

**ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED
AT THE CAUCUS PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL MEETING
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, May 3, 2022
7:00 P.M.**

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

III. DISCUSSION:

1. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 11143-2020, AUTHORIZING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BROOK PARK HOME MAINTENANCE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM (HMAP), AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Orcutt – PER COUNCIL PRESIDENT VECCHIO

IV. ADJOURNMENT:

Posted: 4/29/22

**ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED
AT THE CAUCUS PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL MEETING
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, MAY 3, 2022**

The meeting was called to order by Council President Vecchio at 7:00 p.m., the clerk called the roll and the following Members of Council answered:

TROYER, COYNE, SCOTT, MENCINI, ROBERTS, POINDEXTER, SALVATORE

Also in attendance were Mayor Orcutt, Law Director Horvath, Finance Director Cingle, Economic Development Commissioner Marnacheck, Service Director Beyer and Recreation Director Gonzales.

DISCUSSION:

1. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 11143-2021, AUTHORIZING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BROOK PARK HOME MAINTENANCE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM (HMAP) AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Introduced by Mayor Orcutt. **Note:** Moved by **motion** from the April 26, 2022 Sp. Council meeting.

Mr. Troyer stated spent some time and talked to some people on this and still adamant this not be a grant should be a loan; to recoup some of the monies. This would be a loan with no interest and no payments; just a lien. Talking with Mr. Cingle he suggested no sunset and I agree due to tax ramifications. This would be a loan on the house and when it changes hands the city gets some monies back, if there are any. This hasn't come up before with the 50/50 split what if people don't have the monies for their half. Perhaps look at making that a 25% match or something like that, another city does that to qualify people.

Madam Coyne stated there is a few amendments to this legislation and keep in mind that (former) Mayor Coyne's (name) is mentioned a lot. In 2015 and 2017 some people on this Council voted for this. There should be an increase to some of the funds, not being a loan, not having people to pay it back and increase the spending to \$100,000.00. There should be a limit of seven years once monies are received and don't think \$50,000.00 is enough.

Mr. Mencini stated I thought a lot about this and the lengthy discussion last week on this, don't know what we're missing here. This is to help residents, to help people who need it. I received calls and asked who was out citing people and found out people weren't cited they just had so many days to fix things up. On the bottom of the sheet it reads there is a program from the city's community development department. When Mr. Troyer asked Mr. Marnacheck who received the letter I think the answer was 20; not to apply, not to have names thrown out all over. Again, this was to help Brook Park residents and most people who received this, from the history of this program, were seniors and people struggling. This is an improvement to homes and helping residents

Discussion: cont.

and am fine with residents not having the money. It will be the economic development commissioner's responsibility if someone applies with the intent to sell the home. Think the sooner we get this done the sooner we can help our residents.

Mr. Scott stated I presented an amendment last week about adding a line number one to section 6 putting wording in about a resident timespan that received a lot of feedback. Speaking with the law director her recommendation for wording is 'once a grant has been awarded to a household recipient that household recipient is not eligible for award assistance for a period of five years'. Looking at all the ordinances from 2015 to current each ordinance has three to five speculations of owner-occupied dwellings, owner-occupied residence and owner-occupied housing. Four of the seven Councilmembers went along with that and don't know why there is an issue from 2017 - 2022. Think the law director's recommendation should be included to protect a repeat person that has the system down, hope that doesn't happen. Tossing around loan or grant and there was discussion about the sunset provision; don't think we should do that because if the person doesn't pay the loan it then turns into a 1099 forcing them to pay more taxes. Either tax them up front with the grant and we all know, people will not pay that loan back.

Madam Coyne reiterated a few amendments and asked Council if they want her to read the amendments?

Mr. Salvatore asked Mr. Scott to cite the recommendation for the amendment.

Mr. Scott responded Madam Coyne has seven years and I'm looking at five years and also adding the word 'recipient'.

