

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(CDAAC)
Minutes
December 9, 2004

Members Present: Pegg Osowski, Chair; Mark Fricke, Vice Chair; Charley Coss;
Jurel Fullerton; Doris Jackson; MonaLisa James; David Kinsey;
Eric Miles; Susan Oakes

Members Excused: MonaLisa James

Guests: David Juarez, City Commissioner; Greg Milliken, McKenna
Associates; Beth Broome, Beth Broome Consulting; Shirley
Coleman; Stuart Area Restoration Association; Harold Bolger;
Orlando Little, owner of T & O Dollar Deals, N. Westnedge; Pat
Phillips, Program Director, Northside Economic Potential Group;
Eric Trevan, Executive Director, Northside Economic Potential
Group

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

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA (December 9, 2004)

There were no changes to the agenda.

**Mr. Fricke, supported by Mr. Coss, moved approval of the December 9, 2004
CDAAC Agenda. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (October 21, 2004)

There were no changes to the minutes.

**Mr. Kinsey, supported by Ms. Oakes, moved approval of the October 21, 2004
CDAAC minutes. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.**

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS' REPORTS

None

OLD BUSINESS

City of Kalamazoo Consolidated Plan 2005-2009
Final Draft Presentation – McKenna Associates

Mr. Milliken provided a brief review of the Consolidated Plan process. He then stated that, during the 30-day public comment period on the Consolidated Plan, six letters of public comment had been received. The NEPG (Northside Economic Potential Group) and the Disability Resource Council provided comments that were incorporated into the Plan.

(Mr. Fullerton arrived at 6:35 p.m.)

Mr. Milliken stated that a motion was required by CDAAC for the Consolidated Plan to proceed to the City Commission on January 17th. If the Plan is approved by the City Commission, it will then be forwarded to HUD for approval.

Commissioner Juarez inquired if the goals of the Plan were the same as the goals in the Executive Summary and if there had been any changes. Mr. Milliken stated that there are changes regarding self-employment training for entrepreneurs. The changes reflect goals targeted by HUD in the statutory language. The five main goals (in no particular order) of the revised Consolidated Plan are as follows:

- A commitment to use the majority of funding for affordable housing;
- Infrastructure rehabilitation to accommodate special needs population, including easier access to sidewalks, ramps, and other public right of way;
- Maintenance, rehabilitation, and weatherization for income eligible homeowners;
- Neighborhood based economic development, community development, retail and commercial development; and
- Focus on youth programming and crime prevention programs.

These goals reflect the comments received from the public during the numerous public meetings hosted by McKenna Associates.

Ms. Broome commented that youth programming and crime prevention were consistent concerns heard in the public meetings. Someone commented at one of the meetings that youth programming was more than crime prevention. Changes were made to clarify this in the Plan and these subjects are stated separately in the revision.

Commissioner Juarez inquired as to how much of the projected 15 million dollars of federal resources over the five years of the plan would go to low-income households. Mr. Milliken advised that specific funding is not laid out in the Plan. Commissioner Juarez inquired if there were projections for the first year. Mr. Thomas clarified that the Consolidated Plan is the City's roadmap of priority areas only. HUD requires that the city know what the needs of the community are over the next five years. HUD specifies what the entitlement funds can be used for, but it doesn't say how much money will be used. That decision would be at the discretion of the City Commission, and would be made on a year-by-year basis.

Mr. Fricke commented that the higher priority needs were listed in no particular order and that the "majority" of funding is to be used for affordable housing. He inquired as to what would happen if there were only one applicant. Mr. Fricke expressed concern regarding the phrase, "majority of funding" and inquired if it committed CDAAC to putting too much funding into that category.

Ms. Broome stated that, historically, the City of Kalamazoo has used a majority of funds for affordable housing and the groups that were consulted stated that affordable housing is a priority. Mr. Fricke suggested that the phrase, "substantial amount of funding" be substituted for the phrase "majority of funding."

Mr. Thomas clarified that HUD sets a cap on certain categories of spending. For example, 15% is the limit for public services and 10% is the limit for administration. Accordingly, a majority of the entitlement funds will most likely be used for affordable housing. Ms. Broome advised that the wording could be changed from, "majority" to "substantial."

Mr. Coss inquired about CDBG Section 570.309 being referenced and added to the Consolidated Plan (See Page III, 3). Mr. Milliken advised that it was to accommodate the multi-jurisdictional arrangements discussed in the Plan which states that funds could be used in another jurisdiction. Accordingly, if partnerships are formed, the partners would be able to assist the City of Kalamazoo. Mr. Coss inquired if it pertained to the housing trust fund. Ms. Broome advised that it could be but that the intention was for it to be applied to the cross-jurisdictional collaborations.

