The meeting was brought to order at 8:00 a.m.

Present: Councilmember Vanorny; Councilmember Poe; Councilmember Hoeger; Jennifer Pratt, Community Development Director; Bill Michel, Community Development Assistant Director; Seth Gunnerson, Community Development Planner; Adam Lindenlaub, Community Development Planner; Sylvia Bochner, Community Development Planner; Eric Pate, Community Development Planner; Sara Buck, Housing Programs Manager; Lauren Freeman, Community Development Program Coordinator; Nate Kampman, City Engineer; Justin Holland, Engineering Construction Manager; Brenna Fall, CIP Program Manager; Jillane Shultz, Community Development Administrative Assistant;

1. Approval of Minutes
 Councilmember Vanorny motioned to approve the minutes from the July 17, 2018 meeting. Councilmember Hoeger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Presentation Items
   a. Contract Management/Change Orders
      Jennifer Pratt, Community Development Director, prefaced the topic by stating that it will be presented to a number of council committees. Questions about change orders come up frequently for elected officials. Nate Kampman, City Engineer, and Justin Holland, Public Works Construction Manager, led the presentation. Mr. Kampman shared that there are currently 45 infrastructure projects under construction, and Public Works continues to increase the number of improvement projects. Mr. Kampman stated that construction change orders are a normal part of the construction process and serve as a tool to document agreement on changes for a complete, quality project. Each project has a contingency budgeted for potential change orders and can be owner or contractor-initiated. A construction change order can result from an increase or decrease in cost or construction schedule. Triggers for change orders could be unknown site conditions, material substitution, an owner-requested change, errors or omissions in contract documents.
Mr. Kampman shared a flowchart to explain the change order approval process:

1. Change order request – initiated by contractor or City
2. Calculation of cost and schedule impact
3. Justification of cost and schedule impacts
4. Work change directive – signed by City construction staff and contractor
5. Change order routed for approvals – multiple checkpoints: Contractor, Contract Administrator, Construction Manager, City Engineer, Contracts Manager, City Manager, and City Council
*On federal-aid – the Department of Transportation also approves the change order
6. Change order incorporated into contract

Councilmember Hoeger asked if certain contractors consistently submit change orders and what the process is from bid opening. Mr. Kampman stated that the City is bound by State code to accept the lowest, most responsible and responsive bid. Mr. Holland stated that in relation to the amount of contracts a contractor possesses the change orders are relative to that number.

Councilmember Hoeger asked if change orders have a multi-step sign off process. Mr. Holland stated that if the City has established bid prices and it is for an extended quantity, those sign-offs are relatively easy. If a change order is submitted for an added bid item or scope change, they are discussed in a progress meeting. Historic bid prices are retained to review in these situations.

Councilmember Vanorny asked how often the City is initiating change orders compared to the contractors, as well as what types of projects tend to go over budget. Mr. Holland stated that all quantities are measured and bids cannot be padded, which gives contractors the same advantage for a project. Each month, a contractor is compensated to estimate quantities. Final measurements are verified with GIS equipment and cameras to view the inside of pipes and sewer, with the exception of the water main.

Councilmember Vanorny asked what the biggest variations are in bids, and the reason for that. Mr. Holland stated that it tends to be tied to schedules and crew availability. Certain contractors may have different equipment or source of materials. When a contractor appears to have a large number of change orders, it is important to review that number in relation to the amount of work they are completing.

Councilmember Hoeger asked if data is available for the triggers for comparison. Mr. Kampman stated that this information has not been kept historically; however, the City is working on tying reason codes to a change order to report at that level.

Councilmember Poe asked if additional engineering staff will be required with the construction of the Flood Control System. Mr. Kampman stated that the Army Corps projects will be managed by them from start to finish. The City will need to coordinate with the Army Corps at a certain level to remain in sync. As for the local share,
additional staff may be required but a dramatic increase in staffing is not anticipated at this time.

3. Recommendation Items
   a. Community Development Block Grant Administrative Guidelines
   Sara Buck, Housing Programs Manager, shared a presentation on the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Administrative Guidelines.

   Examples of Eligible Activities (CDBG)
   - Housing Rehabilitation
   - Homebuyer Assistance
   - Infrastructure improvements
   - Public facility improvements
   - Public services to special needs populations

   Ms. Buck stated that the eligible activities for CDBG must meet a National Objective:
   - Low/Moderate Income Benefit (Primary Objective)
   - Eliminate Slum/Blight
   - Urgent Need with no other funding source (ex. disaster)

   Examples of Eligible Activities (HOME Investment Partnership Program)
   - Housing Rehabilitation
   - Homebuyer Assistance
   - Housing New Construction
   - Tenant Based Rental Assistance
   - All activities must serve:
     - Low/Moderate Income Benefit

   Ms. Buck shared that the Administrative Plan is reviewed on an annual basis. Feedback from residents and stakeholders is welcomed, as well as HUD guidance and changes in regulation. Major changes are brought before City Council for consideration.

