

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(CDAAC)
April 2, 2009
Minutes

**Development Center
445 W. Michigan Ave., Suite 101
Kalamazoo, MI 49007**

Members Present: Mildred Smith, Chair; Buddy Hannah, Vice Chair; David Bills;
Shirley Coleman; Charley Coss; Trent Hines; David Kinsey

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Guests: None

City Staff: David C. Thomas, Neighborhood Development Supervisor;
Jackie Haske, Recording Secretary

PLEASE NOTE:

This special meeting takes the place of the regularly scheduled April 9, 2009 meeting, which has been cancelled.

CALL TO ORDER:

Ms. Smith called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

AGENDA (April 2, 2009)

Mr. Kinsey, supported by Ms. Coleman, moved approval of the April 2, 2009 CDAAC agenda as submitted. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (March 12, 2009)

Mr. Hannah, supported by Mr. Hines, moved approval of the March 12, 2009 CDAAC minutes as submitted. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS' REPORTS

NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION PROGRAM (NSP) FUNDING UPDATE

Mr. Thomas distributed a handout regarding the Federal Stimulus funding Kalamazoo is expected to receive. Part of that funding, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP), will be available to the city from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA), although no date has been given. The distribution of this funding is formula-derived and based upon MSHDA's criteria. Mr. Thomas explained the process of applying for NSP funds included a public notice followed by an application. More information will be shared with CDAAC as it becomes available.

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT (ARRA) UPDATES

(Mr. Bills joined the meeting at 6:34pm, followed by Mr. Coss at 6:36pm during the below discussion.)

Mr. Thomas began further discussing the handout, which he stated was compiled by Jerome Kisscorni, Executive Director of the Economic Development Division. Mr. Thomas explained that more information regarding ARRA funding is forthcoming. He then briefly went over the sheet and commented upon program areas significant to CDAAC as follows.

First, Mr. Thomas discussed the **Community Development Block Grant-Recovery** funds, for which \$495,533 is anticipated. These funds will be used for "shovel-ready" projects. He stated the City will submit a Substantial Amendment to the PY2008 Annual Action Plan informing HUD of how these dollars will be spent. Additionally, an April 30th public hearing will inform the public of the release and intended usage of these funds, followed by a public comment period per HUD regulations. Finally, an amended plan will be sent to HUD. Mr. Thomas then reiterated that the goals of ARRA are to create jobs, train workers, and to do so in a transparent, highly accountable way. He then continued discussion on the specific funds as listed on the handout.

City staff recently took part in a webinar for the **Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP)** funds. Mr. Thomas stated the webinar included information on how the funding will be processed, to also include a Substantial Amendment to the PY2008 Annual Action Plan, public notification, and public comment period. He added that the Homeless Prevention funds are similar to ESG funds, but focus on getting people back into a home or preventing them from having to go to a shelter. He also stated that the amount of funding for this program is nearly 10 times the amount of ESG awarded this year.

Mr. Thomas then briefly summarized **Energy Retrofits** and **Lead Paint Remediation** before discussing **Weatherization**, to be distributed by the County. He stated the County will administer this new funding. It will require a concerted effort since the annual

allocation of CDBG for this program has been approximately \$250,000. Under the ARRA, \$4.4 million is slated for distribution to the County. Other programs noted were **YouthBuild** (\$50 million to be distributed on a competitive basis nationwide), as well as **Youth Activities** funding (\$800,000 countywide), and a **Community Services Block Grant**, the guidelines for which will be forthcoming.

It was then explained that Mr. Kisscorni has been charged by the City Manager to be the go-to person for Stimulus funding, and that there is a possibility of the City hiring a grant facilitator to keep track of this information. Discussion on the ARRA funds then closed.

OLD BUSINESS

2009/2010 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. Kinsey stated that he and Mr. Bills recently attended the Vine Neighborhood Association meeting, where they explained CDAAC and its membership needs. He stated a few people were interested in applying to the board. Mr. Kinsey also stated that one Edison neighborhood member showed interest. He added that person could fill an at-large position. Mr. Kinsey also stressed the need for a homeless representative, and that his contact at Ministry with Community gave him names of three possible future members.

