



# City Council Information Packet

February 1, 2024

## **Council Tentative Meeting Schedule**

**IP1.** Council Tentative Meeting Schedule

### **February 6 Work Session**

**IP2.** Work Session Agenda

**IP3.** Memo from City Manager: Utility Rate Background Information

**IP4.** Pending City Council Work Session Topics

### **Miscellaneous**

**IP5.** Memo from Budget Management Analyst: Quarterly Financial Summary for Period Ending December 31, 2023

**IP6.** Civil Service Examination: Recreation Program Supervisor - Special Events & Communications

### **Draft Minutes**

**IP7.** Historic Preservation Commission: January 11

**IP8.** Human Rights Commission: January 23



# CITY OF IOWA CITY COUNCIL ACTION REPORT

---

February 1, 2024

---

Council Tentative Meeting Schedule

---

Attachments: [Council Tentative Meeting Schedule](#)



# City Council Tentative Meeting Schedule

*Subject to change*

**February 1, 2024**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Location</u>
Tuesday, February 6, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Thursday, February 15, 2024	7:00 PM	Joint Meeting with University of Iowa Student Government (USG)	Old Capitol Senate Chambers 21 N. Clinton Street, 2nd Floor
Tuesday, February 20, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, March 19, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, April 2, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Special Formal Meeting Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, April 16, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, May 7, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, May 21, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, June 4, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, June 18, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, July 16, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, August 6, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, August 20, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, September 3, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, September 17, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, October 1, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
Tuesday, October 15, 2024	4:00 PM 6:00 PM	Work Session Formal Meeting	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street

---

Monday, November 4, 2024	4:00 PM	Work Session	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
	6:00 PM	Formal Meeting	
Tuesday, November 19, 2024	4:00 PM	Work Session	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
	6:00 PM	Formal Meeting	
Tuesday, December 10, 2024	4:00 PM	Work Session	City Hall, Emma J. Harvat Hall 410 E. Washington Street
	6:00 PM	Formal Meeting	

---

Item Number: IP2.



# CITY OF IOWA CITY COUNCIL ACTION REPORT

---

February 1, 2024

---

Work Session Agenda

---

Attachments: [Work Session Agenda](#)

Subject to change as finalized by the City Clerk. For a final official copy, contact the City Clerk's Office 356-5041

If you will need disability-related accommodations in order to participate in this program/event, please contact Kellie Grace at 319-356-5041, [kgrace@iowacity.org](mailto:kgrace@iowacity.org). Early requests are strongly encouraged to allow sufficient time to meet your access needs.

**Iowa City**  
**City Council - Work Session**  
**Agenda**  
**Work Session**  
**February 6, 2024 - 4:00 PM**  
**Emma J. Harvat Hall**  
**410 E. Washington Street**  
[www.icgov.org](http://www.icgov.org)



City of Iowa City Land Acknowledgment can be found at:  
[icgov.org/landacknowledgement](http://icgov.org/landacknowledgement)

Meeting Rules can be found at: [icgov.org/meetingrules](http://icgov.org/meetingrules)

You can watch the meeting on cable channel 4 (118.2 QAM) in Iowa City, University Heights and Coralville, or you can watch it online at any of the following websites:

- <https://citychannel4.com/live>
- <https://www.youtube.com/user/citychannel4/live>
- <https://facebook.com/CityofIowaCity>

1. Presentation on City Hall Building Space Needs Study
2. Annual Historic Preservation Plan Presentation
3. Continued discussion on the FY 25 budget proposal
4. Clarification of Agenda Items
5. Information Packet Discussion [January 18, January 25, February 1]
6. University of Iowa Student Government (USG) Updates
7. Council updates on assigned boards, commissions, and committees



# CITY OF IOWA CITY COUNCIL ACTION REPORT

---

February 1, 2024

---

Memo from City Manager: Utility Rate Background Information

---

Attachments: [Memo from City Manager: Utility Rate Background Information](#)



# CITY OF IOWA CITY MEMORANDUM

---

Date: January 31, 2024  
To: Mayor and City Council  
From: Geoff Fruin, City Manager  
Re: Utility Rate Background Information

At the January 22, 2024 operating budget review work session, the City Council requested additional information on the proposed FY25 water rate increase. This memo provides additional information on all utility rate increase proposals to support your February 6<sup>th</sup> work session discussion.]

## **FY25 Utility Rate Recommendations**

Iowa City's FY 23-28 Strategic Plan includes the following action item:

*Ensure Enterprise Funds are well supported through incremental rate and fee increases and do not become reliant on large rate spike, property taxes or unplanned debt issuance. (Page 22)*

The FY25 budget proposal includes the following utility rate increase proposals:

- Water: 3%
- Wastewater: 5%
- Recycling: \$1/month
- Refuse: None
- Organics: None
- Stormwater: None

For comparative purposes, the average monthly consumption metric for an Iowa City utility account is 800 cubic feet of water. This equates to just under 6,000 gallons of water consumed. Attached to this memo are two utility bills that can provide a helpful visual. The first is based on a customer that has used the 800 cubic feet average. The second is from a household of five that uses less than the monthly average (516 cubic feet used).

The residential water and wastewater utility rates have two components – the service fee and the volumetric fee. The service fee is the base amount paid by all users even if no water is consumed during the month and covers the first 100 cubic feet of usage. The FY24 service fee is \$8.52 and \$8.31 for water and wastewater respectively. The FY24 volumetric fee is \$3.97 per 100 cubic feet of use for both water and wastewater. For clarity and comparison 100 cubic feet is 748 gallons, therefore the average utility account pays \$0.0061 per gallon of drinking water delivered to their home. A gallon of drinking water purchased from a store in a plastic jug costs \$1.00 or more.

During the opening budget presentation on January 22<sup>nd</sup> staff noted that the proposed increases would add an estimated \$3.93 to the monthly bill for the average household. This calculation is based

on the consumption of 800 cubic feet of water consumed per month. The following table details the calculation of the increased costs per month.

	Proposed	
	Current	Increased
Water	\$ 36.31	\$ 37.40
Sewer	36.80	38.64
Refuse	14.00	14.00
Recycling	7.50	8.50
Organics	3.50	3.50
Stormwater	5.50	5.50
Excise Tax	2.18	2.24
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 105.79</b>	<b>\$ 109.78</b>
Increase		\$ 3.99

*\*Note the \$.06 difference from the budget presentation figure is the increase to the Excise Tax calculation*

Iowa City maintains a Utility Discount Program for qualifying customers. This program provides a discount of 60 percent of the service fee for water and sewer charges, 60 percent of the monthly storm water charge, and 75 percent of the refuse, recycling and organics charges each month. For a customer enrolled in this program, here is what the proposed increase would look like assuming the same 800 cubic feet of water consumed per month.

	Discount	
	Current	Proposed
Water	\$ 31.20	\$ 32.13
Sewer	31.81	33.40
Refuse	3.50	3.50
Recycling	1.88	2.13
Organics	0.88	0.88
Stormwater	2.20	2.20
Excise Tax	1.87	1.93
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 73.34</b>	<b>\$ 76.17</b>
Increase		\$ 2.83

The increases that are proposed are needed to support current operations and projected capital needs. The 3% water rate increase will generate an estimate \$320k for the Water Fund. This will enable the Water Fund to continue status quo operations and maintain progress toward funding the Capital Improvement Program projects without the issuance of debt. The 5% wastewater rate increase will generate an estimate \$630k for the Wastewater Fund. This increase not only supports current operations and transfers to the Capital Fund, but it also helps establish annual income

sufficient to support projected borrowing for the Digester Complex Rehabilitation and Digester Gas Capture projects. Finally, the recycling rate increase of \$1/month is estimated to generate \$190k for the Refuse Fund. This increase is needed to offset the rapidly increasing costs of third party recycled materials processing.

**Utility Rate Comparisons**

Comparing utility rates between communities can be complex as varying levels of service, different customer bases (i.e. heavy industrial bases), different source waters, and large debt issuances can create differences that are not apparent when simply looking at rates. Cities may have different rate structures or even rely on third-party utility companies to provide the service to their customers. With these differences in mind, each year in the final budget book staff includes a utility rate comparison. This can be found on page 688 of the approved FY24 budget and is also included below.

**Utility Rates (Residential Monthly Billing – July 1, 2022)**

City	Water	Sewer	Waste	Storm	Total	Rank
Davenport	\$56.83	\$57.72	\$18.13	\$3.06	\$135.84	1
Des Moines	\$41.61	\$54.79	\$22.90	\$15.87	\$135.17	2
North Liberty*	\$52.38	\$59.30	\$19.80	\$2.00	\$133.48	3
Dubuque	\$33.09	\$47.28	\$20.85	\$9.00	\$110.22	4
Ames*	\$37.15	\$37.04	\$30.00	\$5.20	\$109.39	5
West Des Moines	\$41.57	\$41.77	\$13.10	\$6.90	\$103.34	6
Iowa City**	\$34.93	\$36.08	\$23.00	\$5.00	\$99.01	7
Cedar Rapids	\$35.03	\$32.53	\$22.53	\$7.26	\$97.35	8
Sioux City	\$38.20	\$41.30	\$15.55	\$1.25	\$96.30	9
Coralville	\$18.96	\$40.15	\$21.75	\$3.00	\$83.86	10
Council Bluffs	\$31.73	\$31.90	\$20.00	\$0.00	\$83.63	11
Waterloo	\$20.84	\$31.95	\$20.75	\$5.00	\$78.54	12

\* Ames and North Liberty trash collection provided by private contractors

\*\* Average rate is \$105.51/difference of \$6.50

At the January 22 work session, Council expressed particular interest in the proposed 3% water rate increase. To provide you broader perspective on how Iowa City's water rate compares statewide, the following table is an excerpt from a statewide rate study that the City of Ames, Iowa conducts annually. The table shows rates at various levels of consumption. In each consumption category, Iowa City ranks well below the median.

