AGENDA
IURA Neighborhood Investment Committee (NIC)
8:30 am, Friday, February 11, 2022
Virtual Meeting

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86544854910?pwd=S1FEVkZIWVWS2tGRlFSdHdKMWk0QT09

I. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

II. Changes/Additions to Agenda

III. Public Comment

IV. Review of Minutes - January 2022

V. New Business
   A. Discussion - Review of Public Service and Economic Development Applications to the City of Ithaca’s HUD Entitlement Program for the 2022-23 Program Year (PY)
      1. Workforce Development Matrix

VI. Other Business
   A. IURA Grant Summary
   B. Staff Report
      1. HUD-Related Items
         a. HUD Spenddown modification
         b. HUD Buffalo ACA Letter & CAPER Review
      2. CoC Needs Assessment - Lisa Horn - View on YouTube

VII. Motion to Adjourn
If you have a disability and require accommodation in order to fully participate, please contact the City of Ithaca Clerk’s Office at 274-6570 at least 72 business hours prior to the meeting.
Present: Karl Graham (Chair); Fernando de Aragon (Vice-Chair); Tracy Farrell: Paulette Manos.
Absent: None
Staff: Nels Bohn, Director of Community Development; Anisa Mendizabal, Community Development Planner
Guests: Steven Williams

I. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

II. Changes/Additions to Agenda

None.

III. Public Comment

None.

IV. Review of Minutes - November 2021

Motion by Farrell, second by de Aragon. Approved 4-0 (unanimous).

V. New Business

A. Discussion - Committee Member Vacancy
   The Chair has received one recommendation from a community member about a potential member. Discussion ensued about the procedure for filling vacancies. Mendizabal will ask the City Hall Communications person to draft a press release for local outlets, City Notices service, and HSC listserv.

B. Discussion - Nels Bohn, IURA Director of Community Development; Draft City Policy on Encampments on City Property
   Graham welcomed Bohn to discuss the policy he has drafted regarding encampments on City property. [See Draft Policy in its entirety attached to these Minutes]
Bohn is the Co-Chair (with Kathy Schlather of the Human Services Coalition) of the Tompkins County Continuum of Care (CoC) which is an affiliation of groups working to move people from homelessness to stable housing. The CoC is a coordinating body that facilitates collaboration but does not have authority over the member groups and cannot make City or County policy. The draft policy being discussed today came about because the City and Bohn often receive questions about the encampments from individuals and organizations of all kinds -- outreach workers, businesses, residents, and so on-- and the City has no explicit policy to guide actions or responses. Bohn suggested to Mayor Svante Myrick that it would be wise to have such a policy both as a municipality and as a property owner; the Mayor invited Bohn to draft a proposed policy. Bohn will be meeting with the Enhanced Street Outreach Team, the County, City Department heads, the IURA and Committees, and others for input and comment on the Draft City Policy on Encampments.

Bohn said Ithaca is not an outlier in having encampments. Cities across the country including cities of similar size to Ithaca-- Burlington and Montpelier, VT; Portland, ME; Saratoga Springs, NY-- all have similar or larger encampment issues. On the West Coast, the magnitude of the issue is even greater. Tacoma, WA has over 5,000 encampments. It’s hard to find a community that has found “the solution.” There doesn’t seem to be a single solution that fits all. That may be a result of the causes of homelessness are many, as are individual characteristics of people experiencing homelessness.

Bohn’s overall recommendation is that the City’s policy on encampments should be supportive of the CoC’s strategy and approach, which is to make homelessness a brief, rare, and non-recurring event, recognizing that is the goal even if it’s not a metric that can be met at any one time. The CoC tries to create a system that 1) prevents homelessness and 2) helps people move from homelessness to stable housing. The purpose of this policy is not to criminalize homelessness. Poverty is not a crime. Bohn shared an example of a municipality in Idaho that outlawed camping in its boundaries; a federal court found this ordinance to be cruel and unusual punishment since there weren’t alternative, safe, indoor spaces that could be provided.

Generally speaking, encampments really point to a problem in our homeless response system. The homeless response system does not address encampments in any direct way, there is not member agency of the CoC that heads up encampment issues. No one operates the encampment. So, Bohn thought it important to look at this question. He looked at Point in Time (PIT) data. The Point in Time Count is a HUD-mandated national effort that occurs in every CoC-area once every two years during the last week in January, which is usually one of the coldest weeks of the year. The last few counts by the Tompkins County CoC have revealed about 130 people are unhoused at the time of each count. Two years ago, 133 people were counted as homeless. Of those 133 that were counted, most were indoors/sheltered at the time of the count (shelter, hotels, transitional housing); about 35 people were unsheltered. The vast majority of the 35 that were unsheltered had a severe mental health diagnosis and/or substance use disorder. That’s a snapshot look at the local numbers at a point in time.

On an annual basis, the CoC uses a Homeless Information Management System (HMIS) to track how many people are imminently facing homelessness or are actually homeless, as well as what the outcomes are of those who have entered the homeless response system. Annually, about 600 people move through the homeless response system. Of that 600, about 350 are experiencing homelessness for the first time. The CoC is very successful at linking up most people with services and housing. However, it doesn’t work for everyone.
Of the services available, permanent supportive housing has been the most successful way of moving people from homelessness to stable housing. About 92% of those who moved into local permanent supportive housing have remained housed. There are about 113 units or beds of permanent supportive housing in Ithaca. Chartwell House, Magnolia House, and Amici House are examples of permanent supportive housing. Lakeview’s new development, West End Heights, has permanent supportive units for about half of those living there. The 113 units does not include Arthaus’s 40 units of permanent supportive housing (the rest of the units in Arthaus are not in that category-- there are not wraparound services tied to the rest of the units) which just came online nor the Green Street Garage (Asteri) development which will create another 40 units of permanent supportive housing when it comes online. A Place to Stay is not permanent supportive; it is transitional housing.

Graham asked if any of these 113 permanent supportive units follow the Housing First model. Bohn responded that none of the facilities in the City (or County) that offer permanent supportive housing are Housing First-- none allow drug and alcohol use on premises. There’s a new County facility on Triphammer that offers services to people using substances, but it is not permanent supportive housing.

There are a lot of reasons why encampments are not healthy for their residents or for (housed) neighbors of the encampment. The Fire Department responds to issues in the encampment about three times a month, because cooking and heating occurs there and sometimes fires get out of control. There have been some horrible accidents there over the years.

