AGENDA

Meeting Type:	W
Date	08-07-1989
SUBJECT	

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office

CHARLOTTE

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA

August 7, 1989

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP AGENDA
August 7, 1989

5:00 - 5:45 p.m.	Sister Cities Report on China Trip and Policy Direction
5:45 - 6:15 p.m.	Policy Framework for Expanding Innovative Housing Funds Not Allocated to the Housing Partnership
6·15 - 6:30 p.m.	Dinner
6:30 - 7:30 p.m.	Belmont Task Force Implementation Strategies
7:30 - 8:00 p.m.	Convention Center
8:00 - 8:30 p.m.	Water and Sewer Extension Policy Discussion
8:30 - 8:40 p.m.	Development Fees - Request for Proposal Review

Sister Cities Report on China Trip

Charlotte Sister Cities Committee

The Charlotte Sister Cities Committee asked to appear before the City Council to provide an update on the recent trip to China as well as to discuss several policy issues. Sister Cities Chairman Jerry Licari and Executive Director Peggy Wesp will be present. Several information sheets will be distributed at the workshop.

NOTES

Innovative Housing

Policy Framework for Expending Innovative Housing Funds

Not Allocated to the Housing Partnership

At the July 25 meeting Council deferred action on the recommendation for the expenditure of Innovative Housing funds not allocated to the Housing Partnership. Attached is another copy of the agenda item for further consideration by the Council. Staff will be present to answer questions as needed.

Recommend approval of a policy framework for expending Innovative Housing funds not allocated to the Housing Partnership.

Innovative Housing History

On April 6, 1987, City Council adopted a Housing Policy Plan which advocated development of housing units using public/private partnerships. Since 1986, $8,100,000.00 has been appropriated for innovative housing projects and $5,084,034.00 has been expended to date. This leaves $3,015,966 in the Innovative Housing Fund for carryover into the FY90 budget. These carryover funds will be reviewed with City Council separately from the recommended policy framework (see attached status report).

$4.5 million has been approved for the FY90 year and $2.0 million will be available to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership.

$2 Million to Housing Partnership

On June 26, 1989, City Council approved a contract between the City and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Housing Partnership, Inc. and allocated $2 million to the Partnership to provide for the development of 100 additional housing units through public/private ventures targeted to families earning 60% or less of median income. Prior to the approval of the Partnership contract, Council approved several revisions to the Housing Policy Plan on May 22, 1989. These revisions affected the specific roles of the City, the Charlotte Housing Authority, and the Housing Partnership. The City's mission was defined as "reducing the number of households living in substandard, overcrowded, or unaffordable housing conditions." The City's priority is to provide housing assistance to those households earning 40% and less of median income and to provide opportunities for economic self-sufficiency to assisted families.

$2.5 Million Innovative Housing Funds

Council is requested to approve a policy framework for spending $2.5 million from a total budget of $4.5 million per year to be allocated as follows.

1) $1,500,000 to be funded on the basis of competitive Request for Proposals being recommended by the Innovative Housing Committee and approved by City Council; these proposals will create 50 - 75 new housing units with preference being given to proposals complying with the RFP criteria established as part of the policy framework.

2) $500,000 to be used to fund a local voucher program, City Housing Assistance Payment Program (CHAPP), for 25 families. The Housing Voucher Program is a rental assistance program whereby a family relocated chooses a rental unit in the private market which:

   - Meets City Housing Code.

   - The gross rent is not subject to the HUD Fair Market Rent (a rental maximum established by HUD for different size families) as in the Section 8 Certificate Program (a maximum of 30% of the renter's income). The Housing Authority determines a payment standard to calculate the subsidy. The payment standard may be equal or less than the Fair Market Rent. Families may choose housing that rents above the payment standard. If so, the family will have to pay more than 30% of its adjusted monthly income toward their housing cost.

3) $500,000 to be a source of funding small housing proposals on a case by case basis for property owners, small businesses, or non-profit corporations on an optional basis.

