporting the new position that we're going to have in this budget.

To all the citizens, I think you need to know that we receive your emails. We hear you loud and clear. We know there's a struggle, but the challenge that we have is, how do we continue to move this city, keep you safe, making sure that we continue to do the important things, pick up your garbage, provide good water, but more importantly we still have affordable housing challenge before the 14th largest city in America. So, thank you City Manager for putting $125 million, that's more than we've ever done before. It was always $100 million. So, thanks to all, thanks for your emails, and thank you to this Council for all the hard work that got us here today.

Mayor Lyles said alright, thank you. I think that everyone has had an opportunity to speak, and I really appreciate the kindness of understanding how difficult it can be to do something in a company like this, and government is important, and the people along this dais are working very hard to be a part of what we can do and to do it better for our City.

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.

Connie Proctor, c.a.proctor@gmail.com

Nichole Smith, littlenicholesmith@gmail.com

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

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

NAYS: Councilmembers Driggs and Mayfield

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 074-113.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 505-506.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 10: TEMPORARY MORATORIUM ON NEW TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND DATA STORAGE FACILITIES

Motion was made by Councilmember Mazuera Arias, and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera to adopt Ordinance 1139-X to impose a 150-day moratorium on the acceptance, processing, and approval of applications for new telecommunications and data storage facilities within the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, and its Extraterritorial Jurisdiction pursuant to NC General Statute 160D-107.

Councilmember Ajmera said first, I just want to recognize individuals and organizations that have helped us with getting us to this process. I wanted to give a shout out to my neighbors who are here, Susanna; Gustavo; and Charlotte East, Greg Asciutto, and the entire crew who's here. Thank you for speaking up for our communities and our neighborhoods. I also wanted to give a shout out to Robert Dawkins, ActionNC, and the entire team, for providing us white paper on what regulations should look like, I certainly appreciate it. I want to also give a shout out to Toni Mingo, and neighborhood leaders like Reverend Janet Garner-Mullins, for speaking up for neighborhoods from University area to West Charlotte, I certainly appreciate the work, and many experts who had reached out to us over past several months, from Clean Air Carolina to Catawba Riverkeeper, to all other organizations who have helped us to get to this point.

So, I just want to be very clear, because the question before us today, it is not whether data centers are good or bad. The question is whether Charlotte has the right policy framework in place to manage them responsibly. So, today I believe the answer is that we need to do our homework, and we need to make sure we put guardrails and safeguards in place to protect our taxpayers, to protect our residents, and to protect our health. So, this 150-day pause gives us the time that we need to do our homework. A 150-day pause today can prevent years of unintended consequences tomorrow, and 150-day pause so we can get this right. I also want to thank the Attorney, Andrea Leslie-Fite, and your team, Terrie Hagler-Gray, for your due diligence on this. I think your staff led on this issue, and I certainly appreciate that. I also want to highlight the work that's been done by Heather Bullock and her team and Alyson and her team.

With that, we need to move forward, and I hope that this action tonight is unanimous, because it will send a strong message to our community that this is not a partisan issue when it comes to protecting our neighborhoods across the City. This is not a blue or red issue. This is an issue about quality of life. This is about clean air, clean water, and good neighborhoods. That's all I have, thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said thank you all for coming out tonight. I have to say ya'll, I'm proud of you, because we're on a roll, and what I mean when I say that is that we are showing up, whether you are a member of the business community or a neighbor or you're an advocate for clear air or sustainable solutions. This is what it looks like when people come together. This is what policy work is at its best, is that people who have totally different experiences, backgrounds, and in some cases even values, are willing to come to the table and have a conversation so that we're not having to make false choices here at the dais. I absolutely support the 150-day moratorium to do exactly that. We are facing new issues that we have not had to face at this level, because we are growing so rapidly, and I think that's a great thing, because we have the capacity and the capability in our community to do exactly that. We've got to dig deeper. We've got to really understand, not only the legal framework, but also the technical information, whether it's the data itself or it is the scientific basis behind the impacts to our communities. When we can agree on the facts, then we can talk about good policy, and I think that that's exactly what this 150-day moratorium will do, is give us an opportunity to come to the table together to review and understand and align on the facts, and then decide what's best for our community, because ultimately we determine how it grows. We are growing, there is no mistake about that, but we need to do it intentionally, and so I look forward to reviewing the policies and co-developing the policy with you. I look forward to seeing how that informs our economic development incentives, how it informs our infrastructure investments going forward, and frankly how it informs our housing policy going forward. It is far reaching, far beyond one data center or two data centers. So, I look forward to building the City with you. Thank you.

Councilmember Mayo said I'm very appreciative of Dimple and her leadership, and others on Council for really spearheading this. I think this is so important for us, particularly when we think of land use and our policies. So, I too will be supporting this, as many of my colleagues. As someone who works at an environmental nonprofit at my real job, or not that isn't my real job, but it's part-time/really full-time, you know what I mean, but yes, just that I know how important it is for us to really be forward thinking. At

my job we always talk about the best time to plant a tree was 20 years ago, and while I know we've heard a lot about, maybe we should've thought about some policies in 2020 or 2023, I'm really proud of the work that we're doing now, and also incorporating community into those conversations. So, I continue to support these conversations about how we can be better stewards to meet the needs of our community. So, excited to continue to work with you all.

Councilmember Anderson said thank all of you all for coming out and having a continued level of engagement around a variety of different topics. This topic of data centers is something that is not new, but has bubbled up in a very meaningful way over the last several months, not only here in Charlotte, but really throughout the entire country, as we're looking at the proliferation of hyperscale data centers and different types of data centers that we haven't seen traditionally. I think it's important to know, as we ask questions through this process, and staff provided us information, we have data centers in our community here in the City of Charlotte that have been around since 1990, and so that's what I mean when I say it's not a new issue, but what we now have to see is, we are operating in the 21st Century, and with the advanced technologies, that really advance on an exponential level, because that's the way tech works, we have to understand what the impacts are to communities. We have to understand what the impacts are to the environment, the impacts to small children, and having these facilities close or proximate to K-12 schools, and so that is, I hope, part of the work that we'll do during this moratorium.

The other thing that I think we can do is be very savvy about what the General Assembly allows us to do here at the local level. So, looking at the types of data centers that might move forward, looking at the technologies, whether it's a closed-loop system, whether it takes advantage of chilling the chips right there on site rather than having a large water chilling system, whether it's having what is called behind-the-meter strategies which means that all of that electricity and all of that power source is right there on that site and not pulling from our municipal utility, and then therefore having an adverse effect on your rates that you pay as regular citizens.

So, a lot of that work is going to be done. I commend our staff on immediately standing up an interdisciplinary team to look at this. There's a lot of newness to it, so as you all advocate, I just want you all to extend some grace to staff as we're navigating through this, because there really is no rubric around how you actually specifically deal with this. We are learning as we go. We're learning from others who might be a step or two ahead of us, and we're trying to be nimble to make sure that we're taking care of your needs, our residents, and making sure that our City is safe. So, of course without saying, of course I'm going to support this 150-day moratorium while we do all that heavy lifting that I just described. Thank you all.