Bohn found there are four major types of response or approach to encampments:

1. An explicit policy of no camping on public land- clearance of camps.
2. Clearance of camps with support. People must leave the site but may be helped in moving to another site and/or to be made aware of services that are available through area CoC or other programs.
3. Tacit acceptance of encampments. Don’t acknowledge encampments officially; don’t try to clear them immediately, but try to keep some limits. Approach from a harm reduction model understanding that when clearance occurs, people will need to set up elsewhere. When people disperse, it is hard to reach them to connect them with services. This has been the City’s primary approach.
4. Formally sanctioned encampments. Many communities on the West Coast have moved this direction for a subset of the population. This model doesn’t work for all, however. One of the challenges is to manage the encampment. Management brings rules. Rules can be an obstacle for people who might live there. There needs to be an entity to do the management. Cities often do not have the skill set to manage any kind of residence-- indoors or out; they hire another organization to manage.

Historically Ithaca has done tacit acceptance with occasional clearance with support. The Jungle I was cleared, the dewatering site was posted and cleared with a lot of advance notice, as was Cherry Street. Street Outreach Workers helped people living in those areas understand what the City policy was going to be in those areas and helped with services.

There are not always options for people to come into the homeless response system. Not everyone can be served by the homeless response system as it currently exists. People who are registered sex offenders, for example, and there are about 15 people who fall into that category. People who are sanctioned by DSS for failure to comply and are not eligible for
services. People suspected of having a mental health issue must undergo assessment. If they miss an appointment, they will be temporarily sanctioned. So, people who are sanctioned for any time period don’t have a lot of options. Finally, and probably the largest group, is people who are actively using drugs or alcohol and unable to abstain. People in this group will eventually not be allowed to stay in shelter and/or housing facilities because many people in those housing sites are abstaining and/or trying to maintain sobriety and it creates conflict. There is no “wet” [low- or no-barrier] shelter in the area.

De Aragon commented that looking at these numbers, any new proposal for fully serving unhoused people is likely to fail unless the needs of people who are using substances and/or have mental illnesses are acknowledged. Otherwise, those same people will always be unserved and outside. Bohn agreed that those are key underlying issues.

The shelter system in Ithaca is very small, Bohn continued. The shelter on W. MLK/W. State has very few beds. Therefore, in the winter, motels become the sheltering system [in Cold Weather Policy]. Shelter is also a night-by-night remedy.

At many times, people in encampments are not even counted in the HMIS, just as not everyone can be counted in the Point in Time Count (adults doubled up in other households are not captured by the PIT, for example).

People and outreach workers report that, for some, a sense of autonomy and freedom is lost when engaging in governmental or other systems of care. People have pets that cannot come with them, they may want to open their homes to friends who are not allowed to be there or be there all the time, they may have to adhere to rules such as when they can come in and when they need to leave (as in the shelter). All of these can amount to barriers to attaining housing stability.

Bohn is suggesting that the City, as a major owner of vacant land, will continually be facing the issue of encampments, and that the best approach for the City from a landowner’s point of view is to minimize the number of encampments and the footprint of encampments while recognizing that given all the barriers that have been discussed, there needs to be some area of the City where people can camp until we can expand the system to implement a Housing First model to serve all of those who are currently unserved. There are a number of issues, legal and otherwise, with formally sanctioning an encampment. Once sanctioned, encampments become subject to code-- hygiene, health, building, and liability. An approach that some communities are taking is to identify high- and low- priority areas for enforcement. Low-enforcement areas are those that are tacitly authorized. They are not targeted for clearance. Those locations are communicated to the community. That’s the land use recommendation that the Draft Policy contains-- try to identify areas that are reasonably convenient for people to access, that have lower impacts on residential neighborhoods, that have fewer environmental impacts, etc.

De Aragon wondered if there is any opportunity to relax some regulatory requirements in order to provide some services, assistance, or better housing. Perhaps Second Wind-style cottages, for example, could be allowed-- an improvement over tents. That type of unit would not meet code, but sometimes codes are a barrier to providing some level of help. On the other hand, there are sometimes good reasons for codes, namely safety. Yet, if people are being allowed to live in a tent [which is unsafe], there are times codes are ineffective. Street Outreach Workers and others in the CoC have addressed some of these issues with temporary restrooms and handwashing facilities. Some of these type of
improvements—safe cooking facilities, even a campfire pit for cooking, lockers for storage, clean drinking water, etc.—have been proposed. At the State level, a tiny home code standard has been established, which is more flexible than other building codes.

Bohn said that what de Aragon is pointing to is that it is not enough to work on encampments in isolation. That will not get us very far down the road. What Bohn wants to emphasize is being able to spend more time or as much time to expand the CoC to meet the needs of people who have not so far been well-served by the existing homeless response system. One idea is for the City to develop an RFP to see what services organizations have the ability to provide and how. Developing several smaller facilities to address particular needs could be one direction. The City will have about $1 million of American Rescue Plan (ARP) funds that the IURA will administer. The County can apply to the State for some additional ARP funds. If there were City and County resources available, and City land available, what could agencies provide?

Bohn continued: What is the role of the County in this draft policy? A whole other set of questions has to do with how to give people support in moving, if needed. The City is not well-equipped to undertake such an endeavor. A City-County interagency staff that would focus on the issue would be ideal. Right now, homelessness is one of many priorities for many City or County departments, it’s not anyone’s primary focus.

De Aragon said that the County Mental Health Department would seem to have a clear role and desire to be involved. There is no “silver bullet,” but is there a role and opportunity for involving organizations like Second Wind and INHS to help? Bohn said organizations may be willing to help, especially if the City invites them. There is, again, limited capacity in the community, though, as many organizations have many projects they are already managing.

Farrell said that she sees the Sanctioned Encampment as a stopgap measure. Even so, it would be a much higher level of responsibility for the City and she’d want to see that happen in conjunction with the County and with some sort of contract with an agency to operate it. With consolidation of encampments, there would be more opportunities for portable restrooms, drinking water, and fire safety. Manos concurred with Farrell’s comments and said she felt that a sense of urgency was needed, as it is cold to be living outside. Assigning a point person to move things along and manage the process with the least possible disruption to the lives of those who are living in the encampment is necessary, she said, then focus on the longer-term solutions. Manos added that identifying a structure that can be modified for the needs of unhoused people would be most expedient.

Bohn departed at approximately 9:30 a.m.

