

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES
CITY OF GLENDALE
PUBLIC HEARING #3
MUNICIPAL OFFICE COMPLEX
5850 W. GLENDALE AVENUE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**January 26, 2011
6:30 p.m.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris Flippen, Chair
Karen Mankoski, Vice-Chair
Sharon Wixon
Madelin Page
Pattie Johnston
Yolanda Hernandez
Shirley Wong
Randy Miller
Glenn O'Bannon

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mary Jean Eggleston

STAFF PRESENT: Erik Strunk, Community Partnerships Director
Mona Francis-Spellman, Revitalization Supervisor
Gilbert Lopez, Revitalization Administrator
Elizabeth Garcia, Revitalization Coordinator

I. Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Flippen called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed all attendees and scheduled presenters.

II. Roll Call

Chair Flippen took roll call. Committee members introduced themselves.

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes – January 12, 2011 and January 13, 2011

Committee member Mankoski motioned to approve the January 12, 2011 and January 13, 2011 meeting minutes as presented. Committee member Johnston made the second. The motion passed 9 – 0.

IV. Business from the Floor

None.

V. Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG), and Home Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program Funding Requests

For the CDBG Physical Improvement Grant requests, there are \$2,551,130 in funds requested with approximately \$732,763 in funds available based on FY 2010-11 CDBG funding levels.

For the Emergency Shelter Grant requests (ESG), there are \$115,000 in funds requested with approximately \$93,364 in funds available based on FY 2010-11 CDBG funding levels.

For the Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) grant requests, there are \$455,000 in funds requested with approximately \$412,959 in funds available based on FY 2010-11 CDBG funding levels.

Mr. Lopez stated that once the final figure for the FY 2011-12 CDBG funding levels are announced by the federal government in April, all awards will be adjusted prorata based on that final figure.

The Committee agreed to discuss the grant requests, make preliminary recommendations, make necessary revisions and then motion and vote on the final recommendation package as a whole.

VI. Public Hearing and Comment on FY 2011-12 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Process

Chair Flippen opened the floor for public comment on the FY 2011-12 CDBG/HOME/ESG process or the Council funding priorities.

No comments were made.

VII. FY 2011-12 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Physical Improvements Funding Requests, Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG), and Home Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program Funding Requests

Chair Flippen explained that during this meeting, the agencies that submitted CDBG Physical Improvement Funding Requests, Emergency Shelter Grants and Home Investment Partnership Program Requests will present their grant applications to the Committee. Presentations are limited to four minutes each. Committee members may ask clarifying questions and there would be no time limit on this question and answer period. Chair Flippen added that upon review and voting, the Committee will make final recommendations to Mayor and Council for approval in spring.

Mr. Strunk introduced staff and thanked the Committee members for their time and dedication during the hearings and review process and thanked the presenters for their participation in the funding process.

Mr. Strunk stressed the importance of the funding priorities as stated by Mayor and Council in Fall 2010:

1. Keep people in their homes.
2. Keep neighborhoods stabilized.
3. Emergency home repairs are a priority.
4. Provide assistance with food, shelter and utilities.

Mr. Lopez also thanked the Committee members for their participation in the hearing process and for the agencies who have applied for CDBG funds.

Presentations were made by representatives from the following agencies:

PHYSICAL IMPROVEMENTS

HOUSING RELATED

#2-1 A Bridge to Independent Living (ABIL) – Glendale Home Accessibility Program: \$90,850 request

Mr. Darrel Christensen, Director of Community Integration, stated that the request for the Glendale home modification program for people with disabilities would be enough for approximately 22 qualified homes/clients in the city. ABIL utilizes licensed contractors and also requires a 10 percent match from the clients. Currently, there have been 18 intakes for Glendale home modifications, with four clients ready to go out to bid. Typically, turnaround from client call to project completion is six to eight weeks, but with the assistance of city staff, turnaround has been lowered to a two- to three-week turnaround.

