

AGENDA
HOUSING, NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES, & REDEVELOPMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 5, 2020 3:00 PM
WebEx Meeting - access information provided to internal staff

Public Participation Dialing Instructions
Dial Access Number: 1.877.820.7831
Enter Participant Code: 254610#

Council Member Crystal Murillo, Chair
Council Member Francoise Bergan, Vice Chair
Council Member Alison Coombs
Roberto Venegas, Deputy City Manager
Nancy Sheffield, Interim Director, Neighborhood Services Department
Andrea Amonick, Manager, Planning & Development Services

The Housing, Neighborhood Services, & Redevelopment Committee's Goal is to:

- Maintain high quality neighborhoods with a balanced housing stock by enforcing standards, in relation to new residential development, and considering new tools to promote sustainable infill development
- Plan for redevelopment of strategic areas, including working with developers and landowners to leverage external resources and create public-private partnerships

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review/Approval of Minutes – June 3, 2020 and July 1, 2020
3. Announcements
4. New Items
 - Homelessness Services RFP Program Recommendations
 - Affordable Housing Gap Financing Application Program Recommendations
 - Policy Committee Review of Committee Name and Goal/Purpose
5. Miscellaneous Matters for Consideration

Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

HOUSING, NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES & REDEVELOPMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

June 3, 2020

Members Present: Council Member, Chair Crystal Murillo
Council Member, Vice-Chair Francoise Bergan
Council Member, Alison Coombs

Others Present: Council Member Juan Marcano, Council Member Allison Hiltz, Michael Lawson, Roberto Venegas, Nancy Sheffield, Jessica Prosser, Sandra Youngman, Tim Joyce, Shelley McKittrick, Andrea Amonick, Karen Hancock, Stephen Ruger and Cecilia Zapata

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Council Member Murillo welcomed everyone to the meeting and formally welcomed Cecilia Zapata as the new staff liaison.

MINUTES

The March 11, 2020 minutes were approved by Council Member Bergan, Council Member Coombs and Council Member Murillo.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

NEW ITEMS

SOLID WASTE SERVICE MODEL ALTERNATIVES

Summary of Issue and Discussion

City staff presented pros and cons of alternatives to the City's 'open subscription' solid waste hauling model at the August 28, 2019 Housing, Redevelopment, and Neighborhood Services (HoRNS) committee meeting. The committee did not advance a recommendation to the full Council at that time, directing staff to return to HoRNS for further discussion in early 2020.

During this presentation, Michael Lawson, Manager of Special Projects, detailed concerns associated with the current 'open subscription' model of solid waste hauling currently allowed by the City. He identified four different categories of concerns voiced by residents, the Council itself, and City staff:

- Growing prevalence of service interruptions;
- Incongruity in services offered and pricing across the community;
- Environmental impacts; and
- Other costs being incurred by the City and residents.

Alternative models to the open subscription model capable of addressing these four areas of concern, to include enhanced licensing, contracted waste collection (with or without ability to opt-out), and municipalized collection, were presented along with the pros and cons of each. Staff recommended the City initiate a public engagement campaign to better understand the solid waste hauling challenges facing residents.

Questions/Comments – Council Member Murillo asked if we know why customers are not receiving composting services even though they are offered. Mr. Lawson stated it was up to individuals or corporations like HOAs to choose their level of service but does not know if there is a global answer as to why. He stated the cost of the composting service may also be a reason as it is expensive and can roughly double the cost of the service. Jessica Prosser, Manager of Community Development, stated one of the barriers is not having a compost transfer station in Aurora. She stated it is cost burdensome because there needs to be infrastructure and a place to dispose of and process the compost.

Council Member Bergen stated she has never had a constituent request composting. She asked if the requests were coming from certain neighborhoods and if individuals could compost themselves. Mr. Lawson stated there have been isolated questions whether it could be offered or not, but it's largely a personal preference and that individuals could compost themselves or obtain a service provider. Council Member Coombs and Council Member Murillo stated they have had constituents ask about the service, particularly in areas where people have smaller outdoor spaces.

Council Member Murillo asked how many of the current providers offer the same competitive options of services. Mr. Lawson stated all providers offer the curbside and recycling services but is unsure if the pay-as-you-go model or composting is offered by all.

Council Member Bergen stated she does not like any of the alternative options because they promote anti-business, take away consumer choice, push smaller haulers out of the market, and there are a lot of startup costs for the City. Council Member Coombs stated HOA's concern would be losing good deals that they would get with their hauler, but with a city-wide contract, the price may still go down and not make a big difference and there is potential for HOAs to opt-out.

Council Member Bergen asked how the issues brought forward would be solved if the City did not make any changes. Mr. Lawson stated the enhanced option allowed the City to have more formal regulations on the books or the City could have senior staff speak to the leadership of the companies.

Council Member Marcano asked how haulers compete, outside of the pricing and type of hauling they offer currently, and was it something that could be captured in a contracted system and potentially realize cost savings for everyone involved. Mr. Lawson stated it comes down to the price and the number of services made available for that price and that all could be wrapped up in the contract. Council Member Murillo asked if haulers would be able to do a joint-bid with another company to provide more services. Mr. Lawson stated that would be possible, but prices may not be as competitive.

Council Member Bergen asked what steps have already been taken to solve the issues brought forward. Mr. Lawson explained that in terms of the environmental pieces, there is only so much we can do. The City has offered programs and held events to address the other concerns and the Neighborhood Liaisons been the "ear to the ground".

Outcome – The Committee unanimously agreed to move the request forward to Study Session for further discussion. Per the Committee's request, staff will provide a financial cost analysis for all options presented to the Committee in advance to the Study Session to allow the Committee to review the information gathered and ensure all questions are answered. The cost analysis will include context of different costs involved such as start-up costs, ranges of costs, cost to city versus resident costs, and cost of a community engagement campaign.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

No miscellaneous matters were presented for consideration.

Next meeting: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 3:00 p.m.
Meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m.

APPROVED:

Committee Chair, Crystal Murillo

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

HOUSING, NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES & REDEVELOPMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

July 1, 2020

Members Present: *Council Member, Chair Crystal Murillo*
Council Member, Vice-Chair Francoise Bergan
Council Member, Alison Coombs

Others Present: Council Member Juan Marcano, George Adams, Andrea Amonick, Brandon Cammarata, Bob Gaiser, Ryan LeCompte, Dan Money, Tim Joyce, Dan Krzyzanowski, Shelley McKittrick, Karen Hancock, Mindy Parnes, Jessica Prosser, Nancy Sheffield, Sharyn Vellenga, and Cecilia Zapata

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Council Member Murillo welcomed everyone to the meeting.