Innovative Housing Committee

Request for Proposals (RFP's) will be sent to all known developers and ads will be run in local and regional newspapers. All RFP's and optional housing proposals will be reviewed by the Innovative Housing Committee. The composition of that Committee will include:

Assistant City Manager for Policy and Evaluation
Assistant City Manager for Development Services
Director, Community Development Department
Director, Planning Department
Director, Finance Department
Two Board members of the Charlotte Housing Authority
Two Board members of the Housing Partnership.

This committee will provide a technical review of all proposals and RFP's and make recommendations to Council.

Evaluation of RFP's

Competitive RFP's will be developed during the first quarter of each fiscal year and as needed thereafter with the responding proposals being evaluated on the following basis:

1) Priority assistance is to be provided to families earning less than 40% of median income and living in substandard, overcrowded, or unaffordable housing, or are residing in public housing, or are listed on the Charlotte Housing Authority's master list needing housing;

2) Compliance with the Housing Assistance Plan and the Housing Policy Plan - the geographic disbursement of proposed projects and proximity to other assisted housing will be a major consideration;

3) The project's effect on the School Board's pupil assignment plan and other impacts created on the school system in terms of total new students and current plans for the construction of new schools;

4) Land use and urban impact of projects on neighborhoods and commercial areas;

5) Neighborhood renewal and number of housing units;

6) Cost comparison to the City with other funded projects; this will require a financial analysis of the City's cost per unit, private funds leveraged in a ratio with total replacement cost and the term of the City loan in regard to payback of City funds for reuse within the Innovative Housing Fund;

7) Private funds committed with financial sources or tax credit allocation by the State Housing Finance Agency should be committed by letter;

8) Design compatibility with the neighborhood, and the provision of necessary amenities for children, available public transportation, and assurance of a good maintenance program.

<u>Funds</u> City Innovative Housing Fund.

<u>Clearances</u> City Council approved Housing Policy Plan on May 22, 1989 with consensus of the CD and Housing Committee.

INNOVATIVE HOUSING FUND STATUS REPORT AS OF July 17, 1989

PROJECTS FUNDED	DATE APPROVED BY COUNCIL	# OF UNITS	TOTAL PROJECT COST	AMOUNT OF CITY PARTICIPATION	AMOUNT OF PRIVATE PARTICIPATION	LEVERAGE RATIO (Private to City)	CITY COST PER UNIT
Summit Avenue Second Mortgages (Homeownership)	6-23-86	24	$ 1,693,765	$ 443,765	$ 1,250,000	2.8:1	$18,490
Shalom Homes (Rehab/Sale)	11-10-86	3	N/A	64,346	0	N/A	N/A
Highland Park Feasibility Study		0	N/A	17,000	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grier Heights Economic Foundation (Foundations for relocation of houses)	7-11-88	6	N/A	85,727	0	N/A	N/A
Hoskins Mill (Private Rental Housing)	7-11-88	189	8,055,000	2,355,346	5,699,654	2.4:1	12,462
Winman Park (Private Rental Housing)	9-13-88	17	523,000	150,000	373,000	2.5:1	8,823
Habitat for Humanity (Homeownership)	9-26-88	8	276,850	52,850	224,000	4.6:1	6,600
McAlpine Terrace/Stonehaven (Private Rental Housing)	1-17-89	162	7,709,820	500,000**	7,209,820	5.2:1	9,115
Habitat for Humanity (Homeownership)	4-24-89	75	3,200,000	1,200,000*	2,000,000+	1.6:1	16,000
Saratoga Park (Private Rental Housing)	4-24-89	20	650,000	215,000	435,000	2.0:1	10,750
	SUBTOTAL	504	$22,108,435	$5,084,034	$17,191,474		
Wilmore-Neighborhood Housing Services - (Rehab/New Construction)	PROPOSED	23	540,660	415,660	125,000		18,072
John Crosland Co. - Fairmarket Square - (Private Rental Housing)	PENDING	60	2,653,532	1,240,405	1,413,126	1.14:1	20,673
	TOTAL	587	$25,302,627	$6,740,099	$18,729,600		

