

# Agenda

## Housing & Community Development Commission (HCDC)

Thursday, March 14, 2019  
6:30 P.M.

Senior Center, Room 202  
28 S. Linn Street, Iowa City  
*Use the Washington Street entrance or  
2<sup>nd</sup> floor skywalk via Tower Place parking garage*

1. Call meeting to order
2. Approval of the February 21, 2019 minutes
3. Public comment of items not on the agenda
4. Recommendation to City Council for FY2020 Emerging Aid to Agencies applications – available online at [www.icgov.org/actionplan](http://www.icgov.org/actionplan)
5. Recommendation to City Council for FY2020 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME) applications – available online at [www.icgov.org/actionplan](http://www.icgov.org/actionplan)
6. Presentation on Fair Housing Study
7. Staff/commission comment
8. Adjournment

If you will need disability-related accommodations to participate in this program or event, please contact Kirk Lehmann at [kirk-lehmann@iowa-city.org](mailto:kirk-lehmann@iowa-city.org) or 319-356-5230. Early requests are strongly encouraged to allow sufficient time to meet your access needs.



# CITY OF IOWA CITY MEMORANDUM

---

Date: March 8, 2019  
To: Housing and Community Development Commission (HCDC)  
From: Neighborhood Service Staff  
Re: March 14, 2019 meeting

The following is a short description of the agenda items. If you have any questions about the agenda, or if you are unable to attend the meeting, please contact Kirk Lehmann at 319-356-5247 or [Kirk-Lehmann@Iowa-City.org](mailto:Kirk-Lehmann@Iowa-City.org).

\* Indicates Action Item

**Item 1. Call Meeting to order**

**Item 2. Approval of the February 21, 2019 minutes\***

**Item 3. Public comment of items not on the agenda**

**Item 4. Recommendation to City Council for FY2020 Emerging Aid to Agencies applications\***

Applications can be found online at [www.icgov.org/actionplan](http://www.icgov.org/actionplan). At this meeting, HCDC will make a recommendation to City Council regarding apportionment of FY20 Emerging Aid to Agencies funds. Applicants are strongly encouraged to send a representative to answer any questions.

**Item 5. Recommendation to City Council for FY2020 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME) applications\***

Applications can be found online at [www.icgov.org/actionplan](http://www.icgov.org/actionplan). At this meeting, HCDC will make a recommendation to City Council regarding apportionment of FY20 CDBG and HOME funds. Staff has compiled your scoring criteria and individual funding recommendations for reference at the meeting. Note that the scoring criteria are just one piece of information to aide your decision-making. Applicants are strongly encouraged to send a representative to answer any questions.

**Item 6: Presentation on Fair Housing Study**

Staff will present on the Fair Housing Study process so far, and preliminary findings of impediments to fair housing choice in Iowa City. Staff requests feedback from Commissioners regarding the process and findings.

**Item 7: Staff/Commission Comment**

**Item 8: Adjournment\***

**MINUTES**

**PRELIMINARY**

**HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
FEBRUARY 21, 2019 – 6:30 PM  
SENIOR CENTER, ASSEMBLY ROOM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Megan Alter, Mitch Brouse, Charlie Eastham, Vanessa Fixmer-Oraiz, Christine Harms, John McKinstry, Maria Padron and Paula Vaughan

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** [vacant position]

**STAFF PRESENT:** Kirk Lehmann, Erika Kubly

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Ryan Halst, Elias Ortiz, Craig Moser, Jake Kundert, Maryann Dennis, Shirley Tramble, Natasha Voelker, Kari Wilken, Roger Lusala, Roger Goedken, Carla Phelps, Brianna Wills, Heath Brewer, Ashley Gillette, Anthony Smith, GT Carr

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER:**

Vaughan called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

**APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 17, 2019 MINUTES:**

Eastham moved to approve the minutes of January 17, 2019 with corrections. Harms seconded. A vote was taken and the motion passed 8-0.

**PUBLIC COMMENT FOR TOPICS NOT ON THE AGENDA:**

None.

**MONITORING REPORTS:**

The Housing Fellowship (FY17, FY18, and FY19 Rental Rehab, FY19 Rental Acquisition, and FY19 CHDO Operating): Lehmann noted that Maryann Dennis with The Housing Fellowship provided a written monitoring report to the Commission. For the FY17, FY18, and FY19 Rental Rehabilitation of affordable rental housing, The Housing Fellowship has awarded HOME funds in the allocation years of FY17, FY18, and FY19 to rehabilitate 9 rental homes owned and managed by The Housing Fellowship. The Housing Fellowship also received an allocation from The Housing Trust Fund of Johnson County for the project. To date The Housing Fellowship has rehabbed 5 of the 9 units and Dennis attached a spreadsheet that illustrated the properties and expenditures. The properties are: 1105 Pine Street, 700 S. 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, 2110 & 2112 Taylor Drive, and 1121 Ash Street. Bid advertisements were published for the rehab of 3 properties 2510 Friendship, 1202 Kirkwood and 58 Amber Lane. The bid opening was held on January 24, 2019. Four bids were received and three contracts awarded and work will start this month. Work bids are being put together for the remaining properties at 1226 Williams Street and 125 South Lowell Street. Work is expected to be complete by this summer. The properties currently occupied by low-income tenants are 1226 Williams Street, 2110 Taylor Drive, 1121 Ash Street, 125 South Lowell Street and 58 Amber Lane. For the FY19 HOME funds CHDO Rental Acquisition, The Housing Fellowship received a HOME allocation of \$100,000 to acquire a rental property, The Housing Fellowship also received a State of Iowa HOME CHDO award of \$450,000 to acquire three properties. The State required the properties

be less than 10 years old and move-in ready, and required the acquired properties be secured by State mortgage in first place, no private bank loan allowed, City HOME funds and State HOME funds were used to acquire a new townhome at 4940 Raleigh Lane, the cost of the townhome was \$227,280 and the home is occupied by a low-income family of four. For the FY19 CHDO Operating The Housing Fellowship received \$12,500 of the \$25,000 in CHDO Operating HOME Grant to support the salary of The Housing Fellowship's Chief Financial Officer.

Habitat for Humanity (FY17 Acquisition on N. Governor, FY18 Acquisition at 2629 Blazing Star, and FY19 Acquisitions at 2764-2774 Blazing Star). Lehmann read an email he received from Heath Brewer, director of the Iowa Valley Habitat for Humanity, for this monitoring report. The FY17 Acquisition on N. Governor was completed in July 2018 and sold to an approved Habitat for Humanity applicant for under 50% of the area median income (AMI). There are five members in the family, mom and dad work for the school district as para-educators and the three children attend school in the Iowa City School District. The family utilized a homeownership assistance through the Housing Choice Voucher Program to help pay for the mortgage. The assistance administered by The Iowa City Housing Authority will allow the family to complete all payment of all mortgages on the property within 15 years of the sale all while paying less than 28% of their current income. This means the family will have an asset which is currently appraised at \$250,000 in an area with consistent appreciation and real estate values. This also means they will no longer need any assistance from The Housing Authority and most importantly this opportunity has provided a stable and safe environment for the family to thrive. For the FY18 Acquisition at 2629 Blazing Star plans have been approved and the lot will be developed upon thawing of the ground. This project is slated to be the Doris Preucil Women Build project and will serve a family with an income just exceeding 40% AMI. The project timeline is March 2019 to November 2019, which allows the organization to fundraise and leverage local partnerships to develop the project for the least amount of cost. Previous women build projects raised between \$50,000 and \$75,000 in cash and received an average of \$20,000 in free labor and materials. Finally for the FY19 Acquisitions at 2764-2774 Blazing Star plans have been approved and the lot will be developed upon thawing of the ground. This project is a zero-lot duplex project with the design highlighting two five-bedroom homes, both families building with this project have several members and will require larger than normal homes. The families have each received \$25,000 from their churches to help development and are designated as the 2019 Interfaith Builds I & II. Both families have incomes under 50% AMI. It is an exciting project with a quick timeline from March 2019 to July 2019.

