

HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION (HCDC)

March 12, 2020
Regular Meeting – 6:30 PM
Senior Center Room 202
28 S. Linn Street

AGENDA:

1. Call to Order

2. Public comment of items not on the agenda

Commentators shall address the Commission for no more than 5 minutes. Commissioners shall not engage in discussion with the public concerning said items

3. Monitoring Reports

HCDC invites CDBG and HOME recipients to provide updates on projects to inform them on progress and learn about agencies' roles serving the community. Staff or recipients will provide updates for the following agencies: 4Cs; Domestic Violence Intervention Program; Neighborhood Centers of Johnson County; and Shelter House.

4. Discuss FY21 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Program funding requests and consider budget recommendation to City Council

FY21 CDBG/HOME applications are available online at www.icgov.org/actionplan. At this meeting, HCDC will discuss applications, rankings, and funding amounts. HCDC will consider a recommendation to City Council for FY21 CDBG/HOME funding of up to \$105,000 CDBG and \$448,000 HOME, in addition to a contingency plan in case funding varies. Applicants are strongly encouraged to attend. City Council will provide final funding allocations in May.

5. Discuss FY21 Emerging Aid to Agencies (EA2A) funding requests and consider budget recommendation to City Council

FY21 EA2A applications are available online at www.icgov.org/actionplan. At this meeting, HCDC will discuss applications and funding amounts. HCDC will consider a recommendation to City Council for FY21 EA2A funding of up to \$25,000. Applicants are strongly encouraged to attend. City Council will provide final funding allocations in May.

6. Discuss Community Development Week Activities

Determine what HCDC wants to do for Community Development Week, April 13-18.

7. Consideration of Meeting Minutes: February 20, 2020

8. Housing & Community Development Information

9. 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 or 319-356-5230. Early requests are strongly encouraged to allow sufficient time to meet your access needs.



CITY OF IOWA CITY

CITY OF IOWA CITY MEMORANDUM

Date: March 3, 2020
To: Housing and Community Development Commission
From: Kirk Lehmann, Community Development Planner
Re: Staff Concerns Regarding the FY21 Competitive CDBG/HOME Round

Introduction:

The City received public facility and housing pre-applications from seven applicants totaling \$653,767 in requested CDBG/HOME funds by the January 31, 2020 deadline. These were provided to HCDC to review, rank, and provide a funding recommendation. For FY21, the City has \$553,000 in available funds, \$105,000 CDBG and \$448,000 HOME.

Concerns:

Upon staff review of the applications, two concerns arose regarding applicant capacity and risk of either repayment to the CDBG program with non-federal funds by the City or the loss of federal funds for eligible projects within the community. This memo details these concerns.

Concern 1: Under the CDBG program, public facility applicants receiving more than \$25,000 must meet a national objective, i.e., serve low- and moderate-income persons through an eligible activity, at the funded site for five years after project completion. Should the recipient move or stop providing the required services in those five years, invested CDBG funds must be repaid to the CDBG program with non-federal funds under a federal provision called “reversion of assets.”

In FY18, the City provided \$73,000 in CDBG funds to Little Creations Academy (LCA), which was substantially amended to \$109,000 after cost overruns. This project is not yet closed due to complications with contractors. Staff believes LCA can successfully complete the project but is concerned that if allocated an additional \$78,160, the City is liable to repay \$187,160 with non-federal funds should the childcare center cease operations at this site within five years.

While staff strongly supports the mission of LCA, the agency is relatively new and there is always a risk that services could stop within that 5-year timeframe. Since its initial CDBG award, LCA has had a staff member open a competing childcare center with several of LCA’s enrolled children. Childcare centers also close for various other reasons. In the past, the City has also had a CDBG-funded, church-affiliated childcare center close within the five-year window. In that case, the center was in a different building than the church, and the City had a mortgage on the building to secure the funds upon sale. For LCA, the childcare center is in the same building as the church, and it would be difficult to secure these funds if the childcare center were to close for any reason.

Concern 2: For housing projects, HOME funds require an affordability period of 5 to 15 years depending on the amount of HOME funds awarded per unit. While most applicants have experience using HOME funds and managing HOME properties, Unlimited Abilities (UA) is a new agency, has no experience with CDBG or HOME funding, and has had compliance issues with its rental units in the recent past. Staff again supports the mission of UA but has concerns that funding it creates risks if the agency does not comply with HOME regulations for the required period of affordability. HOME recipients unable to comply with program requirements typically sell their property on the private market, and HOME funds are repaid to the HOME program. This means they no longer assist projects in our community. Unlike program income or loan

repayments that return to the City's line of credit for reuse in the community, HUD can requirement repayment of these funds back to the federal line of credit, not to Iowa City. The City strives to build the capacity of HOME applicants before providing funds to ensure that they can meet their commitments for the entire affordability period once funded.

Recommendation:

To avoid or minimize staff concerns, the following actions are recommended:

1. If HCDC recommends funding LCA and/or UA, restrict funding to CDBG funds not to exceed \$25,000; and
2. If necessary, re-open CDBG/HOME applications for FY21 to allow additional applicants to submit eligible projects.

CDBG/HOME Applications Summary

	Requested	Ave HCDC Recomm.	CDBG Recomm.	HOME Recomm.	Ave Pts	Staff Pts
Successful Living Acquisition #1	\$ 48,000	\$ 46,667			90	88
Successful Living Acquisition #2	\$ 48,000	\$ 46,667			90	88
Successful Living Acquisition #3	\$ 48,000	\$ 45,000			90	88
The Housing Fellowship CHDO Ops <i>Max: \$24,000</i>	\$ 20,000	\$ 19,167	NA		84	82
Habitat Down Payment Assistance #1	\$ 30,000	\$ 29,167			82	83
Habitat Down Payment Assistance #3	\$ 30,000	\$ 26,667			82	83
Habitat Down Payment Assistance #2	\$ 30,000	\$ 24,167			81	80
Systems Unlimited New Construction	\$ 100,000	\$ 94,667	NA		81	79
City South District #2	\$ 50,000	\$ 48,270			73	74
City South District #1	\$ 50,000	\$ 48,269			73	72
Unlimited Abilities Acquisition	\$ 121,607	\$ 82,101			66	57
Little Creations Public Facility <i>Min: \$30,000</i>	\$ 78,160	\$ 42,193		NA	63	47
Total	\$ 653,767	\$ 553,000	\$ -	\$ -		
Expected CDBG/HOME	\$ 553,000		\$ 105,000	\$ 448,000		

Emerging Aid to Agencies Applications Summary

	Requested	Ave EA2A Recomm.	Actual Recomm.
Grow Johnson County - FY21 Season	\$ 10,000	\$ 6,721	
Houses into Homes - Inventory Mgt	\$ 5,438	\$ 5,052	
Successful Living - Snow/Mow	\$ 9,200	\$ 2,250	
Successful Living - Software	\$ 13,350	\$ 5,594	
Unlimited Abilities - Operations	\$ 11,300	\$ 5,383	
Total	\$ 49,288	\$ 25,000	
Expected EA2A	\$ 25,000		

All EA2A

Max: **\$15,000**

Min: **\$5,000**

HCDC Scoring and Funding

CDBG/HOME

	PF	Housing										
	Little Creations Public Facility	City South District #1	City South District #2	Habitat Down Payment Assistance #1	Habitat Down Payment Assistance #2	Habitat Down Payment Assistance #3	Successful Living Acquisition #1	Successful Living Acquisition #2	Successful Living Acquisition #3	Systems Unlimited New Construction	The Housing Fellowship CHDO Ops	Unlimited Abilities Acquisition
Aguilar												
Alter	59	80	82	84	82	84	87	87	87	77	78	58
Drabek	47	72	74	83	80	83	88	88	88	79	82	57
Eastham	88	63	63	77	77	77	94	94	94	81	83	88
Fixmer-Oraiz	62	75	75	85	85	85	93	93	93	87	95	68
Kealey												
McKinstry	57	74	72	83	80	83	88	88	88	79	82	57
Nkumu												
Padron												
Median	59	74	74	83	80	83	88	88	88	79	82	58
Average	63	73	73	82	81	82	90	90	90	81	84	66