APPROPRIATIONS TO INNOVATIVE HOUSING FUND

FY86 General Revenue Sharing	$ 400,000
FY87 General Revenue Sharing	500,000
FY88 Pay-As-You-Go Capital	2,500,000
FY89 Pay-As-You-Go Capital	3,500,000
FY88 Community Development Block Grant	1,200,000*
TOTAL	$8,100,000

CURRENT FUNDS AVAILABLE IN INNOVATIVE HOUSING FUND

Total Appropriations	$8,100,000
Expenditures to Date	-$5,084,034
Subtotal	$3,015,966
Wilmore-NHS - Proposed	-$ 415,660
John Crosland Co. - Pending	-$1,240,405
Total	$1,359,901

**City subsidy required after construction: 1st Year Maximum $300,000 - Yearly Maximum $275,000

NOTES

Belmont Task Force Implementation Strategies

Belmont Task Force Implementation Strategies

Background

The Belmont Task Force was established by the City Manager in March 1987 with the charge of identifying the reasons for the deterioration of the Belmont neighborhood and to develop strategies for revitalization. The Task Force first assembled in April 1987 and actively met through March 1988.

Previous efforts to rehabilitate the neighborhood were assessed as were current conditions. The Task Force found the neighborhood to have a multitude of physical and social problems that included substandard housing conditions which may be heavily attributed to an absentee landlord rate of 85%, the prevalence of crime and drugs, an overall lack of cleanliness, the absence of suitable recreational opportunities and shopping facilities, the lack of adequate day care availability, widespread violations of the City's Housing Code, as well as a multiplicity of infrastructure inadequacies.

The Task Force adopted a holistic approach in addressing the immense scope and severity of the neighborhood's problems and concluded with a comprehensive set of recommendations that were summarized and presented at a Council workshop on October 5, 1988. Council then directed the City Manager's Office to develop a strategy for implementing the various recommendations. The proposed Organizational Structure of the Belmont Action Plan, which is attached, is the recommended mechanism for implementing the recommendations of the Task Force.

Actions to Date

The accomplishments that have occurred thus far in efforts to revitalize the Belmont community include the following actions.

- Operations Department began clean up efforts in the Summer of 1987. This included removal of junk cars, stray dogs, citing owners of property with high grass and increased pick-up of bulky items and other trash.

- Council adopted Belmont Small Area Plan in September of 1987.

- Habitat for Humanity began construction of their first house in the Belmont neighborhood in June of 1988.

- Council approved the rezoning of most of Belmont to single family so as to make it consistent with existing land use. This occurred in October of 1988.

- St. Paul's Baptist Church opened a 100 child capacity day care center in February of 1989.

- Since 1988, the Community Development Department has made 19 rehabilitation loans totalling $344,840 through the Standard Rehabilitation Loan Program; made 13 loans totalling $65,000 through the Rental Rehabilitation Loan Program which leveraged over $65,000 in private funds; brought 244 housing units into code compliance, relocated 34 households out of the Belmont area.

- Council approved a $1.2 million loan to Habitat to facilitate the construction of 73 houses in Belmont. This occurred in April of 1989.

- In approving the Capital budget, Council earmarked funds for infrastructure improvements in Belmont through the Neighborhood Reinvestment Program.

- Council has also allocated $200,000 in CD funds for enhanced City services in Belmont.

Action Requested

In proceeding with efforts to revitalize the Belmont community through the implementation of the recommendations of the Belmont Task Force, Council is requested to approve the proposed Organizational Structure of the Belmont Action Plan.

SUGGESTED TEAM ROLES
for the Implementation of the
PROPOSED BELMONT ACTION PLAN

BELMONT NEIGHBORHOOD STRATEGY FORCE

1. Provide input from Belmont citizens to continue the momentum developed by the Belmont Neighborhood Task Force.

2. Review and comment on implementation priorities developed in conjunction with the Development Team.

CITIZENS ADVISORY GROUP

1. Review and comment on implementation priorities developed in conjunction with the Development Team.

2. Coordinate activities to provide the most efficient use of community resources to implement the Action Plan.

3. Market efforts to stabilize property values and encourage reinvestment in the neighborhood.

ACTION TEAM

1. Make decisions on projects and expenditures for the coordination of the Belmont Action Plan and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Program in the Belmont Neighborhood.