Madam Coyne read her proposed amendments to Ordinance No. 11250-2022, as follows: First Whereas to read City Council shall appropriate the amount of \$100,000.00 from the American Rescue Fund No. 292. Amend section one, subsection number four, to read 'and eligibility requirements set forth in section 5'. Amend section 1, subsection number four, to read '\$10,000.00 in grants'. Amend to create a new subsection number 5 - Qualifications. In section one, priority shall be given to applicants to correct property maintenance violations provided they meet one or more of the following requirements: a) Owner-occupant is 70-years of age or older; b) Owner-occupant is a veteran of the United States military. Amend section two to read 'once a grant has been awarded to a household, that household is not eligible for another assistance award for a period of seven years. As Mr. Scott stated five-years that is fine with me and workable. Sub-section two would become subsection three and follow in numerical sequence to subsections five.

Mr. Poindexter asked Madam Coyne, you are suggesting eliminate the income requirements and isolate this to 70-years and older and military veterans only?

Discussion: cont.

Madam Coyne responded also those applicants that a home has been cited and residents can't afford the monies to pay would be taken into consideration. The 70-years old and Veterans' applicants would be foremost and think would be important but wouldn't want to eliminate residents that have applications in that have been cited, definitely want to help them if they are unable to make repairs.

Mr. Roberts stated to Madam Coyne, are you saying of an owner-occupant is 70-years or older and a veteran of the United States military; they automatically qualify even if above the federal income level?

Madam Coyne responded no, they would still have to qualify.

Mr. Roberts clarified would have to be below the federal guideline regulations.

Madam Coyne concurred.

Mr. Vecchio asked Madam Coyne does this grant work with veteran benefits that are out there for home maintenance?

Madam Coyne responded no, this is something for us to take care of veterans' in Brook Park.

Mr. Vecchio asked do the veterans' exhaust those programs first and go for this; or do they exhaust this program first and go for those?

Madam Coyne responded if they have exhausted those first and, again, a lot of those benefits have changed and don't know the criteria, there are a lot of items the veterans' need to go for those. As far as I'm concerned this is our responsibility to take care of Brook Park veterans'.

Mr. Mencini stated there are things I like and don't like with this. One of the things is that the demographics are definitely different then when this was originated. People are paying a lot more monies for a house in Brook Park and then COVID-19 hit with job losses or a variety of things that people might need this and it's not listed on here about a person being cited. To Mr. Cingle how is the city with the American Rescue Fund 282?

Mr. Cingle responded first I'm hearing about this and would need to do some research. During budget talks it was mentioned that some of those dollars would be used for employee bonuses and the remaining dollars for the roof and walls of the recreation center. Any other dollars that would be spent out of the rescue plan fund would be less money put towards the roof and walls. Less money for repair of the roof and walls would be more needed to borrow.

Discussion: cont.

Mayor Orcutt stated we look at this program the same as the senior grass cutting/snow removal program. Some of the suggestions with putting a lien may make this more complicated for finance and law departments as well as economic development to actually administer this program. The way this legislation is written this is for low and moderate income families that have issues with the exterior of their homes and furnaces. The applicants that do qualify are within the federal guidelines which is a very basic system that has been around since 2015. With the talk about Fund 282 this legislation can be amended if the monies are available. Once Council sees the presentation from Bud Griffith (of Construction Resources) about the roof and walls there will be a better understanding of how much that will cost. In fund 282 there is approximately \$1.9 million-dollars and as Mr. Cingle stated \$100,000.00 of those dollars will be used for bonuses for employees and after that there will be approximately \$1.82 million-dollars to put towards the repairs of this building that still won't be enough.

Madam Coyne to mayor do you know approximately homes are in violations of exterior property maintenance, is there a list?

Mayor Orcutt stated will provide that information.

Mr. Salvatore stated taking the proposed amendments, one at a time, I don't have problem with the \$100,000.00 but we haven't used the \$50,000.00 yet, would be on board to increase if the need should arise. Putting an age of 70 years-old or older can't support that there may be people in their late 60's that might need help.