Graham wondered what the PIT Counts of neighboring CoCs reveal about their communities, for example, Elmira and Cortland. Mendizabal said that type of data could be pursued. Anecdotally, she said, there is some feeling that communities put varying levels of effort into doing the mandated PIT Count. There may be reluctance to accurately count the number of unhoused people because doing so would indicate a need to dedicate more resources to bringing services to them. Mendizabal is not aware of any agency that oversees or audits PIT Counts, even though conducting the Count is mandated by HUD. In surrounding rural areas, there tends to be more substandard housing where people are living because they have access to it—perhaps it was in the family, or was abandoned but not torn down. Such housing would likely not meet code in municipalities like Ithaca, but rural areas have limited inspection resources. In rural areas there also tend to be extremely
limited services for unhoused people-- or people who would be unhoused were it not for these substandard structures-- other than possibly meals or food pantries. Guest Steven Williams commented that he was aware there are grants available to repair housing in rural areas but that delivering such services was extremely difficult-- people were reluctant to engage. De Aragon pointed out that extreme cases always exist and working with those who are willing to engage is a starting point.

VI. Other Business

A. IURA Grant Summary

Graham noted that the IURA is above the CDBG spend-down ratio at this point. Mendizabal said that IURA Staff recently spoke to HUD Buffalo about this. HUD Buffalo is aware that communities are struggling to reach the spend-down ratio, mostly for pandemic-related reasons. However, HUD Buffalo is not expecting a spend-down waiver from HUD Headquarters. One of the projects slowing the spenddown is the GIAC Gym project, which has a lot of funding attached to it but is not ready to move forward. There are a number of other projects that have had trouble spending down their funding, most are pandemi-related. Staff is trying to problem solve now in order to be better prepared in the coming months.

According to the Grants Summary, the Salvation Army still has not vouchered, Graham noted. However, at the time of this meeting, the Salvation Army has submitted a voucher for having helped one household. (Note that this project is CDBG-CV which in not counted toward the spend-down).

B. Staff Report

Mendizabal said that hard copies of the 2022 applications to the HUD Entitlement Program would be available no later than Friday, February 4, 2022.

Mendizabal gave an overview of what applications might be coming forward to the 2022 HUD Entitlement Program. She expects eight Affordable Housing applications and four Public Facilities applications. Mendizabal has spoken to six applicants who would be submitting for the first time. Organizations that have applied in the past may error on the side of not submitting an application due to capacity issues this year.

VII. Motion to Adjourn

Graham motioned, de Aragon seconded. 4-0. Adjourned at 10:11 a.m..
City of Ithaca, NY
Proposed Policy – Response to Encampments on City Property

The City seeks to align its policy regarding encampments with the Ithaca/Tompkins County Continuum of Care (CoC) plans and policies to connect people experiencing homelessness with housing and needed services to set them on a quick path to permanent and stable housing. The CoC believes:

1. Homelessness should be rare, brief, and non-recurring.
2. Homelessness is not a crime. Everyone experiencing unsheltered homelessness is deserving of being treated with dignity and respect in accordance with their rights.
3. Homelessness is entwined in larger societal issues, including a history of systemic discrimination against non-white persons.
4. A ‘Housing First’ approach, where there are no preconditions to access housing and services, is essential to successfully address unsheltered homelessness.

Encampments represent a failure to make homelessness rare, brief, and non-recurring. Encampments do not provide safe, healthy, or secure living environments, particularly for those staying within an encampment. At best, encampments should be viewed as a temporary stop on a pathway to needed services to gain stable housing.

For the City policy to support the CoC, it is important to understand the scope of homelessness and the resources available to assist persons experiencing homelessness through the CoC.

Snapshot Count of Homeless Population

On a biannual basis in January, each community conducts a Point-in-Time (PIT) count of the homeless population, both sheltered and unsheltered. The most recent PIT was conducted in 2020 when 133 persons were experiencing homelessness of which 25% were unsheltered persons. The count omits persons who secure temporary sleeping accommodations during only the coldest nights of the year, persons who do not want to be identified, and youth and others who you are “couch surfing.”

Black, Indigenous, and other Persons of Color (BIPOC) disproportionately experience homelessness at 32% of all sheltered and unsheltered homeless population, though 88% of the unsheltered persons were white in the 2020 PIT. Unsheltered homeless persons reported extremely high incidence of substance use disorders (79%) and/or mental health illness (65%).

Takeaways: POC experience homelessness at an elevated level disproportionate to their population in the community. Most of the unsheltered homeless population have a substance use disorder and/or mental health illness.
Annual Population in Homeless Response System

In 2020, almost 600 unduplicated persons entered the emergency shelter database, of which over 350 people were experiencing homelessness for the first time. About 450 persons exited the shelter with positive outcomes. Over 200 persons had successful exits to permanent housing. 92% of persons who secured permanent supportive housing upon exit from the emergency shelter successfully retained housing or exited to other permanent housing in 2020.

A sizable number exit the system with unknown outcomes. Unsheltered persons who do not seek emergency shelter services during the year are excluded from this database.

Takeaways: The local homeless response system works for many, but not all, persons to set them on a path to permanent and stable housing. Linking persons with permanent supportive housing was the most effective means to exit homelessness to stable housing without a return to homelessness.

The Local Homeless Response System

The local CoC homeless response system includes the following components operated by over a dozen separate agencies in a collaborative arrangement:
- Outreach
- Emergency Shelter (29 year-round beds, 16 seasonal beds, 40 overflow off-site)
- Coordinated Assessment (prioritizes housing placement for most vulnerable persons)
- Day Center (i.e., Samaritan Center)
- Rapid Rehousing (42 beds)
- Transitional Housing (23 beds)
- Permanent Supportive Housing (113 beds)
- Other Permanent Housing (28 beds)
- Case management, including tenant supportive services
- Data Collection (HMIS)

There is no formal role for encampments in the local homeless response system, yet they exist in multiple locations on City property. While several of the above shelter and housing options provide access to persons with substance use disorders, none explicitly allow on-premises use of drugs or alcohol.

Encampment Management Options

Unregulated encampments are unhealthy for its residents, harm the environment, and adversely impact the surrounding community. Resident health and hygiene are at risk when encampment conditions lack bathrooms, handwash facilities, potable water, and safe ways to cook and store food. Inadequate human waste disposal negatively impacts nearby waterways and burning of plastics creates hazardous air pollution. Abandoned encampments leave behind massive amounts of garbage and discarded materials despoiling natural areas. Heating and cooking fuels can become out of control and start fires that spread. In the first 11 months of 2021, the Ithaca Fire Department responded to 31 service calls to
extinguish fires associated with encampments. Encampments located near entrances to businesses can deter customers and threaten business viability. Outdoor fires and late-night noise near residential neighborhoods disrupt the quality of life in those neighborhoods. Finally, the presence of encampments can interfere with community use or maintenance of public resources.

