

HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION (HCDC)

September 17, 2020

Electronic Regular Meeting – 6:30 PM

Zoom Meeting Platform

Electronic Meeting

(Pursuant to Iowa Code section 21.8)

An electronic meeting is being held because a meeting in person is impossible or impractical due to concerns for the health and safety of Commission members, staff and the public presented by COVID-19.

You can participate in the meeting and comment on an agenda item by going to:

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_yIHfz3QRH2qtWxoz_5tIQ

to visit the Zoom meeting's registration page and submitting the required information. Once approved, you will receive an email message with a link to join the meeting. If you are asked for a meeting or webinar ID, enter the ID number found in the email. If you have no computer or smartphone, or a computer without a microphone, you can call in by phone by dialing (312) 626-6799 and entering the meeting ID 914 0743 7756 when prompted. Providing comment in person is not an option.

AGENDA:

1. Call to Order

2. Consideration of Meeting Minutes: August 20, 2020

3. 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.

4. Overview of the Housing Trust Fund of Johnson County

Ellen McCabe, Executive Director of the Housing Trust Fund of Johnson County with present an overview of the organization.

5. Iowa City Council Meeting Updates

Two commissioners are assigned each month to monitor Council meetings. This agenda item provides an opportunity for brief updates on Iowa City Council activity that is relevant to HCDC business.

6. Consolidated Annual Performance & Evaluation Report (CAPER) Status

The CAPER is typically reviewed by HCDC in September. However, due to extenuating circumstances surrounding COVID-19, the City has received a waiver to allow an additional 90 days for submission. Staff will provide a status update on the report and explain the waiver granted by HUD.

7. Review of City Steps (Five Year Consolidated Plan) Priorities

HCDC will review and discuss City Steps priorities and offer feedback to staff. Commissioners will also discuss how solicitation of public input should occur in the future.

8. Proposed Policy Changes to 2016 Equal Access Ruling

HCDC will consider opposing HUD's proposed policy changes that will eliminate protections for transgender people and remove critical equal access protections.

9. Coordination of Joint Funding Application Process

Chair Padron will provide an update on the draft letter to City Council recommending that Council work with participating organizations to streamline the joint funding application process.

10. Housing & Community Development Information**11. Adjournment**

If you will need disability-related accommodations to participate in this program or event, please contact Brianna Gabel at brianna-gabel@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

410 East Washington Street
Iowa City, Iowa 52240-1826
(319) 356-5000
(319) 356-5009 FAX
www.icgov.org

Housing and Community Development Commission September 17, 2020 Meeting Packet Contents

Agenda Item #2

- August 20, 2020 HCDC Draft Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item #6

- U.S. Housing and Urban Development CAPER Waiver Memo

Agenda Item #7

- City Steps 2025 Priorities
 - Full document located at icgov.org/actionplan

Agenda Item #8

- Correspondence from Crissy Canganelli, Executive Director of Shelter House
- Letter to Secretary Carson from Agency Impact Coalition and Local Homeless Coordinating Board of Johnson County

Agenda Item #10

- 21 Day Equity Challenge
 - Link to 21 Day Equity Challenge located at www.equitychallenge.org.

MINUTES

PRELIMINARY

**HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
AUGUST 20, 2020 – 6:30 PM
ELECTRONIC MEETING**

Electronic Meeting

(Pursuant to Iowa Code section 21.8)

An electronic meeting is being held because a meeting in person is impossible or impractical due to concerns for the health and safety of Commission members, staff and the public presented by COVID-19.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Peggy Aguilar, Megan Alter, Matt Drabek, Lyn Dee Hook Kealey, Theresa Lewis, Nasr Mohammed, Peter Nkumu, Maria Padron, Kyle Vogel

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Brianna Gabel, Erika Kubly

OTHERS PRESENT: Sara Barron, Cady Gerlach, Crissy Canganelli

CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

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

CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: JULY 16, 2020:

Vogel moved to approve the minutes of July 16, 2020. Lewis seconded and a vote was taken and the motion passed 7-0 (Aguilar and Nkumu not present for vote).

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR TOPICS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

None.

HOUSEKEEPING ITEMS:

Padron noted because there are new members to HCDC it would be a good time to discuss meeting formats and Commission responsibilities.

First, since the meetings are not in person and having to meet via zoom is making everything more difficult for voting, especially when the Commissioners don't have camera, they will begin doing a roll call procedure for each item that needs a vote.

Second, Padron discussed the HCDC bylaws to make sure everybody understands the way these meetings are held, and how to bring issues forward. If there is something that one thinks the Commission should talk about it can added to the agenda next meeting. The Commission follows the Robert's Rules of Orders for meeting procedures.

Third, because again these meetings are being held via zoom and it is much more difficult than having them in person Padron wants every Commissioner to be heard. She encouraged everyone to please speak up if they're happy or unhappy with the way something is been handled, or if they would like to change something or if think the Commission should recommend something to Council. Additionally, if someone has talked quite a bit, perhaps they can wait to speak again once others have had a chance.

Next, there is a tentative meeting schedule for the year, please let Padron know if anybody has questions or comments about the schedule.

Finally, City Council has usually two meetings per month, every other Tuesday, and she thinks it would be useful if the Commission monitors those meetings. Sometimes those meetings are really long and not everybody can be there all the time. She would like to have maybe two Commissioners per month to volunteer to watch and read the meeting minutes from Council, and then try to write a very brief description of the Council meeting, or bring your comments to this meeting so the Commission can what's going on in the Council.

Lewis agreed and thinks it's a really good idea to do the rotation and to have a presence at the meetings. Others agreed as well.

Kubly mentioned the Council meets the first and third Tuesday of every month, they have a work session at five o'clock, and then the regular meeting is at seven o'clock. A lot of times at the work session, they discuss items relevant to this Commission, so it would be good to tune into the work session and then the regular meeting, there will be an agenda so one can kind of see if there's items to listen to. Also there is also a public comment at the regular meeting that's usually pretty interesting and oftentimes relevant to community development.

Alter asked if the idea is that the Commissioners in this rotation would be responsible for the work sessions and for the formal meeting. If they review the agendas beforehand they could just decide to attend and not potentially five hours of meetings and just be selective and look at agendas and not attend the work session unless there's something really important for the Commission's purpose.

Sara Barron (Johnson County Affordable Housing Coalition) stated she goes to all the meetings and thinks it's wonderful for the Commission to consider paying attention to those conversations. A couple of things she wanted to point out, if you want to weigh in on an issue before they vote on it, you will not be able to determine what those issues are using your monthly meeting schedule because they don't release their formal agenda until the Thursday before the meeting. Additionally, she doesn't even know what communication you all are allowed to have with each other about even scheduling someone to be there having those conversations. You're just not always going to be able to prepare for it. She did add if something comes up that anyone thinks would do for some additional HCDC review and consideration of a discussion they've had, particularly if they're talking about something in a work session that will come up at a future meeting, those meetings, whether they're happening in zoom or in person are also always recorded to Facebook, and on the City channel website, and anyone could go look at them and doesn't have to be there for the meeting to watch the meeting and its entirety. Barron just wanted to offer those couple of things for the Commission to consider in their planning.

Padron noted her idea was she didn't think that they will be making comments, just listening to know what's going on and then bringing things back to the Commission. No one should comment on behalf of the Commission if they haven't talked about things before and have voted.

Kubly noted typically if there's an agenda item that Council wants HCDC to weigh in on, they're going to have us put it on our agenda and discuss.

Barron stated that thinking of this from the Coalition perspective, she'd be interested in everyone being transparent about what the process is for that because part of the advocacy and getting the policy through and reviewed, will also impact the kinds of communication the Coalition might want to have with the Commission all as well, as they're thinking about that decision-making process and the information gathering,

Kubly noted there's a couple things that are outlined in the Citizen Participation Plan that regularly go to HCDC for recommendation and then go to Council like the Action Plan and Consolidated Plan and things that guide the funding of the federal grants. Kubly added then there are other projects that are kind of random that Council may decide would be a good thing for HCDC to look into.

The Commission discussed schedules and volunteered for various months to attend the Council meetings.

Kubly added one more housekeeping thing and asked the Commissioners to identify themselves as a Commissioner next to their names on zoom, it is helpful for the public to know who's a Commissioner and who's not.

