The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina convened for an Action Review on Monday, September 14, 2026, at 5:02 p.m. in Room 267 of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Rob Harrington presiding. Council members present were Danté Anderson, J.D. Mazuera Arias, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Lawana Mayfield, Joi Mayo, James Mitchell, Kimberly Owens, and Victoria Watlington.

ABSENT: Councilmember Dimple Ajmera

ABSENT UNTIL NOTED: Councilmember Renee Johnson

* * * * * * *

Mayor Harrington said good evening. We will now call the meeting to order. First of all, thanks to everyone for joining us. We've got basically a full house in 267, and I know there are folks joining us online, and we appreciate everyone taking the time to join us this evening. As usual, we will start with introductions, and we will go around the room starting with our Clerk.

* * * * * * *

ACTION REVIEW

ITEM NO. 3: ACTION PREVIEW OVERVIEW

Mayor Harrington said okay. Thank you to everyone, and typically we would start with Consent Agenda. We're going to move that to the primary session in chambers, and move directly to our Action Preview, and for that I'd like to turn it over to the City Manager to introduce our Action Preview topic.

Marcus Jones, City Manager said tonight we have one item on Action Preview, and that will be I-77 South Express Lanes project, and so Mayor if there aren't any questions of Council, I'd like to turn it over to our team, the City Attorney, our CFO (Chief Financial Officer), as well as our Deputy City Manager.

Mayor Harrington said and just before we go there, and I'll just jump in briefly just to sort of level set. So, tonight we're taking an important step in ensuring that the City continues a clear, transparent process as we consider our role in the I-77 South Expansion. This evening's presentation is intended to make sure that our community has a clear understanding of the key components of this project, especially those elements that directly intersect with the City's interest and responsibilities. You'll hear information related to the following. Providing a summary of significant activity related to the I-77 South project since the Council's May 2026 action and subsequent State legislation enacted in early July 2026. We will share a factual foundation for the public and Council as you consider the City's position ahead of the CRTPO (Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization) vote on September 23, 2026, and finally staff will provide an overview of the legal framework for Council's consideration of Session Law 2026-41. I'd also point out that we anticipate a public hearing and vote on an action item in this regard a week from today on Monday, September 21, 2026. With that, I'll turn it over to our staff to walk us through the presentation.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 4: ACTION PREVIEW ITEMS

Rebecca Hefner, Deputy City Manager said alright, we're doing a little bit of a tag team presentation this evening. We had planned to stay seated, but I could tell there was a little bit of the audience that want to be able to see us, so please bear with us as we transition between speakers. So, good evening, Mayor and members of Council, Deputy City Manager Rebecca Hefner. I'm joined tonight by City Attorney Andrea Leslie-Fite and our CFO Matt Hastedt. As the Mayor stated, we have three primary

objectives for tonight's presentation. We'll be providing a summary of significant activity related to the I-77 South project since Council's May 2026 action, and the subsequent State legislation enacted in July 2026. Our intention is to provide a common factual basis, both for the public and for Council as you consider the City's position ahead of the CRTPO vote on September 23, 2026, and we will be providing an overview of the legal framework and the new financial consequences established therein related to Session Law 2026-41. I will note as I begin that I started my new role in the City Manager's Office on May 11, 2026. So, this presentation is also a full recounting of everything we've done together since I joined the City Manager's Office. I do want to note that staff are not recommending a position tonight or advocating for a specific recommendation. Our goal is really to ensure that you are equipped with all of the information that you need to discuss and deliberate in preparation for a Council action on the I-77 South Express Lanes that's planned for next Monday, September 21, 2026.

Councilmember Johnson arrived at 5:08 p.m.

So, this timeline, this is the one when I can say Rebecca's start date, May 11, 2026. This timeline illustrates the activities that have occurred since City Council voted to rescind support of the P3 (public/private partnership) funding mechanism on May 11, 2026, including the new actions that have occurred and the new information and inputs that have been received. Significant actions, as you can see in the timeline, include the CRTPO vote on May 20, 2026, to rescind P3 support, subsequently NC-DOT (North Carolina Department of Transportation) stopped work on the project, the subsequent State legislation that was passed July 7, 2026, establishing new financial consequences for municipalities. Attorney Leslie-Fite will share more about that in the presentation. Also, in July 2026, the Secretary of Transportation sent a letter to community stakeholders outlining up to $300 million in community investments if the project resumes. Throughout August 2026 and September 2026, both City Council, at your TPD (Transportation, Planning and Development) Committee meeting and other regional partners in other forums, held discussions really in response to the new State law. CRTPO has scheduled a vote for September 23, 2026, to consider whether to reinstate support for the P3 funding mechanism, and that has established your timeline. Throughout all of this time, staff worked at Council's direction to answer your questions, get clarity from NC-DOT, and provide options to you for further exploration. In addition, the community continued to provide input both to you and to NC-DOT. They engaged in conversations directly with the State and continued to communicate both support for, and opposition to, the project as planned.

This project has a long history, one that I will not belabor here. I will share a few slides of project overview, and I want to convey three kind of key points about the proposed project. The first, the project was proposed as two tolled express lanes, two lanes in each direction, along the 11 miles of Interstate 77 between the South Carolina State Line and Uptown Charlotte. The primary stated objectives are to improve safety and travel reliability and manage congestion, and both CRTPO and City Council approved a public/private partnership as the funding and delivery mechanism for the managed lanes project in October 2024.

So, many stakeholder's concerns and questions that we received from you Council members centered around the exploration of alternatives. Really the question of, is this the best project? In response to that question, NC-DOT did share an I-77 South Alternatives Analysis Summary with City Council in August 2026, and most of the alternatives reviewed by NC-DOT included managed lanes, and that was per the project definition in the State Transportation Improvement Plan, also known as the STIP. The no-build and transit options, the first two here on the list, were determined not feasible to meet the project objectives, again, the managed congestion and improve safety and improve travel time reliability. However, the analysis notes CATS (Charlotte Area Transit System), but in this case MPTA (Metropolitan Public Transportation Authority), transit vehicles would use the express lanes for free and then experience reliable travel time. So, they've characterized the express lane as being able to function as a bus rapid transit route. The remainder of the alternatives studied are essentially design

alternatives. So, NC-DOT reviewed multiple at-grade widening options, an elevated option, a tunneling option, and a community connectivity option.

In the resolution that City Council passed in May 2026, you called for an independent alternatives analysis, and you asked for that to include multiple options beyond the managed lanes that would include multimodal, non-highway, and transportation demand management strategies. Staff explored this request but ultimately determined there was not sufficient time to procure and complete a comprehensive and credible alternatives analysis in the current timeframe. So, as we're going through the presentation tonight, I'm trying to highlight both the things that we know, and the things that you've asked and we haven't been able to answer.

Additional components of the project design create an opportunity for what NC-DOT calls reconnecting the corridor. So, I wanted to share reflection on the TPD Committee Meeting in May 2026. City staff at that meeting provided an assessment of the proposed project, and shared with you that the multimodal investments that are included in the project, plus additional community investment opportunities, advance City goals related to safety, accessibility, connectivity, and transit access. So, there's a lot on this slide, but bear with me here. This includes the base project design, which is the middle section here on bridges. Seventeen of 22 bridges and over or under passes are proposed to be replaced as part of the project, and the reconnecting the corridor conceptual designs that NC-DOT has proposed as part of the additional community investment, which are the bullets down at the bottom. So, you can see this information on the bridges reshares the information that staff provided at your May 2026 TPD Meeting. NC-DOT, subsequent to that, developed six conceptual designs to reconnect the corridor where it was split when I-77 was initially constructed. I know we have some engineers on team Council here, but I did learn through this process that an engineering concept is a design that can be feasibly constructed, so these are opportunities that are feasible. So, the concepts include cap structures, pedestrian and bicycle stitches, landscaped crossings, and the six concepts were developed in response to community input that was gathered through NC-DOT's engagement process. Each concept addresses a specific location along the corridor that you can see here, the variety of opportunities that have been identified at Oaklawn, West 5th Street, West Trade Street, Revolution Park, and Remount Road, in addition to the long cap between West 5th Street and West Trade Street.

I'll also note, I should have done this at the beginning, I have included on all of the slides the information source for where these details are gathered from for a couple of reasons. One, so that everyone can access those original sources, but also as a reminder that much of this presentation is sharing information that has been generated and shared by NC-DOT. I will make it clear when I'm adding staff analysis into the mix.

This slide shows the overall proposed investment in the corridor. So, overall, NC-DOT has proposed an investment up to $1 billion, which is comprised of up to $600 million of State transportation funding that is accessed because the project is funded as part of the STIP, up to $100 million in what's called bonus allocation. For other eligible roadway projects, the bonus allocation is a part of the State Transportation Investments Law that provides additional funding for projects that are funded by tolling, and then the up to $300 million in additional community investment as outlined in Secretary Johnson's letter to the community, which we'll talk more about those components in a moment.

As noted earlier, there was interest in an independent alternatives analysis, but insufficient time to procure such, and so at Council's request, staff are preparing an existing conditions analysis for you. This analysis is intended to update the baseline data related to the I-77 South corridor, describe how the corridor is used today, and describe what travel demand is expected to be in the future. I will tell you, staff are furiously working on this to get you something in this timeframe, and the full draft report will be shared with you later this week in your packets, but just a couple of key points I can pull out for you are all things that we would expect. First, I-77 connects a large and diverse set of communities, jobs, and destinations. It serves a mix of both local and regional travel needs. Trips on I-77 tend to be longer and connect destinations across a

broader geography than trips on the nearby parallel arterials, such as South Boulevard and South Tryon. One of things the team is looking at is, are there other opportunities to meet travel demand on parallel routes. They note that continued population and employment growth will increase demand for connections across the corridor. Right now, the corridor supports a range of trip purposes, so they're looking at origin and destination data. I'm just going to say to all my fellow data nerds on Council, this is a really fascinating report that they're working on, taking a look at origins and destinations, and I think it's going to be very useful to you as you deliberate, but there's really a range of trip purposes, work, school, shopping, other daily activities, and essentially as many of us experience, traffic demand for I-77 far exceeds capacity both now and into the future.

Staff are also taking a look, under this bullet around community connections, at the proposed multimodal improvements. They're doing some preliminary analysis on the bridge projects of potential associated roadway investments that could be funded through the bonus allocation. Their initial findings indicate that those projects do increase accessibility, neighborhood connectivity, safety, walking and biking access to adjacent neighborhoods. So, I'm pleased that we will be able to get you something more on that later this week, but I wanted to give you a little bit of a sneak peek into what's coming. So, at this point, I'd like to hand the presentation to City Attorney Leslie-Fite, and CFO Matt Hastedt to review legislative provisions and related financial considerations.

Andrea Leslie-Fite, City Attorney said thank you, DCM (Deputy City Manager) Hefner, Mayor, members of Council. Session Law 2026-41 requires local governments to reimburse NC-DOT for preliminary costs incurred by NC-DOT. At this point, NC-DOT has identified preliminary costs dating back to 2018 in the amount of $69,577,547.67. We'll talk a little bit more about that some a little bit later in the presentation.

Reimbursement is triggered in one of two ways. First, by taking a unilateral action to remove the project from the transportation improvement plan, or two, preventing the project from being delivered as originally programmed. Reimbursement would be based upon the weighted vote. The City of Charlotte holds 31 percent of the vote. The legislation also contemplates withholding Powell Bill funding and new STIP projects until the predevelopment funds are repaid. The legislation would eliminate, and does eliminate, the need for NC-DOT to pursue additional legal action in order to secure these funds. This legislation also exempts local governments who choose to vote to reinstate the project on or before October 5, 2026.

The CRTPO Chair has scheduled a vote for September 23, 2026, for members to consider whether to reinstate support for the P3 funding mechanism of the project. Per State legislation, the repayment provision is based on the weighted vote of those jurisdictions who vote to remove their support. Members voting to rescind support May 20, 2026, were Charlotte, Cornelius, Davidson, Huntersville, Matthews, Mecklenburg County, Mint Hill, Monroe, and the MTC (Metropolitan Transit Commission), for a total of 47 weighted votes. Member jurisdictions have been discussing this and deliberating. Some have already signaled an intent to reinstate. City Council will have an opportunity to consider this in its next meeting scheduled for September 21, 2026. The business item will be placed on Council's agenda for consideration, and the RCA (Request for Council Action) will be broken up into two parts. Please note that this RCA is tracking with the legislative language and is not intended to drive a particular outcome, but instead to match the legislative language in the budget bill. So, specifically, item one would be in accordance with Section 43.27(d) of Session Law 2026-41, "Conduct a vote on whether to reinstate support of the public/private partnership, P3, for the I-77 South Lanes Expansion Project," and two, or item B, "Direct City Council's CRTPO Representative to cast a vote on behalf of the City of Charlotte on whether to reinstate support of the P3 at the Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization." Members of the public will have an opportunity to sign up to speak to the item with the Clerk's Office, as is the standard practice, after the agenda is published.