There are four major approaches to managing encampments:

1. Clearance with little or no support to occupants
2. Clearance with support to occupants
3. Tacit acceptance
4. Formal sanctioned encampments

To date, the City has primarily followed a tacit acceptance approach consistent with a harm reduction model, as clearance can lead to negative outcomes for provision of coordinated services, trust, trauma of occupants, and no resolution of the problem as occupants relocate to alternative locations. There are no formal sanctioned encampments in the City.

The City-owned former Southwest Park site located at the end of Fairgrounds Memorial Parkway has hosted many encampments in the past 10 years. This area continues to be an area where the City has prioritized harm reduction over enforcement of trespass, open fire restrictions, and building codes.

On rare occasions the City has cleared encampments with advance warning and support to occupants. The so-called ‘Jungle 1’, located between Taber Street and Cecil A. Malone was cleared several years ago and vegetation mowed to open sight lines. This area has been re-occupied by over a half-dozen scattered urban campers. Encampments in this highly visible area has raised the profile of the unsheltered homelessness issue.

In 2019, encampments in the former Southwest Park were removed by NYS contractors to construct the 10+ acre dewatering facility. Most campers shifted the locations of their encampments elsewhere in the same vicinity.

In 2021, campers relocated away from the Cherry Street extension area after four months of advance notice was provided that camps would be removed in April. This area was repopulated during the summer, but now contains no encampments. The City Department of Public Works has constructed an accessway for first responders to access this area to facilitate enforcement of the ban on urban camping at this location adjacent to the future Black Diamond Trail along the Flood Control Channel.

**Why Are There Encampments?**

As identified previously, encampments are an outshoot of the housing crisis coupled with poverty, mental illness, addiction to substances, and racial inequity, and represent a shortcoming in the community’s homeless response system even though the system works well to connect most people experiencing homelessness with services and housing. Persons experiencing homelessness make pragmatic choices about where to stay based on comparison among the best available alternatives, given an individual’s circumstances at a point in time. There are several reasons why a person may not access the emergency shelter or other elements of the homeless response system.
Legal and regulatory requirements create barriers for subgroups of persons experiencing unsheltered homelessness. Certain registered sex offenders are ineligible for certain governmental services, so the homeless response system may offer limited benefits to them. Registered sex offenders face an effective barrier to entry to government supported housings. Similarly, a person sanctioned for noncompliance with DSS programmatic requirements may be ineligible for assistance for a period of time until the sanction expires. Currently, a person with a substance use disorder who cannot abstain from on-premises use of drugs/alcohol currently lacks housing choices within the local homeless response system.

For others, the choice to remain unsheltered represents the least bad choice. People weigh the disadvantages of shelter against tolerance for the difficulties of staying in an unsheltered location when the shelter offered:

- requires separation from a pet
- requires abandoning some or most of their personal possessions
- strictly controls entry/exit times that don’t match their daily routines
- is distantly located or inhospitable
- interferes with access and use of illegal substances
- conflicts with their sense of autonomy and privacy

The City recognizes that the homeless response system does not currently offer reasonable access to all persons experiencing unsheltered homelessness. By implication, the City acknowledges a need to accommodate a limited number of temporary encampments somewhere in the community until the homeless response system can be expanded to address several of the above legal, regulatory, and practical barriers.

City Policy Regarding Encampments

Encampments are just the most visible reminder of the housing affordability crisis where housing costs exceed 50% of a household’s income for 44% of the City’s residents. Encampments cannot be successfully managed in isolation of the overall homeless problem and the local homeless response system. Rather, unsheltered homelessness is best addressed through collaboration with community partners to make enhancements to the local homeless response system.

The City is a major property owner of undeveloped land which is used without permission by 20-40 unsheltered homeless persons at any single time for camping and erection of temporary structures for transient occupancy. The key land use policy concern regarding encampments is to balance the needs of the community with the needs of residents experiencing unsheltered homelessness. This objective is best satisfied by reducing the total number of urban campers and encampment locations and minimize the adverse impact of remaining encampments.

Reducing the number of unsheltered homeless persons will require further investment in the homeless response system to create alternative housing options accessible to persons residing in encampments.

Managing the adverse impacts of encampments is best achieved by directing temporary encampments away from sensitive areas and accommodating them on an interim basis at a limited number of areas that are less sensitive and where services can be provided to promote safe and sanitary living conditions for camp residents and the broader community.
The City’s approach to enforcement against encampments on City land should be strategic and guided by realistic understanding of the political will, cost, and resources needed for enforcement and clearance. Moreover, an area cleared is often reestablished as an encampment location within a few months without vigilance. It is unwise to adopt a policy that will not be enforced on the ground.

Managing encampments is resource intensive and requires a skill set that the City lacks as it does not provide social services or operate any residential or camping facilities. Even clearing encampments with provision of supportive services to occupants stresses City resources as DPW is not trained to address biohazards and other conditions found at encampments, discern between valuable possessions and abandoned junk, and facilitate relocation and storage of personal possessions. Clearing encampments often just leads to dispersion of campers to new locations that just restarts the entire process. All told, a wiser use of City resources whenever possible is to invest in community-based solutions to expand low-barrier shelter beds available on terms acceptable to those occupying encampments.

Much of the City’s objective regarding encampments can be achieved by clearly communicating directly with persons experiencing unsheltered homelessness, outreach workers, City and County staff, and community partner agencies, which locations are low-priority for enforcement and which areas are high-priority for enforcement. Undoubtedly, it will be important to back up the policy on the ground to relocate campers away from agreed-upon high-sensitivity areas after sufficient notice and with support.

City-owned high-sensitive areas to be prioritized for enforcement against encampments include:

1. public parks, designated natural areas, The Commons, and areas targeted for redevelopment, such as the Cherry Street Extension area and publicly owned land on Inlet Island;
2. locations near homes, schools, daycare centers, the main entrance to businesses, recreation trails such as the Cayuga Waterfront Trail and the Black Diamond Trail;
3. waterfront areas where sanitary facilities are not available;
4. areas that interfere with municipal operations and maintenance;
5. camping that interferes with public use of City lands; and
6. areas posted against trespass.

The former Southwest Park area behind Walmart and Lowe’s is designated as low-sensitivity area where enforcement against encampments will not be prioritized until realistic housing alternatives are available to be offered to persons living in an unsheltered encampment.