MINUTES

A request was made by Council Member Bergan to include questions asked and answers given during meetings in the minutes. She stated she reviews minutes later to help her remember what happened. The minutes for the June 3, 2020 meeting will be revised to include all questions and answers.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

NEW ITEMS

HOMELESSNESS SERVICES RFP AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING GAP FINANCING APPLICATION UPDATES

Summary of Issue and Discussion

City staff gave an update regarding the number of applicants and types of programs that have been received through the request for proposal process. Jessica Prosser, manager of Community Development, stated the application process has closed for both programs. A total of thirteen (13) applications for the Homelessness Services RFP and nine (9) applications for the Affordable Housing Gap Financing were received. The review committees have reviewed the applications, and all applicants met the initial eligibility review. Both review committees will meet the following week to score the applications using evaluation criteria. Once scored, the recommendations will be shared with the CHD committee, followed by the Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment Policy Committee in August, and to study session thereafter.

CM Murillo asked if all who applied qualified, or if it was just the people who were filtered out. Jessica stated the review committees completed general eligibility checks which were met by all applicants. CM Coombs requested the list of applicants, and CM Murillo asked if the Committee would be receiving the full list of applicants after the recommendations go through CHD, or an amended list based on CHD's recommendation. Jessica stated they could provide both the full list of applicants and the recommended list with the funding amounts and scores.

CM Bergen asked if it was a two-year term. Jessica stated the Homelessness Services RFP terms are based on operation needs, are a two-year term, and start in 2021. The Housing Gap Financing program is dependent on the project, to include if they're going to CHFA for tax credits, when they are going to begin, and if they are either a construction or rehab project. CM Bergen stated she received feedback stating that if it's a two-year term, it's difficult sometimes to continually apply and to plan within that window. Jessica stated they received that feedback as well, so they are working on aligning their program timelines and create consistency. CM Coombs asked if it was possible to do performance-based renewal contracts requiring reports or presentations for those who do get approved versus having them reapply fully. Jessica stated they could consider that option and said performance measures would be used in the application. She added that some of it is dependent on the funding sources and the

amount. She stated they have two years to spend ESG funds, which matches up well with the program, and marijuana money is projected out a year in advance. Pros and cons will have to be weighed and performance-based renewals is something to consider, especially after seeing how everything works out the first time.

Outcome – The Committee looks forward to the August meeting to review updates.

HOUSING OCCUPANCY

Summary of Issue and Discussion

On June 22, 2020, after the Governor's Executive order, CM Marcano asked for the current code around housing occupancy to be examined and a staff proposal for amending it be brought to Council. The item was referred to the Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment Policy Committee for further discussion.

City staff gave a presentation with topics to include why the change to household size for unrelated individuals was being proposed, the definition of family, possible combinations of what constitutes unrelated living situations, data from past complaints and enforcement practices, responses to Council questions, and clarity around the process and options to make a change to household size for unrelated individuals. The Governor's order came out on June 13 to help create housing security. The Order requested that cities suspend regulating the limit on the number of individuals in a household, lifted the eviction moratorium, and instated a 30-day eviction notice rather than a 10-day notice. Staff reviewed the Order specifically around unrelated persons, along with impacts of employment and people being able to pay their mortgages and rents, potential eviction of individuals from multi-family setting who may be looking to rent a room in a home, and mortgage impacts expected in early 2021. Staff is also looking into integrating this change with the UDO amendments proposed as part of the housing strategy.

George Adams, director of Planning, described the definition of family and family group and went over occupancy examples. He explained that in five of the six definitions, the city would not be changing the way we enforce or interpret the definitions. The change would only impact the definition of unrelated individuals, and all definitions are standalone. Staff would identify which definition applies to the situation that they are concerned with, and not combine multiple definitions. CM Bergan asked if a home has four family members that live together, then unrelated people may not be added to that family. George explained there are variations and offered the example of a family of four plus a nanny or someone who was caring for one of the family members. He gave a second example where currently a family of 4-5 individuals could not rent out a bedroom to an unrelated individual.

CM Bergan asked how the city would verify that everyone is related in the same house. Sharyn Vellenga, Code Enforcement supervisor, stated the officers do not do proactive enforcement, and only respond to complaints. They use a standardized questionnaire for occupants to self-report when trying to establish how many occupants live in the home, if they meet the requirements of a single-family unit and 150 square feet, and if it's not a single-family unit, are there more than 4 unrelated individuals living in the home. Staff refers to the county assessor to determine the square footage of the home, to include finished basement area that may be utilized for living. When staff encounters violations, a notice of violation is issued with 30-60 days for compliance. The individual is not given advice on how to come into compliance.

Sharyn gave an occupancy report history, to include the number of complaints and notices issued in 2018, 2019 and YTD. CM Bergen wanted to confirm staff does not do proactive enforcement and is only complaint driven, and individuals don't have to answer truthfully on the questionnaire if they don't want to. She asked for clarification on the single-family to duplex. She asked if someone could have 4 unrelated people in a house, why would that person be out of compliance when they're just renting out their basement. Sharyn stated if an individual has converted the basement space into a separate living unit, where there is a single entrance into the basement and a full kitchen, and the person didn't pull proper permits to do so, and based on county records it's still listed as a single-family home, the individual technically converted a single-family home into a duplex where two people can reside separately.

CM Bergen asked if out of the violations issued, has staff followed up and resolved them. Sharyn stated that once the notice is issued with the 30 to 60-day period for compliance, staff follows up with the owner. Staff also works

with property owners and the occupants to help them work through the process and help them understand how the code reads, without giving legal advice. CM Bergan asked what happens if the person does not comply. Sharyn stated that worst case scenario, if staff can establish the violation, ultimate grounds would be to take the person to court. She could not think of a time where this measure was taken and expressed again that staff prefers to work with the individuals involved to help them get into compliance. CM Bergan asked how long it has taken to get into compliance. Sharyn stated 30 to 60 days are given for compliance, but staff understands there are cases where more time is needed if the individual is beginning the eviction process or when contract work needs to be completed on the home. Staff will not interfere with these processes. They want to give individuals time to find a new place to stay or for life safety work to be completed; however, they need to see progress.

CM Bergan asked if an individual has four, or the now being proposed six, unrelated people living in a home, are there any requirements on the number of bathrooms. Sharyn stated there was not. CM Bergan asked if staff would be able to prove that one of the six unrelated people doesn't have a wife or husband, girlfriend or boyfriend also living in the home. She stated people are not going to self-report and she doesn't know that staff would get a complaint on that. Sharyn stated staff can only utilize the tools they have been given; i.e. the questionnaire. Staff must respect the individual's right to privacy and can only hope the answers were given truthfully. CM Bergan asked about animals and what if everyone had a dog or cat. Sharyn stated that would fall to Animal Services and they do have regulations on the number of animals that can be in a home.