Mayor's Youth Empowerment Program (FY19 Acquisition) Lehmann said again the Commission has been provided a handout with details of the properties and pictures and the use of CDBG funds that were a part of the project. Lehmann noted they were funded for one house for three SRO units and purchased 1311 Esther Street with \$35,000 so they still have \$40,000 outstanding they will use to purchase another home; they will purchase two properties instead of just one.

#### **QUESTION/ANSWER SESSION FOR FY2020 EMERGING AID TO AGENCIES APPLICATIONS:**

Vaughan stated they would review the applications one by one and the Commission can ask questions of any of the agencies that are in attendance.

Eastham removed himself from the discussion of this agenda item as he is a board member of one of the applicants.

Fixmer-Oraiz also removed herself as she is employed with one of the applicants.

Redevelopment of Forest View Mobile Home Park. Lehmann said Rafael Morataya (Executive Director for the Center for Worker Justice) is unable to be here today because the Forest View Mobile Home Park is being discussed at the Planning & Zoning meeting at the same time. If there are any questions, Lehmann will relay them to Morataya and get answers back to the Commission.

Padron asked about the requirements of the emerging agencies, she noted they must be less than two years old or have never had received money in the past. The Center for Worker Justice is six years old and has received funding in the past. It is unfortunate they aren't present because The Center for Worker

Justice is requesting funding on behalf of the Forest View Tenant's Association. Lehmann stated that for the Emerging Aid to Agencies they cannot have received Aid to Agencies funding in the last five years and The Center for Worker Justice has received City funding but not Aid to Agencies funding. Vaughan agreed that led to some confusion and asked Lehmann to update the application for future rounds.

McKinstry asked if the entity that receives Aid to Agencies funding must be incorporated. Lehmann states the application criteria are that they do not need to be a legal entity for more than two years; it does not specify if they must be incorporated to receive funding. He noted that could be up to the discretion of the Commission as this is a new program. It was set up for new agencies, Lehmann would prefer it to be an established organization in advance of the funding, but it is not required.

Padron stated she does not understand the numbers that were entered, they are requesting to pay the tenants \$960 and that is \$10.10 per hour which is \$9,660 but they are requesting \$15,000. She does not see where they explain what they will do with the rest of the funding. Lehmann said they noted the remainder would be used for general organizational funding such as communications, interpreters, child care and space rent. Lehmann said the funds are being applied for on behalf of the tenant's association so that is what the funds would be used for, not Center for Worker Justice operations.

Padron asked about this tenant's association and why they are being paid to attend their own meetings. Harms agreed noting she was the chairperson for the Grant Wood Neighborhood Association for many years and never got paid, they went out and fundraised for various initiative such as the splash pad but it was all volunteers. She feels if there is an association vested in what they want done they shouldn't have to be paid. If there is a need for space, there are churches and community spaces they can use for free, and if there is a need for childcare they can find volunteers for that. Padron acknowledged that the residents of Forest View are low income residents and can see they may have difficulty getting to the meetings, she would just like to have more information from the organization. McKinstry agreed, the Commission needs more information. Lehmann said he can meet with Morataya to get answers to some of the Commission's questions and relay those back, and Vaughan as Chair can join the meeting if interested. Vaughan agreed.

Padron noted that she used to work with HBK Engineering and was part of the new development of Forest View and HBK and Neuman Munson were paying for some of interpretation costs at meetings with the group so she questions how much the developer is responsible. Lehmann noted that some of those details are still being worked through as well as the relocation plan for the residents as the area is redeveloped. The reason Morataya is not here is because at the Planning & Zoning meeting tonight they are discussing those issues and he needed to be present there.

Grow Johnson County. Vaughan commented that on the split of the AMI categories it has 25 persons in each category which is 100 people total and she said they likely serve many more and those numbers are important when making their considerations. She is unsure if all the recipients are low-income and it is probably hard to get those numbers but perhaps the organizations they deliver to could help get those numbers because she believes their impact is much larger than what the application states.

Jake Kundert (Grow Johnson County) noted that was a technical issue and when discussed with Lehmann he suggested to just fill it out with zeros because they were having issues submitting the form. He noted because they work with a range of agencies that don't collect client data and therefore they do not have data on exact number of people served.

Vaughan understands and acknowledged they do have good figures for poundage of food and number of servings that would make, etc.

Johnson Clean Energy District. Vaughan asked for clarification on the structure of the organization, are they a subgroup of the Green Iowa AmeriCorps

Craig Moser and GT Carr (Johnson Clean Energy District) noted they are just forming a new organization and at this point have an organizing committee that will become the board once they are set up. It will involve various persons who have worked with energy situations in other states such as architects,

homebuilders, energy auditors, etc. They are forming a 501(c) 3 this spring and their intent is to collaborate with the Green Iowa AmeriCorps team that is connected with the City and make referrals to that team as part of the process of getting the work done.

Vaughan asked how far along are they in their process. Moser said their group has been meeting since October and are developing a plan and will be submitting another City grant that would help them implement a program model after the solarized Johnson County program to try and implement a large amount of energy efficiency work throughout the county next year. They are trying to coordinate with others, have met with City staff and several other agencies, and collaborate to pull together all these efforts to meet the ambitious goals in the City Climate Action Plan.

McKinstry asked about incorporation and an organization that doesn't have bylaws yet and likes the idea of corporate responsibility and insurance. He asked for clarification that the actual work done on homes is not done by the Johnson Clean Energy District. Moser confirmed that is correct. McKinstry asked where the money for the materials and labor to put into those homes would come from. Moser said some of it would come from the grant, some would come from the Green Iowa AmeriCorps (federal funds) and they are also expecting to do some significant fundraising. Moser said this is all modeled on the Winneshiek Energy District which was established seven years ago and Moser was a founding board member, and this model has been working up there and has done a great deal of energy efficiency work as well as renewable energy work. McKinstry noted it is like a clearing house for people to come to them and they do the research and investigation on what needs to be done and then someone else comes in and does the actual labor and installation. Moser confirmed and said at this point they do not have staff to do that work and would also be referring to the City rehab program which does some energy efficiency rehab work. McKinstry noted apprehension of developing capacity of telling everybody what they need to have done and needed reassurance that the ability to get it done was also available. He understands the need for a central place for people to come and get information and referrals but wanted to know there is the capacity to get work done. Moser noted part of the plan is to apply for HOME funds next year to do rehabilitation, they are just not at the point where they can do that yet. In their meetings with City staff they discovered a number of programs the City has to assist with pieces of this project but they are not well coordinated and can be confusing or difficult for clients or consumers to know which program to apply for. That this agency could play a coordinating role in steering people to the appropriate program. McKinstry asked how much it would cost to do an energy audit per household. Moser said other programs such as the one in Winneshiek County have found that a level 1 visit or audit can be completed for \$125 which is a basic audit that changes out lightbulbs and aerators and a few minor things like that. A basic audit tends to create on average \$100 worth of savings for a family per year.

Lehmann noted they also discussed the organizations ambitions are beyond Iowa City but any use of City funds would have to be focused in Iowa City. McKinstry noted this is a way to leverage more federal funds by receiving local funds.

Moser also noted there is a need for standardized data collection on amount of energy that is saved and amount energy bills are reduced and they have a program and can do this and document energy savings.