Actions on encampments should focus initially on mitigating negative impacts related to public safety, public health, environmental protection, and removing obstructions to intended public use or maintenance. The use of an encampment advocacy agency to work in collaboration with encampment residents and the City to mitigate concerns is encouraged. Such an encampment advocacy agency could be a non-profit agency, an advocacy group, a faith-based organization, or a grassroots collaborative that has gained the trust of encamped persons to interact with the City on their behalf. For instance, a small encampment may have no means to manage hygiene or trash removal, leading to complaints and concerns about human waste and vermin. An encampment advocacy agency may provide a portable bathroom and handwashing facility near the encampment and arrange for periodic waste removal. The City could elect to provide garbage tags to an encampment advocacy agency as a means to minimize city effort and cost of cleanup when the encampment is abandoned.
Strengthening the Homeless Response System

The City will work with community partners to strengthen the homeless response system to improve its effectiveness to connect people and with safe, stable housing, with a special focus on providing realistic alternatives to homeless encampments. Currently, there are gaps in the continuum of housing to serve persons with substance use disorders on a ‘housing first’ model. Registered sex offenders appear to have few options to access permanent housing. Other needs appear to exist for an emergency shelter to serve a youth population, an expanded day center, and permanent affordable housing.

The City and County have a unique opportunity to strategically invest American Recovery Plan (ARP) funding in facilities and services to improve the homeless response system. In 2021, the City received a HOME-ARP allocation of $1.2 million targeted to reduce homelessness. The County can likely access a similar level of HOME-ARP funds awarded to, and administered by, New York State. Both the City and County also received significant one-time Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds that are eligible to address homelessness.

The City can also further offer City lands currently used for encampments as a location for new housing targeted to unsheltered homeless persons. One approach to consider is for the City and County to jointly issue a Request For Expression of Interest (RFEI) to explore what organizations are interested to construct and operate housing facilities if land and financial support were offered.

Discussion Questions

What specific enhancements to the homeless response system would reduce the population of unsheltered homeless persons?
What are the major barriers to unsheltered persons entering the ES?
What specific services and/or facilities would minimize the impact of encampments?
What areas should be identified as low-sensitivity areas where enforcement against encampments is a low priority?
What should be the County's role in encampments?
How should clearance of encampments be implemented? Who should be involved? What supports should be provided?

Prepared by N. Bohn, Ithaca Urban Renewal Agency
Email comments to nbohn@cityofithaca.org
## 2013-14 Program Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal/Activity: Skill-Building/Job Readiness</th>
<th>GIAC (HETP)</th>
<th>Finger Lakes ReUse (ReSET)*</th>
<th>Learning Web (Learning by Doing)</th>
<th>TOTALS/AVGS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amended Goal:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Skill-Building/Job Readiness</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeric Objective:</td>
<td>20 LMI individuals</td>
<td>10 LMI individuals</td>
<td>5 placements</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IURA Funding:</td>
<td>$58,500.00</td>
<td>$98,000.00 (50.00)</td>
<td>Skill-Building/Job Readiness</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Enrollee:</td>
<td>$3,433</td>
<td>$5,734</td>
<td>Place at Cayuga Med. Ctr./Post-Placement Support</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Entry - Unemployed:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7 LMI youth placements at CMC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Training:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate:</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Full-Time Employment:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Job-Placement Goal by:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>140%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## 2014-15 Program Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal/Activity: Skill-Building/Job Readiness</th>
<th>GIAC (HETP)</th>
<th>Finger Lakes ReUse (ReSET)*</th>
<th>TOTALS/AVGS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amended Goal:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Skill-Building/Job Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeric Objective:</td>
<td>20 LMI individuals</td>
<td>20 LMI individuals</td>
<td>5 placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IURA Funding:</td>
<td>$582,500.00</td>
<td>$92,495.00</td>
<td>16 LMI individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Enrollee:</td>
<td>$2,115</td>
<td>$4,624</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Entry - Unemployed:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled:</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Training:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate:</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Full-Time Employment:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Job-Placement Goal by:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>220%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*not IURA-funded (included for comparison purposes)

## 2015-16 Program Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal/Activity: Skill-Building/Job Readiness</th>
<th>GIAC (HETP)</th>
<th>Finger Lakes ReUse (ReSET)*</th>
<th>TOTALS/AVGS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amended Goal:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Skill-Building/Job Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeric Objective:</td>
<td>20 LMI individuals</td>
<td>16 LMI individuals</td>
<td>4 placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IURA Funding:</td>
<td>$387,500.00</td>
<td>$109,372.86</td>
<td>21-33 LMI individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Enrollee:</td>
<td>$5,468</td>
<td>$6,835</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Entry - Unemployed:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Training:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate:</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Full-Time Employment:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Job-Placement Goal by:</td>
<td>166%</td>
<td>425%</td>
<td>433%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2016-17 Program Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal/Activity: Skill-Building/Job Readiness</th>
<th>GIAC (HETP)</th>
<th>TOTALS/AVGS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amended Goal:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeric Objective:</td>
<td>20 LMI individuals</td>
<td>16 LMI individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IURA Funding:</td>
<td>$587,500.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Enrollee:</td>
<td>$4,375</td>
<td>$5,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Entry - Unemployed:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Training:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate:</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Full-Time Employment:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Job-Placement Goal by:</td>
<td>125%</td>
<td>325%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Historic Ithaca (Work Preserve)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal/Activity</th>
<th>Finger Lakes ReUse (Job Skills Training)</th>
<th>GIAC (HETP)</th>
<th>Historic Ithaca (Work Preserve)</th>
<th>TOTALS/AVGS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill-Building &amp; Micro-Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training &amp; Placement</td>
<td>Skill-Building/Job Training &amp; Placement</td>
<td>Job Training &amp; Placement</td>
<td>Job Readiness &amp; Placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeric Objective</td>
<td>20 LMI individuals</td>
<td>14 placements</td>
<td>20 LMI individuals</td>
<td>6 placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IURA Funding</td>
<td>$57,800.00</td>
<td>$110,725.28</td>
<td>$87,500.00</td>
<td>$293,754.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Enrollee</td>
<td>$3.382</td>
<td>$3.355</td>
<td>$7.292</td>
<td>$4.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Entry - Under/Unemployed:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>31 (incl. 13 Re-Entry)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Training</td>
<td>7 (incl. 1 Re-Entry)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Training Goal by:</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Full-Time Employment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Job-Placement Goal by:</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>133%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Entry - Under/Unemployed:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Training</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Training Goal by:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Full-Time Employment</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Job-Placement Goal by:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEMORANDUM FOR: All CDBG Entitlement Grantees and All CPD Field Office Directors
FROM: James Arthur Jemison II, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, D
SUBJECT: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Entitlement Program
Restarting the Corrective Actions Process for Untimely Expenditure

This memorandum will provide explanatory background and a temporary change in process for the application of corrective actions for untimely expenditure in the CDBG Entitlement Program. HUD’s goal, through the implementation of this process, is to address the expenditure challenges that many grantees are facing right now and to lessen the administrative burdens on HUD personnel in Headquarters and the Field.