ANNUAL REVIEW OF FAIR HOUSING STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Kubly noted in 2018 staff completed a report called the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, which is referred to as the Fair Housing Study. It identifies barriers to Fair Housing Choice in our community and provides recommendations to overcome those barriers over the next few years. This report was a HUD requirement, as part of the City's duty to affirmatively further fair housing after the 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule, and that's a HUD phrase is defined as taking meaningful actions to overcome historic patterns of segregation, promoting Fair Housing Choice and fostering inclusive communities free from discrimination. Kubly stated for those Commissioners who weren't here last year, staff spent several months compiling this report in partnership with the City's Human Rights Division. The process included a lot of data analysis and review of current past policies and practices, including public sector and private sector, stakeholder focus groups, research on best practices, agency feedback. They also did a community wide survey and all of that information was used to develop chapter five, which was in the agenda packet, which is the impediments and recommendations. Kubly stated they wanted to bring this to the Commission today, partly to keep the Fair Housing study in everyone's mind so they can continue working towards the recommendations, and then to inform the Commission on progress staff has made since last year. Before going through some of the updates, Kubly did want to touch on the press release from HUD that's in the agenda packet. A couple weeks ago, Secretary Carson terminated the 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule that required the City to complete this study as part of the overall grant process. It was stated that the process was too complicated and costly and ineffective, so now there's still reporting requirements but it's not as extensive as what they did for this report. Still the City is committed to removing barriers to Fair Housing Choice. The 2019 study was adopted by Council and staff intend to continue working towards those strategies, regardless of all the changes that are happening at the federal level, because that could change the other way in the future. Kubly next went through some of the recommendations and bullet points that they've made progress on.

The first recommendation, improving Housing Choice and one of the strategies was facilitate a range of housing types. So currently, staff is working on a final draft of the Form Based Code for the South District, which is a different type of zoning code that allows a large range of different housing types with a mix of uses. This helps ensure a diversity of housing types because people won't have to rezone their property

and go through a public process to have different types of housing. A lot of times there are Not in My Backyard (NIMBY) attitudes and projects might get derailed through that process. The goal is to use the South District as a pilot program for the Form Based Code in green-field areas on the edge of town, and then expand the use of it to other areas of the City in the future. They will also have their first project that is subject to the affordable housing requirement for annexed land out on American Legion Road past Scott Boulevard. The City annexed a parcel of land that will be a mix of uses but primarily residential and the developer will be required to make 10% of the units affordable for that project.

Vogel asked if the developer would be allowed to do the fee in lieu of or they're going to be required to make 10% of the actual units affordable. Kubly stated with the annexation they're required to do the units.

Kubly stated the next strategy is to lower the cost of housing. The City has received comments from the Home Builders Association about ways the City can reduce the cost of constructing housing. That's still in review and going through the different departments for review of how they can adjust policies to reduce costs of building houses.

Next is continued investment in affordable housing. Kubly stated this current fiscal year they have another million dollars for the Affordable Housing Fund just as they have had for the past couple of years. Last year, they revised how they use those funds and included a Security Deposit Assistance Program in partnership with Community. That program helps remove the barrier of people having to come up with enough savings to provide a security deposit when they get a new apartment.

Vogel stated regarding the lowering the cost of housing and continuing investment he has heard a lot is these programs only being offered to nonprofit housing organizations so he is curious as he works in the field and knowing the percentage of landlords and clients that provide HCV homes to Housing Choice Voucher clients. Things like what is the current number of Housing Choice Voucher individuals working through Iowa City Housing Authority that are in organization housing versus in private landlord housing because what he doesn't see is any of the rental permit cost reduction given to private landlords who are participating in the program. Additionally, he is not seeing the security deposit program being offered to private landlords either. He is just curious what that percentage is because he knows they've had as high as 30 to 35% just in his business alone and that of their properties that are affordable housing properties and it is not given down to the private landlord. He is curious why those HCV clients and the expansion of affordable housing isn't being looked at from an overall city-wide standpoint, instead only focusing on organizations that provide housing. Kubly replied this particular program is just administered by Community, it is eligible city-wide so someone who's possibly renting any property could go there and get security deposit assistance if they qualified. It is not specific to nonprofit agencies although she believes they work with coordinated entry to determine who gets the assistance.

Vogel asked about the rental permit reduction waiting and fees for properties. Kubly doesn't have specific information and doesn't know if there's a request for that. Vogel said regarding the lowering the cost of housing strategy two it says to recommend that the City explore reducing or waiving fees for properties which are operated for affordable housing by nonprofit housing organizations to offset negative, disproportionate impacts. It says this could be used for properties in the private market receiving City assistance for a period of time for affordable housing as well. Stan Leverman does go and meet with the Greater Iowa City Apartment Association on a monthly basis but he has never seen any movement forward on any kind of waiving of rental permit fees for properties that are currently offering affordable housing to HCV clients. Kubly agreed that's something that they haven't made progress on yet, noting this is a multi-year report and while it's something that's on the agenda it is something they haven't made progress on yet. With regards to inspections, they've had to cancel inspections for several months and now they have new software that they're working through.

Next Kubly talked about investment in affordable housing, the City has the Affordable Housing Fund and they also did some additional funding to housing assistance as part of the COVID response with funding to Shelter House and Center for Worker Justice. They continue to enforce and monitor the Riverfront Crossings Affordable Housing requirements, which has resulted in about 50 affordable units in that area, although not all are quite built out yet.

The next recommendation is facilitating access to opportunity and one of the strategies is community investment. Kubly pointed out they continue to use the Neighborhood Improvement Set Aside from CDBG funds to do projects in low income census tracts. Right now they're doing a project at Villa Park on the west side of town to get a new shelter and then the next project is to pave the trail at Weatherby Park, which will be another amenity for that neighborhood. The City has also invested in the South District Homeownership Program, which has resulted in two very affordable home owner occupied units, soon to be four units, near Taylor Drive and Davis Street, and they're going to continue that program in partnership with Habitat.

The third recommendation is increasing education and outreach. One of the strategies is to increase demand side awareness, which is tenants, homeowners, mobile park residents, people who use housing essentially. A couple things they promoted were information on eviction prevention during this whole COVID thing, but one of the challenges related to that is that they're really limited with communication and are basically limited to digital communication right now.

Next strategy is increased regulator awareness and ensure officials have had fair housing training. Human Rights offered fair housing training for this Commission and few people on the Commission participated in that. Next is providing meaningful language access and this can be a challenge and is time consuming. It takes longer to get information out now, and when they do this and it's also pretty expensive to translate things, but it's definitely something the City is trying to be better at. They've made a greater effort to translate important community information into Spanish, French, Arabic, Chinese and Swahili for a few things. Also there has been the Community Connections videos that the mayor has been doing and he's been having staff and a few other people translate those types of things. Signs in City Hall are posted in different languages as well so people know that offices are closed.

Kubly stated the last one is operational improvements and one of the strategies is to improve fair housing enforcement and transparency. One thing that they're beginning to look at related to this is how people are submitting nuisance complaints and if they can identify the biases. For example, if a neighbor reports someone for tall grass and weeds is that because of a bias. The next one is to improve data collection and they've started adding spots for demographic information on the local programs. They have always collected it for the federal programs because it is required, but they've added it to the local housing programs so they can see who they're serving with local funds.

Lewis asked about improving housing choices and the couple of strategies regarding increasing density, and if they are targeting areas on the southeast side and on the fringes of town that's where the plan is to increase density. Kubly replied not necessarily, those were just specific things that they're working on and there are not specific targeted areas where they're thinking about increasing density.

Alter asked with the partnership between the City and Habitat on the South District Rent to Home Program who actually is looking through the applications and what's that process look like. Kubly said the City's going maintain that that part of the program because they've already been doing the intake, so if someone's interested they would still apply on the City website and the City would review their application.

SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OVERVIEW (CDBG FUNDS):

Kubly stated each year they set aside \$50,000 in CDBG funds for small business assistance. They typically use this for micro enterprise assistance for small business owners who are at or below 80% of the area median income. Funding is provided as a loan for profit businesses. Currently the program provides up to \$25,000 as percent interest for qualifying applicants. Kubly noted there are some well-known businesses in the community that have benefited from this program, Oasis, Baroncini's and Molly's Cupcakes are a couple that received assistance in the past. They also use the funds right now for technical assistance for micro enterprises, specifically they provide a grant to Four C's as a community coordinated childcare and they use the funds to help in-home childcare providers work towards DHS

certification so they can get the DHS payments for the children that they're watching. The City wants to continue to offer this assistance to Four C's as part of the set aside because it has a number of community benefits such as the increase in income for the providers as well as adding childcare units throughout the community. For the business loan portion of the program Kubly outlined some of the challenges they're experiencing in the memo in the agenda packet. The challenges include a lack of applications, the need for more in depth and ongoing technical assistance, which staff is not necessarily equipped to provide, and then there's a lot of uncertainty in the business community right now with COVID. Tracy Hightshoe has been working with local lenders and BIPOC business owners group through ICAD to review a proposed loan program that with CDBG funds combines a loan with a grant for technical assistance and that also is in the agenda packet, the draft flyer of that proposed program. They're looking at revising the business assistance to include a grant loans would be \$5,000 to \$10,000, still as zero percent interest and applicants would have to match the CDBG loan with a commercial loan of at least equal value. In addition to the CDBG loan, the City would provide a grant to reimburse for technical costs like website development, accounting services, legal services, tech services, and other things that small business entrepreneurs might need. So based on this program, staff would need to revise the application to make it simpler, right now it's pretty cumbersome and a lot of the information is not applicable to the CDBG program. From there they would work on marketing the program more proactively throughout the community to get some more applications in. Kubly asked the Commission to share this program with their networks noting the City does have this program.

Vogel asked with the Economic Development Fund, he sees it is for private sector jobs for low to moderate income persons and wondered if there is any consideration to include not just low to moderate income persons but people with disabilities as well. He noted Iowa Compass has really stressed over the last couple years in Iowa City as there is a real need for companies that employ disabled individuals. He is wondering what the City has in the way of economic development that aims for employers to do that. He knows for example there's a construction company in town, True Construction, that hires disabled people to help with construction and works with a grant with the State that helps pay part of their salary to make up for the difference in labor hours that it takes for disabled people to do the job versus able bodied people to do the job. He wonders if there is something the City offers to help people, especially with special needs.

Kubly is not aware of anything that the City currently offers that would meet that but agrees it would be a good program to offer. She noted it would be really difficult to use CDBG funds for that purpose and meet the requirements of CDBG. Additionally, they wouldn't be able to do it long term, partly because they don't have that many funds but the other reason is CDBG is all about job creation for this kind of project.

Vogel asked if that is a restriction from the federal government that restricts how those funds are used and states they can only be for low to moderate income job creation or is it somewhere else in the City planning or in City rules that that requires those fund to be used in such a way. Kubly replied it is a federal restriction.

Drabek finds this to be a really tricky issue, in part because they're a Community Development Commission and this is the community development side, trying to promote things that are good for the community and small businesses line up perfectly with that. He would like to put something in there that really promotes good small business and good job creation and is wondering if when they're looking at the various metrics to also look at a metric for a cooperatively owned business. He noted there's been discussion of, for example, cooperative ownership buying The Mill and if that was a business cooperatively owned, he feels it probably would benefit the community.

Kubly acknowledged she hasn't specifically looked into that type of structure before, but again it's a situation that'd be really hard to fund with CDBG based on the federal requirements.

Mohammed stated some of the small businesses already went out of business due to COVID-19 and wondered if there is any chance for them to apply to get some help through this program to recover. Kubly replied that is depending on what they're looking for funding for, they may be eligible. The City can

use CDBG money, for small business assistance, they would just have to make sure they didn't get a duplicate of funds from another agency for the same purpose.

Nkumu noted they are looking at the household income in order to qualify for a business loan, he wondered what was the correlation between household income and business, he thought it would probably be looking at a business record itself or how the business is doing rather than basing the decision on the personal income. Kubly said it is essentially just another layer to use the community development block grant funds, in order to spend that money it has to serve low income people.

Drabek asked if there is some sort of measure of who they're serving to provide along with the application. Kubly said the people they typically serve are considered micro enterprises, which means their business with five or fewer employees and one of those employees owns the business. In the application they are looking at the owner's income and typically they're a low-income person that's starting a business. It is just a onetime income review so it's not something they're looking at over time.

Lewis asked then in that respect, can there be some sort of specific focus on minority businesses? Kubly agreed they'd like to do better with their program marketing and reach different areas of the community.

Nkumu noted in the challenges it states the City is not receiving applications on a regular basis and wondered why. Kubly states they could do a much better job of marketing this program, it just hasn't been a priority since she has been working with the City so that's why she is bringing it up to get input. Kubly noted if they're going to revise the program, then they can market the new format of the loan with a grant for technical assistance. The other issue is they see people and applications from people that just came up with the idea for the business the same day they came to City and haven't really thought through all the details. Other people have their business plan in place and have gone to the Small Business Development Center, but maybe their projections and their numbers are not very realistic and they're going to serve way more people than is really realistic for what they're proposing. Some people just have financial issues like credit issues or something that prevents them from getting approved, there's a variety of things. Kubly noted they do get applications fairly regularly, maybe a handful a year, but they're probably the higher risk applications and staff doesn't really have the expertise to give them good pointers on how to improve their process. They're looking for community partners that can provide that technical assistance, and maybe the City could give them a grant to pay for that service.

Padron asked if Four C's is getting money from this CDBG grant. Kubly confirmed they are getting money from this fund through technical assistance for micro enterprises and that's an allowable CDBG program. The City is giving them the money to provide the technical assistance and they are helping in-home child care providers with classes and on how to get their DHS certification and translation services and helping immigrants work through the whole process because it's kind of challenging to meet those standards.

Padron asked if they are considered a small business and if so do they meet the limit for the household income. Kubly said the childcare providers would be the small business and they would be meeting the income requirements. Four C's is helping the low-income childcare providers create their business and so the providers are the metric rather than Four C's.

Padron noted Four C's is also part of the legacy agencies, so they are getting money from the legacy agencies program and they're getting money from this program. Kubly confirmed they are getting this Technical Assistance Grant specifically for this job creation of micro enterprises for childcare. Padron wondered why don't those micro enterprises get the money directly. Kubly said then it would have to be offered as a loan and they would have to qualify, to give it to Four C's it can be a grant which allows the City to provide broader services.

Nkumu asked what happened to the money if Four C's doesn't use it all, do they return or do they get keep it and just keep using it for the next year's program. Kubly said typically the grant funds are used to provide classes, or one-on-one meetings with the childcare providers, the business owners, and so the costs are a reimbursement for their time, and they have a certain amount of time per the agreement to

spend that money. If they're unable to spend it they would return it and it would just go back into the regular CDBG pot of funds.

Padron asked who reviews the applications. Kubly said staff does through the City's Economic Development Committee.

Alter noted the Downtown District may want to help promote this program as they have talked quite a bit about wanting to extend mentorship through their own small businesses and business owners. It's just something that might be something to follow up on because they sort of have that model in place.

AID TO AGENCY VISITS REPORTS:

Padron stated staff has assigned each agency a liaison from HCDC after the July meeting and this item provides an opportunity for each agency to establish a timeline for visits and as well as methods for Commissioners to report on completed visits. She wanted to discuss the timeline of when they think HCDC will be able to visit the agencies and report back. She called The Neighborhood Centers of Johnson County and they are not accepting visitors right now. She did have a phone meeting with Brian and they talked briefly. She is also planning on calling the Free Lunch Program very soon in the next few weeks, but she doesn't know if she will be able to visit them because if they're going to be open.

Lewis said she has contacted both of her agencies, Four C's and DVIP and have face-to-face visits scheduled with them when the first and second weeks of September. She just needs to know exactly what she needs to report back to the Commission.

Padron said the main question that they need to ask is how are they doing and how can the Commission help them, what do they need from us, and what would they like to see the Commission recommending to City Council. These are very difficult times for everyone because of COVID and probably all agencies have had to change the way they do things and operate but the main goal of the visit is to mainly listen and see how we can help.

Padron suggested doing all the visits in September and October and have the reports at the November meeting. Aguilar agreed with that time frame. Mohammed stated he has already visited his two organizations. He set up a video meeting with both of them and does have his reports done and can't wait until November to share them with the Commissioners.

Nkumu noted last year the Commission did a tour of a few agencies and understands with COVID they're not going to be able to do that but perhaps that is something they can resume in the future. Especially for the new people it would have been a learning training session for them too.

COVID-19 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM LETTER TO CITY COUNCIL:

Padron noted she and Drabek wrote a letter and the letter was included for the July 21 Council meeting. In the letter they recommended to the City that they keep using local funds to assist with COVID-19 as there can be less restrictions then with the federal funds.