CM Marcano stated he's received several emails from the 80016-area talking about six unrelated families living in a home, and wanted clarification that it was not possible under the changes proposed. Sharyn confirmed that was not possible.

Jessica went over responses to Council's previous questions. Regarding tax implications, she stated property tax would not be impacted. Regarding the impacts to renters, she stated that is something to consider, as the changes may create a price gouging situation that landlords take advantage of, which is something that could be happening today. Regarding the neighborhood impacts, Jessica stated that is something that is currently monitored. Staff would continue to monitor complaints. She said they researched HOAs and their ability to regulate. She said there are some areas around HOAs, but they are typically linked to short term rentals and not specifically around the number of people in a home. Regarding the question of why six unrelated people in the proposed change, Jessica stated the Governor's Order did not prescribe a number of people and rather stated to simply suspend regulating what is currently in place. She said Denver recently went through this process and created a spreadsheet of different cities and how many are allowed in each city, which ranged from two individuals to an unlimited number of people in a home. Six was the middle range. It felt comfortable and placed a parameter, rather than putting a moratorium and leaving it unlimited.

Jessica outlined the options for UDO change. One option is to make no change. The second option is passing a resolution referencing the disaster declaration to increase occupancy to six unrelated persons. When the disaster declaration expires, so would the resolution. The third option is to begin the ordinance amendment process to include community outreach, going to different citizen and council committees, holding public hearings at Planning Commission and City Council, and complete other steps in the robust process to make an amendment in the UDO. The fourth option is to pass the resolution as described in the second option, and concurrently start the process of changing the ordinance.

Jessica stated staff recommends passing the disaster resolution in the very near term, understanding the need for this would be more immediate. Staff would monitor the impacts from a code compliance standpoint, initiate public engagement and include other changes that are thought to be needed in the UDO as part of the housing strategy. Staff would then come back to Council in early 2021 as impacts start to be seen on evictions and mortgages coming to fruition in the fall. At this point in early 2021, staff would present revisions to the ordinance for Council to consider. If Council wished to move forward with the ordinance amendment process, staff would move with the formal change to the ordinance.

CM Bergan stated she was thankful for the clarification and answering all the questions, but she doesn't believe everybody is going to self-report and there will be situations where there will be more than six unrelated persons in a home, should it be changed to six unrelated persons. She stated she was concerned with this being under the COVID-19 disaster resolution. She understands that people may have possibly lost their job and may have to find other living arrangements, but to put it under the auspice of COVID, the city is overlooking another issue of COVID which is to practice social distancing and the virus spreads more widely in places of crowded households. She stated the problem is more acute in the minority and poor communities in terms of contracting COVID, so she's concerned the city is not being responsible by putting this under an emergency declaration, exposing more people to COVID, increasing hospitalizations, and so forth. She stated that as the city starts reopening business, we want to stop transmission of the virus, and doing that means we must be cognizant of how many people are in a household. If we add more people to a home, we could be adding to a second wave of COVID. She stated she did not like the idea of a COVID emergency response and that looking at making an ordinance change and getting public input is a different story.

Shelley McKittrick, Homelessness Program director, stated that one of the reasons for the Governor's Order is because we have people in congregate shelter, sleeping very close to each other, who could probably end their homelessness if they could rent a room. Another would be getting folks out of encampments and into homes. She stated she appreciated CM Bergan's concerns with COVID. She said most of the overcrowding is among poor families and they are all related. Shelley also stated this is an opportunity for individuals to open their homes to those who don't have one, and to do so legally during this COVID time. CM Bergan stated 150 square feet times six people is a 900 square foot home, and now there are more unrelated people, possibly essential workers who may be even more exposed to COVID, bringing it back into the home where there are more people; adding to a second wave.

CM Marcano expressed there are some points that CM Bergan brought up, but they are not necessarily dependent on COVID. Rather it is an issue of class and employment status and it being a bigger contributor to the spread of the disease. He stated unemployment benefits are going to be reduced heavily at the end of the month. For those who are essential workers, the payroll protection program funding has already lapsed. While businesses are reopening, they are not able to 1) bring everyone back, and 2) bring them back at full hours. Part of the idea of opening this restriction is to allow folks to have other options for shelter. The reality is that individuals will be living in homes with more people, or living on the streets. CM Marcano stated he personally would rather have people housed than unhoused, and mentioned it was a harm prevention method. He stated that an individual is a higher risk in this situation, especially if the housemates are all essential workers. But any individual going to the grocery store, for example, is at risk. This doesn't address the housing status problem, where the Governor is coming from.

CM Murillo wanted to echo the comment about opportunity costs; folks having a home and access to a home, potential for the homeowner to recoup lost income via renting a room, as opposed to folks in mass becoming homeless. She stated data has shown it is less expensive when proactively addressing housing as opposed to reactively trying to support folks. She stated she supported this and knows there is such a high rate of unemployment at this time, and money is not available to support housing projects. CM Murillo stated it concerned her deeply to know what kind of living situations people are going to be in and this could be a small part of alleviating that pressure so folks can pay other bills, not forgo feeding their children, or going to the hospital when they need to.

CM Coombs stated she wanted to draw out what reactive housing solutions might look like if they were available to us; such as standing up more COVID hotels which have been very expensive, putting dramatically more funding into emergency shelters, and further proliferation of encampments where the risk is increased for COVID. We either create denser and less safe living situations, or spend dramatic amounts of money to avoid that. She said we were already in a housing crisis before COVID.

CM Bergan stated that having to spend more money on COVID hotels and emergency shelters is not a city responsibility and is something counties should take care of with health and human services. She stated she doesn't know if she will accept that it is the City's responsibility as it is not part of the city charter. She stated we want to

have emergency funding to house and do the great things we have done, but going down that road when it's a county responsibility is not the right answer either.

CM Coombs asked if the counties are unable or unwilling to provide those services, at some point it is our moral responsibility to the people in our city, and not just say that's not in charter so we're not going to do it. She stated there is a lot we do as a matter of our moral responsibility to the people in our city. CM Bergan stated we don't ever go to the counties to advocate or push the issue because it's a foregone conclusion that the city will take care of it. She said efforts have never been there to partner and come up with solutions, leading to years and years of more problems.