Mr. Coss asked if there is HUD interest in having service recipients on boards. Mr. Thomas stated HUD's interest lies in policy/decision-making boards. Mr. Coss clarified that he would like to see board membership broaden into representatives from other services. For instance, in addition to having a homeless population representative, CDAAC could recruit members from other service categories. Mr. Thomas explained HUD requires participation from the homeless population specifically. Other categories are not required by HUD regulations. The consensus was that it was a good idea to broaden CDAAC's membership.

Discussion then turned to appointments for the 2009/2010 Nominating Committee. Mr. Kinsey stated that he, Ms. Smith, and Ms. Coleman are the current members of the Nominating Committee. After a brief discussion in which CDAAC members expressed interest or past participation, **Ms. Smith appointed Mr. Hines, Mr. Hannah, Mr. Kinsey and Mr. Bills to serve as the 2009/2010 Nominating Committee.**

2009 CITY COMMISSION INITIATIVES: MEETING WITH CATHERINE DANCE, DIRECTOR/PASTORAL WORKER OF VINEYARD OUTREACH MINISTRY

On March 19, 2009, Mr. Thomas and Alfrelynn Roberts of the City Manager's office met with Catherine Dance of the Vine Outreach Ministry (VOM) upon Ms. Dance's request. Ms. Dance wished to clarify several points raised by CDAAC regarding the VOM's application for City Commission Initiatives funding. Mr. Thomas reminded CDAAC that VOM was not recommended for funding because it had received the lowest score

(26.83 out of 45) of all applicants for Initiatives funding. Ms. Dance wished to publicly correct any inaccurate statements or misinterpretations made during CDAAC's funding review. Mr. Thomas directed CDAAC members to the Inter-Office Memo distributed to CDAAC members in the April 2, 2009 meeting packet. He then discussed the meeting with Ms. Roberts and Ms. Dance, summarized in the Memo, as follows.

First, Ms. Dance pointed out that the November 13, 2008 Minutes indicate that CDAAC members stated 30 children would be impacted by the program. Ms. Dance stated that observation was taken from the 2008 Special Activity final report and did not accurately represent the full impact of VOM's services. VOM's 2008 "Statistical Summary and Project Overview" indicates that 899 individuals were served, approximately 7,100 households were contacted through mailing outreach efforts, 1,707 meals/snacks were served, 351 short-term projects and yearly activities were hosted, and 105 community volunteers took part in VOM activities.

Next, Ms. Dance pointed out that VOM is not a church. In the November 13, 2008 Minutes, a CDAAC member stated "funding [VOM's] program would be giving too many government dollars to support the church." Although the term "ministry" is used 30 times in the application along with other faith-based terms, Ms. Dance wanted to clarify that VOM provides public services and other activities which are not affiliated with a specific church.

Ms. Dance also indicated during the meeting with Ms. Roberts and Mr. Thomas that although CDAAC questioned the need for a grant based upon VOM's 2007 IRS 990 report of \$122,156 in revenues over expenses, that was a one-time anomaly due to a capital campaign.

Finally, Ms. Dance clarified that VOM's activities provide valuable services to the Vine neighborhood, and the grant would not be used for general operation, contrary to CDAAC's interpretation of the proposal. Mr. Thomas stated he had offered additional technical assistance through a pre-submission training which may help VOM to strengthen its application regarding the above issues as well as project specificity.

Mr. Thomas stated he informed Ms. Dance that he would write up a report about the discussion that took place during the meeting (which became the Inter-Office Memo), distribute it to CDAAC members, and that the April 2, 2009 minutes would include the clarification from Ms. Dance that took place during the March 19, 2009 meeting.

Ms. Coleman commented that perhaps VOM could have a representative on CDAAC. Mr. Coss commented that he would welcome their application in the future.

NEW BUSINESS

TARGETED NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION COMMITTEE

Mr. Thomas directed CDAAC to a handout for the Targeted Neighborhood Improvement Fund. He stated \$250,000 of CDBG funding is eligible for revitalization projects as a result of the Federal Stimulus funding. He stated this funding had been discussed at previous CDAAC meetings as a possibility for future CDAAC input. The distribution and activities supported by this funding would be used to address some systemic issues based upon foreclosure data and vacancy rates recently identified in the Neighborhood Stabilization Program application. The handout summarized the criteria and decision process.