Sara Barron (Johnson County Affordable Housing Coalition) commented on the funding sources and noted the ways that they're being applied locally have been shifting since when they initially envisioned the programs and she definitely believes that with the resources continuing to improve thanks to the feedback from their nonprofit partners and the willingness of the City to consider that feedback and also because HCDC and other community advocates are monitoring the success of those programs. Barron thanked HCDC for their willingness to join that conversation and wanted to express a profound amount of appreciation for everyone who is working through this very difficult time trying to learn as they go to meet such an urgent need. Barron stated as they've been working with they're partners she has been incredibly impressed with everyone's willingness to continue to evaluate their practices and improve them. She

hopes the Commission is able to see how hard everyone is working to resolve people's housing concerns and here's hoping that they continue to push for that in such a way that they can really prevent the expected tsunami of evictions. She believes they can make a huge difference for so many Iowa City families and her goal is to convince other cities that they need to step up and do the same for their residents.

Nkumu asked if it is correct in order for a resident to access local funds for assistance they have to have apply for State assistance, which is IFA, first, and if they don't qualify them, and they then they can apply for local assistance. Kubly confirmed that was correct, they want to be able to leverage State funds if they can. If someone is not eligible for the State funding, then they try to direct them to Community which has the CDBG funds, and then if that's not going to work for whatever reason, Shelter House would be the other option as Shelter House has the local funds.

Nkumu feels that's still a barrier for a resident and a lot of people don't go through the trouble of applying for assistance through the State because they either think it's too time consuming or it takes too long for them to approve any assistance so they'd rather apply for local funds. He understands they're trying to discourage them from double dipping State and local funds but people have an urgent situation or urgent needs right now and the sooner they get funds the better and looks like local funds are more quickly accessible.

Crissy Canganelli (Shelter House) said she'd be happy to provide an update and more of a report once they're a little further into this for everyone, even by next month probably, but they are helping people go through that initial screening on the Iowa Finance Authority website and can get a pretty good idea as to whether or not people would qualify for those funds and can take action and then redirect to either Community or the local fund. She wanted to assert leverage isn't even quite enough of a description of what they're trying to do here, the State has made \$22 million available for eviction prevention and foreclosure prevention assistance and they're still sitting on over \$17 million at this time. By comparison, there is \$50,000 in the Iowa City fund and that \$50,000 is going to go pretty quickly. So they really do need to maximize the utilization of those State funds.

Barron added about the response time, if someone is able to successfully complete the application, they understand from their local partner who's administering the funding that they're able to turn those applications around pretty quickly. The biggest holdup is that people don't supply accurate information when they complete the application or if a landlord is difficult to reach for the automatic payment information. But for people who have applied with all the correct information and the landlord is willing to participate the turnaround time is pretty rapid, around 24 to 48 hours it's approved.

Vogel confirmed they have completed probably about a dozen applications for the State and have completed about a dozen references for tenants and have gotten three to four months' worth of rent checks for tenants in need within 7 to 10 business days.

Nkumu stated one of the barriers in this case is a lot of low income folks probably don't have access to internet for the State assistance they have to apply online and a lot of families don't have access to that or they need assistance doing that. With the library not open and with a lot of places not open, it is very hard.

Kubly stated there are people who are going to directly to Community and Shelter House where they can provide assistance. There is also a local administrator of the State funds, HACAP, so there is a local agency handling those requests. Also if someone applies to Community and they fill out all this stuff and then end up not qualifying for CDBG for whatever reason Community can provide that information to Shelter House so the applicant doesn't have to start over at Shelter House to get their assistance, there is some coordination on that end.

Kubly also noted the City amended the agreement with Shelter House to allow self-certification of income and COVID financial impact as a result of feedback that they got on the program to remove barriers for people qualifying. Then they increased the months of assistance, it was initially two months and now it's

three for Shelter House. They're currently at three with Community but CDBG provided a waiver that they can go up to six months so they are figuring out how they want to prioritize funding, if they want to do six months for people or if they want to serve more people with a shorter number of months. Additionally at Council this week they authorized the City Manager to increase those awards so Shelter House got \$50,000 and the City Manager can amend their agreement to provide up to \$75,000 total if the funds get expended. Same with Community and Center for Worker Justice, if those agencies end up using all the funds that they've been provided by the City, the Council has already authorized more money.

LEGACY AID TO AGENCIES APPLICATION PROCESS:

Padron stated HCDC suspended the application process for the Legacy Aid to Agencies funding and accepted recommendation from the Agency Impact Coalition to renew funding with their understanding that their allocations may be prorated based on the City's budget. If HCDC wishes to continue at the Agency's discretion in order to prepare for the assumption of regular application process in the year 2024 this item is an opportunity to discuss legacy agencies application and scoring process.

Lewis said thinking about an annual application for a legacy agency just doesn't seem to jive and wondered if there's a process that if they are selected as a legacy agency, then maybe just like this year they are a legacy for three years, and then have to reapply to be a legacy. It seems really cumbersome for organizations to have to apply every single year, if they're already designated as a legacy agency to receive this funding.

Padron agrees with Lewis and said it doesn't make any sense to have agencies that have been providing services since the 70s have to apply every year to receive funding. Additionally HCDC did research two years ago to show the increase in service, as well as an increase of taxes and the number of people that the agencies are serving has gone up, in some cases four times or more. When they analyzed all the funding and the services for some agencies, the funding that they received from the City had decreased with not even taking into consideration the inflation, so that was a huge factor to making the recommendation that the funding almost double. Padron stated the second thing they need to review is the application process. She doesn't think it makes sense for agencies to apply every year and thinks three years will be a good number or even every five years but that may be too long to update the amounts that they need.

Alter stated she knew COVID threw everything off but thought they had determined for legacies that the Commission would not be reviewing them every year, it was going to be every two years and they were going to be funded without having to do applications for two years. However, now are saying they have to make sure that the pot of money they were giving is consistent and updated and current. Additionally, she noted it was just this past year that HCDC asked for the full funding for everybody to get their full ask. That's what happened last time and it was going to be continued over then COVID hit and the Commission decided to shut down all applications so the agencies do not have to deal with that on top of dealing with the pandemic, but it was already decided that the agencies were funded for two years. Alter stated at the last funding cycle that they did, they went to Council and did request a special session with them and the Agency Impact Coalition to ask for the full amount and then additionally to say this needs to be adjusted for the inflation, which it hasn't been, so that's why they're asking for "so much". The reason they did away with the application process was because of COVID, but they had already determined in the last Commissioner cycle, that legacy agencies wouldn't have to do this application every year.

Crissy Canganelli (Shelter House) said in her capacity as co-chair of the Agency Impact Coalition she doesn't know about whether or not it was approved for a two-year cycle by the City already. That would be great news. Their requests to the Commission originally was just to seek relief for FY22. But if the Commission came back and recommended the suspension of the application requirement for FY22 and FY23 it is with extraordinary relief and enthusiasm that they received that information. Canganelli also added they were just notified yesterday that the City of Coralville has also voted to suspend the application requirement for both FY22 and FY23. She noted this was a bye year for Johnson County so the request to them will just be if they can suspend FY23 but they'd really like to be able to get everybody

on the same cycle because that's where the true benefit for the organizations would be. Now, it is the case every legacy agency is a United Way partner agency and most every agency that is a legacy agency is funded by Johnson County, definitely not most legacy agencies are funded by the City of Coralville. Canganelli can send an Excel document that charts out who's funded by whom, but if they can truly make this joint funding application process joint and get everyone on the same cycle, it would be extraordinarily beneficial. What they learned from the United Way of East Central Iowa, which is in Linn County, is that they have a three-year cycle. Unfortunately, when the Agency Impact Coalition approached the United Way of Johnson and Washington Counties, they responded that it would not be possible to have anything other than an annual application, they feel that their donors and their volunteers would not tolerate that. Canganelli stated they are going to continue to go back to the United Way and make their case again, most particularly now that the City of Coralville has joined and the City of Iowa City in suspending the requirement for these next two fiscal years and with the addition of knowing that the United Way of Central Iowa actually in ordinary times has a three year grant cycle. Canganelli stated even if it is a two-year cycle, but that everybody was on that same cycle, it would be very impactful.

Mohammed had a question about the new organizations who want to compete for these public funds, if they designate all the funds to the legacy agencies for the two years, how much is left for the new agencies. Kubly stated they can do 5% of the budget and the Commission usually decides if they want to do the full 5% and then the rest would be for legacy. This year the Commission did a little less than 5% based on the applications, but 5% is the maximum of the budget they would allocate to the new agencies.