**2022 WATER RATE SURVEY**  
Softening Water Plants Only  
Iowa Cities (Population 10,000+)  
Prepared by the City of Ames, Iowa

0 CF	600 CF	1,000 CF	10,000 CF	50,000 CF	100,000 CF
Spencer 28.98	Pleasant Hill 53.84	Pleasant Hill 83.31	Oskaloosa 782.89	Oskaloosa 3,888	Oskaloosa 7,920
Burlington 23.88	Spencer 53.81	Grimes 79.87	Grimes 783.52	Grimes 3,921	Grimes 7,835
Pella 19.97	Grimes 48.58	Oskaloosa 79.20	Waukee 888.79	Waukee 3,427	Waukee 6,848
Keokuk 16.29	Oskaloosa 47.52	Waukee 72.77	Pleasant Hill 659.24	Ankeny 3,146	Ankeny 6,312
Oskaloosa 15.84	Johnston 45.80	Spencer 71.02	Ankeny 627.87	Pleasant Hill 3,134	Pleasant Hill 6,227
Cedar Rapids 15.50	Waukee 45.39	Johnston 69.29	Clive 609.02	Clive 3,078	Clive 6,156
Storm Lake 15.26	Pella 41.60	Norwalk 62.93	Johnston 597.78	Johnston 2,947	Johnston 5,883
Ottumwa 14.14	Norwalk 40.15	Ankeny 58.41	Norwalk 575.26	Norwalk 2,852	Norwalk 5,699
Waukee 13.47	Fort Madison 39.57	Fort Madison 58.75	Boone 541.24	Boone 2,718	Boone 5,439
Council Bluffs 13.23	Ottumwa 37.66	Clive 57.61	Urbandale 480.27	Urbandale 2,388	Urbandale 4,788
Ames 13.15	Ankeny 35.85	Pella 56.03	Indianola 471.28	Indianola 2,341	Indianola 4,679
Grimes 12.08	Clive 32.92	Ottumwa 53.34	West Des Moines 468.78	West Des Moines 2,331	West Des Moines 4,657
Boone 12.00	Urbandale 32.87	Urbandale 51.78	Altoona 465.80	Altoona 2,309	Altoona 4,613
Newton 11.45	Altoona 32.65	Altoona 51.08	Spencer 458.13	Spencer 2,179	Spencer 4,329
Altoona 11.16	West Des Moines 32.30	West Des Moines 50.85	Fort Madison 437.34	Ottumwa 2,001	Pella 3,626
Fort Madison 10.80	Boone 31.98	Indianola 50.51	Des Moines 426.91	Pella 1,823	Ottumwa 3,474
Johnston 10.58	Indianola 31.80	Des Moines 47.89	Ottumwa 412.60	Fort Madison 1,791	Storm Lake 3,427
Marshalltown 10.22	Cedar Rapids 31.58	Boone 45.30	Pella 380.53	Storm Lake 1,718	Fort Madison 3,310
Indianola 10.00	Des Moines 31.13	Storm Lake 42.59	Dubuque 367.75	Des Moines 1,704	Ames 3,257
Pleasant Hill 10.00	Storm Lake 28.92	Iowa City 42.57	Storm Lake 350.28	Dubuque 1,672	Dubuque 3,121
Ankeny 9.37	Ames 28.57	Cedar Rapids 42.23	Ames 336.27	Ames 1,629	Newton 2,876
Dubuque 8.27	Iowa City 27.29	Dubuque 41.38	Iowa City 313.12	Newton 1,441	Des Moines 2,874
Iowa City 8.19	Marshalltown 27.02	Ames 38.85	Cedar Rapids 295.41	Marshalltown 1,428	Marshalltown 2,844
Des Moines 6.00	Dubuque 24.82	Marshalltown 38.22	Burlington 293.21	Iowa City 1,427	Iowa City 2,821
Norwalk 6.00	Keokuk 24.58	Council Bluffs 37.00	Newton 292.71	Cedar Rapids 1,395	Cedar Rapids 2,770
Urbandale 4.50	Burlington 23.88	Keokuk 34.54	Marshalltown 292.46	Council Bluffs 1,162	Keokuk 2,078
West Des Moines 4.47	Newton 22.93	Newton 34.41	Council Bluffs 284.15	Keokuk 1,072	Council Bluffs 2,012
Council Bluffs 12.35	Council Bluffs 12.35	Burlington 34.13	Keokuk 253.34	Burlington 1,054	Burlington 1,054
High 28.98	High 53.88	High 83.31	High 782.89	High 3,888	High 7,920
Median 11.31	Median 32.48	Median 50.97	Median 447.74	Median 2,090	Median 3,978
Low 6.00	Low 22.20	Low 34.13	Low 253.34	Low 1,054	Low 1,054

**Conclusion**

Staff is confident that our current rates are very competitive with our peer communities. In recent years, our Water Division operations have been hindered by inflationary pressures on critical supplies, such as chemicals, and have experienced significant increases in capital construction costs. To maintain current service levels and to complete projected capital needs, periodic rate increases will be needed. Consistent with our Strategic Plan, staff believes these increases are best considered on an annual basis in smaller increments. Forgoing these increases will only hinder current operations, create costly deferred maintenance scenarios, increase risk of chronic system failures, and set the community up for larger rate increases that will be more difficult to absorb into our customers' own budgets.

Staff will be happy to respond to questions at your February 6<sup>th</sup> work session.

UTILITY BILL  
PAY ONLINE:



**Average Cubic Feet Used**  
 [REDACTED]  
 IOWA CITY, IA 52240

BILL DATE	ZONE	ACCOUNT # - CID #
01/17/2024	C	[REDACTED]
SERVICE ADDRESS		
[REDACTED]		
SERVICE FROM	SERVICE TO	
12/11/2023	01/08/2024	
PAST DUE AMOUNT	CURRENT BILL AMOUNT	
\$0.00	\$105.79	
DATE CURRENT BILL DUE	TOTAL BALANCE DUE	
02/01/2024	\$105.79	

CONSUMPTION INFORMATION

Meter Number	Present Reading	Previous Reading	Cubic Feet Used	Read Code
[REDACTED]	213700	212900	800	ACTUAL READ

USAGE INFORMATION

SUMMARY OF CURRENT CHARGES

	Cubic Feet	Gallons		
Present Usage:	800	5,984	WATER	36.31
Average Monthly Usage:	925	6,919	SEWER	36.80
Usage One Year Ago:	700	5,236	REFUSE	14.00
			RECYCLING	7.50
			ORGANICS (YARD WASTE & COMPOST)	3.50
			STORMWATER RESIDENTIAL	5.50
			WATER EXCISE TAX	2.18
			TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES	105.79
			CURRENT DUE AFTER 02/08/2024 (includes 10% late fee)	\$116.15

BATTERIES CAN CAUSE LANDFILL FIRES. DON'T PUT THEM IN THE TRASH. PROPERLY DISPOSE OF ALL BATTERIES, INCLUDING ALKALINE, LITHIUM, AND RECHARGEABLE, AT BATTERY DROP-OFF SITES. VIEW IOWA CITY LOCATIONS AT ICGOV.ORG/HHM.

BILLING DATE	ZONE	ACCOUNT # - CID #	PAST DUE AMOUNT	CURRENT BALANCE DUE DATE	CURRENT BALANCE DUE	TOTAL BALANCE DUE	AMOUNT PAID
01/17/2024	C	[REDACTED]	\$0.00	02/01/2024	\$105.79	\$105.79	

Total Balance Due will be \$116.15 if not paid by 02/08/2024.

CHECK HERE FOR:

Address correction and complete reverse side.

MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: CITY OF IOWA CITY  
REMIT TO:

CITY OF IOWA CITY - UTILITIES  
PAYMENT PROCESSING DEPARTMENT  
P.O. BOX 3246  
CEDAR RAPIDS, IA 52406-3246

[REDACTED]  
 IOWA CITY, IA 52240

00006042024800863586400000105791

UTILITY BILL  
PAY ONLINE:



Household of Five

IOWA CITY, IA 52245-4104

BILL DATE	ZONE	ACCOUNT # - CID #
01/03/2024	A	[REDACTED]
SERVICE ADDRESS		
[REDACTED]		
SERVICE FROM	SERVICE TO	
11/27/2023	12/27/2023	
PAST DUE AMOUNT	CURRENT BILL AMOUNT	
\$0.00	\$83.28	
DATE CURRENT BILL DUE	TOTAL BALANCE DUE	
01/18/2024	*SUREPAY	

Total Amount due of \$83.28  
will be deducted from your account on  
01/18/2024.

CONSUMPTION INFORMATION

<u>Meter Number</u>	<u>Present Reading</u>	<u>Previous Reading</u>	<u>Cubic Feet Used</u>	<u>Read Code</u>
[REDACTED]	81264	80748	516	ACTUAL READ

USAGE INFORMATION

SUMMARY OF CURRENT CHARGES

	Cubic Feet	Gallons		
Present Usage:	516	3,860	WATER	25.04
Average Monthly Usage:	648	4,848	SEWER	25.24
Usage One Year Ago:	571	4,271	REFUSE	14.00
			RECYCLING	7.50
			ORGANICS (YARD WASTE & COMPOST)	3.50
			STORMWATER RESIDENTIAL	5.50
			WATER EXCISE TAX	1.50
			UTILITY DONATION	1.00
			TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES	83.28

YOUR PAYMENT WILL COME OUT OF YOUR ACCOUNT ON THE DUE DATE.  
BATTERIES CAN CAUSE LANDFILL FIRES. DON'T PUT THEM IN THE TRASH.  
PROPERLY DISPOSE OF ALL BATTERIES, INCLUDING ALKALINE, LITHIUM,  
AND RECHARGEABLE, AT BATTERY DROP-OFF SITES. VIEW IOWA CITY  
LOCATIONS AT ICGOV.ORG/HHM.

BILLING DATE	ZONE	ACCOUNT # - CID #	PAST DUE AMOUNT	CURRENT BALANCE DUE DATE	CURRENT BALANCE DUE	TOTAL BALANCE DUE	AMOUNT PAID
01/03/2024	A	[REDACTED]	\$0.00	01/18/2024	\$83.28	*SUREPAY	

Total Amount due of \$83.28  
will be deducted from your account on 01/18/2024.

CHECK HERE FOR:  
 Address correction and  
complete reverse side.

IOWA CITY, IA 52245-4104

00006042024800845543800000083287



# CITY OF IOWA CITY COUNCIL ACTION REPORT

---

February 1, 2024

---

Pending City Council Work Session Topics

---

Attachments: [Pending City Council Work Session Topics](#)



CITY OF IOWA CITY  
UNESCO CITY OF LITERATURE

## PENDING CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION TOPICS January 31, 2024

---

### **February 20, 2024**

- City Conference Board meeting
- Update presentation from Greater Iowa City, Inc.

### **March 19, 2024**

- City Conference Board meeting

### **FY23-24 Strategic Plan Action Item Topics Requiring Council Discussion:**

- Explore legal steps to discourage or prevent bad faith and predatory property investors
- Advance prioritized recommendations in the 2022 Affordable Housing Action Plan. Work with partners to undertake significant-scale affordable housing efforts
- Develop a vision statement for a singular regional transit system with metro Johnson County entities and obtain initial commitments to study a regional system from each entity's elected officials
- Evaluate with the State of Iowa reverting Dodge and Governor to 2-way streets

### **Other Topics:**

- Quarterly American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA-SLRF) update
- Consider a strategic plan decision-making framework
- Develop strategies to address equity gaps noted in the Parks Master Plan and plan for the equitable distribution of destination parks within an easy and safe distance of all residents.
- Discussion on the impact of land use decisions on long-term City financial health
- Discussion on City Charter
- Update on alternative crisis response services
- Discussion of board and commission appointment process
- UNESCO City of Literature update

*Note: Some items on the Pending List may require staff research and information gathering prior to scheduling.*



# CITY OF IOWA CITY COUNCIL ACTION REPORT

---

February 1, 2024

---

Memo from Budget Management Analyst: Quarterly Financial Summary for Period Ending December 31, 2023

---

Attachments: [Memo from Budget Management Analyst: Quarterly Financial Summary for Period Ending December 31, 2023](#)



# CITY OF IOWA CITY MEMORANDUM

---

Date: February 1, 2024

To: City Manager, City Council

From: Angie Ogden, Budget Management Analyst

Re: Quarterly Financial Summary for Period Ending December 31, 2023

## **Introduction**

Attached to this memorandum are the City's quarterly financial reports as of December 31, 2023. The quarterly financial reports include combined summaries of all fund balances, revenues, and expenditures for fiscal year 2024 through the end of the second quarter, which is 50% of the way through the fiscal year. Below are some of the highlights from this quarter's financial activity.