CM Coombs said counties have provided funding during COVID. She said TIF funding has been used for building affordable housing projects, which is also the counties contributing due to the property tax they are not collecting, and the City is signing off on them not collecting. She stated it's unfair to say they never do anything. She stated we should be asking for more and building regional partnerships to include the counties, but as a city we still have that responsibility to be a part of the solution. CM Marcano stated he served on the Arapahoe County Budget Committee, and they face the same issues that we do as a city. He stated we are not preempted by our charter to supplement where needed. He said our charter specifically says that we are responsible for good governance, general welfare, security of the city, so on and so forth. He stated we should think about becoming a city and county as well because we are doing a lot of things that counties are responsible for.

Dan Money, senior assistant city attorney, stated he needed direction from the Committee. There is an option to do a disaster declaration which would be temporary, or do something more permanent to expand the number of persons in a single-family unit. An ordinance is a longer process, but is permanent, unless changed by another ordinance. For the immediacy, they may pass on the resolution to be voted on and it takes effect immediately and ends when the disaster ends. He asked if the Committee was comfortable with six, and if they wanted a sunset period.

CM Marcano stated he was surprised how fast this moved along and said he was leaning toward option number four due to the immediacy of the situation with the pandemic, and to avoid evictions further down the road by reverting down to four after the pandemic. He stated evictions are a terrible, dramatic and fairly violent process in a lot of ways, and he wants to make sure we can avoid that as much as possible. He wishes to make this part of the city code as a permanent change.

Shelley gave an example of two single parents, each with their kids being able to live together in a single-family home and stated there are school children and infants involved. CM Bergan asked if she could get clarification on what Shelly said. If there are two single parents with two children, under all definitions they are not supposed to mix with other unrelated persons. Dan clarified that it still wouldn't allow the city to mix families unless it was written in that way. He said two unrelated families don't fit the definition even if changed to six or more, because single-family homes are meant for a single family, unless you fit it the definition of what a single family is. CM Murillo asked under which scenario would Shelley's example be able to happen. Dan stated it would not be allowed but it could be put in the ordinance as well. CM Murillo stated she'd be interested in incorporating that. CM Marcano stated regarding the situation that it's a distinction without a difference and asked if we could find a way to make it permissible, but keeping the limit of six in mind.

Dan asked if the sunset period should be removed. CM Marcano stated he would like to instate the change using the disaster declaration and then work through the ordinance amendment process to make the ordinance permanent. CM Coombs stated it was important that we make it possible. She said the story that Shelley told was her family's story. Because her mother and her best friend could live together with their kids and help each other out, her mother was able to leave an abusive relationship, and all were able to thrive more in that situation. CM Bergan stated she didn't have an issue with that scenario, but was more interested in keeping it to four unrelated persons. She stated she felt we were creating a solution with no enforcement for an unknown problem because we don't know if people are even utilizing the rule of four unrelated persons.

CM Bergan stated a lot of people in her community bought a home in a single-family zone and are up in arms about not choosing to live in an urban area or a multi-family apartment and bought their house with specific parameters in mind. She asked if we were now changing the rules in the middle of the game, and after they made a huge investment, when individuals bought under a single-family zoned area. Dan stated that in a sense we are, but we created the number in the first place, and changing the rules is always the risk when someone moves to an area. He said in a zoning perspective, the group tried to determine when the number became four and presented cases where zoning was challenged. Families move into areas expecting to live in single-family zoning, but we have the legislative power as a Council to change it.

CM Murillo asked if this was the same kind of argument one could make if an area was rezoned. Dan stated no one is ever guaranteed zoning for life. CM Murillo stated we have a dispute process to help overcome disputes in neighborhoods. Dan stated yes, and that they could be handled in different ways. Nancy Sheffield, interim director of Housing and Community Services, stated we have a mediation services agreement, and both the neighborhood liaisons and the code enforcement officers have mediated disputes along the way.

Jessica reminded the group that we would still go through the process of community engagement ahead of the ordinance to help inform what is going into the ordinance. CM Murillo agreed, stating any opportunity to get input and avoid rushing through an ordinance makes sense. She stated she supports the short-term pursuit in the form of a resolution as well as a longer-term ordinance that has to be more robust with process where we are educating and letting people share their frustrations or support. CM Murillo thanked CM Marcano and staff for their input on the matter. CM Marcano also thanked staff for their work.

Outcome – CM Murillo and CM Coombs voted in favor of moving option four to Council, a resolution referencing the disaster declaration with a concurrent start to an ordinance process. If the resolution passes, staff is to monitor the impact, should there be any, and regularly report back to the Committee during public engagement.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

CM Coombs asked for a brief update on the dangerous animal and breed specific legislation public outreach. Nancy Sheffield stated the virtual townhall was done on June 18th to respond to the questions we solicited from the public in advance to that meeting. There were 13 questions total, which were augmented with questions heard throughout the years. Constituents expressed they wanted the ability to comment, not just ask questions; however, we are not equipped to take live comments at this point. Nancy said the idea was to have a dedicated email so the public may respond to the survey to retain or repeal the restricted ordinance, and if they want to repeal it, should it be done by ballot or by ordinance. She gave an update on the online survey, stating that to date, staff has received over 1500 responses, with the majority indicating they would like to repeal the ban, and do so by ordinance. The survey was mentioned in the recent distribution of News Aurora, so staff will see if they get more responses and if that changes the majority. Nancy said the survey will be online through July 24th and that there's a time restriction if this goes on the ballot.

Nancy asked the Committee if they would like to see a dedicated email, in addition to social media, giving the public the ability to comment. CM Coombs stated it was a good idea and asked for another meeting with representation on both sides, where pros and cons could be discussed. The Committee unanimously agreed to move forward with the dedicated email for public comments and an additional public meeting.

Next meeting: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 3:00 p.m.
Meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

APPROVED: _____
Committee Chair, Crystal Murillo

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK



Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment Policy Committee

Agenda Item Commentary

Item Title: Homelessness Services RFP Program Recommendations
Item Initiator: Shelley McKittrick
Staff Source: Jessica Prosser, Manager of Community Development, 303-739-7924
Deputy City Manager Signature:
Outside Speaker:
Council Goal: 2.4: Work with our partners to ensure that every child and young person in Aurora have access to fundamental resources-2012

ACTIONS(S) PROPOSED *(Check all appropriate actions)*

- Approve Item and Move Forward to Study Session
- Approve Item and Move Forward to Regular Meeting
- Information Only

HISTORY *(Dates reviewed by City council, Policy Committees, Boards and Commissions, or Staff. Summarize pertinent comments. ATTACH MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETINGS, POLICY COMMITTEES AND BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS.)*

During the HORNS meeting on Wednesday, August 5, 2020 staff from the Housing and Community Services Department will present an update of the newly developed Homeless Services RFP Applications for funds available to community-based agencies. This RFP process is intended to simplify, streamline, improve transparency and improve equitable distribution of funding. The process also intends to identify the best grant source with the best funding guidelines for each agency. The funding can serve low to moderate income persons: individuals and households, households at risk of losing their homes and those who are currently homeless.