   Ms. Buck stated that the Comprehensive Rehab Program will have a new annual application process. Applications will be due the 1st Monday in October and the City anticipates receipt of fifty applications prior to closing. Eligible property guidelines will be updated to fifty years and older. Contribution requirements for certain households will decrease. Ms. Buck shared that the project costs will cap at $35,000, or 50% of pre-rehab assessed value. The program is opening for the first time since 2013.

   Ms. Buck shared that the Minor Repair Program will raise the minimum general maintenance amount from $300 to $500. An asset limit will also be established of $25,000 in non-retirement assets.

   Ms. Buck shared that the First-Time Homebuyer Program annual applications will be accepted the first Monday in October. The asset limit will increase to $25,000 in non-
retirement assets. Ms. Buck stated that the homebuyer contribution will range from $500 - $1500 based on non-retirement asset totals. Household expense calculations will be incorporated, in addition to housing and debt to income ratios.

Councilmember Hoeger asked if these programs are marketed. Ms. Buck stated that an extensive email list is utilized and the City has positive relationships with area lenders and realtors. The City’s Communications team also assists in marketing various programs.

Councilmember Vanorny asked if residents can take advantage of these programs in conjunction with the Neighborhood Finance Corporation. Ms. Buck stated that residents can utilize both.

Councilmember Poe asked if residents could combine with the Historic Rehabilitation Program. Ms. Pratt and Ms. Buck stated that both could be combined.

Councilmember Vanorny motioned to approve the CDBG Administrative Guidelines. Councilmember Hoeger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Updates

a. Rezone
Mr. Gunnerson shared a verbal update for Rezone. Meetings have concluded with the Design Review Technical Advisory Committees, explaining how their role is incorporated into the new code. The City has received over two hundred developer and citizen comments that were both general in nature and specific to language. Mr. Gunnerson shared that meetings were held with Development Services, Public Works, and Parks and Recreation to discuss recommended changes. The next step is to coordinate a meeting with the developer community to review responses to comments received, so they understand what to anticipate in the final draft. Mr. Gunnerson stated that the City’s goal is to adopt Rezone in the fall and implement on January 1, 2019.

Councilmember Poe asked if the final draft will be listed on the Development Committee agenda before moving to City Council. Mr. Gunnerson stated that it will go before both Development Committee and City Planning Commission.

b. Czech Village/NewBo Area Action Plan
Adam Lindenlaub, Community Development Planner, shared an update for the Czech Village/NewBo Area Action Plan. EnvisionCR creates the framework for sub-area plans to aid in implementation of goals. Mr. Lindenlaub stated that Area Action Plans are focused planning efforts in a specified geographic area, which act as a guide for future decision making, creating a unified vision, identifying initiatives, and unifying actions. Mr. Lindenlaub shared the typical Area Action Plan elements, which are driven by process:
- Place making – Key intersections, gateways, signage
• Connectivity – Vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists, transit
• Land use – density and intensity, mix and integration of types, efficient utilization
• Character – building placement, location, height, historic value
• Streetscapes – landscaping, lighting, amenities

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approached the City with $20,000-30,000 of technical assistance for the Sinclair site. A three-day design workshop was held to focus on urban design, character, and facilitating opportunities for the site. The role of the advisory group was to provide feedback on significant concepts throughout the planning process, preview community input opportunities, and act as champions to advocate.

Ms. Pratt shared that the City was very specific in making sure there was representation from groups who are active in the area. This was critical, because it gave something for people to react to. Ms. Pratt stated that there are three, well thought out concepts that can be shared with the public.

Mr. Lindenlaub shared that the EPA will be providing the three concepts and a draft for the City to utilize this fall. A consultant will complete the larger area process throughout the fall and into the spring/summer of 2019.

Councilmember Hoeger asked how the City will communicate with property owners in the area who were not engaged in the process. Ms. Pratt stated that the City was sensitive to this aspect. There will be an outreach effort to adjacent property owners, which is always standard. Ms. Pratt shared that it is an opportunity to open lines of communication.

Councilmember Poe asked if receiving EPA assistance is new. Ms. Pratt shared that this is newer, and resulted from recent contact. The City received the Phoenix Award for the redevelopment work in the NewBo area because the EPA’s Brownfield cleanup funding was utilized to clean up the area. The EPA was vocal about how they love being part of projects where there is success and momentum. When they returned to visit after the ceremony, their visual of the Sinclair site from Mt. Trashmore is what inspired them to approach the City with the technical assistance.

c. Historic Preservation Sub-Committees: Bever Bridge & Property Prioritization
Bill Micheel, Community Development Assistant Director and Mr. Lindenlaub provided a verbal update. Mr. Lindenlaub shared that there is a cost estimate for the Bever Bridge repairs and have discussed fundraising strategies this sub-committee can use to begin.