Let's talk a little bit about the repayment provision. Session Law 2026-41 does not direct or prohibit sources of funding for repayment. Limitations within the PAVE (Projects for Advancing Vehicle-Infrastructure Enhancements) Act do likely prohibit using the funds for that purpose. PAVE Act funds are what we call use-restricted funds. In other words, they are limited to being used for costs associated with financing, constructing, operating, or maintaining road systems. The cleanest and most defensible path is to use unrestricted dollars for repayment as described by the PAVE Act. At this time, I will turn the floor over to our CFO to talk about what some of those options may entail.

Matthew Hastedt, Chief Financial Officer said thank you, Andrea. Matt Hastedt, CFO. Thank you, Mayor, Council, and City Manager for the opportunity today. So, in looking at the unrestricted funds, the primary source we are currently looking at is the Municipal Debt Service Fund, which is what is used to support our steady state debt model, and as Council remembers we sort of broke that out into two steady state models as a part of this last budget, one being for transportation which is primarily funded by the PAVE Act which as City Attorney Andrea Leslie-Fite just said is not something that we should be looking at. So, the other steady state model is our affordable housing and public facilities. So, as of our FY (Fiscal Year) 2025 Financial Statement, our fund balance in the Municipal Debt Service Fund that we could look for this was approximately $171 million with about $161 million of that being sort of cash and cash equivalent, and much of that is restricted by either state statute or as a part of our Equipment Financing Loan Program. So, we have approximately about $55 million to $56 million that is available for appropriation, and I do want to say that's available for appropriation. That does not mean that it is free and clear, it just means that it is not needed today or next year for the current sort of bond cycle, but it is programmed for future referendums to support the affordable housing program or a public facilities program.

So, as we reviewed just a moment ago, the total NC-DOT reported expenses is approximately $69 million. The City's portion of that could be anywhere from about $59 million to $69 million, and we're going to walk through a little bit of what some of those implications could be. So, as I said, the $55 million or so that is available for appropriation essentially requires us to find another source for that money long term. So, we either have to raise revenue or cut expenses going forward. So, if we were to repay that money and using an approximate $60 million just as a round figure for discussion today, it would require us to raise property taxes in perpetuity, starting with the FY2028 Budget, approximately $0.01. So, that would generate about $2.35 million. So, an alternative would be to reallocate approximately $2.35 million from the existing General Fund or PAYGO (Pay-As-You-Go) revenue sources to refill the Debt Service bucket, or to reduce expenses, we could look at reducing the affordable bond package. So, going forward, the adopted steady state for City Council was $100 million every other year with the bond package starting in calendar year 2028. That would approximately be lowered down to $92 million in perpetuity, or a public facility funding would go from about $45 million a year to $41 million a year. One thing I do want to stress is that that is an approximation, because steady state debt modeling is always done as a point in time, and we don't know what interest rates will be next year. We don't know what revenue projections will be next year. So, as we get into next year's budget or future year's budget, that sort of adjustment could be a little bit up or down as many may see that the Fed is considering a rate increase in just a couple weeks. No one had that on the table a year ago at this time. Everyone was expecting rates to go down. So, we always have to be reactionary to where we are in the current environment, and also we can always do a combination of these.

A couple of things I do just want to point out just as we're looking at this is, there are some additional considerations that I think are important for City Council. One of those is rating agency considerations. As our debt burden continues to grow as a city, one of the things that's very critical for us is our available fund balance, and that is our ability to just sort of remain liquid and meet our obligations. So, any significant spend down of our fund balance would certainly require a conversation with the rating agencies. Now, this is a one-time expense and not for operating, so those are sort of discussions that can't be had, but anytime you're spending down a fund balance to that level it could generate questions. It also would restrict our ability to respond to an emergency perhaps. When

we had the large SouthPark fire, we used some of the Debt Service Fund balance to buy fire trucks that were immediately needed, so that way we could address the community's need right away. So, our ability to do some of those quick responses would be restricted. Then, one last one I wanted to just discuss without going too far into the weeds is the concept of a contingent liability. I know that we have some accountants on the Council, and just as an example, one of the things we do every year with our external auditor and our financial reporting team and our City Attorney's Office is look at any type of pending litigation or any of those types of things. So, it may be a situation where we try to challenge this ruling, but if it is more likely than not that we still may have to pay it at some time, the external auditors may require us to actually expense this on our balance sheet before the end of the fiscal year, which means that we still may be in a position where our fund balance on paper has significantly dropped, so rating agency considerations would still be in consideration. We may have to look at doing things like property tax or adjusting to the steady state. Even if no dollars have actually gone out the door, from an actual accounting point of view, that money would now be restricted and not be eligible for any other use, so it'd be the same as us having written sort of the check out the door. So, we still may have to have some of those considerations. With that, Andrea, I'll turn it back to you.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said thank you, Mr. Hastedt. The City would argue that NC-DOT's expenses to CRTPO's jurisdiction should only date back to 2024 with CRTPO's adoption of the resolution supporting the P3. The City continues, and will continue to, explore all available legal remedies to address the legislation. There have been a number of questions in the community about how these funds would be paid in addition to, could the City of Charlotte pay the penalty for another jurisdiction? Under North Carolina Law, every expenditure of a city's fund must serve the public purpose, and two, be the primary benefit that flows to the city's own citizens. In other words, paying any sort of penalty or reimbursement for another jurisdiction's penalties or citizens, would be a violation of the North Carolina Constitution. A city paying a fine for another municipality would be for the primary benefit of those citizens rather than the benefit of the citizens of Charlotte. At this time, I will turn it back over to Rebecca.

Ms. Hefner said so, City Attorney Leslie-Fite and CFO Matt Hastedt have shared some of the considerations if CRTPO does not reinstate support for the P3. I'm going to walk through just a couple of items related to what happens if CRTPO does reinstate support for the P3. So, NC-DOT will resume the project following the steps that they had outlined initially as part of the project schedule, but also in alignment with specific commitments that NC-DOT has incorporated either into the RFQ (Request for Qualifications) for the project or committed to the community. So, this slide illustrates some of those activities, which include continuation of environmental analysis, under the need for process, Matt's including evaluation of property and project level environment impacts, and also the associated mitigations that would be required either under NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) or under other related federal requirements. So, this is one that I can tell you I am very familiar with from my work in housing, because we do this every time you make an investment in housing with federal dollars. NC-DOT will also continue community engagement, and I'll note for you that NC-DOT has committed to the requests that were made in City Council's May 2026 resolution, including collaboration with regional partners on community engagement, and designating a community liaison within the City's Community Relations Department.

The RFP (Request for Proposal) process would also resume, and that includes multiple rounds of RFP's that are working towards a competitive design bid submission, and each of those rounds would be inclusive of community input, and finally incorporating commitments that have been made both within the draft RFP and by NC-DOT since May 2026, that includes the CRTPO priority terms, the additional community investments, and accountability.

So, this slide outlines the 15 priority terms designated with the CRTPO workgroup. They are codified in the Request For Qualifications from NC-DOT, actually in Appendix 3, and also in the NC-DOT indicative terms sheet. So, these are all available as part of the procurement information on NC-DOT's website. The priority terms are guidelines for the

implementation of the managed toll lanes, and they cover provisions such as toll rate caps and thresholds, free lane usage for transit and high occupancy vehicles, that's known as HOV3+, toll discounts for low-income residents, emergency vehicle usage of express lanes for free, some commercial truck regulations, and small business outreach. So, you'll note that some of these items are a little bit different from the way that the tolls are currently operating on I-77 North. It was a really important piece of the CRTPO working group, and priority terms was to make sure that as a community we would be able to learn from what was done on I-77 North, and ensure more transparency and accessibility on the managed lanes.

As referenced earlier in the presentation, the project's funding and delivery model allows for up to $300 million in additional community investment. This commitment was made in a letter sent from NC-DOT's Secretary Johnson to community stakeholders on July 28, 2026. In the letter, Secretary Johnson outlined opportunities to invest in the community under the pillars of economic mobility, neighborhood stability and housing, reconnecting the corridor, environment, health and green space, and quality of life. No specific projects were outlined in the letter, but NC-DOT has identified a process for establishing community priorities if the project resumes. One of the primary concerns that we've heard from community and questions from Council has been related to the enforceability of these commitments and accountability over the course of the project if it resumes. So, I'll ask Attorney Leslie-Fite to discuss the opportunities that exist for the City to partner with NC-DOT to ensure accountability.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said so, as we continue to have this conversation about exploring accountability, there is an opportunity to explore an agreement with NC-DOT that would memorialize the project commitments with an emphasis on reconnecting communities, including outlining and addressing the total funding commitment and funding sources, the schedule for making funds available, the entities responsible for project development and delivery, procedures for community participation and public review, addressing challenges created by connecting the corridor, incorporating projects and objectives that focus on improving access to daily needs such as jobs, education, healthcare, food, nature and recreation, and foster development and restoration. Of note, here the key would be to connect this framework as well as the community benefit plan to reconnecting communities, which is outlined under the Federal Highway Administration's Reconnecting Communities framework. The ultimate contract that would codify many of these commitments, particularly those related to the financial components, would be incorporated in the RFP and ultimately in the final contract with the developer.

Ms. Hefner said alright, we're almost there. So, I want to note about community input. So, City Council, we talked in August 2026, at the TPD Committee about the potential for community engagement, and again ultimately decided we were in quite a time crunch and did not move that forward, but you have received a lot of community input on this topic. So, NC-DOT collected and published summaries of the community feedback shared in their public meetings about the project last November 2025. City staff have conducted a cursory review of constituent input that was shared during public forums earlier this year, as well as in constituent correspondence. So, in a quick review of that information, the feedback has been mostly opposed to the I-77 South toll lanes, and the majority of the concerns expressed in those forums centered on toll affordability, private toll operations, neighborhood harms, displacement risk, state financial considerations, and a perceived lack of a transparent public process. However, you have received comments supporting moving the project forward as well, and those messages emphasize worsening congestion, regional growth, available funding, the value of the express lanes, the risk of damaging Charlotte's relationship with NC-DOT, and the opportunity for additional community benefit and investment. In addition, I will note many community stakeholders have provided input directly to NC-DOT, including the community impact framework that was submitted by Reverend Mack of NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), and Rickey Hall of the West Boulevard Neighborhood Association. There may be others that were submitted that I have not seen, and I'm sure if that's the case, I will find out about them shortly after this presentation. The community impact framework asks City Council and CRTPO

to preserve the project delivery path and establish a clear process for developing, evaluating, and tracking an attainable corridor benefits package. So, what staff plans to do is complete a summary of all of the community input that we have seen, that we can compile and share with you all later this week as you consider and deliberate.

This final slide just compares the information that is known and the information that is unknown or incomplete. So, what has been provided or what's known includes the project preliminary design, alternatives reviewed, reconnecting the corridor concepts, the requirements of NEPA including residential acquisition and relocation, the CRTPO priority terms, the general outline of community benefits that could be available, and the range of financial consequences as well. Some of the things that are unknown, have not been studied, or are not yet known, are a study of the specific alternatives to managed lanes, the marginal benefit of each segment. We've heard asked a couple of times the measurable comparison of harms and benefits, and then what are the specific investment amounts and projects eligible for community benefit investment.

So, I want to thank you all for your time and your patience as we walked through this. Our goal is really to ensure that you all and the public have a comprehensive understanding of what has occurred, what new information is available, what's known versus what's unknown, and the potential legal, financial, and community implications of the decision that's before you next week. So, with that, I'll turn it back to Mayor Harrington.