	PF	Housing										
	Little Creations Public Facility	City South District #1	City South District #2	Habitat Down Payment Assistance #1	Habitat Down Payment Assistance #2	Habitat Down Payment Assistance #3	Successful Living Acquisition #1	Successful Living Acquisition #2	Successful Living Acquisition #3	Systems Unlimited New Construction	The Housing Fellowship CHDO Ops	Unlimited Abilities Acquisition
Aguilar												
Alter	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$74,000	\$20,000	\$75,000
Drabek	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$100,000	\$20,000	\$99,000
Eastham	\$78,160	\$29,616	\$29,617	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$100,000	\$20,000	\$121,607
Fixmer-Oraiz	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$94,000	\$20,000	\$55,000
Kealey												
McKinstry	\$30,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$100,000	\$20,000	\$69,000
Nkumu	\$45,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$30,000	\$100,000	\$15,000	\$73,000
Padron												
Median	\$47,500	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$100,000	\$20,000	\$74,000
Average	\$42,193	\$48,269	\$48,270	\$29,167	\$24,167	\$26,667	\$46,667	\$46,667	\$45,000	\$94,667	\$19,167	\$82,101

Emerging Aid to Agencies

	Grow JC	Houses Into Homes	Successful Living - Snow/Mow	Successful Living - Software	Unlimited Abilities
Aguilar					
Alter	\$7,062	\$5,438	\$7,500	\$0	\$5,000
Drabek	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
Eastham	\$8,262	\$5,438	\$0	\$0	\$11,300
Fixmer-Oraiz	\$5,000	\$5,438	\$0	\$9,562	\$5,000
Kealey					
McKinstry	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$10,000	\$0
Nkumu	\$5,000	\$4,000	\$1,000	\$9,000	\$6,000
Padron					
Median	\$6,031	\$5,219	\$500	\$7,000	\$5,000
Average	\$6,721	\$5,052	\$2,250	\$5,594	\$5,383

MINUTES

PRELIMINARY

**HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 20, 2020 – 6:30 PM
SENIOR CENTER, ROOM 202**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Peggy Aguilar, Megan Alter, Matt Drabek, Charlie Eastham, Lyn Dee Kealey, John McKinstry, Peter Nkumu, Maria Padron

MEMBERS ABSENT: V Fixmer-Oraiz

STAFF PRESENT: Kirk Lehmann, Erika Kubly

OTHERS PRESENT: Jake Kundert, Susan Craig, Ally Hanten, Simon Andrew, Michelle Heinz, Shirley Tramble, Whitney Stevenson, Lucy Barker, Jason Barker, Ron Berg, Barbara Vinograde, Becci Reedus, Heath Brewer, Roger Goedken, Ashley Gillett, Carla Phelps, Missie Forbes, Ronda Lipsius, Delaney Dixon, Daleta Thurness, Michelle Cole, Lindsay Glenn, Chelsey Markle, Michelle Lloyd, Brian Loring, Christi Regan, Tony Smith, Mark Serterth, Nicki Ross, Amanda Bloomer, Adam Robinson, Sara Barron

RECOMMENDATIONS TO CITY COUNCIL:

By a vote of 8-0 HCDC recommends to City Council the following FY21 Legacy Aid to Agencies budget totaling \$650,000 and preserving \$25,000 for Emerging Aid to Agencies:

CommUnity Crisis Services and Food Bank	\$68,220
Iowa City Free Medical/Dental Clinic	\$24,611
4 C's Community Coord. Child Care	\$24,610
Neighborhood Centers of JC	\$54,142
Domestic Violence Intervention Program	\$49,220
Shelter House	\$83,674
Prelude Behavioral Services	\$39,376
Big Brothers / Big Sisters	\$24,610
Rape Victim Advocacy Program	\$24,610
United Action for Youth	\$32,485
Pathways Adult Day Health Center	\$24,610
Inside Out Reentry Community	\$39,376
HACAP	\$24,610
Table to Table	\$30,516
Iowa Valley Habitat for Humanity	\$24,610
Arc of Southeast Iowa	\$19,688
Free Lunch Program	\$17,719
Horizons, A Family Service Alliance	\$43,313
Total Request:	\$650,000

By a vote of 8-0 HCDC recommends to City Council that the City continue to support the 12 recommendations in the Johnson County Mobile Home Task Force Report, with the additional recommendation that the City assist with developing an acquisition plan to transition a private manufactured housing park into a resident-owned cooperative to prepare for future possible acquisitions.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR TOPICS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

Anthony Smith (Little Creations Academy) wanted to comment on the application process. He has an issue with the ranking criteria that looks at how much of a project's budget is CDBG or HOME compared to the amount the agency has brought in. He believes there are agencies that want to be funded but may not receive funds if this is their only resource to do a project because of the point system. They don't have an equal chance to get CDBG funding. Smith asked the Commission to consider changing the ranking system so agencies that can't get funding from other resources could still be funded with CDBG.

PRESENTATION ABOUT THE CENSUS 2020:

Susan Craig (Complete Count Census Committee) introduced herself and noted that the committee is composed of representatives from Iowa City, Johnson County, North Liberty, Coralville and several nonprofits. Lehmann is also on this committee. The committee is charged to work with people who they may have a hard time reaching with the census. Craig showed a video that talked about the census.

From the video: the 2020 Census is written in the constitution and data is used for services such as fire stations, schools, and clinics. Where there are more people there are more needs for public services. That's why the Census is used by the government to make funding decisions each year. It's also used by nonprofits to inform services, by businesses to create jobs, and even by students for school projects. Understanding how the population changes helps us shape communities across the country for the better. How does the 2020 Census affect representation? There are 435 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. Those get distributed to the 50 states by population and an accurate census response helps decide that. How can a person take the 2020 census? In March 2020 everyone in the country will receive invitation to answer a simple questionnaire and there are three ways to respond; (1) to complete it online, (2) to call by phone, (3) to send in by mail. For those that do not respond a census taker from the community will follow up. Is your 2020 census data safe? After sending your census response, your personal information is kept safe. By law, it can't be shared with any other government agency, law enforcement or landlord. So take your 2020 census with peace of mind.

Craig next emphasized a couple of things. Number one is how important the census is particularly to the people in this room who need funding for a lot of good causes. Craig stated for every person that Iowa does not count in the census, that's \$28,000 they won't get from the federal government over the span of 10 years. If we do not count 1/10th of 1% of the population of Iowa, over 10 years, we will lose \$90 million, \$9 million a year. And the federal funds are so important to keeping the support services at the level that they are in Johnson County.

Craig encouraged everyone to please take their census, encourage everyone they know to take the census. Regarding the timeline, between March 12 and March 20 people will get an invitation in the mail and it can be completed online or by calling the telephone number provided. If someone hasn't responded by March 26, between the 26th and April 3, they will receive a reminder. If someone has not responded by April 8, that next week, they will be sent another reminder that includes the paper questionnaire. A final reminder will be sent between April 20 and April 27 and on May 1, enumerators start knocking on doors. If you know of anyone who is looking for a part time job in Johnson County, the pay scale is going to be \$21 an hour, go to 2020census.gov and apply.

Lehmann added that people who do not speak English can take the census over the phone in over 40 languages. There are also materials in different languages for a broad reach across the communities.

Alter asked if there was a one-page brochure that outlines the non-English-speaking opportunities for enumerators needed for different languages. Lehmann confirmed there was a large need, but wasn't

aware of such resources. Generally the City looks for Arabic, Spanish and French speakers because those are the largest foreign language populations. Mandarin is also a large population in Iowa City

Craig reiterated everyone should fill out the census, she acknowledged there is a lot of fear these days associated with giving the government information. She confirmed there is no citizenship question on the census and that no one will ask for that kind of information. So, there is no worry and it is totally confidential for 72 years, after 72 years, the National Archives releases census form information.

