

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(CDAAC)  
Minutes  
August 10, 2006

City of Kalamazoo  
Development Center  
445 W. Michigan, Suite 101  
Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Members Present: Charley Coss, Chair; David Kinsey, Vice Chair; Shirley Coleman; Mark Fricke; Doris Jackson; Jennifer Mills; Mildred Smith

Members Excused: Kathy Steppenwolf; Pegg Osowski; Susan Oakes

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

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Amendments to PY2002 – PY2005 Annual Action Plans**

Mr. Thomas referred to the information contained in the CDAAC packets and advised that the following details serve as an amendment to the City of Kalamazoo PY2002, PY2003, PY2004 and PY2005 Annual Action Plans (AAP) as per the requirements of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), 24 CFR 91.505.

Under U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development program regulations found at 24 CFR 91.105 (b)(1) and 91.505 (a), the City of Kalamazoo is obligated to inform the public of any changes that have occurred with proposals in Annual Action Plans by having a public hearing such as the one being held tonight. Notice of the public hearing was posted in the local paper. The amendments show changes that have taken place from what was proposed in the original Action Plan. The changes are as follows;

**HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) – PY2002 AAP**

**1. Project ID – 02-025 Community Planning and Development Department – Rehabilitation Services**

14B Rehab; Multi-Unit Residential – 570.202  
HOME: \$462,600

Originally, the \$462,600 in HOME funds were earmarked to assist private and non-profit property owners with bringing substandard rental structures into compliance with federal, state and local codes through the city's Community Planning and Development Department.

**Amendment – 02-025A – HOME, Appleridge Apartment Development, Construction of new housing, \$462,600.**

The PY2002 AAP has been amended to show that the \$462,600 in HOME funds was actually used to directly assist eleven units of affordable housing in a total 56-unit townhouse development to be located at 2301 Flower Street and developed by Opportunity Builders, Inc. The eleven units will remain affordable for 20 years. The balance of funds will be obtained by reprogramming other HOME funds.

**Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) PY2002 AAP**

**1. Project ID – 02-005 Community Planning and Development Department – Rehabilitation Services.**

14A Rehab; Single Family Residential – 570.202

CDBG: \$453.598

These funds were designated for housing services for low to moderate income persons in the community through the City of Kalamazoo's Community Planning and Development Rehabilitation Services program for repairs such as roof and furnace replacements. The city will also partner with other community organizations on initiatives designed to address housing needs.

**Amendment – 02-005A Downtown Tomorrow, Inc.**

Downtown Tomorrow, Inc. (DTI) will utilize \$82,000 of reprogrammed rehabilitation funds toward the acquisition of a blighted property, located at 1343 Portage Street, in the Edison neighborhood, CT 10, BG.7. The intent of the acquisition is to gain control for demolition to eliminate blight and provide for future development and revitalization.

**HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) PY2003 AAP**

**1. Project ID – 03-026 – HOME, Construction of New Housing, HOME \$850,000.**

These HOME funds were originally allotted for use by the City of Kalamazoo to directly assist eleven units of affordable housing in a total 56-unit townhouse development to be located at 230 Flower Street and developed by Opportunity Builders, Inc. The eleven units will remain affordable for twenty years.

**Amendment – 03-026A – HOME, Appleridge Apartment Development, Construction of New Housing, \$250,000.**

The City of Kalamazoo will use \$250,000 of HOME funds to directly assist Trinity Village Non-Profit Housing Corporation's Ashley Square Single-Family housing development located at 226 – 234 E. Frank, 705 – 721 N. Pitcher, and 227 – 233 E. North

Streets, CT 2.02, BG 2. The project consists of 6 duplexes, 12 units which will be affordable rentals for 15 years, with homeownership opportunity after that.

**Amendment – 03-026C – HOME, Construction of New Housing, \$400,000.**

The City of Kalamazoo will use \$400,000 of HOME funds to directly assist Brookstone Capital, LLC's Kalamazoo Village I and II rental development located at 3840 S. Burdick Street and 3914 South Burdick Street. There will be a total of (10) HOME-assisted units of the total 24 housing units developed.

Ms. Jackson inquired as to why the buildings at Trinity Village are so close together; there are no yards. Mr. Fricke advised that a zoning variance was obtained for that project. He further commented that he had served on the Zoning Board of Appeals for 6 years and that the Trinity Village project is compatible with the rest of the neighborhood. Ms. Jackson expressed concern that there is no backyard for children to play in. Mr. Thomas advised that Rob Bauckham might have information about Trinity Village and the zoning for that project.

**Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) PY2004 AAP**

1. **Project ID – 04-045 Community Planning and Development Department – Public Facilities and Improvements.**  
03 Public Facilities and Improvements (General) – 570.201(c)  
CDBG: \$15,000

The City of Kalamazoo will utilize CDBG funds to enhance infrastructure to public facilities within the Partners Building Community Crosstown neighborhood revitalization strategic area.

**Amendment – 04-045A Downtown Tomorrow, Inc.**

Downtown Tomorrow, Inc. (DTI), will utilize \$15,000 toward the acquisition of a blighted property, located at 1343 Portage Street, in the Edison neighborhood, CT 10, BG 7. The intent of the acquisition is to gain control for demolition to eliminate blight and provide for future development and revitalization.

01 Acquisition of Real Property – 570.201(a)

CDBG: \$15,000

National Objective: Slums and Blight

Location: 1343 Portage Street, in the Edison neighborhood, CT 10, BG 7

**HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) PY2005 AAP**

**1. Project ID – 05-025 Housing Resources, Inc. Family Self-Sufficiency Program.**

05S Rental Housing Assistance, including Tenant Based Rental Assistance,  
HOME: \$84,544

Funds are to be used to temporarily assist qualified low to moderate income households with partial rents. At the time of this allocation, \$84,544 of HOME funds were known to be available to HRI for this FSS program.

**Amendment – 05-025A – Housing Resources Inc., Family Self-Sufficiency Program.**

Housing Resources, Inc. will assist approximately 200 individuals with temporary rent assistance funds during the program year. HOME funds from two (2) cancelled projects will be reprogrammed to fund the FSS project at \$250,000.

05S Rental Housing Assistance, including Tenant Based Rental Assistance.

HOME: \$250,000

Location: Eligible CT Citywide

**2. Project ID – 04-044 – West Douglas Redevelopment, Acquisition of Real Property  
HOME: \$125,000**

\$125,000 of HOME funds were to be used for a mixed use development including two (2) affordable housing units and commercial space located at 1021 – 1029 West North Street.

**Amendment – 04-044A Cancelled and reprogrammed.**

This project was found to be infeasible and was cancelled at the developer's request. The \$125,000 of HOME funds were reprogrammed to project 05-025, Housing Resources, Inc., Family Self-Sufficiency.

**3. Project ID – 04-045 – Habitat Project at Rose and Wall, Construction of New Housing  
HOME: \$50,000**

\$50,000 of HOME funds were to be used by Kalamazoo Valley Habitat for Humanity to support the development of five (5) single family housing units to be located in Census Tract 11, Block Group 3, Rose and Wall Streets.

**Amendment – 04-045A Cancelled and reprogrammed.**

No HOME funds were required to complete this project, and the project was cancelled. The \$50,000 of HOME funds were reprogrammed to project 05-025, Housing Resources, Inc., Family Self-Sufficiency.

### **Citizen Participation Plan**

As per the City of Kalamazoo's Citizen Participation Plan, this notice of amendment was posted on July 24, 2006 in the Kalamazoo Gazette, with a 30-day public comment period. Copies of the amendments to the PY2002 through PY2005 Annual Action Plans are available July 26, 2006 through August 25, 2006 at the Community Planning and Development Department, 445 W. Michigan Avenue, Suite 101, Kalamazoo, MI.

Comments regarding the Annual Action Plan may be submitted to the Community Planning and Development Department at the aforementioned address.

Mr. Fricke inquired if there is concern about projects that fall through after CDAAC granted money for them; he mentioned the Beaver Supply project. Mr. Thomas advised that such circumstances don't occur very often. The Beaver Supply project is being pursued again. The previous owner passed away and the individuals in charge of the estate are interested in pursuing this project. Mr. Thomas reminded CDAAC that the HOME program allows the city two years to commit those funds to projects, and the project has 5 years to expend the funds. Sometimes adjustments need to be made.

Mr. Fricke requested that prior to the budget process, CDAAC be provided with a summary of projects they have funded over the past 4 years. The summary should be very brief and show which projects were completed, which ones have not started, which ones were cancelled, etc. He also advised that the summary should show when sub-recipients requested the funding from CDAAC, what is the sub-recipient's history, when did they come back for funding after the project fell through, etc. That way, if we see a request in 2006 and the project from 2001 is not completed, CDAAC will know the status of the project. Ms. Jackson advised that CDAAC always inquires about such details during the budget process.