Ms. Osowski inquired if a decision had been made with regard to the trust fund and Ms. Broome stated that the trust fund concept was still being studied. The recommendation is scheduled for late spring. If the trust fund is established, the City will consider contributing \$250,000 of seed money if that amount is matched by funds from another

source. Ms. Osowski inquired if any CDGB money would be contributed to the trust fund. Ms. Broome stated that, if available, general fund dollars would make a better source of matching funds but that CDBG money might be used.

Mr. Coss mentioned that the focus was on youth programming and he inquired how the Plan would change the current funding. Ms. Broome stated that it would put a greater priority on youth funding because the neighborhoods expressed a need for quality youth programming. Mr. Coss inquired as to how neighborhood associations would be involved with the youth programs. Ms. Broome stated that such a change would be specific to the Annual Action Plan. It is not within the scope of the Consolidated Plan to specify how someone would need to apply.

Mr. Thomas commented that the operations of the neighborhood associations are funded by the general fund, but each association may still have projects which would be eligible for CDBG funds. The Consolidated Plan is not a funding plan but rather a list of things that are eligible for CDBG funds. Mr. Coss inquired if it would broaden the opportunities of the neighborhoods and Ms. Broome responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Fricke, supported by Mr. Coss, moved approval of the Consolidated Plan with the change that the reference to affordable housing be corrected to say “substantial” funding rather than a “majority” of funding.

Mr. Trevan gave a brief overview of the NEPG and stated that their purpose is to do three things: 1. Teach people to develop their business plans, 2. Loan money to businesses and, 3. Assist with commercial developments. Mr. Trevan commented that the NEPG’s business training program has been so successful that 80% of the graduates are still operating their businesses. He further stated that the NEPG was looking to align its priorities with CDAAC. Mr. Trevan had submitted a written statement which had already been incorporated into the draft plan, but from the floor, suggested several new changes to the Consolidated Plan. Mr. Fricke advised that the public comment period on the Consolidated Plan had already passed. He further commented that making changes to the Plan at this point was beyond CDAAC’s scope and that he would not amend his motion. Ms. Osowski advised Mr. Trevan that his comments would be taken into consideration. She called for a vote on the motion.

With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

7:05 p.m. to 7:10 p.m. – The CDAAC members took a short break.

7:10 p.m. – Ms. Jackson arrived.

NEW BUSINESS

Nominating Committee Update

The CDAAC Nominating Committee consisting of Ms. Osowski, Ms. Oakes and Mr. Miles interviewed two candidates for CDAAC: Shirley Coleman and Tristan Brown. A brief discussion followed with regard to David Anderson who has expressed an interest in serving on CDAAC. He is currently serving on another board from which he has agreed to resign if he is nominated to CDAAC. Ms. Coleman was present at the meeting to answer questions. She stated that she has been on the Stuart Neighborhood Board for four years and she has lived in the Stuart Neighborhood for 40 years. Ms. Coleman is a retired RN. She worked with Community Mental Health for 12 years.

Ms. Oakes, supported by Mr. Coss, moved approval of Shirley Coleman as the Stuart Area Restoration Association's representative to CDAAC. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Coleman's nomination will be forwarded to the City Commission for review.

Mr. Thomas stated that Tristan Brown was applying for the one remaining at-large seat. Mr. Brown was not present but Mr. Thomas advised that he had spoken with Mr. Brown and had advised him of the activities and time commitments concerning CDAAC.

Mr. Coss, supported by Mr. Fullerton, moved approval of Tristan Brown to fill the remaining at-large seat on the CDAAC board. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Thomas advised that the nominations of Ms. Coleman and Mr. Brown should be on the City Commission agenda in either late December or January. CDAAC still needs representatives from the Fairmont and Northside Neighborhoods.

Assignment of Grant Review Subcommittees

Mr. Thomas advised that there are four categories of CDBG applications this year: housing, public services, public facilities, fair housing/capacity building.

Discussion followed as to whether or not the CDAAC members would be requesting assistance with reviewing the grants. A suggestion was made to enlist help from staff at the United Way when reviewing grants for youth programs since that organization coordinates the Kalamazoo Youth Development Network (KYDN). The group was reminded that the CDAAC Chairperson has a non-voting role but must review the applications and attend the sub-committee meetings. After further discussion, the following groups were formed:

Housing/Public Facilities

Mark Fricke, Chair
Shirley Coleman
David Kinsey
Eric Miles

Public Services/Fair Housing/Capacity Building

Charley Coss, Chair
Jurel Fullerton
Doris Jackson
MonaLisa James
Susan Oakes

The Housing/Public Facilities Subcommittee meeting was scheduled for December 21 from noon to 1:30 p.m. in Conference Room #1 at the Development Center. The Public Services/Fair Housing/Capacity Building Sub-Committee meeting was scheduled for December 21 at 6:30 p.m. in conference Room #1 at the Development Center.

(Commissioner Juarez left the meeting at 7:50 p.m.)

CITIZEN COMMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Oakes, supported by Mr. Kinsey, moved to adjourn the December 9, 2004 CDAAC meeting. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Submitted by: _____ Date: _____

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Approved by: _____ Date: _____