Multiple Funding Sources will support this program:

- General Fund
- Marijuana Tax Revenue
- HUD Federal Funds
- ESG – Emergency Solutions Grant Fund
- CDBG – Community Development Block Grant fund
- HOME TBRA – Tenant Based Rental Assistance

Eligible Service Categories:

- **Homelessness Prevention** - Assisting Households who are at-risk of losing their housing through eviction. Progressive Engagement supportive services provided, rental payments can be on-going.
- **Housing-focused Emergency Shelter** – Day, Night, and Street Outreach
- **Light Touch Rehousing** – House Aurora Partnership Case Management / Navigator funding. Assisting Households with first month's rent and deposit to move into a rental unit. Does not include ongoing case management or ongoing rental assistance.
- **Rapid Re-Housing** - Assists Homeless households with deposit and short-term (3-18 months) rental assistance that ends a household's homelessness. Includes Case Management and on-going assistance

- **Housing Navigation** (for all of A@H collaborative) - Housing Navigator assists in locating rental housing, building relationships with Landlords/Property Managers. Navigator assists in mediating between Landlord/Property Manager and tenant

ITEM SUMMARY (*Brief description of item, discussion, key points, recommendations, etc.*)

An update will be provided regarding the number of applicants and types of programs that have been received through the Request for Proposal process. Staff will also provide the review committee's recommendations.

QUESTIONS FOR Committee

Does the Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment Committee support the recommendations presented at its August 5, 2020 meeting, and send it forward to City Council Study Session for review?

EXHIBITS ATTACHED:

PPT_Homelessness Services RFP_08052020.pdf

City of Aurora Neighborhood Services

Application for Homeless Services Grants

Within the City of Aurora, Colorado

Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment
Policy Committee

August 5, 2020



Various Funding Sources

Funding sources:

General Funds -257K

Marijuana Funds- 1.8 million

ESG- Emergency Solutions Grant- 250K

HOME –Tenant Based Rental Assistance-200K

CDBG- Public Services-about 100K



WHY A UNIVERSAL RFP (Request for FUNDING)?

- To simplify and Streamline the application process for City of Aurora Homeless Services Grant Funds
- To minimize the need to complete multiple grant applications (avoid repetitive applications).
- To simplify reporting requirements and the invoicing/payment process.
- To assist in identifying the best grant source and funding guidelines for your program.
- The current process for assigning funds is repetitive and often creates uneven funding to agencies.
- To improve Transparency and Fairness in funding.



Eligible Service Categories

- **Residential Projects**

(Assisting Households who are at-risk of losing their housing through eviction.)

- **Housing-focused Emergency Shelter – Day, Night, Street Outreach**

- **Light Touch Rehousing – House Aurora Partnership**

(Assisting Households with first month's rent/deposit for new unit. Does not include ongoing case management or ongoing rental assistance.)

- **Rapid Rehousing**

(Assists homeless households with deposit and short-term rental assistance. Includes Case Management and on-going assistance)

- **Housing Navigation (for all of A@H)**

(Housing Navigator assists in locating rental housing, building relationships with Landlords/Property Managers, for all of A@H collaborative.)



RFP Review Committee

Karissa Johnson, Denver Govern. Karissa.Johnson@denvergov.org
Kenneth Forrest, APD, Division 2 kforrest@auroragov.org
Charlene Wisner-Howard, CHD Comm. iolcmdenver@gmail.com
Teri Marquantte, CHD Committee Teri@swanexperience.com
Julie Patino, Denver Foundation mjpatino@denverfoundation.org
Shelley McKittrick, CoA Homeless Director smckittr@auroragov.org
Jessica Prosser, CoA Comm Develop Mgr jprosser@auroragov.org
Sharon Duwaik, CoA Program Specialist II sduwaik@auroragov.org



Agency:			Reviewer:
Activities (please select): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homelessness Prevention • Emergency Shelter – Day – Night – Street Outreach • Light Touch Rehousing (no c/m, services) • Rapid Rehousing (w/cm, services) • Housing Navigation (for A@H collab) 	Max points	Points assigned	Notes: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> PRO's CON's </div>
Program Design – focuses on reducing homelessness	5		
Experience/Qualifications in program	5		
Benefit to Aurora (provides an unmet need)	5		
A@H Homeless Plan Active participation	5		
Collaborative – agency works with a developed network of resources	5		
Fiscal capacity to perform this grant (Financial capacity to perform and monitor this grant.)	5		
Match grant funds – ability to match	5		
Measurable Outcomes - Performance Measurement Tool	5		
STAFF DEVOTED TO PROGRAM (Knowledgeable staff assigned to program)	5		
HMIS CAPACITY (staff trained and devoted to HMIS)	5		
TOTAL POINTS	50		

Homeless Services RFP Reviewers				Scores ranged from 1-5, 5 being highest	
Organization	2019 Amount	Amount Requested	Recommended Grant Amount	Average Score	Score Ranking
AuMHC	\$192,648	\$313,307	236,540	4.48	1
Aurora@Home/AHA	\$377,000.00	\$603,700	484,800	4.43	2
Salvation Army	\$50,000	\$325,600	325,600	4.34	3
MHBHC	\$1,291,891	\$2,942,851	1,700,000	4.28	4
BH/RTW	\$0.00	\$143,245	143,245	4.25	5
Gateway	\$99,324	\$215,637	215,624	4.23	6
Second Chance Center	\$0	\$289,600	289,600	4.05	7
AWTN/JOC	\$25,000	\$141,000	125,000	3.8	8
Mosaic	\$0.00	\$224,500	80,000	2.86	9
Total Requests	\$2,035,863	\$5,198,840	3,600,409		