Ms. Smith inquired about the numbering system for the projects/amendments. Mr. Thomas advised that projects listed in the Action Plan are assigned a number. For instance, "02" refers to the program year it took place, and "025" is the 25<sup>th</sup> project, etc. The amendments include up to 2005.

Ms. Jackson mentioned the W. Douglas project and inquired if they would be eligible for funds if they asked again. Mr. Thomas advised that they would be eligible again but they would have to apply and be able to justify the need for funding. LISC has been supportive of the W. Douglas project and they may provide funds in the future.

Ms. Smith inquired as to who redirects funds, and Mr. Thomas advised that it is primarily done through city administration. In the past, developers have approached the city with projects, especially when low-income housing tax credits are involved because the state requires city support in those instances. City staff is then requested to determine if there are any available HOME funds. There is also a request for proposal process, which the city initiates. The request for proposal process was recently updated. The typical

allocation for HOME funds is under \$700,000 per year. However, there have been several large HOME projects lately and the city was over committed. Accordingly there were no requests for proposal for the past two years.

Ms. Smith inquired if under funded projects solicit funds. Mr. Thomas responded in the affirmative and stated that city staff would be consulted regarding such projects.

There being no further questions, Mr. Coss closed the public hearing regarding amendments to PY2002 – PY2005 Annual Action Plans.

### **PY2005 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report**

Mr. Thomas stated that during the program year June 1, 2005 through May 31, 2006, reports were submitted by 44 sub-recipients. That information must be reported to HUD by August 31, 2006. Every project funded is listed on a separate document; the entire report is the size of a phone book. CDAAC has been provided with the abbreviated version but the entire document is available upon request. The draft version is being presented tonight.

The first two pages of the CAPER are the Executive Summary, which stated the amounts of the two federal allocations as follows: CDBG – 2,056,687; HOME – 732,828 (for last year). That was the first year that funds were expended through the new 5-year Consolidated Plan. The CAPER provides an opportunity to look at how well the goals of the Plan are being met.

Typically, CDBG and HOME funds can be expended anywhere within the jurisdiction. However, the Kalamazoo City Commission prioritized where the funds should be spent and the following neighborhoods were determined to have Low-to-Moderate Income populations of 51% or greater: Eastside, Edison, Stuart, Fairmont, Vine, Northside. This decision was made so that the neighborhoods with the highest level of low-income populations could receive the bulk of the funding.

Over the last several years the city has changed from having its own rehabilitation program to having an anti-blight program. The focus of the anti-blight team is to reduce the number of blighted, abandoned and vacated properties in the city. The second page of the Executive Summary provides the following data: During PY2005, the anti-blight team initiated 116 new abandoned residential structure cases. They did 107 initial inspections, 299 re-inspections, identified 92 cases of vacant buildings open to casual entry, and oversaw 45 condemnations. Seven of those homes were voluntarily rehabilitated by their owners, 12 houses became certified as rental properties, 9 houses were demolished by their owners, and 7 of the houses were demolished by the city.

The section in the middle of page 2 of the Executive Summary refers to a city program called Partners Building Community, which has two areas in the city targeted for revitalization: Crosstown and Northeast Partners.

Toward the end of page 2, the Executive Summary refers to the Fair Housing Center, which has expanded its area to include Battle Creek and surrounding rural areas as well. The Fair Housing Center is committed to reducing those conditions which contribute to discrimination and to providing equal access to housing in the City of Kalamazoo and the region.

Mr. Thomas referred to Table 46 on page 3 of the CAPER. Table 46 provides a summary of specific plan objectives from the 5-year Consolidated Plan. The objectives were determined as the result of a study done by consultants who studied various issues in the community. Those issues were incorporated into various goals and objectives with specific numbers. This provided a challenge to the city to see that its resources met certain goals. Table 46 is attached to these minutes.

Mr. Fricke inquired as to where the housing trust fund dollars are. Mr. Thomas stated that he isn't sure if the funds are set aside in an account. At this point the trust fund is a paper transaction that has been pledged in the city's "balance forward." Mr. Coss commented that the trust fund won't proceed until matching funds are provided by the County, but that hasn't happened yet.