Alter asked if with these funds would help with rehabilitation that would then provide the savings and they would use that data to do the fundraising. Moser confirmed that was his understanding of the purpose of these emerging agency grants, to help agencies get launched and get going so they can leverage additional funding from other services. Alter asked what else they would be using for their allocation for other than doing the \$125 basic audit results. Lehmann noted the last page of the application has the full budget that shows the breakdown of how the allocation would be used. Moser noted that part of what they would do is coordinate agencies and advocate for clear air and clean energy efficiency, they need to sell the public on this whole idea.

Padron noted that right now the Green Iowa AmeriCorps go to houses and do energy audits so can this agency collect data from them since they are already doing that. Moser said they would refer people to that organization to help complete the audits and do the "boots on the ground" work.

Vaughan asked if both Johnson Clean Energy District and Green Iowa AmeriCorps will be doing audits.

Moser said Green Iowa AmeriCorps would be doing the level 1 audits and Johnson Clean Energy District would provide level 2 audits that include things like possibly changing out a furnace or adding insulation, doing advance air sealing and ventilation, etc. These are additional services that would likely be a different income group that could afford to do them. They would do audits and hire contractors in town to do the actual work which would also strengthen the local economy by generating more market demand for contractors to do this energy rehabilitation and efficiency work. He noted that in Winneshiek County when they started doing this work there was one person doing the solar installations, at the end of a seven year period there were six electrical companies in town all doing solar installations and one actually bought solar panels by the truckload due to the high amount of business.

Vaughan said they stated they would also be energy auditing and planning for homeowners, landlords and businesses and asked what percentage of their overall business they think would be for the low or middle income population. Moser said initially at least 75% with this grant fund, eventually and hopefully they will find people who can afford to pay for the audits which will help support the organization. He would also like the possibility of working with organization such as The Housing Fellowship in the future. Vaughan noted the application states the goal is to do 120 households with level 1 audits and 60 would be referred to the Green Iowa AmeriCorps. Moser said they could do some level 1 themselves but will also talk with the City rehab to see if they can assist as well. Vaughan asked if there is any charge for the audit to the low or middle income client. Moser said not the audits done by Green Iowa AmeriCorps. Vaughan asked if Johnson Clear Energy District did the audit there would be a charge. Moser said there could be some cost sharing, he is unsure since they don't have any funding as of yet, but are seeking funding to make the audits cost free.

Lehmann noted that City is beginning to require that folks who receive city rehab dollars must get a Green Iowa AmeriCorps audit inspection prior to the rehab as part of the City's Climate Action Plan.

Little Creations Academy. Lehmann noted a clarification, in terms of budget the amount of funds requested showed up as \$56,247 but for the emerging agencies the maximum allocation is \$15,000.

Anthony Smith (Little Creations Academy) noted that was the amount requested for CDBG funds. Lehmann asked what the emerging funds request would be then, if it was just for the smartboard and labor costs or smartboard with labor costs per the attached bid. Smith said the request is for the cost of the smartboard and labor to install. Lehmann clarified the request is for \$6,970.

Vaughan said the application stated the number of people serving from the 0-30% AMI is 4 and they serve 20 children over the 80% and wondered if that was correct. Smith noted that was a mistake on the application they serve 80% at the low-income. Smith noted the smartboard will be used for the 20 children in the program plus 13 children in the afterschool program for doing assignments, lessons, etc.

Padron said the daycare is in the basement of a church and wondered if the smartboard would belong to the church or to Little Creations Academy. Smith stated Little Creations Academy is a separate 501(c) 3 from the New Creations International Church and would own the smartboard.

Successful Living. Vaughan asked if all clients are in residence there or if there are also outpatients.

Roger Goedken (Successful Living) said at most 1/3 of the clientele live in their housing program and the rest are in an outreach program who live in their own houses or apartments. They make house visits to those clients.

Vaughan noted the funding request is to pay staff. Goedken said it was to help cover additional expenses. He noted the rate the State pays for their services frankly has tightened and paperwork has increased so this request is to help cover the extra hours the staff puts in to complete their jobs. Vaughan stated that is likely a challenge they will face every year. Goedken agreed noting it has increased every year but they are working towards goals to be more efficient by developing or enhancing programs. Vaughan asked if they have a long-range plan for covering these additional costs. Goedken said there are different software programs that will be helpful and are requesting funds for those in this particular request.

Padron asked if the previous funding Successful Living has received from the City was from Aid to Agencies. Lehmann said in the past they have received CDBG or HOME funds for specifically acquiring or rehabilitating their housing, not from Aid to Agencies.

Unlimited Abilities. Vaughan said the request is to look for a transitional home for four people and in the income breakdown 0-30% income nine people were listed.

Shirley Tramble (Unlimited Abilities) said their organization currently serves eleven individuals who are below the 30% income level. Vaughan asked if that was the total population and Tramble confirmed it was. Tramble noted she founded Unlimited Abilities in 2017 and they are almost two years old. They currently lease two homes that house four individuals in one and three in the other, the rest of the individuals have their own homes. They are asking for funding to purchase their first home to house four individuals. Vaughan noted it appears to be an ambitious timeline and questioned how realistic the timeline was to one month close on a house, the next hire staff and her experience is these things typically take much longer. Tramble stated they have already begun the process, she already employs four staff and each house typically needs two members to staff it and they will have to hire two more staff members to work in the newly acquired home.

Vaughan asked where the clients are referred from and if there is a waiting list. Tramble said she has a waiting list and gets referrals from DHS. She currently has four or five on the waiting list. The two homes she has now are transitional so there are clients that come, live for a bit and then move out and make space for others on the waiting list.

McKinstry asked what the total cost was of the house they wish to purchase. Tramble said they have been looking and the house they were looking at was \$150,000. Vaughan asked if they anticipate having to remodel or do any work on the house. Tramble said it was move-in ready and is working with a realtor and trying to stay within the \$150,000 to \$200,000 range. Vaughan asked if it was four bedrooms or was there a need for staff to live there as well. Tramble said they only staff the homes Monday – Friday 9am to 5pm. McKinstry noted that finding a 4 bedroom house for \$150,000 in Iowa City is difficult.

Padron asked if they do not anticipate having to do any remodeling to the house so are the homes they are looking at already ADA compliant. Tramble noted the residents are diagnosed with mental illnesses and not physical ones so extra ADA needs are not necessary, they provide services under the habilitation waiver for mental illness.

Harms asked if they have money in case they find they do need to do some repairs or remodeling on the home they purchase. Tramble said they do have a budget for those types of issues.

**QUESTION/ANSWER SESSION FOR FY2020 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) AND HOME INVESTMENTS PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM (HOME) APPLICATIONS:**

Eastham and Fixmer-Oraiz rejoined the meeting.

Lehmann began with staff comments, concerns, and questions from the applications. He noted they have a rough budget of \$100,000 CDBG funds and \$540,000 in HOME funds, there are currently \$730,000 in requests for housing projects and \$280,000 for public facilities projects. He will send out the budget sheets to the Commission so they will have that information as they put together their rankings and funding allocations. He stated they just got the appropriations announcement so they know HOME dollars are expected to go down a bit and CDBG are expected to stay flat although based on new cities joining the program and the funding allocation process, the City does not know its final allocation yet. Hopefully they will have it by the next meeting, if not the commission must set a contingency policy.

Habitat for Humanity. Lehmann had five concerns/notes. First, they will have to deal with federal procurement standards (competitive bids) depending on how the project is structured. Currently the structure is the City helps with the acquisition of the lot and some of the construction so they get those funds at the end, for that construction they would have to do it competitively. The City may also structure it as down payment assistance then Habitat would essentially float the construction until the point where



they sell it to the tenant and the City would provide the funds directly to the tenant. The City will work through this to find the best fit within the federal regulations. With regards to Section 3, it is a requirement that happens with construction and rehabilitation, if it is over \$100,000 of HOME funds then they may have to provide any new jobs that are created to be focused on low AMI individuals. For new construction of housing, the construction has to be completed within one year of the signing of the agreement, which happens after the environmental review, and the house must be sold within nine months. The sales price has to be within the HUD home limits for sales price limits which is currently at \$228,000. Habitat has never been close to that with appraisal so that has never been an issue. The sale has to pass underwriting standards for both Habitat as the developer and the homebuyer.