Kealey wanted to acknowledge Canganelli's comment about trying to streamline and to coordinate the application so they are not doing it every year and supports them going back to United Way and letting them know it would be beneficial and then they could utilize resources elsewhere.

Kubly noted the two-year cycle is starting in FY22 as outlined in the Consolidated Plan so right now they were supposed to do an application process which of course they skipped because of COVID. She feels if it's easiest to coordinate, they are supportive of coordinating with the other communities and funding sources. If they had to address that, it would just be a Consolidated Plan amendment, but that's something they can always do.

Padron wondered if the Commission can help by writing a letter to United Way or if they could ask Council if they could send a letter to United Way and the other communities to at least to start a conversation. Canganelli agreed and stated that'd be very beneficial.

Padron will write a letter asking the Council to write to United Way to set up a method to coordinate this into a three-year process with other communities. Additionally, HCDC can also write a letter directly to United Way

Kubly stated even though Council doesn't typically review the application process she would recommend starting with Council and then going from there.

Alter moved to request Padron draft a letter to Council on behalf of HCDC recommending that Council coordinate with participating communities and United Way of Johnson and Washington Counties on the Community Impact Funding joint application process in order to align application cycles and require applications every three years. Lewis seconded the motion.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 7-0 (Aguilar and Drabek not present for vote)

HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION:

Kubly noted they recently held our CDBG-CV public services agency allocation round. They received 10 applications for about \$260,000 total. She stated they had set aside \$164,000 of the CDBG funds for this purpose for agency needs related to COVID. They also have some unallocated regular CDBG money from program income or projects that didn't expend their full amount and plan to use the extra money for

this purpose if needed as well, but are about \$90,000 to \$100,000 short of fulfilling all the asks. Kubly reviewed the applications they received. The first was from Table to Table for food assistance to purchase a refrigerated vehicle to transport food for \$7,800. DVIP requested \$10,000 for direct aid for child care of victims/survivors of domestic violence, Successful Living requested about \$42,000 to enable them to provide their services remotely, so computers for their clients and some general operational costs, Four C's applied for \$51,000 for a program to support school aged children who are experiencing homelessness, so it'd be like a childcare educational program, Neighborhood Centers requested about \$16,000 for childcare as well to create more functional classrooms to social distance. Shelter House requested \$44,000 to staff costs for a coordinated entry position, Community requested \$50,000 for food assistance for expansion of a second location for their food bank program, Horizons requested \$20,000 for emergency meal service for homebound, older adults and delivery of hygiene and personal care products, Arc of Southeast Iowa requested \$16,000 to repurpose their childcare space and use it more appropriately for the pandemic and social distancing. Kubly said those projects the City will allocate additional CDBG funds and approved funding them all. The last project was the Free Lunch Program who requested \$3,000 to support their current free meal service as they have to revise it to provide to-go meals. Kubly noted that because of the CDBG reporting requirements and the Free Lunch Program doesn't collect any sort of income data, it was recommended that the City support this with local funds rather than CDBG because of the smaller amount, and because it would be hard to meet those CDBG reporting requirements and they did get approval from the City Manager's office to do that. Kubly stated they went through all the applications, make sure they were eligible, had a couple of them revise their applications based on program criteria. She noted they should be able to fully fund everything that was eligible and notified agencies this week, noting it was nice to write good news to people.

Kubly stated regarding other staff updates, they are expecting additional CDBG-CV money through the State and it's going to be about \$700,000, staff is working on how they want to propose using those funds, perhaps things like utility assistance, adding more money to the direct housing assistance through Community, and then also just looking at what other needs agencies might have moving forward.

Gabel noted that light of the terrible storm, there's two funding opportunities for Disaster Assistance Grants. One is through DHS and then there's a second one through Iowa Association of Realtors. She will share information about those programs via email tomorrow and encouraged the Commission to feel free to share those with anyone they think might benefit.

Gabel also shared there is a vacancy on the Iowa City Human Rights Commission, so feel free to share that as well.

Gabel stated at the next meeting, Ellen McCabe from the Housing Trust Fund of Johnson County is going attend and give an overview of what they do. Gabel is also working on the CAPER which should be up for approval at the next meeting.

Crissy Canganelli (Shelter House) wanted to first just wanted to thank Mohammad for his time when they met, it was a tremendous opportunity to get to know one another. She added other organizations have also said they deeply appreciate these opportunities to have this time with the Commission. Canganelli also wanted thank the City for the award for the coordinated entry position, it is really going to help them lean into and further develop the coordinated entry response not only for Iowa City but the impact on all of Johnson County. She noted this is an unfunded mandate from HUD and they've done so much to develop a system. Canganelli acknowledged there are significantly more resources today, especially with the addition of the eviction prevention funds so being able to have a dedicated person to do this means that they're going to be able to increase their rapidness of response and have a more robust system.

Canganelli's request tonight is actually on response to something that is happening at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. There's been a policy change recommended that will have a significant impact for individuals that are transgender and she would like to forward information to the Commission tomorrow about this recommended policy change and request that they might consider signing on to the campaign regarding the opposition to this policy change. Canganelli stated back in 2016, HUD passed what is called the Equal Access Ruling, which protects transgender people seeking safe shelter and

ensures their access to safe shelter. The current proposal would turn back the clock and would negate the good work and the safety precautions that have been taken and that have been put in place through the 2016 Equal Access Ruling. The current attempts will gut these protections for transgender people and remove critical equal access protections to regulations meant to ensure their safety. Specifically, she shared that one in every three transgender and non-binary people experience homelessness at some point in their lives. This rate increases to nearly one in two where transgender and non-binary people who identify as black, Middle Eastern, multiracial and undocumented. Access to safe and secure housing is sometimes all that stands between transgender people and deadly violence. That violence is disproportionately affecting transgender people of color, with 91% of victims of fatal anti transgender violence in 2019 being black women. Canganelli would like to send this information to the Commission members, whether that be through City staff or to directly, and her hope is that everyone will go through the links there where they can submit individual comments if they are supportive of this as a Commission. HUD is accepting responses until September 22 and a letter to HUD would be also very powerful. Canganelli can send a copy of a letter that she worked on, on behalf of the Iowa Council on Homelessness that is sending a letter directly to Secretary Carson. The Agency Impact Coalition and the local homeless coordinating board will be sending similar letters. Canganelli said they also intending to approach city councils for Iowa City, Coralville and North Liberty and the United Way of Johnson and Washington Counties, asking them also to submit their opposition as well. Canganelli thanked everyone for their time and consideration of this request.

Padron would like to receive that information but doesn't know if as a Commission there is time before the next meeting to discuss and send a letter.

Vogel would like to see the links and see the letter first but it sounds like something he would be behind, but without seeing it couldn't make a statement of support right now.

The next meeting and the third Thursday in September is the 17th so they could add that to the agenda and maybe they can write like a draft of a letter and bring it to the next meeting on the 17th and read it and talk about it and then can agree if as a Commission they want to send the letter, All agreed.

ADJOURNMENT:

Alter moved to adjourn. Vogel seconded the motion and a vote was taken and the motion passed 9-0.

**Housing and Community
 Development Commission
 Attendance Record 2020-2021**

Name	Terms Exp.	7/16	8/20									
Aguilar, Peggy	6/30/22	O/E	X									
Alter, Megan	6/30/21	X	X									
Drabek, Matt	6/30/22	X	X									
Kealey, Lyn Dee Hook	6/30/22	X	X									
Lewis, Thersea	6/30/23	X	X									
Mohammed, Nsar	6/30/23	X	X									
Nkumu, Peter	6/30/22	O/E	X									
Padron, Maria	6/30/21	X	X									
Vogel, Kyle	6/30/23	X	X									

- Resigned from Commission

Key:

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



ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR
COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, DC 20410-7000

MEMORADUM FOR: All Community Planning and Development Field Office Directors,
Deputy Directors and Program Managers

FROM: John Gibbs, Assistant Secretary, Acting, D

SUBJECT: Availability of a Waiver and Alternate Requirement for the
Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report
(Performance Report) for Community Planning and Development
(CPD) Grant Programs in Response to the Spread of Coronavirus

This memorandum authorizes and explains a waiver of the regulatory requirement at 24 CFR 91.520(a), that within 90-days of the end of a jurisdiction's program year a grantee shall submit to HUD a performance report known as the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). The CAPER is associated with several CPD grant programs. Please disseminate this memorandum to all affected grantees.