## **Revenue Analysis**

This revenue analysis pertains to the revenue reports, *Revenues by Fund* and *Revenues by Type*, on pages 4-6. In these two reports, the actual revenues would ideally be near 50% of budget since we have completed one-half of the fiscal year; however, due to accruals back to the previous year and quarter, many of these percentages are below 50%.

Funds with budget anomalies on page 4 worth noting:

- CDBG fund has actual revenues at 18.0% and HOME 3.3% due to timing of grant receipts.
- Other Shared Revenue at 1182.1% due to higher interest allocations.
- Transit fund has actual revenues at 20.4% due to the timing of receipt for the federal operating grant.
- Risk Management fund has actual revenues at 104.2% due to the entries made for loss reserve payments to intra-city charges.
- Governmental Projects fund has revenues of 4.9% and Enterprise Projects fund has revenues of 1.5% due to timing of funding for CIP projects through grants and bond sales.

On page 5, an example of revenue that is below the 50% mark due to accruals include Utility Franchise Taxes at 26.4% under Other City Taxes. This revenue source is received quarterly and had the first receipt during the fiscal year accrued back to last fiscal year. The report appears as if this revenue is behind budget projections; however, this revenue source is in line with last year.

Other revenues on page 5 that are either above or below the 50% mark due to the timing of grants, 28E agreements or contributions receipts include Federal Intergovernmental Revenue at 25.1%, State 28E Agreements at 81.4%, Operating Grants at 122.9%, Other State Grants at 17.3% and Local 28E Agreements at 62.3%.

Additionally, other revenues above or below 50% of budget include:

- Interest Revenues at 290.0% due to higher interest allocations than expected.
- Building & Development at 94.3% due to Developer Fee for Rohret Road improvements.
- Code Enforcement revenues at 22.1% due to a decline in patrol and animal services enforcement.
- Transit Fees at 7.0% due to fare free riding.

The combined total actual revenues for all budgetary funds through December are \$101,738,861 or 40.6% of budget. Overall, the City's revenues are not substantially different than projected, and the anomalies and budget variances can be explained.

### **Expenditure Analysis**

This expenditure analysis pertains to the expenditure reports, *Expenditures by Fund* and *Expenditures by Fund by Department* on pages 7-9. The analysis of the City's expenditures for fiscal year 2023 through December is similar to the analysis for the City's revenues. We generally expect the actual expenditure levels to be around 50% of budget at this time of year.

Some of the funds have expenditure activity through the second quarter that differs significantly from the 50% mark. The following funds have a significant expenditure variance above or below 50%:

- Other Shared Revenue fund is at 2.1% due to the timing of projects.
- Tax Increment Financing funds are at 2.2% due to the timing of rebate payments.
- Debt Service Fund expenditures are at 8.2%, because the general obligation bond principal payments are not due until June 1.
- Water fund is at 63.9% due to bond principal and interest payments paid in July.
- Housing Authority fund is at 61.6% due to an increase in landlord rents.
- Governmental Projects expenditures are at 14.7% and Enterprise Projects expenditures are at 12.0% because many of the capital projects are scheduled for construction this spring.
- Equipment fund is at 32.7% due to the timing of equipment purchases and replacements.

Overall, the combined total actual expenditures for all budgetary funds through December are \$103,506,322 or 31.2% of budget. Overall, the City's expenditures through the second quarter have a few major anomalies; however, these can be explained and are not unusual.

### **Conclusion**

Generally, there are no major concerns to report with the City's fund balances at December 31. There are a few funds presented (on page 3) with a negative fund balance, CDBG fund at -\$35,360 and HOME at -\$24,148. These negative fund balances should reverse following the receipt of grant proceeds. The other fund balances appear healthy. Additional information is available from the Finance Department upon request.

**City of Iowa City**  
**Fund Summary**  
**Fiscal Year 2024 through December 31, 2023**

	<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>Year-to-Date Revenues</b>	<b>Transfers In</b>	<b>Year-to-Date Expenditures</b>	<b>Transfers Out</b>	<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>Restricted, Committed, Assigned</b>	<b>Unassigned Fund Balance</b>
<b><u>Budgetary Funds</u></b>								
<b>General Fund</b>								
10** General Fund	\$ 59,638,625	\$ 32,528,634	\$ 7,280,950	\$ 37,287,966	\$ 3,326,778	\$ 58,833,464	\$ 25,727,855	\$ 33,105,609
<b>Special Revenue Funds</b>								
2100 Community Dev Block Grant	395	242,492	-	278,247	-	(35,360)	-	(35,360)
2110 HOME	44	119,500	-	143,692	-	(24,148)	-	(24,148)
2200 Road Use Tax Fund	6,170,699	4,664,377	406,690	3,711,484	1,564,787	5,965,494	-	5,965,494
2300 Other Shared Revenue	14,321,198	362,356	-	300,038	1,635,455	12,748,060	-	12,748,060
2350 Metro Planning Org of J.C.	537,565	328,893	217,052	395,309	-	688,200	-	688,200
2400 Employee Benefits	4,287,578	7,905,217	1,274	1,088,565	6,929,001	4,176,502	-	4,176,502
2450 Emergency Levy Fund	1,157,208	458,298	-	245,955	175,000	1,194,552	-	1,194,552
2500 Affordable Housing Fund	7,399,710	173,907	500,000	1,038,336	-	7,035,281	-	7,035,281
2510 Peninsula Apartments	345,486	123,076	-	74,120	-	394,442	-	394,442
26** Tax Increment Financing	186,089	2,234,881	-	47,853	-	2,373,116	-	2,373,116
2820 SSMID-Downtown District	-	334,520	-	260,700	-	73,821	-	73,821
<b>Debt Service Fund</b>								
5*** Debt Service	7,252,520	6,021,337	-	1,082,010	-	12,191,847	-	12,191,847
<b>Enterprise Funds</b>								
710* Parking	2,074,298	2,807,614	546,022	2,016,745	1,014,297	2,396,890	713,702	1,683,188
715* Mass Transit	12,462,468	1,341,341	2,251,029	4,227,197	37,500	11,790,140	11,226,411	563,729
720* Wastewater	21,174,871	6,288,835	1,806,668	4,110,621	2,318,398	22,841,355	4,323,762	18,517,593
730* Water	15,824,989	6,070,712	2,157,963	6,529,814	1,570,292	15,953,559	7,654,971	8,298,587
7400 Refuse Collection	1,938,934	2,253,555	50,385	2,221,536	-	2,021,338	-	2,021,338
750* Landfill	24,087,723	4,318,564	837,250	2,983,822	512,317	25,747,399	22,088,218	3,659,180
7600 Airport	295,565	233,236	52,316	241,293	-	339,824	196,385	143,439
7700 Storm Water	1,284,753	857,691	555,235	303,767	670,000	1,723,912	862,961	860,951
79** Housing Authority	6,173,092	6,805,167	30,102	7,204,185	23,246	5,780,930	-	5,780,930
<b>Capital Project Funds</b>								
Governmental Projects	32,475,993	1,092,103	2,066,795	9,939,584	-	25,695,308	-	25,695,308
Enterprise Projects	18,289,364	442,311	963,852	7,026,731	-	12,668,795	-	12,668,795
<b>Total Budgetary Funds</b>	<b>\$ 237,379,166</b>	<b>\$ 88,008,617</b>	<b>\$ 19,723,582</b>	<b>\$ 92,759,572</b>	<b>\$ 19,777,072</b>	<b>\$ 232,574,721</b>	<b>\$ 72,794,265</b>	<b>\$ 159,780,456</b>
<b><u>Non-Budgetary Funds</u></b>								
<b>Internal Service Funds</b>								
810* Equipment	\$ 21,052,457	\$ 4,351,843	\$ 25,471	\$ 2,908,403	\$ -	\$ 22,521,367	\$ 19,124,624	\$ 3,396,744
8200 Risk Management	4,257,230	1,158,367	4,168	608,480	-	4,811,286	-	4,811,286
830* Information Technology	4,258,905	1,075,673	72,692	1,461,679	50,000	3,895,592	1,924,899	1,970,692
8400 Central Services	877,316	109,179	1,158	78,732	-	908,921	-	908,921
8500 Health Insurance Reserves	16,400,412	6,802,146	-	5,494,834	-	17,707,724	8,730,093	8,977,631
8600 Dental Insurance Reserves	529,317	233,036	-	194,622	-	567,731	-	567,731
<b>Total Non-Budgetary Funds</b>	<b>\$ 47,375,637</b>	<b>\$ 13,730,244</b>	<b>\$ 103,489</b>	<b>\$ 10,746,749</b>	<b>\$ 50,000</b>	<b>\$ 50,412,621</b>	<b>\$ 29,779,616</b>	<b>\$ 20,633,005</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	<b>\$ 284,754,803</b>	<b>\$ 101,738,861</b>	<b>\$ 19,827,072</b>	<b>\$ 103,506,322</b>	<b>\$ 19,827,072</b>	<b>\$ 282,987,342</b>	<b>\$ 102,573,881</b>	<b>\$ 180,413,461</b>