Mr. Christensen noted that last year, the goal was 25 home modifications in Glendale and 28 were completed. Mr. Christensen added that it is difficult for people to find accessible, affordable housing and ABIL hopes to close the gap for those looking for this type of housing.

Mr. Christensen thanked the Committee for its prior support.

Committee member Miller noted that the funding request included only 25 percent of a full-time employee and wondered how the rest of that employee's salary was paid. Mr. Christensen explained that this employee also works on projects in Peoria and other areas whereby the salary is funded by those factions.

Committee member Miller wondered how many projects were inspected last year. Mr. Christensen replied that all 28 projects were inspected.

Chair Flippen wondered how clients found out about ABIL. Mr. Christensen explained that word-of-mouth is the best advertisement, but there is also outreach via city staff, postings at mobile home parks and senior centers as well as through other assistance agencies.

Chair Flippen inquired about income screening. Mr. Christensen explained that clients are pre-screened over the phone and if that is successful, further confirmation is done in person at the home visit.

Chair Flippen inquired about the \$5,000 maximum assistance per client. Mr. Christensen explained that when a home assessment is performed, primary modification needs are identified and the project is put out to bid. A pre-established price list is provided by the contractors for basic jobs.

Chair Flippen thanked Mr. Christensen for his presentation.

#2-2 A New Leaf, Inc. – Faith House Shelter Renovation-Exterior/Interior, Landscaping, Heavy Duty Washer/Dryer: \$375,000 request

Mr. Michael Hughes approached the Committee and commented that A New Leaf has been in business for the past 40 years and was formerly called PreHab of Arizona. Mr. Hughes explained that the new name is more appropriate for the agency as clients are turning over a new leaf in their lives.

Mr. Hughes explained that the entire floor of Faith House needs to be replaced due to issues causing the subflooring to buckle. Once the subfloor is fixed, it then needs to be re-tiled. Mr. Hughes added that the building needs interior and exterior painting and needs a new washer and dryer.

Committee member Miller inquired as to the number of beds at the facility. Mr. Hughes replied that there are 16 emergency beds and 64 transitional beds.

Committee member Mankoski asked about additional sources of funding. Mr. Hughes replied that the agency is looking forward to \$50,000 in funding from the Bank of America. Mr. Hughes added that the agency has also applied for funding from the City of Peoria and other valley cities but has not received any confirmation at this time. A request to the City of Phoenix has been denied.

Chair Flippen wondered how the agency would utilize half of the funding request if so granted. Mr. Hughes replied that the subflooring is the greatest priority as the project could be completed in stages, with the tile afterward.

Chair Flippen noted that the floor was reported as not meeting construction standards and wondered if there was a change of code within the 12 years since the floor was installed. Mr. Hughes explained that the agency purchased Faith House after the floor was installed and was not aware of the fact that particle board was used for flooring at that time, which is substandard.

Committee member Page inquired as to how many Glendale residents are served at the facility. Mr. Hughes replied that there are approximately 11 to 15 Glendale residents served annually. Mr. Hughes added that many times residents of a city are transferred to other facilities in other valley cities for safety purposes and so there may be Glendale residents served at the Mesa location as well.

Chair Flippen thanked Mr. Hughes for his presentation.

#2-3 City of Glendale Emergency Home Repair Program – (RFP): \$300,000 request

Mr. Lopez announced that Community Services of Arizona (CSA) has withdrawn its grant application; however, the City of Glendale Revitalization Department will still be offering the same services via the RFP process. In this manner, the City of Glendale will be providing emergency home repairs for qualified, low-income residents utilizing the best qualified, best priced contractor via the bidding process. Mr. Lopez appreciated the prior services provided by CSA and commented that the agency is still eligible to participate through the RFP process.

#2-4 City of Glendale Community Housing Division – Modernization of Bathrooms at Three (3) Public Housing Units: \$200,000 request

Ms. Elaine Adamczyk, of the City of Glendale, explained that the goal of public housing is to provide decent, sanitary and affordable housing to low-income families. Ms. Adamczyk commented that there are 155 public housing units in three complexes in the City of Glendale. Ms. Adamczyk added that the good condition of the units is due to the ongoing improvements and consistent maintenance of the properties.