As a result of the COVID-19 virus, a majority of States have declared a state of emergency with most shutting down large gathering places and limiting the movement of residents. More State and local governments are operating under extenuating circumstances and may need additional time for certain administrative requirements.

Under the authority of 24 CFR 5.110 and 24 CFR 91.600, HUD may, upon a determination of good cause and subject to statutory limitations, waive regulatory provisions. As Acting Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, I have determined that there is good cause to waive the following regulatory requirement for the program year 2019 CAPER, subject to the condition that grantees comply with the modified requirement in the applicability section below:

Requirement: The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (performance report) submission to HUD within 90 days after the close of a jurisdiction's program year.

Citation: 24 CFR 91.520(a).

Explanation: The regulation at 24 CFR 91.520(a) requires each grantee to submit a performance report to HUD within 90 days after the close of the grantee's program year.

Justification: Under the authority at 24 CFR 91.600, HUD is authorized to waive this requirement when a determination of good cause is made and supported by documentation. Given the outbreak of the coronavirus known as SARS-CoV-2 and the extenuating circumstances placed on state and local governments, and citizens, HUD has determined that there is good cause for

waiving this provision. The extenuating circumstances and administrative strain supporting this waiver are well documented in the broad public news coverage related to the outbreak.

Applicability: For program year 2019 CAPERs, the requirement that grantees submit a performance report within 90 days after the close of a jurisdiction's program year is waived, subject to the condition that within 180 days after the close of a jurisdiction's program year the jurisdiction shall submit its performance report.

We appreciate your efforts in this challenging time. If you need additional information regarding this waiver, please contact your Headquarters program office desk officer(s).

SP-25 Priority Needs – 24 CFR 91.215(a)(2)

Priority Needs

Iowa City is committed to serving the needs of LMI residents. Assisting households with incomes less than 60% AMI, particularly those with incomes less than 30% AMI, has been identified as a priority. The City has also identified special needs individuals among those who should receive higher priority in the expenditure of funds, including at-risk children and youth, low-income families, persons experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of homelessness, the elderly, and persons with disabilities. The City will consider approving and providing certifications of consistency and supporting applications submitted for non-City funds by other entities.

In light of the increasing severity of the COVID-19 pandemic, Iowa City is interested in making available CDBG funding to program eligible projects and activities. While the level of severity in the community is not fully known at this time, the number of confirmed cases is expected to rise as testing becomes more readily available. To assist in providing public facilities (new, expanded, retrofitted, etc.), special economic development assistance to businesses, public services and/or planning (in some limited cases) that could enhance our community's response to the impact of the pandemic, the community will place a high priority on providing facilities and services in support of a coordinated pandemic response.

The City used a multi-step process to establish priorities. First, the City analyzed data within four primary categories - housing, homelessness, non-homeless special needs, and non-housing community development – to determine trends over time. Second, the City consulted with a diverse group of individuals, public agencies, non-profit organizations, and community development entities to determine the needs as perceived by the clients of these groups and the stakeholders themselves. This included 10 stakeholder/public meetings which garnered 133 “touches” with the public, in addition to 309 responses to surveys. Finally, the City used the data analysis and community/stakeholder input to establish to categories of priorities: High priorities are those that will be considered first for funding with federal resources in competitive application processes. Low priorities are those that will be considered in competitive application processes after high-priority projects if federal or other resources are available. In some cases, City Council has set aside federal funds for lower priority needs outside of the competitive application process to provide a variety of different supports for LMI residents.

For projects that address a high priority, the City will base competitive funding decisions on the capacity of the applicant, the type of project, the anticipated impact of the project, and the reasonableness of the proposed budget. In some cases, this may mean that a project proposing to meet a high priority may not be funded or funded in full. Once proposed projects that address high priorities are acted upon, the City will then review projects proposing to meet low priorities. It is conceivable that projects identified as low priorities may be funded if resources are available. These activities are still important

and are not meant to be understood as being unnecessary. Rather, it is perceived that some of those needs may have other, more appropriate funding sources.

The City will adopt specific set-asides to structure the spending of CDBG and HOME funds and ensure that the funds available have the greatest possible impact. For each of the next five years, these set-asides include:

-)] Up to the maximum of 15% of CDBG funds to public service activities
-)] A minimum of \$75,000 in CDBG funds to public infrastructure needs and sustainability improvements in LMI neighborhoods
-)] A minimum of \$235,000 in CDBG and \$90,000 in HOME for the City's housing rehabilitation program
-)] A minimum of 15% of HOME funds to Community Housing Development Organization Activities
-)] A minimum of \$50,000 in CDBG funds to support economic development initiatives, including loans and technical assistance activities
-)] Up to the maximum of 20% of CDBG and 10% of HOME funds for planning and administration to ensure programs are successful and meet federal requirements

Any remaining funds are available to any eligible category as laid out in the Annual Action Plans, including public facilities improvements. The City will focus its efforts on fewer projects that make a greater impact addressing City priorities. In addition, the City will utilize the following program-specific minimums and maximums as funding guidelines:

-)] Minimum award of \$1,000 per unit for housing projects, with the exception of owner-occupied emergency rehabilitation projects, which could be under \$1,000;
-)] Minimum award of \$15,000 for public service activities (including both City and Federal funds);
-)] Minimum award of \$25,000 for public facilities activities;
-)] Maximum of \$25,000 per business for economic development activities; and
-)] Maximum of \$24,999 per unit hard costs for homeowner and rental rehabilitation activities.

In addition to CDBG public service funds, applicants may apply for non-CDBG Aid to Agencies funding. First consideration will be given to Community Housing Development Organization activities, followed by public facility and housing projects of \$50,000 or more. With respect to the Aid to Agencies projects, the City recognizes the need for additional funding and, in the first year of *City Steps 2025*, will allocate local funds for public service activities. With respect to public facility activities, agencies that provided a summary of their capital improvement needs will receive priority for identified improvements over other applicants in competitive rounds, as discussed below.

If funds for a particular set-aside are not allocated or expended within a certain time frame, remaining funds will be made available for any eligible category. This includes CDBG owner-occupied housing rehabilitation funds that are not expended within the project year and CDBG economic development funds that are not allocated within two years. Remaining funds will be reallocated according to the City's uncommitted funds policy.

Table 44 – Priority Needs Summary

Priority Need Name	EXPANSION OF AFFORDABLE RENTAL AND OWNER HOUSING OPTIONS
Priority Level	High
Population	Extremely Low Income; Low Income; Moderate Income; Large Families; Families with Children; Elderly Families; Public Housing Residents; Elderly; Frail Elderly; Persons with Mental Disabilities; Persons with Physical Disabilities; Persons with Developmental Disabilities; Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions; Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families; and Victims of Domestic Violence
Geographic Areas Affected	AHLM Eligible Areas Citywide
Associated Goals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the number of affordable rental housing units including through new construction and acquisition 2. Provide Tenant-based rental assistance (TBRA) 3. Support homebuyer activities such as down payment and/or closing cost assistance
Description	The City has a strong need to support the development of additional safe, decent, and affordable, units for renters as well as support homebuying activities such as down payment and closing cost assistance for owners. In addition, the City may assist local nonprofits acquire housing units to be rented as affordable housing. Increasing the availability of affordable housing through efforts such as TBRA or rental deposit assistance is another effective way to expand affordable housing options.
Basis for Relative Priority	High housing costs reduce economic opportunities and access to prosperity. Data analysis and stakeholder input strongly points to high housing costs as a major issue in Iowa City. Stakeholders consistently reiterated the need for affordable housing.

Priority Need Name	PRESERVATION OF EXISTING AFFORDABLE RENTAL AND OWNER HOUSING
Priority Level	High
Population	Extremely Low Income; Low Income; Moderate Income; Large Families; Families with Children; Elderly Families; Public Housing Residents; Elderly; Frail Elderly; Persons with Mental Disabilities; Persons with Physical Disabilities; Persons with Developmental Disabilities; Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions; Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families; and Victims of Domestic Violence
Geographic Areas Affected	AHLM Eligible Areas Citywide Housing Rehab Targeted Areas
Associated Goals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rehabilitate and improve owner-occupied housing units 2. Rehabilitate and improve renter-occupied housing units
Description	The preservation of affordable housing options is important and includes activities such as rehabilitation and/or acquisition of affordable units within both the owner and renter markets as well as making accessibility modifications to existing units to allow persons with disabilities to live in their homes more easily or for elderly persons to age in place. Manufactured housing communities are an important component of affordable housing in Iowa City and the City is committed to supporting the continuance of these as a relatively low cost housing type in Iowa City. They are thus included in this goal. Weatherization and energy efficiency upgrades are also supported among other activities that would preserve the number and quality of affordable units and improve the sustainability and reduce long-term utility costs.
Basis for Relative Priority	Stakeholders reported the need for housing rehabilitation and for accessibility modifications. Rehabilitation or modifications to existing structures is frequently more cost effective than new construction. Additionally, Iowa City generally has high quality housing stock, therefore, rehabilitation is often a more efficient use of funds. Stakeholders also noted that utility costs can be high, which indicates a need for improving weatherization and other possible sustainable improvements that would lower utility costs.