**City of Iowa City  
Revenues by Fund  
Fiscal Year 2024 through December 31, 2023**

	2023 Actual	2024 Budget	2024 Revised	2024 Actual	Variance	Percent
<b><u>Budgetary Fund Revenues</u></b>						
<b>General Fund</b>						
10** General Fund	\$ 61,176,203	\$ 60,373,756	\$ 60,820,756	\$ 32,528,634	\$ (28,292,122)	53.5%
<b>Special Revenue Funds</b>						
2100 Community Dev Block Grant	1,175,809	909,524	1,347,095	242,492	(1,104,603)	18.0%
2110 HOME	1,074,710	1,480,386	3,613,443	119,500	(3,493,943)	3.3%
2200 Road Use Tax Fund	10,511,555	10,078,709	10,078,709	4,664,377	(5,414,332)	46.3%
2300 Other Shared Revenue	608,543	30,654	30,654	362,356	331,702	1182.1%
2350 Metro Planning Org of Johnson Co	371,171	415,352	545,352	328,893	(216,459)	60.3%
2400 Employee Benefits	14,856,963	14,814,799	14,814,799	7,905,217	(6,909,582)	53.4%
2450 Emergency Levy Fund	868,282	868,626	868,626	458,298	(410,328)	52.8%
2500 Affordable Housing Fund	2,204,266	-	-	173,907	173,907	0.0%
2510 Iowa City Property Management	264,453	266,988	266,988	123,076	(143,912)	46.1%
26** Tax Increment Financing	4,154,649	4,083,031	4,083,031	2,234,881	(1,848,150)	54.7%
2820 SSMID-Downtown District	552,028	634,124	634,124	334,520	(299,604)	52.8%
<b>Debt Service Fund</b>						
5*** Debt Service	11,511,672	11,173,415	11,173,415	6,021,337	(5,152,078)	53.9%
<b>Enterprise Funds</b>						
710* Parking	5,444,648	5,611,532	5,629,848	2,807,614	(2,822,234)	49.9%
715* Mass Transit	7,291,060	6,562,268	6,562,268	1,341,341	(5,220,927)	20.4%
720* Wastewater	12,897,699	12,548,301	12,548,301	6,288,835	(6,259,466)	50.1%
730* Water	11,730,665	11,668,360	11,668,360	6,070,712	(5,597,648)	52.0%
7400 Refuse Collection	4,635,713	4,968,435	4,968,435	2,253,555	(2,714,880)	45.4%
750* Landfill	8,069,944	7,292,093	7,292,093	4,318,564	(2,973,529)	59.2%
7600 Airport	410,662	406,797	406,797	233,236	(173,561)	57.3%
7700 Storm Water	1,765,023	1,903,038	1,903,038	857,691	(1,045,348)	45.1%
79** Housing Authority	11,923,721	12,274,066	12,274,066	6,805,167	(5,468,899)	55.4%
<b>Capital Project Funds</b>						
Governmental Projects	16,926,266	15,940,000	22,516,194	1,092,103	(21,424,091)	4.9%
Enterprise Projects	1,227,866	28,420,000	29,636,471	442,311	(29,194,160)	1.5%
<b>Total Budgetary Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 191,653,572</b>	<b>\$ 212,724,254</b>	<b>\$ 223,682,863</b>	<b>\$ 88,008,617</b>	<b>\$ (135,674,246)</b>	<b>39.3%</b>
<b><u>Non-Budgetary Fund Revenues</u></b>						
<b>Internal Service Funds</b>						
810* Equipment	\$ 8,228,072	\$ 8,742,979	\$ 8,742,979	\$ 4,351,843	\$ (4,391,136)	49.8%
8200 Risk Management	1,395,250	1,111,193	1,111,193	1,158,367.37	47,174	104.2%
830* Information Technology	3,076,963	2,947,642	2,947,642	1,075,672.82	(1,871,969)	36.5%
8400 Central Services	262,194	232,764	232,764	109,179.10	(123,585)	46.9%
8500 Health Insurance Reserves	12,624,342	13,386,552	13,386,552	6,802,145.95	(6,584,406)	50.8%
8600 Dental Insurance Reserves	446,962	430,941	430,941	233,036.06	(197,905)	54.1%
<b>Total Non-Budgetary Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 26,033,784</b>	<b>\$ 26,852,071</b>	<b>\$ 26,852,071</b>	<b>\$ 13,730,244</b>	<b>\$ (13,121,827)</b>	<b>51.1%</b>
<b>Total Revenues - All Funds</b>	<b>\$ 217,687,356</b>	<b>\$ 239,576,325</b>	<b>\$ 250,534,934</b>	<b>\$ 101,738,861</b>	<b>\$ (148,796,073)</b>	<b>40.6%</b>

**City of Iowa City  
Revenues by Type  
Fiscal Year 2024 through December 31, 2023**

	2023 Actual	2024 Budget	2024 Revised	2024 Actual	Variance	Percent
<b>Budgetary Fund Revenues</b>						
<b>Property Taxes</b>	\$ 66,685,014	\$ 66,312,743	\$ 66,312,743	\$ 34,888,721	\$ (31,424,022)	52.6%
<b>Other City Taxes:</b>						
TIF Revenues	4,086,247	4,083,031	4,083,031	2,204,402	(1,878,629)	54.0%
Gas/Electric Excise Taxes	783,781	680,064	680,064	374,401	(305,663)	55.1%
Mobile Home Taxes	52,975	56,797	56,797	32,024	(24,773)	56.4%
Hotel/Motel Taxes	1,885,263	1,708,100	1,708,100	683,087	(1,025,013)	40.0%
Utility Franchise Tax	1,116,963	1,151,500	1,151,500	304,377	(847,123)	26.4%
Subtotal	7,925,229	7,679,492	7,679,492	3,598,292	(4,081,200)	46.9%
<b>Licenses, Permits, &amp; Fees:</b>						
General Use Permits	104,127	102,610	102,610	11,732	(90,878)	11.4%
Food & Liquor Licenses	118,650	181,740	181,740	73,467	(108,273)	40.4%
Professional License	2,155	2,755	2,755	1,340	(1,415)	48.6%
Franchise Fees	508,934	540,200	540,200	131,744	(408,456)	24.4%
Construction Permits & Insp Fees	2,060,778	1,676,600	1,676,600	1,176,114	(500,486)	70.1%
Misc Lic & Permits	59,731	70,216	70,216	27,376	(42,841)	39.0%
Subtotal	2,854,375	2,574,121	2,574,121	1,421,773	(1,152,348)	55.2%
<b>Intergovernmental:</b>						
Fed Intergovernmental Revenue	22,351,695	18,880,564	27,774,035	6,962,521	(20,811,514)	25.1%
Property Tax Credits	1,243,694	1,602,806	1,602,806	371,073	(1,231,733)	23.2%
Road Use Tax	10,346,324	9,900,316	9,900,316	4,570,769	(5,329,547)	46.2%
State 28E Agreements	2,200,799	2,632,892	2,957,892	2,408,480	(549,412)	81.4%
Operating Grants	71,122	55,875	55,875	68,697	12,822	122.9%
Disaster Assistance	15,297	-	-	0	0	0.0%
Other State Grants	1,184,587	1,442,554	2,587,376	446,999	(2,140,377)	17.3%
Local 28E Agreements	1,259,516	1,410,659	1,410,659	878,371	(532,288)	62.3%
Subtotal	38,673,034	35,925,666	46,288,959	15,706,910	(30,582,049)	33.9%
<b>Charges For Fees And Services:</b>						
Building & Development	2,631,328	532,214	532,214	501,625	(30,589)	94.3%
Police Services	101,476	80,000	80,000	71,535	(8,465)	89.4%
Animal Care Services	12,826	19,403	19,403	5,491	(13,912)	28.3%
Fire Services	9,060	9,300	9,300	26,225	16,925	282.0%
Transit Fees	1,054,035	927,000	927,000	64,504	(862,496)	7.0%
Culture & Recreation	637,499	594,123	594,123	308,141	(285,982)	51.9%
Misc Charges For Services	116,981	59,976	59,976	21,959	(38,017)	36.6%
Water Charges	10,477,522	10,555,850	10,555,850	5,231,549	(5,324,301)	49.6%
Wastewater Charges	12,332,334	12,359,703	12,359,703	5,801,616	(6,558,087)	46.9%
Refuse Charges	5,211,519	5,606,210	5,606,210	2,487,012	(3,119,198)	44.4%
Landfill Charges	6,594,015	6,148,000	6,148,000	3,510,407	(2,637,593)	57.1%
Storm Water Charges	1,729,888	1,880,000	1,880,000	830,571	(1,049,429)	44.2%
Parking Charges	5,595,020	5,825,255	5,825,255	2,983,872	(2,841,383)	51.2%
Subtotal	46,503,504	44,597,034	44,597,034	21,844,506	(22,752,528)	49.0%
<b>Miscellaneous:</b>						
Code Enforcement	159,632	280,731	280,731	62,030	(218,701)	22.1%
Parking Fines	524,471	676,634	676,634	254,744	(421,890)	37.6%
Library Fines & Fees	1,576	1,000	1,000	499	(501)	49.9%
Contributions & Donations	586,167	532,735	551,051	243,007	(308,044)	44.1%
Printed Materials	18,676	20,340	20,340	9,799	(10,541)	48.2%
Animal Adoption	60,491	57,840	57,840	37,665	(20,175)	65.1%
Misc Merchandise	23,871	22,302	22,302	8,357	(13,945)	37.5%
Intra-City Charges	6,086,864	6,383,611	6,383,611	3,135,410	(3,248,201)	49.1%
Other Misc Revenue	1,616,048	936,093	1,066,093	539,303	(526,790)	50.6%
Special Assessments	2,003	1,381	1,381	338	(1,043)	24.5%
Subtotal	\$ 9,079,800	\$ 8,912,667	\$ 9,060,983	\$ 4,291,152	\$ (4,769,831)	47.4%

**City of Iowa City  
Revenues by Type  
Fiscal Year 2024 through December 31, 2023**

	<b>2023 Actual</b>	<b>2024 Budget</b>	<b>2024 Revised</b>	<b>2024 Actual</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Use Of Money And Property:</b>						
Interest Revenues	\$ 5,948,797	\$ 1,663,327	\$ 1,663,327	\$ 4,823,515	\$ 3,160,188	290.0%
Rents	1,548,884	1,509,022	1,509,022	718,555	(790,467)	47.6%
Royalties & Commissions	99,854	126,915	126,915	58,443	(68,472)	46.0%
Subtotal	7,597,534	3,299,264	3,299,264	5,600,513	2,301,249	169.8%
<b>Other Financial Sources:</b>						
Debt Sales	9,941,862	42,535,000	42,535,000	-	(42,535,000)	0.0%
Sale Of Assets	1,931,799	445,400	892,400	420,931	(471,469)	47.2%
Loans	461,420	442,867	442,867	235,819	(207,048)	53.2%
Subtotal	12,335,081	43,423,267	43,870,267	656,750	(43,213,517)	1.5%
<b>Total Budgetary Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 191,653,572</b>	<b>\$ 212,724,254</b>	<b>\$ 223,682,863</b>	<b>\$ 88,008,617</b>	<b>(135,674,246)</b>	<b>39.3%</b>
<b>Non-Budgetary Fund Revenues</b>						
Internal Service Funds	\$ 26,033,784	\$ 26,852,071	\$ 26,852,071	\$ 13,730,244	\$ (13,121,827)	51.1%
<b>Total Non-Budgetary Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 26,033,784</b>	<b>\$ 26,852,071</b>	<b>\$ 26,852,071</b>	<b>\$ 13,730,244</b>	<b>\$ (13,121,827)</b>	<b>51.1%</b>
<b>Total Revenues - All Funds</b>	<b>\$ 217,687,356</b>	<b>\$ 239,576,325</b>	<b>\$ 250,534,934</b>	<b>\$ 101,738,861</b>	<b>\$ (148,796,073)</b>	<b>40.6%</b>