Mr. Thomas referred to page 111-7, table 46 and provided a brief explanation of some of the information contained in the table. For instance, the number "13" in row 1D of the table is the number of different agencies who received training to improve the quality of the services they provide. If each of the 13 agencies has helped 6 people/organizations then the goal of the Consolidated Plan has been met. He added that LISC (Local Initiative Support Corp.) doesn't advise the city of training they have done. Page 2 of the report lists organizations being trained to provide assistance. Referring to the chart under Community Development, Mr. Thomas advised that under 3A the number of actual units has been left blank because nothing had been done in that category.

Mr. Coss referred to 3A on the chart and inquired about the funding for the ramps. Mr. Thomas stated that information on the ramps would show up in the next report. Ms. Coleman commented that 11 ramps had been funded.

Mr. Thomas advised that the numbers on new lead-based paint cases are not available at this time, but the city is continuing to work with the county in that regard. Mr. Coss inquired if condemnation of a home of a certain age would be counted as lead abatement. Mr. Thomas advised that the condemnation would count as an abatement if the house had lead-based paint. Ms. Jackson mentioned that she works with KNHS (Kalamazoo Neighborhood Housing Services) and they use 1978 as the cut-off point when dealing with issues regarding lead-based paint.

Mr. Thomas advised that under economic development, it is hoped that CDBG funds would assist two more commercial sites. Mr. Fricke commented that CDAAC doesn't get many requests for economic development; CDAAC can't approve funds if there are no applications.

Mr. Fricke inquired if CDAAC funded the Boundless Playground; he recalled that it had not been funded at the recommendation of Jeff Chamberlain. Mr. Thomas advised that the information provided includes old projects that are finally coming to fruition. Ms. Coleman commented that CDAAC hadn't approved funds for the playground last year, but maybe they did in prior years.

Mr. Thomas provided an overview of the Consolidated Plan priorities as follows:

1. ***A COMMITMENT TO USE A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF FUNDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING.***

The total CDBG and HOME funds expended under this category was \$814,048, with 52 units and 563 persons being served.

2. ***MAINTENANCE, REHABILITATION, AND WEATHERIZATION FOR INCOME ELIGIBLE HOME OWNERS.***

CDBG fund in the amount of \$627,228 were expended under this category, and 298 units were served.

3. ***INFRASTRUCTURE REHABILITATION TO ACCOMMODATE SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATIONS, INCLUDING EASIER ACCESS TO SIDEWALKS, RAMPS, AND OTHER RIGHTS OF WAY.***

CDBG funds in the amount of \$312,448 were expended under this category.

4. ***NEIGHBORHOOD BASED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, MICRO ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT.***

Mr. Thomas stated that the city has its own small business revolving loan fund. There are no CDBG funds involved in that fund at this point, but there were in the past so that is reported as program income. There was a loan made during PY2005 for \$26,298, which created 4 jobs. The Northside Economic Potential Group received \$25,000, which provided training for 9 persons. This resulted in a total expenditure of \$51,298 which served 13 low/moderate income persons.

5. ***PUBLIC SERVICES WITH A FOCUS ON YOUTH RECREATION PROGRAMMING AND CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMMING.***

The combined total of CDBG and HOME funds expended under this category was \$547,415 with 6,604 persons being served.

6. ***OTHER – ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING.***

The combined total of CDBG and HOME funds expended under this category was \$326,767 and 1,595 persons were served.

Mr. Coss mentioned that there have been discussions in the past about coming up with a threshold regarding the least amount of grant money that can be awarded. The previous discussion focused on the possibility that it may cost more in staff time to monitor the grant than the amount of money that was awarded for the grant. Mr. Fricke stated that he would not advise setting a threshold because that might encourage people to ask for more money than they actually need. Also, certain projects may be very important but they might only need a small amount of funding.

Mr. Coss inquired if there is a possibility of minimal oversight for smaller grants so that not as much city staff time is needed. Mr. Thomas suggested that maybe sub-recipients who received smaller amounts (\$1,000 for example) could expend their funds over a three-month period (June, July & August). Accordingly, sub-recipients would only have to provide monthly reports for the first three months of the program year as opposed to all twelve months, and then they could provide an end of year report. There would be less need for staff monitoring under these circumstances.

Mr. Fricke mentioned the need to look at CDAAC providing money to applicants just because the funds are available; the project should be worthy of staff time. Mr. Coss mentioned Ms. Jackson's comment about the need to seed new organizations or just to maintain programs. Ms. Jackson advised that there should be instances of both seeding new programs and maintaining old ones. That subject should be more closely explored as we approach the next round of funding.

There being no further questions, Mr. Coss closed the public hearing regarding the PY2005 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Coss called the regular CDAAC meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

### **ROLL CALL**

The secretary completed roll call and it was determined that the above-referenced CDAAC members were present.