McKinstry asked if Habitat for Humanity had any issues with the federal regulations.

Heath Brewer (Habitat for Humanity) confirmed they have briefly discussed with City staff regarding the acquisition of properties versus down payment assistance to alleviate some federal administration. He added they can float the purchase of the lot and wait until closing to use City's funds. He believes down payment assistance is probably preferable to lot acquisition as it is more direct to the homebuyer as opposed to the organization.

Brouse asked if down payment assistance rather than lot acquisition would alter the project other than paperwork. Brewer said it may make the project move faster. He noted the benefit to acquisition is it requires the home to be built within a year, but even if they use the funds for down payment assistance they will still build right away, they will not land bank.

McKinstry noted that the Commission scoring looks at number of individuals served and as Habitat is a homeowner project, it generally affects fewer people though more deeply. Therefore the scoring for Habitat is generally lower than other organizations that serve rental properties. Brewer acknowledged there is a large investment required to build a home to sell to a qualified buyer and a large subsidy is part of that, however his organization helps more people in other areas. In terms of selling a home to a qualified buyer, in Habitat's case between 40% and 80% AMI, when using HOME funds they look for buyers below 50% so they are subsidizing a project for people much lower than traditionally would qualify or even consider home buying opportunities. So yes, maybe they are helping fewer people but the impact is more profound, it is more of a generational investment. Homeownership provides stability for families. Many are larger in number and have trouble finding affordable rentals. Habitat is able to sell a property to a family with all home costs under 30% of the gross income, provide a mortgage they can pay for as it is well below market value, and they have equity in the home immediately. For instance they will sell a property for \$140,000 that is appraised at \$200,000 so that is \$60,000 in instant equity and after 15 years the homeowner has full access to all that equity. This is a wealth building tool that is provided to these families so their children won't need these programs as their parents can now provide for them.

Eastham asked if Habitat works with residents and families who have not obtained lawful status yet. Brewer stated they do not, per Habitat for Humanity international rules they can only work with documented citizens. The investment Habitat is making for these families is for up to 30 years so they want to make sure the homeowners will be here for 30 years. If a family is undocumented their stay in the United States may be out of their control. Lehmann noted the source of funds also requires citizenship for individuals receiving the funding.

Harms noted that of course there are never enough funds to go around to fund all the great programs the community has so could Habitat take less allocation than requested and continue with their project. Brewer confirmed they could, it would just be fewer families they could serve or more time to complete projects. For every \$50,000 they receive they can develop a new project. HOME funds are essential to allow Habitat to serve a lower income population. The request of \$120,000 for four properties is for low income families, which frees Habitat funds to help other families that are maybe above 50% AMI. If they receive less than they asked for they will have to slow down the development of these projects.

Fixmer-Oraiz asked if they did get less how they would decide if they move forward on the less than 50% AMI projects or the over 50% AMI projects. Brewer said they would move forward with the less than 50% AMI project first. He noted they have less and less applicants in the under 50% AMI category.

Eastham noted the Forest View relocation plan that is under consideration will provide homeownership opportunities for 50-60 households in the community who are mostly under 30%-40% AMI. Lehmann noted The Housing Fellowship has also developed homeownership opportunities in the past.

Brewer mentioned the holistic approach of Habitat with housing goes beyond just the monthly mortgage, insurance and tax payment, they also go well beyond Code for insulation and systems they put in homes to make them affordable to operate and live in. They are always looking for opportunities to build these homes and make them affordable to live in. The goal is for homes that are safe, healthy and affordable.

Mayor's Youth Empowerment Program (MYEP). Lehmann noted this is a rental/new construction project. They are requesting \$200,000 to acquire two lots and construct two three-bedroom fully accessible homes to be operated as six single room occupancy units in their supported living community program. The total project budget is \$600,000. Lehman said staff notes are similar to those for Habitat, they will need to comply with sealed bids, federal procurement standards, and depending on the funds allocated section 3 may apply, they have to build within one year and occupy within six months or put together a marketing plan. Also as this is five or more HOME assisted units they will have to implement the City's affirmative marketing plan. As a rental project it must comply with City underwriting requirements and regarding that with mortgage interest rates increasing and HOME rents expected to decrease need to address any concerns about adequate cash flow or borrowing ability. The proforma should also show a 1<sup>st</sup> year loss due to applying for tax exemption and the organization has to have the cash to cover it.

Alter wondered if the partner could elaborate on their services and where the 16 homes they operate are, 11 of which they own.

Roger Lusala (Mayor's Youth Empowerment Program) said all of their properties are in neighborhoods and named the various locations of the houses. He noted some houses have been purchased by MYEP, HOME funds have not been used for all.

Eastham noted MYEP is financed with private funding for development of other homes and if they plan to continue that practice along with HOME funds. Lusala said they always finance, it is the down payment for the homes they partner with the City to provide. If MYEP has extra cash and can afford to put a down payment on a home they will do so, because they are a nonprofit they fundraise for home purchases.

Eastham asked about the demand for additional units. Lusala said the demand for wheelchair accessible homes is high, currently there are people in their 20's and 30's living in nursing homes, not because they need nursing care but because there are no accessible homes elsewhere. When MYEP built the house in 2013 one of the first persons to move in was a 39 year old who had been living in a nursing home for years. The amount of accessible units available does not meet the need for the number of people they serve, additionally the wheelchairs are now bigger, people are larger and it is hard to find builders to build ADA accessible homes. When they build these units they add track ceilings to transport someone from a bedroom to a bathroom, sinks where wheelchairs can fit under, overall functioning to meet all a person's needs. Lusala said they have people on waiting lists for these units.

Harms asked if the clients are renting or owning their units in these supported homes. Lusala said the clients are renting, MYEP purchases the homes so they can modify the homes to be accessible but are not in the real estate business to turn around and sell those homes. They also provide 24-hour services to those residents of the homes.

Padron asked how long most residents stay in these homes. Lusala said it is very long-term living, for most it is permanent living, only to move out if their level of needs change.

Harms asked if there is a three-bedroom house is it for three individuals that need services or is it a family. Lusala said it would be three individuals that need the services with staff coming and going. Lehmann added it is categorized as single room occupancy units and each client is on a separate lease.

Lusala noted they were able to use the money the City awarded them last year to acquire two units rather

than just the one requested. Harms asked then how much does MYEP really need to move forward with this project this year. Lusala said the lots they purchase to build accessible units on have to be bigger lots because they cannot build up (which is cheaper, smaller lots), they often look for corner lots and those lots run about \$75,000 to \$100,000 each so that is why they are requesting \$200,000. If they are only awarded \$75,000 for each lot they will just have to search harder for those less expensive lots or do more fundraising to get to the \$100,000 threshold. He noted they really need both lots as they have over 20 people on their waiting list for accessible units.

McKinstry asked about the staff comment about rental rates falling and that the reimbursement rate is based on the rental rates in a given area, so if the rental rates for the whole area fall then the reimbursement to the agency falls. Lehmann said this is a concern is because they have to pass the underwriting standards with specific thresholds and CDBG fair market rents decreased from \$468 to \$459; rents are becoming more affordable as vacancies increase in the market. However underwriting may mandate less units being built or purchased or their mortgage rates may not stay under the \$860 per month mandate. Lusala stated they are not looking at making money by the houses they rent, they are looking at providing services to the people. He added they use seven different banks because they make them compete for his business and give him the rates he needs to stay in his margins.