**City of Iowa City**  
**Expenditures by Fund**  
**Fiscal Year 2024 through December 31, 2023**

	2023 Actual	2024 Budget	2024 Revised	2024 Actual	Variance	Percent
<b><u>Budgetary Fund Expenditures</u></b>						
<b>General Fund</b>						
10** General Fund	\$ 63,194,004	\$ 68,071,131	\$ 75,202,188	\$ 37,287,966	\$ 37,914,222	49.6%
<b>Special Revenue Funds</b>						
2100 Community Dev Block Grant	1,075,683	778,376	1,215,947	278,247	937,700	22.9%
2110 HOME	1,187,632	1,348,625	3,481,682	143,692	3,337,990	4.1%
2200 Road Use Tax Fund	6,976,684	7,792,239	7,982,005	3,711,484	4,270,521	46.5%
2300 Other Shared Revenue	2,653,065	30,654	14,375,967	300,038	14,075,929	2.1%
2350 Metro Planning Org of Johnson Co.	769,755	830,005	1,085,005	395,309	689,696	36.4%
2400 Employee Benefits	1,209,467	1,338,854	1,338,854	1,088,565	250,289	81.3%
2450 Emergency Levy Fund	566,870	468,850	468,850	245,955	222,895	52.5%
2500 Affordable Housing Fund	1,086,455	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,038,336	(38,336)	103.8%
2510 Iowa City Property Management	151,997	247,229	247,229	74,120	173,109	30.0%
26** Tax Increment Financing	3,013,704	2,192,030	2,192,030	47,853	2,144,177	2.2%
2820 SSMID-Downtown District	552,028	634,124	634,124	260,700	373,424	41.1%
<b>Debt Service Fund</b>						
5*** Debt Service	13,165,630	13,210,690	13,210,690	1,082,010	12,128,680	8.2%
<b>Enterprise Funds</b>						
710* Parking	4,050,511	4,359,209	4,385,709	2,016,745	2,368,964	46.0%
715* Mass Transit	8,876,777	10,333,648	10,340,148	4,227,197	6,112,951	40.9%
720* Wastewater	10,849,521	8,183,257	8,224,237	4,110,621	4,113,616	50.0%
730* Water	9,454,497	10,085,483	10,221,728	6,529,814	3,691,914	63.9%
7400 Refuse Collection	4,077,516	4,627,383	4,902,383	2,221,536	2,680,847	45.3%
750* Landfill	5,631,227	6,108,611	6,108,611	2,983,822	3,124,789	48.8%
7600 Airport	450,629	406,307	406,307	241,293	165,014	59.4%
7700 Storm Water	613,262	738,481	738,481	303,767	434,714	41.1%
79** Housing Authority	11,921,444	11,686,205	11,686,205	7,204,185	4,482,020	61.6%
<b>Capital Project Funds</b>						
Governmental Projects	22,949,801	31,178,470	67,411,738	9,939,584	57,472,154	14.7%
Enterprise Projects	11,186,857	34,458,750	58,526,829	7,026,731	51,500,098	12.0%
<b>Total Budgetary Expenditures</b>	<b>\$185,665,018</b>	<b>\$ 220,108,611</b>	<b>\$305,386,947</b>	<b>\$ 92,759,572</b>	<b>\$ 212,627,375</b>	<b>30.4%</b>
<b><u>Non-Budgetary Funds Expenditures</u></b>						
<b>Internal Service Funds</b>						
810* Equipment	\$ 6,325,457	\$ 6,554,320	\$ 8,888,125	\$ 2,908,403	\$ 5,979,722	32.7%
8200 Risk Management	1,196,091	1,771,250	1,771,250	608,480	1,162,770	34.4%
830* Information Technology	2,785,766	3,275,051	3,275,051	1,461,679	1,813,372	44.6%
8400 Central Services	199,503	212,479	212,479	78,732	133,747	37.1%
8500 Health Insurance Reserves	10,659,783	12,271,023	12,271,023	5,494,834	6,776,189	44.8%
8600 Dental Insurance Reserves	386,892	382,521	382,521	194,622	187,899	50.9%
<b>Total Non-Budgetary Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 21,553,492</b>	<b>\$ 24,466,644</b>	<b>\$ 26,800,449</b>	<b>\$ 10,746,749</b>	<b>\$ 16,053,700</b>	<b>40.1%</b>
<b>Total Expenditures - All Funds</b>	<b>\$207,218,510</b>	<b>\$ 244,575,255</b>	<b>\$332,187,396</b>	<b>\$ 103,506,322</b>	<b>\$ 228,681,074</b>	<b>31.2%</b>

**City of Iowa City**  
**Expenditures by Fund by Department**  
**Fiscal Year 2024 through December 31, 2023**

	2023 Actual	2024 Budget	2024 Revised	2024 Actual	Variance	Percent
<b><u>Budgetary Funds Expenditures</u></b>						
<b>General Fund</b>						
10** General Fund						
City Council	\$ 174,794	\$ 178,611	\$ 178,611	\$ 90,072	\$ 88,539	50.4%
City Clerk	558,189	624,775	\$ 624,775	303,237	321,538	48.5%
City Attorney	896,859	914,555	\$ 914,555	461,777	452,778	50.5%
City Manager	4,623,699	5,148,457	\$ 10,921,528	7,037,286	3,884,242	64.4%
Finance	4,168,894	5,090,596	\$ 5,354,624	2,858,665	2,495,959	53.4%
Police	15,682,533	17,346,723	\$ 17,852,621	7,872,765	9,979,856	44.1%
Fire	9,506,985	10,313,473	\$ 10,326,070	4,857,536	5,468,534	47.0%
Parks & Recreation	10,338,539	10,567,119	\$ 10,642,829	4,847,769	5,795,060	45.5%
Library	7,226,829	7,877,340	\$ 7,877,340	3,689,509	4,187,831	46.8%
Senior Center	1,053,569	1,154,420	\$ 1,166,420	471,151	695,269	40.4%
Neighborhood & Development Services	5,162,196	4,830,294	\$ 5,296,181	2,875,641	2,420,540	54.3%
Public Works	3,092,286	3,339,887	\$ 3,349,887	1,589,985	1,759,902	47.5%
Transportation & Resource Management	708,629	684,881	\$ 696,747	332,574	364,173	47.7%
<b>Total General Fund</b>	<b>63,194,004</b>	<b>68,071,131</b>	<b>75,202,188</b>	<b>37,287,966</b>	<b>37,914,222</b>	<b>49.6%</b>
<b>Special Revenue Funds</b>						
2100 Community Dev Block Grant						
Neighborhood & Development Services	1,075,683	778,376	1,215,947	278,247	937,700	22.9%
2110 HOME						
Neighborhood & Development Services	1,187,632	1,348,625	3,481,682	143,692	3,337,990	4.1%
2200 Road Use Tax Fund						
Public Works	6,976,684	7,792,239	7,982,005	3,711,484	4,270,521	46.5%
2300 Other Shared Revenue						
Neighborhood & Development Services	2,653,065	30,654	14,375,967	300,038	14,075,929	2.1%
2350 Metro Planning Org of Johnson Co						
Neighborhood & Development Services	769,755	830,005	1,085,005	395,309	689,696	36.4%
2400 Employee Benefits						
Finance	1,209,467	1,338,854	1,338,854	1,088,565	250,289	81.3%
2450 Emergency Levy Fund						
City Manager	566,870	468,850	468,850	245,955	222,895	52.5%
2500 Affordable Housing Fund						
Neighborhood & Development Services	1,086,455	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,038,336	(38,336)	103.8%
2510 Iowa City Property Management						
Neighborhood & Development Services	151,997	247,229	247,229	74,120	173,109	30.0%
26** Tax Increment Financing						
Finance	3,013,704	2,192,030	2,192,030	47,853	2,144,177	2.2%
2820 SSMID-Downtown District						
Finance	552,028	634,124	634,124	260,700	373,424	41.1%
<b>Total Special Revenue Funds</b>	<b>19,243,340</b>	<b>16,660,986</b>	<b>34,021,693</b>	<b>7,584,301</b>	<b>26,437,392</b>	<b>22.3%</b>
<b>Debt Service Fund</b>						
5*** Debt Service						
Finance	13,165,630	13,210,690	13,210,690	1,082,010	12,128,680	8.2%
<b>Total Debt Service Fund</b>	<b>13,165,630</b>	<b>13,210,690</b>	<b>13,210,690</b>	<b>1,082,010</b>	<b>12,128,680</b>	<b>8.2%</b>

**City of Iowa City**  
**Expenditures by Fund by Department**  
**Fiscal Year 2024 through December 31, 2023**

	<b>2023 Actual</b>	<b>2024 Budget</b>	<b>2024 Revised</b>	<b>2024 Actual</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Enterprise Funds</b>						
710* Parking						
Transportation & Resource Management	\$ 4,050,511	\$ 4,359,209	\$ 4,385,709	\$ 2,016,745	\$ 2,368,964	46.0%
715* Mass Transit						
Transportation & Resource Management	8,876,777	10,333,648	10,340,148	4,227,197	6,112,951	40.9%
720* Wastewater						
Public Works	10,849,521	8,183,257	8,224,237	4,110,621	4,113,616	50.0%
730* Water						
Public Works	9,454,497	10,085,483	10,221,728	6,529,814	3,691,914	63.9%
7400 Refuse Collection						
Transportation & Resource Management	4,077,516	4,627,383	4,902,383	2,221,536	2,680,847	45.3%
750* Landfill						
Transportation & Resource Management	5,631,227	6,108,611	6,108,611	2,983,822	3,124,789	48.8%
7600 Airport						
Airport Operations	450,629	406,307	406,307	241,293	165,014	59.4%
7700 Storm Water						
Public Works	613,262	738,481	738,481	303,767	434,714	41.1%
79** Housing Authority						
Neighborhood & Development Services	11,921,444	11,686,205	11,686,205	7,204,185	4,482,020	61.6%
<b>Total Enterprise Funds</b>	<b>55,925,386</b>	<b>56,528,584</b>	<b>57,013,809</b>	<b>29,838,981</b>	<b>27,174,828</b>	<b>52.3%</b>
<b>Capital Project Funds</b>						
Governmental Projects	22,949,801	31,178,470	67,411,738	9,939,584	57,472,154	14.7%
Enterprise Projects	11,186,857	34,458,750	58,526,829	7,026,731	51,500,098	12.0%
<b>Total Capital Project Funds</b>	<b>34,136,658</b>	<b>65,637,220</b>	<b>125,938,567</b>	<b>16,966,315</b>	<b>108,972,252</b>	<b>13.5%</b>
<b>Total Budgetary Expenditures</b>	<b>\$185,665,018</b>	<b>\$ 220,108,611</b>	<b>\$305,386,947</b>	<b>\$ 92,759,572</b>	<b>\$ 212,627,375</b>	<b>30.4%</b>
<b>Non-Budgetary Funds Expenditures</b>						
<b>Internal Service Funds</b>						
810* Equipment						
Public Works	\$ 6,325,457	\$ 6,554,320	\$ 8,888,125	\$ 2,908,403	\$ 5,979,722	32.7%
8200 Risk Management						
Finance	1,196,091	1,771,250	1,771,250	608,480	1,162,770	34.4%
830* Information Technology						
Finance	2,785,766	3,275,051	3,275,051	1,461,679	1,813,372	44.6%
8400 Central Services						
Finance	199,503	212,479	212,479	78,732	133,747	37.1%
8500 Health Insurance Reserves						
Finance	10,659,783	12,271,023	12,271,023	5,494,834	6,776,189	44.8%
8600 Dental Insurance Reserves						
Finance	386,892	382,521	382,521	194,622	187,899	50.9%
<b>Total Internal Service Funds</b>	<b>21,553,492</b>	<b>24,466,644</b>	<b>26,800,449</b>	<b>10,746,749</b>	<b>16,053,700</b>	<b>40.1%</b>
<b>Total Non-Budgetary Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 21,553,492</b>	<b>\$ 24,466,644</b>	<b>\$ 26,800,449</b>	<b>\$ 10,746,749</b>	<b>\$ 16,053,700</b>	<b>40.1%</b>
<b>Total Expenditures - All Funds</b>	<b>\$207,218,510</b>	<b>\$ 244,575,255</b>	<b>\$332,187,396</b>	<b>\$ 103,506,322</b>	<b>\$ 228,681,074</b>	<b>31.2%</b>



# CITY OF IOWA CITY COUNCIL ACTION REPORT

---

February 1, 2024

---

Civil Service Examination: Recreation Program Supervisor - Special Events & Communications

---

Attachments: [Civil Service Examination: Recreation Program Supervisor - Special Events & Communications](#)



**CITY OF IOWA CITY**

410 East Washington Street  
Iowa City, Iowa 52240-1826  
(319) 356-5000  
(319) 356-5009 FAX  
[www.icgov.org](http://www.icgov.org)

January 25, 2024


TO: The Honorable Mayor and the City Council

RE: Civil Service Entrance Examination – Recreation Program Supervisor – Special Events & Communications

Under the authority of the Civil Service Commission of Iowa City, Iowa, I do hereby certify the following named person(s) as eligible for the position of Recreation Program Supervisor – Special Events & Communications.