Priority Need Name	HOUSING AND SERVICES TO THE HOMELESS AND THOSE AT-RISK OF HOMELESSNESS
Priority Level	High
Population	Chronic Homeless; Individuals; Families with Children; Persons with Mental Illness; Veterans; Persons with HIV/AIDS; Victims of Domestic Violence; Unaccompanied Youth; Extremely Low Income; Low Income; Moderate Income; Large Families; Families with Children; Elderly Families; Public Housing Residents; Elderly; Frail Elderly; Persons with Mental Disabilities; Persons with Physical Disabilities; Persons with Developmental Disabilities; and Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions
Geographic Areas Affected	AHLM Eligible Areas Citywide
Associated Goals	1. Serve those experiencing homelessness and reduce homelessness
Description	Providing a range of supportive services and housing assistance to individuals and families experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of homelessness and seeking to move persons to or retaining individuals in stable housing is integral. This includes transitional and permanent supportive housing; shelter operating expenses; health, mental health and other supportive services; homelessness prevention activities including utility assistance, food pantries and other services that can provide stability and allow individuals and families to stay housed or become housed after experiencing homelessness.
Basis for Relative Priority	Stakeholders reported the significant need for additional services for those experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness. Service providers stated that the complexity of cases has increased over recent years and additional care is needed despite a lack of increased funding to adequately meet the demand. Stakeholders reported an increased need for utility assistance and that this can be an effective means of keeping a household stably housed in the event of financial hardship.

Priority Need Name	PROVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES
Priority Level	High
Population	Extremely Low Income; Low Income; Moderate Income; Large Families; Families with Children; Elderly Families; Public Housing Residents; Elderly; Frail Elderly; Persons with Mental Disabilities; Persons with Physical Disabilities; Persons with Developmental Disabilities; Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions; Chronic Homeless; Individuals; Families with Children; Persons with Mental Illness; Veterans; Persons with HIV/AIDS; Victims of Domestic Violence; and Unaccompanied Youth
Geographic Areas Affected	Citywide
Associated Goals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide public services 2. Assist Community Housing Development Organizations in their regular operations
Description	Having a range of public services is essential to assisting those with lower-incomes. Activities include but are not limited to childcare, transportation, health/mental health services, youth activities and programming, elderly activities and programming, assistance for persons with disabilities, food pantries, services for victims of domestic violence, services for immigrants and refugees, utility assistance and financial literacy and credit repair programs.
Basis for Relative Priority	Stakeholders identified the numerous public service needs through stakeholder workshops that were advertised and open to the general public. In addition, needs have been increasing over time while funding has remained stable or declined, requiring agencies to do more with less and creating a challenging operating environment.

Priority Need Name	PUBLIC FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS
Priority Level	High
Population	Extremely Low Income; Low Income; Moderate Income; Large Families; Families with Children; Elderly Families; Public Housing Residents; Elderly; Frail Elderly; Persons with Mental Disabilities; Persons with Physical Disabilities; and Persons with Developmental Disabilities
Geographic Areas Affected	LMI Areas Citywide
Associated Goals	1. Improve public facilities
Description	The improvement of public facilities includes but is not limited to the construction or rehabilitation of parks, playgrounds, community centers, youth centers, elderly centers, libraries, trails and walkways and other public facilities for use directly by the public or for service providers that serve vulnerable populations within the community. This also includes adding amenities such as bike racks.
Basis for Relative Priority	Stakeholders commented that funding is needed for public facilities as well as for facilities used by service providers.

Priority Need Name	PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE & NEIGHBORHOOD-BASED CLIMATE ACTION
Priority Level	Low
Population	Extremely Low Income; Low Income; Moderate Income; Large Families; Families with Children; Elderly Families; Public Housing Residents; Elderly; Frail Elderly; Persons with Mental Disabilities; Persons with Physical Disabilities; and Persons with Developmental Disabilities
Geographic Areas Affected	LMI Areas
Associated Goals	1. Improve public infrastructure
Description	Improve public infrastructure including but not limited to street and sidewalk improvements, water and sewer line improvements, and lighting and neighborhood improvements. Enhance neighborhood sustainability through tree plantings in right-of-way areas and other measures that would reduce greenhouse emissions. This also includes adding amenities such as bike racks.
Basis for Relative Priority	Stakeholders commented that there is a need for improvements to public infrastructure and that climate action initiatives should be incorporated into projects.

Priority Need Name	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Priority Level	Low
Population	Extremely Low Income; Low Income; Moderate Income; Large Families; Families with Children; Elderly Families; Public Housing Residents; Elderly; Frail Elderly; Persons with Mental Disabilities; Persons with Physical Disabilities; Persons with Developmental Disabilities; Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions; Chronic Homeless; Individuals Families with Children; Persons with Mental Illness; Veterans; Persons with HIV/AIDS; Victims of Domestic Violence; and Unaccompanied Youth
Geographic Areas Affected	LMI Areas Citywide
Associated Goals	1. Support economic and workforce development
Description	There are digital literacy and language barriers faced by LMI persons and immigrants/refugees. Increased digital literacy and language classes are needed to overcome barriers. Education for hard and soft skills (i.e. how to be an employee) are also needed, as are services that allow individuals to work, such as childcare and transportation. Finally, supports for entrepreneurship should be encouraged through technical assistance and/or direct loans.
Basis for Relative Priority	Stakeholders reported the need for programming to overcome barriers, though other factors were often considered higher needs. However, some economic development activities that provide services allowing persons to work, such as childcare and reliable transportation, were noted as higher priorities and improve economic self-sufficiency.

Priority Name	Need	ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING
Priority Level		High
Population		Extremely Low Income; Low Income; Moderate Income; Large Families; Families with Children; Elderly Families; Public Housing Residents; Elderly; Frail Elderly; Persons with Mental Disabilities; Persons with Physical Disabilities; Persons with Developmental Disabilities; Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions; Chronic Homeless; Individuals; Families with Children; Persons with Mental Illness; Veterans; Persons with HIV/AIDS; Victims of Domestic Violence; and Unaccompanied Youth
Geographic Areas Affected		Citywide
Associated Goals		1. Effective administration of and planning for the CDBG and HOME programs and ability to respond to emergency situations
Description		Funding allows for the effective administration of, and thoughtful planning for, the CDBG and HOME programs. Without planning and administrative funds to carry out required planning, management, and oversight activities, activities would be unable to receive CDBG and HOME funds and no beneficiaries would be able to be served. Additionally, funds could be used for emergency situations.
Basis for Relative Priority		Effective administration and planning are essential to maximize the impact of federal dollars and ensuring compliance with federal regulations. Without administration and planning, no other high priority items could be addressed.

Priority Name	Need	PROVIDE FACILITIES AND SERVICES IN SUPPORT OF THE PANDEMIC RESPONSE
Priority Level		High
Population		Extremely Low Income; Low Income; Moderate Income; Large Families; Families with Children; Elderly Families; Public Housing Residents; Elderly; Frail Elderly; Persons with Mental Disabilities; Persons with Physical Disabilities; Persons with Developmental Disabilities; Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions; Chronic Homeless; Individuals; Families with Children; Persons with Mental Illness; Veterans; Persons with HIV/AIDS; Victims of Domestic Violence; and Unaccompanied Youth
Geographic Areas Affected		Citywide
Associated Goals		1. Provide facilities and services in support of the pandemic response
Description		Funding allows for the allocation of federal dollars to assist as needed and as permitted in support of the pandemic response.
Basis for Relative Priority		The pandemic poses a threat to health and safety of residents.

From: [Crissy Canganelli](#)
To: [Brianna Gabel](#)
Subject: Response to HUD's attempt to reverse 2016 Equal Access Ruling
Date: Monday, August 24, 2020 10:55:41 AM
Attachments: [Draft HUD Sec Letter.docx](#)



Good Morning Brianna,

The information regarding HUD's proposed policy change reversing their 2016 Equal Access Ruling is provided below.