Members for a steering committee with knowledge of CDBG regulations are needed for reviewing proposals. He commented that Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) has a subcommittee called “neighborhood reinvestment” which functions similarly to CDAAC. He stated the neighborhood associations are on board with the idea of a steering committee for this funding, and that Director Chamberlain wanted CDAAC to be aware of this.

Mr. Coss stated he would like to volunteer, and inquired about the frequency of the meetings. Mr. Thomas clarified that the steering committee would need to plan the meetings, and review draft applications and proposals. He stated extensive HUD knowledge is not needed. Mr. Bills and Mr. Hines then volunteered to be on the steering committee as well as Mr. Coss.

(At this time, Mr. Coss stated that the March 13, 2009 Minutes indicate that he would submit a letter to the City Clerk regarding his wishes to reapply to CDAAC. Mr. Thomas clarified that he did not need a letter.)

PY2009 ESG APPLICATIONS: REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Thomas handed out a packet that included ESG grant proposal summaries, a worksheet, and City staff recommendations. He stated that there are 7 requests this year, totaling \$193,851. The amount of ESG available is \$81,270.

He then went over the worksheet, with City staff recommendations. Mr. Thomas stated that due to the new Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing (HPRP) funding, it would be inefficient to recommend agencies providing homeless prevention services over those offering shelter operation/maintenance services. For this reason, the Salvation Army was not recommended by City staff for ESG, as they provide homeless prevention services. HRI was recommended for \$5,000 less than their requested amount due to their homeless prevention efforts. This maximization of ESG funding resulted in an updated request amount of \$158,851.

He then stated that Ministry with Community is a daytime shelter and does not have beds. Ministry with Community is already receiving \$18,000 in CDBG funding for shelter and maintenance, so he stated an arbitrary ESG recommendation of \$5,000 could be negotiated. He stated he then recalculated the ESG available and divided it by the total

bed shelter utilities ($\$76,270 / \$118,460 = 64\%$). All comparable requests were then funded at the calculated percentage.

One CDAAC member asked for clarification on why the Gospel Mission was receiving more funding than the HRI Family Shelter although they requested the same amount. Mr. Thomas reiterated that the HPRP will be applied to HRI, as they work towards preventing homelessness, while the Gospel Mission does not. Additionally, the Gospel Mission operates with 463 beds while HRI has 24 beds.

Another CDAAC member wanted reassurance that the Salvation Army would receive funding under HPRP. Mr. Thomas stated he met with the Salvation Army and informed them that ESG may not be granted to them this year in lieu of the HPRP funding. Mr. Thomas advised they are comfortable with the idea and are aware of HPRP.

One CDAAC member stated he felt the City staff recommendations were well thought out, but would like to recommend more to Ministry with Community and less for Catholic Family Services - The ARK. He noted that both are valid services, but Ministry with Community is always at capacity.

Another CDAAC member commented that Open Door Next Door is a small facility and questioned if they should be fully funded because of their size. The member stated HRI receives funding from other organizations, and that not receiving full funding may be a bigger hit to the smaller organizations. The member felt larger organizations help more people, so more funding to them would maximize the benefits. Mr. Thomas pointed to the analysis chart regarding the total bed cost per night. In his observation, larger groups with more beds have less cost per bed, while smaller organizations have a higher cost per bed. The CDAAC member then agreed with the previous member regarding occupancy rates. Other members then asked that member for clarification on how to fund The ARK. The member would like \$4,000 or \$5,000 moved from The ARK to Ministry with Community.

After a brief discussion on what dollar amount to possibly move from the City staff recommendation, several members stated that those recommendations were already well thought out and appropriate. Another CDAAC member expressed concern regarding the Salvation Army, as 60 households are served with utility shut-off prevention. One member asked when the HPRP funding would be available, to which Mr. Thomas stated it may be sooner than ESG.

One CDAAC member asked what other agencies would be eligible for the HPRP funding. Mr. Thomas stated it depends on how their applications read. HPRP will be used for the intention of getting people out of shelters or preventing them from having to go to one. He stated the City's focus was to fund those agencies that perform shelter services with ESG and to set aside those that aim to prevent homelessness for HPRP funding. He stressed that HPRP could not be used to fund the operations of a shelter facility. All local homeless service agencies will be notified of the availability of HPRP.