William Lane

**Iowa City Civil Service Commission**



---

Rick Wyss, Chair



# CITY OF IOWA CITY COUNCIL ACTION REPORT

---

February 1, 2024

---

Historic Preservation Commission: January 11

---

Attachments: [Historic Preservation Commission: January 11](#)

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
JANUARY 11, 2024 – 5:30 PM – FORMAL MEETING  
EMMA J. HARVAT HALL, CITY HALL

PRELIMINARY

MEMBERS PRESENT: Margaret Beck, Andrew Lewis, Jordan Sellergren , Deanna Thomann, Nicole Villanueva, Frank Wagner, Christina Welu-Reynolds

MEMBERS ABSENT: Noah Stork, Carl Brown

STAFF PRESENT: Jessica Bristow

OTHERS PRESENT:

CALL TO ORDER:

Sellergren called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF ANYTHING NOT ON THE AGENDA:

None.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

HPC23-0084: 430 Brown Street – Brown Street Historic District (mini-split installation):

Bristow began the staff report noting this property is in the Brown Street Historic District located on the corner of Van Buren and Brown Street. It's a colonial revival type house with a full front porch, she noted it probably always had a side entry stair off the porch. In fact, for this project she found something about when the change was made for the entry, it used to be a door to the porch on the front of the house and they changed it to the side of the house, probably when it became a bed and breakfast. This project is to remove the six wall air conditioning units that exist on the house and put individual mini split condensing units on grade around the house to replace those. There's also an existing air conditioning condensing unit for the main part of the house that will remain. Bristow showed where they will be placing the three units on the one side, and then screening them. They looked at matching the porch skirting or something like that for the screening instead of making it look like a fence. There is also the existing large square condensing unit to be screened. She also noted where the piping and splits will be and that she encouraged them to screen all of them.

Bristow stated regarding guidelines, the City doesn't specifically have some for mini-split installation and therefore look at the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, which is about not harming the historic character of the house. Staff also look at how they review radon systems because they have similar piping and for radon the goal is to have at least the piping on the non-street facing elevation and located on the rear of the property if possible, and then painting any piping to match the structure. She also noted there was recently a house on Burlington Street, the gray gabled bungalow at the top of the hill, that was going to install a mini split as well and the location was right next to a projecting bay on the side and so while that was on the side, it was still pretty visible and also located next to the large air conditioning condensing unit and therefore it was required to have them screen both of them. Therefore, because of the locations and the screening, staff does recommend approval of this project.

Welu-Reynolds asked if the piping is going to be painted the same color as the siding. Bristow confirmed the recommendation would be to paint it the same color as the siding.

Sellergren asked to see what the piping looks like. Bristow stated it is enclosed in a 2" by 3" channel and painted to match the wall. The units are located on the on the wall, a little higher on the wall inside the room, and so the piping will go down the wall. The ones she has seen look a little bit like an electric baseboard heater only mounted on the wall. The piping will come out and go straight down to a condensing unit.

Villanueva asked what types of repairs will be made to fill the space where the former units were. Bristow noted it will leave a hole in the wall so they will have to repair the interior wall and on the outside they'll add sheathing and the sheathing depth thickness will have to match what's there. Also instead of just putting in a square of siding, they will be required to stagger the joints which could potentially involve removing a little bit more siding to do so.

**Motion: Wagner moves to approve a certificate of appropriateness for the project at 430 Brown Street. Welu-Reynolds seconds.**

Bristow noted this case is less problematic than the one they discussed at the last meeting where the piping was on the front and went through details and arches. This one is on the side and had the house not been on the corner, this could have potentially not come to the Commission and could have been reviewed as an intermediate review between staff and chair.

**A vote was taken and the motion carried on a vote of 7-0.**

#### DISCUSSION OF COMMISSION ANNUAL WORK PLAN:

Bristow stated it is required by the State Historic Preservation Office that the Commission submits an annual report every year and creates a work plan of things to accomplish. Last year's work plan, which was included in the agenda packet was centered on the areas of the strategic plan that had been approved by Council. Since then Council approved a new strategic plan with a graphic that is more of a strategy map and talks about the values that they're interested in and how their strategy will impact the community. Bristow shared some of the goals Council had and some of the resources Council will need to execute their strategy.

The Commission Work Plan is how the Commission will set their priorities and some might be short term goals and others long term goals. The last versions were written very specifically by the previous chair and had a section on climate action, advocating that embodied energy is an important thing to consider when talking about the demolition of buildings and not wasting the energy that already exists, and creating a whole bunch of new energy to make new materials.

Sellergren asked if that has been included in the City's Climate Action Plan. Bristow is unsure so maybe working closely with Climate Action Committee somehow, or maybe having a member attend their meetings might be something that the Commission wants to consider as part of the work plan. The previous plan had short-term goals to contribute to the discussion on demolition. Several of the waste management folks have these similar goals so staff is trying to figure out how they actually move forward so it is an ongoing discussion. Bristow stated there are some communities where if a property is older than 1920, it must be deconstructed, but then that also means that they have a whole system set up where they have contractors who deconstruct things, they have places where the material can be warehoused, they have a way to sell it and distribute it to the community. There are three

communities specifically, Portland, a neighborhood in St. Louis, and a city in North Carolina, that all have pilot projects on that so if they wanted to look into more what they've done and made a make a proposal they could. They've also talked about how demolition permits have just a seven-day waiting period and a really small fee of \$50, so from a staff point of view they haven't really found a way specifically to move forward in that area.

Sellergren noted one thing that works well is social media awareness and spreading of information. Historic Preservation does not have an Instagram page, only Facebook. Bristow stated she did set it up and was running it but just doesn't have time. Sellergren noted they could just itemize some points just so people have really clear information and maybe include resources with each graphic or something so homeowners know what the numbers are when they're dealing with demolition and what the value is of keeping materials in place or removing them.

Bristow acknowledged part of this discussion is deciding what the priorities are but then also they have to decide who actually does what, and where are they going to get the information, do they hire somebody to do it and how do they get the money for that. So they can come up with goals, but then they need to figure out how to work towards them which may involve either volunteering amongst the Commission or staff time.

Sellergren stated she would be happy to make graphics but wouldn't want to be the person necessarily gathering the information because that's not her forte. She also doesn't think it would be a bad idea to start an Instagram account. Bristow stated they would have to work with communications, she started the Facebook page before communications really got involved in the City's Facebook pages but now they are added as an administrator and they won't let a Commissioner be the person who posts because it all has to go through communications.

Beck noted there are really alarming statistics about what percentage of people get their news from social media so having an Instagram site would be a push to reach younger homeowners.

Bristow stated another one of the long-term goals is developing a disaster preparedness guide for preservation. She mentioned this because one of the questions that came up to staff is can they relax all the rules and the answer is no, that's not actually what they would do they don't change the rules. It is just if a disaster happened, they make it easier to get it fixed faster by being prepared. Some of that involves the Commission being on the ground going up to people who just had something happen and helping usher them through the process and getting information out. She noted Iowa City won awards for their tornado response and that's part of what they did, they had more meetings more often, delegated some things to subcommittees, and that's the kind of stuff that they would do for disaster preparedness. The State Historic Preservation Office put out a before and after disasters guide as guidance for how to work with FEMA and the National Park Service and federal agencies, because they also have reviews that they have to go through and this guide is to help get through those things more quickly. Also, for the tornado the City applied for grants to help homeowners and so part of the disaster preparedness would be who to ask for grants from and when and how, they would set up all of those steps. That might just be something where a subcommittee is formed and comes together and brainstorms what is needed and then work it into some kind of a document or brochure for the Commission and staff to have.

Bristow noted there was also a section in the strategic plan about social justice and staff had ongoing work to identify opportunities to highlight Iowa City's history as a leader in these issues. They haven't really moved forward with any of these things as of right now, there haven't been any opportunities necessarily on how to proceed with that unless they just start researching the history.

Sellergren stated one possibility in identifying landmarks that they could pursue is the Shorts building. Possibly, if they could potentially get in touch with the owner as it's an important building with regard to black history in Iowa City from the early 1900s or maybe even late 1800s, as Short's Shoeshine, a business owned by HP Short. Perhaps they could look into landmarking that space.

Bristow stated regarding the short-term goals, there is Oak Park which once was a Mexican barrio where they lived in boxcars and then small homes. There could be a situation where they put an informative plaque similar to the Pest House at Hickory Hill. She believes right now this is something that they've moved forward as much as they can, the Parks and Rec director knows that the Commission wants to be involved in this park and ideas that have been thrown around is making sure that it's named to reflect its history instead of Oak Grove Park, which is a really just a random general name. And then also to put some kind of signage or identifying information there.

Beck asked what opportunity there is to explore if there's any trace of the structures that were there or any material evidence of the people who live there. Bristow noted they rarely get into anything that's archaeological because they are usually so National Register listed properties oriented and usually the properties that they review don't end up having an archaeological component that has been investigated at all. Beck assumes there might be regulations requiring some sort of archaeological survey before doing anything more with the site. When she was in UI field school they did the Pest House excavation and mapping, so it may be interesting to people if that could also be done here to flesh out the record and the information.

Bristow stated the next goal was partnership and engagement and one of the biggest things they do is the annual preservation awards. That's an ongoing thing that hopefully they can continue to revamp and keep going.

Next, following the National Register designation of the Downtown District, there was an interest in a local district and the general consensus was that there would need to be guidelines for a commercial district created before they made the district. Bristow doesn't feel that that's absolutely necessary because they have a way of working through things that don't have guidelines specific to them by using the Secretary of Interior Standards. The problem with that is property owners say it's not clear how to interpret those, so there is work to be done along those lines. This came about because there was a thought that there needed to be incentives for property owners to become involved in a local district so the Iowa City Downtown District and the former Chair got together and provided some ideas for incentives to Council but Council didn't act on it or respond so Bristow is unsure what the next step for a downtown district would be.

Sellergren asked if as the new Chair would the next step be her to pick up the conversation with Council or Iowa City Downtown District. Bristow agreed there is a new Council now so perhaps it's worth looking into if the Commission decides the Downtown District is a priority, then maybe figure out next steps. Bristow believes one of the biggest priorities that the Commission should have is making sure that everybody understands that there are only a very small handful of properties downtown that are protected from demolition at any point with a seven day waiting period- seven days from now in effect. For example, the Jefferson Hotel has been owned by the University a long time but it's not protected so the owner could put in a demolition permit and then take it down seven days from now. That's the case also for the Englert Theater. The Englert Theater is listed on the National Register but the owner has never been interested in locally landmarking their property.

Sellergren asked if the proposal was to offer opt-in incentives and the property owners aren't interested. Bristow explained Council wasn't interested in creating the incentives so they don't know if the owners would be interested in opting-in. The Downtown District who does work with the owners regularly felt

that they were incentives that the owners would potentially be interested in.