Background:

On September 30, 2021, the corrective action suspension for violations of the CDBG timeliness standard ended. Section IV.B. Flexibilities, Waivers, and Alternative Requirements of Federal Register Notice FR-6218-N-01, Program Rules, Waivers, and Alternative Requirements Under the CARES Act for Community Development Block Grant Program Coronavirus Response Grants, Fiscal Year 2019 and 2020 Community Development Block Grants, and for Other Formula Programs, (hereinafter, the “CDBG-CV Notice”), dated August 17, 2020, provided a number of flexibilities, waivers, and alternative requirements for the administration of fiscal year 2019 and 2020 CDBG grants. First among these was Section IV.B.1. Timeliness, that recognized the extenuating circumstances under which many local governments were operating due to coronavirus and that suspended, effective January 21, 2020, all corrective actions, sanctions, and informal consultations for timeliness for fiscal year 2020. Based on government restrictions, closures, shelter-in-place orders, and social distancing guidance related to coronavirus, HUD determined that all entitlement grantees had factors beyond their reasonable control that, to HUD’s satisfaction, impacted the carrying out of CDBG-assisted activities in a timely manner. As a result, HUD determined that corrective actions related to timeliness for fiscal year 2020 were not appropriate. HUD advised grantees that this suspension did not eliminate the timely expenditure requirements set forth in 24 CFR 570.902.

HUD continued to run expenditure reports and notified grantees of deficiencies when their grant fund balances exceeded the regulatory standard. HUD subsequently extended this suspension, by memoranda issued quarterly, through the end of the 2021 fiscal year.

Responding to the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting economic crisis has had an impact on local governments nationwide. This situation requires a measured and deliberate approach in
the restart of the timeliness corrective actions process. This memorandum sets forth a policy
change that fulfills HUD’s statutory obligation, acknowledges the unprecedented amounts of
funding grantees are struggling to spend, and lessens the administrative burdens on HUD
Community Planning and Development (CPD) HQ and Field personnel.

The Timeliness Requirement - HUD’s Statutory Obligation

In accordance with Section 104(e)(1) of the Housing and Community Development Act
of 1974, as amended, HUD must determine on at least an annual basis whether a grantee is
carrying out its program in a timely manner. The regulation at 24 CFR 570.902 implements this
statutory requirement. A grantee must have a line of credit ratio of 1.50 (or less) times its most
recent entitlement grant 60 days prior to the end of its program year to be considered timely
(2.00 or less for insular areas). In November 2001, HUD established the following two-step
corrective actions process for grantees that failed to meet the 1.50 timeliness standard:

- For first time violations of the standard, HUD sends a warning letter to the grantee, usually
  with a request for a workout plan that describes how the grantee will be timely by its next test
date.
- For violations of the standard for a second consecutive year or more, HUD invites the
  grantee, in accordance with 24 CFR 570.911, to an informal consultation at HUD
  Headquarters. In this meeting, the Department provides the grantee the opportunity to
demonstrate to HUD’s satisfaction that the lack of timeliness is due to circumstances beyond
its reasonable control. After the consultation, if HUD maintains its finding that the grantee is
untimely, HUD may reduce the grantee’s next year grant by the amount it exceeds the
standard.

Change to the CDBG Timeliness Corrective Action Policy

Because of the unprecedented funding levels available to grantees through the 2023 fiscal
year, HUD is revising its corrective action process to make it more progressive.

The timeliness test date for January 1 program year start date grantees is November 2nd.
Accordingly, the corrective action suspension took effect after the test date for some grantees for
FY2020. If a grantee was determined untimely in FY2020, before the suspension took effect,
HUD will consider the grantee’s FY2020 status when determining the appropriate corrective
action for a grantee who is again untimely in FY2022. HUD will not consider the timeliness
status in FY2021.

For all other grantees, to determine the appropriate corrective action for a grantee who is
untimely in FY2022 or FY2023, HUD will consider the grantee’s timeliness status on January
21, 2020, for FY2019, as if FY2019, FY2022, and FY2023 are consecutive years. HUD will not
consider the timeliness status of grantees for FY2020 and FY2021.
The new policy is as follows:

- A grantee that was timely in FY2019, or FY2020, if the test date occurred before the suspension, and is untimely for the first time in FY2022 or FY2023, will receive a warning letter from the field office.
- A grantee that was untimely for the first time in FY2019 or FY2020, if the test date occurred before the suspension, and is untimely a second consecutive year in FY2022, receives a letter from the field office requiring it to submit an acceptable workout plan demonstrating that it will be timely by its next test date.
- A grantee that was untimely for the second consecutive year in FY2019, or FY2020, if the test date occurred before the suspension, and is untimely for three consecutive years or more in FY2022, receives an invitation to an informal consultation at HUD Headquarters.

The table below illustrates the new policy for grantees whose timeliness test occurs on February 1st or later:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee timeliness status in FY19 on its test date</th>
<th>Action taken if untimely in FY2022</th>
<th>Action taken if still untimely in FY2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timely</td>
<td>Sent warning letter</td>
<td>Required to submit workout plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untimely for the first time</td>
<td>Required to submit workout plan</td>
<td>Invited to informal consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untimely for the second consecutive year or more</td>
<td>Invited to informal consultation</td>
<td>Invited to informal consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This change to the CDBG Timeliness policies and procedures will remain in effect for a two-year period beginning October 1, 2021, the start of the 2022 fiscal year, and conclude on September 30, 2023, the end of the 2023 fiscal year. HUD will continue to monitor a grantee’s line of credit adjusted ratio (including program income) in the application of this policy.

Potential for, and General Issues Related to, Grant Reductions

A grantee invited to an informal consultation at HUD Headquarters will still have the opportunity to make its case for an exception to the timeliness standard based on circumstances beyond its reasonable control. The burden on a grantee will be to clearly demonstrate with
compelling information how factors beyond its reasonable control caused significant delays in program implementation and affected its timely performance. A grantee should not delay improving its drawdown ratio on the basis that it may meet this burden. If a grantee fails to demonstrate that the untimeliness was due to factors beyond its reasonable control, HUD’s determination following the meeting may result in reducing the grantee’s next grant up to and including the amount exceeding the 1.50 timeliness standard. For example, if a grantee’s annual grant is $1 million and the 60-day adjusted ratio is 1.57, the maximum amount of the reduction is $70,000 (1.57 - 1.50 = .07 x $1 million = $70,000). HUD may also grant an exception to the standard based on the circumstances set forth by the grantee as beyond its reasonable control. HUD will not reduce a grant or sanction a grantee more than the amount of its next year’s grant from HUD.