DISCUSS FY21 LEGACY AID TO AGENCIES (A2A) FUNDING REQUESTS AND CONSIDER BUDGET RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL:

Lehmann noted Social Justice Racial Equity Grant awards came out and those were in the Commission packets. He stated Aid to Agencies budget was \$675,000 for this year and that up to 5% of that can fund Emerging agencies, but that is up to the discretion of HCDC for recommendation. Staff recommends increasing Emerging funds slightly up to \$25,000 then having \$650,000 be for Legacy. Staff also provided scores and recommended funding as was discussed so the Commission can find requests sorted by staff score and alphabetically. Staff determined funding by providing full funding for everything above a score of 75, below that took off \$1,000, and lower scoring agencies had more funds reduced to account for the percentage of the requested budget that was fulfilled and also total dollar amounts as well.

Alter asked about the demarcation line of 75, can Lehmann talk about what brought staff to that decision. Lehmann stated it was based on a relatively simple gradient from full funding to less than full funding, and they chose 75 because it fulfilled that need. It isn't a magic number.

Padron noted if the Commission follows that, then they only have 4% to the emerging agencies. If they move the 75 up to 80 as a cutoff score then they would have more for emerging agencies. Lehmann confirmed that is correct and noted the maximum for Emerging agencies at 5% of the budget is \$33,750.

Padron would like to discuss scores because she has questions and thinks it is not perfect. She is most concerned with Shelter House because according to the priorities shelter is number one but it scored low.

Eastham stated Shelter House received a score of 87.5 and staff is recommending full funding. Lehmann said they scored it in the top quarter. Padron feels that score is low and in the persons to benefit category it only scored two points and in equity scored 2.5. Lehmann acknowledged as they went through the scoring they saw tweaks that are needed, especially equity needs to be reconfigured, it currently is based on the percentage of nonwhite, Hispanic and persons with disabilities served. Lehmann stated it was not calibrated properly when set up, and they realize that now. Others such as community need are written where the full score of 15 is was almost impossible to get, so 5 was pretty much taken off the score of everyone right off the bat and that's something else that needs to change in the next iteration. He acknowledged it's not a perfect scoring system.

Eastham sees an easy recommended change to each agency from the Staff's recommendations which would be to reduce the amount requested by each of these 18 agencies by about \$570 a piece and that would bring almost everyone up to what they requested. His concerns are with Table to Table and the Free Lunch Program, food insecurity programs, he would prefer to have them at what they actually requested. He looked at the Horizons application request carefully and personally doesn't see the rationale for reducing their request by 10 plus percent. Eastham would ask the Commission again to just reduce every request by about \$570 which would bring the total to \$650,000 and is a very small reduction for each agency. He is not concerned about the scoring differences.

Alter stated one of her concerns is the applicants know that there's a scoring system and they're trying to fill out the applications as best they can to obtain the highest score believing that that's how they're going to get their money. If that is true, the Commission needs to make sure they're doing things in the best way possible to give out funding. She is concerned about saying they need to tweak a score in order to justify a funding decision. As they talk about modifying rankings, or how scores are applied, it needs to be made clear to everybody what the criteria are, either they're going by staff recommendations and by a score or

they need to clearly state to everyone this is the guidelines for the Commission to make final decisions in conversation so that it's not a matter of this is what the score is end of story.

Padron apologized if she wasn't clear, she is not trying to tweak the score so that Shelter House scored higher she was just concerned that the equity points were not clear and are not fair to every agency.

McKinstry noticed that agencies conferred with one another this year before making requests and they all kind of agreed, in some way shape or form, about the amount of requests, which is new and hasn't happened before and he thinks it is a good thing. He respects the joint effort to give some scoring that's objective because maybe there may have been too subjective before, making recommendations was not as much on information and more based on how they felt that evening or something. He would like to weigh the joint agency recommendations together as being important, because who understands their relationships with each other and their own needs better than the people who were sitting around that table. McKinstry stated that no objective criteria are ever going to be perfect but they can't just throw them out the window.

Alter agrees and feels it is just to make sure that there's a clear understanding among the group, staff and the agencies that these scores are not in stone and there is going to be discussion and yet, they want this to be sort of a strong fundamental baseline so that there is that objective criteria as best as possible.

McKinstry stated that what Eastman suggested is closer to weighing the agency requests that were made jointly. Staff isn't far off from that, but it does significantly cut some agencies and \$500 is important.

Eastham noted these are staff scores are not his scores so if they averaged all nine of them together, they probably would come up with a noticeable different score ranking for the for these agencies. He recommends lowering staff recommendations by \$572.22 per agency.

Padron questioned taking the same amount from each agency noting it is not the same taking \$500 from the Free Lunch Program when they are only asking for \$16,000 and taking \$500 from CommUnity which is asking for \$69,000. Eastham agreed and said if they want to pay a lot of attention to percent changes than yes that is true, however in his experience he would not object to a reduction of \$570 for any of these requested amounts. He is open to hearing other suggestions or proposals as well.

Padron suggested a percentage from each agency.

Drabek said it would be roughly 1% for each agency. Lehmann calculated what it would be per agency at a 1.56% reduction. Kubly noted from a staff perspective it would be great for the allocations be rounded at least to the nearest dollar. Padron noted if they used 1.5% for agency they would reach the \$650,000.

McKinstry asked if there were a greater difference between the requests, the total of the requests and the total allocation by the Council, he would be more inclined to put more emphasis on the scores. But because he feels it's close, he would not object to a percentage reduction like this.

Drabek agreed his initial preference would be for that system of an equal percentage but questioned if there are any problems that would cause. Lehmann pointed out that those agencies that requested more money will now have a larger reduction and a lot of those are higher scoring agencies. But at the end of the day it's the Commission's decision.

Padron opened the discussion for comment from anybody in the public.

Mark Sertterh (Shelter House) stated he doesn't object to the scores or the percentage reduction but questioned if the scores don't have any weight on the final recommendations. Eastham stated the scores are close enough together that there's not a significant difference between scores and that these are staff scores and not Commissioner's scores. Sertterh is asking for clarification for moving forward in the next couple of years and if scores of 65 and 93 are close enough. He is not disagreeing with the amounts, just questioning the scores.

Alter reiterated this is what she was trying to say that moving forward they need to make sure there is some clarity about the significance of the scores. There is a larger question of how are scores being used so everybody understands.

Eastham suggested in the future to compare Commissioner average scores and staff scores to be sure. McKinstry also noted if there's a bigger discrepancy between what the requests are and what money they have to allocate and if they had to cut significant amounts, percentage wise, they would be looking more carefully at the scores to decide where the cuts would have to be. But since it's closer this year, and because they have the agency's conferring with one another to begin with, he is confident with this.

Becci Reedus (CommUnity Crisis Center/Food Bank) stated she agrees that this looks good and doesn't think it matters a whole lot and 1% is probably an equitable way and everybody can suffer a little bit. However she writes grants toward a target and it feels like every time they come here they don't know the target, it moves a little bit. It worked out fine this year but what would have happened if \$300,000 more had been asked for and the Commission started moving things around based on percentages and things like that. Do scores matter, do you want to get rid of the scores, do the scores not work. She feels those things need to be decided before the Commission starts distributing money. Again, this year it all worked out but it could be different if agencies requested \$300,000 more. She noted the agencies and coalition are willing to help in any way they can but encourages that they communicate the way in which the scores can be met, if its staff recommendation, if it's a Commission recommendation, ahead of time.

McKinstry noted they had a better conversation this past year between agencies and the City and the Commission and the key is to continue the conversation and keep the channels of communication open, starting a little earlier in the year in terms of budgeting to have that conversation, and trusting the process, not necessarily just the scores on the objective side of things, but the process of you telling us next year if the scoring system doesn't make any sense, or whatever.