Mayor Harrington said thank you, staff, for that presentation, and for putting all that into approximately 40 minutes. We have about 50 minutes, I'm being kind of generous, but about 50 minutes before we're scheduled to start our meeting in chambers for the rest of our business. I know several Council members likely have questions. What I intend to do is to start to my left with Councilmember Owens, we'll go around, we'll come back around on the other side and go around. Mayor Pro Tem has asked to address it last. In the interest of time, I'm asking if we can hold our comments and questions to somewhere between four and five minutes, so that we're not too late getting down to folks who are waiting for us in chambers. So, if we can try to hold to that time limit of four to five minutes, preferably four, that would be great, so we can not have folks waiting in chambers too long. Obviously, feel free to pass if you don't have questions, but I want to make that we're able to proceed orderly.

Councilmember Owens said I don't really have as many questions as I just want to sort of level set my understanding of what I've just heard. So, I've spoken with a number of ya'll previously about how every vote we take up here requires a leap of faith. We take information as we're given it by staff, and we bring our lived experiences, and without the ability to see the future we make the best decision we can. For me, at least, I always assume good intentions and good faith out of counterparties. I just want to be very clear that this moment, the path that we've been on, the path that we've taken since the resolution, and then the rescission, the path has really made it much harder for me to make that leap of faith. That assumption of good faith is harder for me to reconcile now. Just to put a finer point on it, quite simply the Sawyer Amendment has not inspired in me a great deal of confidence in a good faith partnership that we have with the State, and that is something that's really sitting with me. It makes phrases like I've just seen here where it says, up to, that makes that unacceptable to me. It cannot be up to, it has to be a defined amount. It makes me want to lean in even further than the slide that we just saw that goes through the CRTPO priority terms, and it makes me want to shoehorn in as many additional elements of certainty as we can into what is now a contract process with a partner whose intentions seem cloudy, at best. Still, I believe in staying at the table. I know that will be a frustration to many of the people who have told me they really want me to go with a rescission. This isn't easy, and I'm not where I am because I trust everything that's been said, but I am where I am, because walking away surrenders our ability to shape this project. This is a project that's going to define West Charlotte for generations to come, and doing nothing on this corridor leaves it I believe truly vulnerable to a cycle of harm that we have seen before and that these communities have already endured, and I just simply can't in good conscience do that.

To be clear, though, being at the table for me doesn't mean I'm accepting this project as is. I want to fight for a better one. Some specific concrete things that I've shared with staff and with some of my colleagues, and I've referred to it just now is trying to shoehorn it into the priority terms. I do want to see a focused alternatives and design challenge. I am truly hopeful that we do still have four counterparties still willing to bid on this project, that our dithering on this has not caused us to lose the potential for a true competitive process to yield a better result for the people. I am pushing to make displacement avoidance a pass/fail requirement, not just a nice to have. I'd like to see a reconnected corridor plan. The bridges and everything that we saw in here, I want to see that happen. I want to see some durable community assets, and for me that comes down to accountability, and accountability is one of these slides, and I'm delighted to see it. What we need is binding commitments with clear timelines, responsible parties, and real remedies. I need independent monitoring. I need to believe that we still have a seat at this table as this goes forward and Community Oversight Committee. I need degrees of toll equity. I mean, there are a number of things that I think fit into the broad concepts that are there, but at the end of the day this is really hard, and I feel this moment of like Charlie with the football. I really hope that the leap of faith that I'm letting myself take, based on conversations with the Mayor, based on conversations with staff, based on conversations with our North Carolina Delegation, I am just really hopeful that this is a leap of faith that is worth it, because God love you, this is a hard one. This is not an easy corridor to manage and to fix, because it has been wronged so many times, and this project has been so mismanaged, but I am willing to get back at the table, and I really appreciate the presentation.

Councilmember Graham said over the last eight weeks, I guess, since July 2026, I've been involved, and I don't have any questions, so I'm questioned out, but I've been meeting with a wide variety of stakeholders from the Governor's Office, this legal team, Senate leadership, just recently all the Mayors directly or indirectly with the small towns around us, a number of community meetings, and my district meetings and Councilmember Mayo's district, NAACP Alliance members. Anyone who called about this issue, I took the call and gave some honest decision. My job is to protect the citizens of West Charlotte, and based on my conversations with a number of stakeholders, I believe the small towns [inaudible] and others are repositioning their votes in favor of moving the project forward. That is their right, their decision to do so, but I told some of the Mayors, I'm not here to tell them what to do and I'm not willing to pay their legal fees or any fines associated with their reversal, that is not Charlotte's responsibility.

As the Chairman of the Budget Committee, I can tell the citizens that we don't have $60 million or $70 million lying around. I am not willing to raise taxes to pay that fee. I'm not willing to jeopardize bonds and our rating to do that. As a member of the State Senate for 10 years, and Chairman of the Delegation for three, I clearly understand how Raleigh works. I believe the state budget provision requiring repayment is both unconstitutional and an affront to due process. It punishes an elected body for exercising its democracy, and its authority on behalf of the constituents. That is damn wrong, I get it, I understand it. However, suing the State makes no sense either.

We have a number of priorities as a city before state government that we have to get through over the next year and a half. For an example, we need to expand the HTA (Hospitality & Tourism Alliance) hospitality tax if we're going to do any economic development projects over the next two to three years. There's NC-DOT projects throughout the City that are funded now and some are pending that we need their help. I am not willing to lose the airport. It's been the hallmark of our community for decades.

We're better together as a city and a state, and we have to work it out. A lawsuit poisons that relationship for sure, and even if we win, we lose. The better path for fighting the state is at the ballot box. We have to win elections. We cannot win in court. If the project moves forward, community benefits must be binding, must be binding, must be binding. Small business owners should be a part of this. It needs to be in writing, legally binding, and any benefits paid at closing with the selected developer up front, in writing, signed by those who are in charge. Homeowners displaced by

construction must be compensated at above fair market rate. Renters must be relocated to housing of equal or of greater standard at no cost to them. Small business owners must relocate and are entitled to full relocation expenses, and business interruption must be compensated as well. All compensation must be paid at closing again, not a promise later. There's much talk about Secretary Johnson's letter about community benefits. The truth of the matter is.

Mayor Harrington said Councilmember Graham, just to let you know you're right at about five minutes, and I want to make sure we have time.

Mr. Graham said I'll take two more, thank you.

Mayor Harrington said then everybody else is going to going forward be late.

Mr. Graham said I gotcha, I gotcha. This is the first time we talked about this in weeks, months. Many of the points in Secretary Johnson's letter were outlined by the Council in April 2026 and May 2026. They aren't new, they were just reframed and redistributed. So, I agree that we should do all that, Mr. Mayor, and it should be binding. I believe that we should do the grocery stores, that we should ask for far greater than that, far greater than that for sure. We need a community advisory board. We need oversight. We need a commitment from the State, and we have to work to get there together. So, I will pause the rest of my remarks. It doesn't mean that I've made a decision, but I'm telling the community what it needs to know versus what it wants to hear. No one is going to get 100 percent of what they want. No one is going to get 100 percent. If we wait five years, the same issues that we're dealing with today will be there five years from now. The road will not be moved. The history will not change. The congestion will get worse. So, this is a defining moment for our community, and we have to make the appropriate decisions. I'm certainly willing to listen more, talk more, but this is a tough decision, Councilmember Owens, and it's one that we must take seriously. Again, I understand both perspectives as a Council member and a former State Senator, and the issues that we have with our state. Thank you.

Mayor Harrington said thank you, Councilmember Graham. Just an alert. We are going to break right at around 6:30 p.m. If we need to come back tonight to finish this, because we're unable to work within time limits, we'll end up having to do that, but I do not want people waiting in the chamber for some period of time while we finish. So, to the extent we can hold our time as requested, I think that will help with the public that's waiting in the chamber.

Councilmember Driggs said Councilmember Graham, I appreciate your remarks and your explanation of the difficulty here. My position has been hard. I was on CRTPO. I participated in the entire runup to this decision. Most of my motivation has been fear of having nothing in the end. So, I accept that the opponents have driven a hard bargain so far, have drawn a lot of attention to things that NC-DOT didn't pay enough attention to. We do have now a commitment from NC-DOT that is different from before because it's a letter and it's in writing. For a long time, the problem was that all we had were conversations and everybody thought, well, what does that mean? There was no number around the community benefits, and I told them myself, you can't hope that people will buy into community benefits if you don't say what they are. So, the news in the letter was, we got this number, $300 million. Now we're needing to look and see what does it mean? What kind of commitment can we get? What does it buy?

The concern I have here is that there is, I think, a lack of clarity as to whether what we're talking about is driving a harder bargain going ahead, but getting better terms, or there are some people who say, just say no, don't do it, and that's the thing I'm afraid of. I think the need to do something along that corridor is critical. I think the opportunity for the communities along the corridor is substantial, and therefore, my position the whole time has not been to dispute in any way the shortcomings of NC-DOT or the needs of West Charlotte. I just have in my mind this possibility that we end up with nothing. We need to be clear too, if we can't get there next week then what comes after that? That has also been I think part of the uncertainty in that there's another 90-day window in the

bill. So, does that mean that we have 90 days longer after that until it comes out of the STIP, in which we can still work on this? My feeling about that is, I'm not sure. I think it's possible that the bidders, if they see another no vote from CRTPO will go, woah, and there was some question as to whether the CRTPO could get it done without Charlotte. That would be a bad result. The community in which the entire project is to take place doesn't support it. Really not a place you want to go.

So, it's a tough one, and I understand that people are under pressure and it's hard. I'm in a relatively fortunate position because nobody's looking to me. So, I can be clear about what I want, but really what I want is simply that we get the benefit of this opportunity, that's it, and understand exactly what the meaning is of what we do next week, and not find ourselves in a position of being surprised that suddenly no one is talking to us anymore, and the entire project has moved back five or 10 years. So, I hope we can figure this out in the coming week.

Councilmember Mayfield said thank you, staff. So, what I'm looking at is to level set. So, public record, Agenda Item No. 15, October 14, 2024, where we had our I-77 South Express Lanes project, the explanation. The project was initially identified in 2007. In 2024, 2025, 2026, it was a very different Charlotte than it was in 2007, but that was when it was adopted as a project for State funding by the Charlotte Regional Transportation Organization, CRTPO, and in 2014 as part of the regions plan for transportation investment to manage congestion, increase safety support, continue economic growth. Drop down three bullets, the P3 delivery model is a long-term partnership in which NC-DOT will select a private developer to design, build, finance, operate, and maintain a project under a design, build, finance, operate, and maintain agreement. If a P3 option is selected, project development could continue as the comparative analysis indicates that the $600 million in State Transportation Improvement Program, the STIP funding, is likely sufficient to fund any necessary public contribution for the project. NC-DOT would work with CRTPO to define key objectives and priorities that would help perform initial key contract terms. If CRTPO votes to support a P3 delivery option, next steps would include CRTPO creates a working group consisting of CRTPO board members and their designees, to partner with NC-DOT, to develop project objectives and priorities to inform indicative terms to be included in the RFQ, including applicable participation goals in collaboration with the Office of Historically Underutilized Businesses in the Department of Administration for the State of North Carolina. Once NC-DOT drafts the key terms, CRTPO will have 60 days to review prior to any public advertisement. CRTPO can rescind support of the P3 at any point up until the NC-DOT issues the RFQ.

Now, one of our local papers, WFAE, did an article that was dated February 23, 2026, on 'Masterful Bureaucratic 'Bait and Switch' on I-77 Toll Lanes", in which this article they note that our representative Driggs, who's a 13-year Council veteran stated, as our one-point person on transportation, Councilmember Ed Driggs reassured them that an upcoming vote will only be one small step. There would still be time to reverse course and back out. Here is what was said, October 14, 2024, meeting. "If there's a moment when we feel that all of the parties are aligned, and then I would come to Council and say, here is where we are. Now is the time we can decide whether or not we want to move ahead, we won't be under any obligation. Bear in mind, sometimes you can get these early votes, and then later on you don't feel like you have a choice." Threatening us with a lawsuit kind of makes me feel like I don't have a choice. "There's nothing to stop us in nine months from looking at whatever comes out of this process and just saying no, not going to do it." The fine print of the I-77 proposal showed that Charlotte City Council wouldn't actually have that much or any flexibility to say no, but what was presented to Council in the presentation was a conversation regarding having our representative move forward in vote to discuss what a P3 would look like. I have clear concerns that once we voted, and community reached out to us with multiple concerns, and let's not forget that some of our residents woke up to representatives from NC-DOT literally walking through their yards, marking up their yards, with no communication, no phone call, no community discussion, and that is what triggered a bigger conversation, but we were told we had the ability to go in. After that dude spoke for 10 minutes, I ain't messing with you.