Eastham noted a concern about underwriting and if staff feels projects are not viable it should be shared. Lehmann said it is more a concern about making sure a project passes federal underwriting rather than a concern about financial viability. In some cases, underwriting may indicate a need for the City to subsidize a project more deeply based on federal guidelines. Eastham requested the Commission see the numbers that cause a concern to be raised so they can evaluate as well. Lehmann said he will send his numbers in a follow up email.

Successful Living – rental acquisition. Lehmann said the project is \$240,000 to acquire four homes, they note they will add a fifth bedroom but HOME dollars are for acquisition only, so if it is not already in the property, the City cannot count any additional bedroom. For federal dollars and underwriting it is only 16 units but there will likely be another unit added after the acquisition is complete. Lehmann added that Successful Living provided responses to all staff concerns and comments. Lehmann continued noting that competitive bids will be required for any work such as adding a bedroom if that is part of the project. Successful Living has a realtor they use who is on their board which can be a conflict of interest for CDBG funds, but not HOME funds; Successful Living prefers HOME dollars. Section 3 may apply depending on the amount of funds allocated, if they have five or more HOME assisted units they will have to implement the City's affirmative marketing plan and they already do that. They may be subject to relocation requirements for properties occupied by tenants at the time of acquisition, historically that has not been an issue as they have been unoccupied or homeowner occupied. The Proforma assumes five units per property but will have to pass underwriting for four units. Additionally with the Proforma, they are assuming a 8% vacancy loss, maintenance and repairs is about \$9,000 over what Lehmann would expect (generally assume 1% of the value of the property) but Successful Living noted that amount is because of the particular houses and client population. Property taxes will show only in the first year, for SROs utilities need to be included under miscellaneous operating expenses so that is showing in the Proforma. Operating expenses are at 8% which is within the requirements, however the City typically prefers 5-7%, and finally they may be subject to federal labor provisions depending on the amount of units they have (kicks in after 8 units). Lehmann noted that he has discussed the proforma with Successful Living staff, and indicated they would not need to update unless requested by the Commission or in the case they are awarded funds

Vaughan asked how many properties Successful Living currently has.

Roger Goedken (Successful Living) confirmed they have five properties. Vaughan asked the occupancy on the five properties. Goedken said they are in the upper 90's right now, around a year ago they added a new intake person who has done marvelously getting better fit clients and occupancy up. The occupancy averages around 90% depending on the time of year. Vaughan asked if they have quite a bit of turnover or if this is transitional housing. Goedken said the houses they pursue are more permanent housing situations, but they have quite a bit of transition for their other houses due to mental health and levels of care changing. Goedken noted that about six months ago they had a waiting list of about 20 people and

now have a whole new list of 20 people and the list is growing so there is no shortage of need. Vaughan noted the application states the units will be affordable for five years, Goedken confirmed the period of affordability is for five years. Vaughan asked what happens after the five years.

Carla Phelps (Successful Living) stated the affordability is a HUD definition based on \$15,000 per unit. However Successful Living continues to provide the affordable rates for tenants past the five years, they never change the rents they charge, and they stay at the City levels. Lehmann noted the five years is for HOME compliance where the City monitors the rents, post five years the City no longer monitors.

Eastham asked how long Successful Living had been operating in Iowa City. Goedken replied 21 years.

Harms noted Successful Living provides supportive services and asked if they could describe the SRO units because the population they serve has specific needs and some of the amenities would be different. Phelps said it is a regular five-bedroom house, they make it nice and welcoming which is important since most people have never lived in a nice home, they keep homes clean and well maintained. They maintain good relationships with neighbors. Staff helps residents, takes them to their psychiatric appointments, takes them to get physical activity, etc. All residents have different needs so the staff working in the homes cater to the needs of the people living there.

Eastham asked about the cost for the services Successful Living provides, where the payments come from. Goedken replied payment is from Medicaid. Eastham asked if Successful Living has the ability to finance home purchases with funds other than the HOME program. Phelps said they need HOME money for down payments. Goedken added they would not be able to expand their housing without support or funding from other grant sources. Banks will only assist with loans if they have down payment funds.

Successful Living – rental rehab. Lehmann said this is for an existing home they own at 3107 Village Road, five bedroom SRO units, they are asking for \$75,000. Staff asked if Successful Living could proceed with rehab if they have to repay any HOME funding or if they could proceed with equity rather than City assistance. Phelps responded stating they need a grant not a loan to proceed with this rehab.

Eastham asked if there was a difference between Successful Living's requests for federal funds for rehab or in this case The Housing Fellowship's use of federal funds for rehab with this round of applications. Lehmann said the differences are clientele, Successful Living is persons with disabilities, The Housing Fellowship is typically families. Another difference is SRO's typically get a better rate of return on investment for the number of units because it is smaller units and they share the house, so you can often help more people in a single household than one family, which depends more on size. Lehmann noted based on the applications, 15% of the HOME allocation has to be awarded to a community housing development organization, which The Housing Fellowship is; in this case it is roughly estimated at \$70,000. Eastham stated he does not see a difference in what Successful Living is doing in their rehab project versus what The Housing Fellowship is requesting. Lehmann said they are both using HOME rehab finance dollars.

The Housing Fellowship – CHDO. Lehmann said this request is \$26,500 for operating expenses which is up to 5% of what a HOME allocation can be used for, that and developer fees are the only ways to fund operating expenses. Lehmann noted the current estimation is around \$23,000. If The Housing Fellowship receives CHDO funds they have to do a CHDO set-aside project (like a rental rehab) within 24 months of being awarded the funds.

The Housing Fellowship – rental rehab. Lehmann said this is the only CHDO project that has come in, the other CHDO is HACAP but they haven't done a CHDO project in a while. They are asking for \$69,180 for rental rehab of one four-bedroom and one two-bedroom property. \$63,000 is requested for rehab and approximately \$6,000 for administration of the grant. The Housing Fellowship must remain a CHDO for the period of affordability which in this case is 10 years minimum. Staff again asked if this project could proceed with rehab using equity rather than City assistance.

Maryann Dennis (The Housing Fellowship) is unsure why the City is questioning if they could proceed with equity when they are required to provide a CHDO with the HOME reserve anyway. Could they do the

rehab with equity, sure but they just spent \$225,000 in predevelopment costs for the low-income housing tax credit project. Dennis noted that even though their balance sheet may show a lot of equity, they could do it but it won't help The Housing Fellowship remain solvent. The Housing Fellowship has been a Certified Housing Development Organization for the State before Iowa City was an entitlement community. Dennis also acknowledged the conflict of interest issue stating on the application it states "identity of interest" which she feels is different than conflict of interest and The Housing Fellowship knows procurement procedures, they have always followed them, her contract manager married someone that owns a contractor company and therefore she is no longer involved in any way in the procurement or award of any contract or administration of rehab award if her husband's company is competitively awarded the bid. Lehmann confirmed that the City's legal counsel cleared that.

Eastham asked Dennis to describe the process or method The Housing Fellowship is using for deciding which particular properties are due for rehab. Dennis said they look at the age and condition of the properties, they have a maintenance staff that keeps apprised of the conditions of the properties, they keep a capital improvement budget they review every year for depreciation of appliances, etc.

Domestic Violence Intervention Program (DVIP). Lehmann stated they are requesting \$120,000 to renovate the emergency shelter for adult and youth victims of domestic violence, more specifically the parking area, youth services area and fencing.

Eastham asked for priorities on the three or four parts of this project.

Ryan Halst (DVIP) said the asphalt repair in the existing lots is the biggest priority as they are badly deteriorating. The fencing is to keep people out of the lot and keep victims safe even if outside. They would like to update the youth area because it is old, the flooring and whatnot, and things need replaced.