**2019 CHD Report to City Council
2020 Recommended Budget**



PROPOSED FUNDING SOURCES PER AGENCY/PROJECT							
Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Proposed	ESG-CV	ESG-Regular	MJ	General Fund	HOME TBRA
AuMHC							
AUMHC HP	\$90,651	131,410			136,540		
AUMHC ES	\$222,656	105,130	50,000	50,000	0		
Aurora@Home/AHA	\$603,700	484,800	107,800		177,000		200,000
Salvation Army	\$325,600	325,600	250,600	75,000			
MHBHC							
Comitis only	\$1,007,901	360,000	50,000	50,000		260,000	
ADRC Only	\$1,016,887	890,000	150,000		740,000		
Street Outreach	\$423,401	230,000	190,000		40,000		
CCN	\$494,661	220,000			220,000		
BH/RTW	\$143,245	143,245			143,245		
Gateway	\$215,637	215,624	115,624	50,000	50,000		
SCC	\$289,600	289,600	189,600	0	100,000		
AWTN/JOC	\$141,000	125,000			125,000		
Mosaic	\$224,500	80,000			80,000		
Total Requests	\$5,198,840	3,600,409	1,103,624	225,000	1,811,785	260,000	200,000



Aurora Mental Health Center

- **Personnel - Employees**

- Homeless Prevention Case Manager
- HMIS Data Entry
- Day Shelter Therapist
- Shelter Case Manager

- **Program Costs**

- Mileage
- Client Engagement
- Homeless Prevention
- Emergency Shelter
- Shelter Operations
- Outreach van
- Client phones

\$313,307 - Requested

\$236,540 - Proposed



A@H -- Aurora Housing Authority

- **Rental Assistance**
- **Deposit Assistance**
- **Navigators Salaries & Benefits**
- **Housing Navigator**
- **Owner/Property Management**

Incentive Fund

\$603,700 - Requested

\$484,800 - Proposed



Salvation Army - Aurora

- **Eviction Prevention
(Homelessness Prevention)**
- **Rapid Rehousing**
- **Housing Navigator**
- **Full time Aurora Case Manager**
- **Housing Now Director**

\$325,600 - Requested

\$325,600 - Proposed



Mile High Behavioral Healthcare

- **Shelter Program Manager**
- **Day Care Navigators**
- **Intake Care Navigators**
- **Overnight Care Manager**
- **HMIS data specialist**
- **Shelter Repairs and Maintenance**
- **Supplies**
- **Emergency Weather Activation and
Community Outreach Coordinator**



Mile High Behavioral Healthcare

(Continued)

Colfax Community Network

- **Family Program Staff**
- **Children's Program Staff**
- **Program Supplies**

Street Outreach

- **Program Manager**
- **Street Outreach Workers**
- **Outreach Supplies**

\$2,942,851 - Requested

\$1,700,000 - Proposed



BH/RTW Bridges – Ready to Work

- **Personnel – Funds two half of two fulltime staff**
- **Flexible funding for Rapid Rehousing costs**
 - Rent and Deposit costs
- **Outreach – Funds two outreach shifts per week**
- **Navigation Assistance for their specific population**

\$143,245 - Requested

\$143,245 - Proposed



Gateway Domestic Violence

- **Shelter Operations - Direct Services Staff**
- **Additional Cleaning Supplies for COVID**
- **Shelter Operations - Utilities**
- **Taxi Cab Vouchers**
- **Hygiene Supplies**
- **PPE – masks, gloves, hand sanitizer, etc.**

\$215,637 - Requested

\$215,624 - Proposed



Second Chance Center/Providence at the Heights

- **Personnel Costs**
- **Project Costs**
- **Rental Assistance for specific ‘just released’ population**

\$289,600 - Requested

\$289,600 - Proposed



Aurora Warms the Night/Jesus on Colfax

- **Personnel – Staff**
- **Office Supplies, telephone, internet**
- **Cold Weather Activation Costs**
- **Basic Outreach –COVID supplies; meals, street food kits, hygiene items**

\$141,000 - Requested

\$125,000 - Proposed



Mosaic Church/Dayton Opportunity Center

- **Personnel – Case Management staff, Housing Navigation staff**
- **Flexible funding for minimal rent and deposit costs**
- **Outreach Incentives for persons served**

\$224,500 - Requested

\$80,000 - Proposed



Timeline

- **March –Final week** Aurora@Home Governance Committee/Partner agency review and feedback given on the RFP process, application components and evaluation criteria.
- **April – First week** follow-up with agencies who were not at the previous meeting and agencies that do not attend Aurora@Home
- **May 6** HORNS Committee presentation and feedback- Mtg Cancelled
- **May 18** City Council Study Session
- **Late May** RFP Release
- **June** RFP applications due/Evaluation team review of RFP (exact date TBD)
- **July –** HORNS Committee briefing of applications and Evaluation team recommendations
- **July** Community Housing Development Committee briefing
- **August-** Funding recommendations to City Council
- **September** Contracts drafted and executed



Does the Committee support the recommendations and wish to move the item to study session?



THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK



Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment Policy Committee

Agenda Item Commentary

Item Title: Affordable Housing Gap Financing Program Recommendations
Item Initiator: Jessica Prosser
Staff Source: Jessica Prosser, Manager of Community Development, 303-739-7924
Deputy City Manager Signature:
Outside Speaker:
Council Goal: 4.0: Create a superior quality of life for residents making the city a desirable place to live and work-2012

ACTIONS(S) PROPOSED *(Check all appropriate actions)*

- Approve Item and Move Forward to Study Session
- Approve Item and Move Forward to Regular Meeting
- Information Only

HISTORY *(Dates reviewed by City council, Policy Committees, Boards and Commissions, or Staff. Summarize pertinent comments. ATTACH MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETINGS, POLICY COMMITTEES AND BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS.)*

The purpose of the Affordable Gap Financing Application is to simplify the process for developers or service providers who are interested in building or rehabilitating a structure used for housing as well as other capital needs. Projects that address housing needs from permanent supportive housing for homeless individuals to for sale products will be considered. All applicants will be asked how their proposals help achieve goals and recommendations within the Housing Strategy and this will be established as one of the evaluation criteria. This process will build upon an existing application process establishing new and efficient ways to evaluate developments which will insure an equitable and systematic process to select projects that will fit the city's need.

By streamlining applications, it will reduce the need for developers to produce duplicate information when utilizing multiple funding sources including State and Colorado Housing and Finance Authority (CHFA). Creating one application form will also allow for staff to operate with greater efficiency, decreasing the time needed for evaluation. In order to align with CHFA's tax credit application process the City's application process will take place on a bi-annual basis in the spring and fall ahead of CHFA's application deadline. CHFA funding will not apply to all applicants but will allow for a review process for all types of application on a routine basis. This application is the first step in establishing new procedural steps for incentivizing affordable housing developments.