Mayor Harrington said Council member, we're at about six minutes, so.

Ms. Mayfield said the concern that I am identifying, lays the foundation of me personally having absolutely no faith in the leadership that is coming out of this Governor's Office, because it is his NC-DOT. So, NC-DOT has not shown any effort to be a good partner. We need to make sure that we have facts, and I am concerned that we just received a 20-plus minute presentation on the why of let's move forward with this and hope for the best. There is no hoping for the best with individuals that will turn around when we are representing our representatives and say, well, because of that we're going to sue you and we're going to back to 2018 and we are not going to give you a line-by-line accounting for how they have mismanaged funds.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said I think we all do share the same fundamental goal here, which is we do need to relieve congestion, make our roads safer, make this corridor safer, and protect working families and small businesses. We also, I believe, share that commitment to ensuring that historical harms are not repeated, and that the Black community never again bears the brunt of top-down decisions, but we find ourselves here once again. My opposition to this project has never been about rejecting community benefits. Actually, it was quite the contrary. If you watch that May 11, 2026 meeting, we made it clear that we voted to rescind this project because we thought there was an opportunity to go back to the table, to the drawing board, and make a fair project for the residents of that community. It wasn't for us to walk away from progress. It was to go back to the drawing board and get it right. If we're going to talk about community benefits that we just heard, I simply cannot believe that they should be vague promises or passing thoughts. When the RFP is issued, because it now very much seems like we're going to rescind our rescission, there has to be a signed, sealed, and delivered document that delivers those community benefits. It must explicitly require them from the bidders. An RFP that does not require it, what are we doing? Three-hundred million dollars that are going to soon disappear because inflation is going to go up, construction costs will go up. I don't know how many excuses my District and District Five I've heard about infrastructure projects that I've mentioned to you, Manager Jones, that have not been delivered in my district for 14 years. One example is Norland Road that now has been half completed because of rising costs.

That is why I do believe that the State's penalty is so disheartening, because we made it clear that night that we were trying to work in good faith. It is deeply unfortunate that local municipalities are being penalized simply for wanting a better project, and to continue the conversation. This is a direct result of local leaders of our State Legislature being pressured by corporate interests and State mandates for trying to protect their own residents. It undermines our local control and the democratic voice of our community, and it is frustrating that every single time one of us speaks up for our community, and private interest are in disagreement with that, a provision in the State's budget or the Omnibus Bill or other Bills, Amendments are passed just to shut our voices. We were duly elected by the residents of Charlotte to do our job, and it seems like we cannot do our job to protect our residents because then we are presented with an ultimatum, either raise our taxes and burden our residents, or pass the project. I may not support this project, but I do support this community. I do think it's time for Charlotte to wake up, stand together, go and vote in these elections because they matter, and demand that our elected voices are respected in our own backyard and not bought by others. It's just unfortunate that we're here, and I wish we weren't. I wish we had a good faith conversation with Raleigh and with folks that really wanted this project to be done, instead of having a last minute amendment done and passed in our State Legislature, just like other things have been passed in our State Legislature recently. Thank you.

Councilmember Johnson said we should all be clear that this all started because we represented we the people. It's said that it's a small vocal subset group that is opposed to the toll lanes. Mr. Manager, I'd like to see some poll of Charlotte's citizens. If there is a way that we could do a survey either on our web page where individuals could only vote once, if we could hear from public as a whole instead of the targeted poll that's been done. The City has not asked how many citizens support this. This is not a small subset of people. I've not heard anyone, other than the business community, who

supports it. Can I ask the Attorney some questions? One of the slides, I want to understand that if we don't move forward, property taxes could be raised, and affordable housing would be reduced, is that correct?

Ms. Leslie Fite said [inaudible].

Mr. Hastedt said yes. That would be to basically replenish the funds that would be required to use to do the repayment. So, we would have to essential make those up in some way, either by raising revenues or reducing.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you. Okay, so this question is for the City Attorney. City Attorney, is this State Law constitutional and legal?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said Councilmember Johnson, as I stated in the slide, there are a number of concerns that we have with the legislation that we would preserve the right to defend the City regarding the legislation, but yes, there are a number of concerns.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you. Can the State retroactively impose a nearly $70 million financial penalty for an action that was lawful when we took it?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said again, Councilmember Johnson, there are number of defenses that we would reserve the right to raise regarding this legislation.

Ms. Johnson said okay. Were we contractually obligated to pay these penalties at the time that we voted?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said there is no contract between the City of Charlotte and any of the developers or vendors associated with NC-DOT related to this project that I'm aware of.

Ms. Johnson said are we contractually obligated now?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said again, not that I'm aware of. We would engage in discovery and additional public records to determine if that is the case.

Ms. Johnson said what responsibility does the State have to ensure that the community benefits are satisfied? The developers are responsible, I think, for completing them. What responsibility will the State have to ensure that they're completed?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said at this time, there is no agreement or requirement by NC-DOT. However, this process is still evolving, and so the RFP would be the binding document, and then a subsequent agreement would be drafted and signed to allow for the commitments to move forward.

Ms. Johnson said okay, we got a short answer [inaudible] to move forward. Thank you. So, governments change transportation plans all the time. I believe more than $50 million was spent for the Matthews Silver Line Extension, and then recently there was money spent for Wilmington when the planners or jurisdiction changed their mind. Why is 77 different? Does anyone know? Okay, that's fine, we'll just leave that out there.

I'll just say this, our Code of Ethics requires us to faithfully perform our duties and responsibly exercise the public's trust. If Charlotte was never contractually obligated to pay these costs, and legitimate constitutional and legal questions remain, don't we as leaders have an ethical responsibility as stewards of taxpayer dollars to challenge the $70 million demand before we pay $1?

Ms. Leslie-Fite said is that a question?

Ms. Johnson said yes.

Ms. Leslie-Fite said the Council has the authority and the right to direct its staff and its City Attorney to move forward with any legal requirements that it would see fit to do. I

will say this legislation is, as I alluded to in the presentation, there are number of concerns. We will continue to explore those, including as I mentioned, the 2024 resolution that began the time period which Council would've expected to be responsible for funds.

Mayor Harrington said Councilmember Johnson, just to let you know, we're right at about six minutes, and we're almost at 6:15 p.m.

Ms. Johnson said I'm at six minutes, okay. We don't have any dates for the $70 million. We rescinded this in 2024. These expenses go back to 2018. I don't know anyone on this Council or anyone in this room that wouldn't challenge someone that says, you owe money, or $70 million, for something you weren't contractually obligated to. Then, we heard the words, unconstitutional and illegal. Every one of us on this dais are here because someone challenged a lack of constitution and illegality, except for Councilmember Driggs. There's black, brown, women we're here, and our ancestors and leaders fought the State when things were unconstitutional and illegal. I think we as leaders have a responsibility. Yesterday, my Pastor "preached on the scripture of 1 Corinthians 16.

Mayor Harrington said Councilmember Johnson, we're at 6:15 p.m., so we've got 15 minutes left for the rest of the Council.

Ms. Johnson said and I know, I know, but this is important. We waited months. This is so wrong that we haven't talked about this. So, I'll concede, but I just think we must carefully stand firm, be brave enough to ask tough questions, and be strong enough to protect our citizens who entrusted us with their tax dollars. Thank you.

Councilmember Watlington said thank you. Councilmember Johnson, were you finished, because I'm happy to yield a minute or two of my time if there was something else?

Ms. Johnson said thank you [inaudible].

Dr. Watlington said you're good?

Ms. Johnson said thank you.

Dr. Watlington said thank you. Mine is relatively short. I mean, neighbors this is a case study in what not to do. We have completely lost the plot. If we sit here today as government for regional planning, for improving the quality of life of our residents and our neighbors, we're in trouble. To be clear, the relationship with NC-DOT is already soured. The relationship with the State Legislature already soured. Special interests abound. Our own neighbors have taken their interest to the legislature against their own neighbors. We sit here today having this discussion because people we walk past and talk to and work with everyday have chosen that their own interest is more important than operating in good faith, and that's a problem. We're here because technical solutions and analysis have fallen short of the community inquiry. The choice was made long ago, and I absolutely understand the respect that we didn't have necessarily, all of the data and all of the computation power that we do today, but knowing that we're here. We've spent more time talking about punishments than we've talked about how to work together to deliver a solution that people can get behind and understand.

To be very clear, as has been stated, community benefits are nonbinding. We can talk all day long about how we want them to be binding, what we hope, what we expect. We don't have any leverage that we're willing to use. As Driggs mentioned, this whole situation frankly, and forgive me I'm misinterpreting your words, but what I've heard and what I've heard all along, this whole situation is driven by fear. Every choice we're making, we are driven by fear of what's going to happen to us, not what could be possible in terms of how we could deliver the best for our constituents, fear and money. So, I will say that I am extremely disheartened, and honestly, it makes me wonder if it's worth it to keep sitting at this dais. I also know that if you're not at the table, you are on

the menu, and let's be clear, even when we sit at the table, we are still on the menu. So, at some point, we've got to be willing to flip the table, and in order to do that at this point, I hope everybody that has been involved in this sees this as a wake up call. The system is rigged against you. You must vote. You must register your loved ones all across this state to vote. Follow the money, stay engaged, because my hope and my aim is that we never end up in this type of situation again. Thank you.

Councilmember Mayo said so, I just want to kind of start. We know that eight of the 11 miles of this project run through District Three, and that means a significant portion of both the impacts and the potential benefits would be experienced by communities I represent. So, thinking of Clanton Park, West Boulevard, and Wilmore. My concerns made about community impact, engagement, and accountability were real, and I still believe they're valid, but we have more information now, so I'm looking closely at what this project could actually deliver for these communities. My question is, if this project moves forward, what can we require it to leave behind for the communities that will live with it? I want residents to understand that we're not only talking about express lanes. As someone who lives in West Charlotte, who sees this everyday, I see people who are struggling to cross bridges, and that is something that I think is a positive about this project. Is it all perfect? No, but unless you are actually in West Charlotte, and you are seeing your neighbors struggle to cross a bridge, something I see everyday on my way to work, on Pressley Road, I see a man in a motorized wheelchair crossing the bridge on Pressley Road to go to South Tryon, and that is something very difficult to see. So, one thing I would ask everyone to do, is to really make sure that you are looking at this project in totality, and that is something that I am very glad that staff has put together. I am hopeful that everyone will do their research, because there are opportunities. Is this project great? Not completely, but there are opportunities, and I hope that everyone will actually do the research, and not just be so quick to condemn. So, I do hope everyone will do that. It is public information that can be shared with everyone.

Another opportunity that I think that we could potentially have with this is bus rapid transit. So, I am a big proponent of multimodal transportation. Anyone who knows me, you can look up the money I've given to environmental nonprofits, not only my time, my treasure, but my talent. My entire career has been public service. So, Madam Attorney, that would be a question I would want to ask. What would it take for CATS, NC-DOT, and the City to turn that opportunity into meaningful, reliable express bus or bus rapid transit service for Southwest Charlotte and South Carolina residents, because I want us to be mindful, when we're talking about multimodal, this could provide some of that. So, I want to make sure everyone has all of the information before making any type of decision.

The other piece I want to talk about is enforcement. A commitment is only as good as the mechanisms behind me. I'm sure ya'll have heard me say that for over a decade before joining Council I worked on my HOA (Homeowner Association) as HOA President. We were able to keep corporate landlords from buying our homes by working closely with our HOA Attorney, understanding our CCR's (Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions) and Bylaws, and creating mechanisms to enforce them. So, because of that, I was able to actually do that and have an affordable pathway to homeownership near the Blue Line, where someone could purchase a townhome for under $230,000.

So, I just want everyone to kind of understand anything that I do, I do with excellence. I can't speak for what anybody else does, but I make sure that all my t's are crossed and all that other stuff that goes into those things. So, I'll just kind of close, that my standard hasn't changed, and ya'll kind of see that I'm just turning, because I want to speak directly to you all. I have a big voice, so I don't necessarily have to be too close to the mic for people to hear me. I want transportation investments that move people, not just in cars, but move people, that reconnect neighborhoods, and we know that this could be an opportunity that protects residents and create opportunity. Eight of the 11 miles run through District Three, and I want to make sure that when this project is finished, if it happens, I don't know, I have not made a decision one way or the other, but I think it's important as a leader to be thoughtful, to listen to all sides, so that you can make the most informed decision. So, those communities can point to things that tangibly are

better because of it, and that those benefits weren't simply a promise we made along the way. So, as some of my colleagues have shared, this has been very challenging, and just appreciate everyone for being here.

