

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(CDAAC)
Minutes
June 9, 2005

The Development Center
445 W. Michigan Ave., Suite 101
Conference Room #1

Members Present: Mark Fricke, Chair; Tristan Brown; Shirley Coleman; Jurel Fullerton; Doris Jackson; MonaLisa James; Dave Kinsey

Members Excused: Charley Coss, Vice Chair; Commissioner David Juarez, Susan Oakes; Pegg Osowski

City Staff: David C. Thomas, Neighborhood Development Specialist; Amy Thomas, Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Fricke called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

ROLL CALL

It was determined during roll call that the aforementioned members were present.

EXCUSED ABSENCES

Mr. Coss, Mr. Juarez, Ms. Oakes and Ms. Osowski all advised that they would not be present for the meeting.

Ms. James, supported by Mr. Kinsey, moved approval of the aforementioned absences. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA (May 12, 2005)

There were no changes to the agenda.

MINUTES (May 12, 2005)

There were no changes to the minutes.

Mr. Kinsey, supported by Ms. Coleman, moved to approve the May 12, 2005 CDAAC Minutes. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Consider New Meeting Date and Time

Ms. James advised that her class schedule conflicted with the current CDAAC meeting day and time. She inquired if other members also had difficulty with the current meeting schedule and if someone could suggest a more convenient day/time to meet.

Mr. Fricke mentioned the need to consider staff resources before changing the meeting dates.

Mr. Thomas stated that the current meeting day/time is stated in the bylaws and changing it would require city staff to give notice to the City Commission.

After further discussion the CDAAC members decided to leave the meeting day/time as it currently is in order to accommodate the majority of the members.

Update on City of Kalamazoo Subrecipient Monitoring

Mr. Thomas advised that city staff is working to have all CDBG subrecipients on a 3-year monitoring schedule. There are currently 44 subrecipients and three staff members to conduct the monitoring. HUD has informed city staff that an on-site monitoring of each subrecipient must be conducted every three years. Thereafter, unless there are specific problems to be examined, a desk review on the alternate two years would be sufficient.

Mr. Thomas mentioned the Forest Hills apartment complex off S. Drake Road and stated that city staff is still required to monitor this complex for the 35 years of its affordability period. Thirty-three of the residents were HOME assisted and city staff is required to review the files and determine if the residents are still eligible for the subsidies. Mr. Thomas stated that he would provide more specifics as the monitoring cycle progresses.

Ms. James inquired if the applicants would be given a specific time period to correct violations if problems were found. Mr. Thomas stated that the applicants would usually have 30 days in which to advise city staff of their plans for remediation. There have been very few violations. If problems occur, city staff will write them up as a finding which would denote a violation of HUD rules; a concern, which is something that appears to be headed for violation status; or a recommendation, which is an explanation of how something could be improved. HUD is now requiring time sheets of actual hours spent by city staff to monitor subrecipients and in conducting any CDBG activities.

(7:52 p.m. – Mr. Fullerton arrived.)

Discussion of Possible Revisions to CDBG Application for PY2006

There was a discussion at the last meeting with regard to possible changes to the CDBG application for program year 2006. Ms. Jackson had suggested that the application be sent to all of the CDAAC members to review and suggestions could be made at the next meeting.

Mr. Fricke inquired as to how representative the applications are of the grading criteria. He mentioned that he didn't need 3 or 4 page resumes of the executive board members. Mr. Brown suggested making the resumes optional. Ms. Jackson mentioned the necessity of checking the qualifications of board members; qualifications should coincide with the program being offered. For instance, if a subrecipient is offering counseling to juveniles, it may be necessary for them to prove they have a qualified psychologist on staff. A housing contractor would be required to provide proof of a contractor's license, etc. CDAAC needs to know if an organization has the capacity to do what they are proposing.

Mr. Fricke recommended condensing the resumes to show only vital information. As an example, CDAAC might not need resumes from larger groups such as the YMCA but it would be helpful to have resumes from smaller groups with whom CDAAC is not as familiar. It isn't necessary for CDAAC to know where someone received their degree, etc. Ms. Jackson mentioned that it might be unfair to request resumes from some organizations and not others. Mr. Fricke concurred and added that such requests might be perceived as micromanaging.