Ms. Adamczyk noted that the grant funds would be used to remodel 30 to 35 bathrooms. Ms. Adamczyk explained that overall, there are 167 bathrooms total in public housing, of which 43 have been remodeled so far. It was noted that due to the number of children and families moving in and out, there is quite a bit of wear and tear on the bathrooms.

Ms. Adamczyk proudly noted that the City of Glendale Public Housing Division was deemed a High Performer by HUD and the Division is very fiscally responsible.

Ms. Adamczyk commented that there are 362 individuals currently in public housing, of which 176 are children under 18 years of age. Moreover, over 79 percent are elderly, disabled or the working poor.

Ms. Adamczyk thanked the Committee for its past support.

Committee member Johnston inquired about the type of shower remodel. Ms. Adamczyk explained that these would be surround-showers.

Committee member Page inquired about handicap accessible units. Ms. Adamczyk replied that HUD does require that five percent of public housing units must be handicap accessible. The City of Glendale does have seven handicap accessible public housing units; however, at this time, none of them are in a critical state requiring upgrade.

Committee member Miller suggested that some of the bathroom decline might be due to neglect. Ms. Adamczyk agreed, citing the fact that there are children in the units and there are many clients who move in and out.

Chair Flippen felt that it was important to maintain the units on an ongoing cycle so that it is perpetually done in phases.

Committee member Hernandez inquired about unit inspections. Ms. Adamczyk replied that inspections are performed six times a year: one annual, three housekeeping, one maintenance and one extra inspection.

Chair Flippen thanked Ms. Adamczyk for her presentation.

#2-5 Valleylife, Inc. – Upgrade/Renovate Three (3) Residential Group Homes: \$80,000 request

Ms. Julie DeFer stated that Valleylife was formerly known as Valley of the Sun School and Habilitation Center and was established in 1947. Valleylife currently serves over 400 individuals with developmental disabilities, has 25 residential group homes and 10 vocational sites as well as other assistance programs.

Ms. DeFer commented that the agency would like to renovate some of its Glendale homes. The projects will include one roof, one kitchen, wall protections, upgrading three bathrooms to ADA requirements and flooring upgrades. Ms. DeFer distributed pictures of areas of disrepair.

Committee member Mankoski asked for details on further funding sources. Ms. Juanita Shafer explained that the agency recently took a \$1.2 million funding cut from the State of Arizona. Ms. Shafer added that the agency is always looking for other funding sources and noted that the Thunderbird Charities recently awarded the agency with \$50,000.

Ms. Shafer stated that many modifications to the homes were completed 15 years ago and there is much wear and tear to the homes due to the use of wheelchairs.

Committee member Johnston inquired about the project bidding process. Ms. Shafer replied that the agency usually utilizes its in-house contractor, but will compare his estimate to outside bids as well.

Chair Flippen thanked Ms. DeFer and Ms. Shafer for their presentation.

PUBLIC FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS

#2-6 Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS) – Emergency Shelter and Program Improvements: \$14,000 request

Mr. Mark Holleran stated that the \$14,000 request would be used for the purchase of durable, aluminum-framed benches with cushions which would serve as couches. Mr. Holleran noted that these benches would be installed at the Sunnyslope location in Phoenix, at which, 28 percent of families specify a prior Glendale residence.

Mr. Holleran explained that the bed bug problem has become so severe and intense that it is best for these types of aluminum-frame couches to be utilized as the cushions can be replaced as necessary at lower cost than replacing a more typical style of couch.