Elias Ortiz (DVIP) added they are a 24 hour shelter that was built in 1993 and have served over 8,600 people and are always at capacity (which is about 40 individuals) and half the clientele at any given point is children. They have received CDBG funds in the past for renovations in the kitchen but the youth area has not been updated and it is important. They hold support groups for children in the shelter, do safety planning, etc. DVIP treats the children as their own clients, not as secondary to the parental client, and need a space for them. They wish to update the flooring, new functional cabinets for storage, and furniture to make the area functional and useful. Ortiz noted that last year they established Hoover's House which is the only shelter in the State of Iowa that has kenneling for dogs and cats so families don't have to make the tough choice of leaving their pets behind. That is why the fencing is so important but also Ortiz stated in the last year they have seen a huge increase (60-70%) in perpetrators showing up on the property, and security, safety and confidentiality are priority one.

Little Creations Academy. Lehmann stated this request is for \$51,968 public improvements project for the Little Creations daycare which predominately services low-income children. The project will consist of replacing some bathrooms, installing a boiler, floor tile, wall shelf and windows. Lehmann stated most of the projects are eligible but the boiler system will require funds to be proportioned and staff will work through how that can be done. The boiler is coming from another property, will be stored and then installed onsite. Because the boiler will also serve the religious portion of the property as well as the daycare they will need to apportion the funds.

Padron noted this daycare is in the basement of the church and wondered if the daycare pays rent to the church. Anthony Smith (Pastor, Little Creations Academy) stated the daycare pays rent to the church. Padron stated they will be fixing restrooms and other items as a tenant and the landlord is the church.

McKinstry recalls a previous application regarding a furnace for this space. Smith replied there are four furnaces in the building and a boiler. McKinstry asked how many of the other furnaces have been replaced. Smith stated they replaced two furnaces that are related to the daycare, the other two are related to the church which are the church's responsibility to replace. McKinstry asked how the boiler fits in, does it help to heat both the church and the daycare. Smith confirmed the boiler heats the church and one section of the daycare so that is why they need to apportion funds. Lehmann said they look at the square footage of the daycare versus the church and apportion the funds accordingly.

Padron asked if the church has any intention of fixing these items themselves instead of making the tenant (daycare) fix them. Smith explained it is a unique situation with the boiler as they are getting it from another location and the church is providing the labor.

Alter stated the Commission awarded a lot of money before to Little Creations Academy to install floors and remove asbestos and asked if this was a different location. Smith said the location is over 5000 square feet so the previous project covered 2400 square feet, this project will be replacing the floor tiles on the other 2400+ square feet.

Old Brick – ADA Improvements. Lehmann noted this is a \$400,553 project with the ADA improvements looking at a kitchen renovation (which serves the event facilities as well as the Agape Café which is the weekly meal for the homeless), ADA restroom and handrail improvements and some new flooring. He noted a wrinkle in the project in that it will need to meet a national objective to be able to qualify for CDBG funds. City staff is currently in discussions with the HUD representative about the possibility, the question has been escalated up the chain at HUD. Lehmann said this issue is for the kitchen renovation as well as the other project that includes the installation of a retaining wall. He stated all the ADA improvements are eligible expenses because it serves a limited clientele who are presumed to primarily be low-moderate income. Lehmann informed the Commission they can still award funds and if staff discovers part of the project may not be eligible, the award would go to the parts that are eligible. Lehmann hopes to have the answers from HUD before the next Commission meeting.

Harms asked about the kitchen renovation and details on why it qualifies.

Brianna Wills (Old Brick) said the primary way they qualify the kitchen renovation for low-moderate income is for 25 years Agape Café has operated out of this kitchen which serves homeless or no/low income individuals, about 80-100 people at each serving. Wills also stated that everyone that rents the ballroom can use the kitchen as part of the deal and because they are a low-cost rental property in Iowa City most of the guests that rent Old Brick qualify as 80% or under. There are 16 nonprofits that have offices within Old Brick and are almost all human services. Those nonprofits use the facility extensively including the kitchen. Old Brick is 163 years old and a very expensive building to maintain, they are aggressively looking at environmentally friendly options as they renovate, which can add more in terms of cost, but is important for the long term. They are trying to do the right thing and upgrade Old Brick to serve all organizations that come through. Other organizations use Old Brick too, including nonprofits that are not tenants. They rent space to tenants at \$2 per square foot and elsewhere in downtown Iowa City the rental rates typically run between \$18 and \$25 per square foot for office space, so they are substantially subsidizing those nonprofits and that is what the mission of Old Brick is, to serve as a nonprofit incubator, and those nonprofits tend to use the facilities for fundraising events, lectures, etc. Wills added that the Agape Café Board of Directors are committed to help fund the kitchen renovation.

Alter asked if Old Brick was on the National Registry and Wills confirmed it is. Wills added it is the second oldest public building in Iowa City, second only to the capitol, and was built on the tallest hill in Iowa City which is where the request for the second grant comes in.

Old Brick – structural reinforcement. Wills continued to discuss the structural reinforcement retaining wall. When she came on board at Old Brick about a year ago she decided the property needed to be “prettied up” and opened a giant can of worms. When MMS Consulting came to survey the property and agreed to a free gardening plan, they discovered the hillside by Clinton Street had eroded to dangerous levels. Over 163 years the hill has now eroded enough to where the foundation is exposed and at a critical point where they are in danger of wall cracking, water damage, etc. Therefore this information led her to take other projects off the table because it was now the primary focus. At first they thought they could put up a retaining wall but found that the drainage from the building’s roof goes through this hillside and would affect the wall. Therefore drains have to be redirected and unfortunately there isn’t a sewage or drainage vent into the road for a whole city block. Therefore they will have to use water permeable pavers and this project is now estimated around \$100,000 because the landscaping will have to be ripped up for the wall to be built, deal with the drainage issues. To deal with drainage they will essentially end up with a large patio at the front of the building, which will add value to Old Brick as an event facility. Wills noted that

being a small nonprofit they do not have the \$100,000 in reserves to pay for such a large undertaking and such a significant capital project so they need to search for funding.

Brouse asked if these improvements would qualify for historical renovation grants. Wills replied they applied through the State for an emergency grant and was not awarded one because all funding for the year had been depleted. They will try again, but noted most of those grants are smaller (\$5,000 or \$10,000) but any funding will help. She has also investigated the cost-sharing option through the City and State and will try to obtain those funds as well for the permeable patio.

Lehmann stated that for items that are not CDBG eligible staff is willing to help look for other sources.

Fixmer-Oraiz asked if they had media coverage of the needs for Old Brick. Wills said they implemented a few programs such as a "brick buying" program, having your name on a brick, and also the repainting of the ballroom will have a donor wall for that, so they have been doing outreach. Fixmer-Oraiz noted that many in the community just don't know these things are going on and it is important to get the word out.

#### **STAFF/COMMISSION COMMENT:**

Lehmann noted the opening to replace Bob Lamkins closes March 5, to be appointed March 12. Looking for someone with a financial background or receiving rental assistance, so please encourage applicants.

With regards to Legacy Aid to Agencies, the funding recommendation for the full amount was approved by Council but only for a single year so the Commission will must revisit this once this funding cycle is complete. He noted support for 3% annual funding increases so that can be built into the future planning. Eastham added he would like to discuss sooner rather than later, possibly April.

Lehmann added Padron asked that applications be more consistent and perhaps give additional guidance to applicants (such as for demographic information). Padron added there were two applications that had no information on demographics and therefore on her chart they scored really low. Eastham agreed that demographic information should be part of the applications for housing projects but noted that some programs, such as the food programs, don't have a way to gather demographic information. Lehmann said this can also be discussed this spring/summer after this funding cycle is complete.