2. Serve as Review Committee to ensure completion and follow through on recommendations for the Action Plan.

3. Review and approve the implementation priorities submitted by the Development Team; forward to City Manager.

4. Forward monthly progress and status reports to City Manager's Office.

5. Serve as liaison to ensure cooperation and coordination of action steps within and between departments.

DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

1. Prepare implementation priorities for the Action Plan, utilizing input from the Neighborhood Association and Citizens Advisory Group.

2. Submit the implementation priorities to the Action Team for approval and forwarding to the City Manager's Office for final approval.

3. Serve as staff responsible for the coordination of implementation.

4. Meet monthly to review progress and status.

5. Provide monthly up-date reports to Action Team, Neighborhood Association and Citizens Advisory Group.

6. Assist the Belmont neighborhood groups in any way possible to facilitate implementation of the Action Plan.

PROPOSED TIME TABLE

- August 7th — Council Workshop
- August 8th - October — Development of Implementation Priorties:
  - Meetings with Neighborhood Association and Citizens Advisory Group.
  - Staff to evaluate the neighborhood's priorties, existing departmental workloads and on-going priorties.
  - Implementation priorities developed with input from all parties.
- October — City Manager will submit recommended implementation priorities to City Council.

FUNCTIONAL ORGANIZATION CHART
(Conceptual)

BELMONT MISSION STATEMENT

"Revitalization of the neighborhood to ..."

NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT	CITY SERVICES	HOUSING	DAY CARE	COUNTY SERVICES
o Non-profits	o City Staff	o Housing Partnership	o St. Paul Baptist CDC	o County Staff
o Private Investors		o Habitat for Humanity	o	
o Foundations		o Other non-profits		
o Lending Institutions		o Sweat Equity		
o		o Private Investment		
o		o		
o		o		

PROPOSED ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE OF THE BELMONT ACTION PLAN

1. CITY COUNCIL

2. CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

3. BELMONT NEIGHBORHOOD STRATEGY FORCE

4. ACTION TEAM

- Employment & Training (Coordinator)
- Community Development Department
- Neighborhood Centers
- Parks & Recreation Department
- Engineering Department
- Operations Department
- Police Department
- Budget & Evaluation Department
- Planning Commission (Staff)

5. CITIZENS ADVISORY GROUP

- Belmont Neighborhood Assn
- Habitat for Humanity
- C-M Housing Partnership
- St. Paul Baptist Church
- Housing Authority
- Mecklenburg County Representative
- Charlotte Organizing Project
- New Hope Mission Baptist Church

6. DEVELOPMENT & IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
(Staff assigned to Belmont Project)

- Community Development Department (Coordinator)
- Employment & Training Department
- Engineering Department
- Operations Department
- Police Department
- Planning Commission

Notes:

a. Interested parties may volunteer for appointment to Citizens Advisory Group by City Manager.

b. Action Team members appointed by department heads.

c. Development & Implementation Team members to be appointed by department heads.

NOTES

Convention Center

CONVENTION CENTER UPDATE

Council will be updated on the status of the negotiations with the Schottenstein group regarding the new Convention Center. We will discuss the details of the negotiations as well as a time schedule and the estimated cost for the next 12 months.

If Council agrees that our process is complete and valid, we will bring to Council by the first of September a refined Schottenstein proposal which has several options.

Water and Sewer Extension Policy

Water and Sewer Extension Policy

Over the past several months the Mayor and Councilmembers have expressed interest in our current policies for extensions and connections for water and sewer services. Questions raised relate to the needs for extensions City-wide and the level of financial assistance available for low to moderate income households for installing extensions.