Mayor Lyles said so, I wanted to say this. Sitting up on the top is one of our former City Councilwomen, Nancy Carter. I had the opportunity to spend some time with her in the Clean Air group over the weekend, and I want you to always understand that we believe in people, and of course people like Nancy. They've stayed with us. They've made it possible for all of us to be here today, and to actually think how do we do this better. So, Nancy, thank you for the work that you do. Stand up, you've got to stand up and get a round of applause, and Al, where are you, Al? Stand up please. Al also is the Chair of his community, and I think he said that he is actually working harder than he did when he was elected. So, I just want you all to know you can come and be really, really a part of this community, and make it better, and so thank you Al, all of you, and the people that are here. I just want you to know it's because of what we are all able to do and accomplish when we do it together, when we do it collaboratively. Thank you very much. Alright.

Councilmember Owens said in recent months, I've listened to our residents and studied the facts and sought to understand the full impact of this issue. Data centers play a vital role in our economy. They power the systems we rely on and bring investment to our region. However, these facilities can be large, consume significant energy, and operate continuously. Their size, water use, energy demands, and effects

on nearby neighborhoods, noise, light pollution, and land use conflicts, they pose real challenges for our community, and over time we've learned that many function more like industrial uses than office spaces and should be located accordingly.

We've also learned that not all data centers are the same. A small facility is one thing, but a sprawling hyperscale campus is another, and our current rules do not reflect these important differences, and I feel that that must change. However, let me be clear. We do not have the legal authority for projects that've already been approved, and they will move forward unaffected by the moratorium. This pause is about shaping the future. These 150 days give us a chance to step back and ensure our policies are right. During this time, I will ask the City Manager to direct staff to carefully review project scale, tailoring rules based on facility size and impact; neighborhood buffers, setting safe distances from our homes and from our schools; water and energy demand, assessing what our infrastructure can support or should support; equity impacts, protecting vulnerable communities from unfair burdens; costs and incentives, balancing fairness for residents and business. I also would draw attention, this has not been spoken into the room, but I do have a concern about some of the storage tanks for diesel fuel. Backup generator fuel is often necessary for these, and I'd like to have our folks be focused on that as well.

AI is already changing transportation, housing, and many other sectors. At the recent Housing Invocation Summit, nearly every proposal involved AI. I've spoken with small businesses using AI to compete in new ways, getting help with HR (Human Resources), compliance and marketing tasks they couldn't manage before. I don't know that you all are listening, even our own traffic optimization project is going to rely on AI. This shows that data centers and their infrastructure are key to our future, and that's why I ask all of you to be involved. I ask homeowners, The Alliance, the small business community, and all stakeholders to join in our effort. Their expertise is essential to creating a balanced and thoughtful approach. I will be supporting the 150-day moratorium, so that we can take further input from all of those stakeholders, and make a decision that works for our community and our economy. Thank you.

Mayor Lyles said okay, before we take the next step, thank you. We're going to have the City Attorney provide us some information.

Andrea Leslie-Fite, City Attorney said thank you, Madam Mayor. The projects that are exempt by state law include those projects which have a valid building permit, any project for which a special use permit or application has been accepted and completed, any development that has a site specific vesting plan approved by statute, also any development for which substantial expenditures have already been made in good faith, reliance on prior approval, also any project that has a complete application for developmental approval. This is not a City Council policy, this is state law, and any attempt to apply a moratorium to any of these projects that I have just listed would be a direct violation of state law, and subject not only this Council to an overturning of its action, but also exposure to liability, and frankly taxpayer dollars associated therewith. So, this is not a City Council policy with respect to exempt projects, but it is state law.

Councilmember Graham said I too will be supporting the moratorium for the 150 days. I think it's extremely important that we tell people what they need to know versus what they want to hear, and that we have a conversation based on truth and honesty about what we can and what we can't do. Certainly, Councilmember Anderson is correct. A lot of the framework will be shaped by state legislation, in terms of how they perceive this issue. So, I would encourage everyone here to also talk to your state representatives and your state senators in reference to this. That's where a bulk of this thing, the framework, the guardrails that we will work within, will come from. So, I won't delay it any longer. I think we need to take the 150 days to pause and, even for me, I've learned more about data centers in the last six weeks than I ever knew, and so even for these 150 days for me to be better educated about what we can, what we can't do, the impacts. Certainly, the number one goal is protecting neighborhoods and communities, that goes without saying, but there's a balance there, and I think we need to figure out collectively together where that line is. Thank you.

pti:pk

Councilmember Driggs said so, I look forward to joining my colleagues in support of the moratorium. I think there are undeniable national trends in data science, and we need to reconcile those with our concerns about the welfare of our community. So, we will have 150 days in order to educate ourselves, to hear different points of view, and to work out what is best for Charlotte. Thank you.

Councilmember Mayfield said so I appreciate that we're having this discussion. I would like for Council to start being more proactive instead of reactive. When we received the proposal over the million square feet back in 2023, and I asked questions then, and shared information then regarding the potential impacts of data centers, because we've always had data centers, but not at the scale that we're seeing now. We're in a drought. We're not the only ones in a drought. There's a drought throughout the nation that's happening. Without having language in place that mandated or incentivized heavily, and for me making the cost for the access to our water being cost prohibitive, that's how you incentivize internal cooling systems and/or location. It should be nowhere near schools. I speak all the time about the fact that we are losing manufacturing areas. Manufacturing is the place where it needs to go, because of the constant hum that has not only a physical impact to us, it is having an impact on our wildlife, on bees, on [inaudible]. There are a lot of environmental. So, you think about the fact that we passed the conversation around pollinator, but these buildings have so many other negative impacts on environment that will be long term for us. So, I appreciate that there's a lot of conversation now, but honestly all of you that are sharing your thoughts very loudly, I need ya'll to consider why we need you to be engaged, because this isn't new. We're in 2026. We've already passed a couple of them. No, we can't backtrack to 2023, but when that information was out there, when we were having conversations about it, we didn't hear from the community, and our biggest challenge is when we don't hear from the community, even when we try to outreach to the community, and community's like I don't know, we're all using AI, so it must be okay, and then you learn information later. We need you to help us. We want to work with you, but we've got to hear from you. So, us having this moratorium now is a step, but it is not going to retract what was already approved, and the two largest potential facilities, over a million square feet, one of them which 2023 is outside of City of Charlotte limits, it's actually in the County, yet, we need to hear from ya'll. We need to know that this is a concern. This moratorium's going to help us do more research and hopefully get us to a place of policy language, but as my colleague mentioned, the North Carolina General Assembly, understand the rules, they set them. At any time, the General Assembly can decide what is going to be the policy language for all 120 counties across North Carolina. So, if the right person gets to them and says, hey, we want access to put data centers wherever we want, they have the legal ability to do that. What does that mean? Go out and vote. Don't complain about it, just go vote, that's how you fix it.

So, I appreciate that ya'll think that we have more control and ability than what we do. We serve at the pleasure of the North Carolina General Assembly. So, as we move forward and try to create language that's going to benefit our residents, I cannot say that there are going to be no data centers, but what I can commit to is working with staff for us to figure out where's the best location as far away from students, as far away from our elders, as far away from residents as possible, so that we can try to minimize, and what can we do to ensure we are protecting our water source so that we don't end up like other communities that don't have access to healthy water, and so that we can try to make sure that the cost of running that facility 24/7, for all of us that like to use ChatGPT and Claude and AI and everything else, we're going to use it, because that's a reality. The question is. Do I come to ya'll's job and start acting up? So that's what I'm asking you not to do. So, when we look at the impact of data centers, the question for me is, where data centers are going to be located? How large is that data center going to be? What access to our national resources are you trying to get access to? Do we have the legal ability to not only limit our natural resources from being utilized that way and/or eliminate our natural resources to be eliminated?