After a brief discussion reexamining of the services The ARK and Ministry with Community as well as HPRP, **Mr. Kinsey, supported by Mr. Bills, moved to shift a to-be-determined amount of recommended PY2009 ESG funding from The ARK to Ministry with Community. With a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.**

One member suggested \$2,000 be moved, to which another voiced his concurrence. Mr. Thomas observed that The ARK received \$2,000 more this year under CDBG than last year. **Mr. Coss, supported by Mr. Hannah, moved to amend the City staff ESG recommendation for The ARK from \$9,700 to \$7,700, the recommendation for Ministry with Community from \$5,000 to \$7,000, then submit these recommendations to the City Commission. With a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously. The final amended chart for PY2009 ESG follows:**

	Catholic Family Services: The Ark – 990 W. Kilgore	HRI: Family Shelter 522 Eleanor	YWCA: Domestic Assault 353 E. Michigan	Salvation Army: Homeless Prevention Utility Shutoffs 1700 S. Burdick	Kalamazoo Gospel Mission 448 N. Burdick	Open Door and Next Door Shelters 414 Ranney	Ministry with Community 440 N. Church
PY2008 Award	\$10,000	\$28,981	\$20,000	N/A	\$22,400	N/A	N/A
Amount requested: PY2009	\$15,000	\$40,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$9,460	\$29,391
Staff Amount recommended: PY2009	\$7,700	\$15,450	\$19,200	\$0	\$25,600	\$6,320	\$7,000
Rehabilitation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Essential Services	N/A	\$11,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Operation/ Maintenance	\$15,000 Staffing @ \$1,500; Occupancy @ \$8,800; Supportive Services @ \$1,820; Communications @ \$1,200; Insurance @ \$1,680	\$24,000	\$30,000 Shelter maintenance, operation, staffing, insurance, utilities, and furnishings	N/A	\$40,000 Water/Sewer, electricity, heating/air conditioning	\$9,460 Shelter utilities: gas, electricity, water and waste	\$29,391 Facility maintenance and utilities
Homelessness Prevention	N/A	\$5,000	N/A	\$30,000	N/A	N/A	N/A
# of Beds	*10 (*13 on page 4)	24	46	N/A	463	12	*4,015 hours units of service
Total Shelter Budget	\$940,638	\$338,621	\$639,482	\$1,754,000	\$2,340,035	\$381,110	\$991,551
ESG Request as a % of Shelter Budget	1.5%	12%	4.6%	1.7%	1.7%	2.4%	2.9%
Maximum Capacity/Nights of Shelter	3,650	8,760	16,790	N/A	154,818	4,380	N/A
Annual Bed Cost	\$94,064	\$14,109	\$13,902	N/A	\$5,054	\$31,759	N/A
Total Bed Cost per Night	\$257.71	\$38.65	\$38.09	N/A	\$15.11	\$87.01	
Average Occupancy Rate	51.5%	100%	97.5%	N/A	75%	80%	500 – 1,000 people per day
Population Assisted	Runaway youth –	One and	Domestic		Chronically	Single,	Open to all age

	ages 10 – 17; 500 days of Service for 50 youth; Crisis intervention for 80 youth; Counseling for 25 youth families; Other services for 50 youth; 10 community presentations	two parent Families; (62% of beds filled by children) 1,081 nights of shelter for 60-65 persons	assault victims and dependent children; 2,190 nights of shelter	60 households directly with utility shutoff prevention; 198 others for referrals and information assistance	and temporarily homeless people – families, men, women, elderly, veterans	younger (ave. age @ 27) homeless adults, 25% of whom are chronically homeless	groups of homeless and low income persons; “hard-to-serve” adults
Match Commitment	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Mr. Kinsey, supported by Mr. Hines, moved to submit the amended PY2009 ESG recommendations to the City Commission. With a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Kinsey, supported by Mr. Coss, moved to adjourn the April 2, 2009 CDAAC meeting. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Smith adjourned the meeting at 7:44 p.m.

Submitted by: _____ Dated: _____
(Recording Secretary)

Reviewed by: _____ Dated: _____
(Staff Liaison)

Approved by: _____ Dated: _____