Committee member Miller inquired to the cost, process and success of eradicating bed bugs. Mr. Holleran replied that exterminators have tried various treatments that really have not been effective. Mr. Holleran commented that the exterminators are now using a heat treatment whereby 160- to 170-degree air is shot into an apartment and surrounding apartments. This, so far, has been the most successful treatment. Mr. Holleran noted that the best steps are to monitor the clientele and review clientele at intake and what is brought into the units. Mr. Holleran explained that only new items are allowed with invoices shown to personnel.

Chair Flippen thanked Mr. Holleran for his presentation.

#2-7 City of Glendale Code Compliance Department – Identification and Elimination of Code Violations in Residential Areas: \$90,000 request

Mr. Sam McAllen, Code Compliance Director, thanked the Committee for its past support and was hopeful that the partnership could continue this fiscal year.

Mr. McAllen gave the following presentation regarding the City of Glendale Code Compliance Department:

- Mission Statement:
 - To maintain established community standards that preserve and promote the health, safety and living environment of our community and neighborhoods
- City Council Strategic Goal
 - Be proactive in Code Enforcement to improve neighborhood appearance
- Codes and Ordinances
 - Property Maintenance
 - Zoning
 - Residential/Rental
 - General Nuisances
- Slum and Blight Elimination
 - Identify
 - Educate
 - Enforce
 - Eliminate
- Clean and Lien Program
 - Out-of-town and/or non-responsive owners
 - If no response after 30 days, the City remedies the violation, bills the homeowner and liens the property for reimbursement.
- Positive Impact of CDBG Funding: Proactive Code Enforcement Results
 - 2,122 Cases Initiated
 - 5,537 Inspections Conducted
 - 196 Properties Contractually Abated

- 63 percent Lien Repayment
- Request for Funding: \$90,000
 - Leverage CDBG funding with \$3,545 in General Funds
 - Identify and eliminate blighting and unsafe conditions
 - Achieve the City Council's goal of creating "One Community with Strong Neighborhoods"

Committee member Page asked if volunteers could be used in the Code Enforcement Program. Mr. McAllen replied in the positive, but only for identification of violations, not for remedy due to liability issues. Mr. McAllen further explained that there are currently five volunteers, of which four are in the field, working four hours a day, one day a week minimum.

Committee member Hernandez inquired about other methods of code violation reporting. Mr. McAllen explained that neighbors do call in violations but primarily, there are 11 inspectors and currently one CDBG-funded part-time inspector.

Chair Flippen wondered if the Code Enforcement Department works with other City Departments. Mr. McAllen commented that the Department does benefit from some other departmental software regarding homeownership and bank information.

Chair Flippen inquired about the performance of the CDBG-funded part-time inspector. Mr. McAllen reported that the employee handled 5,500 cases during so far.

Chair Flippen thanked Mr. McAllen for his presentation.

#2-8 City of Glendale Field Operations – Street Improvements West of the Orchard Glen Neighborhood

#2-9 City of Glendale Field Operations – Street Improvements West of the Orchard Glen Neighborhood: \$220,000

#2-10 City of Glendale Field Operations – Street Improvements In the Orchard Glen Neighborhood: \$240,000

Ms. Michelle Woytenko, of the City of Glendale, approached the Committee regarding three funding request for street improvements in census tract #928, a low-income neighborhood as deemed in the 2000 census.

Ms. Woytenko announced that the request for #2-8 has been withdrawn, as it will be completed with funds received from the FY 2010-11 CDBG grants.

Ms. Woytenko distributed sample pictures of the streets in the neighborhood and noted that the asphalt must be removed and the street must be repaved.

Chair Flippen wondered why there has not been regularly scheduled maintenance of the streets through the city's capital improvement budget. Ms. Woytenko explained that there is a systematic street maintenance program, however, only thin re-surfacing has been done on these streets and this type of upkeep is no longer adequate. Ms. Woytenko

added that because the city budget has been slashed, street repair has been reduced as well.

Chair Flippen wondered if the project could be completed in phases if necessary. Ms. Woytenko replied that if partial funding were received, the contractor would be asked to complete as much of the project as possible.

Chair Flippen wondered if the condition of these streets were typical in Glendale. Ms. Woytenko replied that, based on a recent assessment, approximately 10-15 percent of the Glendale streets are in this condition.

Chair Flippen thanked Ms. Woytenko for her presentation.

#2-11 City of Glendale Neighborhood Partnerships – East Catlin Court Neighborhood Construction and Installation – Landscaping, Sidewalk Modifications and Driveway Apron: \$200,000

Mr. Matt Cohrs, Neighborhood Partnerships Administrator, provided details regarding the funding request, including the following:

- Representatives from the East Catlin Court Neighborhood were in attendance in support of the grant request.
- The neighborhood is in a low-to-moderate income census tract and is in the downtown Glendale area.
- The request would include installation of historic street poles, installation of crushed granite, sidewalk and curb repair, installation of trees and bushes with corresponding irrigation sources and ADA ramps at sidewalk corners.

Mr. Cohrs noted that other streets in the neighborhood have recently been upgraded and this would be another phase in the community master plan. The goal is to rehabilitate the neighborhood over time and in phases as funds are available. Mr. Cohrs added that various city departments have partnered with the revitalization of the neighborhood including: Code Compliance, the Police Department, the CAT Team, Vineyard Church and the Neighborhood Partnerships Office.

Mr. Cohrs stressed that the improvements were a tangible way to improve a neighborhood and the community connection. Furthermore, the neighborhood is adjacent to the Glendale Centerline which is a Council priority for redevelopment. Lastly, the community experiences much traffic during downtown Glendale events. Mr. Cohrs added that the neighborhood has seen an increase of teachers, artists and the like moving into the homes which has added to the diversity of the neighborhood.

Chair Flippen cautioned that this type of streetscape project might not be able to be funded during this harsh economic climate and wondered if partial funding would be useful. Mr. Cohrs replied that upon receipt of funds, the contractor would be consulted for the optimum use of monies.

Chair Flippen thanked Mr. Cohrs for his presentation.

#2-12 City of Glendale Parks and Recreation Department – Glendale Community Center Revitalization Project: \$58,500 request

Mr. Darrel Reagan and Ms. Valenzuela were in attendance to present the grant request.

Mr. Reagan, a Senior Recreation Coordinator, stated that the revitalization project of the Community Center would spur pride in the community and also provide safety for the users.

Ms. Valenzuela commented that the Community Center is in the Heart of Glendale Community and serves over 150 people daily, mostly seniors and teens.

Ms. Valenzuela explained that much of the deterioration is due to graffiti, paint problems, substandard ADA, and broken asphalt on the basketball court.

Committee member Miller wondered if the paint was just faded or peeling. Ms. Valenzuela replied that it was just fading, but the colors are very old and in blocked sections and almost an eye-sore.

Chair Flippen suggested that vandalism was a problem. Ms. Valenzuela commented that she has worked at the Center for the past five years and the deterioration was there before she started at the Center. Ms. Valenzuela felt that the vandalism situation has improved at the Center and that visual improvement of the building would spur more community pride.

Chair Flippen inquired about a capital improvement budget. Mr. Reagan replied that there is an operating budget, but no plans for capital improvement funds at this time.

Mr. Reagan elaborated that average daily used is comprised of the following:

- 25 to 35 seniors
- 35 to 40 Kindergarten to 6th Grade Children
- 35-40 Teens Aged 12-17

Committee member Hernandez inquired about program fees. Ms. Valenzuela stated that the After-School Program does have a supply fee of \$35, but there are scholarships available.

Committee member Hernandez asked if any child is turned away from the After-School program. Ms. Valenzuela replied in the negative, adding that scholarship funds are utilized for children who cannot afford the program.

Chair Flippen thanked Mr. Regan and Ms. Valenzuela for their presentation.

#2-13 City of Glendale Economic Development Department – Visual Improvement Program: \$300,000

Mr. Robert Lamb presented the request for the City of Glendale Visual Improvement Program.

Mr. Lamb explained the following facts about the program

- What is the Visual Improvement Program?
 - The program assists in the improvement of properties located in the City's redevelopment area (Centerline)
- What are the Objectives?
 - Help the community to grow and meet the needs of residents.
 - Assist non-profits with redeveloping infill locations.
 - Help enhance the visual appeal of the Redevelopment area and therefore attract new services and amenities for the residents.
 - Attract new services to enhance the local community and increase the job base.
 - Encourage commercial and industrial property owners and long-term tenants to reinvest and renovate their properties.
- Mr. Lamb provided photos of previous projects.
- Mr. Lamb explained that clients must provide a 50 percent match for the project.
- There are currently 8 projects pending approval.
- Funding for the program is no longer available through the City's General Fund.

Committee member Mankoski expressed concern that there was not an exact breakdown of project expenditure in the \$300,000 request. Mr. Lamb replied that 100 percent of the funds go to the projects and there is no administrative cost deducted. Mr. Lamb added that once funding is received, the projects are determined.

Committee member Page asked for further project description. Mr. Lopez interjected that it could be exterior building upgrade or signage upgrade which increases business visibility. Mr. Lopez added that there is a 50 percent client match which solidifies owner stake in the project.

Chair Flippen wondered how businesses were to find out about the program. Mr. Lopez replied that it is advertised on the city website, word of mouth, and other means.

Chair Flippen inquired as to departmental oversight. Mr. Lopez replied that it was the responsibility of the Revitalization Department.

Committee member Miller wondered about the true impact of the program. Mr. Strunk interjected that a cohesive look to the downtown area was important and other businesses would be drawn to the downtown area if it had a visual appeal. Furthermore, the downtown area and Centerline area is a Council priority.

Chair Flippen thanked Mr. Lamb for his presentation.

HOMELESS PREVENTION

#3-1 A New Leaf, Inc. – Faith House Emergency Shelter Operations: \$55,000 request
Ms. Kathy DiNolfi, Program Manager for the Faith House represented the agency and noted that approximately 35-40 Glendale residents were served per fiscal year at the Emergency Shelter.

Ms. DiNolfi stated that the shelter provides supplemental domestic violence services such as case management, life skills, educational classes, child care and transition services.

Committee member Miller inquired as to the specific use of the funds. Ms. DiNolfi replied that the funds would be used to help pay for the salary of a licensed childcare worker plus some operational costs.

Chair Flippen thanked Ms. DiNolfi for her presentation.

#3-2 Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS) – Emergency Shelter Services for Homeless Single Adults: \$30,000 request

Mr. Mark Holleran explained that this request was to cover a small part of salary costs for emergency shelter services.

Mr. Holleran noted that at the downtown Phoenix facility, 15 percent of adults serviced stated prior residency in Glendale. Therefore, of the 4,000 men and women serviced annually, Glendale residents account for 600 people. For the Glendale residents, the cost is estimated at \$833,000 for 100 beds per year. Mr. Holleran stressed that the agency is happy to provide service, but needs additional funding beyond the county, state and federal funding already received.

Chair Flippen thanked Mr. Holleran for his presentation.

#3-3 Homeward Bound – Utilities Assistance for the Thunderbirds Family Village – Glendale: \$20,000 request

Ms. Dawn Bogart stated that the agency was requesting assistance with utilities cost at the Thunderbird Village location, which is actually in Phoenix but serves Glendale residents as well.

Ms. Bogart provided various program facts, including the following:

- The program serves victims of domestic violence and homelessness
- There are 80 apartment units which house 15 families annually or 60 individuals (20 adults and 40 kids)
- Utilities cost \$1,200 per year.
- The request is to fund less than two percent of the annual utility budget.
- Other funding sources include program service fees, HUD and general fundraising

Chair Flippen thanked Ms. Bogart for her presentation.

#3-3 UMOM New Day Centers, Inc. - Emergency Shelter for Families – Glendale: \$10,000 request

Ms. Karin Fletcher, Chief Development Officer, announced that the needs have never been so great for families experiencing homelessness.

Ms. Fletcher highlighted the following:

- For 2008-09, there was a 17 percent increase in homeless families in Arizona.
- This is the largest growing section of the population.
- UMOM is the only shelter that takes in all types of families (dual-parent, single-parent, grandparent, etc.)
- Services are wrapped around families for customized care.
- There is an average of 300 children in the emergency program each day.
- Last year, 88 clients reported Glendale as a primary residency.
- Various services are provided, including:
 - Case management
 - Crisis management
 - Childcare
 - Education
 - Afterschool and tutoring programs for kids
- UMOM merged with Helping Hands two years ago and now offers 232 low-income affordable housing units.
- 50 families were placed via the federal Rapid Rehousing Program.
- Foreclosures and job loss were the biggest reasons for homelessness stated by clients.
- UMOM estimates that \$120,000 has been spent on Glendale families and UMOM is only asking for \$10,000 in support for the upcoming fiscal year.

Committee member Miller inquired about the success rate of families becoming independent. Ms. Fletcher estimated that there was a 96 percent success rate for a family to stay in a home for one year upon leaving UMOM.

Chair Flippen thanked Ms. Fletcher for her presentation.

HOME

#4-1 Habitat for Humanity Central Arizona – Infill Acquisition and Renovation- \$255,000 request

Mr. Roger Schwierjohn addressed the Committee and stated that the request was for funding for housing renovation efforts for vacant and foreclosed homes in the City of Glendale. Mr. Schwierjohn noted that houses would be purchased, renovated and resold at affordable prices to qualified, low-income clients.

Mr. Schwierjohn noted that it costs on average \$35,000 per home for renovation and the home is made energy efficient. Many times this requires the installation of a new roof, Energy Star doors and windows, air conditioning unit or new stucco.

Mr. Schwierjohn was proud of the past projects completed in partnership with the City of Glendale and looked forward to future projects.

Mr. Schwierjohn stressed that the families do pay to purchase Habitat for Humanity homes and that they are not a gift. Mr. Schwierjohn noted that Habitat for Humanity is that 8th largest home builder in the world and has 1,500 affiliates in the United States.

Chair Flippen thanked Mr. Schwierjohn for his presentation.

#4-2 Newtown Community Development Corporation - Newtown Community Land Trust (CLT) Homeownership Project: \$200,000 request

Mr. Jonathan Peiffer represented the Newtown agency and provided various facts, including the following:

- The agency is in the business of purchasing, acquiring and rehabilitating homes.
- The goal is to provide quality, owner-occupied affordable housing.
- The land-trust model is utilized to provide affordable housing.
- This increases homeownership in the community, thereby stabilizing the neighborhood.
- All home buyers must complete homeowner education and counseling prior to purchase.
- Newtown buys and rehabilitates the property.
- The home is sold to a qualified buyer.
- When the home is sold, a deed restriction dictates that 25 percent of the assessed equity is portable, but 75 percent of the equity stays with the property.
- Newtown manages/owns 65 homes, with locations in Tempe, Chandler and one in Glendale.
- Newtown would like to focus on the Centerline area in Glendale.
- Of the 65 homes, there has not been one foreclosure.

Committee member Miller wondered what would happen if a homeowner did not leave or sell the property. Mr. Peiffer explained that there is a 99-year renewable ground lease which could be transferred to other owners but there is still no land deed.

Committee member Miller inquired as to the process of selling the property. Mr. Peiffer explained that Newtown has the first right of refusal to purchase the property, indicating that most times, Newtown will buy back the property.

Chair Flippen thanked Mr. Peiffer for his presentation.

VI. Adjournment

Committee member Miller motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:01 p.m. Committee member Wong made the second. The motion passed 9 – 0.

The next meeting will be Thursday, January 27, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. at Council Chambers at 5850 W. Glendale Avenue.

Respectfully submitted,

Recording Secretary
Denise Kazmierczak