Mr. Kinsey referred to pages 3 & 4 of the executive summary and commented that applicants tend to reuse information from these pages to answer other questions on the application. Mr. Fricke agreed that this does happen frequently. He further commented that a reason for this happening is that there is a misunderstanding of what is needed on page 4, particularly question #2 which may be the most critical question on the application. Mr. Fricke advised that question #2 should be stated more clearly.

Mr. Thomas suggested that maybe the resumes didn't need to be reproduced for every member of CDAAC. CDAAC members could inquire of city staff as to the capacity of a subrecipient if there was need for clarification. Mr. Fricke advised that if capacity is a grading point, he didn't want to rely strictly on city staff; the CDAAC members need to use their own judgment.

Ms. Jackson suggested that maybe it was not necessary to have an executive summary. Ms. James stated that she liked the executive summary because it is an indicator of how good the grant will be. Further concern was expressed that information from the executive summary was reused on other questions in the application. Mr. Fricke suggested having a shorter summary. Ms. Coleman advised wording such as, "Please

limit your comments to the space on this page.” It was mentioned that the font could be made smaller so applicants might still provide more information than necessary.

Ms. James mentioned that question #2 on page 4 is asked again later in the questionnaire; maybe it should just be one question for the applicants to answer in detail? Mr. Fricke mentioned that usually the first question is the most important but question #2 needs to be the focus of the application. Mr. Brown suggested combining the two questions. Mr. Fricke commented that the executive summary could be answered with that 1 question but the executive summary becomes the answer to all 5 questions.

Mr. Thomas advised that the entire application used to be 3 or 4 pages and the executive summary was useful for finding out what activity the applicant was proposing. He further commented that with the new 5-year plan, there are other ways to obtain the information that CDAAC needs.

Mr. Fricke advised exploring the possibility of combining the executive summary and projected overview into one and put more emphasis on question #2.

Discussion followed with regard to the questions about capacity on page 6 of the application. This gives the applicant the opportunity to explain what they are doing and is particularly helpful when the program involves something that the applicant doesn't normally do. The term “key staff members” was also discussed. Who determines who is “key?” If a “key” staff person is no longer with the applicant, such information might not be brought to the attention of city staff until they complete a monitoring for the applicant.

Ms. Coleman advised that she relied on people's qualifications a lot while reviewing the applications. She suggested that the questions not be omitted but that they be summarized better. Ms. Jackson advised writing the questions so that the applicants couldn't cut and paste the answers from the executive summary. Mr. Fricke concurred and added that the questions should be written so as to elicit different information.

Mr. Fricke mentioned that during the last round of funding, CDAAC had four categories to consider rather than just the two they previously had, and that this might also affect the length of the application. He suggested having an outside entity such as The United Way look at the applications and provide suggestions on how to improve them.

NEW BUSINESS

Nominating Committee: Recommendation to Renew a Three-Year Term for MonaLisa James

A brief discussion followed with regard to the reappointment.

Ms. Jackson, supported by Mr. Fullerton, moved to recommend to the City Commission the approval of the reappointment of MonaLisa James to CDAAC. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Thomas advised that he received a new application from someone interested in joining CDAAC. Mr. Fricke inquired as to the status of the vacant CDAAC seats and was informed by the recording secretary that there are three vacant seats: Northside, Fairmont and one at-large seat. Mr. Thomas advised that none of the current members' terms will expire before March of 2006. Mr. Fricke suggested having the nominating committee review the new application and provide a recommendation to CDAAC. The new application would be for the at-large seat. Mr. Fricke requested that the next CDAAC agenda include a discussion about the nominating committee.

Program Income: Recommendation to use \$34,000 in CDBG Program Income for Northwinds.

Mr. Thomas reminded the committee that HUD has advised that the City of Kalamazoo needed more of a public process for the special initiative funds; the amendments were provided at the last CDAAC meeting. He gave a brief review of the history of the special initiative fund.

