

Agenda Questions/Answers 05/16/2017 City Council Meeting

I.12.

Receive the staff report for Court Place Townhomes located at 17 Court Place, PZC 17-1-023 (Item 1 of 3)

Boyd-Obarski, Rebecca: Item I.12 – (17-345) Court Place Townhomes

1. Are the architectural elements of the attached elevation drawing consistent with design guidelines (regulations) for a property in the Historic District? If so, please provide a copy of that determination.

2. Are the rooftops of these units to be occupied? Is that a 4th floor?

3. If the zoning remains TU could these be converted to offices or retail businesses?

1. The property is not located within the City's Historic District.

2. The rooftops will not be occupied. The rooftop projections shown are the access points from the dwelling units to the roof.

3. The property may be used for any use permitted in the TU district; however, the property would be required to comply with applicable zoning regulations for the use (i.e. screening, parking, etc.). As configured, the site would likely not have adequate parking for the non-residential uses permitted in the TU district. (Evans)

0.1.

**Receive 1st Quarter Financial Report** 

Boyd-Obarski, Rebecca: Item O. 1

1. Please confirm that Garbage Collection Fees are a pass through – the City does not make net profit on this item.

2. If "Charges for water service are down \$664,000 and wastewater services are down \$240,000." Then is there a corresponding reduction in purchased water expenditure? Based on the charts it looks like the cost of purchased water and the number of gallons of purchased water is approximately the same as last year – why didn't that go down?

3. In the same Purchased Water charts – why are there two \$1, two \$2 and two \$3 increments on the left side of the chart? What does that represent?

4. On the Food and Beverage Fund, the report says "with approximately \$500,000 expended on SECA grants through the first quarter of 2017". Do you mean \$500,000 of SECA FY17 SECA grants have been paid out? The SECA FY is still catching up with the City FY, SECA is presently in a SY.

1. Correct, the garbage collection fees are a direct pass through of the expenditure for refuse and recycling collection services. The recycling fee is \$2.43/household per month and the refuse fee is \$10.28/household per month (increased May 1), therefore residents will see a direct charge for \$12.71 on their monthly bill.

2. Staff recognizes the same trends and is currently reviewing the relationship between the purchased water

and the charges for service received by the City. Our initial examination indicates that there are several factors affecting the charges for service. They include timing of the utility bill which will correct itself throughout the year; a slight increase in unmetered water, which includes water main breaks; and an increased accuracy of billing due to the water meter reading contract - through the first quarter in 2016, the City had issued estimates on 64,000 bills and has only issued 2,269 estimates in 2017. Each of these is a contributing factor to the differential between the purchased water and charges for service.

3. The chart is in \$500,000 increments. We have uploaded an updated chart with the axis corrected.

4. The \$500,000 of SECA grants paid out in the CY2017 budget report are related to the SECA grants approved from May 1, 2016 through April 30, 2017. Due to the timing of reimbursement requests, the amounts are shown in the CY17 financials. The amount paid out in Q1 (490k) is consistent with the amount in Q1 of 2016 (\$513k). The City will start reporting on the approved 8-month stub period for SECA in June. (Mayer)

## 0.2.

## Accept the 2017 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice Report

## Boyd-Obarski, Rebecca: Item O. 2. Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

1. What has changed in this report since the April 5, 2017 city council meeting?

## 2. The Action Requested is to "Accept the 2017 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice Report" – the Discussion states "Following adoption of the AI, the HAC will begin to implement the Action Items, starting with ..." At what point will Council "adopt" the AI?

1. There were just two minor changes made to the document after April 5, 2017:

- On Page 15, Community Participation Process, Summary of Outreach and Community Engagement, Stakeholders and Residents, the last bullet point was deleted, which read "Several residents stated that they did not want the City to include Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) in its definition of "legal source of income." Reasons given generally fell into one of two categories: (1) misperceptions of increased crime and blight associated with properties occupied by HCV recipients or (2) a view that adding this to the definition would produce a hardship for landlords"

- On Page 100, Fair Housing Goals and Priorities, Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, Impediment #1, the first bullet point was deleted, which read "Public opposition to amending the City's Fair Housing Ordinance to include Housing Choice Vouchers in the definition of "legal source of income" (This revision was also made to the Executive Summary on Page 5).

2. According to Acting City Attorney DiSanto, the City generally uses a number of verbs to describe Council actions. These verbs may include passes, adopts, approves, accepts, receives, etc.

HUD regulations require the City to affirmatively further fair housing as a condition of receiving CDBG funding. Affirmatively furthering fair housing is defined as engaging in fair housing planning by conducting an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI), and taking appropriate actions to overcome the effects of identified impediments. (The City must also maintain records to document the analysis and actions taken.)

Either adoption or acceptance of the AI report by Council will satisfy the requirement to engage in planning by conducting an AI, and will provide sufficient direction to staff and the Housing Advisory Commission to work on the second step of taking appropriate actions to overcome the effects of the identified impediments.

For Program Year 2017, Council has already approved the CDBG budget which includes funding to implement actions to be completed in the first year. Where necessary, funding for additional action items will be included in future CDBG budgets, which Council will also have the opportunity to review and approve.



**CITY COUNCIL Q & A - ATTACHMENT PAGE 1** 

CITY COUNCIL Q & A - ATTACHMENT PAGE 2