Madam Coyne clarified we could accommodate a senior citizen if they qualify with the income level.

Mr. Salvatore continued with the veteran it doesn't matter how old the veteran would be if they are in the guidelines they would be covered as well.

Madam Coyne concurred and mentioned there are a lot of unemployed veterans in the city of veterans that have been cited.

Mr. Salvatore think on right track supported this program since 2015 and don't want to see a loan program, like the idea of a grant. Also, not in favor of the seven-years like the five-years, if a resident has to come back for more assistance fine with that.

Mr. Vecchio suggested this should be moved forward after the presentation from Mr. Griffith and the proposed amendments heard.

Mayor Orcutt clarified more monies can be added to this and would like to see this moved forward as soon as possible due to a timeline to get contractors now. There seems to be a problem with getting contractors, in the first place, and the longer we

Discussion: cont.

delay don't think the residents will have the opportunity to grab contractors.

Mr. Troyer provided a scoring matrix that another city uses as follows: Owners on deed over 65-years of age - ten points; one owner on deed over 65-years of age - five points; income at or below 300% of the 2021 federal poverty level ten points if under 200%; 201-300% - five points; 301% of higher - zero points. Veterans that have received a grant from the city, in the past, if no - five points and if yes - zero points. This is a scoring system that incorporates what is being discussed here. Would like to get this done next Tuesday and the easiest way to get done, in my opinion, is to add Mr. Scott's amendment and my amendment of changing grant to a loan and monies can be added later as an amendment. What this was for seniors to stay in home as long as possible their income isn't increasing but inflation is going up. Doesn't make any difference seniors are helping seniors whether a grant or a loan. With the loan we are helping the city get that money clawed back with no payment, no interest, no tracking. All that matters are this goes into a lien and when the home changes hand the county sends the city money if those monies are available. Not a lot of work and, again, it's watching out for the residents' monies. If grants are given that money is gone and we need to find monies every year to promote this program. If a loan and put a lien on without payments or interest the city gets those monies back if available. Changes nothing whether a grant or loan it helps the resident or senior and allows us to watch the residents' monies more closely. Cannot give one resident's money away to another resident so somebody could reap the benefits for that whether a family member or whoever down the road.

Mr. Poindexter stated there are some great ideas and would like to see the amendments made and move this forward. Like Mr. Scott's idea of five-years and also Mr. Troyer's idea of a loan with a sunset of that five-years, not indefinite. Would like to see this legislation recurring year after year and when monies come back from the loans placed in the fund. Also, okay with the matrix scoring system to be fair across the board and can be verified that people are actually in need.

Mr. Salvatore asked Mr. Troyer if this matrix scoring system is from the City of Cleveland.

Mr. Troyer responded no.

Mr. Salvatore asked Mr. Troyer to share the city this came from.

Mr. Troyer stated will later looking to get more information. This has been talked about in the past and Mr. Salvatore brought up the monies have not been spent. I have asked for many years for information and in every piece of legislation it states that proper records will be kept and have asked for them. To Economic Development Commissioner, Marnacheck, I'm asking, call it a public records request, am asking for all

Discussion: cont.

the records of who received, what they were for and how much, one last thing this started out as loans and grants both.

Motion by Mr. Troyer, supported by Mr. Mencini, this was discussed.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Troyer, Mencini, Roberts, Poindexter, Salvatore, Coyne

NAYS: Scott.

There being no further business to come before this meeting a **motion** by Mr. Salvatore, supported by Mr. Poindexter, to adjourn.

ROLL CALL: AYES: Salvatore, Poindexter, Roberts, Mencini, Troyer, Coyne, Scott

NAYS: Unanimous.

Council President Vecchio declared this meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED Carol Johnson
Carol Johnson
Clerk of Council

APPROVED June 21, 2022

THESE MEETING MINUTES ARE A SYNOPSIS, NOT TRANSCRIBED IN THEIR ENTIRETY, ALTHOUGH ACCURATE.