Any grant reduction will affect the amount of CDBG funds available for planning and administration. By law, no more than 20% of any grant may be used for these purposes. If there is a significant grant reduction or a reduction to zero of a new grant, there will be limited or zero CDBG funds to pay the grantee's administrative staff.

Conclusion

The Department expects that this more progressive corrective action process will not only provide relief to grantees struggling to spend extra dollars but also lessen the burden on its field office personnel monitoring the expenditure of these extra dollars. Nevertheless, HUD does want to remind grantees of certain obligations regarding funds under their control and implications for the management of those funds.

The policy set forth in this memo does not extend to the timely expenditure of CDBG-CV funds. The period of performance obligations set forth in Section III.B.7.(a.) Period of Performance of the CDBG-CV Notice still apply to CDBG-CV funds. CDBG-CV funds have been excluded [see Section III.B.7.(b.) of the CDBG-CV Notice] from the CDBG Timeliness adjusted ratio calculation. Nevertheless, HUD reminds grantees that any program income generated from the use of CDBG-CV funds accrues to the grantee’s annual formula CDBG program adjusted line of credit. Grantees should consider this and other factors in their program design decisions for the use of CDBG-CV dollars.

Grantees may direct questions about how this policy specifically affects their community to their assigned local HUD field office. HUD field office staff may direct general questions about this policy to C. Duncan Yetman, Deputy Director, Entitlement Communities Division, at c.duncan.yetman@hud.gov.
Annual Community Assessment (ACA) Report

for

City of Ithaca, New York

Covering the Program Year of:

August 1, 2020 – July 31, 2021
INTRODUCTION

As a recipient of HUD Entitlement funds, the City of Ithaca is required to annually report on the progress made in carrying out the goals and priorities of the Consolidated Plan. The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) is designed to be a tool to report the activities undertaken during the previous year and shared with HUD as well as the local community stakeholders and residents.

The HUD Office is required to conduct an annual assessment of the City’s performance to determine whether the planning, activities, and reporting were carried out in accordance with applicable requirements. The City is invited to provide any updates or comments to the HUD Office within the next 30 days. Following the 30-day period, the report will be finalized and sent to the Chief Elected Officer of your community. The report will be available to the public as requested.

Assessment Period: August 1, 2020 – July 31, 2021
2nd Year of a 5-year Consolidated Plan

The City applied for and received funding for the following programs:

- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) $ 682,620
- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG-CV) $ 769,461
- Home Investment Partnerships (HOME) $ 335,099
- Total Funding Awarded: $ 1,787,180

Total funding expended during the reporting period: $807,004.00 (includes funds from prior years)

The total CDBG-CV funding expended during the reporting period: $351,002.00

PART I: Summary of Grantee Performance

CPD Programs
The City submitted the 2020 Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) which summarized performance during the reporting period. The report revealed that activities were implemented consistent with the goals and objectives set forth in the City’s Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan. Any exceptions are noted for additional information or clarification.

Highlights include:

- Citizen participation was conducted during the program year that exceeds HUD requirements.
- The City was compliant with Admin. caps for CDBG and HOME.
- The City was compliant and exceeded expectations with the CDBG Low-Mod Income beneficiary threshold in 2020 by expending 100% of CDBG resources in low-moderate income communities.
- Ithaca satisfied the CDBG timeliness test as of 6/2/21 at 1.34
- Ithaca met the HOME commitment and expenditure deadlines during the reporting period.
• Ithaca’s Single Audit Report is current through 12/31/19 and is in need of updated submission for 2020.
• Through actionable relationship building the City and its partners created the Ithaca Eviction/Displacement Defense (IEDD) Project, which provides a full spectrum of services to tenants from basic tenants’ rights information to services designed to support housing stability including homeownership services for Ithaca tenants.
• During the pandemic, Ithaca increased their level of collaboration not only at the onset of an extremely challenging programming year but remained consistent with a heightened level of collaboration and communication with partners and community stakeholders necessary for successful program implementation to prevent, prepare, and respond to the coronavirus.

Areas for follow up or clarification:

• Ithaca was very communicative throughout the review process and satisfactorily made adjustments and updates when necessary. The City provided timely explanations during the CAPER review process and all items of question were addressed thoroughly.

Compliance Summary and Updates:

• Ithaca has no open monitoring findings.

Other HUD Programs
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity:

FY-2020
The 2020 Ithaca CAPER was evaluated by Region 2 Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FEHO) on December 15, 2021. A copy of the full FHEO CAPER review will be sent in a separate attachment. Any FHEO questions and concerns regarding this 2020 FHEO CAPER review should be addressed to Jennifer Liebman, Equal Opportunity Specialist at jennifer.m.liebman@hud.gov

Ithaca continues to incorporate goals and action steps identified from their 2017 Assessment of Fair Housing report, which addresses barriers and actions necessary to remove them, which is commendable.

PART II: HUD Evaluation and Conclusions

The following determinations have been made relative to the City’s capacity to carry out CDBG funded activities:

1. The City has carried out its program substantially as described in its Consolidated Plan submission.

2. The Consolidated Plan submission as implemented complies with the requirements of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, and other applicable laws and regulations.
3. The City has the continuing capacity to carry out the approved program in a timely manner.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss the Assessment Report, please feel free to contact Tremeeka L. Norman, Community Planning and Development Representative on behalf of Rashika Hall, Community Planning and Development Representative, at 716-646-7077 or Tremeeka.L.Norman@hud.gov. If you disagree with this assessment, please respond via email to: William.T.OConnell@hud.gov. Your response should identify any areas of disagreement and corrections or any additional comments you would like HUD to consider.
2/8/2022

Ms. JoAnn Cornish, Director
Planning and Development Department
City of Ithaca
City Hall – 3rd Floor
108 E. Greene Street
Ithaca, NY 14850

Dear Ms. Cornish:

SUBJECT: Program Year 2020 Annual Community Assessment (ACA)
Reporting Period: August 1, 2020 to July 31, 2021
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) Program

Enclosed please find HUD’s Annual Community Assessment (ACA) reviewing the implementation and performance of the City of Ithaca’s CDBG and HOME Programs. While continuing efforts are taken into consideration, this assessment primarily focuses on the 2020 program year, which covered the period August 1, 2020 to July 31, 2021.