Alter noted it sounds like some of it is in the interim, before the Commission scores again next year, that they make decisions about how this works, and then communicate to the agencies in conversation. This year they ran into having a conversation at the same time as having to allocate money or make decisions and that's highly problematic. She feels they have moved forward in productive ways since that time, but now it comes to being able to clearly say what are the expectations to reach certain scores and it's something that they can work on over the course of the year.

Reedus noted this happened last year too, the scores didn't matter because the funding started at the low priority, moved up to middle and high priority, so it didn't matter. There was a scoring sheet attached to the application but they could have written a quicker application because it really didn't matter. Reedus noted she will always strive to try and give the best information, give all the information they can and maybe they can go through some of the recommendations and read them and give feedback.

Lehmann noted that staff and the Commission has gone through robust processes so far and when they make decisions, they have to be willing to stand by the process they've made, which happens sometimes but not all the time. So, as the Commission makes decisions through any new process, as they have conversations, there has to be a will to follow through with the decisions they make. From the staff perspective that's important; the Commission can write a perfect policy and Council can adopt it, but if the Commission doesn't follow that policy 100%, then there is no point. He agrees with Reedus and Alter, that a lot of what they want is predictability because as an agency without predictability it's impossible to plan.

McKinstry asked if the agencies would be getting together again in the coming year and making a joint recommendation. Reedus confirmed they will, they have meetings scheduled and are going to have regular meeting scheduled so they can put it on the agenda.

Brian Loring (Neighborhood Centers) wanted to thank the Commission because he knows last year was a big deal, they left the room in January having a conversation about scarcity and feeling pitted against one another and this Commission actually went ahead and made a bold request to Council that probably wasn't easy to do. He just wanted to say thank you to the Commission for doing that.

Alter moved to recommend the following FY21 Legacy Aid to Agencies budget to City Council totaling \$650,000 and preserving \$25,000 for Emerging Aid to Agencies:

CommUnity Crisis Services and Food Bank	\$68,220
Iowa City Free Medical/Dental Clinic	\$24,611
4 C's Community Coord. Child Care	\$24,610
Neighborhood Centers of JC	\$54,142
Domestic Violence Intervention Program	\$49,220
Shelter House	\$83,674
Prelude Behavioral Services	\$39,376
Big Brothers / Big Sisters	\$24,610
Rape Victim Advocacy Program	\$24,610
United Action for Youth	\$32,485
Pathways Adult Day Health Center	\$24,610
Inside Out Rentry Community	\$39,376
HACAP	\$24,610
Table to Table	\$30,516
Iowa Valley Habitat for Humanity	\$24,610
Arc of Southeast Iowa	\$19,688
Free Lunch Program	\$17,719
Horizons, A Family Service Alliance	\$43,313
Total Request:	\$650,000

Aguilar seconded the motion, a vote was taken and the motion passed 8-0.

QUESTION/ANSWER SESSION FOR FY21 APPLICATIONS: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG), HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS (HOME), AND EMERGING A2A PROGRAMS.

Lehmann noted for CDBG/Home currently they have \$448,000 HOME and around \$94,000 CDBG for next year. They received \$653,767 in competitive CDBG and HOME funding requests. Staff prepared ranking sheets and shared the allocations from the past three years. They also received the funding amount from HUD, so for the upcoming fiscal year, in total, there are \$697,678 in CDBG and \$511,786 in HOME which is slightly higher than they expected. Lehmann feels they might be able to bump up the CDBG amount but the HOME that they had initially planned on was actually an aggressive amount so the \$448,000 is the same. Potentially HCDC could go up to \$105,000 in CDBG for the competitive allocation.

Staff scored points based on the ranking sheet for CDBG/HOME as they did for Aid to Agencies, though HCDC is must still do its own rankings as well. Staff's ranking sheet and a staff report for each applicant and criteria were included in the packet which explains how staff scored applications. Lehmann stated they may notice that there are duplicative applications and the reason staff had them submit multiple applications this year was that in situations where there are multiples of one kind of activity with separate funding sources, such as multiple acquisitions, breaking them into individual projects makes it easier for the Commission to make funding decisions. Or example, Successful Living needs \$48,000 to buy a house, Habitat needs \$30,000 for a house, and while that was known in the past, staff wanted that split out more clearly. Lehmann stated the Commission will also notice that where there are duplicative applications, they score differently because the timing is off on them by a little bit. For example with the South District applications one project would be completed earlier, so the later one lost some points for that. Lehmann included the rationale behind all of this and noted the Commission may not use the same rationale as they go through their ranking process it's just a method to try and prioritize funds.

Lehmann also asked while the Commission is making allocations next month to consider projects of more than \$50,000 first and then go into the rankings or however it is decided. This meeting is to ask any questions of staff or the agencies to help make ranking and funding decisions.

Alter asked for clarification on the sheet Lehmann distributed, CHDO is listed for \$24,000 and then under Little Creations it said a minimum of \$30,000, is that because it is the minimum project size for public facilities. Lehmann confirmed the minimum project size for public facilities is \$30,000 and the cap is set higher to make sure the projects are making a more substantial difference.

Eastham noted he reviewed the Little Creations Academy application and stated his scoring will be significantly higher than the staff scoring, he will score them in the 80s or so. One big difference is how he assesses the project differently than staff for project leveraging of other financial resources. The applicant notes money from the church that hosts the site and money from First Presbyterian Church in prior years, which doesn't necessarily reduce the cost of this project. However, it is an indication of other financial resources that are supporting the daycare center. This is a daycare center for low income families and there's no other source of income to operate or capitalize the daycare center rather than public sources or daycare fees and daycare fees for low income families can't be increased to increase leverage because the idea is to have low fees. He also believes staff scored low in the terms of project completion and capacity and he will score higher because the applicant is in the process of completing the previous allocation. Eastham reiterated this is a center that's targeting very low-income childcare for very low-income families and is something the Commission needs to support.

Lehmann commented briefly to the point regarding leverage, that's been a discussion before and he based his scoring off what percentage was funds and to go to Smith's point at the beginning of the meeting that may be something the Commission wants to explore next funding cycle. Eastman noted leveraging as for this project, this center, is a much different than leveraging for some of the group home projects, or some of the other applications too, it's just a different financial picture.

Alter noted that when she first came onto the Commission she questioned if it is a good thing that they're able to bring in more money and yet then doesn't that send a certain message of if they can bring in money from other funding resources, then why aren't they. Why should the Commission give them more money when there may be agencies that can't bring in any money? It's a larger question about need and allocation. There are many sides, there are the ways in which this is beneficial, as well as the ways that maybe on a project by project basis and we have to understand the context of the agency, and what their resources truly are balanced against their need. Alter would appreciate having more of a discussion about that particular area because it's never been completely clear to her how it works.

Padron noted that with emerging agencies fundraising takes so much time and effort and these are small agencies and sometimes they don't have the capacity to have a staff person write grants or go out and fundraise. It is different for the legacy agencies, they have staff and more resources. The agencies could note that don't receive money from other sources but may have volunteers that are donating hours and reaching out to the community and consider other thing other than money.

Lehmann noted that some of this discussion should be brought up as they are looking at next year's application process. For tonight, while the agencies are here, were there any questions the Commission had on the applications. They could discuss agency by agency or Commissioner by Commissioner. Padron suggested agency by agency and any Commissioner can speak up.

Eastham stated for group home applications, Successful Living and United Abilities are both supporting group homes trying to expand their operation. He would like to ask them if they would comment a little bit more about what the need they see now for additional group home rooms or group home beds.

Shirley Tramble (Unlimited Abilities) founded Unlimited Abilities about two and a half years ago to help individuals with chronic mental illnesses. She had been doing this work about 15 years and has seen a growing need in the services that they provide. She acknowledged on the online application they score low and feels the scoring should be looked at more thoroughly because they don't have the experience handling City funds, but as a new agency how do you get the experience if you never get a chance?