Bristow stated another question is do they want to locally designate the same boundary as the National Register boundary, most of Iowa City districts are the same, the Northside District is on the National Register as the Gilbert/Linn Street Historic District, but it has a different boundary than the local Northside District. Bristow believes that was done for political reasons so all of those are things that would have to be discussed for a Downtown District.

Sellergren asked if there's low hanging fruit like looking where they have existing guidelines and to take what is available and just rewrite them as Iowa City guidelines. Would that help property owners feel like they have specific guidelines to follow. Bristow stated in the Iowa City guidelines they list the Secretary of Interior Standards, the National Park Service does have a longer document that goes in more detail, it still leaves a whole lot open to interpretation because they have to provide information for so many different scenarios. Other communities, for instance the City of Milwaukee, has a hugely active preservation program and they are very strict with a separate book that's fully illustrated for residential and commercial. The best-case scenario is Iowa City would hire an outside consultant that would work with the Commission and staff to create guidelines, but they would always be based on other community's guidelines, as well as the existing Iowa City guidelines, as there's no reason to reinvent the wheel. Therefore, the first step would probably be looking at other community's guidelines and getting an idea of what might best fit with Iowa City to some degree. At some point they would have to hire a consultant, staff could do it, but they don't have time. Additionally, since Iowa City is a certified local government any new guidelines would also have to go through review from the State Historic Preservation Office and they would comment on things that they thought Iowa City shouldn't do or should do, so it'd be a lengthy process.

Sellergren asked if it is in the budget to hire consultant or is that something that the Commission would have to request money from Council. Bristow replied they would have to make that request from Council.

Bristow stated another short-term goal was to follow up with a unanimous request from this Commission and the Parks and Recs Commission to move forward on the Montgomery Butler House and coming up with an idea of how it could be reused. She noted this was another thing where Council just decided not to respond but there's been a little bit of communication amongst staff that maybe the fact that no one could come up with a use is the hold-up. Also, the fact that the study is so old and the budgetary numbers are outdated. Maybe they should they have a subcommittee of the Commission come up with potential uses, maybe meet with community members. Bristow acknowledged the building is going to fall down sooner than later and be gone due to its current condition.

Bristow stated there are a lot of potential priorities and the Commission has to decide which ones are most important. For housing and neighborhoods, they have the historic preservation fund and got an extra \$2,000 from Council this year which is nice. Regarding being a partner for neighborhoods interested in historic preservation, a long-term goal was to work to get the form-based code for areas that are adjacent to or surrounded by historic districts. Bristow explained a form-based code means that new construction is based on the form of the building, not the use. Right now the building code is based on uses which is common for planning. The reason for discussion in the past about form-based code was to make sure that new buildings adjacent to historic districts fit in with the other buildings in the area instead of not. There are some spots of form-based code now within the community, but staff is unlikely to want to make other individual little areas or to adopt a city-wide form-based code, which would change how Planning and Zoning works. Again, that was a big goal based on things that came out of past projects.

Regarding short term goals, there was the Summit Street monument, the City did pay for a study that reported how to fix it, move it and make a replica and they've asked for money to do that from City Council so if the budget comes through then they can move forward. She noted the biggest problem currently is where does it get moved to. The Old Capitol Museum was approached and they don't want it. It does need to go somewhere inside to stabilize it but it's fairly tall, four or five feet tall, and has probably at least a couple feet in the ground. Perhaps there's a spot in the library as that's a public space where things are displayed and there's some open space to some degree. There is no update on the Sanxay-Gilmore House because the University own it and are not going to move it, there was an update to the College Green Historic District because of moving the house. They have discussed they do want to update the preservation handbook, guidelines and maps and all of that. There's been some thought of hiring a consultant for that too, but that again takes money from Council. The City did pay for the survey from 2040 Waterfront Drive and that property was eligible for the National Register. They could also look into local landmarking, she has not yet sent the study to the owner as they got the study back, talked about it briefly and then COVID happened.

For long-term goals there is the goal of evaluating the City's mid-century housing stock. They have also increased digital online presence.

The goals in the Preservation Plan: goal one is identifying historic resources and that ties in also to the telling of the full history as well. Second, continuing the policy of protection of resources, through legislation and regulatory measures, which could be updating the plan or the handbook or coming up with commercial guidelines, any of those kinds of things. Third, establishing economic incentives, they do have the historic preservation fund, but the opt-in incentives goal didn't go anywhere with Council. Fourth, providing technical assistance necessary, that falls on Bristow, she used to do drawings for people but doesn't anymore. Fifth, heightened public awareness into preservation, letting people know about the downtown. Maintaining partnerships with the local government, the state government, federal agencies, etc. Bristow stated this one is kind of difficult as she doesn't have any contact with the National Park Service, and doesn't have that much contact or getting involved with the State government through this job. But there are options for the Commission. For instance, there are three state nomination review committee meetings that happen through the State Historic Preservation Office every year. There are set dates on a Friday morning that are open to the public where anyone can attend, there's also a zoom component. The meetings take place in the preservation office in Des Moines on Belle Avenue. There is also the preservation summit they can attend. Locally they could attend Park Commission meetings and everybody can attend council meetings. Seventh is to establish and implement Historic Preservation objectives for the University and surrounding neighborhoods. Bristow acknowledged some of this is related to districts that involve fraternities and sororities along Dubuque Street. Eight, heritage tourism and teaming with Friends of Historic Preservation to do a home tour, if they want to do it. Also maybe having someone from the Commission who attends their board meetings just as an observational member or creating tour brochures or something, they used to have some walking tour brochures. Finally, making maybe a subcommittee that reviews whether or not there's certain areas, neighborhoods that they need to look at to landmark and regular review and evaluation of initiatives by the community, looking at how preservation is going in the community.

Bristow stated these were the goals that the preservation plan assigned a really long time ago, in 2007, but are still the ones that guide the Commission.

Sellergren stated on a practical level is the purpose of a subcommittee is to bypass the issue of a quorum. Bristow acknowledged a subcommittee does two things, one there's multiple people so it's not all just one person's job. Also with a subcommittee they don't have to deal with a quorum, meeting minutes, all of that formal stuff, that subcommittee can then report to the full Commission.

Lewis asked if the next step is to document the work plan. Bristow confirmed yes, the way the annual report works is it is due to the State Historic Preservation Office on February 29. Since this Commission meets the second Thursday of the month that means that they will have to approve it the report at the February meeting and part of what they submit is the Commission's work plan. Bristow will send out an email at some point asking if anyone has anything in these areas that they want her to add to the annual report. She will compile everyone's responses, present it to them next month, and they will vote on it. If they are unsure how to proceed that is when she would suggest they form a subcommittee to make the work plan and come up with ideas.

Beck noted her immediate reaction to the work plan is there's lots of great stuff on it that needs more work. She doesn't immediately think they have to scrap these goals and find new ones, there is still more to do on the things that are listed, admittedly, some have external reasons why they can't move forward at the moment.

Sellergren feels like the work plan is a little overwhelming personally, like for 2024 they could pull one item from each of the City Council's strategic goal map, for example for social justice, racial equity and human rights, maybe they work on getting a sign up or an archeological study of Oak Grove, so that when people visit the park they have some context. Beck can think of a couple of clear action items related to that. One would be the historical research, there's some already done, but one would it be just simply, for example, approaching the Office of the State Archaeologist to see what kinds of geophysics they could use to see if there any evidence of anything underneath, ask if there are ways to non-invasively look at the property to assess that. She acknowledged that will probably take some money but they could approach them and ask for a budget.

Sellergren stated she likes the idea of expanding into neighborhoods like the Kirkwood/Lucas Farms neighborhood for one and then another is the mid-century neighborhood that's over on Morningside.

Bristow stated there's two, there's Morningside near City High, and then there a little area over by Foster Road and Dubuque Street, it's just one little cul-de-sac of like five houses but it's all mid-century and that was already reviewed as eligible for the National Register as part of Dubuque Street when they raised it.

Sellergren stated if she were to select a focus for 2024 it would be to identify the things that are most in danger, to consider the most precious and the most vulnerable. That would be like the buildings downtown and who could they identify who might be willing to landmark their own property. She knows there are a few properties where the owner has expressed interest in landmarking so that's one thing they could move forward with. She feels like some of these items are so all over the place and they could maybe be pushed aside so that they could save things that could be torn down at any second and will completely change the vibe of the City.

Thomann agrees with looking to see what they can landmark locally, especially if there is interest out there. Also the downtown is going to continue to be developed and she is a little concerned that there is going to be this tone of tear down and develop so they should be looking now to see what can they save.

Sellergren stated maybe and she could meet with the downtown district and see about identifying what those properties are.

Bristow noted they made their first landmarks in 1996 where they took everything that was listed on the National Register individually and tried to landmark them but two of them didn't happen so they got 36 landmarks. She still has that list from 1996 and in 2015 this Commission formed a subcommittee and

they went through and looked at all of the important properties that they knew about that aren't in a district and Pagliai's was on that but was overlooked because it wasn't seen as being threatened. So in 2015 the Commission subcommittee did come up with a list but then things happen with Council and it all got stalled.

Bristow is interested in knowing are there things from the 2023 work plan that they should outright remove, then basically keep everything else as their list. They can separate out the ones that must wait due to more research and investigation needed or resources to support future work. She doesn't feel they need to necessarily relate it to the City Council goals. They heard from Councilor Thomas that he appreciated the fact that it was related to the goals but jumping through the hoops to make it relate to their goals is a little more political than they need to be.

Sellergren feels they do not need to create work just to create works, just a list of properties and some marching orders would be great.

Thomann agrees but feels they are getting from Council that they aren't making a presence and Council doesn't really know what this Commission does. They want this Commission to engage with the public and maybe that will come about if they get this property list together and look at property's worth saving.

Sellergren also feels providing resources to the public by way of social media graphics would fall under that, getting the Commission to establish a presence in people's subconscious and City Council would see that.

Bristow stated it appears goals are to do some initial investigation research in Oak Grove Park, maybe having a subcommittee looking at landmarking potential things and then third is engaging with the public and Council.

Sellergren noted it could fall into the climate action goals, explaining to people why preservation is so important, of course the history of the town is really important, but also on a practical level this is an environmental issue. They all could be working a little bit harder to preserve, whether in a historic district or not.

Lewis stated engaging with the public and Council really allowing them flexibility to shift focus, or at least get information to people, and if they decide later that they want to talk about resource management they can put that on there. If they want to talk about landmarking things, they can put it on there. It allows them to do a lot without having to say one of their goals is to make sure that people know that resources are out there, they can just on their own engage and tell people the resources that they have.

Sellergren stated she is a little confused as there seems to be an etiquette with politics that she doesn't understand like when they have their eye on landmarking a property and maybe the owner isn't immediately willing to landmark it, that's not really something they could discuss openly or throw up on social media. The reason that Pagliai's building became a public issue is because it was up for sale and so there was outcry that preceded this Commission's involvement.