Mayor Harrington said thank you, Councilmember Mayo. I believe we're going to be able to get this done if we can be close to time limits of the last two.

Councilmember Anderson said thank you Councilmember Mayo for your level of involvement and engagement and representing your community here. This is not a good place for us to be, and I won't relitigate that for a variety of reasons. I also don't believe that this is the opportunity to point fingers at anyone who are our colleagues or have been a part of this process, because it was clear that we didn't all have complete information or near complete information, and so we were doing the best that we could, and we stepped on some landmines, and so now we have to deal with what we have in front of us. First and foremost, I have been clear-eyed throughout this process, and I've doubled down since, that I wanted to hear directly from the community members that are directly impacted along this 11-mile corridor. Some of us have bigger voices than others. Some of us can project, but those that go to sleep and wake up proximate to this highway, who see it, smell it, touch it, and their lives are impacted by it, I wanted to hear directly from them. So, I want to thank Reverend Mack and Rickey Hall and other community members for coming together and putting together the community impact framework, and sitting down individually and sharing your thoughts, because I think that's most impactful here.

The opportunity for us to hold feet to the fire or to codify benefits really is seeing this language as it relates to the impact framework and other community benefit needs to be represented in the RFP and then further in the contract. If this language is codified in the contract, then by definition, those who win the contract have to deliver upon it, and that's how we create the stickiness. It's not another resolution. It's not a potentially superseding document that would overlay it. It's having the language directly in the RFP and then in the contract.

I also believe that, just from a negotiations perspective, throughout my entire life and my career for over 25 years, walking away from the negotiation table is never a tactic that you pull out immediately. It is one of the very last tactics that you leverage, and we're coming back to the negotiation table, but in that regard in a lot of respects we have lost some leverage and there's a ticking time clock on the leverage that we potentially have. From a municipal governments and operations perspective, as some of staff has shared, our hands are being handcuffed here, as we think about the options of how we can act. Certainly, raising taxes in perpetuity is something that the City has never taken a posture on, and there's risk associated with that relative to legislation that's in the General Assembly that would handcuff us from doing so. The future debt capacity conversation is also a financial risk when you consider the time value of money, and how we can exercise and best utilize those dollars today relative to years to come, as well as our overall AAA rating. I have to say, as our Financial Office says all the time, we have a managed AAA rating. It's due to our management of our funds, and so looking at how we're cutting some of our priorities potentially, like affordable housing, investment in public safety, and other infrastructure needs, as well over 150 people move to our region daily, would impact our municipal governance and operations. Lastly, in this bucket, I'll speak to the new STIP participation. So, as part of the State Transportation Improvement Plans, there is a cadence to these STIPs that are built upon the municipal improvement plans and being negated from that process furthers the tail of how we can address infrastructure and congestion.

My last portion, and Mayor, I'm at four minutes and 30 seconds, so I'm going to bring it on home here. I want to say clearly that the West Side has endured for decades, and that goes without saying. I grew up on the West Side, and I grew up flanked by the original 77 and a landfill that we're still dealing with here in 2026. So, we don't have to preach to the West Side communities. They know what they've been dealing with, and I believe that many of them feel, as I've spoken to some of them, that allowing continued pollution, congestion and displaced congestion from the highway to spill over into these

neighborhoods that flank I-77, would further impact underrepresented neighborhoods and certainly does nothing to address our safety. So, the reality is, we are, I believe, in a space where we're losing leverage, and the potential for our residents to have the ability to insert their voice and shape their future relative to how this project is developed, and the community benefits that they've worked so ardently on to see manifest in future years.

Councilmember Mitchell said you know one thing about going last, everything has been said. So, can you go to the slide number 11, please? I want to start there and while they're bringing up slide number 11, I'm just going to say I appreciate the community engagement. I appreciate people mentioned Reverend Mack and Rickey Hall and other community leaders who really helped organize the community engagement. City Attorney, for me, the language needs to change a little bit, because my support and my passion's about for the community benefits, and not having that language part of the request of City Council I think does not bode well for me. I don't know how other Council members feel, but if we really want to support I-77, to me in my mind, it's about the community benefits. I'm going to go along just putting my voice out there as well. It has to be binding. I think in this community, and all of us know, there's been a serious trust factor involving all this conversation, and so we need to have language that really says what we're going to do, what we want to accomplish for our citizens, and we talked about the community benefits. I think Councilmember Graham brought up there are three grocery stores, I think Districts One, Two, and Three, need. I think we should have a small business grant program for our small businesses. There's business district organizations this City Council said it's a priority that we need to help fund and be successful. We heard from the community more funding for anti-displacement as we talk about new development. Recently, we started talking about how can we engage our youth more, and so to me there's a youth summit engagement we need to do and talk about it as a community benefit for our teenagers.

Doing nothing is not an option for me. We know we've got a traffic problem. We're know we're a growing city. The methods we've got here, I think, has been troubling to all of us, but as you're talking about moving forward, there has to be some way that we continue to take the 14th largest city and make sure it continues to grown and to grow in a way that we hope does not bring negative quality impact to our citizens. So, I'm looking forward to supporting it, but for me we need to spell out in binding community benefits so our citizens will know and trust us what we're trying to deliver on.

Mayor Harrington said [inaudible] we were pushing hard [inaudible] we got there. I know there are folks waiting for us in the chamber, and so I would ask that we move from here as quickly as we can to get to the chamber and start the rest of the Business Meeting.

Ms. Johnson said there were lots of outstanding questions. We talked about legal binding RFPs or community benefits. That's not possible. So, when are we going to followup, so people can hear responses to some of the things that we said? I talked to somebody from NC-DOT, it's not even going to be in the RFP. So, we need facts.

Mayor Harrington said alright, there are lots of conversations with lots of different people on all sides. We will endeavor over the next short period of time to get as many answers as we can, but I also think that they are lots of folks in these conversations, and I think it's our responsibility to provide answers to those as best we can. I think we need to move now downstairs, but we'll continue the discussion.

The meeting was recessed at 6:33 p.m. to move to the Meeting Chamber for the regularly scheduled Business Meeting.

* * * * * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina reconvened for a Business Meeting on Monday, September 14, 2026, at 6:44 p.m. in the Meeting Chamber of the Charlotte Mecklenburg Government Center with Mayor Rob Harrington presiding. Council members present were Danté Anderson, J.D. Mazuera Arias, Ed Driggs, Malcolm Graham, Renee Johnson, Lawana Mayfield, Joi Mayo, James Mitchell, Kimberly Owens, and Victoria Watlington.

ABSENT: Councilmember Dimple Ajmera

* * * * * * *

Mayor Harrington said alright, good evening, and we will call this meeting to order. Thank you all for joining us here in person and for those watching online for our September 14, 2026, Business Meeting. Now, let us begin with introductions around the dais.

* * * * * * *

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

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

* * * * * * *

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

ITEM NO. 6: BIRD SAFE AWARENESS MONTHS

Councilmember Owens read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, bird populations are in steep decline across North America, with an estimated 2.9 billion breeding adults lost since 1970 and tens of millions of birds migrate across Mecklenburg County each spring and fall; and

WHEREAS, most birds migrate at night, using the stars, sun and moon for navigation, and artificial city lights interfere with these signals causing migratory birds to become disoriented, losing their migratory path, and subsequently colliding with buildings or becoming vulnerable to other urban threats; and

WHEREAS, a 2019 study found that Charlotte is the 19th riskiest city for birds migrating at night among the 125 largest cities in the county; and

WHEREAS, the Charlotte City Council's vision states, "Charlotte will be a global leader in environmental sustainability, balancing economic growth with preserving our natural resources, and can join many other cities who have committed to turning out or dimming nonessential lights during migratory periods, such as Atlanta in 2017, Austin in 2022, Nashville also in 2022, Raleigh in 2021, Asheville in 2022, Cincinnati in 2018, Denver in 2018, and New York in 2021; and

WHEREAS, turning out lights yields many rewards, including energy and cost savings, reduced light pollution, and decreased CO2 emissions, as well as benefiting birds, pollinators, and other beneficial insects, resulting in a healthier environment for us all; and

WHEREAS, the Bird Safe Charlotte is supported by many community partners, including but not limited to, Wing Haven, Mecklenburg Audubon, Charlotte Wildlife Stewards, Discovery Place, University of North Carolina at Charlotte:

NOW, THEREFORE, we, Robert E. Harrington, Mayor of Charlotte, and Mark D. Jerrell, Chair of the Mecklenburg Board of County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim the periods of March through May, and September through November, as

"BIRD SAFE AWARENESS MONTHS"

and urge all residents and businesses to protect birds by turning out all nonessential lighting between 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. during these peak migration periods, and to update essential lighting to comply with the principles for responsible outdoor lighting.

I wish to just add to this that the delightful woman who first came to one of my Coffee's with Kimberly, and is affectionately saved in my phone as The Bird Lady, is here today and will be coming down on behalf of Wing Haven to accept this proclamation from our Council. Thank you.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 7: CONCUSSION AWARENESS MONTH

Councilmember Johnson said before I read tonight's proclamation, I want to ask everyone a question. How many of you have ever suffered a concussion, please raise your hand? Now, how many of you know someone who has suffered a concussion, please raise your hand? Look around the room. A concussion is a brain injury, and you do not have to lose consciousness to have one. North Carolina shows that about one in four adults reported experiencing a head injury that's caused them to be knocked out or to lose consciousness. As the incoming Chair of the North Carolina Brain Injury Advisory Council, this work is very important to me. For the past five years, Charlotte has held the largest Brain Injury Awareness Month recognition in North Carolina, and Mr. Tracey Suggs and Protect Your Skull have been a part of that effort. Tonight, we continue that work by recognizing Concussion Awareness Month. Awareness matters, prevention matters, and it's my honor to read tonight's proclamation.

WHEREAS, a concussion is a mild brain injury caused by a bump, blow, or jolt to the head or body that can affect brain function, and symptoms may involve thinking, memory, balance, sleep, emotions, vision, concentration, and other aspects of daily life; and

WHEREAS, concussions can happen to anyone through falls, motor vehicle crashes, workplace or recreational injuries, military service, interpersonal violence, sports, and other physical activities, and every suspected concussion deserves to be taken seriously; and

WHEREAS, because concussion symptoms are not always immediately visible or recognized, public awareness, honest communication, appropriate evaluation, recovery, and support are important to protecting health and quality of life; and

WHEREAS, National Concussion Awareness Day is observed on the third Friday of September, falling on September 18th in 2026, creating an opportunity to educate families, athletes, coaches, schools, employers, health professionals, and communities about concussion recognition and safer practices; and

WHEREAS, Protect Your Skull Health & Safety founded in 2013, together with brain injury organizations, advocates survivors, families, educators, health professionals, and community leaders, works to advance awareness, prevention, support, and a culture in which the injury may be invisible, but the person is not:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Robert Harrington, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim September 2026 as

"CONCUSSION AWARENESS MONTH"

in Charlotte, and encourage all residents to increase concussion awareness affected by brain injury, promote safer practices, use their voices, look out for one another, and remember that quality of life matters most.

Accepting this proclamation is Mr. Tracey Suggs of Protect Your Skull organization. Thank you.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 8: MONARCH PLEDGE DAY

Mayor Harrington read the following proclamation:

WHEREAS, the Monarch Butterfly is an iconic North American species whose multigenerational migration and metamorphosis from caterpillar to butterfly has captured the imagination of millions of Americans; and

WHEREAS, both the western and eastern monarch populations have seen significant declines with less than one percent of the western monarch population remaining while the easter population has fallen by as much as 90 percent; and

WHEREAS, the City of Charlotte recognizes that human health ultimately depends on well-functioning ecosystems and that biodiverse regions can better support food production, healthy soil, and air quality, and can foster healthy connections between humans and wildlife; and

WHEREAS, cities, towns, and counties play a critical role in saving the monarch butterfly, and on August 18, 2026, I Mayor Rob Harrington sign the National Wildlife Federation Mayors Monarch Pledge committing the City of Charlotte to taking meaningful action to protect monarchs; and

WHEREAS, the City of Charlotte together with its residents is advancing monarch and pollinator conservation by planting native milkweed and nectar plants throughout the community, and by installing and maintaining pollinator gardens at locations including old City Hall, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center, Third Ward Gathering Garden, and the Tuckaseegee Arboretum & Gardens, and other sites across the City:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Robert E. Harrington, Mayor of Charlotte, do hereby proclaim September 19, 2026, as

“MAYORS MONARCH PLEDGE DAY”

in the City of Charlotte, and encourage all residents to participate in community activities that support and celebrate monarch conservation.