Unlimited Abilities has so much to offer in the community. Right now every home they have they lease and take all the risk if there's damages. They will do great things for the community because within almost three years of being in Johnson County, they've served almost 90 clients, and that's not even counting their outreach clients, just the clients that are staying in the group home.

Lehmann asked in terms of need, how has Tramble seen the transition to the managed care organizations affecting them, because he noticed some recent projects have had issues filling units, and doesn't know if that's a demand issue where there aren't enough clients or a MCO transition issue where there's no longer the funds to pay for it. Perhaps someone from Successful Living could speak to that.

Roger Goedken (Successful Living) noted that its more due to lack of staffing, they have seen an increase in demand for services for the mentally ill population.

Tramble added she really loves what she does and would appreciate some support so she can continue doing what she loves to do.

Eastham commented that from Unlimited Abilities application, their income targeting is good, less than 30% of AMI but looking at the leveraging question, staff scored fairly low on that because of the relative low amount or nonfederal funds. His question are there other funds that the agency could apply for and receive, or does she think they are not going to be able to receive any additional money from other sources. Tramble stated they will not receive any additional funding because they're a newer agency, just been in business two full years, and it's hard within the first couple years as a nonprofit to get funding because everything is allocated to the agencies who've been established for a while.

Lehmann asked if Unlimited Abilities had Day Hab funding. Tramble replied they do not use Day Hab funding now without but hope in the future, probably 2021, starting a Day Hab program because she is seeing a big need for that currently they are just doing residential and community.

Michelle Lloyd (Systems Unlimited) stated the reason they asked for money was to build a fully accessible house. The people with intellectual disabilities are aging and that's something that's different because as a lot of you know not too long-ago people with intellectual disabilities didn't get to the age where they needed accessible housing. However, now they are seeing they need to have more accessible housing and in this town especially, it's really hard to find something to buy that is fully accessible.

Lehmann asked if they have land already. Lloyd confirmed they did. Lehmann asked in terms of moving forward, could she talk about what it would look like if they weren't awarded full funding, how would they approach construction, did they have a plan prior to applying for these funds, etc. Lloyd replied that they didn't have a lot of discussion about it until they started filling out the grant but any funds that they didn't get from the City they would probably do a mortgage for which would be a construction loan.

Carla Phelps (Successful Living) spoke about the need for additional people, they always have a long waiting list. She noted it's a hard population sometimes to capture because when someone is chronically mentally ill without any resources and often unmedicated it is hard to keep track of where these folks are and they have to have experienced people doing it and their waiting list is around 20 people. The homeless, whether they're homeless or they're in and out of the emergency department or in and out of the shelter or wherever they happen to be, they never go away really. They have talked it over and feel that a lot of it is due to the closure of the facilities around Iowa. There are very sick people out there.

Eastman next asked to hear comments from Pastor Smith about the Little Creations application.

Anthony Smith (Little Creations Academy) stated they originally made this request because their center is in need of renovation in the kitchen because they serve hot meals to the children and the equipment that they are currently using is an electric stove with no hood. Additionally the range they have can't handle the capacity of what they do on a daily basis so they need to upgrade their equipment to commercial equipment. With the current funds that they had received, they were able to purchase a commercial freezer and a commercial refrigerator. They still need a range, hood and a commercial dishwasher that also does sterilization because in daycare they have to have some sort of sterilization.

Lehmann asked if that kitchen is exclusively used for the childcare or is it also used for church functions as well. Smith stated every now and then they do use it but because the daycare has expanded the way it has it has limited the ability to use the lower level of the church now. Lehmann stated they will have to keep track of the amount that the kitchen is used for the daycare versus the church, because they can't use federal funds on religious uses, they need to apportion it by time. So there is a chance that the ratio of federal and nonfederal funds might have to change from what's in the application, if it's 8% of the time, then it's about right. But if it's more than 8% of the time federal funds couldn't be used as much. Smith said they use that kitchen every day for eight hours a day, Monday through Friday. The church would only use it on a on an event basis, which could be once every six months or something like that, not a lot. Lehmann said they will just have to document that if awarded funds, but it shouldn't be a problem when the church uses it. Smith also noted there is a second refrigerator and that is designated for the church with water and juices dedicated for church purpose.

Padron noted the total amount that the Commission has right now for the emerging agencies is \$25,000 and Little Creations Academy is requesting \$78,000. Lehmann clarified they are requesting that amount of CDBG funds. Padron still wondered if Little Creations did not get fully funded would they still be able to do some of the work they want to do. Smith responded that yes they could do some of the work but would not be able to finish the project. Lehmann noted that Little Creations has a good scope of work laid out as to what the work would cost in their application.

Smith added that on the previous project they had some difficulties with a general contractor, and they are no longer using that general contractor but that is why they had such a delay to finish the project. Smith noted that most of the contractors they reached out to would not work with them but they finally found a contractor that they believe would do the work expeditiously. He wanted to make sure the Commission was aware of this since that's part of the points and didn't want to get hacked for that too.

Padron moved on to questions for the applications for emerging agencies. Lehmann noted there are five applications for emerging agencies. There is \$25,000 in the budget and \$49,288 in requests. He stated they received two applications from Successful Living that total more than the \$15,000 maximum awards, and the minimum award amount is \$5,000.

Lehmann briefly described each application. Grow Johnson County is requesting \$10,000 for its FY21 season and they were funded last year. Houses into Homes is doing an inventory management project for just over \$5,400. Successful Living has a snow and mow application for \$9,200 and a software application for \$13,350 and Unlimited Abilities as an operations application for \$11,300.

Eastham asked if the Houses to Homes could talk about if there's been any change in what they're seeing for need for applications since they submitted the application.

Lucy Barker (Houses into Homes) commented on if they have seen a change in need in the one month since they submitted their application and in February, they've had 20 referrals or requests. Two of those were repeats from different agencies, but the need does not seem to have changed.

Eastham asked for an estimate of what dollar amount is for furniture that they're supplying to people or if they have tried to calculate that. L. Barker stated that is hard to calculate, for example there is no market for used mattresses. Even if they tried to figure it out on the cost of new mattresses it could vary depending on if they are from McGregor's or Costco. The thinnest twin mattress somebody has purchased for them was \$200 just for a mattress and the bed frames are in the hundred-dollar range. They also bought the ones that fold out into a platform so there is no need for a box spring and those were \$60 to \$90 depending on the size.

Jason Barker (Houses into Homes) stated they tried to calculate what they do by going online and to do mass estimates of material they've diverted from the landfill. There are apps that will estimate the weight of a sofa, chairs, tables, box springs and everything. Barker stated those numbers are so high he hesitated to put them in a grant application, it was over 70 tons.

Padron asked if they applied for the climate action grant. Barker stated they did apply for that grant last year, it's not up yet this year, but they will apply again this year as well. Lehmann noted that application just opened on February 14.

Eastham asked if there were restrictions on the use of that money and does it adversely affect how they can use it.

Lucy Barker (Houses into Homes) stated the application they turned in this year for the emerging aid to agencies was the second step in the grant that they got from the Climate Action Plan last year, which was optimizing efficiency. So they used those funds for an inventory software and iPad and other things like crates and bags that they use to empty the homes and then bring back and reuse.

Padron asked about the grant because there are other agencies that will not be able to apply for the climate action grant and don't have that option.

Eastham stated that any agency that's furnishing homes could apply for that grant because all of them are diverting. Lehmann noted that possibly agencies could apply and stated some agencies such as Habitat have used it to do energy efficiency improvements. A lot of housing agencies have used it in that capacity, but not as much diverting from the landfill as much as it was energy efficiency, electrification or switching to an air system that's way more efficient.