At the workshop, Joe Stowe, CMUD Director, will make a brief presentation to Council about our current extension policy and available financial assistance. Attached is the outline of topics he will be covering. We will be asking Council for direction about any changes to the policy you may wish to pursue so we may come back to Council at a later date if necessary.

Assistance for Water & Sewer
Extensions/Connection

Program Outline

I. Review various components of extension policy with brief overview of the four visual aids

II. Review programs to help extend mains or get basic water or sewer service

A. Introduction - Cost to provide full street service availability to all areas in current system or near future CIP, including plants but not including connection charges is $180-200 million for water and $180-200 million for sewer

B. 50/50 program in which CMUD pays half the cost of street main extension

C. Health hazard extension - for documented health hazard CMUD pays all extension costs (does not include Tapping Privilege Fee or Connection Charge)

D. Indigent Policy (Loan)
- Applicant must be declared indigent by Social Services of Mecklenburg County
- Loan for Tapping Privilege Fee and Connection charge to be repaid over 5 years - requires 10% down
- Must be declared health hazard
- Available to customers throughout system

E. Community Development Assistance
- Loans for any water or sewer need to low-to-moderate income families (80% or less of median income)
- Applicable to City of Charlotte residents only

III. Issues

A. Programs are currently in place to provide CMUD funds to pay for 50% of all street main extensions, CMUD funds for 100% assistance to virtually any health hazard situation for extensions of street mains, CMUD loans for indigent with health hazards for tapping fees and connection charges, and CD loans (or grants) for any water and sewer need for families below 80% of median income.

B. Conversely, those who are not covered by a loan or grant program are people without health hazards who make above 80% of median income.

C. Median income for family of four is $35,300; 80% of median income is $28,230.

D. Number of households in Mecklenburg County = 197,000
" " " " Charlotte = 157,000
" " " Above 80% of median in County = 112,000 (59%)
" " " Above 80% of median in City = 93,000 (59%)

E. Cost to provide assistance to all above 80% median income level for street main extensions is very generally estimated to be in excess of $250,000,000 for water and sewer (60% of total estimated costs for all areas without water and sewer mains).

IV. Decision Steps

A. Does Council want to provide additional funding for water and sewer service when no health hazard exist?
- Or are current programs adequate?

B. If so, should programs be applicable to all residents or just City? If just City then CMUD funds would not be available

C. Should any assistance be applicable to citizens other than low-to-moderate income property owners?

Development Fees

Development Fees
Request for Proposal Review

At a joint meeting held in December of 1988 between the City Council and Board of County Commissioners with the Planning Commission in attendance, a decision was reached to proceed further with consideration of development fees as an option to finance capital facility needs. The City Council and Board of County Commissioners requested that the Planning Liaison Committee develop a process through which development fees and their implementation could be examined and report back to the respected bodies within ninety days.

After defining the process and reporting back to the two bodies, a Request for Proposals (RFP) was developed. The RFP was distributed locally and across the Country, seeking a qualified consultant to conduct a "joint" City-County examination of development fees. The total $60,000 cost for this study was to be partially funded by each body. However, as a result of a decision by the Board of County Commissioners not to participate in a joint study, efforts to solicit and select a consultant were put on hold until further direction was given.

Since that time, the City Council has approved the expenditure of $60,000 to fund the total cost of the development fee examination. The attached Request for Proposals reflects the change from a joint City-County funded project to a City funded project. Upon review and comment from City Council, the Planning staff will solicit proposals from qualified consultants. In reviewing the RFP, the Council should also give consideration to the following major policy issues:

- Should the scope of the examination be undertaken on a City-wide or County-wide basis, and;