Mr. Lindenlaub shared that the Property Prioritization Sub-Committee members are exploring proactive strategies, with the assistance of City staff, to further historic preservation in the City. Two non-profits, SaveCR Heritage and Friends of Historic Preservation, are also involved. The initial meeting was a kick off to discuss shared goals. Ms. Pratt shared that the group is tasked with drafting a list, but the outcome is less about prioritizing structures and more about prioritizing actions. The criteria used to come up with the list is important to be able to identify issues, and use those issues to identify
initiatives. The list helps people understand which properties in our community to appreciate for their historical significance.

Councilmember Hoeger asked if the list contains public and private historic structures. Ms. Pratt stated that it contains both.

d. Bike Share
Mr. Micheel shared a presentation to provide background on the Bike Share Program and different types of systems, as well as the pros and cons of docked & hybrid systems.

**Dock-Based**
- Traditional bike share system with docks or stations for each bike

**Hybrid (What the City chose)**
- Uses smart bikes and provides docking systems
- Bikes can be parked at docks or parked anywhere within a geofenced service area
- Typically charges a few when parked outside of service area

**Dockless**
- Smart bikes with no docks
- “Stations” are created using very small geofences
- Can use existing bike parking or not
- Bikes have self-locking mechanisms

**Pros of Docked & Hybrid Systems:**
- Relies on sponsorship which can create community partnerships
- More predictable
- Planning and designing of stations can be tailored to support City goals
- Control over service level
- Permanence as infrastructure

**Cons of Docked & Hybrid Systems**
- Higher infrastructure costs
- Need to plan and design stations
- Most cities require a permit for each station
- Relies on sponsorship
- Station requires winter maintenance

Mr. Micheel shared a timeline and next steps:
• September/October 2018 – Equipment/Operations RFP out to bid & Sponsor Meetings
• October/November 2018 – Launch of public sponsorship campaign
• October 2018 – Selection of Equipment/Operations Vendor(s) - Sponsor Meetings
• October/November 2018 – Finalize contact with Equipment/Operator Vendor(s)
• November 2018/April 2019 – Equipment Purchase Order
• May 2019 – Bike Share Program Launch

Councilmember Poe asked what the total investment is. Mr. Micheel stated that the City is seeking a title sponsor that will have the majority of the branding on the system. Mr. Micheel estimated that the title sponsor’s investment would be near $200,000-$300,000 for two years, covering the cost of equipment and operations. Station sponsorships range from $15,000-20,000 and decrease from there. Mr. Micheel stated that the sponsorships were structured to provide opportunity for large employers to small businesses to participate.

Councilmember Vanorny asked what the cost is for use of the bikes as a user. Mr. Micheel stated that the cost would be $2.50/30 minutes and $0.10/minute after the 30 minutes expires. Users may also purchase an annual membership for $90.

Councilmember Poe asked why a monthly pass is not available. Mr. Micheel stated that their research with other communities indicated that users were more apt to purchase daily or annual passes.

e. Trail Projects
Brenna Fall, CIP Program Manager, shared a presentation update for trail construction, trails in design, and funded trails.

Trail Construction
• Kirkwood Boulevard Trail
• Edgewood Road Trail
• Sac and Fox Trail

Trails in Design
• CEMAR Trail
• Cherokee Trail Phase I & II
• Lindale Trail Phase I

Funded* Trails
• CEMAR Trails – Multiple phases
• Edgewood Road Trail – Multiple phases
• Cherokee Trail – Phase III
- Lindale Trail – Phase II
- Bowling Street Trail

*Partially funded with MPO Grants in FFY18-21

Councilmember Hoeger asked when the trail would cross the Cedar River over Edgewood Road. Ms. Fall stated that there is no firm date, however, the funding is in place through the Corridor MPO and anticipated completion within the next few years.

Councilmember Poe asked when the Edgewood O to Ellis Blvd will open. Mr. Holland stated that completion is anticipated this fall.

Councilmember Poe asked how much funding is being received from the MPO. Ms. Pratt stated that the funding received from the MPO is 30% trails, 50% roads, and 20% transit.

Councilmember Poe asked if the Lindale Trail includes the old railroad bed. Ms. Fall stated that it does and that is the reason for the diagonal alignment.

Councilmember Hoeger asked if the railroad gives the City an idea of what their long term plans are. Ms. Fall stated that they typically do not share this information.

Councilmember Poe asked if the Stickle Property is still in negotiation and if the trail would go under 1st Ave. Ms. Fall stated that it will go under 1st Avenue after raising it slightly. There is an old structure buried under 1st Avenue that will be reopened for this purpose. Negotiations have not begun with Stickle, as the DOT needs authorize to begin the acquisition process.

5. Public Comment

6. Future Discussion Items

Councilmember Vanorny inquired about the Cedar Rapids flag. Ms. Pratt stated that she would look into.

Councilmember Poe requested an update on 1st & 1st West at the October 16 meeting.

Councilmembers Vanorny and Hoeger adjourned the meeting at 9:27 a.m. with unanimous consent.

Respectfully submitted,

Jillane Shultz, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development