JOHNSON COUNTY MOBILE HOME TASK FORCE REPORT DISCUSSION:

Lehmann sent the Commission the link to the Mobile Home Task Force report. The Task Force was a mix of elected officials, mobile home park residents and a couple advocates led by the Affordable Housing Coalition. Lehmann also shared with the Commissioners staff comments on the recommendations, talking about some of the challenges of different ones and some that the City's already doing. Council wanted the Commission to talk about the report and provide them with any recommendations that HCDC had about the report. Lehmann will begin by going through the staff comments and then have Sara Barron from the Affordable Housing Coalition talk.

Lehmann noted there are 12 recommendations total in the Mobile Home Task Force report. The first recommendation is to make rental assistance and/or relocation assistance available to residents harmed by unexpected sharp rent increases. Currently the City has an affordable housing fund that can be used for emergent situations, it's around \$50,000 currently, it has been used in the past for similar things and it generally follows URA standards which includes advisory services, moving expense payments, and housing assistance up to \$7,200. Lehmann noted there are a couple other programs that may assist in such a circumstance like the security deposit program, which should be off the ground shortly, Johnson County general assistance, and things such as rapid rehousing if they become literally homeless, however, that emergent situation amount is not a lot, obviously, if someone is looking at \$7,200 of lost rent payments that presents a challenge. Lehmann also noted there are some challenges with budgeting, especially as these things can't really be expected, so they can't fit into an annual budgeting process, but in the past City Council has provided funds to support relocation efforts.

Alter noted this situation is not exactly the same as of being flooded out and yet, this would be an emergency situation for a large number of people so wouldn't the funds allocated for emergencies be available? Lehmann stated that is the same funds he is talking about, the emergent funds.

Sara Barron (Affordable Housing Coalition) noted that the recommendations were made to all the municipalities within Johnson County, they went to Johnson County, Iowa City, Coralville, and North Liberty primarily. In this case there are not any mobile homes located within Iowa City limits that have been impacted by the unexpected sharp rent increases. There are two right outside of Iowa City limits that are owned by out of state investment groups that have threaten the stability of those neighborhoods, the others are in Coralville and North Liberty. Barron stated this recommendation is for the other municipalities to look at Iowa City's model. Iowa City budgets annually for unexpected emergencies that threaten the stability of people's housing at a large scale. Barron met with the Johnson County Board of

Supervisors about creating a line item for housing emergencies in their next budget process. She added this is a more of a medium-term solution for some municipalities, however, it is worth remembering that the emergency is being faced now. She feels it is still worthwhile to look and see if there are some funds that can be available right now and maybe it's pooled across many municipalities or go to a private institution that would want to do a charitable one time donation with the support of the local municipality.

Lehmann added the City is doing many of these things, so the audience of this report is often not the City.

McKinstry noted the City can require the people who want to do the rezoning and eliminate this housing to make a contribution toward relocation. Lehmann confirmed and that will be discussed in point four.

Lehmann moved on to the next recommendation which is to partner with local banking institutions to back loans to owner occupants of manufactured housing. The City currently provides grants to owner occupants of manufactured housing to rehab properties, since FY18 they've done 20 mobile home repair projects. Some of the challenges for the City is because they use federal funds, they must have the title the property to participate and then also be a legal resident, which can be a challenge. Additionally, those funds can only be used in Iowa City. When an applicant doesn't meet those criteria for some reason or another the City directs people to ECICOG or to Habitat for assistance because they do have other rehab programs, but those sources of funds are limited.

Barron added the Mobile Home Task Force has reconvened now to address some of the things outside of the municipal lens that they started with, some of the other wraparound issues and some knitting together other resources and services, including social services, legal services, etc. She added they renamed themselves the Manufactured Housing Task Force because one thing that came to light during this process is referring to them as mobile homes is not helpful because they can't be moved for the most part. Barron noted the Manufactured Housing Task Force is looking at working with some private lenders and they may look for municipal investment or at least some kind of backing for more secured loans or grants. That would be a bigger pool that would be available to more people, not just in numbers of people, but also in categories of people. Habitat has done a tremendous job with their Helping Hands program of working in manufactured housing and they would like to do more with more resources. Barron noted one problem in the past has been difficulty finding folks who would work on manufactured housing, because of the specialized characteristics particularly in the older units, they're not built in the same way that a stick built house would be. Now they have the partners lined up to do the work so it's more a matter of finding the funding and making sure that families know about the resources especially for critical repairs, like holes in a roof, holes in a floor, windows that are broken or missing, those kinds of things.

Lehmann stated recommendation three is establishing urban renewal districts through tax increment financing, which can help mobile home communities purchase. He noted it is challenging with an urban renewal district because it assumes two things; one, that there's a willing seller, if you have that great; two, you have to rely on an increase in value to provide the funds. The second point was the challenge the City saw because if we're looking to preserve existing homes and rents, there may not be an increment, so that may not work in the context of what the Manufactured Housing Task Force is trying to do. Lehmann stated also in extra jurisdictional circumstances, counties can also do urban renewal districts so there isn't a need for the City to do extra-jurisdictional TIF districts if the County is on board. He also noted those efforts have to be led by motivated manufactured housing folks, because in a resident cooperative model, they're going to be carrying that on to the future. Lehmann noted although it's tertiary to this recommendation, one can do urban renewal districts in one area and use some funds in a different area, such as is happening at Foster Road right now and that might be an opportunity to try and, leverage funds in a different sort of way.

Barron stated one thing they were looking at is how to create a municipal investment without going before the voters for a bond or something and urban renewal districts are one way to generate significant money without going through a borrowing scheme or putting it before voters. She also noted lots of manufactured housing communities are on the edges of existing communities so it depends on how large the boundary would be drawn for the urban renewal district. There are some areas where future development could be tied to the existing neighborhoods. Also, in continued discussions with the folks who do resident owned communities, they're good at pulling together resources to finance the purchase of the manufactured

housing, the hardest part is finding willing sellers. The Manufactured Housing Task Force wants to be prepared if the opportunity comes up, so they don't have to then scramble to find the resources.

Drabek asked if this is a proposal to establish an urban renewal district or is it a proposal for resident cooperatives, which one is the core, it seems like the residential cooperatives is in fact the core of the ideas and the rural urban renewal district is if there's some better method than you'd prefer the better method. Barron confirmed that was correct. Drabek noted it's maybe worth stressing with this one, that if something like this went well, and there was some way to have residential cooperatives in the medium or long term that would make recommendations one and two almost totally unnecessary. Residential cooperatives are not going to manifest themselves, or mass raise their own rent.

Lehmann moved on to recommendations four and five noting they are similar, one with zoning and one with annexation and doing conditional zoning as part of that. As the report notes, the City currently has zoning protections in place but is willing to participate in review to find additional protections that might be available. It can be a double-edged sword because if you're trying to implement new parks and you have to rezone it, then you run into the difficulty of opposition in the rezoning process. As staff talked about this internally, when they first read the report, and they're not sure which direction that leads, they think it's good for the existing ones, but it may be bad for future ones. For recommendation five similarly that protection is generally in place. Upon annexation, the City requires upgrades to infrastructure that matches a City scale, which can improve living conditions, but the City can phase in tax rates based on State law and that can be used as a hook to get landlords more willing to maybe think about other things such as more affordable rents over the long term. There have also been some more recent talks with mobile home parks about coming into the City and the City has tried to bring up that affordability side of things. However, the infrastructure issues sunk those annexations.

Barron agreed and stated the Task Force is continuing to talk with local governments about this, as she earlier stated she was just talking to the Board of Supervisors on Wednesday and now has talked to Josh Boussard, who's their planning and zoning person, he's going to help convene a meeting of Iowa City, Coralville, North Liberty and Johnson County planning and zoning folks to comb through those zones that are specifically for mobile home parks and look at best practices. Barron also said it is important to note that one of the weapons that has been used against manufactured housing residents is the threat of redevelopment. In other words, if you make this too much of a problem, we'll just take the whole thing down and put up a new pretty building here instead. Barron reiterated it's important to have strong zoning that protects their rights as much as possible, and to reaffirm the commitment to preserving those neighborhoods. The new owners can't just decide to put something else up on the space because they'd have to go before planning and zoning and the city council's before that change could be made.