With regards to community development happenings Lehmann announced they are monitoring right now, they received the RFPs for City Steps and are doing rankings and will hopefully have a consultant chosen soon to begin work this spring. Staff has started a preliminary review of affordable housing programs, they are still in ongoing discussions about how those might look.

On March 5 in the Iowa City Public Library meeting room A the Chamber of Commerce is putting on an Affordable Housing Forum for developers and contractors, Commissioners are welcome to attend.

Lehmann noted the next meeting is March 21 and they will do the Fair Housing Study Presentation, CDBG/HOME recommendations and Emerging Aid to Agency recommendations. He acknowledged the meeting is during spring break week and wondered if Commissioners wanted to reschedule. After discussion the Commission agreed to hold the next meeting on March 14.

Community Development Week is April 22-27 please let Lehmann know of any ideas.

Lehmann stated that organizations are mixing different pots of funding, Aid to Agency, CDBG/HOME, Sustainability, Human Rights Commission, Housing Trust Fund of Johnson County, City funds and it has been raised whether this should be coordinated. He noted staff is also discussing this, but now they are just tracking funding; they have no formal recommendations on how to better coordinate.

#### **ADJOURNMENT:**

Fixmer-Oraiz moved to adjourn. Alter seconded. Passed 8-0



**Housing and Community  
 Development Commission  
 Attendance Record**

Name	Terms Exp.	7/10	9/20	10/11	11/15	12/20	1/17						
Alter, Megan	7/1/21	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Brouse, Mitch	7/1/21	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Eastham, Charlie	7/1/20	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Fixmer-Oraiz, Vanessa	7/1/20	X	O/E	X	X	X	O/E						
Harms, Christine	7/1/19	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Lamkins, Bob	7/1/19	O/E	O/E	X	O/E	O/E	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
McKinstry, John	7/1/17	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Padron, Maria	7/1/20	X	X	O/E	O/E	X	X						
Vaughan, Paula	7/1/19	X	X	X	X	X	X						

- Resigned from Commission

Key:

- X = Present
- O = Absent
- O/E = Absent/Excused
- = Vacant

### FY20 CDBG/HOME Applications Summary

Housing Projects (CDBG & HOME eligible unless noted)	Requested Amount	CDBG Recomm.	HOME Recomm.
Habitat - Lot Acq./Homebuyer Assistance (4 homebuyers)	\$120,000		
MYEP - Lot Acq. and Rental Construcion (2 lots, 6 SROs)	\$200,000		
Successful Living - Rental Acq. (4 properties, 16 SROs)	\$240,000		
Successful Living - Rental Rehab. (1 property, 5 SROs)	\$75,000		
THF - CHDO Operating ( <b>HOME-eligible only</b> )	\$26,500	NA	Max: \$23,000
THF - Rental Rehabilitation (2 properties)	\$69,108		Min: \$70,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$730,608</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

#### Public Facilities Projects - CDBG eligible only

DVIP - Shelter Repair	\$120,000		NA
Little Creations Academy - Renovation Phase 3	\$51,968		NA
Old Brick - ADA Improvements	\$40,553		NA
Old Brick - Structural Fortification/Water Mitigation	\$67,670		NA
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$280,191</b>	<b>\$0</b>	

<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$1,010,799</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
---------------	--------------------	------------	------------

Funds Available \$640,000    \$100,000    \$540,000

*Parts of project must be apportioned/may not be eligible*

### FY20 Emerging Aid to Agencies Applications Summary

Emerging Aid to Agencies (EA2A) Projects	Requested Amount	EA2A Recomm.	Max: \$15,000 Min: \$5,000
CWJ - Forest View Mobile Home Park Redvelopment	\$15,000		
Grow Johnson County - 2019 Production	\$15,000		
Johnson Clean Energy District - Start Up	\$12,000		
Little Creations - Smart Board	\$6,970		
Successful Living - Additional Staffing Pay	\$15,000		
Unlimited Abilities - Building Acquisition	\$15,000		
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$78,970</b>	<b>\$0</b>	
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$78,970</b>	<b>\$0</b>	
Funds Available		<span style="background-color: #d4edda; padding: 2px;">\$19,000</span>	



## HCDC Scoring and Funding

	<i>Public Facilities</i>				<i>Housing</i>					
	DVIP - Shelter Repair	Little Creations Academy - Renovation Phase 3	Old Brick - ADA Improvements	Old Brick - Structural Fortification/Water Mitigation	Habitat - Lot Acquisition	MYEP - Lot Acquisition	Successful Living - Rental Acquisition	Successful Living - Rental Rehabilitation	THF - CHDO Operating	THF - Rental Rehabilitation
Vaughan Brouse Padron	65	55	60	70	74	68	69	48	69	51
Harms	76	66	60	55	76	86	69	49	59	84
Eastham	71	68	49	51	72	84	87	72	74	72
Fixmer-Oraiz	78	49	70	72	66	83	92	72	95	64
Alter	67	45	52	54	67	62	67	60	55	55
McKinstry	66	55	65	50	67	75	80	66	71	71
<b>Median</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>66</b>

	<i>Public Facilities</i>				<i>Housing</i>					
	DVIP - Shelter Repair	Little Creations Academy - Renovation Phase 3	Old Brick - ADA Improvements	Old Brick - Structural Fortification/Water Mitigation	Habitat - Lot Acquisition	MYEP - Lot Acquisition	Successful Living - Rental Acquisition	Successful Living - Rental Rehabilitation	THF - CHDO Operating	THF - Rental Rehabilitation
Vaughan Brouse Padron	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,000	\$ 70,000
Harms	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 23,000	\$ 70,000
Eastham	\$36,500	\$30,567	\$32,933	\$0	\$0	\$180,000	\$220,000	\$70,000	\$0	\$70,000
Fixmer-Oraiz	\$ 75,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 44,392	\$ 26,500	\$ 69,108
Alter	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 23,000	\$ 70,000
<b>Median</b>	<b>\$ 75,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 60,000</b>	<b>\$ 150,000</b>	<b>\$ 200,000</b>	<b>\$ 70,000</b>	<b>\$ 23,000</b>	<b>\$ 70,000</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>\$ 72,300</b>	<b>\$ 6,113</b>	<b>\$ 11,587</b>	<b>\$ 10,000</b>	<b>\$ 70,000</b>	<b>\$ 148,400</b>	<b>\$ 134,400</b>	<b>\$ 52,878</b>	<b>\$ 19,100</b>	<b>\$ 69,822</b>
<b>Requested</b>	<b>\$ 120,000</b>	<b>\$ 51,968</b>	<b>\$ 40,553</b>	<b>\$ 67,670</b>	<b>\$ 120,000</b>	<b>\$ 200,000</b>	<b>\$ 240,000</b>	<b>\$ 75,000</b>	<b>\$ 26,500</b>	<b>\$ 69,108</b>

## HCDC RANKINGS AND CDBG/HOME ALLOCATIONS: FY14-Present

### FY19

Project Name	Average Score (Max. 100)	Requested	Allocated	Percent Allocation	Amended
Arthur Street Healthy Life Center	80	\$ 100,000	\$ 51,000	51%	\$ 51,000
NCJC Siding Improvement	68	\$ 51,467	\$ 41,000	80%	\$ 41,700
THF - CHDO Operating	88	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	100%	\$ 25,000
THF - Rental Acquisition	76	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	100%	\$ 100,000
Habitat for Humanity - Ownership	83	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	100%	\$ 80,000
MYEP - Rental Acquisition	81	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	100%	\$ 75,000
Successful Living - Rental Acquisition	80	\$ 310,000	\$ 194,000	63%	\$ 194,000
City of Iowa City - South Dist. Part.	59	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	100%	\$ 100,000
Prelude - Transitional Housing Impr.	62	\$ 82,010	\$ 34,000	41%	\$ 34,000
Unlimited Abilities	21	\$ 200,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Habitat - Lot Acquisition 1	NA	\$ 40,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Habitat - Lot Acquisition 2	NA	\$ 40,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -
MYEP - Lot Acquisition	NA	\$ 80,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -
THF - Rental Rehabilitation (Round 2)	NA	\$ 91,362	\$ 87,034	95%	\$ 87,034
Shelter Housing - Rental Acquisition (Round 2)	NA	\$ 185,000	\$ 93,966	51%	\$ 93,966