* * * * * * *

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

Mayor Harrington said alright, we’re going to move into our Business Agenda. We will start with consideration of Consent Agenda items. Before we take the vote, are there any for comment or otherwise for separate vote? We will vote on the items not pulled first, and then address any items that have been pulled for a separate vote. Are there any that are being pulled?

Councilmember Mayfield said I would like Item No. 16 pulled for staff comment and separate vote.

**A complete copy of the Council Agenda Q&A is available in the City Clerk’s Office.

* * * * * * *

pti:pk

CONSENT AGENDA

ITEM NO. 3: CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 16 THROUGH 46 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 Owens, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as presented with the exception of Item No. 16 which was pulled for a separate vote.

The following items were approved:

Item No. 17: Fire Personnel Testing and Promotional Process Administration Services
(A) Approve a contract with Industrial/Organizational Solutions, Inc. for entry level testing and process administration services for a term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 18: Program Services for Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS
(A) Approve a contract in the amount of $500,000 with Kintegra Health for a term of one year to provide short term housing assistance programming that supports individuals and fam lies living with HIV/AIDS, and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate, modify, amend, and extend the contract for up to two, one-year terms consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 19: Municipal Agreements for Asset Maintenance on State-Maintained Streets
(A) Approve municipal agreements with the North Carolina Department of Transportation in the amount of $75,000 for: Sign installation and maintenance on state-maintained streets, Pavement marking installation and maintenance on state-maintained streets, and (B) Adopt a resolution to authorize the City Manager to execute these municipal agreements, including subsequent renewals for up to five years, and amend the agreements with possible reimbursement adjustments consistent with the purpose for which the agreements were approved.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 706-727.

Item No. 20: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department Hangar Relocation
Approve a guaranteed maximum price in the amount of $15,277,197 to J. E. Dunn Construction Company for construction services of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department Hangar Relocation Progressive Design-Build Project.

Item No. 21: Ready Mix Concrete
(A) Approve a unit price contract with the lowest responsive, responsible bidder Stevenson Weir Southern LLC for the purchase of ready-mix concrete for a term of one year, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to three, one-year renewal terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Summary of Bids

Stevenson Weir Southern, LLC	$ 821,460.00
Concrete Supply Co., Inc.	$1,078,625.00

Item No. 22: Construction Administration and Inspection Services at Mallard Creek Water Resource Recovery Facility
(A) Approve a unit price contract with CDM Smith, Inc. for construction administration and inspection services for a term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to

renew the contract for up to three, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 23: Irwin Creek Water Resource Recovery Facility Stormwater System Improvements
Approve a contract in the amount of $1,729,750 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder Gilbert Engineering Company for the Irwin Creek Water Resource Recovery Facility Stormwater System Improvements project.

Summary of Bids

Gilbert Engineering Company	$1,729,750.00
Harper General Contractors, Inc.	$1,878,000.00

Item No. 24: Lee S. Dukes Water Treatment Plant Chemical Piping Replacement Project
Approve a contract in the amount of $776,348 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder Harper General Contractors for the Lee S. Dukes Water Treatment Plant Chemical Piping Replacement project.

Summary of Bids

Harper General Contractors	$ 776,348.00
Gilbert Engineering	$ 856,189.70
PC Construction	$1,744,946.00

Item No. 25: McDowell Creek Water Resource Recovery Facility Clarifier and Headworks Improvements
Approve a contract in the amount of $4,644,420 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder M.B. Kahn Waterworks, LLC for the McDowell Creek Water Resource Recovery Facility Clarifier and Headworks Improvements project.

Summary of Bids

M.B. Kahn Waterworks, LLC	$4,644,420.00
PC Construction Company	$4,801,500.00
Wharton-Smith, Inc.	$5,052,660.00
Cove Utility, LLC	$5,127,581.80
J.S. Haren	$6,017,000.00
Harper General Contractors, Inc.	$8,654,800.00

Item No. 26: Municipal Agreement for Relocation and Installation of Water Infrastructure along U.S. Highway 21
(A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to negotiate and execute a municipal agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation for construction of water and sanitary sewer line relocations, adjustments, and improvements, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to approve the reimbursement request for the actual cost of the utility construction.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 728-729.

Item No. 27: Paw Creek Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation and Sanitary Sewer Diversion
Approve a contract in the amount of $5,178,074.47 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder North American Pipeline Management, LLC for the Paw Creek Sewer Rehabilitation and Sanitary Sewer Diversion project.

Summary of Bids

North American Pipeline Management, LLC	$5,178,074.47
SAK Construction, LLC	$5,341,635.00
Cajenn Construction & Rehabilitation Services, Inc.	$6,960,633.75

Item No. 28: Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation Program

(A) Approve a unit price contract with North American Pipeline Management, LLC for the Fiscal Year 2027 Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation project for a term of one year, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to three, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Summary of Bids

North American Pipeline Management	$6,662,084.55
Fuller & Co. Construction, LLC	$6,954,098.83

Item No. 29: Valve Assessment Services

(A) Approve the purchase of valve assessment services from a cooperative contract, (B) Approve a unit price contract with Hydromax USA, LLC for the purchase of valve assessment services for a term of three years under The Interlocal Purchasing System Cooperative Purchasing Contract #240501, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to extend the contract for additional terms as long as the cooperative contract is in effect at prices and terms that are the same or more favorable than those offered under the cooperative contract.

Item No. 30: Water Main Infrastructure Construction

Approve a contract in the amount of $7,587,389.70 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder Fuller & Co. Construction, LLC for the FY27 Water Main Replacement project.

Summary of Bids

Fuller & Co. Construction, LLC	$ 7,587,389.70
Classic City Mechanical	$ 9,484,564.65
HG&L Development	$10,272,026.05
State Utility Contractors	$11,216,623.00
Propst Construction Co.	$11,396,016.50
G.S. Construction Services	$13,738,979.45

Item No. 31: Collective Storm Drainage Improvement Project Series W

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of $2,665,653.43 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder GS Construction, Inc. dba GS Construction Service, Inc. for the Collective Storm Drainage Improvement Project Series W, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Summary of Bids

GS Construction, Inc. dba GS Construction Service, Inc.	$2,665,653.43
United of Carolinas, Inc.	$2,948,698.50

Item No. 32: Professional Engineering Services for Surface Water Quality and Green Stormwater Infrastructure Projects

(A) Approve a unit price contract with Ardurra Ground North Carolina for surface water quality improvement projects for a term of three years, (B) Approve unit price contracts for green stormwater infrastructure projects for a term of three years with the following: Hazen & Sawyer, McAdams Company, Tetra Tech Engineering PC, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 33: Severn-Tyndale Storm Drainage Improvement Project

(A) Approve a contract in the amount of $10,774,995 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder Sealand Contractors Corp. for the Severn-Tyndale Storm Drainage Improvement Project, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Summary of Bids

Sealand Contractors Corp.	$10,774,995.00

United of Carolinas, Inc.	$11,448,254.40
Mountain Creek Contractors, Inc.	$11,651,823.25
Crowder Construction Company	$12,732,904.80
Zoladz Construction Co., Inc.	$13,035,402.60
Efficient Developments, LLC	$13,464,800.47

Item No. 34: Airport and CATS Transit Buses
(A) Approve the purchase of transit buses from cooperative contracts, (B) Approve unit price contracts with the following vendors for the purchase of transit buses for a term of two years under Washington State Department of Enterprise Services contract #04824: Gillig LLC, Model 1 Commercial Vehicles Inc., Motor Coach Industries, New Flyer of America Incorporated, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to extend the contracts for additional terms as long as the cooperative contracts are in effect at prices and terms that are the same or more favorable than those offered under the cooperative contacts.

Item No. 35: CATS Blue Line Track Reprofiling Services
(A) Approve a contract with Loram Maintenance of Way, Inc. for rail track reprofiling for a term of five years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 36: CATS Bus Operations Wheelchair Lift Parts
(A) Approve unit price contracts for the purchase of wheelchair lift parts for a term of three years with the following: Neopart Transit LLC, The Aftermarket Parts Company, LLC dba NFI Parts, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to two, one-year renewal terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 37: CATS Light Rail Vehicle and Streetcar Brake Pads and Discs
(A) Approve unit price contracts for the purchase of light rail vehicle and streetcar brake pads and discs for a term of three years with the following: Hi-Tec Enterprises, Siemens Mobility Inc., and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contracts for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 38: CATS Streetcar Onboard Energy Storage Systems
(A) Approve the purchase of onboard energy storage systems by the sole source exemption, (B) Approve a contract with Siemens Mobility Inc. for the purchase of onboard energy storage systems for a term of three years, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 39: Airport Facility Lease – 4821 Express Drive
(A) Approve a five-year lease with Delta Air Lines, Inc. for an office and warehouse facility at 4821 Express Drive, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend and extend the lease for up to five, one-year terms consistent with the purpose for which the lease was approved.

Item No. 40: Airport Landscape Maintenance Services
(A) Approve a contract with Bland Landscaping Company Inc. for landscape maintenance services for a term of three years, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to renew the contract for up to two, one-year terms with possible price adjustments and to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 41: Airport Planning and Architectural Consultation Services
(A) Approve contracts for planning consultation services for a term of five years with the following: AECOM Technical Services of North Carolina, Inc., Landrum & Brown, Incorporated, Ricondo & Associates, Inc., RS&H Architects-Engineers-Planners, Inc., HNTB North Carolina, P.C., (B) Approve contracts for architectural consultation services for a term of five years with the following: C Design Inc., GS-NC P.C., M. Arthur Gensler

Jr. & Associates, Inc., Perkins + Will North Carolina, Inc., RS&H Architects-Engineers-Planners, Inc., The Wilson Group Architects, PA, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contracts consistent with the purpose for which the contracts were approved.

Item No. 42: Aviation Underground Storage Tank Consulting and Remediation Services
(A) Approve a contract for up to $3,000,000 with Hart & Hickman PC for underground storage tank consulting and remediation services, and (B) Authorize the City Manager to amend the contract consistent with the purpose for which the contract was approved.

Item No. 43: Refund of Property Taxes
Adopt a resolution authorizing the refund of property taxes assessed through clerical or assessment error in the amount of $2,646.91.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 730-731.

Item No. 44: Set a Public Hearing on the Hajoca Building Historic Landmark Designation
Adopt a resolution setting a public hearing for October 26, 2026, to consider historic landmark designation for the property known as the “Hajoca Building” also known as the Fowler Building (parcel identification number 123-041-09).

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 732-733.

PROPERTY TAXES

Item No. 45: Aviation Property Transactions – 8212 Douglas Drive
Acquisition of 30,404.88 square feet (0.698 acres) at 8212 Douglas Drive from Tina Jane DaSilva for $443,000 and all relocation benefits in compliance with Federal, State, or Local Regulations for Voluntary Program.

Item No. 46: Aviation Property Transactions – 8532 Steeleberry Drive
Acquisition of 86,118.12 square feet (1.977 acres) at 8532 Steeleberry Acres from Marcus Reed for $490,000 and all relocation benefits in compliance with Federal, State, or Local Regulations for Voluntary Program.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 16: OFFICER EARLY INTERVENTION SYSTEM

Motion was made by Councilmember Mayfield, and seconded by Councilmember Driggs to (A) Approve the purchase of an early intervention system from a cooperative contract, (B) Approve a unit price contract with Benchmark Buyer Inc. dba Benchmark Solutions LLC for the purchase of an early intervention system for a term of five years under General Services Administration contract #47QTCA20D00B9, and (C) Authorize the City Manager to extend the contract for additional terms as long as the cooperative contract is in effect at prices and terms that are the same or more favorable than those offered under the cooperative contact.

Councilmember Mayfield said I reached out to staff. This is our Officer Early Intervention System. Please share exactly what this particular vote will be moving forward this evening?