- Is the Planning Liaison Committee the appropriate group to monitor this process, or should a City Council sub-committee be created to monitor this examination?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	GENERAL INSTRUCTION TO BIDDERS	
	A. Statement of Purpose	2
	B. Project Description	2
	C. Proposal Preparation Costs	2
	D. Contracting Organization	2
	E. Rules and Regulations	2
	F. Periodic Reporting	2
	G. Payment Information	3
	H. Inquiries	3
	I. Closing Date	3
	J. Rejection of Proposals	3
	K. Validity of Proposals	3
	L. Addenda and Supplements to RFP	4
	M. Proprietary Information	4
	N. Acceptance of Proposal Content	4
	O. Acceptance Time	4
II.	SCOPE OF WORK	
III.	PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS	
	A. General Requirements	5
	B. The Proposal	6
IV.	EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS	
	A. Method of Evaluation	6

I. GENERAL INSTRUCTION TO BIDDERS

A. Statement of Purpose

The City of Charlotte (hereinafter referred to as the City) is seeking a qualified individual or firm to serve in a consulting capacity for the purpose of examining development fee options and the feasibility of instituting any such option or combination of options in Charlotte-Mecklenburg. This process should be conducted within a six month time frame.

B. Project Description

The selected individual or firm will be chiefly responsible for the examination and assessment of five development fee options (see item III. Scope of Work). It will be the responsibility of the selected individual or firm to examine how well each option addresses local capital needs. The primary goal of this exercise is to develop a road map which can be followed in implementing development fees in Charlotte-Mecklenburg.

C. Proposal Preparation Costs

This Request For Proposals does not commit the City of Charlotte to pay any cost for the preparation of a proposal.

D. Contracting Organization

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission staff (hereinafter referred to as "Planning Staff") will serve as agent for the City of Charlotte, solicit proposals from consultants, negotiate with the assistance of the City Legal staff the selected individual or firm(s) contract, and be responsible for administering the contract.

E. Rules and Regulations

The bidder selected to perform the work described in the RFP must comply with all necessary Federal and State laws and local rules, regulations, and ordinance. These laws, rules et cetera, will be outlined in any contractual agreement between the City of Charlotte, and the bidder.

F. Periodic Reporting

It will be the responsibility of the selected individual or firm to report to the Planning staff on a pre-arranged time basis, the status and progress of the project. This shall be in written form or in the form of telephone conversations. Also, periodic meetings will be held with various civic and community groups to provide general information and updates on the project. It is important that cost projections

submitted for this project include costs for attending these meetings.

G. Payment Information

Thirty (30) days shall be allowed for the processing of payments. There will be zero (0) percent interest penalty for both partial and final payments.

H. Inquiries

Inquiries concerning this proposal should be directed to.

Mr. Stanley D. Watkins, Strategic
Planning & Research Manager
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, N.C. 28202-2853
Phone: (704) 336-2205

I. Closing Date

Respondents to the RFP should submit 7 copies of their proposal no later than the close of the business day (5:00 p.m. EST) on Monday, October 2, 1989. Proposals should be mailed to:

Mr. Stanley D. Watkins, Strategic & Research
Planning Manager
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission
600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, NC 28202-2853

J. Rejection of Proposals

The City of Charlotte reserves the right to reject any and all proposals received in response to this Request For Proposals, or negotiate separately with any source, in any manner necessary, to serve the best interest of the City. Individuals submitting proposals will be formally notified if a proposal has been rejected.

K. Validity of Proposals

All proposals shall be valid for 120 days.

L. Addenda and Supplements to RFP

In the event it becomes necessary to revise any part of the RFP, addenda will be provided to each individual or firm solicited. If additional information is necessary to enable the individual or firm to make an adequate interpretation of provisions of this RFP, a supplement to the RFP may be provided.

M. Proprietary Information

Any reservations of the use of data contained in a proposal must be clearly stated in the proposal itself. Any information submitted in response to this request will be free to be used within the City of Charlotte on a proprietary basis.

N. Acceptance of Proposal Content

At the option of the City of Charlotte, the proposal of the selected candidate(s) may be included in applicable clauses of the contract to be awarded. Consequently, the consultant must be prepared to accept the conditions as outlined in the RFP.