### FY18

Project Name	Average Score (Max. 100)	Requested	Allocated	Percent Allocation	Amended
Crisis Center Food Pantry	83	\$ 100,000	\$ 85,000	85%	\$ 95,000
Successful Living	81	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	100%	\$ 87,000
CHDO operations - Housing Fellowship	75	\$ 25,000	\$ 18,000	72%	\$ 18,000
Habitat for Humanity	74	\$ 90,000	\$ 50,000	56%	\$ 50,000
The Housing Fellowship Rehab	67	\$ 100,000	\$ 86,000	86%	\$ 86,000
Housing Authority Rent Assistance	62	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	100%	\$ 200,000
Little Creations Academy Daycare	54	\$ 107,934	\$ 73,000	68%	\$ 109,141
MYEP Facility	52	\$ 60,000	\$ 31,000	52%	\$ 31,000
Mid-Year Habitat for Humanity	N/A	\$ 70,000	\$ 35,000	50%	\$ 35,000
Mid-Year THF Rental Construction	N/A	\$ 245,000	\$ 100,000	41%	\$ -
Mid-Year MYEP Rental Acquisition	N/A	\$ 75,000	\$ 50,000	67%	\$ 50,000
Mid-Year Successful Living Rental Rehab	N/A	\$ 74,895	\$ 50,000	67%	\$ 57,994
Mid-Year Successful Living Rental Acquisition	N/A	\$ 100,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -

### FY17

Project Name	Average Score (Max. 100)	Requested	Allocated	Percent Allocation	Amended
Shelter House	87	\$ 450,000	\$ 275,000	61%	\$ 25,000
The Housing Fellowship	79	\$ 300,000	\$ 58,000	19%	\$ 58,000
Habitat for Humanity	77	\$ 80,000	\$ -	0%	
MYEP Housing	76	\$ 65,000	\$ 50,000	77%	\$ 50,000
CHDO operations - THF	75	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	100%	\$ 16,000
DVIP Shelter	70	\$ 45,917	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Diamond Senior Apartments	68	\$ 237,636	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Arc of SE Iowa	67	\$ 160,000	\$ 51,000	32%	\$ 51,000
MYEP Facility	63	\$ 60,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -
United Action for Youth	60	\$ 50,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -
CSCC Childcare	60	\$ 145,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -

## HCDC RANKINGS AND CDBG/HOME ALLOCATIONS: FY14-Present

### FY16

Project Name	Average Score (Max. 100)	Requested	Allocated	Percent Received
THF - CHDO Operating	72	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	100%
Habitat for Humanity	76	\$ 80,000	\$ 70,000	77%
CHARM Homes	75	\$ 61,650	\$ 61,650	100%
Mayor's Youth Employment Program	71	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	100%
Systems Unlimited Inc	70	\$ 250,000	\$ 184,000	74%
THF - Rental Acquisition & Rehab	69	\$ 200,000	\$ 49,998	25%
THF - Sabin Townhomes	67	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	100%
Domestic Violence Intervention Program	66	\$ 116,256	\$ 116,256	100%
Neighborhood Centers	63	\$ 94,140	\$ 94,140	100%
Mid-year THF Rental Rehab	N/A	\$ 49,998	\$ 49,998	100%
Mid-year Systems Unlimited	N/A	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	100%
Mid-year Bilam Properties LLC - Walden Ridge	N/A	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	100%

### FY15

Project Name	Average Score (Max. 100)	Requested	Allocated	Percent Received
Shelter House - Rapid Rehousing	77	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	100%
The Housing Fellowship - Rental	76	\$ 300,000	\$ 200,000	67%
The Housing Fellowship - CHDO Operating	73	\$ 20,000	\$ 15,000	75%
Iowa City Downpayment & Assistance	66	\$ 250,000	\$ 140,000	56%
Arc of Southeast Iowa	64	\$ 100,000	\$ 75,000	75%
Neighborhood Centers of JC	60	\$ 84,000	\$ -	0%
Habitat for Humanity	56	\$ 100,000	\$ -	0%
United Action for Youth	55	\$ 122,620	\$ 25,000	20%
Iowa City Co-Housing - Downpayment	53	\$ 100,950	\$ -	0%

### FY14

Project Name	Average Score (Max. 100)	Requested	Allocated	Percent Received
City of Iowa City - Owner-occupied Rehab.	67	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	100%
CHARM Homes LLC - Rental	66	\$ 61,650	\$ 61,650	100%
The Housing Fellowship - CHDO Operating	66	\$ 23,250	\$ 22,000	95%
3 Diamond Development - Rental	65	\$ 350,000	\$ -	0%
NCJC - Playground	60	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000	100%
Sudanese American Community Services	56	\$ 50,000	\$ -	0%
Mayor's Youth - Facility Rehab.	56	\$ 114,270	\$ 70,000	61%
MECCA - Facility Rehab.	54	\$ 50,645	\$ 23,850	47%
IC Free Medical Clinic - Facility Rehab.	50	\$ 85,371	\$ 20,000	23%
City of Iowa City - Façade Improvements	43	\$ 50,000	\$ -	0%

## Clarification from the Forest View Mobile Home Park Application Discussion

**Date:** February 28, 2019

**Location:** City Hall, Neighborhood & Development Services

**City Staff Present:** Kirk Lehmann, Erika Kubly

**Others Present:** Center for Worker Justice (CWJ) Executive Director Rafael Morataya, CWJ Applicant Barbara Ziegler, Housing & Community Development Commission (HCDC) Chair Paula Vaughan

**Background.** The CWJ has been working with Forest View Mobile Home Tenant Association and the developer since 2016 to ensure successful relocation of tenants who would be displaced by the redevelopment of the site. Currently around 94 families containing 400-500 persons will be impacted.

CWJ coordinates monthly meetings with the Association members, and the developer. No dues are charged and participation is voluntary. Some services are provided by the developer (translation at certain public meetings), and some services provided for by CWJ (transportation to meetings, childcare, meeting space, translation at other meetings). The CWJ does not pay people to attend, but the Association has had good involvement. To date, they have worked with the developer to create a Tenant Relocation Plan with a mixture of affordable modular homes, multi-family condos, and relocation assistance to limit displacement.

The Association is not and has not considered becoming a City-recognized neighborhood organization. It has also not sought other funding sources for this project. It has primarily relied on volunteers and services provided by CWJ and the developer. CWJ suggested other funding may be a next step.

**Application.** The project does not intend on paying people to attend neighborhood association meetings. Rather, the application is intended to cover CWJ staff costs (\$10,000) and other costs that have been borne by CWJ (\$5,000). In order of most important to least, they include: meeting space rent, translation, childcare, and transportation. Staff time includes advocacy on behalf of the tenants, training sessions, and coordination of meetings/information.

Currently the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) is considering a rezoning. Staff has recommended approval in conjunction with the developer signing an affordable housing agreement to carry out its Tenant Relocation Plan. If the plan is approved and an agreement signed, the Association plans to continue its monthly meetings to ensure the plan is carried out. Funding is expected to be spent within one year of being awarded.

In addition, the income breakdown in the application underestimates the number of persons assisted in the project. CWJ suggests that the number of people are closer to 400-500, many of whom are children. CWJ intends on attending the next HCDC meeting to be available to answer any additional questions that the Commission has regarding the application.