Housing Strategy Alignment: The Aurora Housing Strategy focuses on the most effective, efficient, and outcome-proven methods to expand housing options in the city, with a focus on:

- 1) Increase and leverage existing resources to address housing needs
- 2) Set housing goals and manage housing investments to achieve those goals
- 3) Preserve existing housing while increasing the supply of housing for households across the income spectrum
- 4) Improve regulatory processes as needed to reduce the cost of housing development

Types of Projects Funded: New rental or for sale affordable housing, rehabilitation of existing affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, public services, homeless program providers with capital needs

Funding Sources: Amounts will vary from year to year based on changing federal grant allocations, program income received, and funding needs for other programs. Sources will include some or all of the following: HOME (Home Investment Partnership Program) funds, CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) funds, unallocated Marijuana funds, General Funds, development waivers, and Private Activity Bonds.

Estimated annual funding includes \$300,000 from unallocated Marijuana funds, \$800,000 from federal HUD grants, \$1.1 million from the General Fund, and \$19 million in State of Colorado Private Activity Bonds.

Application Components/Evaluation Criteria: Alignment with Housing Strategy, meets an identified housing need in the community, demographics to be served by the project, average median income to be served by the project, cost effectiveness, leveraging of funding, review of sources and uses, funding sustainability, available City funding sources based on project type, developer or organization experience, surrounding compatible uses.

Proposed Review Committee: City staff including Community Development, Homeless, Finance, Planning and Urban Renewal. Two Community Housing and Development (CHD) Committee members.

Timeline:

- Request for applications released mid-May
- Application due second week of June
- Review of applications June
- HORNS Committee July- review of applications and review committee recommendations
- CHD committee meeting- 2nd week of July review of applications and review committee recommendations
- City Council Study Session- late July/early August, review of applications and review committee recommendations

ITEM SUMMARY (Brief description of item, discussion, key points, recommendations, etc.)

An update will be provided regarding the number of applicants and general types of projects that have been received in response to the Request for Proposal(RFP). Staff will also provide the review committee's recommendations.

QUESTIONS FOR Committee

EXHIBITS ATTACHED:

PPT_Affordable Housing Gap Finance_08052020.pdf

City of Aurora Housing and Community Services

Affordable Housing Gap Financing

Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment
Policy Committee

Aug 5, 2020



Types of Projects Considered

- **New rental or for sale affordable housing**
- **Rehabilitation of existing affordable housing**
- **Public Services with capital needs**
- **Permanent supportive housing**
- **Homeless program providers with capital needs**



Housing Strategy Alignment

The Aurora Housing Strategy focuses on the most effective, efficient, and outcome-proven methods to expand housing options in the city, with a focus on:

- 1. Increase and leverage existing resources to address housing needs.**
- 2. Set housing goals and manage housing investments to achieve those goals.**
- 3. Preserve existing housing while increasing the supply of housing for households across the income spectrum.**
- 4. Improve regulatory process as needed to reduce the cost of housing development.**



Application Evaluation Criteria

- **Alignment with Housing Strategy**
- **Meets an identified housing need in the community**
- **Demographics to be served by the project, average median income to be served by the project**
- **Cost effectiveness**
- **Leveraging of funding**
- **Review of sources and uses**
- **Funding sustainability**
- **Available City funding sources based on project type**
- **Develop or organization experience**
- **Surrounding compatible uses**



Review Committee

- **City staff including:**
 - **Community Development**
 - **Homelessness Program**
 - **Finance**
 - **Planning and Urban Renewal**
- **Community Housing and Development (CHD) Committee members**



2020 PAB	\$19,821,789
MARIJUANA FUNDS	\$300,000
GENERAL FUND	\$500,000
HOME	\$1,700,000
CDBG	\$600,000
TOTAL	\$22,921,789



Review Committee Results

2020 Gap Financing Fund Calculator

Applicant Name	Eval Scorer 3 JP	Ave Score	Score out of 800	Requested Funding Amount	Committee Funding Recommendation	Funding Source	PAB Funding Recommendation	Ward #
Elevations Community Land Trust: Scattered Sites/Iliff Station/Blackhawk Greenway/Emporia		67.28571429	471 \$	1,329,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	General Funds		I,IV, and TBD
Jesus on Colfax Ministries: The JOC Ministry Center		61.85714286	433 \$	300,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	CDBG		I
Mile High Development: The Point Affordable Apartments		80.14285714	561 \$	500,000.00	\$ 350,000.00	HOME		IV
CHDA: Jewell Apartments		84.85714286	594 \$	500,000.00	\$ 500,000.00	HOME	\$ 4,900,000.00	IV
Second Chance: Providence at the Heights (PATH)		83	581 \$	260,000.00	\$ 260,000.00	MJ funding		III
Habitat for Humanity: Mountain View/Acquisition and Renovation		73.83333333	443 \$	1,450,000.00	\$ 450,000.00	HOME		IV and TBD
Community Housing Partners: Eagle Meadow Homes		83.42857143	584 \$	600,000.00	\$ 400,000.00	HOME	\$ 4,900,000.00	III
Aurora Housing Authority: Fitzsimons Veterans Independent Living		86.85714286	608 \$	1,250,000.00	\$ 500,000.00	250HOME/250CDBG	\$ 10,000,000.00	I
Total Sum:				\$ 4,860,000.00	\$ 2,960,000.00		\$ 19,800,000.00	
Funding Committed:				\$ 22,760,000.00				



New Affordable Housing Projects 2020

Project Name	Units	Address	Source	Funding Amount
Scattered Sites – Elevated Land Trust	12	Various Sites	General Fund	\$250,000
Iliff Station Townhomes - Elevated Land Trust	12	Iliff Light Rail Station		
Blackhawk Greenway - Elevated Land Trust	12	1953, 1955, 1957, 1959 Blackhawk Street, Aurora, CO, USA		
Emporia Duplexes - Elevated Land Trust	12	Emporia Street, Aurora, CO, USA		
The Point Affordable Apartments – Mile High Development	63	3150 South Peoria Street, Aurora, CO	HOME	\$350,000
Jesus on the Fax - Jesus on Colfax Ministries	3-4	9605(also known as 1526 Dallas) and 9617 E Colfax Ave, Aurora, CO 80010	CDBG	\$250,000
Eagle Meadow Homes – Community Housing Partners (CHP)	93 Phase I	14875 E. 2nd Avenue, Aurora, CO, 80011	HOME	\$400,000
Jewell Apartments – Community Housing Development Association (CHDA)	81 Phase I	10150 East Colorado Avenue, Aurora, CO, USA	HOME	\$500,000
Providence at the Heights – Second Chance	50	15602 E Alameda Pkwy, Aurora, CO, 80017	Marijuana Funding	\$260,000
Acquisition and Renovation - Habitat for Humanity	10	City-Wide with Focus Areas of 80011, 80012, 80017	CDBG/HOME	\$250,000
Mountain View - Habitat for Humanity	Up to 20	10810 East Evans Ave., Aurora CO 80014	HOME	\$450,000
Fitzsimons Veterans Independent Living -Housing Authority of the City of Aurora Connections at 6 th Rehab- not funded	60	1919 Quentin Street	CDBG/HOME	\$250,000