### **AGENDA (August 10, 2006)**

There were no changes to the agenda.

**Mr. Fricke, supported by Mr. Kinsey, moved approval of the August 10, 2006 CDAAC agenda as presented. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

### **MINUTES (July 6, 2006)**

Ms. Jackson referred to page 7, line 3 and requested that “Ms.” be changed to “Mr.”  
Coss. Mr. Fricke referred to page 6, paragraph 3 and advised that Portage is not involved  
with the “Kalamazoo Promise.” “Portage” should be changed to “Kalamazoo Township”  
in the minutes.

**Mr. Fricke, supported by Mr. Kinsey, moved approval of the July 13, 2006 CDAAC  
minutes as amended. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

### **CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

None

### **COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS' REPORTS**

None

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **Follow-Up Report: Federal Entitlement Funds**

Mr. Thomas stated that he had requested information from HUD regarding national  
CDBG funding allocations from 2001-2006. HUD was not able to provide the  
information in time for the July meeting, but it is now being provided for CDAAC's  
review. Mr. Thomas noted that 2003 was the watershed year for CDBG and HOME  
funds. On the national level, CDBG funds were down less than 1% and HOME funds  
went up 6% in 2003. In 2003 the City of Kalamazoo's CDBG allocation went down  
9.5% and HOME funds were down 31.2%. 2003 was the year that the demographics  
from the 2000 census were finally integrated into the formula. Thereafter, the level of  
CDBG and HOME funds allocated to the City of Kalamazoo have been fairly consistent  
with the amount of funding at the national level. For instance, in 2004 CDBG funds  
decreased by less than 1% at the national and local level. HOME funds were down 1%  
on the national level and less than 1% locally. In 2005 CDBG funds decreased 5%  
nationally and locally. That same year, HOME funds decreased 4% nationally and 5%  
locally. Mr. Fricke commented that when the 2010 census numbers are incorporated into  
the formula there will likely be a similar adjustment to CDBG and HOME funds, which  
would lead to another decrease in funding.

#### **Neighborhood Associations of Michigan (NAM) Conference Update**

Mr. Thomas provided to CDAAC a copy of the press release concerning the upcoming  
NAM meeting in Kalamazoo. Jennette Tarver from the Ecumenical Senior Center serves  
on the statewide neighborhood associations' board and the local steering committee for  
NAM. The NAM conference will take place at the Holiday Inn West on September 22<sup>nd</sup>  
and 23<sup>rd</sup>. There will be a bus tour, which will include points of interest in the City of  
Kalamazoo.

Ms. Jackson advised that the theme of the NAM conference is “Changing Faces in our Community.” We normally think of the neighborhoods as changing from white (Caucasian) to black (African American) and white. Now there is more of an influx of Native Americans and people from the middle-east. The conference will address how we will interact with them and the need too assimilate and get along.

Mr. Coss inquired if CDAAC would have some input at NAM. Ms. Coleman advised that Ms. Steppenwolf and Ms. Jackson would be present at the NAM meeting.

Ms. Coleman advised that the Stuart Area Restoration Association (SARA) voted to spend \$75.00 to have Leslie Decker attend the NAM meeting.

Mr. Coss inquired if there would be any representatives from the City at the NAM meeting. Ms. Jackson stated that City of Kalamazoo Mayor Hannah McKinney, representatives from the City of Kalamazoo Public Safety Department, and the Kalamazoo public school system would also be present at the NAM meeting.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **A+ Neighborhoods Overview**

Mr. Thomas provided to CDAAC a concept paper from Jeff Chamberlain, Director of the city’s Community Planning and Development (CP&D) Department, regarding the A+ Neighborhoods Program.

The city’s Partners Building Community (PBC) program is a neighborhood revitalization project that has not been moving forward at the desired pace for the last couple of years. Accordingly, the PBC program is on hold for now. The A+ Neighborhoods Program was designed to take over where PBC left off, but the A+ Neighborhoods Program has a slightly different focus. First of all, there will be a restructuring of responsibilities for the department’s housing inspectors. One of the inspectors will be focusing on zoning violations and commercial/industrial blight. Another group of inspectors will be focusing on blighted rental properties and the possibility of land-banking through the building authority. There will also be an increased focus on owner-occupied home improvements.