I'm looking forward to the conversations we're going to have regarding the impact of data centers, and what legal language we can put in place. The Attorney and I have actually already started this conversation. She's only been here seven months, so I

think I gave you the first 45 days to let you get situated before we started having the conversation, so that we can look at what can we do within the legal constraints and how can we interpret the language that is out there in a way that's going to benefit our community. I think this moratorium is going to help us move that conversation a little further.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said tonight's vote on a 150-day moratorium I do believe is more about data centers. I think it is about the kind of city we want to build, and who we believe should have a meaningful voice in shaping our City's future, whether it's those who make profits at the expense of our community or the people of the community, the workers who are helping make those corporations the profits in the first place. As my colleague just said, we should have done this years ago, particularly when my colleague, Councilmember Mayfield, sounded the alarm on this two, three years ago. When I think about this decision, I think about the people of District Five who are facing a potential data center in their backyard. People like Gustavo Toro, who is up there, a father fighting everyday for his son with autism, navigating the systems that are already stretched thin. When we talk about land use infrastructure, energy, and environmental impacts, we are not talking about abstract policy or money, we are talking about families like Gustavo's who feel the consequences of our choices in their daily lives. Data centers have real impacts, a simply Google search would help you identify that, on our environment, on our water supply, on our energy grid, on noise, on heat, on the long-term sustainability of our neighborhoods, and I believe this moratorium gives us the space to ensure that growth does not come at the expense of the people who already live here.

We also have to be honest about the corporate reality in front of us. The corporation who is petitioning for a rezoning in my District to build a 40,000 square foot data center, already has in holding approval for a 10,000 square foot center if the rezoning is denied, because of what you just heard from the Attorney and my other colleagues, the state legal environment we live here in North Carolina, such as downzoning restrictions and by-right state statute that allows this to happen without City Council's approval. That tells us something important. They have options, and they have flexibility. To what my colleague just said, Councilmember Mayfield, this is your time to hold other public institutions accountable, to hold our state representatives accountable, to make your voices be heard, because listen, I think I've said this to many of you in the audience, as much as I wish we could live in what New York City is experiencing right now, we do not live in that reality in the good old state of North Carolina, so our work is cut out for us. We can, if you elect representatives to our state legislature that represent your voices. So, I am reminded of what Atlanta Mayor Andre Dickens recently reminded corporate leaders. We cannot attend to corporate needs if they can't attend to societal needs. That is not anti-business. That is a reminder that I believe partnership must be mutual, not one sided. We also have to confront the policy framework we are working within. Our Unified Development Ordinance gives far more flexibility to developers than to residents, allowing data centers by-right in seven zoning districts, and because of state downzoning restrictions and by-right zoning enabled by state law, our ability to protect those neighborhoods is very limited even if this moratorium is passed. So, this is a moment, as I said it before, to understand the power that the state has over local jurisdictions. This happened in 2019 when the City of Charlotte wanted to pass municipal ID's to residents that didn't have documentation here. The moment the state legislature found that out, they passed a state statute that prohibited every municipality, every local government in the state of North Carolina, from protecting those residents.

So, it is a moment to say clearly that local governments need the authority to make decisions for the people who actually live here, not just those who profit here. Passing this moratorium is not the end of the work. It is the beginning of broader conversation about all types of advocacies about restoring local control so we can protect our neighborhoods, our infrastructure, our quality of life. If residents have to be asked to conserve water during drought conditions, if families can be asked to reduce energy use during peak demand, then corporations, especially those with massive water and energy footprints, should be held to the same standard, especially when Duke Energy is pushing for higher rates and when our residents are already facing property tax

increases and service fee increases. If we are going to ask more of our people, we should expect at least as much from those folks that are petitioning for data centers who can afford it.

I want to express my gratitude to the people and organizations who have been relentless in raising awareness and demanding accountability, ActionNC, The District Four Coalition, PSL (Party for Socialism and Liberation) Indivisible, and East Charlotte residents, and the law and academic experts who have helped us understand the implications of not only state law, but also our Unified Development Ordinance. Your advocacy is the reason why we're here tonight. Your persistence is the reason this conversation is happening. Your voices, your noise must continue. This moratorium is not about anti-growth. It is smart growth. It is smart development. It is people first policy. It is a pause, a necessary pause, to ensure that Charlotte grows in a way that protects are neighborhoods, respects our infrastructure, and honors the people who call this city home. So, let us not be lost in this moment, because this is not isolated. There is more work to do, more advocacy to pursue, more voices to uplift, and tonight we take a step forward to make sure that Charlotte, where the development is happening, serves the people, not the other way around. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said I won't belabor the point. I think you all know that I'll be supporting the moratorium. I want to thank Councilmember Ajmera for your leadership on bringing this forward. I also want to thank the City Attorney and Toni Mingo, she's in the room. She's the one with the sign, University City Lives Matter Too. She's the original Chair of the Council District Four Coalition, and she's been on this for a long time. I want to thank you, and as well as your predecessor, Juan Euvin, and the Coalition. ActionNC, Dr. [inaudible] White, just thank you. This is a huge moment tonight. I know it's not perfect. I know it's not everything that we want, but you all have to realize the moment that we're in right now. Last year this time, I used to call a moratorium the M word. We wouldn't have mentioned this, and so this is huge. This is a huge step for our City. I think what you're seeing is people first leadership. So, give yourselves a hand for your engagement, give yourselves a hand. You have to know. I think the rule on here, what's the law that mentions the exception, is it 160C?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said Councilmember Johnson, it's 160D-107, Subsection C.

Ms. Johnson said the exempt project, right?

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

Ms. Johnson said so, the exempt project. We've had long discussions regarding the exempt projects. This is where our state legislators will be able to help. You all reach out to your state legislators. I'm going to be meeting with the state legislators and also the County, and we'll take a look at this from an intergovernmental perspective, but we need your help. You just have to know that you've got some fighters on this Council. We're going do all we can for the Moores Chapel and the PowerHouse, but it's already passed, so just know that, but we are going to be, I think more proactive from now on. Councilmember Mayfield and I voted against this in 2023. We asked questions about health. We asked questions about the capacity, but there was not the public knowledge of what data centers were. There wasn't staff knowledge of it. So, now we know and we're going to try to do better, but we are going to take a pause during this 150 days to implement policies that will be beneficial for the City and the residents, and I look forward to supporting it. Thank you.

Ms. Ajmera said I just wanted to make sure, I would be remiss if I did not recognize June Blotnick and her crew of climate leaders, please stand, for pulling together interdisciplinary team of all the experts from air, water, health, to quality of life. I appreciate you and the white paper you have given us. We'll continue to keep that in mind as we develop regulations. Thank you, June.

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.

pti:pk

Scott Cogar, SCoar@rbh.com

Diana Arevalo, diana.g.arevalo3@gmail.com

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

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 114-116.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 11: DISCUSSION ON COUNCIL RULES AND PROCEDURES

Mayor Lyles said as you recall from our last Business Meeting during Council topics, Council voted to add this item to tonight's agenda for the discussion. To open up the topic, it would be good for our City Attorney to give an overview of current rules and procedures.

Andrea Leslie-Fite, City Attorney said for the benefit of Council and the public, I would like to briefly explain how items are placed on the City Council agenda. The process is governed by the City Council's Rules of Procedure, not the City Charter. This means that the Rules of Procedure can be updated pursuant to Council's own processes. Currently, the Rules of Procedure provide, and actually Rule 4D of your Rules of Procedure, which you have before you at the dais, that any member of Council may request the City Manager to place an item on a future agenda by making such a request at a Council meeting. Unless a Council member or the City Manager objects, the requested item shall be included. If a Council member or the City Manager has an objection, the item in question shall not be included on the future agenda unless a majority of the Council votes in favor of including the item.

At this time, this item has come back before Council certainly on the last motion that was made, and I will say, it is my understanding that there was an earlier referral of this question to committee several years back, and it has now come back before the full Council for consideration. There is nothing in your Rules of Procedure that would prohibit consideration at this time, nor any referral process to committee as well. Thank you.

Councilmember Ajmera said Madam Attorney, thank you for clarifying that. I just wanted to thank Councilmember Johnson for her leadership on this, and for advocating for it to be added to the agenda, and I'll be supporting the change.

Motion was made by Councilmember Johnson and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera to make a modification: (d) Any member of Council may request the City Manager to place an item on a future agenda by making such a request at a Council meeting. Unless a Council member or the City Manager objects, the requested item shall be included. If a Council member or the City Manager has an objection, the item in question shall not be included on a future agenda, unless a ~~majority~~ four of the Council votes in favor of including the item.

Councilmember Watlington said I'm sorry, mine's just a question. I'm looking at 4D. Can you tell me what it would read?

Councilmember Johnson said "If a Council member or the City Manager has an objection, the item in question shall not be included on future agenda unless four of the Council members votes in favor of including the item."

Ms. Watlington said thank you.

Councilmember Mayfield said is there any other item you're trying to amend while we've got this open?

Ms. Watlington said and it might be what you were just saying. I know that there was the whole decorum thing, and I saw that land in our email box. It would seem that this discussion is a part of that, but I'm just wondering if your motion, Councilmember Johnson, is separate from what may come after it, or if you were waiting to compile? That's all.

Ms. Johnson said this might be a good time to talk about it, but yes, it is a separate issue.

Ms. Watlington said okay, thank you.

Councilmember Anderson said so, I just want to be clear here that on 4D, the third sentence in, "If a Council member or the City Manager has an objection, the item in question shall not be included on the future agenda." Where's the strikethrough here?

Ms. Johnson said right there.

Ms. Mayfield said "unless four."

Ms. Leslie-Fite said so, instead of majority, it would be four. Is that correct, Council member?

Ms. Johnson said yes. May I in plain language? So, if we bring something up on the agenda, it doesn't get done unless there's a majority, because anybody can object to it, and then there had to be a majority of Council to get it on the agenda. This way it would only be four Council members to get something on the agenda, if anyone objects.

Ms. Ajmera said on the future agenda.

Ms. Johnson said a future agenda. Now, currently there's a unanimous vote that's required to get something on a current agenda. There was some discussion on that, but I don't want to get too complicated today.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said thank you, Councilmember Johnson and Councilmember Mazuera Arias. That is actually overlapping with your charter, and so this is different for a future agenda, but the charter specifically says that for the same night for something to be added to the agenda that it requires.

Ms. Johnson said thank you for that clarification.

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

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

NAYS: Councilmembers Driggs and Graham

Councilmember Mayo said can we talk about the decorum that I just sent people via email that the decorum committee has been talking about as well. I'd like to make a motion to pass that.

Mayor Lyles said I think you have a motion to discuss it.

Ms. Mayo said oh, yes, can we do that?

Ms. Mayfield said so, for clarification, Mayor, and I'm just asking the Attorney. We have the agenda for tonight for this Business Meeting. We're on Item No. 11, which is discussion on the Council rules and procedures, which was specifically what we just voted on in this book. We need to go through the business items, because is this a night where we don't even have Council topics on the agenda. That's where that would come up, is in Council topics. We have to go to Item No. 11 according to our agenda, because

the decorum discussion is not a part of the rules and procedures, so Attorney, am I correct that our next item for discussion is Item No. 12, because we just discussed Item No. 11 and voted on it? The decorum conversation can't be brought up in this conversation that we're having right now.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said so, two quick things. Rule 4C of your Rules of Procedure provide that any item that is not on the agenda can then be taken up at the conclusion of the agenda.

Ms. Mayfield said at the conclusion, so after.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said correct, and with respect to Item No. 11, discussion on Council's rules and procedures, my recollection of the request and the motion by Councilmember Johnson was specifically with regard to item 4D of the Rules of Procedure with respect to changing the number of required votes to add something to a future agenda. So, that is the basis of my conclusion on this evening, is based on that.

Ms. Mayfield said so, we've got to continue with the original agenda.

Ms. Watlington said so, point of order, I have a question then. Because we don't know necessarily, and this is maybe a general question, but this is an example. We don't know what motion would've come out of the discussion associated with decorum. It may have resulted in a change to the Rules of Procedure, and there's no rule that we can only make one motion on a particular topic. So, to me this is absolutely germane to the agenda topic that's at hand, because just because Councilmember Johnson, we knew she was going to talk about that specific thing, the agenda says a discussion about rules and procedures. So, I'm not understanding why that doesn't fall clearly within what was just discussed.

Ms. Mayo said I would agree as well. I mean on the agenda it's very broad, it's not very specific about exactly what we're talking about. So, I would say we could add this, but I mean I'll go with the majority.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said I would leave it to Madam Mayor to decide whether it was appropriate based on the agenda topic.

Mayor Lyles said okay, great. Alright, so we're going to go to the next item.

Ms. Watlington said so, I'm sorry, can you rule on that, please? Was it in or out of order?

Mayor Lyles said is in order.

Ms. Watlington said it is in order, so we can talk about.

Mayor Lyles said you can talk about it, yes, sorry, I couldn't hear.

Ms. Mayfield said so, the Attorney ruled that it's in order. We just voted on it. So, we just voted and closed Item No. 11. Wouldn't that have been an amendment to the first amendment? If we closed Item No. 11, which was the discussion on Council Rules and Procedures. Now, what I'm hearing, and I want to make sure I'm hearing it correctly, is an introduction of a new topic, but according to our rules, that can be added after we complete the agenda.

Ms. Watlington said point of order. The Chair of the meeting just said that it was in order, and a part of the topic that was discussed. That motion closed, but the topic didn't close based on what she just ruled.

Ms. Mayo said Madam Mayor, I'm going to withdraw my motion, and we'll just go based on my email, and hopefully we can vote on this later. So, I apologize, I did not mean to open a can of worms.

pti:pk

* * * * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 12: FEDERAL FUNDING FOR THE EAST CHARLOTTE CONNECTOR

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute a grant agreement with the Federal Highway Administration to accept Fiscal Year 2023 Active Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program funds in the amount of $1,400,000 for the East Charlotte Connector, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance 1140-X appropriating $1,400,000 from the Federal Highway Administration to the General Capital Projects Fund.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said I did want to call down Debbie Smith from C-DOT (Charlotte Department of Transportation) to answer some questions, please?

Debbie Smith, C-DOT Director said hi, good evening, Council, Mayor. Good to see you. Debbie Smith with C-DOT, and I've also brought with me Samantha Miller, also from C-DOT, to be able to answer your questions.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said thank you, Debbie and Samantha. So, I first want to go to Council. You all have a one-pager of the East Charlotte Connector in front of you. It is a proposed Active Transportation Network that seeks to improve connectivity and safety for vulnerable users, increase job diversity, employment opportunities in the East Side, so think of it kind of like the SouthPark Connector.

So, I do want to ask a few questions regarding this, because I've had community members raise some concerns. So, I'll just go one by one. When did we initially apply for these funds to fund this project?

Samantha Miller, C-DOT said yes. So, we actually applied for this in July of 2024. They were not awarded until January of 2025, and we needed to wait for FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) to get back to us for a kickoff meeting, which did not happen until October of 2025. At that time, we could work on an agreement with them, and we needed to be sensitive to the fact that it needed to go through their headquarter approval to ensure that all of the funding would come to us as had been prescribed, and that actually did not happen until May of this year. That's a seven-month process, which is actually pretty speedy for our federal agreements, and so we are pretty pleased with that, but we wanted to make sure that everything was in place before we brought it to this Council.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said so, would you say that there was a delay in the funds being released?

Ms. Miller said yes.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said and then accepting the funds, and then there was a delay with the kickoff meeting, or what did you call it?

Ms. Miller said so, we have to have a kickoff meeting with FHWA and where they talk about the agreement. There was a lot of agreement language that they were changing during the process. There was a lot of things happening, and so they were trying to get all of their information correct before we executed the agreement with them.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said thank you, and when was this all settled?

Ms. Miller said so, May 1, 2026.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said May 1, 2026, okay. How much community feedback have we gotten on this framework? I saw that a framework has been released, and the concerns that the community brought up is that those initial stakeholders, particularly those in the East Side, were not brought into the conversation to come up with the final adoption of the framework for the East Charlotte Connector. So, could you walk me through that timeline, please?

Ms. Miller said yes. So, we did have robust communication. There were several events in 2024 with a stakeholder agreement, open houses, and a logo and branding survey. Then, we came back to the community in March of 2025, with a full public meeting to give some of the updates that we had. We did seek to get this planning grant so that we could continue that work, and actually as part of that grant, one of the deliverables will be increased and more extensive public engagement, and is all part of the process of what we need to give back to the federal government, so that they can understand that we have engaged the public properly.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said perfect. So, when was the last time City staff checked back in with the community?

Ms. Miller said so, that would be March of 2025, and we've just been waiting. The community said to us that they wanted us to come back with more information, and we wanted to wait until we had that information to share with them in a more better fashion.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said and just to be clear, what we're voting on today is more so a formal procedural vote to go ahead and accept the dollars, rather than finalizing and adopting the framework plan, because the framework plan is still going through revisions, and as set forth by the grant guidelines, more community engagement will be done?

Ms. Miller said yes.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said yes, okay, great. Thank you so much. I greatly appreciate it, and please keep me appraised of the community sessions that you'll have, and please use me as an active working partner to bring those stakeholders along.

Ms. Smith said absolutely, we certainly will. Thank you, Councilmember.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said thank you so much, Debbie and Samantha.

Councilmember Ajmera said so my question is related to overall infrastructure investment program. So, over the weekend, staff shared these performance metrics for us. It's a long PDF, and that was a really good document, where we have performance measures for each department. I looked at the transportation, and miles of new sidewalks, miles of new bikeways, and there were other infrastructure projects where we are far below our target. So, I just want to highlight that concern, not specifically East Charlotte, but just throughout the City, we are not meeting the target where clearly there is progress needed. I think we need an action plan to improve, to ensure that we are meeting the benchmark, because our target should be 10-plus, but right now the data shows we are at 4.54, which is not even half. So, that means we need to do more progress on investing our dollars into our infrastructure, where we promise a timely delivery. We are certainly falling behind on that, and these performance metrics specifically call out sidewalks and bikeways. There are more, but I'm not going to go through every single item, but I just wanted to highlight that. That's all I have.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said Manager Jones, more so of a suggestion in direction. When it comes to projects like these that require community engagement, as a District Representative I really would like to be made appraised of those conversations and dialogue, so we can help connect the dots. As we've said, I think we've gotten a slogan this term on Council, which is be proactive and not reactive. I want to make sure that I'm not finding out about this project from my constituents. I want to make sure that I'm ahead, because I think we want to build that public trust where, hey, East Charlotte

Connector, and as a District Representative, if I go to my constituents and say, well, I had no idea, and they know more about it, there's clearly a disconnect between communication and dialogue from residents with their City Council Representative or the institution that is the City of Charlotte. So, if we can find a way to perhaps create a community engagement process that includes the District Rep, at least in my perspective. I'm not going to speak for my At-Large members, because they represent the entire City, but for at least the District Reps, since we're the first line of defense in those conversations.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said sure.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said thank you.

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

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 117.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 507.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: FEDERAL FUNDING FOR THE ROZZELLES FERRY MOBILITY PATH

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute a grant agreement with the Federal Highway Administration to accept Fiscal Year 2024 Reconnecting Communities funds in the amount of $1,290,480 for the Rozzelles Ferry Mobility Path, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance 1141-X appropriating $1,290,480 from the Federal Highway Administration to the General Capital Projects Fund.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 118.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 508.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 14: GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND REFERENDUM

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Ajmera, to adopt resolutions authorizing staff to proceed with the necessary actions to conduct a general obligation bond referendum on November 3, 2026.

Councilmember Watlington said Mayor, yes. Pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 160A-75A, I must recuse myself from this vote.

Mayor Lyles said okay, so Ms. Watlington is recused from Item No. 14.

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

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 509-515.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 15: AMENDMENT TO AMENDED AND RESTATED LEASE FOR THE BANK OF AMERICA STADIUM

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Owens to authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all documents necessary to complete a First Amendment to Amended and Restated Lease for the Bank of America Stadium property (parcel identification numbers 073-281-01A and 073-281-02) with Panthers Stadium, LLC.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said can I get a member from City staff to talk about this?

Shawn Heath, Assistant City Manager said good evening.

Mayor Lyles said good evening.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said hey Shawn, thank you so much. I just would like for you in layman's terms to describe to the public what we're voting on in terms of this restated lease agreement for the Bank of America Stadium.

Mr. Heath said of course. This is an adjustment to the lease that was executed in December of 2025, and it's a scenario that was contemplated as far back as October of 2025 when there were discussions at the committee level about the opportunity for a fully private sector funded performance venue adjacent to Bank of America Stadium on City-owned property. In the last couple months, the North Carolina Department of Transportation has conveyed a very small piece of property, 0.244 acres, next to the stadium to the City of Charlotte. As discussed with the committee in October 2025, the aspiration for the team is to have part of the performance venue straddle City-owned property in what was previously NC-DOT (North Carolina Department of Transportation) property, which is now City-owned property, that we are seeking to tuck into the lease that was executed in December of 2025.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said and no additional taxpayer funding is needed for this amendment, correct?

Mr. Heath said that's correct. This will be a purely private sector funded performance venue with a seating capacity of approximately 4,400, with an estimated number of performances between 80 to 100 per year. So, the job creation and tourism benefits associated with that asset will require no investment whatsoever from the City of Charlotte, no financial investment.

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

Councilmember Mayfield said Shawn, for clarification, since this is City-owned land that we are talking about leasing, are we generating any revenue from this lease?

Mr. Heath said so, no, we are not generating any revenue from the lease, but in exchange for including this in the lease, all of the jobs and tourism benefits associated with the venue will accrue to the City of Charlotte.

Ms. Mayfield said so, it benefits hospitality and tourism and hospitality and tourism tax, but what we are adding, we're expanding to include this corner into the current lease for them to build a venue on, which is going to generate income for them, but generate hospitality and tourism taxes for us?

Mr. Heath said yes, this will be less than one percent of the total amount of property included in the lease.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said Shawn, I just wanted to understand, was the land conveyed from NC-DOT for the purpose of us transferring it to the stadium?

Mr. Heath said so, the land was deemed surplus by NC-DOT, so the deed was handed over to us with no restrictions or obligations associated with our use of the property. So, we received it free and clear. They are no restrictions that would prevent us from including it in the lease.

Ms. Watlington said or anything else?

Mr. Heath said correct, correct, and this is a piece of property that it's in our long-term interest to have this as City-owed property, as it's been that little tiny 0.244-acre triangular parcel within a much larger piece of City-owned land for quite some time.

Councilmember Johnson said so we're donating the land so that they can build the practice facility, right?

Mr. Heath said no, so this is not that.

Ms. Johnson said I'm sorry. Are there any allotted days in the venue to the community?

Mr. Heath said so, if we were to find ourselves, in hopefully the very unlikely circumstances that after the 20-year non-relocation period associated with Panther Stadium that the team were to leave, then in that instance there would be five City-use days associated with the performance venue.

Ms. Mayfield said after 20 years?

Mr. Heath said in what is hopefully the unlikely event that the team leaves the stadium, then there would be City-use days associated with the performance venue.

Ms. Johnson said and what's the size of the lot?

Mr. Heath said so, it'll be approximately two acres in total, almost all of which was previously City-owned land. It's only this little 0.244-acre parcel that was previously owned by NC-DOT that is relevant to this proposed amendment to the lease.

Ms. Watlington said have we had any conversation as far as community benefits associated with it? I mean, it would seem that we could just call. I'm sure they would be amenable to some community days, but before we vote on this, it would seem that we would at least have that conversation.

Mr. Heath said so, I think it goes back to the conversation that we had with Jobs and Economic Development Committee in October 2025, and then there was a vote by full Council subsequent to the committee meeting that contemplated the construction of a performance venue next to the stadium. We needed Council to allow us to include that in the negotiations with the team that were completed in December 2025. So, the conversations we've had around community benefits really revolved around any scenario where the football team were to leave after 20 years, then there would be certain benefits, including a rent payment and City-use days associated with the performance venue.

Ms. Watlington said but only if the team leaves. As long as the team is here, there is no community benefit.

Mr. Heath said well, the way it was discussed in committee was, by allowing for the performance venue to be on this small piece of property, but for that, there may not be a performance venue, was essentially the way the committee discussion was.

Ms. Watlington said so, is this time sensitive? Because I would much prefer, if it's the will of the Council, to at least have a friendly conversation. I would hate for us to miss an opportunity to simply say, hey, if we're providing this land so that you can build for this amenity. Yes, we understand there's going to be some level of jobs and some tax

revenue, but that tax revenue goes to the Housing and Tourism Fund anyway, which we just learned is restricted for anything that actually benefits residents.

Councilmember Ajmera said not for property tax.

Ms. Watlington said okay, so we'll get the property tax, that's fair, but any sales that go there will be associated with the Tourism Fund. I think it would behoove us to at least have a conversation about community benefit days or anything of that nature. That doesn't seem like a tall order. So, if this is not time sensitive, I'd love to see us come back to that, just after we have that conversation, and like I said, I would expect that the Panthers there, they are a great community partner, that they would be amenable to something.

Mr. Heath said so, the way that we've worked on the timeline, we've given ourselves a little bit of latitude in the month of June 2026. I will say that all of the conversations around the performance venue were really contemplated in the negotiations we had with the team leading to the execution of the lease in December of 2025. So, I would want to make everyone aware that staff did have conversations with the team around the value proposition. We did have conversations with committee about the value proposition. It's been a number of months since we had those conversations, but I just want to make sure that was on the record.

Ms. Watlington said and does that mean that that has already been executed?

Mr. Heath said well, the existing lease was executed in December 2025. What's being contemplated here is really just one adjustment to allow for this little piece of land to be included in the lease.

Ms. Watlington said yes, so then we've got time to have this conversation about this piece?

Mr. Heath said yes.

Ms. Watlington said okay.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said so, as Shawn has said earlier, this had been contemplated, and I think it's just been a while since Council has had the conversation, a little bit of a refresher. I believe that the option on the table now is, I guess I'll try to use the right words, almost easier than some of the things that were contemplated over the course of the agreement. So, Shawn, can you bring everybody up to speed about what was contemplated versus where we are now, and I think we're in a better place, but please?

Mr. Heath said yes, there really is a long history on it, so I don't want to go back too far in time. Where we thought we could end up as of six months ago was that the team could actually have control of the parcel, and then where it landed obviously was NC-DOT ultimately decided that this is surplus property that was warranted to provide conveyance to the City of Charlotte. So, with us having control of the property, it's much more beneficial to us in the long term. Mr. Manager, I'm not sure if that was the specific scenario you were referring to.

Mr. Jones said exactly, yes.

Ms. Johnson said thank you, Shawn, and Mr. Jones. The challenge for us is, it may seem like a little bit of land, two acres, but it's not. We have vendors that are being displaced. They're no longer able to provide business or do their business in front of different shops in NoDa and different locations, and there's restrictions. I think of truck parking. I think of affordable housing. I mean, there's just opportunities for land, maybe not here, but two acres of land is two acres of land.

Ms. Mayfield said it's only 0.244.

Ms. Johnson said well, land is land. So, when we ask for some type of community benefit, I think that that's reasonable. I think that what Dr. Watlington said is reasonable if we could go back to the Bank of America Stadium folks and see what we can come up with. I mean, these are taxpayer dollars that we are stewards of, especially since it's the Tourism Fund and we're being told kind of hands off, we just need to be stewards. So, if this is an opportunity to do something for the public, we need to really be asking these questions.

Ms. Mayfield said so I want to clarify, because what the Manager just noted is, yes, we started this conversation back in December of 2025. Mr. Heath, what you noted was when we started this conversation it was under a premise that they were going to be purchasing it. So, we were saying, okay, yes, we'll support the idea of a venue. When that conversation shifted, there was an opportunity to have come back to Council before bringing us a decision tonight for us to be able to ask these questions. Because once it was shifted that they were not going to be the ones purchasing the land, that the land was going to be conveyed to the City, I agree with my colleagues, we had the opportunity to then look at, where are the community benefits? We can have all these venues Uptown of which I'm pretty sure when we first had this conversation, I was a no vote, because we have multiple venue spaces around the City that our residents can't even attend, because of location and cost. So, I don't understand when the conversation shifted to ownership of this land by the City, that the first question wasn't, what are the benefits? Because I know I'm going to have to go before my Council, and my Council is going to ask me, how does this benefit the community. It's a given that that's going to be the question that comes from at least three people from around this dais. So, Manager Jones, help me get to the place of why, once the conversation shifted from Bank of America owning the land, to the land being conveyed to the City, why that didn't trigger a conversation prior to coming before us tonight in the form of a vote?

Mr. Jones said yes, thank you, Councilmember Mayfield. I appreciate the conversation we're having, and I think waiting for two more weeks is probably a good thing. Having the City have control of this 0.2 acres is much better than having a private entity having control over 0.2 acres, if they were ever to not renew the lease in the next 20 years. So, that's why when I was saying to Shawn earlier, I think we're in a better position being in control of that 0.2 acres than not being in control.

Ms. Mayfield said and I agree with you that it's a better position for the City to be control of it. The challenge I have is it's not benefitting the community for the City to be in control of it. So, if our having control is still just going to give them the ability to build and develop how they do without there being a community giveback, and I'm not talking about the holiday giveaway that you do actually at Carowinds, which is on the South Carolina line. I'm talking about an actual impact to what we have here within the City limits. So, I agree that it's in our best interest to own this piece of land Uptown. That does not answer my question of why we didn't think that was an opportunity to go back and have a discussion on how this can benefit the residents of Charlotte. I was thinking that Dr. Watlington was going to do a motion to defer.

Substitute motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, and seconded by Councilmember Watlington, to defer until the next Business Meeting, the action to authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all documents necessary to complete a First Amendment to Amended and Restated Lease for the Bank of America Stadium property (parcel identification numbers 073-281-01A and 073-281-02) with Panthers Stadium, LLC.

Ms. Mayfield said so, that's to defer to our next Business Meeting to give us a chance to work with our partners, because public/private partnerships are so very important and we know as an organization, they have given and supported a number of opportunities, and this will be another yet great opportunity for them to show support to the local Charlotte community that supports them.

pti:pk

Ms. Watlington said I'm so proud.

Councilmember Graham said 0.02 acres?

Mr. Heath said 0.244.

Mr. Graham said okay, a quarter of an acre, in close proximity to the proposed?

Mr. Heath said adjacent to the stadium, freestanding by the north gate, correct, on land that's not currently being activated.

Mr. Graham said not currently. So, it's in District Two, and Council can certainly have a perspective. My perspective is this is really within our entertainment district. It's a small swath of land, and we do have a community partner that has invested in our community, Travel and Tourism, Sports and Entertainment. They're building a new music venue that seats 4,200, Charlotte Soccer, Carolina Panthers, economic impact, employee workers, City controls it, work with our partners who part of the [inaudible] is on the North Carolina side too, so it's like in the middle, depending on which side you stand on, so it's either or. I think the bigger point is that they do have an impact on our community, and I think that, I'm not sure you can put any other usage there. It's something that's not really consistent to the majority of the activity there. I mean, so I think it's very narrowly tailored usage that should be consistent with its surrounding compatible functions, activity, people moving around. So, I thought this was going to be a no-brainer when I read through the weekend, but I hope that we can, Mr. Manager, you said two weeks. I'm ready to move it forward tonight, but if there's unreadiness, then I just don't understand why we need to do that. I'm struggling to find why we should do that.

Councilmember Driggs said so, I have a lot of the same concerns as Mr. Graham. This is normally something we would pursue eagerly, and they might in fact apply for Hospitality Fund support in order to create this resource, revitalize and energize that entertainment district. It's a vision that we had. It was part of the reason that we partnered with the team. It provides a lot of benefits. The people who go to those concerts will enjoy the opportunity to go. Many of them will come from out of town. It will provide jobs through economic stimulus, and the point is, they haven't asked for any hospitality money. They could have. The fact that they didn't, means that there will be hospitality dollars available to us for other uses. So, I think it's unfortunate, in fact, that the team is willing to make the, is it $40 million investment, to create this facility?

Mr. Heath said they haven't announced the particular construction cost, but it's a 4,400 capacity.

Mr. Driggs said I heard a number, $40 some odd million dollars that they're going to invest in Charlotte with all of the jobs that go with that investment, creating a facility that will add to the appeal of our City to visitors, and be a benefit in that sense, and it's a quarter of an acre. We have a $1.3 billion partnership with this team. This should not be something that we niggle about. This is something that we should sort of recognize is of benefit to us, and I have the same feeling you did. I didn't see why this would turn into a thing. It's not a gift to them in that sense. We are making a small accommodation in order to realize a very significant facility that people will appreciate.

Mr. Graham said and I think they're giving us the gift with the building of a facility without any public money.

Ms. Watlington said point of order, there's a queue.

Mr. Graham said well, they made a contribution as well. So, it's a partnership that we're doing.

Ms. Watlington said point of order.

Councilmember Anderson said I have a couple questions. My question is, Mr. Graham, was this item in the ED (Economic Development) Committee when you were the Chair? Did this item come through Committee?

Mr. Heath said this item was discussed at the October 2025, Committee Meeting.

Ms. Anderson said okay. So, when it was discussed at the Committee, was there a vote on it at Committee level, or was it just an update on the modifications?

Mr. Heath said it was an update in advance of a full Council vote on October 13, 2025, which granted the City Manager the authority to negotiate a lease that included provisions related to a potential performance venue.

Ms. Anderson said yes. So, I vaguely remember when it was.

Mayor Lyles said I just wanted to ask if there's a question. I thought that there was a representative from the stadium in that meeting, I think. Do you recall it that way?

Mr. Graham said I don't recall who was in attendance at the meeting. I do recall the conversation being had at the meeting, and again I don't have any meeting notes or anything, but I didn't think that there was a whole lot of discussion about it.

Ms. Anderson said so, I remember the conversation, and I do think that there was representation in the room. My perspective on this is, I agree with the City Manager, that I believe it behooves us to own this piece of land in the future of anything potentially happening. It is proximate to an asset that can be built in together, yet can be leveraged here with the plans that the Panthers have for this entertainment complex. So, I respect the consternation that my colleagues have. I don't have that same consternation remembering that discussion in committee and understanding the intertwining's of this years out in the future. I think this makes it less difficult and less complicated if we go about it through this process. So, thank you, that's all I have.

Ms. Ajmera said so Shawn, if you can help me understand. So, was the amendment to amended lease, which I'm talking about specifically 0.244 acres, was that in the committee? I remember the first amendment, but not the second, just the one specifically.

Mr. Heath said no. What was in committee was a specific conversation about the concept of a performance venue lease at the stadium, because in June of 2024, there were discussions about a private sector fully funded owner-mandated project, referred to as a stadium annex. So, that was a more generic concept.

Ms. Ajmera said right, but I don't remember discussing the amendment to amendment.

Mr. Heath said correct.

Ms. Ajmera said I remember discussing the concept, which we agreed on, because it was all private investment. There was no public subsidy from hospitality dollars. So, this is something new. I think what my colleagues are saying is this is something that we haven't discussed as the committee.

Another question. So, there is a two-acre piece, which was already signed into the lease, and then there is 0.244 acre, that is the new piece that is the NC-DOT portion that was given to the City, so the City could do whatever they wanted to do, find the best purpose for this site. So, I consider this as the General Fund asset, not necessarily Hospitality Tourism asset, am I correct?

Mr. Heath said so, the way you've described it, yes, the overall performance venue will take about an approximate two-acre footprint of which 0.244 would relate to this triangular parcel conveyed from NC-DOT, that's correct.

Ms. Ajmera said yes. So, I just want to make sure we are not comingling General Fund asset and Hospitality asset. I mean, I think consternation here that this is General Fund asset, and I know that there was a recent state bill that was approved that said, hey, do not use any Hospitality Funds even for safety purposes. So, I guess now that we are talking about General Fund asset, even though it's a very small piece of property, what is the fair market value of this property, number one, and if we were to put it up for a lease, how much would it generate? I mean, we are looking at General Fund, so we need to be very good stewards of our taxpayer's dollars. This is ultimately a property tax revenue.

Mr. Heath said I don't know the fair market value of this particular parcel, but I would go back to the conversation in October 2025, which really focused on, what do we get in exchange for having a performance venue as part of the overall deal?

Ms. Ajmera said that's the sales tax. I'm trying to figure out what are we getting in terms of fair market value of this small parcel, what would be the fair market value if we were to market it to an outside third party, and now with this performance venue, maybe there might be a value proposition that this would generate a lot more in property taxes than maybe another use, or if we were to lease it to another source. I don't know, but I think it's worth having a conversation around it, just to ensure that our General Fund, our taxpayers, are not subsidizing a private, a billionaire. That's all I have, thank you.

Mr. Heath said understood. I would just go back to the conversation focused on, in addition to the $150 million the team is required to invest into stadium modernization, and the $421 million the team is required to invest in operations and maintenance during the 20-year nonrelocation period, and the City use days and the MWSBE (Minority, Women, Small Business Enterprise) benefits, that without any incremental City funding, the team is contemplating building a performance venue, which would provide 80 to 100 events per year, for up to 40 years in a 4,400 seat capacity venue. So, that was how the value proposition associated with this very small, and I said, it equates to about, well, it's between a half and one percent of the total land that's being leased, associated with the Panthers' modernization efforts.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, I mean that was a separate conversation for the renovation of the Panthers Stadium. I mean this is separate. This 0.244 acres was never part of that conversation when that renovation for Bank of America Stadium was approved. So, this is different. This is a nuance. I do not recall discussing this 0.244-acre piece at all. I do remember the concept, but this was never in the picture. When did the NC-DOT provide this piece of land to the City?

Mr. Heath said in April 2026, of this year.

Ms. Ajmera said yes, so that means this would not have happened before. So, I think this is a new concept. I agree with Councilmember Mayfield, since this is a nuance, it's worth having a conversation, and we need to understand the impact on General Fund. That's all I have, thank you.

Mayor Lyles said so, I want to make a suggestion. It's been a pretty long day for most of us here, and so I wonder if we should just take, as I think Ms. Watlington suggested, that we take a moment and pause on this one, and then come back in a couple of weeks, and then there will be opportunity, time for us to do and look up all of these differences, because I saw it on the list differently. I wasn't really sure, but I know that they came by, and I thought that they were part in participating on some of this, not the committee for me, but for the meeting that I had with them.

Ms. Watlington said Mayor, if I may, though, because I was in the queue.

Ms. Mayfield said I made a motion and it got a second.

Ms. Watlington said I was in queue. I do want to say something here though. I'm glad that you made the comments that you made, because I do think we're conflating a

couple of different things. I know that some of ya'll were out when we started the conversation. So, I just want to be clear about what I was talking about. I wasn't talking about even necessarily changing the use. For me, that wasn't a conversation about changing the use. For me, it wasn't about whether or not we should own it, that was not even a discussion point as far as I was concerned. The only thing I was wanting to understand is because this is a separate part, had we had a conversation about community benefits, because of all the things that Councilmember Ajmera just mentioned. So, I just want to make sure that I was clear for the record.

Mayor Lyles said I think giving it time to do that. I think if we can just hold on for a while.

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

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

NAYS: Councilmembers Anderson, Driggs, Graham, and Owens

* * * * * * *

NOMINATIONS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor Lyles explained the rules and procedures of the appointment process.

ITEM NO. 16: NOMINATIONS TO THE BECHTLER ARTS FOUNDATION BOARD

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

- Dr. Mahari Freeman, nominated by Councilmember Owens
- Hunter Widener, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Hunter Widener by acclamation.

Mr. Widener was appointed.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 17: NOMINATIONS TO THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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.

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. 18: 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 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.

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. 19: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE MECKLENBURG PUBLIC ACCESS CORPORATION

The following nominations were made for five appointments for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2029:

- Phyllis Barnette, nominated by Councilmember Mayo
- Faye Barnette-shell, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington
- Nimish Bhatt, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington
- Tiocea Hagins, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, and Watlington
- Tyler Loveless, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington
- Ayesha Raza, nominated by Councilmember Mayo
- Sasha Tomaszycki, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Faye Barnette-shell, Nimish Bhatt, Tiocea Hagins, Tyler Loveless, and Sasha Tomaszycki by acclamation.

Mr. Bhatt and Ms. Hagins were appointed. Ms. Barnette-shell, Mr. Loveless, and Ms. Tomaszycki were reappointed.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 20: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE REGIONAL VISITORS AUTHORITY

The following nominations were made for two appointments for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2029:

- Alvin “Al” Austin, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington
- Stephanie Hand, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, and Owens
- Cheryl Myers, nominated by Councilmember Driggs
- Angel Pendergrass, nominated by Councilmember Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Alvin “Al” Austin and Stephanie Hand by acclamation.

Mr. Austin and Ms. Hand were appointed.

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

- Abigail Gravgaard, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Abigail Gavgaard by acclamation.

Ms. Gavgaard was appointed.

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a General Travel category representative for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2028:

- Tracy Montross, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Tracy Montross by acclamation.

Ms. Montross was appointed.

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

- Tripp Cagle, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Tripp Cagle by acclamation.

Mr. Cagle was reappointed.

pti:pk

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

- Marcie Kelso, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Marcie Kelso by acclamation.

Ms. Kelso was reappointed.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 21: NOMINATIONS TO THE CHARLOTTE WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a Financial Expert category representative for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2027:

- Whit McLeod, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Whit McLeod by acclamation.

Mr. McLeod was appointed.

There were no nominations made for one appointment for a Water/Sewer Contractor category representative for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2029.

Nominations will be kept open until the next Business meeting.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 22: NOMINATIONS TO THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The following nominations were made for three appointments for a partial term beginning upon appointment and ending June 30, 2028:

- Patricia Campbell, nominated by Councilmember Mazuera Arias
- Sade' Cannon, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, and Owens
- Nichel Dunlap, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, and Watlington
- Alexis Hilling, nominated by Councilmembers Owens and Watlington
- Michael Hoard, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, and Owens
- Kelly Kelly, nominated by Councilmember Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Sade' Cannon, Nichel Dunlap, and Michael Hoard by acclamation.

Ms. Cannon, Mr. Dunlap, and Mr. Hoard were appointed.

pti:pk

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 23: 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. 24: NOMINATIONS TO THE KEEP CHARLOTTE BEAUTIFUL COMMITTEE

The following nominations were made for three appointments for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2029:

- Maggie Brackett, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington
- Martin Doss, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington
- Lauren Earley, nominated by Councilmember Mayo
- Stephanie Griffin, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mazuera Arias, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington
- Hamiz Rasool, nominated by Councilmember Mayo

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Maggie Brackett, Martin Doss, and Stephanie Griffin by acclamation.

Ms. Brackett, Mr. Doss, and Ms. Griffin were reappointed.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 25: NOMINATIONS TO THE PASSENGER VEHICLE FOR HIRE BOARD

The following nomination was made for one appointment for a Company Operating Certificate Licensee category representative for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2028:

- Hamad Kashmary, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Hamad Kashmary by acclamation.

Mr. Kashmary was appointed.

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.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 26: NOMINATIONS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

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

- Emma S. Allen, nominated by Councilmembers Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, and Mazuera Arias
- Robert Hillman, nominated by Councilmembers Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington
- Jim Marascio, nominated by Councilmember Driggs
- Wil Russell, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, and Graham

This appointment will be considered at the next Business meeting.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 27: NOMINATIONS TO THE PUBLIC ART COMMISSION

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

- Nina Jackson, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Nina Jackson by acclamation.

Ms. Jackson was reappointed.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 28: NOMINATIONS TO THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

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

- Devin Gangadeen, nominated by Councilmembers Ajmera, Anderson, Mazuera Arias, Driggs, Graham, Johnson, Mayfield, Mayo, Mitchell, Owens, and Watlington

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, seconded by Councilmember Anderson, and carried unanimously to appoint Devin Gangadeen by acclamation.

Mr. Gangadeen was appointed.

* * * * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Billie Tynes, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 3 Hours, 47 Minutes
Minutes completed: July 29, 2026

pti:pk