Veterans Renaissance Apartments Fitzsimons



- **1919 Quentin Street.**
- **60 units of permanent supportive housing**
- **Homeless and At-risk Veterans**
- **54,253 SF Four-stories**
- **Requested Amount \$1,250,000**
- **Committee Recommended Amount \$500,000**

Requested Amount \$1,250,000

Committee Recommended Amount \$500,000



Eagle Meadow Homes (formerly E. 2nd Avenue Residences): Community Housing Partners



- **14875 E. 2nd Avenue, Aurora, CO, 80011**
- **Up to 70% AMI**
- **93 units (Phase I) 162 units (Phase II)**
- **Eagle Meadow Homes is designed with single parents and children's needs in mind, with in-unit washer/dryers, and plenty of outdoor play areas and gardens**

Requested Amount \$600,000
Committee Recommended Amount \$400,000



Jewell Apartments: Community Housing Development Association



- **10150 East Colorado Avenue, Aurora, CO, USA**
- **81 units for Phase I**
- **30%-80% AMI**
- **Within walking distance of public transportation, employment opportunities, childcare, medical services, grocery, and other retail facilities .**

Requested Amount \$500,000
Committee Recommended Amount \$500,000



The Point Affordable Apartments: Mile High Development LLC



- **3150 South Peoria Street, Aurora, CO**
- **63 units**
- **30%-80% AMI Served**
- **Redevelopment of the former Regatta Plaza Shopping Center.**
- **Studio one bedrooms**
- **Has precured tax credits from CHFA**

Requested Amount \$500,000
Committee Recommended Amount \$350,000



Providence at the Heights(PATH): Second Chance Center



- 15602 E Alameda Pkwy, Aurora, CO, 80017
- 50 units
- 0-30% AMI served
- Units are available to all homeless individuals and families who score as being at high need on the One Home system.



Requested Amount \$260,000
Committee Recommended
Amount \$260,000



The JOC Ministry Center: Jesus on Colfax Ministries



- **9617 E Colfax Ave, Aurora, CO**
- **Rehabilitation/Public Service**
- **Day Shelter and Emergency Overnight Shelter**
- **Phase II service providers will provide trauma, mental health, and addiction assistance**
- **Requested Amount \$300,000**
- **Committee Recommended Amount \$250,000**

Requested Amount \$300,000
Committee Recommended
Amount \$250,000



Elevation Community Land Trust Emporia Duplexes/Scattered Sites/Iliff Station Apartments/Blackhawk Greenway Solar Decathlon:

- **Scattered Sites** – Single Family Homes will be in the north, middle, and south of the city utilizing a scattered site model, ECLT will expand the stock of affordable for-sale homes while stabilizing and enhancing neighborhoods through increased homeownership rates, exterior beautification, and upgraded health, safety, and efficiency features of existing housing stock.
- **Iliff Station Apartments** - Iliff TOD site The gentle density units are a perfect bridge between the multifamily rental units and the single family homes that make up the neighborhood surrounding Iliff Station.
- **Blackhawk Greenway** - 1953, 1955, 1957, 1959 Blackhawk Street, Aurora, CO, USA the project adds 4 units of for-sale housing stock affordable to low and moderate income families.
- **Emporia** - Emporia Street, Aurora, CO, USA the project adds 4 units of for-sale housing stock affordable to low and moderate income families.

**Committee Recommended
Amount \$250,000**



Habitat For Humanity



- **Mountain View**
- **New construction-townhomes, for sale**
- **On the Site of Mountain View United Church- 10810 East Evans Ave**
- **20 Units**
- **AMI 40-70%**
- **Habitat's construction of homes on the Mountain View United Church land adds to Aurora's housing strategy by providing affordable homeownership opportunities to hard working essential workers who serve Aurora's community.**

Requested Amount \$1,450,000
Committee Recommended
Amount \$450,000



Does the Committee support the recommendations and wish to move the item to study session?



THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK



Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment Policy Committee

Agenda Item Commentary

Item Title: Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment Review of Committee Name and Goal/Purpose
Item Initiator: Nancy Sheffield
Staff Source: Nancy Sheffield
Deputy City Manager Signature:
Outside Speaker:
Council Goal: 4.5: Maintain high-quality, livable neighborhoods-2012

ACTIONS(S) PROPOSED *(Check all appropriate actions)*

- Approve Item and Move Forward to Study Session
- Approve Item and Move Forward to Regular Meeting
- Information Only

HISTORY *(Dates reviewed by City council, Policy Committees, Boards and Commissions, or Staff. Summarize pertinent comments. ATTACH MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETINGS, POLICY COMMITTEES AND BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS.)*

ITEM SUMMARY *(Brief description of item, discussion, key points, recommendations, etc.)*

Neighborhood Services finalized a reorganization and department name change on June 1, 2020. The department is now named Housing and Community Services.

Currently, Council Rules defines the Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment Committee as follows:

Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment Committee

The Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment Committee shall recommend objectives and initiatives in the following areas:

1. Neighborhood stability and code enforcement
 - a. City housing and animal codes
 - b. Policies and procedures of code enforcement
2. Incentives for redevelopment
3. Urban renewal projects
 - a. Redevelopment policies
 - b. Economic development and business/Chamber groups (urban renewal)

4. Community housing needs
 - a. Community development programs (including housing counseling and homelessness prevention programs)
 - b. Programs to address the foreclosure issue (including vacant property registration and the Neighborhood Stabilization Program)

5. Programs to strengthen and enhance neighborhood organizations and address neighborhood and business community issues including:
 - a. Neighborhood liaison programs, including the Neighborhood Fence Replacement Program
 - b. Graffiti
 - c. Citizens' Code Enforcement Academy
 - d. Learn about Aurora, Neighbor to Neighbor roundtables, and the Neighborhood Referral Program

6. Annual reports from the following boards and commissions:
 - a. Aurora Housing Authority
 - b. Building Code, Contractors Appeals & Standards Board

QUESTIONS FOR Committee

Does the Committee wish to update the name, goal and or objectives of the Housing, Neighborhood Services and Redevelopment Policy Committee?

EXHIBITS ATTACHED:

None

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK