Village of Arlington Heights
Housing Commission
Commissions Room, 2nd Floor
Arlington Heights Village Hall, 33 S. Arlington Heights Rd
Arlington Heights, IL 60005
February 16, 2022
7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes 11-17-21

IV. REPORTS

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Single Familly Rehab Program Status Report
B. Calandar of Publicity for Housing Commission Program
C. Affordable Housing Trust Fund
D. Update on Rental Registry Recommendation

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2021-2022 CDBG Group Home Rehab Projects
B. Arlington Heights Affordable Housing Data

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Topics for March Housing Commission Meeting
B. Regular Meeting Day
C. Schedule of March 2022 Housing Commission Meeting

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Persons with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services, such as an American Sign Language interpreter or written materials in accessible formats, should contact David Robb, Disability Services Coordinator, at 33 S. Arlington Heights Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005, (847)368-5793 (Voice), (847)368-5980 (Fax) or drobb@vah.com.

Housing Commission
2/16/2022

Item: Minutes 11-17-21

Department: Planning & Community Development

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
Minutes 11/17/21	Minutes

DRAFT

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS HOUSING COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
November 17, 2021

IN ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners Present:	Ken Kiefer	John Eggum
	David Miller	William Delea
Commissioners Absent:	None	

Staff Present: Nora Boyer, Housing Planner/Staff Liaison

I. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call
Present: K. Kiefer, J. Eggum, D. Miller, W. Delea

It was announced that Chairman/Commissioner Tripp has resigned from the Housing Commission. Commissioner Eggum was selected to chair this meeting.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Kiefer, seconded by Commissioner Delea to approve the minutes of the October 20, 2021 meeting.

The motion was approved
Ayes: K. Kiefer, J. Eggum, D. Miller, & W. Delea
Nays: 0

IV. REPORTS
None

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Single-Family Rehab Program
Ms. Boyer reviewed the loan application files.
Case 20-01: The application has been withdrawn by the home owner.

Case 20-16: The construction work is being completed.

Case 21-02: Staff is working with the home owner to develop a scope of work. The tentative items for the scope of work are: waterproofing the crawlspace; repairing water damage at the back door; soffit repair; chimney tuckpointing, upgrading the electrical service; and evaluating HVAC system for uneven heating.

B. Review of 2021-2022 CDBG Budget

The overall CDBG budget was reviewed for the 2021 budget year which began on October 1, 2021. Ms. Boyer gave the update that Journeys|The Road home will not be using the $28,000 allocation for their new building. Several other suburbs and Cook County had allocated CDBG grants for the project. If the CDBG funds were used for the project, a number of Federal procurement and other regulations would apply. The agency determined that since the CDBG funds were a small part of the overall budget that the Federal requirements were an issue especially since they applied to the entire project. Therefore, Journeys has withdrawn their request for the CDBG funds, including the $28,000 allocated by the Village of Arlington Heights. Journeys is proceeding with the project but without Federal funding. Journeys will still receive the allocation of $5,000 for homeless services. Ms. Boyer stated that it might be possible to apply Federal funds for a separate project at the building after completion of the building.

The Single-Family Rehab Program budget is $60,465.

Ms. Boyer said that $85,000 has been allocated to the Group Home and Transitional Housing Program. There are three applications to that program.

The allocation for public infrastructure projects is $150,000.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Public Awareness of Housing Commission Issues including Fair Housing

There was a discussion of promoting programs on Village social media and placing Facebook ads. Commissioner Eggum commented that the section of the Village Code about the Housing Commission includes the procedure for the Housing Commission's handling of fair housing complaints, no complaints have been coming to the Housing Commission. He suggested Village social media as a way to publicize that fair housing complaints can be made to the Village.

Ms. Boyer stated that a non-profit organization called Open Communities provides online workshop covering fair housing issues and education. She suggested that the Village could publicize Open Communities' programs as a way of providing education to the public.

Ms. Boyer said that Fair Housing month is the month of April. She said that sometimes HUD puts out information that can be used by municipalities.

Mr. Moens asked about the location of the information about fair housing in the Village Code. Commissioner Eggum stated that the information about fair housing including the Housing Commission's role is in the section of the Village Code about the Housing Commission. He said that the Housing Commission's role concerning fair housing complaints is something the Housing Commission hasn't done or has not done for a long time because complaints have not been received. This is why the Housing Commission is thinking the public may not be aware of the ability to make those complaints to the

Village. Commissioner Eggum pointed out that there are other avenues for making fair housing complaints, but there is a desire to let the public know that making a complaint to the Village is an option. Ms. Boyer specified that the provisions in the Village Code about fair housing are in Chapter 6, Section 6-504 of the Village Code. Commissioner Kiefer said that the section covers discrimination in housing and the handling of complaints.

Ms. Boyer said that the Village sometimes received questions and potential complaints about fair housing. She said these concerns are sometimes rectified by Staff working with landlords. David Robb in the Health and Human Services Department sometimes works with landlords to make reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. She said that fair housing education is worthwhile but she wanted the Commissioners to understand that issues are sometimes raise by residents that do not rise to the level of formal complaints that reach the Housing Commission. She said that when taking complaints to the Housing Commission has been raised with residents, they have been reluctant to take their concerns to open, public meetings especially if their issues can be resolved otherwise.

B. Public Awareness of Housing Commission Issues including Fair Housing
It was commented that the Housing Commission has a budget that could be used for publicity materials. Commissioner Eggum suggested that a calendar be drafted at the January meeting of a program to be publicized each month throughout the year.

Commissioner Miller asked about the process for publicizing information by the Village. Ms. Boyer explained that the Village has a Communications and Outreach staff person who coordinates announcements via the Village's social media. It was decided that the Commissioners would give some possible strategies and language some thought and this topic will be placed on the January Housing Commission meeting when a timetable for publicity could be put together. Ms. Boyer said that she will ask the Communications and Outreach Coordinator how she would like to receive information on this topic.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Schedule Consideration of CDBG Applications for Group Home Renovations
Ms. Boyer stated that the Village Board approved $85,000 in CDBG funds for the 2021/2022 CDBG program year. As in the past, the Village Board approved the overall project funding amount and the Housing Commission is to approved the individual projects and their allocations. There are three applications totaling

One of the projects is for a transitional housing home owned by Shelter Inc. which required a zoning change. The zoning change was recently approved. Application for one group home each were receive from Little City Foundation and Clearbrook.

Ms. Boyer suggested that the Housing Commission could review the applications at the January 2022 meeting if the representatives from the agencies are available that evening to answer questions. Ms. Boyer said that she has asked the agencies to provide photographs and general information about the nature of the homes and residents.

Commissioner asked is this program is analogous to the Single-Family Rehab Program. Ms. Boyer stated that it is; however, Commissioner Kiefer pointed out that the funds under the Group Home and Transitional housing program have traditionally been provided as grants rather than loans. Ms. Boyer pointed out that Federal regulations required that if a CDBG-funded property is not continuously used for a CDBG-eligible purpose for 5 years after the closing of a grant, the grant must be repaid.

Commissioner Delea stated that group homes owned by non-profit agencies are different from home owned privately by residents. Commissioner Eggum stated that if funds to agencies would not be repaid until the house is not longer used for a CDBG-eligible use, then repayment may be something that should be discussed. Ms. Boyer stated that in her tenure with the Village, none of these non-profit agencies have sold a home owned by them and used as a group home of transitional housing.

Commissioner Kiefer asked about the transitional housing facility owned by Shelter Inc. on Golf Rd. that was used for sheltered housing and for which the Housing Commission approved a grant. Ms. Boyer stated that the grant was not used because shortly after it was approved the landlord notified Shelter Inc of their intent to sell the home. The home that would be renovated under the current CDBG application is owned by Shelter Inc.

Commissioner Eggum state that in addition to the other information mentioned, it would be helpful if the agencies have at least on construction bid from a contractor as backup documentation that their grant amount applications are reasonable and accurate.

The review of the applications will be put on the Housing Commission agenda for the January 2022 meeting.

B. Scheduling of January 2022 Meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Delea, seconded by Commissioner Miller to not hold a Housing Commission meeting in December 2022. The motion was approved unanimously.

The January monthly meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, January 19, 2022 at 7:00 pm.

C. Other

It was asked when the Housing Commission’s rental registry recommendation will go to the Village Board. Ms. Boyer said that the Village Board meetings are currently taken up by the topic of the 2022 budget, and other matters will be scheduled likely beginning in January 2022.

Commissioner Delea asked if including single-family detached homes used as rentals was considered in the rental registry proposal in light of the foreclosure period. Commissioner Eggum responded that the existing multiple dwelling unit licensing program was used as the springboard for the proposal which does not include single-dwelling units, but it is something to think about. He said though that a main purpose of the proposal is to gather data on affordable housing and the rent levels for rented single-family homes is probably too high to be considered affordable. There was a discussion concerning other ways to possibly gather information on the numbers of rented single-family homes, especially those owned by owners of more than one single-family rental. One data source suggested was the Cook County Assessor’s Office. Commissioner

Eggum asked, and Ms. Boyer will inquire, whether the Village's GIS division can sort housing units by the name of the owner which may reveal owners of multiple single-family homes.

Mr. Moens asked about Affordable Housing TF priorities and process discussed by the Housing Commission in previous months. Ms. Boyer said that the recommendation on this topic, like that concerning the rental registry, will be taken up after the 2022 Village budget is approved.

Another member of the public commented that the Village should eliminate the food and beverage tax so that residents have more money to spend. She also commented that government services should be consolidated amount government entities in order to conserve resources. Commission Eggum commented that these topics are outside the mission of the Housing Commission and suggested that the commenter could take these comments to the Village Board during the Village Board Citizens to be Heard item on the Village Board agenda.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Delea to adjourn the meeting at 7:40 pm. The motion was approved unanimously.

The next meeting was set for Wednesday, January 19, 2022 at 7 pm.

Housing Commission
2/16/2022

Item: Single Familly Rehab Program Status Report

Department: Planning & Community Development

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	**Type**
Sing Family Rehab Program Status Report	Report

02/09/22

SINGLE-FAMILY REHAB PROGRAM STATUS REPORT - 2021-2022

FILE # SUFFIX	APPLICATION SUBMITTED	OUT TO BID	SCOPE OF WORK SUMMARY	STAFF COST ESIMATE	PROJ COST	CHANGE ORDERS	TOTAL PROJECT COST	PAID TO DATE	STATUS
20-06 MC536	12/15/20	7/15/21	Requesting: Furnace, Windows, Electrical	25,000	$21,764	$8,880 Exterior platform piers and water damage in bathroom and kitchen	$30,644	$30,164	Work to be competed in January 2022. File is being closed out.
21-02 DO1217	7/7/2021		TBD	TBD					Developing scope of work and comparing basement water proofing proposals.
21-03 ZA1504	11/23/2021	By Owner	Window and door replacement	$14,800	$14,759	$0	$14,759		Work completed. File is being closed.

SFR LOAN PROGRAM - FINANCIAL SUMMARY

2021/2022 CDBG ALLOCATION:	$	60,465.00
20-06		10,860 ($19,784 paid in prior program/fiscal year)
21-02 Estimate		TBD
21-03		14,759
TITLE SEARCHES/APPRAISALS/LEAD PAINT COSTS/PERMITS:	-	TBD
LESS PROGRAM INCOME NOT YET RECEIVED:	-	TBD
Total:	$	34,846

Loans Repaid CDBG Fiscal Year To Date: 10/1/21 – 9/30/22

Case #	Date Paid	Yrs to Repayment	Amount	Reason sold (if known)
06-01	10/25/2021	15 years	$12,354	Unknown
11-04	10/22/1021	10 years	$32,236	Unknown
88-89	12/13/2021	32 years	$14,041	Unknown
	Total		**$58,631**	

Housing Commission
2/16/2022

Item: Affordable Housing Trust Fund

Department: Planning & Community Development

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	**Type**
Affordable Housing Trust Fund	Exhibits

Report to the Housing Commission

To:	Chairman and Members of the Housing Commission
From:	Nora Boyer, Housing Planner
RE:	Affordable Housing Trust Fund
Meeting Date:	February 16, 2022
Prepared:	February 9, 2022

On January 10, 2022, the memorandum “Affordable Housing Trust Fund – Priorities and Process” was reviewed by the Village Trustees at their Committee of the Whole meeting. At the February 7, 2022 Village Board meeting, the Village Board approved a motion to direct staff to proceed with requesting Letters of Interest and the next steps as outlined in the report (i.e. “Affordable Housing Trust Fund – Priorities and Process”) with final ranking criteria and feedback from the Village Board to occur when they are received.

Staff is proceeding with drafting a Request for Letters of Intent which will be provided to the Housing Commission for comment prior to its release.

Exhibits:

1. Memorandum: Affordable Housing Trust Fund – Priorities and Process (Dated: 12/27/21)
2. Committee of the Whole, Meeting Minutes, January 10, 2022

Exhibit 1

MEMORANDUM

To: Charles Witherington-Perkins, Director of Planning & Community Development

From: Nora Boyer, Housing Planner

RE: Affordable Housing Trust Fund – Priorities and Process

Date: December 27, 2021

Background
In 2013, the Village Board approved the creation of the Arlington Heights Affordable Housing Trust Fund. The purpose of the Arlington Heights Affordable Housing Trust Fund (Village Code Chapter 7, Sections 1201-1208) "is to address the attainable housing goals, policies and programs of the Village Board by providing sustainable financial resources to address the Attainable Housing needs of Eligible Households in Arlington Heights; and preserving and producing dedicated Attainable Housing."

Revenue into the Trust Fund may come from several sources specified in the Trust Fund Ordinance. To date, the revenue into the Trust Fund has come from the sale of the Village's tax-exempt bond cap and fees in lieu of affordable housing units paid by multi-family housing developers.

In 2020, the Village Board approved and Inclusionary Housing Ordinance that formalized the Village's affordable housing unit and fee-in-lieu requirements.

The Affordable Housing Trust Fund Ordinance discusses three activity types for the use of funds:

1. Creation and preservation of Attainable Housing including, without limitations, new construction, rehabilitation, and adaptive reuse;
2. Acquisition and disposition, including without limitation, vacant land, single family homes, multi-unit buildings, and other existing structures that may be used in whole or part to provide Attainable Housing; and
3. Payments for costs incurred in connection with administering the Housing Trust Fund. No costs shall be reimbursed except pursuant to a written agreement between the Village and any third-party approved by the Village to administer a program or a funded program.

The Village Board asked Staff and the Housing Commission to make recommendations by the end of the summer 2021 regarding specific priorities and processes for making Trust Fund allocations.

Priorities for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund
Staff prepared lists of possible priority activities for the Affordable Housing Trust for the Housing Commission's review. The possible activities were grouped into tables according to the three general activity areas discussed in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Ordinance. Staff suggested its rankings for the activities using a standard of high, medium, or low priority. The Housing Commissioners discussed the

priority rankings at their February and April 2021 meetings. The high priorities identified by the Housing Commission are as follows. Attachment A represents all priorities ranked by the Housing Commission.

Trust Funds High Priorities

Creation and Preservation of Affordable Housing

For-Profit Developers:

- New construction of multi-family rental units
- Preservation/rehab of existing multi-family rental units

Non-Profit Developers:

- New construction of multi-family rental units
- Preservation/rehab of existing multi-family rental units
- Adaptive reuse of existing structures for rental units
- New construction of group homes, supportive housing and transitional housing

Acquisition and Disposition of Property

- Acquisition/disposition of multi-family buildings
- Acquisition/disposition of housing to be used as group homes and supportive housing

Payment of Costs Incurred in Connection with the Trust Fund

- Costs to administer the Trust Fund (typically 5 – 15%)
- Payments for costs of consultant services for concepts, architectural services, or other pre-construction services for Village-initiated development
- Costs associated with working with a non-profit partner to develop concepts or other pre-construction work for Village-initiated projects

Priority Populations

- Senior/Elderly households
- Veterans
- Persons with disabilities
- Current Arlington Heights residents
- Employees of Arlington Heights businesses

Forms of Assistance

For-Profit Developers:

- Zero or low interest loans to private, for-profit developers to make units more affordable

Non-Profit Developers:

- Zero or low interest loans
- Deferred zero or low interest loans
- Forgivable loans
- Long term (ex. 99 years) leases of property purchased by the Village

Other Considerations

- Leveraging of other funds
- Proposals to provide units lower than the maximum income eligibility (ex. affordable to 30% or 50% of Area Median Income (AMI) rather than 60% of AMI for rental)

Steps/Process for Affordable Housing Trust Fund

At its May and June meetings, the Housing Commission discussed possible options for taking applications and distributing/utilizing funds from Arlington Heights' Affordable Housing Trust Fund. The options were:

1. Request for Letters of Interest (LOI). Issue a Request for Letters of Interest to be sent to non-profit and for-profit affordable housing developers.
2. Request for Proposals (RFP). Draft and issue Request for Proposals (RFP) informed by the received letters of interest and possible group discussions with developers submitting letters of interest.
3. Evaluation Requests for Proposals. Staff to evaluate submittals and make recommendations to the Housing Commission and Village Board.

Housing Commission Motion

At the June 16, 2021 Housing Commission meeting, a motion was made by Commissioner Eggum, seconded by Commissioner Kiefer to recommend to the Village Board:

1. Approval of the priorities identified by the Housing Commission in consultation with Staff created for use in operating the Affordable Housing Trust Fund provided as Attachment A; and
2. That the Village Board authorize the publication of information about the Affordable Housing Trust fund including the priorities for the purpose of requesting Letters of Interest from developers to be used by the Housing Commission to create a formal Request for Proposals targeted to those developers who submitted Letters of Interest.

Ayes: A.Tripp, J. Sweis, J. Eggum, K. Kiefer, W. Delea, and D. Miller.
Nayes: None
Absent: None

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Village Board:

a) Provide any feedback on the Trust Fund priority rankings; and
b) Concur with staff proceeding with the steps as outlined.

Attachments

Attachment A - Full List of Priority Rankings as Approved by the Housing Commission June 16, 2021
Attachment B – Minutes of the Housing Commission April 21, 2021, May 19, 2021 and June 16, 2021

ATTACHMENT A

Full List of Priority Rankings (High, Medium and Low)
as Approved by the Housing Commission and Recommended to
the Village Board on June 16, 2021

ACTIVITY TYPE 1: Creation and preservation of Attainable Housing including, without limitation, new construction, rehabilitation and adaptive reuse			
FOR-PROFIT Developer Activities			
High	Medium	Low	**HOMEOWNERSHIP** Activities:
		X	New construction of single-family homes
		X	New construction of multi-family units
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing single-family homes
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing multi-family units
		X	Adaptive Reuse of existing structures
			RENTAL Activities
		X	New construction of single-family homes
X			New construction of multi-family units
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing single-family homes
X			Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing multi-family units
	X		Adaptive Reuse of existing structures
NOT-FOR-PROFIT Developer Activities			
High	Medium	Low	**HOMEOWNERSHIP** Activities:
		X	New construction of single-family homes
		X	New construction of multi-family units
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing single-family homes
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing multi-family units
		X	Adaptive Reuse of existing structures
			RENTAL Activities
		X	New construction of single-family homes
X			New construction of multi-family units
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing single-family homes
X			Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing multi-family units
X			Adaptive Reuse of existing structures
X			New construction of group homes or supportive housing
X			New construction of transitional housing

ACTIVITY TYPE 2: Acquisition and disposition, including without limitation, vacant land, single family homes, multi-family buildings, and other existing structure that may be used in whole or in part to provide Attainable Housing			
High	Medium	Low	
		X	Land acquisition for affordable housing development (ex. Community Land Bank or Community Land Trust)
		X	Land acquisition for mixed income housing development
		X	Acquisition/disposition of single-family homes
X			Acquisition/disposition of multi-family buildings
X			Acquisition/disposition of housing to be used as group homes or supportive housing
	X		Acquisition/disposition of housing to be used as transitional housing
		X	Homebuyer assistance (ex. down payment assistance program)
		X	Tenant based rental assistance (rent subsidies to landlords for low/mod income households)
		X	Project based rental assistance (monthly rent subsidies to make units affordable)
			Other

ACTIVITY TYPE 3: Payments for costs incurred in connection with administering the Housing Trust Fund			
High	Medium	Low	
X			Costs incurred in connection with administering the Housing Trust Fund (5 – 15% is typical)
X			Payment for costs of consultant services for concepts, architectural services, or other pre-construction services for Village-initiated developments
	X		Payment for costs of consultant services for concepts, architectural services, or other pre-construction services for developer-initiated developments
X			Costs associated with working with a non-profit partner to develop concepts or other pre-construction work for Village-initiated projects
	X		Costs associated with working with a non-profit partner to develop concepts or other pre-construction work for developer-initiated projects

Other considerations for uses of the Trust Fund:

PRIORITY POPULATIONS: For Trust Fund Activities			
High	Medium	Low	
X			Senior/Elderly: Households with at least one household member ___ years of age or older
X			Veterans: Households in which one or more persons is a military veteran
X			Disabled: Households in which one or more persons 18 years of age or older is severely disabled
X			Current Arlington Heights Residents
X			Employees of Arlington Heights Businesses
			Other

FORMS OF ASSISTANCE: To be provided through the Trust Fund			
FOR-PROFIT DEVELOPER assistance to create more affordable units or make units affordable to lower income levels			
High	Medium	Low	
		X	Predevelopment costs (ex. feasibility studies, design)
		X	Grants
	X		Zero or low interest loans
	X		Deferred zero or low interest loans
	X		Forgivable loans
	X		Long term (ex. 99 year) lease of Village owned property
X			Zero or low interest loans to private, for-profit developers to make units more affordable
	X		Long term lease (ex. 99 years) of property purchased by the Village
NOT-FOR-PROFIT DEVELOPER assistance to create more affordable units or make units affordable to lower income levels			
High	Medium	Low	
	X		Predevelopment costs (ex. feasibility studies, design)
	X		Grants
X			Zero or low interest loans
X			Deferred zero or low interest loans
X			Forgivable loans
	X		Long term (ex. 99 year) lease of Village owned property
	X		Grants to non-profit developers to make units more affordable
X			Long term lease (ex. 99 years) of property purchased by the Village

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS			
High	Medium	Low	
X			Leveraging of other funds
	X		Sustainability (Green/LEED)
X			Proposals to provide units lower than maximum income eligibility (ex. affordable to 30% or 50% AMI rather than 60% AMI for rental)

As recommended by Housing Commission June 16, 2021

Attachment B

Minutes of the Housing Commission:

- April 21, 2021
- May 19, 2021
- June 16, 2021

APPROVED

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS HOUSING COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
April 21, 2021

IN ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners Present:	Andrew Tripp	Ken Kiefer	John Eggum
	David Miller	Jennifer Sweis	William Delea
Commissioners Absent:	Alex Hageli		
Staff Present:	Nora Boyer, Housing Planner/Staff Liaison		

I. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call
The following Commissioners responded to roll: Tripp, Kiefer, Eggum, Miller, Delea & Sweis.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Kiefer to approve the minutes of the March 2, 2021 meeting.

The motion was approved
Ayes: Tripp, Kiefer, Eggum, Miller, Delea & Sweis
Nays: 0.

IV. REPORTS
Ms. Boyer announced that the developer for the Arlington 425 project has elected to comply with the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance with respect to the amended development.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Affordable Housing Trust Fund Priorities
The Housing Commissioners discussed the matter of priorities for the Village's Affordable Housing Trust Fund. A consensus reached and it reflected in the tables below.

ACTIVITY TYPE 1: Creation and preservation of Attainable Housing including, without limitation, new construction, rehabilitation and adaptive reuse			
FOR-PROFIT Developer Activities			
High	Medium	Low	**HOMEOWNERSHIP** Activities:
		X	New construction of single-family homes
		X	New construction of multi-family units
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing single-family homes
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing multi-family units
		X	Adaptive Reuse of existing structures
			RENTAL Activities
		X	New construction of single-family homes
X			New construction of multi-family units
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing single-family homes
X			Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing multi-family units
	X		Adaptive Reuse of existing structures
NOT-FOR-PROFIT Developer Activities			
High	Medium	Low	**HOMEOWNERSHIP** Activities:
		X	New construction of single-family homes
		X	New construction of multi-family units
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing single-family homes
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing multi-family units
		X	Adaptive Reuse of existing structures
			RENTAL Activities
		X	New construction of single-family homes
X			New construction of multi-family units
	X		Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing single-family homes
X			Preservation/Rehabilitation of existing multi-family units
X			Adaptive Reuse of existing structures
X			New construction of group homes or supportive housing
X			New construction of transitional housing

ACTIVITY TYPE 2: Acquisition and disposition, including without limitation, vacant land, single family homes, multi-family buildings, and other existing structure that may be used in whole or in part to provide Attainable Housing			
High	Medium	Low	
		X	Land acquisition for affordable housing development (ex. Community Land Bank or Community Land Trust)
		X	Land acquisition for mixed income housing development
		X	Acquisition/disposition of single-family homes
X			Acquisition/disposition of multi-family buildings

X			Acquisition/disposition of housing to be used as group homes or supportive housing
	X		Acquisition/disposition of housing to be used as transitional housing
		X	Homebuyer assistance (ex. down payment assistance program)
		X	Tenant based rental assistance (rent subsidies to landlords for low/mod income households)
		X	Project based rental assistance (monthly rent subsidies to make units affordable)
			Other

ACTIVITY TYPE 3: Payments for costs incurred in connection with administering the Housing Trust Fund			
High	Medium	Low	
X			Costs incurred in connection with administering the Housing Trust Fund (5 – 15% is typical)
X			Payment for costs of consultant services for concepts, architectural services, or other pre-construction services for Village-initiated developments
	X		Payment for costs of consultant services for concepts, architectural services, or other pre-construction services for developer-initiated developments
X			Costs associated with working with a non-profit partner to develop concepts or other pre-construction work for Village-initiated projects
	X		Costs associated with working with a non-profit partner to develop concepts or other pre-construction work for developer-initiated projects

Other considerations for uses of the Trust Fund:

PRIORITY POPULATIONS: For Trust Fund Activities			
High	Medium	Low	
X			Senior/Elderly: Households with at least one household member ___ years of age or older
X			Veterans: Households in which one or more persons is a military veteran
X			Disabled: Households in which one or more persons 18 years of age or older is severely disabled
X			Current Arlington Heights Residents
X			Employees of Arlington Heights Businesses
			Other

FORMS OF ASSISTANCE: To be provided through the Trust Fund			
FOR-PROFIT DEVELOPER assistance to create more affordable units or make units affordable to lower income levels			
High	Medium	Low	
		X	Predevelopment costs (ex. feasibility studies, design)

		X	Grants
	X		Zero or low interest loans
	X		Deferred zero or low interest loans
	X		Forgivable loans
	X		Long term (ex. 99 year) lease of Village owned property
X			Zero or low interest loans to private, for-profit developers to make units more affordable
	X		Long term lease (ex. 99 years) of property purchased by the Village
NOT-F**OR-PROFIT** DEVELOPER assistance to create more affordable units or make units affordable to lower income levels			
High	Medium	Low	
	X		Predevelopment costs (ex. feasibility studies, design)
	X		Grants
X			Zero or low interest loans
X			Deferred zero or low interest loans
X			Forgivable loans
	X		Long term (ex. 99 year) lease of Village owned property
	X		Grants to non-profit developers to make units more affordable
X			Long term lease (ex. 99 years) of property purchased by the Village

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS			
High	Medium	Low	
X			Leveraging of other funds
	X		Sustainability (Green/LEED)
X			Proposals to provide units lower than maximum income eligibility (ex. affordable to 30% or 50% AMI rather than 60% AMI for rental)

The public was asked for any comments they may have. Melissa Cayer asked if the people who determine people's eligibility for housing funding are certified. Ms. Boyer said that there is no certification process and that she determines whether applicants are eligible the for the Single-Family Rehab Program.

B. Single-Family Rehab Program

Ms. Boyer reviewed the active cases. There was no project for presentation at this meeting.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2021-2022 Annual Action Plan – Community Development Block Grant Budget

Ms. Boyer stated that the Housing Commission traditionally makes a request to the Village Board for CDBG funds to support the Single-Family Rehab Program, and for the past several years has made a request under which group home projects have been funded.

Ms. Boyer said that she prepared and submitted applications for these two programs since the Housing Commission did not meet between the date the application process was opened up for the 2021-2022 year and the application deadline. She requested $250,000 for each program which far exceeds the amount that would likely be needed with the intention that the Housing Commission would adjust the requested amounts. She said that under the application process, applicants are able to decrease (but not increase) their requested amounts after the deadline date. Ms. Boyer stated that the Village received individual grant applications from a few non-profit organizations for group home renovations totaling approximately $105,000.

A motion was made by Commissioner Eggum, seconded by Commissioner Miller to recommend to the Village Board that it allocate $67,000 for the Single Family Rehab Program and $105,000 for the Group Home Acquisition and Rehab Program from the Village CDBG funding for the 2021-2022 program year.

Ayes: Tripp, Kiefer, Eggum, Miller, Delea & Sweis
Nays: 0.
Commissioner Delea had left the meeting at this point.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

The members of the Housing Commission asked that the following items be added to the agenda for the next meeting:

1. Rental Registry
2. The Village owned property off Rand Rd. including a map

The public was invited to make any comments. Keith Moens complimented the Housing Commission on having stuck to the requirements of the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance at the April meeting when discussing the Arlington 425 and 310 Arlington developments. He commented that the Village should look at updating the ordinance in the future with regard to the amounts of affordable housing required and because senior housing is not included. He mentioned that State Senator Ann Gillespie is looking into proposing State law to require inclusionary affordable housing.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Kiefer, seconded by Commissioner Tripp, to adjourn the meeting. The motion was approved.

Ayes: Tripp, Kiefer, Eggum, Sweis & Miller
Nays: 0.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting be held on May 19, 2021 at 7 pm.

<u>APPROVED</u>

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS HOUSING COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
May 19, 2021

IN ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners Present:	John Eggum	Ken Kiefer
	David Miller	William Delea
Commissioners Absent:	Andrew Tripp	Jennifer Sweis
Staff Present:	Nora Boyer, Housing Planner/Staff Liaison	

I. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order by substitute chairman John Eggum at 7:00 p.m. It was announced that Commissioner Hageli has resigned from the Housing Commission.

II. Roll Call
The following Commissioners responded to roll: Eggum, Kiefer, Miller, & Delea.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Kiefer, seconded by Commissioner Miller to approve the minutes of the April 21, 2021 meeting.

The motion was approved
Ayes: Eggum, Miller, Delea & Kiefer
Nays: 0.

IV. REPORTS
No Reports

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Affordable Housing Trust Fund Process
The Commission has gone over the priorities as reflected in the last meeting minutes. The next subject for discussion is the process for the Trust Fund. Commissioner Eggum listed the following options for consideration:

1. Issuing a general Request for Proposals (RFP) stating that there is a certain amount of money available for to support an affordable housing development and inviting proposals that align

with the Village's priorities as reflected in the rankings.
2. Issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) stating that three is a certain amount of money available for to support an affordable housing development and inviting proposals that align with certain of the Village's priorities.
3. Address specific developers (for-profit and non-profit developers) to seek their input on how to proceed with the RFP process.

Commissioner Eggum commented that the discussion tonight will a beginning of the discussion regarding developing a process for awarding money from the Trust Fund. He asked if any of the members had comments on the three options presented.

Commissioner Miller said that he thinks that an RFP should be firmed up as much as possible regarding what the Village is looking for before an RFP is issued. Otherwise there will be a wide range of responses that will be difficult to evaluate.

Commissioner Kiefer said that it would be helpful to have more information about the a specific direction the Village Board would prefer to go in, and he asked about exchanging information with the Village Board. He said that issuing a general RFP would provide information on what's out there.

Commissioner Delea agreed that it would be good to know what the possibilities are and what the interest is; and a general RFP would be a pay to find out what can be done.

Commissioner Eggum pointed out that a general RFP may result in a wide variety of responses, but could also result in limited interest. Commissioner Eggum suggested:

1. Soliciting interest by contacting developer, providing information on the Village's priorities, and asking if they would be interested in responding to an full RFP. A meeting would be held with those developers who responded to gather information that would be helpful in developing the full RFP.
2. The release a full, focused RFP informed by the information gathered at the meeting with the interested parties.

Commissioner Eggum said that we don't want to waste peoples' time, and the developers could help develop RFP.

Commissioner Miller said that he likes this idea and we would need to give some direction on how the Trust Fund monies could be used (purchase of land, supplement construction, etc.). He suggested that in response to the solicitation of interest, the developers could submit a 1 page response and make a 5 minute presentation at the meeting. This would put the Village in touch with people who are interested without wasting peoples' time on an extensive proposal.

Ms. Boyer said that the Village Board has asked that the Housing Commission provide recommendations on the priorities for the Trust Fund and the process. She said that it may be possible for the Housing Commission to address the Village Board before making its recommendations (in the form of a motion(s)) as an intermediate step for feedback. The Village Board is looking to receive the recommendations regarding priorities and process by the end of the summer.

Commissioner Eggum suggested that this be tabled for now and discussed at the next meeting; and at the next meeting talk about a specific framework about how to use the priorities that have been developed and a bullet point process. These can be put into a recommendation to the Village Board that would then be followed up on (with Village Board approval), or there may be open questions that need to be clarified. There was concurrence that this will be taken up again at the June meeting.

Commissioner Miller suggested that any final discussion on the priorities be taken up at the next meeting and that the recommendation regarding the priorities then be formalized by way of a Housing Commission motion/vote so that portion of this endeavor is completed.

B. Village Owned Property

A map was included in the packet identifying the Village owned property discussed previously. Ms. Boyer said that the activity observed at the location was limited to tree removal on an adjacent property. Commissioner Kiefer said that he brought the site up at the last meeting because he observed the tree removal and wondered if the property was still owned by the Village and if anything was happening there. He reminded the Housing Commission that this property has been looked at for the possibility of a development project utilizing the Trust Fund. Ms. Boyer confirmed that the parcel is still owned by the Village and there is no activity going on in that area other than the tree removal

C. Rental Registry

Commissioner Eggum suggested this be tabled for now. Some responses were received from Staff. The responses included that previously Staff had not viewed a need to inspect individuals rental units as a high priority and funding for this is not currently available.

The other purpose for expanding the rental registry that has been discussed is data gathering, and Staff was open to discussing this further. There is also a program some communities use called "Crime Free Housing" that might be something the Village could look at to enhance security at rental developments.

This topic will be discussed further at a later meeting.

D. Single-Family Rehab Program

Ms. Boyer reported that there is one active project. Mold remediation and HVAC work has been completed at the home. Tiling work in the bathroom is expected to be put under contract with the week.

Another application was received, but the household for found to be ineligible because their household income exceeded the maximum permitted by HUD for eligibility.

Another case is being worked on now. Ms. Boyer said that she met with the homeowners a the home be begin putting together a scope of work. There are a number of small items. The largest item is work in a bathroom (mainly drywall replacement) due to excessive moisture.

Ms. Boyer had no projects for approval at this meeting.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. **Letter from Senior Commission**

A letter from the Senior Citizens Commission to the Village Board concerning the removal of senior residential communities from the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance was distributed to the members of the Housing Commission. The letter was not discussed specifically at this meeting since it was not on the agenda for the meeting. The Housing Commission has stated previously that the Ordinance was too new to consider amendments yet. The letter will be appended to the minutes.

Commissioner Kiefer agreed that when this was brought up that there had not been an opportunity to apply the Ordinance as adopted. He commented that there is nothing to preclude senior citizens from residency in units developed under the existing program. However, he said that the Housing Commission could spend some time on a more thorough response.

Commissioner Delea asked about the independent living units mentioned in the letter and whether they tend to be more often for-profit developments.

Commission Eggum stated that the issue was mainly around senior residential communities with various levels and care and services where there are complexities such as spouses needing different types of housing/services, and some people move into independent living units in these communities with the expectation of moving into a unit that comes with a higher level of care. He said that the complexity is that the pricing of the levels of housing/services are often inter-connected in their pricing as opposed to a simply age-restricted housing. He said that he did not think that there was anything in the Ordinance that would exclude developments that are just age-restricted.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Eggum opened the meeting to public comment. Mr. Fred Feldman from the Senior Citizen's Commission joined the meeting. He stated that a survey under the Village's Age-Friendly Initiative reveals that affordable housing was the top priority of seniors who responded to the survey. Mr. Feldman received a summary of the earlier discussion regarding the Trust Fund. He was not able to log in for that part of the meeting.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Kiefer, seconded by Commissioner Miller, to adjourn the meeting. The motion was approved.

Ayes: Eggum, Kiefer, Delea & Miller
Nays: 0.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting be held on Wednesday, June 16, 2021 at 7 pm.

APPROVED

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS HOUSING COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
June 16, 2021

IN ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners Present:	Andrew Tripp	Ken Kiefer	John Eggum
	David Miller	William Delea	Jennifer Sweis
Commissioners Absent:	None		
Staff Present:	Nora Boyer, Housing Planner/Staff Liaison		

I. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call
The following Commissioners responded to roll: A. Tripp, K. Kiefer, J. Eggum, D. Miller, & W. Delea. Commission Sweis was absent at the time of roll call but soon after joined the meeting.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Eggum, seconded by Commissioner Miller to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2021 meeting.

The motion was approved
Ayes: Tripp, Kiefer, Eggum, Miller, & Delea
Nays: 0.

IV. REPORTS
None

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Affordable Housing Trust Fund Priorities & Process

The progress on developing recommendations on the priorities and process for the Trust Fund were reviewed. It was stated that since there is such a broad list of priorities that there may also be too broad a response to a general Request for Proposals (RFP). It was suggested that inviting developers to indicate their interests in a 1 page summary of the types of project they might propose was a good way to start, and then develop an RFP based on the responses.

It was suggested that the list of priority has some redundancies and could be pared down. It was also suggested that only the high and medium priorities be emphasized for make the list less overwhelming, and then the full list could also be attached. Ms. Boyer said that she will be working on a transmittal of the Housing Commission's work on this matter and will try to incorporate these suggestions.

The letters of interest would be one to two-pages and would be a test of the market to see where interest lies. Out of respect to our community partners, the letters of interest would be one- to two-pages as opposed to a full RFP which would take a lot of time and resources.

A motion was made by Commissioner Eggum, seconded by Commissioner Kiefer to recommend to the Village Board:

1. **Approval of the priorities identified by the Housing Commission in consultation with Staff created for use in operating the Affordable Housing Trust Fund provided as Attachment A; and**
2. **That the Village Board authorize the publication of information about the Affordable Housing Trust fund including the priorities for the purpose of requesting Letters of Interest from developers to be used by the Housing Commission to create a formal Request for Proposals targeted to those developers who submitted Letters of Interest.**

Ayes: A.Tripp, J. Sweis, J. Eggum, K. Kiefer, W. Delea, and D. Miller.
Nayes: None
Absent: None

B. Rental Registry

This was tabled at the last meeting. Commissioner Eggum said that she will follow up with people who have made comments on this. He said that there was not an indication of a need for a comprehensive inspection process and there is not a budget for that at this time. It appears that we may be headed in the direction of creating the rental registry. Ms. Boyer stated that the current multi-family license only applied if an owner owns more than two units in a building. Therefore, the rental of single-family homes and duplexes is not included. She also mentioned the Crime Free Housing program offered by several of our neighboring communities. In addition to crime awareness and prevention, this national program encouraged landlord training on a variety of topics as a condition of being licensed.

Ms. Boyer was asked to circulate the provisions of the Code on the Village's current multi-family licensing program. Commissioner Eggum stated that the ultimate goal of looking at this is to gather data to better understand the rental situation, and especially affordable rental, in the community. The topic was tabled again until the next meeting.

C. Senior Citizens Commission Memo Regarding Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance

Commissioner Trip moved on to the agenda item concerning the memo to the Village Board from the Senior Citizens Commission concerning the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. He asked Ms. Boyer if a written response was needed. Ms. Boyer said that one has not been requested. Commission Tripp said then that the matter can be discussed and Commissioner reactions included in the meeting minutes.

Commissioner Eggum commented that he thinks that what he previously said last month when members of Senior Citizens Commission (Fred Feldman or Dr. Motto) were present still applies. He said that he thinks that the at some point, after there is more experience with enforcing the ordinance, that a comprehensive assessment of the ordinance would be appropriate. However, he thinks that such a review or assessment is premature at this point. He pointed out that the Housing Commission has looked at two development since the ordinance was adopted. One was a previously approved development back for a re-review and the other was a development that exceeds the requirements of the ordinance since it is a 100% affordable development. He stated that the Housing Commission understands and appreciates the Senior Citizens Commissions concerns, and they can be looked at when it is appropriate to do a comprehensive review of the ordinance. He also pointed out that the Housing Commission expressly discussed and came to a consensus that the senior communities differed from other types of housing and that applying the ordinance to the communities is not economically viable or practical. He recommended tabling this matter.

Public input was received from Mr. Keith Moens who asked when the review of the ordinance will occur. He said that two senior developments have come through the approval process since the ordinance was approved – Ryan Properties and Trammel Crowe. They included independent living components and the original draft ordinance included requirements for independent senior units including how those requirements would apply. He said that the senior communities were removed from the ordinance at the January 2020 Committee of the Whole meeting by a 5-4 vote. He commented that this is a good time to review this at the anniversary of the adoption of the ordinance on August 3. He commented on reasons the Trustee gave for removing the senior communities form the ordinance and that he thinks it is clear that they did not want to burden developers with affordable housing requirements. He stated that the ordinance should go farther and require developers to build senior housing. He said that's what is missing in the ordinance.

Commissioner Tripp stated that he does not think that the Housing Commission is the correct forum to debate proposed changes to ordinance. That why this Senior Citizens Commission Memo is directed to Village Board. He commented that the Housing Commission did a lot of work on the ordinance, and the Village Board did with it as is saw fit. He said that if there are problems with the ordinance, those should be taken up with the Village Board and the Village Board can decide if the Housing Commission should look at possible changes.

Commissioner Eggum said that the Senior Citizens Commission's Memo can be attached to the minutes for this Housing Commission meeting to document that the Housing Commission is aware of the Senior Citizen Commissions' concerns. However, he said that the Housing Commission has not had that much experience with applying the ordinance. The comment from the public about developments to which the ordinance does not apply bypassing the Housing Commission is a question that could be directed to Village Board.

Commissioner Delea said that he appreciated the comments. He agreed that, at this point, this is a matter that should be taken up by the Village Board. He pointed out that senior citizens have been identified as a priority by the Housing Commission and that the Housing Commission is doing what it can.

Commissioner Kiefer said that he also agrees with the other Commissioners' comments. The Village has not had the opportunity to work with the ordinance yet because it is still new. He concurred that the public should that this matter up with the Village Board directly.

No action taken.

D. Draft Annual Action Plan/Draft CDBG Budget Update

Ms. Boyer said that the draft Annual Action Plan including the CDBG budget is available for a 30-day public comment period that ends on July 9. She stated that the Housing Commission had requested $67,000 for the Single-Family Rehab Program and $105,000 for the Group Home Rehab Project. However, her previous estimate of available funds did not include a re-budgeting of $28,000 that was previously allocated for Journeys|The Road Home's new building. Draft allocations needed to be adjusted for that re-budgeting and the draft allocations being considered by the Village Board are $60,465 for the Single-Family Rehab Program and $85,000 for the Group Home Rehab Program. No action by the Housing Commission was needed.

Ms. Boyer said that there will be a second public hearing on July 21st and it is expected that the Annual Action Plan will be adopted later at the meeting after considering public comment during the public hearing and the 30-day public comment period. After approval by the Village Board, the Annual Action Plan will be submitted to HUD which has a 45-day review period. Funding is than made available by HUD.

Commissioner Eggum asked if there is an indication from Journeys that they will use the money. He said that he understood that there was a ground breaking. Ms. Boyer said that Cook County made a $100,000 allocation for the project and allocations of around $25,000 have been made by other nearby suburbs. Cook County is taking the lead in coordinating communication and compliance around the CDBG funding from all of the CDBG funding entities.

E. Single Family Rehab Program Update

Ms. Boyer said that one project that as expected to be completed last month is ongoing due to a conflict with a contractor, but a new contractor is now working on the project. Bids are being collected on another project which she hopes to present to the Housing Commission soon, and a new application was just received.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Statements of Economic Interest

Commissioners who have not turned in their Statements of Economic Interest are asked to do so.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

As a procedural comment, Commissioner Eggum stated that Item C (Senior Citizens Commission Memo Regarding Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance) has been discussed and resolved and should be removed for the next meeting's agenda.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Eggum, seconded by Commissioner Tripp to adjourn the meeting.

Ayes: A. Tripp, J. Sweis, J. Eggum, K. Kiefer, and D. Miller.
Nayes: None
Absent: None

The next meeting was tentatively set for July 28, 2021 but was later postponed to August 18, 2021 at 7:00 pm.

Exhibit 2

MINUTES
COMMITTEE-OF-THE-WHOLE
PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
BOARD ROOM
MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 2022 7:00P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:	President Hayes; Trustees: Bertucci, Canty, Grasse, LaBedz, Schwingbeck and Tinaglia
BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:	Baldino, Scaletta
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:	Randy Recklaus, Village Manager; Charles Perkins, Director of Planning & Community Development, Chris Papierniak, Nora Boyer, Housing Planner; Tracy Colagrossi, Senior Center Manager; Kim Peterson, Recording Secretary

SUBJECTS:

A. Senior Center Utilization, Modernization, & Programming Study Update

B. Affordable Housing Trust Fund Priorities and Process

Other Business

Adjournment

President Hayes called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

President Hayes advised that there are two items of New Business to discuss, however he acknowledged that there are some people in the audience who would like to address the Board on items that are not on the agenda, which is usually done at the end of the agenda, therefore he asked for a motion to move Other Business up and allow those audience members to speak first.

Trustee Tinaglia moved, seconded by Trustee Schwingbeck, to take Other Business first. Upon a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

President Hayes stated that from the signs held by some audience members, a number of people want to talk about the Cook County Vaccine Mandate Order, therefore he would like to make some comments first. President Hayes discussed the many he emails he and the rest of the Board have received throughout the Covid-19 pandemic, including those received since Cook County instituted a Vaccine Mandate Order two weeks ago. President Hayes advised that with this latest surge in positive cases, he and the rest of the Board, including Village Staff, are still taking these issues very seriously, as their primary obligation is the health, safety and welfare of the community. President Hayes clarified the Village's position, stating that they are handling this mandate the same as all of the prior State and Cook County pandemic mandates. As with previous mandates, the Village does not have the authority to opt-out or enforce the Cook County Department of Public Health (CCDPH) Vaccine Mandate. President Hayes explained how the Village's Health Officers do respond to complaints of businesses that are not in compliance and if Health Officers are able to verify the complaint, the establishment receives a warning from the Village stating they are in non-compliance with the CCDPH Order. If the Village receives a second complaint, the Health Officers will refer it to the CCDPH for investigation. If the County is able to verify the second complaint, the establishment will then be cited for a violation of the Order by the County, not the Village. President Hayes advised that neither himself, or anyone on the Village Board, have ever suggested or encouraged that these Orders be defied or ignored. President Hayes stated that he is confident that the businesses and other local governmental bodies, including the park district and school districts, will continue to make well-reasoned decisions that they believe are in the best interests of their customers, patrons, students, teachers, staff and employees.

Michael DeWyze, citizen, stated that he believes that in the best interest of the people is to have no mandates and that those who support these mandates should be ashamed of themselves. Mr. DeWyze would like everyone on the Board to do what they need to do to push back on the mandate.

Jennifer Huntzicker, citizen, stated that she feels extremely oppressed by this mandate, as she cannot take her children to do the things they want to do because of it.

Marlee Griek, citizen, stated that she is anti-mandate, as she does not agree with people being told what to do. Ms. Griek hopes that people start standing up and stop saying their hands are tied, as something needs to happen.

Kerri Hood, citizen, stated that she hopes the Board takes a firmer stance like the Mayor of Orland Park has done, as this mandate is illogical and discriminatory. Ms. Hood asked the Board to stand up and tell the business leaders the Village will not enforce the mandate and will not report anyone to the County, and to push back on the County.

Maryann Zaleski, citizen, stated that the Board is allowing the division of people in the community, which will go on record, especially when it comes to election time. Ms. Zaleski asked what the exit plan is and asked the Board to pursue this.

Casey Deja, citizen, stated that she is ashamed to be part of a community that has a divide like this and feels that she has had her rights and freedoms taken away because of this mandate. In addition, Ms. Deja stated that she understands this is a Cook County mandate, but believes any and all leadership should take a stand against segregation and discrimination.

Stacey Howland Pacilio, citizen, stated that she is very ashamed of this town and would like to see something happen locally to give her some hope.

Christy Witherow, citizen, stated that the vaccine for children only became available six weeks before the Cook County Department of Public Health announced its' mandate. Ms. Witherow stated that natural immunity is being treated as if it doesn't exist and requests that the Board has a discussion regarding this.

President Hayes explained to the audience that the Village Board is not the enemy, as this is the County's mandate and the Village of Arlington Heights will not be issuing any similar mandate. The Village has not instituted any mask or vaccine mandate/ordinance, during the course of the 22 months pandemic. President Hayes reiterated that the Village does not have the option to opt out of the County's mandate, or to enforce it, and they are taking the same approach that the vast majority of other communities in this area have. President Hayes stated that he believes in freedom of choice, in freedom of businesses operating their business the way they see fit, as they should be the ones to decide whether they comply and take the risk if they don't comply.

Trustee Tinaglia stated that Village Board is taking the Village wide perspective, as the schools, library and park districts have completely separate boards and are responsible for the approach they are taking when it comes to this mandate.

Trustee Bertucci stated that the Board does see and hear the passion in everyone's voices and statements. Trustee Bertucci advised that the Village Board takes care of the Village and even if the Board spoke out against the mandate, that doesn't mean that the mandate won't be enforced by Cook County. Trustee Bertucci suggested that the audience members take their fight to the Cook County Board and school and park district boards.

Trustee Canty stated that she fully supports what President Hayes said and understands how frustrating it is to still be dealing with this pandemic, but wanted to let the audience know that the Board hears them and they are doing the absolute best that they can for all the residents of this Village.

President Hayes and Mr. Recklaus engaged in further discussion with several of the audience members regarding the Cook County vaccine mandate, including the role the Village's Health Officers when it comes to investigating complaints, as their mission is to ensure the health, safety and welfare of the Village's residents and businesses.

A. Senior Center Utilization, Modernization & Programming Study

Mr. Recklaus advised that part of the Village Board's 2020-2021 Business Plan, a strategic priority included a project that would Update the Senior Center and conduct a Feasibility Assessment based upon facility changes to meet the future needs of the community. The Village retained the services of the BKV group in partnership with Lifespan Design Studios, who specializes in the design of senior centers across the country, and they developed an initial conceptual floor plan based on the feedback they received.

Mr. Perkins introduced Henry Pittner from BKV and Doug and Ellen Gallow from Lifespan Design Studios, who will walk everyone through the existing floor plan and the program-fit concept developed to evaluate feasibility of the full program.

Mr. Pittner advised the plan for this evening is to provide a brief recap of the visioning phase, as well as the building addition assessment, and then discuss the architectural program and what the needs assessment provided, including a parking analysis and layouts.

Ms. Gallow provided a brief recap of the findings that were originally reported by her colleague, Jill Jackson Ledford, at the end of phase one, which was to determine the interests of people in the senior center's target population, including the types of activities and services they like. Ms. Gallow discussed some of the key takeaways from phase one, which included the fact that there is strong support for updating program, services and amenities to engage the emerging generation of seniors and to offer current patrons even more, as well as updating the appearance of the building, re-branding to erase outdated impressions of what the senior centers offers and who goes there, and prioritizing onsite experiences. Ms. Gallow advised that the need for available parking was also identified in this phase, as people will not stay or come back if they cannot find a place to park.

Mr. Pittner advised that the existing conditions of the wall structure will require a complete gut rehab of the facility, which will extend into the inside of the building. The mechanical system is at the end of its' useful life and will need to be completely replaced. Mr. Pittner stated that the possibility of expanding the footprint of the building was explored, however due to circumstances beyond their control, any updates will have to be done within the four walls of the building.

Ms. Gallow discussed how the design of the building needs to be leading edge, to optimize long lasting effectiveness, and the interior needs to be welcoming with an emphasis on community. The design should also incorporate features that honor and celebrate the strategic partnerships, and the tenant agreements should also be reviewed and updated for efficient space use.

Ms. Gallow advised that phase two is focusing on architectural programming and space planning and numerous interviews with the partner agencies have already taken place to discuss these issues. Following these interviews, BKV drafted a "program of requirements", which is a descriptive list of needs and spaces to be incorporated in the current facility. A parking needs analysis was also conducted, to identify parking lot improvements that will need further study. Three interior layout concepts reflecting different program options were presented to the executive committee, who identified a preferred concept which is being presented tonight.

Mr. Gallow further explained how the "program of requirements" is a descriptive list of dedicated and shared-use rooms and spaces proposed to accommodate the expressed functions and space needs, which was developed after information was gathered from the partner agencies and Village. Mr. Gallow advised that the study does not include the parking lot design, however as the project moves forward, a senior center design specialist will identify what is needed to create a safer, more comfortable experience for drivers and pedestrians, as well as meeting the needs of parking.

Mr. Gallow referred to the floor plans included in the Board's packets and discussed the existing floor plan and the suggested floor plan "Modified Program C", as well as the suggested outside green space configuration.

Mr. Pittner advised that the next step is to take concept C and begin an interior/exterior concept design so everyone could see what the exterior would look like, as long as the interior, including the materials and colors, along with some furniture. In addition, the cost estimate would also be determined at this time.

Mr. Recklaus advised that no formal action is needed from the Board, as this presentation was simply an opportunity to provide an update and get some feedback from the Board and perhaps answer any questions.

President Hayes thanked Staff and all of those involved in putting this presentation together and asked for questions from the Board.

Trustee LaBedz thanked everyone for all of their hard work and asked about the overall concept of the senior center and what will be done to attract the next generation of seniors. Ms. Gallow acknowledged that this is question senior centers nationwide are dealing with, but said in the end, a successful senior center is first and foremost about the quality of the programs and services it offers. Ms. Gallow stated that as long as the staff is in touch with the needs and interests of the community and planning responsibly and creatively, the senior population will be well served. Ms. Gallow also discussed the re-branding of the senior center and how it may not even be referred to as a senior center, to make it more appealing. Mr. Gallow advised that if the building is designed with appropriate features, it will allow for aging in place. Trustee LaBedz stated that she believes the updates will not only enhance the building, but the entire community, and make it more attractive.

Trustee Tinaglia thanked everyone for their fine work in putting this presentation together and asked about the project being a total gut and rehab and what this means for the outside of the building. Mr. Pittner advised that the north and east walls are deteriorating and will need to be replaced, as will some window frames and sills. Mr. Pittner explained how the work inside is all about getting the parts in the right locations.

Trustee Tinaglia asked if the size of the building is the right size, which Mr. Pittner stated that with the program space they have been given, they are making it work the best they can. Ms. Gallow explained how a bigger senior center design is not necessarily better, as long as it meets the interests and needs and associated services of the community. Mr. Gallow advised that they can increase the size of the building by expanding the useable hours.

Trustee Tinaglia asked about parking and if the number of parking spaces are suitable for a building this size. Mr. Perkins explained how there are 190 spaces in the front of the building and 12 in the rear. Mr. Perkins advised that some of the upgrades to the parking lot to make it more user friendly may actually reduce the number of available parking spaces.

Trustee Tinaglia stated that he completely in favor and looking forward to having an updated and modernized senior center, although he is concerned about the location and size limitations of the facility, as well as the budget.

Trustee Bertucci asked what the plans are for paying for this project. Mr. Recklaus stated that Staff wanted to determine cost first and what would be the idealized version of this and then go back to figuring out how and when to pay for it. Mr. Recklaus advised that the Village has some debt expiring over the next few years, therefore some additional money can be borrowed without increasing taxes, which can be a source of revenue. In addition, Mr. Recklaus advised that they will be talking to their partners, which could be potential sources of revenue as well. Mr. Perkins advised that there are some maintenance costs that the Village has been holding off paying for until a decision about the future of the building has been made. Trustee Bertucci stated that he is going to hold back his opinion until he knows how the Village is paying for the project.

Trustee Schwingbeck advised that he has the same thoughts that Trustee Tinaglia has and is extremely concerned with putting a lot of money into a facility like this. Trustee Schwingbeck would like to get a better understanding of who uses the senior center and if any neighboring communities could help pay for the cost, since it is not exclusive to Arlington Heights residents. Ms. Colagrossi advised that approximately 97% of the users are from Arlington Heights and that she definitely thinks a rebranding initiative to make the senior center more appealing to others is important, as most can imagine themselves "living well and aging well" in the community. Ms. Colagrossi stated that she and her staff are working on educating the community about what they do at the senior center, and that aging is a positive thing.

Trustee Bertucci asked how many individuals use the facility each day. Ms. Colagrossi advised that pre-pandemic there were 400 – 500 people per day, and as of last month, there were almost 7,000 people using the facility during the month.

Trustee Grasse expressed her appreciation for the work going into this project and how much she likes the idea of the "live well and age well" name. Trustee Grasse advised that she has met a lot of older adults who frequent the senior center and love it, and believes that once this pandemic is over, we will all have a better understanding of what we need in our community and looking at and exploring this kind of a building for our community is wonderful.

Sue Viecelli, Chairperson, Arlington Heights Senior Citizens Commission, asked if the consultants have considered doing more than a café of coffee and vending machines and turning the space into a more serious restaurant, as people who go there to meet and eat, may join in other activities as well. Ms. Gallow explained how this idea is on the leading edge of senior center planning and design everywhere, as nothing brings people more together than food. People who have never been to the center might choose to meet for breakfast or lunch and then decide to participate in some of the programs or activities they see going on around them. Ms. Viecelli asked about the possibility of leasing the space out to a restaurateur and this individual opening up a small restaurant. Ms. Gallow advised that there are a small number of senior centers nationwide who have forged these partnerships and explained how senior center staff will be exploring this concept.

Cathy Motto, citizen, stated that the new senior center newsletter is fabulous and how she really enjoys the energy and connections you find in the senior center.

Melissa Cayer, citizen, stated that there is already a restaurant in that strip mall, and how she would rather conserve resources and keep her property taxes low.

B. Affordable Housing Trust Fund

Mr. Recklaus stated that since the adoption of the Village's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance in August of 2020, the balance of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, that was established in 2013, has seen significant growth. Mr. Recklaus advised that there is now approximately $800,000 in the Trust Fund, and it is now appropriate for the Village to decide how to prioritize its use. The Board did ask Staff and the Housing Commission to take a look at this and make some recommendations concerning priorities for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and the process for distributing funds for eligible projects.

Mr. Perkins advised that funds going into the Trust Fund have come from the recently adopted Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. The revenue into the Trust Fund has come from the sale of the Village's tax-exempt bond cap and fees in lieu of affordable housing unit and fee-in-lieu requirements. The purpose of the Trust Fund is to promote attainable housing and provide sustainable financial resources to address attainable housing within the community.

Mr. Perkins explained how the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Ordinance did set forth three activity types for the use of these funds: creation and preservation of attainable housing, including, new construction, rehabilitation, and adaptive reuse; acquisition or disposition of buildings; and for cost incurred with administering the Trust Fund.

Mr. Perkins advised that in August of 2020, the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance was adopted, which included linkage fees that are contributing quite well to the Trust Fund, and since then Staff has worked with the Housing Commission to come up with a process and priorities for utilizing the funds.

Ms. Boyer advised that Staff provided the Housing Commission with lists of possible priority activities for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, which the Housing Commission discussed over several months last year. The Housing Commission was largely in agreement with Staff, however there were some minor changes made following their discussions.

Ms. Boyer further discussed the three activity types and informed the Board of the Housing Commissions priority rankings for each activity. Ms. Boyer also discussed the priority populations, which were all given high priority, as well as the forms of assistance, which differed based upon those developers that are for-profit and those that are not-for-profit.

Ms. Boyer advised that the next steps that are recommended are for the Village to issue a request for Letters of Interest in using the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, followed by Request for Proposals. Once the Letters of Interest are evaluated, Staff would work with the Housing Commission to develop a Request for Proposals for use of those funds and evaluate those proposals when they're submitted, and then make recommendations.

Mr. Perkins advised that Staff is seeking feedback from the Board regarding the priorities and then concurrence with Staff proceeding with the steps as outlined.

President Hayes advised that he is in general agreement with the priority rankings, however he is unsure if all of the categories in priority populations should all be ranked "high" if these rankings will determine where this money will go. President Hayes is concerned that it would be difficult to discriminate where the money would go if they are all ranked the same. President Hayes advised that if he had to choose he would leave the top three, senior/elderly, veterans and the disabled, in the high category and move current Arlington Heights residents and employees of Arlington Heights businesses to the medium category.

Trustee Tinaglia asked if there are any programs for group homes in any of the five categories listed in the priority populations, which Ms. Boyer stated that there are group homes for those with disabilities and Shelter Inc. is also a state licensed group home. Trustee Tinaglia stated that he thinks there is a need for these types of group homes and would like for these funds to go towards them. Trustee Tinaglia would like this evaluation process to be open and fluid and not exclusionary. Mr. Recklaus advised that decisions made might be based on who comes through the door, as all of these population options may not be available.

Trustee LaBedz advised that she is not surprised that all of these priority populations are listed high, as they can overlap, and it would be hard to differentiate. Trustee LaBedz stated she likes the idea of Letters of Intent as the first step in the process.

Trustee Grasse advised that she thinks the process of prioritizing the populations needs to be as open and flexible as possible, and would like to see environmental sustainability a high priority.

George Motto, Senior Citizen's Commission, stated that affordable housing is the top issue for seniors and the Senior Citizen's Commission adopted an action plan and affordable housing is their number one priority, therefore he encourages the Board to strongly consider senior citizens as a high priority. In addition, Mr. Motto

requested that the Board revisit the exemption of the senior communities from the Inclusionary Ordinance.
Sue Motto, citizen, stated that the priority for seniors is affordable housing, which also includes adapting their homes so they can age in place, as well as the concept of shared housing.

Melissa Cayer, citizen, stated the Board should keep property taxes reasonable and abolish tax increment finance districts.

President Hayes asked Staff if the Board needs to concur with the priority rankings, which Mr. Recklaus advised that one of the goals tonight is to confirm or adjust the priority rankings, as Staff would like some general direction that these reflect the views and values of the Village Board.

Trustee LaBedz moved that the Committee-of-the-Whole recommend that the Village Board concur with the priority rankings and direct Staff to proceed with the steps as outlined.

The motion was not seconded.

Trustee Canty has an issue with the words concur with these priority rankings in the suggested motion, as she would like to see the Letters of Intent first, before proceeding with the next steps.

Trustee Bertucci asked if the Board is concurring with going ahead with the next steps of the process in Trustee Canty's motion, which Trustee Canty stated yes.

Trustee Tinaglia asked if the Board will be able to review the Letters of Intent to see what kind of interest there really is.

Mr. Recklaus advised Staff's intent with having these priorities set is that if a proposal is received and the Board doesn't like it, it's easier to justify not wanting to accept it if it doesn't address these priorities.

Trustee Canty moved, seconded by Trustee Grasse, that the Committee-of-the-Whole recommend that the Village Board of Trustees direct Staff to proceed with requesting Letters of Interest and the next steps as outlined in the report, with final ranking criteria and feedback from the Village Board on proposals to occur when they are received.

Upon a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

President Hayes thanked Ms. Boyer and the Housing Commission for their good work on this.

Adjournment
Trustee Tinaglia moved, seconded by Trustee LaBedz, to adjourn the meeting at 9:23 p.m. Upon a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Housing Commission
2/16/2022

Item: Arlington Heights Affordable Housing Data

Department: Planning & Community Development

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
No Attachments Available	