The HUD Buffalo Office is providing you a 30-day comment opportunity prior to issuing the Program Year Review Letter to the Mayor. The Mayor will be asked to make the document available to the public as established in your citizen participation plan. In addition, HUD will make it available to citizens upon request.

If you have any questions about this report, would like to discuss the comments, or require further assistance in the administration of your community development programs, please contact Tremeeka Norman CPD Representative, at 716-646-7077 or via e-mail at Tremeeka.L.Norman@hud.gov

Sincerely,

[Signature]
William T. O’Connell
Director
Community Planning and Development Division

Enclosure
FIRST AMENDMENT TO IURA BY-LAWS

BY-LAWS
of the
ITHACA URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY
Adopted September 27, 2007

ARTICLE I

NAME AND OBJECT OF CORPORATION

SECTION 1. This agency, duly established by Chapter 63, Laws of 1965 of the Legislature of the State of New York on April 13, 1965, as a public benefit corporation, shall henceforth be known as the "Ithaca Urban Renewal Agency." However, the Agency shall also be known locally as the Community Development Office.

SECTION 2. The object of the Agency shall be to carry out the functions and duties of urban renewal and community development in and for the City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, State of New York.

ARTICLE II

MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. The membership shall consist of five (5) members, including the Mayor of the City of Ithaca, New York. Members, other than the Mayor, shall be appointed by the Mayor with the concurring approval of a majority of the members of the Common Council, and shall serve at the pleasure of the Mayor.

SECTION 2. A Member shall continue to hold office until his or her successor is appointed and qualified. Members shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be entitled to necessary expenses including travel expenses, incurred by them in the discharge of their duties.

SECTION 3. If a vacancy occurs among the Members, the vacancy shall be filled in the same manner and method as an original appointment as hereinabove set forth.

ARTICLE III

GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. The general management of the affairs of the Agency shall be vested in the Members thereof who shall be appointed as hereinabove set forth.

SECTION 2. The officers of the Agency shall consist of a Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, and Secretary. The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be elected at each annual meeting of the Agency. The Agency shall appoint an Executive Director who shall serve as secretary to the Agency.
ARTICLE IV

MEETINGS

SECTION 1. Regular meetings of the Agency shall be held on the fourth Thursday of each month at City Hall unless otherwise directed. The annual meeting shall be the regular May meeting.

SECTION 2. Notice in writing of any regular meeting together with an agenda containing the business to be discussed and acted upon shall be received by all Members at least forty-eight (48) hours previous thereto. IURA meetings shall comply with the New York State Open Meetings Law.

SECTION 3. Special meetings of Members may be called by the Chairperson, or in the Chairperson’s absence the Vice Chairperson, at any time on his or her own initiative. Notice of the meeting shall be received by each Member at least twenty-four (24) hours previous to the meeting.

SECTION 4. At all meetings of the Agency, either regular or special, three (3) Members shall constitute a quorum; and the concurring vote of three (3) Members shall be necessary for any decision of the Agency to be effective and binding.

SECTION 5. If a quorum is present, the meeting may be adjourned and recalled upon proper notice to all members.

SECTION 6. At all meetings of the Agency, the normal order of business shall include the following:

1) Approval of minutes of immediate prior meeting.

2) Reports of the Chairperson and Committees.

3) Unfinished business.

4) New business.

ARTICLE V

DUTIES OF OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Agency and shall appoint the members to such Committees as required in these by-laws and as the Chairperson or the Agency shall consider expedient, and such committee members shall serve at the pleasure of the Chairperson. At least one Member shall be appointed by the Chairperson to each committee established.

SECTION 2. In the absence of the Chairperson, the Vice Chairperson shall perform the duties of the Chairperson.

SECTION 3. The Secretary shall maintain records of all official proceedings of the Agency.

SECTION 4. The Chairperson shall, on being so directed by the Members of the Agency, sign all leases, contracts, or other instruments in writing.
ARTICLE VI
DUTIES AND POWERS OF THE MEMBERS

SECTION 1. The Members of the Agency shall have general charge and management of the affairs, funds, and property of the Agency. They shall have full power, and it shall be their duty to carry out the purposes of the Agency pursuant to its legal authority.

SECTION 2. The Members may make rules for their conduct, may establish such Committees as they deem necessary, may vote the expenditure of money as they deem necessary or advisable, and may contract for lease or purchase in the name of the Agency.

ARTICLE VII
COMMITTEES

SECTION 1. In addition to any other committees it deems necessary and advisable for proper functioning, the Agency shall establish the following standing committees:

- Audit Committee
- Governance Committee

SECTION 2. An audit committee shall be comprised of at least three (3) “independent” persons as defined in the Public Authorities Accountability Act of 2005, as amended or revised. The audit committee shall oversee financial reporting, adequacy of internal controls and risk management practices of the Agency. The audit committee shall meet at least annually and more often as deemed necessary. It shall report its activity regularly to the Agency.

SECTION 3. A governance committee shall be comprised of at least three (3) “independent” persons as defined in the Public Authorities Accountability Act of 2005, as amended or revised. The governance committee shall advise the Agency on best governance practices and advise the Mayor on the skills and experiences required for potential members. The governance committee shall meet at least annually and more often as deemed necessary. It shall report its activity regularly to the Agency.

SECTION 4. At any meeting of a committee, a majority of the number of members appointed to the committee shall constitute a quorum. A vote by a majority of the appointed members at a duly organized committee meeting shall constitute the action of the committee.

SECTION 5. The committee Chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the committee.

SECTION 6. In the absence of the committee Chairperson, the committee Vice Chairperson shall perform the duties of the committee Chairperson.
SECTION 7. Each committee shall recommend a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson to the IURA for consideration. The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson for each committee shall be selected by vote of the IURA. The committee Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall serve for a term of one year at the pleasure of the IURA Chairperson and shall serve until replaced.

ARTICLE VIII

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

SECTION 1. The Agency will by resolution designate the appropriate method of executing financial management.

ARTICLE IX

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SECTION 1. The Executive Director shall be appointed by the Members of the Ithaca Urban Renewal Agency and shall serve at the pleasure of the Agency.

SECTION 2. The duties of the Executive Director shall consist of being the Administrative officer of the Agency subject to the Members of the Agency, and the Executive Director shall act as Secretary of the Agency and act as ex-officio member thereof.

ARTICLE X

AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1. These By-Laws may be amended by a majority vote of at least three (3) Members present at a regular or special meeting of the Agency provided notice of the purpose of proposed amendment has been stated in the call for the meeting.

END

IURA By-Laws adopted: May 13, 1965
1st amendment adopted: September 27, 2007
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