O. Acceptance Time

Upon the selection of a proposal, it will be the intent of the Planning staff to initiate negotiations within 30 calendar days after the closing date for receipt of proposals. The Planning staff reserves the right to extend or shorten the selection date. The selection of a proposal is not a firm commitment to an award of a contract for the project.

II. SCOPE OF WORK

This six month project will require the selected individual or firm to carry out the following·

- Provide a description of five development fee options which are to include·
  - Exactions
  - Land Transfer Tax
  - Impact Fees
  - Special Assessments
  - Impact Taxes

  Each option should be addressed in a national and local context. In a national context, the history, the advantages and disadvantages, in addition to the issue of equity of each option will be examined. In a national and local context, how each option is likely to affect the local real estate market and the competitiveness of the business community will be examined.

- A review and assessment of the legalities under North Carolina law and how each option would be affected will be required. The examination of the legal implications associated with development fees should also include a review of the Rational Nexus test and how this test applies to each option.

- Provide information on other comparable Cities and Counties where development fees have been instituted, in addition to providing a description of respective state enabling legislation.

- Construct financial models which will demonstrate how each option can be expected to operate in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, and how the option addresses the local capital needs gap. (NOTE: Information on the local capital need gap will be provided by the City staff).

- Provide information on the costs of implementation and administration of each option. This discussion should also address where, when and how fees will be collected and handled once a development fee ordinance is adopted.

- Evaluate the technical feasibility of the development fee option(s) and provide a detailed outline of the necessary steps to implement the option(s). Options should be placed in rank order based upon the results of a technical evaluation.

- Present option(s) and recommendation(s) to elected officials, key local agencies and community groups.

III. PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS

A. General Requirements

Proposals should be straight forward. Concise delineations of the consultant's capability to satisfy the requirements of this RFP should be expressed. Generally, proposals should include the proposed technical approach, management plan and cost estimates for executing the development fee study process. All components of the proposal should be combined into a loose-leaf notebook or folder. If a team approach is proposed involving two or more consultants, a joint qualification packet should be submitted.

B. The Proposal

All proposals shall include the following:

- A work statement indicating a clear understanding of the nature of the work being undertaken. Also included will be a general description of how the task will be approached.

- A detailed work plan must be submitted indicating how the work will be accomplished.

- Information should be provided to explain at a minimum (1) the personnel available to work on the project, and

their individual experience (2) how the work of the organization(s) and personnel participating in the project will be monitored, (3) the method of general planning and master scheduling to be used for internal review and job tracking, and how problems will be detected and appropriate corrective action taken.

- A cost proposal must be included. The cost proposal shall contain costing methodology, and rationale sufficient to establish that the work will be cost-effective and that the cost estimates are realistic. In addition:

  - the cost of individual elements, such as analytical studies, reports, etc shall be itemized; and,

  - the estimated cost of each phase or segment of offered performance should be itemized.

III. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

A. Method of Evaluation

The contract for this project will be awarded to the consultant whose proposal represents the best combination of technical merit and management expertise at the most reasonable cost. Proposals will be evaluated upon designated areas of concentration and given point values for each area, for a total point value of 100. The primary areas of concentration for evaluation purposes and their relative weighting are as follows:

Demonstrated Understanding of Project and Objectives - 30 Points

The consultant must show knowledge and understanding of each of the five designated development fee options and the implications of each.

Clarity and Practicability - 20 Points

The proposal must be reasonable, objective and technically sound with respect to North Carolina law, and the identified objectives for this project. The proposal must be clear on how all elements associated with the scope of the project will be addressed.

Management Plan - 10 Points

A management plan shall be provided to clearly delineate how the individual or firm anticipates management of the work associated with this project. The plan should demonstrate the following:

- efficient and timely use of human, physical and financial resources;

- anticipated completion dates for task associated with the project; and,

- management charts which clearly convey an understanding of the proposed management plan and the project staffing arrangement.

Organization Experience - 40 Points

The proposal shall identify unique qualifications in experience and personnel. Such unique qualifications will demonstrate the ability of the individual or firm to properly conduct this project. Submission of references and work samples from previous work are encouraged.

NOTES