"The Trump administration is once again attacking LGBTQ people, this time by attempting to undermine the Department of Housing and Urban Development's protections for transgender people seeking safe shelter. Their latest proposal out of the Department of Housing and Urban Development attempts to gut protections for transgender people by removing critical equal access protections to regulations meant to ensure the safety of anyone in need of HUD-funded programs." housingsaveslives.org

You will see from the linked and embedded resources the national coalitions that are opposed to this attempted policy change and calling for action to stop it. The Iowa Council on Homelessness is sending a letter to Secretary to Carson calling him to preserve HUD's Equal Access Ruling passed in 2016 as is the Agency Impact Coalition. One Iowa is also submitting a response. I've attached a draft copy of a letter that Shelter House will submit through the portal linked below and then directly to Secretary Carson. Similar letters will be sent jointly by the Local Homeless Coordinating Board and Agency Impact Coalition. HUD is accepting responses until September 22nd.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue.

<https://housingsaveslives.org/>



National Low Income Housing Coalition

[View this email in your browser](#)



Take Action!

Help Stop HUD's Proposed Rule to Allow Discrimination Against Transgender People Experiencing Homelessness

HUD published today a [proposed rule](#) change that would remove protections against discrimination of transgender and gender non-conforming people experiencing homelessness, severely limiting their ability to access emergency shelters and services. The proposed rule is the latest in a series of attacks by the Trump administration against the LGBTQ+ community.

Take action and help stop this harmful proposal by submitting comments in opposition by **September 22**. Tell the Trump administration and HUD that everyone has the right to access homeless shelters and other emergency services paid for with taxpayer dollars. Access to shelter and housing is a fundamental necessity—no one should be left in the street because of bigotry.

Background

Under HUD's 2016 Equal Access Rule, all federally funded housing, facilities, and services must ensure equal access to programs, benefits, services, and accommodations for all individuals regardless of gender identity and without intrusive questioning or documentation requirements. This rule improved the treatment of transgender and gender non-conforming individuals without homes, allowing them to safely secure shelter and emergency services without being turned away due to discrimination.

HUD Secretary Ben Carson's proposed rule would remove anti-discrimination protections for transgender people seeking shelter by allowing shelter providers to refuse services to them based solely on their gender identity. HUD justifies the proposal by citing "religious freedom" and supposed privacy and safety concerns rooted in negative stereotypes rather than on evidence.

NLIHC, True Colors United, National LGBTQ Task Force, National Housing Law Project, and other national organizations have launched the [Housing Saves Lives](#) campaign to oppose this anti-transgender rule. Advocacy tools and resources you can use to oppose the proposal are available at [HousingSavesLives.org](#)

How You Can Submit Comments

The *Housing Saves Lives* campaign is calling for individuals and organizations to submit public comments in opposition to HUD's proposed rule **before the September 22 deadline**.

Comments are most helpful when they are personalized and unique. To help craft your unique comment please use this [template](#) and submit your comment to HUD through a portal at [HousingSavesLives.org](#).

To keep up with the latest news and resources go to [HousingSavesLives.org](#)

 [Share](#)  [Tweet](#)  [Forward](#)

The National Low Income Housing Coalition is dedicated solely to achieving socially just public policy that ensures people with the lowest incomes in the United States have affordable and decent homes.

Contact Us:
National Low Income Housing Coalition
1000 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 500, Washington DC 20005
202-662-1530 x247

[www.nlihc.org](#)

Copyright © 2020 National Low Income Housing Coalition, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you opted in to receive updates and emails from the National Low Income Housing Coalition.

Our mailing address is:
National Low Income Housing Coalition
1000 Vermont Avenue, NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005

[Add us to your address book](#)

[unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)



This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Dear Secretary Carson:

We write today as a continuum of housing and human service professionals to voice our concern with FR-6152-P-01, Making Admission or Placement Determinations Based on Sex in Facilities Under Community Planning and Development Housing Programs, Docket Number HUD-2020-0047, which would remove protections for transgender people seeking shelter under the 2016 Equal Access Rule. To the extent this decision is based on protecting the safety of shelter guests across the country, let us say this: we care about safety in America's shelters. And individuals are safest when all women—whether transgender or cisgender—are housed together and when all men—again, whether transgender or cisgender—are housed together. Similarly, nonbinary individuals should be housed with their preferred cohort.

The experts agree. In 2016, more than 300 national and local providers co-signed the *National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women's* statement that affirmed housing transgender individuals according to the gender they live each and every day does not adversely impact safety. This is true in the more than 200 municipalities and 18 states that at the time had nondiscrimination laws in place. These laws have protected people from discrimination as well as increased access to critically needed facilities without causing harm to other clients and guests.

But this isn't as simple as pressing pause on a rule change that would unnecessarily restrict services to trans and nonbinary individuals to limit a presumed and unproven harm to cisgender individuals. Rather, this proposed rule change would not only *not* protect the cis community; it would actively *harm* the trans community.

Prior to the passage of the 2016 Equal Access Rule, the 2015 US Transgender Survey reported that nearly a quarter of all respondents experienced housing discrimination in the previous year. Of those who experienced homelessness in the previous year, more than one quarter avoided staying in a shelter because, as a transgender person, they feared being mistreated. Of those who did seek and receive shelter, fully 70 percent reported harassment, sexual or physical assault, or removal due to their status as a transgender individual.

When we look at lifetime statistics, the numbers are even more grim. One in three transgender and nonbinary people experience homelessness at some point in their lives. That statistic increases to nearly one in two for trans and non-binary people who identify as black, middle eastern, multi-racial, or who are undocumented.

Access to safe and secure housing is sometimes all that stands between transgender people and deadly violence. And that violence does not accrue evenly within the non-cisgender population; rather, there is a profoundly disproportionate impact on trans people of color. The Human Rights Campaign's research shows that a staggering 91 percent of victims of fatal anti-trans violence in 2019 were black women.

That the proposed rule will permit staff trained only in service provision, not gender discernment, to assess gender and provide or deny shelter accordingly is both risk and liability. This ad hoc assessment and denial put not only trans and non-binary, but cisgender, individuals at risk too. This is particularly problematic in cases where an individual might not present as clearly masculine or feminine.

What a thing, to be denied shelter in a time of desperate need because you don't look man enough, or woman enough.

Secretary Carson, this proposed rule change will in no way impact our operations. We will continue to treat housing as the human right that it is without policing gender identity. Indeed since 2007, transgender lowans have accessed services and facilities in accordance with their gender identities, with no documented rise in safety incidents.

But providers elsewhere—whether for overtly discriminatory reasons or due to the horrible Sophie’s Choice that limited financial and spatial resources present—might not do the same. The proposed rule change will allow providers to turn people away—into sweltering heat and bitter cold—simply based on their gender expression.

This proposed rule change is not the role of the Department charged with creating strong, sustainable, inclusive communities and quality affordable housing for all. If promulgated, you will stand in direct conflict with your very purpose. We implore you to reverse course and preserve the 2016 Equal Access Rule.

Respectfully,
The Agency Impact Coalition
Local Homeless Coordinating Board of Johnson County



Join thousands of central lowans uniting to learn and grow together.

The 21-Day Equity Challenge is a powerful opportunity to develop a deeper understanding of how inequity and racism affect our lives and our community.

- 100% FREE to participate

- Receive an email every weekday **Oct. 5 - Nov. 2** with links to recommended articles, videos, podcasts, and more
- Daily topics include Understanding **Privilege**, Housing & **Redlining**, **Justice System** Inequities, **Allyship**, and many more (see below)

The experience will deepen understanding, suggest ways to take action, and help launch what we hope will be a lifelong commitment to improving equity and inclusion in our community.

Sign up to Participate Here

First Name

Last Name

Email Address*

Employer/Organization

Join the Challenge

ORGANIZATIONS: Register your company or organization as a Supporter

Register your organization as a SUPPORTER of the 21-Day Equity Challenge and join the hundreds of central Iowa organizations who are helping us spread the word. Click the button to see the list and to add your organization's name.

Register as a Supporter

Thousands Will Unite

Goal is to bring together 10,000 central Iowans to participate online.

Daily Learning

Each weekday, participants receive an email with readings, videos, podcasts, and ways to take action.

Individuals or Groups

Participation is free for anyone. Discussion guides will be available for groups, or you can participate solo.

Equity Summit

Participants are invited to the Nov. 10 virtual Equity Summit to continue the learning and conversation.