Mr. Thomas stated that there has been a recent development involving CDBG money: the city is about to receive program income from the sale of a rehab house at 219 Reed. This income has created a new situation and the city is exploring how the funds can be utilized. The house sold for \$58,000 and this money is categorized as program income, which is to be treated like block grant funds. Mr. Thomas suggested that the funds from the sale of the house should be reviewed by CDAAC and then the City Commission. The sale of 219 Reed was the result of a partnership between the City of Kalamazoo and Kalamazoo Neighborhood Housing Services. The house was on the anti-blight list and the owner donated it to the city for a tax write off. Rehabilitation on the house was completed with block grant funds so the sale of the house produced program income.

Mr. Fricke inquired as to what portion of the rehab at 219 Reed involved CDBG funds. Mr. Thomas stated that he had never seen a prorata break down of those figures and that he would look into it.

Mr. Thomas referred to the Collins Street housing development and the recent groundbreaking that took place at that site. He stated that MSHDA provided funding for construction of the houses but not the infrastructure. KNHS approached the city for more funds to assist with infrastructure and someone suggested using the proceeds from the sale of 219 Reed for that project. Mr. Thomas advised that if CDAAC approved of the suggestion, he would approach the City Commission about it. KNHS was hoping to

obtain \$34,000 for the infrastructure on the cul-de-sac on Collins Street. Page 3 of the handout provides a possible breakdown of the how the \$58,000 might be used.

Mr. Thomas stated that, just this week, the City Commission addressed recent problems with youth issues and lack of productive activities for this summer. The City Commission will be holding a special meeting on June 10 to explore the possibility of utilizing the program income from the sale of 219 Reed to fund more youth programs for the summer.

Mr. Thomas stated that Commissioner Cooney convened a group of people who came up with a proposal to fund more youth programs. The City administration recommended using a portion of the program income from the sale of the house at 219 Reed. Further discussion followed with regard to the funding.

Ms. Jackson stated that there was a lack of programs for youth in the Eastside Neighborhood. The Clock Program starts the day school lets out: if kids are not accompanied by an adult and they're out after a certain time, public safety officers will pick them up and take them to the Clock program. Parents retrieve their kids from the program and the kids are back out on the streets again. Ms. Jackson advised that there is no funding this year from the Parks and Recreation Department for youth programs. She expressed concern that the youth of the neighborhood need something more constructive to do so they don't wind up with a police record.

Mr. Thomas provided a proposal from Commissioner Cooney's group showing how the funds would be used. He mentioned that an agreement would be signed stating how the funds will be distributed.

Ms. Jackson expressed concern that \$4,500 was a rather large sum of money for block parties. Mr. Fullerton mentioned that the \$4,500 might include security and different venues for teaching. It was mentioned that HUD has already advised the city that it needed to conduct the appropriate public process for the distribution of funds. Therefore, the CDAAC members expressed concern about the process through which the proceeds from the sale of the house will be distributed. The CDAAC members advised that they would like more details about the proposed programs for which the money has been earmarked by Commissioner Cooney's group. Mr. Thomas advised that reprogrammed funds and program income have not been reviewed by CDAAC in the past and that he was bringing this information to CDAAC for their information, input and discussion prior to the special City Commission meeting.

Further discussion followed with regard to CDAAC's role in this funding process. Mr. Fricke outlined the following options for the CDAAC members: 1. Make a motion to approve and the motion passes; 2. Make a motion to approve and the motion fails; 3. The issue dies for lack of a motion. For lack of a motion, there was no action taken by

CDAAC on the proposal to distribute program income funds to KNHS for the Northwinds project, and for a series of Summer youth programs.

Mr. Fricke stated that he would try to attend the City Commission meeting to convey the concerns expressed by the CDAAC members.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. James, supported by Ms. Coleman, moved to adjourn the June 9, 2005 CDAAC meeting. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Prepared by: _____ Dated: _____

Reviewed by: _____ Dated: _____

Approved by: _____ Dated: _____