Hannah Bromberger, Deputy Director of Strategy and Budget said yes, ma’am. Item No. 16 is a contract to purchase software that helps CMPD (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department) proactively identify and address concerning behavior in officers that conflicts with CMPD’s mission and core values. So, for example, if a resident reported a concerning interaction with an officer, data from that interaction would be input and

stored in this software system and analyzed to help identify patterns. Then, those patterns of behavior help CMPD perform early intervention with the officer, and assist in developing officer trainings.

Ms. Mayfield said I thought it was important for us to pull that out with all the conversations that we're having where it seems like we're giving more and more authority to law enforcement, and it seems like the residents and everyday citizens seem to be losing autonomy and/or authority. I thought this was a move in the right direction to make sure that we have a real process to help if there is, we pray that there would not be, but unfortunately we have seen instances. So, this will be a way for our residents and visitors, if they are interacting with a law enforcement officer that is inappropriate, that we will be able to track that.

Councilmember Owens said thank you for lifting this up Councilmember Mayfield. One of the reasons that I was pleased to see this pulled is I too had some questions about it, but I went at it from a different angle. I think whenever I see the word data, and whenever I see it being used in ways that perhaps are novel or something that we haven't yet done I do inquire. So, I did have questions, and those were answered to my satisfaction, but I also called the FOP (Fraternal Order of Police) and I called several officers to understand, because a number of the problems I personally feel like we've got in Charlotte have come down to a lack of law enforcement. Some of our traffic safety is not being addressed in the ways that we all wish that it would be. Some of the juvenile justice issues that we're seeing in our community are because we are short officers. So, I was really loathed to vote in favor of anything that would potentially be seen by officers as an overreach, and what I heard was absolutely to the contrary. They're very pleased with this. This really memorializes a way that they can track and keep up with the inputs that are really necessary from their interactions with the people. So, I'm really excited about this, and I'm much more comfortable voting for it now that I understand more about it, so thank you for doing that.

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

* * * * * * *

BUSINESS

ITEM NO. 10: DONATION OF SELF-CONTAINED BREATHING APPARATUS

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to adopt a resolution authorizing the donation of self-contained breathing apparatus equipment to Cullasaja Gorge Fire and Rescue and Rowan Cabarrus Community College.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 685.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 11: GOVERNOR'S HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM GRANT FOR TRAFFIC SAFETY EDUCATION CAMPAIGN

Motion was made by Councilmember Mazuera Arias, seconded by Councilmember Driggs, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute a grant agreement and accept a grant in the amount of $110,000 from the North Carolina Department of Transportation Governor's Highway Safety Program for the development of a traffic safety education campaign for the Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization planning area, and (B) Adopt Budget Ordinance 1186-X appropriating $110,000 from the North Carolina Department of Transportation to the General Grants Fund.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 70, at Page(s) 211.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 686.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 12: INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHARLOTTE FOR CAMPUS POLICE

Motion was made by Councilmember Johnson, and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell to adopt a resolution ratifying an interlocal agreement with the University of North Carolina at Charlotte to extend the law enforcement authority of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte Campus Police.

Councilmember Mazuera Arias said could I have staff member come up? Thank you so much. CMPD.

Zerubabel Chickoree, Deputy Chief CMPD said good evening, Mayor, City Council members.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said thank you for being here. I just want to clarify for the public what this is. Is this giving authority to campus police? Is it giving authority to CMPD? I know what it is, but just for the public's record.

Deputy Chief Chickoree said so, this measure basically extends the basic jurisdiction of the police force at UNCC (University of North Carolina at Charlotte). It allows them to actually perform actual police function outside the campus area for public safety, and this is something that had been approved prior. We look forward to it. UNCC has a very capable and robust police department. Now, with us, if some of you remember some of the crimes that have happened around campus, especially in the mid-1990s, I can tell you as a young officer also working that police division where UNCC is located, this is an absolute benefit to the citizens that live in and around the campus, and certainly for the safety of the attendees. We have a huge commuter population that goes to UNCC.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said thank you, and would you also say that this is perhaps a form of early intervention, so those students, their immediate contact in that extended jurisdiction isn't with CMPD directly, but it would be with campus police?

Deputy Chief Chickoree said so, it's both. They basically bolster our police force. They basically are a force multiplier, being able to come out. Obviously, our officers go through campus as well, and it's patrolled heavily; however, this does give the residents on campus, there's a lot of off-campus housing as well, and as the extension of the boundaries go, the UNCC officers are able to actually patrol these areas, which would otherwise not be patrolled other than by the officers from the University City Division.

Mr. Mazuera Arias said got it. Thank you so much, I appreciate it, and thank you for your service.

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

Deputy Chief Chickoree said thank you.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 687-696.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 13: METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROGRAM GRANT MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Owens, and seconded by Councilmember Anderson to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to negotiate and execute a municipal agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation to support transit planning activities for the Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization, (B) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager, or his designee, to execute interlocal agreements with Iredell County Area Transportation System, Union County Transportation System, and Mecklenburg County Transportation System to support transit planning activities for the Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization, and (B) Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager, or his designee, to execute Interlocal Agreements with Centralina Regional Council, the Town of Cornelius, the Town of Huntersville, and the City of Statesville to support transportation planning projects.

Councilmember Johnson said so, earlier tonight we were talking about money that potentially we owe NC-DOT, and there being a change in service level if we don't move forward with I-77. How does this tie into that?

Robert Cook, Director Planning, Design & Development said good evening, Bob Cook with the Planning Department. The two really aren't connected. Most of these funds are directly attributed to CRTPO and then we suballocate them to member jurisdictions, the different transit agencies in the region, as well as the cities and towns, to execute their own transportation planning projects.

Ms. Johnson said so, they've already been approved and allocated the funds?

Mr. Cook said yes, ma'am they have.

Ms. Johnson said okay, thank you.

Mr. Cook said you're welcome.

Councilmember Mayfield said just a follow-up. So, we've identified that through CRTPO the funds have already been allocated, but yet what we're asking tonight is to adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to negotiate and execute the municipal agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation. Where does this conversation sit as we're in the process of transitioning to the MPTA, and the winding down of CRTPO? I just want to make sure I'm understanding exactly what we are committing to as City when we have these two other bodies out here, and what's the impact as we're talking about having agreements with the Centralina Regional Council of Cornelius, Huntersville, Statesville. Help me understand how this ties in?

Mr. Cook said sure. The City serves as CRTPO's fiscal agent. So, any monies that come through NC-DOT actually reside within the City of Charlotte. So, in order for us to share those funds with the other cities and towns, or Centralina, the City has to enter into an interlocal agreement with those entities.

Ms. Mayfield said so, we're basically the fiscal agent?

Mr. Cook said that's correct.

Ms. Mayfield said thank you.

Mr. Cook said you're welcome.

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

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 697-700.

* * * * * * *

pti:pk

ITEM NO. 14: SALE OF CITY-OWNED LAND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Motion was made by Councilmember Mazuera Arias, and seconded by Councilmember Owens to (A) Adopt a resolution approving the sale of approximately 1.16 acres of City-owned property at 3924 and 3932 Freedom Drive (parcel identification numbers 063-052-04 and 063-052-05) to Prosperity Freedom Drive, LLC for $1 for the development of affordable, for-sale housing units, and (B) Authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all documents necessary to complete the sale of the property.

Councilmember Mayfield said so, as we're moving forward with this, one, I want us to consider that we do have limited city-owned land when we're talking about the ability of expanding land banking and supporting trust, I want us to take that into consideration. For this, the proposal is for a minimum of 12 for sale residential townhomes. Do you by any chance know if these are going an HOA, and if so, whether that is going to be a monthly or an annual fee? Because we have a project off of Ashley that in theory was a really good project, because the pricing of the townhomes were in our 80 and below, but those same townhomes had a $263 monthly HOA, which then makes it outside of the affordability. So, do we have any commitments on what that will potentially look like?

Warren Wooten, HNS said thank you. Warren Wooten, Housing & Neighborhood Services. I don't have that information in front of me, Councilmember Mayfield. Because it's going to be subdivided and it will most likely require interior streets, it most likely will have an HOA.

Ms. Mayfield said so, Manager and colleagues, I want us to step back and take into consideration when these projects come before us, if it's a townhome community and if there is an HOA and if that's a monthly HOA, what is that doing to the actual affordability when we were able to support a development say under $300,000 for sale? If you're paying $270 to $300 a month for an HOA, that's doing honestly very little to nothing, because townhomes don't necessarily come with a whole lot of amenities, are we really achieving the goal that we've set in our language of creating affordability? Because that very well will be why that home goes into foreclosure if that HOA fee is not met and/or that will be the challenge in their loan structure is what that monthly HOA fee added to the actual cost of the sale price, the impact that that can have. So, I just wanted us to have that as a consideration and ask the question for Committee members of Housing & Neighborhood Services, for us to start looking it, as we're discussing proposed language as we move into a bond cycle and a new application year, what those applications could actually consist of, especially if we're identifying City-owned land that's out for RFP. Thank you, Mr. Wooten.

Councilmember Mayo said hi Warren. Quick question. I guess I'm struggling a little bit thinking that this is worth almost a million dollars, it's 1. whatever 2.5 acres, and we're going to sell it for a dollar, and I understand the importance of creating a pathway to affordable homeownership. I'm more worried about the 20-year affordability. Can you chat more about that? I just think if we're going to be pretty much giving away such a valuable asset as land. I mean, you can't get that back, and we're only going to keep it affordable for 20 years. I personally feel like it's a missed opportunity for thinking through generational wealth. Can you chat about what your team is thinking, and other options for this?

Mr. Wooten said sure. Thank you, Councilmember Mayo. Homeownership is one of the more complex things that you all take under consideration, and we have to balance both economic mobility, social mobility, and affordability. So, you support a variety of strategies when you do that. There are strategies that are very high social and economic mobility, but they're naturally lower on the affordability scale. There are other strategies, such as land banking, that are high on the continuing affordability, but are lower on the social mobility. So, this is a strategy to this developer's point that is kind of in the middle. When we look at these projects, we look at bringing you a balance of

options, so that the various residents in your community have various options in how they want to pursue their next housing step. Some of them are okay with those long affordability terms and some of them are more capable of stepping into a project that might have a higher payment, but also has more economic or social mobility.

Ms. Mayo said I guess when I think about the grant that we have for home downpayment assistance and things, that is a mechanism that we kind of use to help with revenue and to put back in the pot. Why do we not think of using something similar for this?

Mr. Wooten said absolutely. So, that tool can also be used. You can stack some of our tools together to achieve greater affordability for our targeted residents. So, yes, there are multiple strategies in play here. This developer is not coming back and asking for additional funding, but the program is available for House Charlotte for downpayment assistance. So, it just gives a wide variety of options to households that are at various economic levels.

Ms. Mayo said okay.

Councilmember Johnson said has this project come before us for rezoning? Is this in conjunction with a rezoning?

Mr. Wooten said it is not.

Ms. Johnson said it's not?

Mr. Wooten said it is not.

Ms. Owens said it's by right.

Ms. Johnson said so, this is a new project with Prosperity.

Mr. Wooten said it appeared before Council about a year ago. It went through your land process, that's correct.

Ms. Johnson said okay. Say that last part again.

Mr. Wooten said it appeared before you during your land process about a year ago, where you approved this developer to work on this project. You're now seeing it again because they've done their due diligence, and they're prepared for the land transfer. So, this is the second time that you're seeing this project.

Ms. Johnson said okay, okay, thank you. Who is the targeted consumer for this? Which AMI (Area Median Income).

Mr. Wooten said so, you've got two AMIs, you've got households at 60 percent AMI, and you've got households at below 80 percent AMI.

Ms. Johnson said so, 60 percent and below 80 percent. What Councilmember Mayfield is saying, and we really have to dig a little deeper, by the time you add the HOA fees, that's a different payment, so that's a whole different AMI. So, I wonder if 60 percent AMI, including the HOA fees, are really going to be eligible to be financed for this?

Mr. Wooten said I appreciate the question, and I agree. Those fees are something to be concerned about because they seem to continue to get higher. What I can share with you is that when underwriters and our affordable lending partners look at these deals, they look at the full payment, which includes those HOA fees. So, they are not setting up your residents to fail. They're looking at all of the fees, including that HOA, when they're approving a payment.

Ms. Johnson said so, do we have that in writing? Because we are giving this land away for $1. We can't get it back. This is significant. So, we hold the leverage, and $300 a month makes a huge difference between 60 percent and the 80 percent buyer. So, do we have that in writing that the HOA payment is included?