Bristow noted Friends of Historic Preservation paid to have a historian write up the site inventory form needed for 302 to 316 East Bloomington (Slezak Holub Hall/Pagliai's building) so they are ready to move forward with the landmark procedure and plan to do that for the February meeting. It is completely within their purview to get the word out to talk to the community members and get people to show up to Planning and Zoning and City Council meetings. If the owner decides to protest, that means

that six out of the seven Council members must vote yes to move forward and politically they don't tend to like to go against a single property owner. The only way that they will do that is if the community lets them know it's important enough, so they need enough community members willing to tell both Planning and Zoning but especially Council that it's necessary. Depending on how that all goes, they can use that to judge how much work will be required for downtown. In 2001, they made inroads to try to do a local district downtown and it suddenly died.

Thomann likes the idea of thinking about other properties where there isn't such a pressure situation, like the low hanging fruit and get to landowners before they decide that they want to sell it or before development starts happening around them.

Bristow stated she's heard enough to begin working with Sellergren to come up with a work plan that they can present at the next meeting.

#### REPORT ON CERTIFICATES ISSUED BY CHAIR AND STAFF:

##### Certificate of No Material Effect -Chair and Staff review

##### HPC23-0081: 1603 Jackson Avenue – Dearborn Street Conservation District (window and stucco repair and deteriorated siding and trim replacement):

Bristow stated this is a little Moffitt house. The garage that faced forward was incorporated into the house at some point in time. With this project they're doing a lot of work, stucco repair, window repair, and they are receiving help with Historic Preservation Funds.

##### HPC23-0085: 1118 East Court Street – Longfellow Historic District (piping and venting installation):

Bristow noted with all of the works without permit issues they've been having recently, they're streamlining the process between the building permits and historic review a little bit to try to see if that will help. Therefore, they'll see many more random piping things that come up because it requires a permit and they're making a hole in the wall. Hopefully they can issue certificates of no material effect for those. This one this is a new gas line.

##### Minor Review - Staff review

##### HPC23-0082: 405 South Summit Street – Summit Street Historic District (roof shingle replacement):

This is a roof shingle replacement on this house.

##### Intermediate Review -Chair and Staff review

##### HPC23-0077: 930 East College Street – College Hill Conservation District (5ft metal fence):

Bristow stated this house is between an old sorority that's now apartments and a modern apartment building on the other side. They wanted to put up a metal fence on the front and the one side. At first it was an eight-foot fence but Iowa City Code does not allow that. Code says six foot or less in the rear yard and four feet or less in the front yard. Bristow stated there's the potential for a minor modification, but the minor modification can only give 25% more, so in the front yard that would be a maximum of five feet. She worked with the applicants to mockup what five feet would look like and then they came up with a design that will have a low retaining wall which doesn't count, apparently, because that makes

the grade.

HPC23-0080: 1211 Muscatine Avenue – College Hill Conservation District (deteriorated dormer window replacement):

This bungalow on Muscatine has an addition by a previous owner that happened before the district was created. Now the new owner wanted to remove the window, because that was a bathroom, but a dormer exists for a window so they could not do that. They did approve replacement of it and approved a fiberglass window because of the moisture. The modern window and wall were rotted out.

HPC23-0051: 1211 Burlington Street – College Hill Conservation District (garage revisions including additional window, new floor and foundation, new overhead door and mini-split system):

This house is part of the Grant Wood Art Colony and has one of the only garages amongst all of those houses. They are making the garage into an art studio. They went through a review process and raised the garage to put a new foundation under it. Unfortunately, that does mean that the lovely doors will be replaced so they did work through what they're going to replace them with. Additionally, they are adding some windows and it'll have a bathroom so there's some venting and things that need to go in there.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 14, 2023:

**MOTION: Wagner moves to approve the minutes of the Historic Preservation Commission's December 14, 2023, meeting. Villanueva seconded the motion. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.**

COMMISSION INFORMATION:

Bristow shared regarding the landmarking next month Sellergren and she did visit the property (302 to 316 East Bloomington). Since Friend's of Historic Preservation had the site inventory form created, it was the first real documentation of this property. It needs to go and be on file at the State and the State now has a new process that it has to be submitted as a preliminary evaluation for National Register eligibility. Friends has done that. Bristow stated as part of the process they need some interior photography so they visited the property today and it is the most intact structure than she's been in in a long time. Next step is getting the application for the rezoning, which is in process right now, and then it will be open and available to the public.

Wagner talked about the mid-century modern home at 420 Park Road. It's a 1949 building that was owned by the family that owned Mott's Drugs in Iowa City and it has been occupied by them until January 5. The new homeowner is a guy from Canada and they're redoing the bathrooms because they are worn but the rest of the house is intact. He noted many of the homes in Manville Heights should be landmarks, so many Iowa City legends like James Van Allen lived in those homes.

Bristow reminded everyone they changed the date of the March meeting and it will be the third Thursday. Again the February 8 meeting will be reviewing the landmarking and a few other things, likely there will be a number of the public here for that meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

**Beck moved to adjourn the meeting. Lewis seconded. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:57pm.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ATTENDANCE RECORD  
2023-2024

NAME	TERM EXP.	2/9	3/22	4/13	5/11	6/8	7/13	8/10	9/14	10/12	11/9	12/14	1/11
BECK, MARGARET	6/30/24	X	X	X	X	O/E	X	X	X	O/E	X	X	X
BOYD, KEVIN	6/30/23	X	X	O/E	X	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
BROWN, CARL	6/30/26	O/E	X	X	O/E	X	X	O/E	X	X	O/E	X	O/E
LEWIS, ANDREW	6/30/26	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SELLERGREN, JORDAN	6/30/25	X	O/E	X	X	O/E	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
STORK, NOAH	6/30/24	X	X	O/E	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O/E
THOMANN, DEANNA	6/30/26	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VILLANUEVA, NICOLE	6/30/25	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O/E	X	X	X
WAGNER, FRANK	6/30/26	X	X	X	X	X	O/E	X	X	X	X	X	X
WELU-REYNOLDS, CHRISTINA	6/30/25	X	X	X	O/E	X	O/E	X	X	X	X	X	X

KEY: X = Present  
O = Absent  
O/E= Absent/Excused  
--- = Not a member



# CITY OF IOWA CITY COUNCIL ACTION REPORT

---

February 1, 2024

---

Human Rights Commission: January 23

---

Attachments: [Human Rights Commission: January 23](#)

**Draft Minutes**  
**Human Rights Commission**  
**January 23, 2024**  
**Emma J. Harvat Hall**

**Commissioners present:** Jahnavi Pandya, Doug Kollasch, Kelsey Paul Shantz, Viana Qaduora, Roger Lusala, Mark Pries.

**Commissioners on Zoom:** Sylvia Jons.

**Commissioners absent:** Ahmed Ismail.

**Staff present:** Stefanie Bowers, Sergeant Kevin Bailey.

**Recommendation to City Council:** No.

**Meeting called to order:** 5:31 PM.

**Native American Land Acknowledgement:** Lusala read the Land Acknowledgement.

**Introduction of new commissioner Dr. Liz and farewell to outgoing commissioner Maliabo:**

Commissioners introduced themselves to the newest commission member and bid a wistful farewell to former commissioner Maliabo.

**Election of chair and vice chair for 2024:** Pries nominated Kollasch, Jons seconded the motion. Jons nominated Paul Shantz, and the motion was seconded by Pries. Paul Shantz declined the nomination but would entertain a nomination for vice chair. Lusala nominated Paul Shantz for vice chair, Pries seconded the motion.

The motion for Kollasch as chair passed 8-0. The motion for Paul Shantz as vice chair passed 8-0.

**Approval of November 28, 2023, meeting minutes:** Pries moved, and Lusala seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

**Public comment of items not on the agenda:** Brandon Ross spoke. Ross spoke briefly on capitalism and imperialism. Ross does not think the U.S. should not be in Syria or Ukraine. As to Israel and Palestine, the U.S. is arming Israel for what he believes to be the elimination of an entire people. The U.S. has violated its own laws and international laws. Ross appeals to the HRC to act locally, think globally, act globally, be loud, be active, and be heard.

**Correspondence:** Upcoming events of the office, the Iowa City Foreign Relations Council, and the upcoming Lunar New Year celebration.

**Updates on Outreach and Engagement by the Police Department:** Sergeant Bailey spoke on the recent events of the department. Most of these have been canceled or rescheduled due to the snow and the frigid temperatures. The department has had mandatory training and has recently added an evening/night mental health liaison. A new youth shelter in Iowa City has opened. Bailey and the outreach folks have

been working hard on getting engaged with youth in the winter. They are also seeing more financial exploitation of the elderly and, so intentional outreach is being completed to organizations that cater to older adults.

**Support of the Transgender Protestors:** Commissioners Jons, Paul Shantz, and Kollasch drafted a statement in response to the arrest of transgender activists back in November. Amel Ali, at its November meetings asked the commission and submitted a letter asking for its solidarity in these targeted arrests and charges. The commission read through the prepared draft and approved it. Staff will do a news release. Pries moved, and Lusala seconded. Motion passed 8-0.

**Funding request from November 2023 Jewell Amos:** After its last meeting date, the commission asked staff to seek more details of this request for \$250. The request is for a t-shirt contest at Grant Wood Elementary for its graduating 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> graders. The additional details are that there are approximately 100 students who will be participating. Each student will get a shirt with the winning design and all of their classmate's names.

**Racial Equity and Social Justice Grant:** For grant cycle FY23, the Neighborhood Centers of Johnson County notified the commission that it has delayed the initial start of its project to January of this year. The project was delayed due to competing priorities.

The commission received the submissions for FY23 and will arrange a time to meet in the last week in February or the first week of March to make its recommendation to the city council for grant allocations. Commissioner Ismail is not participating due to a conflict of interest with the Center for Worker Justice and the Immigrant Welcome Network for Johnson County. Commissioner Mendez-Shannon disclosed that in early Jan. 2024, she joined the Greater Iowa City (GIC) Council, and that the City Attorney's Office has determined there is no legal conflict in her reviewing and rating the grant submission by GIC. And that she believes she can be fair and impartial in judging the merits of the GIC application.

**Commission Committees:** Commission members will review the current three committees and their purpose and then discuss who will serve on which committee. The three current committees are breaking bread, reciprocal relationships, and building bridges.

**Announcements of commissioners:** Paul Shantz would like the HRC to connect with the TRC to learn more about their upcoming Healing Circles. Qadoura spoke on a recent winter hike Mariam's Girls participated in with United Action for Youth. Pandaya recently joined a mental health provider that helps people for no charge on Zoom and offers multiple languages. Mendez-Shannon mentioned her support to the ICCSD for ensuring that youth this summer will still be fed meals even though funding will no longer be provided to support such programs in Iowa.

**Announcements of staff:** None.

**Adjourned: 7:01 PM.**

The meeting can be viewed at <https://citychannel4.com/video.html?series=Local%20Government>.

**Human Rights Commission  
ATTENDANCE RECORD  
YEAR 2024**

(Meeting Date)

NAME	TERM EXP.	1/23	2/27	3/26	4/23	5/28	6/25	7/23	8/27	9/24	10/22	11/26	12/24
Jahnvi Pandya	2024	X											
Sylvia Jons	2024	Z											
Doug Kollasch	2024	X											
Viana Qadoura	2025	X											
Ahmed Ismail	2025	A											
Mark Pries	2025	X											
Roger Lusala	2026	X											
Kelsey Paul Shantz	2026	X											
Liz Mendez-Shannon	2026	X											

**KEY:**    **P = Present**  
              **A = Absent**  
              **Z = Present via Zoom**