## City Council Policy/Business/Consent Agenda Q&A's November 28, 2022

Submitted	Agenda Item # and Questions	Answers/Considerations									
<u>By:</u>											
	Policy Items										
СМ	11. Amend Code of Ordinances	For the animal ordinance the move to 30 days was recently									
Anderson	Chapter 3 – Animals	requested by a public forum speaker, and shelter staff concur.									
		The 30 days was to give the owner time to appeal to court. Issue									
	These violations read like a mix of	is currently all seized animals must be held for 30 days prior to									
	actual violation enforcement and pet	being put up for adoption (if adoptable), which is a long time for									
	owner control. What's the origin of	waiting in cases of abused animals that could be rehomed and									
	this ordinance?	for all cases takes up holding space in the facility that could be									
		used for another animal. Staff have determined 10 days is									
		sufficient and aligns with state law.									
Business Items											
MPT	12. Affordable Housing	The RCA for item 12 included seven projects recommended by									
Winston	Development Support Requests	staff as action A, and based on feedback from Council at the Nov									
		14 Action Review, the South Village Apartments was included as									
	Why wasn't the supportive housing	Action B. The Easter Home project was not recommended									
	project included?	predominately due to the exceptionally high city cost per unit of									
		\$122,280 (compared to the HTF award guidelines of \$32,000 per									
		unit). At the November 14 Action Review, staff affirmed its									
		intent to work with the developer for the Easter Home project to									
		determine whether additional actions can be taken to create a									
		stronger value proposition for the city, and then reevaluate the									
		project in 2023. While the Easter Home is not in the RCA, the									
		additional \$1,937,873 funding for that project would bring the									
		total utilization of ARPA funds to \$13,243,118.									
СМ	12. Affordable Housing	The city has several safeguards in place to ensure developments									
Mayfield	Development Support Requests	are not over-subsidized. HTF-funded multi-family projects are									
		required to complete a cost certification at the end of									
	What is the process to ensure we	development. The cost certification is completed by a third-party									
	don't give the developers more	advisor and verifies the actual cost of development. If the cost									
	funding than they need, especially	shows the development does not require all of the provided									
	since the market it starting to correct	financing the funding is not drawn by the developer. This rarely									
	itself? By the time the units are	happens because most multi-family costs are set at the time of									
	complete, the costs of developing the	loan closing. In single-family developments, a subsidy layering									
	units are anticipated to be less.	analysis is completed for each unit to ensure just enough subsidy									
		is provided to make the unit affordable for the low AMI buyer.									
CM	12 Afferdable Llausing	Diagon and the following table for additional information									
CM	12. Affordable Housing	Please see the following table for additional information									
Johnson	Development Support Requests	regarding the Easter's Home project. For reference, the revised									
		cost per unit of \$122,280 [i.e., when taking into consideration									
	Please provide information on the	both the prior HTF award and the recent request for new									
	Easter Homes project request.	funding] equates to a revised cost per unit that is almost four									
		times higher than the historical HTF cost/unit guidelines of									
		\$32,000 per unit [in Districts 1-5]. Per discussions at the									
		November 14 Action Review Meeting, staff will continue discussions with the Easter Home project developer to reassess									
		discussions with the Easter Home project developer to reassess									
		feasible opportunities for future consideration.									

Submitted By:	4	Agenda Item # and Questions				Answers/Considerations							
Easter Ho	mes:												
Туре	District	Previous HTF Award	Additional Funding Request	Total	Revised Cost Per Unit	30% AMI Units	50% AMI Units	60% AMI Units	80% AMI Units	Total Units	Affordability Commitment		
Supportive Housing	1	\$630,000	\$1,937,873	\$2,567,873	\$122,280	4	17	0	0	21	30 years		
CM Anderson	<b>Mee</b> Why	<ul><li>14. Proposed 2023 City Council Meeting Schedule</li><li>Why are the Zoning Meetings scheduled to start at 4pm?</li></ul>				Council voted at the October 24th Business Meeting to start zoning meetings at 4:00 to allow for time to consider rezoning requests. (This was one of the votes clarified after the fact by the Clerk and Attorney)							
				C	Consent Iten	ns							
Please not staff.	e Con	sent <b>Item</b>	44. Proper	ty Transacti	ons - Eleva	ted Sto	orage Ta	anks, P	arcel # 1	is being	pulled by		
CM Mayfield		Why are the CBI goals so low for these contracts?				Please see below for explanation for each contract.							
	Care	29.Charlotte-Mecklenburg Animal Care & Control Facility Renovations, Phase II				Utilizing the Phase II Goal Setting Formula is how staff arrived at the 3.0% MBE goal and 8.0% SBE goal. With this contract, the largest opportunity is on the mechanical scopes of work where there is little MSBE availability.							
		32. Belmont Lift Station and Forcemain				This project is subject to the NC Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) loan guidelines and DBE requirements.							
	33. Clarke Creek Pump Station and Forcemain Construction				The contract is a Design Build where the city negotiates the CBI participation with the selected proposer after the scopes of work are defined. The proposer/contractor has the entire life of project to meet the 6.87% goal. In addition, relative to the scopes of work, it is highly specialized with little MSBE availability.								
	34. Mallard Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements				This contract is a Construction Management At Risk (CMAR) project that is subject to Part G of the CBI Policy, in this instance, the city has negotiated CBI participation at 10% on the project and has the entire life of the project to meet the goals.								