Mayor Harrington said Councilmember Johnson, let me just, I'm going to let you continue if you want to, but I think there's likely to be a motion to refer to committee. Are you willing to.

Ms. Johnson said yes, just do we have that in writing.

Mr. Wooten said so, it wouldn't be in writing with the developer because it's part of the lender process. So, it's part of the work that our buyers and the lenders go through when they're approving their financing, and your buyers have a choice of lenders that they can go with.

Ms. Johnson said that's fine. This is only 1.16 acres. Thank you, Mayor, for referring that, because that's something we need to really nail down. Thank you.

Motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell, and seconded by Councilmember Mayfield to refer Item No. 14 to the Housing & Neighborhood Services Committee to discuss questions around policy.

Councilmember Driggs said just want to ask, is a delay at this point creating you hardship in terms of getting the transaction done?

Mr. Wooten said so, they are ready to start working on this property. The reason it's coming back in front of you is that they've gone through a due diligence process and they're ready to move forward. So, I have not heard from the developer one way or another, but I do know that the reason that you're seeing it tonight is that we have been working with them for a year, and they've been going through due diligence on this project.

Mr. Driggs said Mayor, this project is well down the road. The zoning was approved. We've committed the land to the transaction. I think the discussion that is being suggested should take place prospectively, and that we ought to see this one through, rather than now interfere with it, frankly.

Mayor Harrington said any other discussion or comment on the motion to refer it to committee.

Mr. Driggs said so, I'd like to make a substitute motion.

Mayor Harrington said okay.

Mr. Driggs said alright, that we have exactly the conversation that is proposed, but that we do so prospectively and allow this transaction to complete, as we've been working on it for a year.

Ms. Johnson said point of order. So, the original motion was for this item on the agenda, right? Wasn't there a motion? So, then Councilmember Mitchell made a substitute motion, so that's a third substitute motion.

Mayor Harrington said although, I believe this was not a substitute motion, but a motion to refer.

Ms. Johnson said so, then we needed to vote on this first, before Councilmember Mitchell's motion.

Mayor Harrington said let me ask the City Attorney if the last motion is in order?

Mr. Driggs said but there was no second anyway. I withdraw the motion. I withdraw it.

Mayor Harrington said no second, okay. So, any further discussion on what is now the pending motion to refer to Committee?

Councilmember Anderson said I appreciate the motion to send to Committee, but specifically what are we referring to Committee relative to this project or this type of project? That's what I want to understand a little bit further.

Mr. Mitchell said Councilmember Anderson, I don't want to do a scope creep, so I'm going to say just for this particular agenda item, because I don't know how many other opportunities have come before us, but I'm just saying particular to agenda Item No. 14 to refer to Committee to really talk about more policy enhancements around, and I think you heard a lot of comments all from Committee members about some other issues they would like to discuss as well.

Ms. Anderson said okay, specifically germane to only this project?

Mr. Mitchell said yes, ma'am.

Ms. Anderson said I understand that, and thank you Mayor Pro Tem. My only question is, as I originally heard it I thought it was going to be on the types of projects like this, which would lend itself to a policy discussion within Committee, but if it is narrowly focused to one specific project, should it be referred to Committee or should that be something that total Council would address?

Mr. Mitchell said okay, so I'm going to look at the Chair, and Mayor if you don't know, let the Chair weigh in, because it's her committee, but I think we heard a lot of conversation around it. So, Madam Chair, I'm going to yield to you.

Ms. Mayfield said so, Mayor Pro Tem, thank you. The way I am interpreting this, and plan on working with staff as well as Committee is, for this particular conversation that it is what I'm understand is a referral back to the Committee, but in Committee we have the ability to expand this conversation. Mainly, this will help us because staff is already working on pulling up a map to present to Committee of current land that we have, because we've been working to try to identify how many opportunities do we have like this, and because this has come up tonight in the proposal for land that is owned in an area that has seen tremendous growth, and that we know the proposed extension of Light Rail going up Wilkinson, the impact that that's going to have a block, three blocks near it. What I'm understanding is the referral is for this particular project because this is the first one, but this then opens the door for Committee to have a broader conversation of what is our expectation that we can present to full Council on moving forward with City-owned land based on the goals that we are working on in Housing & Neighborhood Services Committee. Because we are going beyond just housing and really embracing the neighborhood services piece of our Committee.

Mayor Harrington said so, what I understand the motion on the floor is a motion to refer what is reflected in Item No. 14 to Committee, and it's that specific item Committee will have whatever discussions would have if that motion is successful.

Councilmember Graham said so, I just want to make sure what we're trying to address in Committee. So, maybe Mr. Driggs is on to something. This is so far down the road, maybe we should just advance this, and then we take the topic, the policy discussion to Committee, for any future opportunities like this. I'm not sure how long this would stay in Committee, and I don't think it's probably fair, maybe not the right word, to use this as a guinea pig. I just don't know what we're trying to solve. It's a bigger question I think we're trying to solve, and I don't think this petition should be caught in that, notwithstanding the fact that I think you need to resolve it.

Mayor Harrington said so, I think what we have is a motion on the floor to refer the motion that is reflected in Item No. 14 to Committee, and I think we're right for a vote on the motion, the second motion, the motion to refer, the subsidiary motion, call the question there.

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

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

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

Mayor Harrington said okay, the motion fails four to six.

Ms. Mayfield said I do want to just remind my colleagues that we have $364,000 left in totality because of approvals that we identified earlier this year with the reallocation of homeownership and the downpayment assistance piece. Even with moving this forward, and because this potentially, well it definitely is, eligible for housing assistance, that actual line item for homeownership, that $25 million we exceeded, and it is beyond zero. So, we are looking at potentially a four-month gap between today and the November 2026 election, and even at that, it is up to the community to approve the bonds. Faithfully, historically the community has supported our transportation and housing bonds, but that is not guaranteed, especially with other language that's going to be potentially be on the ballot.

So, once we have the support of community of that $125 million, we start a different conversation, but even if this was to move forward and be completed in the next 90 days, we do not have funding in our downpayment assistance bucket. That bucket is zeroed out. So, I was us to be very clear that there's also an expectation that whenever we support something, and we have previous projects that's already out there that we deferred that we have to talk about. I want us to be very clear that there is an expectation that when we approve something like this, especially the opportunity for homeownership, there is going to be downpayment assistance to be bundled to go along with whatever that is. So, I just want to make sure that we have transparency in the fact that that line item was zeroed out, because we approved a number of things, we have $364,000. We don't have enough in the budget right now to buy a single home in the City of Charlotte, much less to help with downpayment assistance. So, I just want to make sure that we have all of that on record as we have this vote.

Ms. Mayo said I would just kind of make note to the Housing & Neighborhood Services team, Dr. Stewart and Warren. There definitely seems to be a lot of conversation about this. I hope that we will talk more about this at an upcoming Committee meeting about how we can be thoughtful if this rezoning already happened and then now we're doing this transfer for a dollar. I know that how this was appraised is different from the original conversation, I did read that in here. It's almost a $200,000 difference, but just going forward, how can we try to get all that information in front of Council in the frontend, instead of us having already made this decision with rezoning and now this is coming back and now we're having all these questions. So, I'm hoping that this can be a lesson learned for all of us, including staff, about how we can better work together, so that we're not necessarily having some of these questions now. Like Councilmember Driggs said, I agree. I don't want to necessarily prolong the process for the builder, and lose the opportunity for homeowners who may be looking forward to this. So, that is why I will be supporting it, even though I do have some hesitancy, and I did note that on my social media this morning. I don't think a 20-year deal is the best that we can do. So, I hope that that will part of those conversations when it starts, when we're going through the rezoning in our Housing Committee meeting in the future. So, thank you.

Ms. Johnson said thank you. I like the idea of the motion and the referral to Committee. So, after this passes or we vote on it, because again, it is only 1.16 acres and it is far into the process. So, can we still have the referral to Committee? Can you make a motion subsequent to this vote, Mayor Pro Tem, or Mayor, if we can get that referred?

Mayor Harrington said yes. I think it'll be for the Mayor to refer, and happy to look at that, figure out exactly what it is that we're referring. I think this gives us the opportunity to do that, and now we've had the question called, folks have been heard.

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

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

NAYS: Councilmember Mayfield

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 701-702.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 15: UPSET BID PROCESS FOR CITY-OWNED PROPERTY ON PEGRAM STREET

Motion was made by Councilmember Anderson, seconded by Councilmember Owens, and carried unanimously to (A) Adopt a resolution authorizing the Upset Bid Process for an approximately 0.084-acre city-owned property located at 1726 Pegram Street (parcel identification number 081-166-32) for an initial bid amount of $175,000, (B) Direct the City Clerk to cause a notice of the proposed sale to be published, which shall describe the property, the amount and terms of the offer, and the terms under which the offer may be upset, and (C) If there are no qualifying upset bids received after the initial public notice, allow the City Manager, or his designee, to negotiate and execute all documents necessary to complete the transaction.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book 56, at Page(s) 703-705.

* * * * * * *

POLICY

ITEM NO. 9: CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Marcus Jones, City Manager said I do believe we have three closed session items tonight. So, we're going to be briefed with the Manager's Report. One thing that's really important is for us to stay on track with data centers. So, we just have a brief, I think it's a two-slide presentation from Alyson Craig, Deputy City Manager, to say where we are in this process.

Mayor Harrington said good evening, Ms. Craig.

Alyson Craig, Assistant City Manager said good evening, Mayor and Council. I don't know if the slides can be pulled up, but I can speak from them, even if they're not there. So, we had previously communicated in the Transportation, Planning, and Development Committee that we would come before Action Preview tonight to talk about an update on data centers, and ya'll have another big topic tonight. So, I wanted to be very clear with Council and with the community that we're going to come back on September 28, 2026, and have a more detailed presentation, and what that presentation will be about is about a proposal to extend the moratorium. So, just wanted to be clear about that. So, staff came to the Committee meeting on September 8, 2026, with some details about what work has been done to date, what additional work remains, and we recommended that Council extend the moratorium past November 5, 2026, to give the community, the taskforce, Council, and everyone some more time, in addition staff more time to evaluate some new things that we have learned. So, the Committee agreed with this. They voted out of Committee to refer it to full Council, and so we'll be back on September 28, 2026, and the topics and the items that we'll cover on September 28,

2026, will be all the work completed to date, what additional work is needed to be done, and what the schedule and the timeline to complete that work will need to be. We'll provide you a schedule for a Council vote prior to November 5, 2026, when the moratorium is currently set to expire. That will include a public hearing, because per state statues if there is an extension longer than 61 days, it requires a public hearing, so we'll need to set that. Then, we will provide a proposal for what an extension would look like and the timeline that we think is necessary. So, that really is a very brief update. Again, we'll be back on September 28, 2026, with a detailed presentation on those topics. I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have, and we certainly will have time at that meeting for questions.

Councilmember Owens said thank you for the presentation. I just want to lift up into the room and hope that this is part of your process as we consider a moratorium. I had some really intentional conversations on Labor Day with some of the trades who are very concerned about a continuation of the moratorium. So, I'm just hopeful that there are trades peoples' voices that you're also taking into account as we look forward to this.

Ms. Craig said yes, very much so. I think there's been some questions raised by the taskforce and the community about jobs, about just general economic development, whether there's incentives that we can provide to the data center industry to put in the measures that we want when we can't regulate them. So, I think there's definitely some conversations to be had in that area, and I believe that's one of the topics for one of the upcoming taskforce meetings very soon. So, yes.

Ms. Owens said thank you.

Ms. Craig said absolutely.

* * * * * * *

ITEM NO. 5: CLOSED SESSION (AS NECESSARY)

Motion was made by Councilmember Driggs, seconded by Councilmember Owens, and carried unanimously to go into closed session pursuant to NCGS 143-318.11(a)(3) to preserve the attorney-client privilege, and (a)(4) to discuss matters relating to the location or expansion of industries or other businesses in the area served by the public body.

Mayor Harrington said alright, we will move to closed session. Thank you so much everyone for being here and staying with us, and good evening.

The meeting was recessed at 7:40 p.m. to move to CH-14 for a closed session. The closed session recessed at 10:58 p.m.

* * * * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:58 p.m.

pti:pk

September 14, 2026
Business Meeting
Minute Book 163, Page 389



Billie Tynes, Deputy City Clerk

Length of Meeting: 2 Hours, 27 Minutes
Minutes completed: September 28, 2026

pti:pk