In the future, neighborhood associations who receive city funding will be the point of contact for homeowners needing home repairs. The neighborhood associations will be expected to assist homeowners with finding the appropriate community resources to help with repairs. The six core neighborhoods receive about \$230,000 in general fund dollars for operating support. Those neighborhoods have a 4 year, 7-month contract, which ends December 31, 2006, so they will soon be entering into a new contract. This information will be included in the new contracts for the six CDBG eligible neighborhoods.

Mr. Coss inquired as to how the liability situation would be dealt with if the neighborhoods didn’t properly handle a situation. Will the neighborhoods be considered

employees of the city? Mr. Thomas stated that the neighborhood associations would continue to be treated as sub-recipients rather than employees of the city. He advised that all of the neighborhoods carry minimum liability coverage, which names the city as an additional insured.

Mr. Fricke commented that the neighborhood associations would add a level of contact so people won't need to contact the city directly with questions. Ms. Coleman advised that the Stuart Neighborhood has a resource guide listing the names of contracts and their references. Mr. Coss inquired if each of the neighborhoods would have a person on staff to handle inquiries, and Mr. Thomas responded in the affirmative. Mr. Thomas added that the city will provide a lot of the necessary data to the neighborhood associations. They will look at what all of the CDBG sub-recipients do so residents can be referred to the appropriate agency to find help. For instance, seniors might be referred to the Ecumenical Senior Center, etc.

Mr. Fricke mentioned that the city building authority appears to be relying on eminent domain and, if that is the case, he strongly objects. Problems could occur if the city is allowed to determine that a site is blighted, gradually make that determination for surrounding properties, and then sell the properties to a developer of their choosing. Mr. Coss expressed concern about the tax reverted properties that have reverted to the city. He inquired if there are in public or private hands at this point. Mr. Thomas advised that the A+ Neighborhoods Program will be focusing on tax reverted properties at this point. Mr. Fricke commented that it appears eminent domain is being presented under the guise of blight, which is a rather subjective term and can be used as a tool for obtaining eminent domain. Tax reversion is a different matter, but these properties are being presented as blighted properties. Mr. Fricke requested that Mr. Thomas pass this concern on to Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Thomas referred to the tentative ideas on page 2 of the concept paper. There are discussions underway with regard to increasing home ownership in the city. Possible methods of achieving this goal include implementing Neighborhood Enterprise Zones (NEZ), which is a form of tax abatement for people who buy or rehab homes in certain areas. Another suggestion is the creation of mortgage pools/funds (some without income limits). The intention is to increase home ownership for all income levels not just lower income households.

Ms. Jackson mentioned that there have been discussions at KNHS (Kalamazoo Neighborhood Housing Services) regarding low-income housing developments in the city. The concern is that taxes paid on low-income housing developments would not sustain the City of Kalamazoo. Mr. Thomas stated that KNHS has a home ownership program called HOP and perhaps other business could implement such programs. Ms. Jackson stated that Bronson Hospital goes through KNHS for their employee homeownership program and KNHS is encouraging other area employers such as Western Michigan University to use the home ownership program.

Mr. Thomas advised that the city has many small, city-owned lots, which are unbuildable. Mr. Chamberlain is looking at possibilities for these lots. Mr. Coss inquired if the list includes parks, and Mr. Thomas advised that he didn't have that information. Mr. Coss stated that he is concerned about development at Woods Lake if the city sells the park located on that lake.

Mr. Thomas stated that in addition to trying to find buyers for the unbuildable lots, the A+ program suggests selling the lots to owners of adjacent properties. The hope is that the new owners will maintain the lots while benefiting from the additional land. At this point, the suggestion has been to sell the non-buildable lots for \$1 and the buildable lots for \$99.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Mr. Fricke inquired as to the City Commission's response to the motion made at last month's CDAAC meeting with regard to establishing a formal effort to identify the reasons for declining population in the city. Mr. Thomas stated that the City Manager's Office (CMO) contacted him for background information on the motion, which he provided to them. He advised that there hasn't been any feedback from the City Commission with regard to the motion. Mr. Fricke stated that he called the CMO but got no response. Mr. Fricke suggested meeting with either the Mayor or the City Manager to determine how to proceed with this issue. Mr. Coss mentioned that CDAAC is an advisory board and, therefore, the motion is merely advice. He suggested adding this matter to the September CDAAC agenda for further discussion.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Ms. Jackson, supported by Mr. Kinsey, moved to adjourn the August 10, 2006 CDAAC meeting. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Recording Secretary)

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Staff Liaison)

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
(CDAAC Chair)

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_