Barron also stressed in the second paragraph that says, "looking at the zoning that might allow some of the current lot lines, lease lines to be turned into owned property". They are talking about very initial stages of a hybrid model where someone who owns maybe a manufactured housing community that has 200 lots, what would it look like for them to take even 50 of those and convert them to owned land under an owned structure. If that is not allowed under current zoning regulations, that might be an example of something that could be added in that would strengthen longer term protections and stability overall.

McKinstry stated if the most affordable private market rate housing are manufactured homes and there continues to be a problem with the affordability of housing slipping away faster than wages are going up, the prices of houses are going up faster than wages, then we have to make it make sense that we have to make more room in the way we zone things for locating a variety of types of manufactured housing and we're talking about high quality manufactured housing that meet normal regular zoning building requirements. They'd be safe, they'd be energy efficient, and all that sort of thing. He mentioned the Forest View development because of the experience that hopefully will be positive in the long run, when people actually in the future get to own some of those properties themselves, the land underneath them as well as the building on top of it. He does not see this problem going away and that it's going to be more and more prevalent. McKinstry also noted that Habitat across the country is going in the direction to be building manufactured housing units, more like modular housing, and not just things built on a foundation. McKinstry thinks the task force hopefully would want to see is not always just rezoning but as new land is annexed or redeveloped in large measure, and some of this has to do with the types of

housing that are allowed under the form-based code. There can be a half a block or a whole block in the midst of other types of housing and other forms of housing, where it could be carved up into smaller lots and have 20 houses instead of 10 on that block and have them be modular manufactured housing units.

Barron said if you look at an example like Forest View and a huge NIMBY concern of the Forest View redevelopment that was expressed was the size of the lots. In manufactured housing communities, the way they're zoned, the lots can be smaller than in areas that are zoned for single family homes, etc. Some view that as a detriment to the neighborhood, but when thought about through the lens of affordability and envisioning different types of communities with shared resources, they could offer a counter vision that is a great step for thinking forward for the future.

Lehmann noted that the draft South District Plan proposes cottage court concepts that's a similar.

Lehmann moved on to recommendation six, which states to be specific about manufacturer housing as a housing type when drafting plans, reports, etc. The City is trying to do that, they made changes in City Steps. In terms of being specific about manufactured housing and programs, again one of the challenges is a lot of manufactured housing is outside of the City, which can be confusing when they have Iowa City addresses, they come to the City and we have to refer them elsewhere. There isn't really an answer to that other than education and hopefully get resources and other jurisdictions as well.

Barron agreed noting it's tricky because Iowa City has federal money that they're allowed to allocate that the cities of Coralville and North Liberty do not. The resources look different, although Iowa City also contributes a significant amount of money from its general fund allocations, not just the pass-through money from CDBG and HOME. The conversation now is to extend this to Coralville and North Liberty. When she spoke with the Board of Supervisors about putting in money, one of the things they said was they'd like to look at the rural areas outside of the incorporated cities. Barron suggested a match so that it's not just one municipality funding these things and everyone is doing it more collaboratively.

Lehmann stated recommendation seven is committing to a regular review of manufactured housing communities and their data. Generally, the City thinks it is important but it makes more sense at a higher level like the task force, because there's so much outside of the City. So perhaps the task force or Affordable Housing Coalition could maintain it, or maybe the County.

Barron added one thing which is to say that Len Sandler also identified a source at the State where you can pull the number of units disaggregated by housing type, including manufactured housing, and also by the age of the housing broken into groups. So if that's not a resource we're in the practice of looking at frequently it'd be worth pulling that data and reviewing it every so often to get that reminder of what the housing stock looks like for all of our housing, not just for manufactured housing.

Lehmann said he has pulled similar data, not for the manufactured housing specifically but for the age of housing by housing type. Some time he would like to start doing more regular housing assessments that aren't just part of the ConPlan, but other priorities take precedent.

Lehmann stated the next two recommendations are quick at least which is issuing a joint statement with Johnson County elected bodies, staff believes City Council be willing to do it, especially in partnership with others. Staff thinks that it would be especially important to have those partners in a joint statement because Johnson County and Iowa City are often loud about those sorts of things at the State level.

Recommendation number nine is not investing in funds from private equity that generate returns for investors using predatory manufacturing housing community management practices. The City is willing to review its local investments, doesn't think that it's going to have any private equity because generally the City looks at more stable sorts of conservative investment mechanisms. Pension investments are managed at the State level.

Barron noted that if as customers of the State investment practices, they had growing interest in divesting from those things, and to continue to think about the investment practices for the City and State employee

pension program. That might be a longer-term thing, but it's not something to lose sight of because our retirement money could be being used right now to make these purchases.

Aguilar asked about number eight regarding the public joint statement among elected, particularly because of what happened in Des Moines with the bipartisan bill not getting out of committee and was wondering if there's been discussion already about issuing some kind of a statement about that. Barron said they are going to issue a statement and also, they finally have come around to the fact that it's going to take the form of proclamations. She reiterated the feedback she has gotten from both Johnson County and Iowa City is, if we want this addressed at a State level, they might not be our best public allies. The City of Coralville's lobbyists did register in favor of the protections when the bills were first introduced. Johnson County and Iowa City have it on their legislative priorities. The Urban County Coalition Association has it on their legislative priorities in person, they're talking to people when they're doing their lobbying efforts, but they don't necessarily want to hang that red flag on it in the current political climate.

Lehmann stated recommendation 10 is to connect people with organizations, which is residents forming cooperatives, it's got to be a resident lead transition, but the City can support it. The City has the Opportunity Fund, which is part of the Affordable Housing Fund with \$75,000 for FY21. While the manufactured housing communities are good at getting money, a lot of these are valued at millions of dollars so City staff is worried about the capacity and affordability to find the funds to pull this together.

Eastham noted this is the most important recommendation the Task Force, the only way to avoid rent increases. Lehmann stated the City supports it. Eastman stated supports but timidly and he is looking for a much more vigorous support by the City Manager. The amount of money is considerable, but investment firms are finding ways to put that much money together to buy these parks and raise the rents, so then the City could lead and guide and help a group of residents to do the same thing.

Barron stated her expertise is not discussing financial products but her understanding from talking to the woman that is affiliated with ROC USA, a technical assistance provider, is that what you're looking for contributions is more filling a gap and they are actually a CDFI and they put together financing packages they do alone that's funded by a modest increase in the lot rent and most of the money is paid back over time through that increase depending on the amount of infrastructure improvements associated with buying the park and preparing it for the residents to manage. Because there is some amount of money that's not usually covered by that they would be looking for other partners to provide those resources. The Manufactured Housing Task Force is not asking Iowa City to give them the \$8 million to buy a park but to assist with helping fill some financing gaps.

Eastham stated the City could run a scenario through in a matter of a few months to determine feasibility and what finance would actually look like and he is going to urge the Commission to recommend the Council to do exactly that scenario and develop an acquisition plan that is ready in the event of an annexation or an attempt by an outside firm to buy one of the parks within the city limits,

Lastly, Lehmann noted with recommendations 11 and 12 the City supports them, so feels like there's not a whole lot else there to discuss. As previously mentioned, that bill has been tabled in legislature for this year so the City will continue to actively support it at the state level.

Barron noted it's worth saying it has a bit of time for tweaks before the funnel closes so they could yank the rent justification. Eastham stated the personal stuff is not going to prevent rent increases, the only way to prevent rent increases is acquisition. Barron stated it is possible that they could still see a bill move forward that, for example, simply prohibits no-cause eviction. It won't be the full comprehensive bill that's proposed. She explained if others were not aware with the mobile home park legislation, there was a bill introduced in both the House and the Senate to offer a range of protections largely shaped from the recommendations referred to in the report, and even going a little further in some cases than what was expected to be included in a bill. Barron noted there was bipartisan support.

McKinstry asked when the deadline for something to get through the funnel. Barron replied it has to make it through the funnel by Friday, tomorrow. Eastham stated that legislature is not going to support

any new legislation that limits rent increases, they're not going to do that. Barron stated they're worried that it would open the doors to rent justification and other housing types.

Eastham reiterated the only way to prevent rent increases is local acquisition. McKinstry agreed in the in the current climate he certainly think that's true too.

Lehmann stated those were the staff comments on the different recommendations, generally a lot of them the City's working towards or supporting. There are different recommendations there or tweaks on recommendations that could also be beneficial as staff noted.

Drabek stated to do numbers three and ten successfully they would need an acquisition plan or urban renewal plan.

Eastham said he would drop recommendation three, it's a financing mechanism and it's probably not going to work well anyway. They have the potential funding financing partner and in ROC, USA, if not money, they have the technical expertise to put together a plan.

Alter stated this is being prepared and given the priorities about affordable housing this is such a no brainer to be prepared for this kind of situation since Iowa is such a target.

Barron stated that this same model they are proposing for manufactured housing communities, ROC, USA is technical assistance providers also are offering this model for multifamily buildings, helping them become resident cooperatives too. Given the current real estate market in Johnson County where the vacancy rates are going up and more multifamily properties coming up for sale, beginning to understand some of these different financing mechanisms in more detail might create other opportunities beyond manufactured housing for resident acquisition or nonprofit acquisition. There are many different types of ownership models that protect affordable housing from the private markets.

Eastham stated the City could do an acquisitions scenario by taking the park in North Liberty as a model, you know what the cost was, you know what the lot rents are, you know what the numbers of units are, and it's not that hard to develop a plan that would say given this situation or a similar situation this is how it could go and do that in consultation with the hands on people at ROC, USA. Eastham stated they need to avoid the Rose Oak situation where this Council was playing catch up and never caught up.

Kubly asked if this is something that the task force could provide the City for reaction or to see how they could fill those gaps, or how can the City partner with the task force on something like this.

Barron stated they have already had one video conference with the technical assistance provider for folks who were able to hop on and they maybe had 10 people just for that initial learning. To answer Kubly's question, there are two potential ways to go. One is to offer a similar training opportunity for folks who are interested in learning more about the financing structure and the second would be to do all the work offline and then just say here's the budget. Barron can see benefits to both, depending on who wants to be involved in the proposal. If they're talking about moving toward resident owned communities, it's important to start involving residents and owners in this conversation now as well, it doesn't do any good to have this conversation those stakeholders are not involved.

Barron stated the question for how to proceed is who they want to have involved in more serious contemplation of what this model would look like and then go from there. Do we just look at numbers dryly or do we want to look at the whole process?

McKinstry said it makes sense then that all the municipalities, including the county, could benefit from having a very concrete scenario to show this is how it could be done.

Lehmann noted they are getting in the weeds, this more of a down the road conversation and HCDC should focus now on what they recommend to Council.

Barron wanted to add one more thing before a recommendation is made noting she had the interesting experience of going to all the different elected bodies and sharing these recommendations with them as 12 recommendations for action. The response then from the elected bodies is "it's a shame we can't do anything about this". What that feedback means to her is that it's difficult for any individual municipality to wrap its arms around these 12 recommendations and say "yes, we can take action on this tomorrow" and part of that is because a lot of these are just mitigating recommendations, they can't stop or reverse the harm that's already been caused, it's just putting more tools in the toolbox. She noted that eminent domain was a consideration that didn't make it into the final report, but some cities and other places in the country have used their eminent domain powers to say this is our land now and we'll pay for it.

Drabek asked if the reason eminent domain is not in the recommendations is because state legislature will probably remove the power to use it. Lehmann said it is already removed for economic development, there would need to be a very specific purpose to use it, and he doesn't think it would pass the courts.

Barron stated just fully embracing all of the recommendations to the best of their ability, like Iowa City has shown interest in doing is doing something and when all of the communities in Johnson County take those same steps, the power of that multiplies. Alter agreed stating if the different vectors are concrete about this and then here's also a proclamation, that symbolism or words can be a layered effect and that can be some momentum.

Barron agreed and said people being willing to put some dollars behind it probably takes the most arm twisting, but it is also the one that's going to make the most immediate difference, so think about your recommendations in terms of what do you want to see the City invest in this.

McKinstry moved to recommend to City Council that the City continue to support the 12 recommendations in this report, with the additional recommendation that the City assist with developing an acquisition plan to transition a private manufactured housing park into a resident-owned cooperative to prepare for future possible acquisitions. Alter seconded the motion, a vote was taken and the motion passed 8-0.

Eastham feels this motion should give Council a chance to direct the staff to work on this and to follow up to Kubly's working with the Coalition and elements from the Board of Supervisors would be a helpful approach. Kubly asked if Eastham has already run the scenario. Eastham has not but he has talked to this a couple of supervisors about the general concept of transitioning to residential communities but not terribly specifically.

CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: DECEMBER 19, 2019:

Aguilar moved to approve the minutes of October 17, 2019. Kealey seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the motion passed 8-0.

HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION:

Lehmann noted the next meeting will be not the third Thursday due to spring break, it will be on March 12. The agenda will include monitoring updates from non-applicants, CDBG/HOME and Emerging Aid to Agencies budget recommendations, and discuss community development week activities. Prior to that meeting, preferably by March 2, please give recommendations to Lehmann for the ranking sheet and also at that time the budget scoring if that is done.

Lehmann stated now that they have Aid to Agency recommendations, they can start scheduling tours. He will send out a sign-up sheet where there'll be a couple slots a month. Commissioners can then reconvene with their agencies about what the best time is and then pass it back through Lehmann. McKinstry noted some of the Commissioner terms end at the end of June. Lehmann said he will take that into

consideration and they can start doing the meetings and reiterating it's really just an opportunity for the agencies to show the Commissioners what they do and to open up lines of communication.

Lehmann noted the FY21 applications for Climate Action Grants are open through March 3 with \$50,000 available. The annual monitoring of rental projects is well underway, he's hoping to get a rental outcome report out of this at the end of it and hopefully be able to share that with the Commission in the future.

Finally, Lehmann wanted to alert the Commission that the Council had asked about an emergency policy and the Commission was going to talk about it at the last meeting. However, upon Council request, staff developed a policy in the interim and Council approved. Lehmann handed out the Emergency Funding Policy. It's based off HUD and Iowa Economic Development Authority requirements. This policy would come into play with requests for funding outside of regular funding cycles. Some of the criteria are the emergency must: alleviate existing conditions posing a serious and immediate threat to health, safety and welfare; be the result of unforeseeable or unavoidable circumstances or events of relatively recent origin; have no known alternatives or actions that are more feasible than the proposed project; and certify that other funds aren't available. So that's what staff would look at during the review process and staff would respond within five business days. It is a quick turnaround if it's within the City's budget authority, if not then the City Manager would request Council for support.

ADJOURNMENT:

Drabek moved to adjourn. Alter seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the motion passed 8-0

**Housing and Community
 Development Commission
 Attendance Record**

Name	Terms Exp.	7/11	8/15	9/19	10/17	12/19	2/20					
Aguilar, Peggy	6/30/22	■	X	X	O/E	X	X					
Alter, Megan	6/30/21	X	X	O/E	X	X	X					
Drabek, Matt	6/30/22	O/E	X	X	X	O/E	X					
Eastham, Charlie	6/30/20	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Fixmer-Oraiz, V	6/30/20	X	X	X	X	X	O/E					
Kealey, Lyn Dee Hook	6/30/22	O/E	X	O/E	O/E	X	X					
McKinstry, John	6/30/20	X	O/E	X	X	X	X					
Nkumu, Peter	6/30/22	O/E	X	X	X	O/E	X					
Padron, Maria	6/30/20	X	X	X	X	O/E	X					

- Resigned from Commission

Key:

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