



PLEASE NOTE:

THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT

ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CDAAC)

WILL HOLD A **REGULAR MEETING** on:

**THURSDAY, February 12, 2015 at 6:30 PM
COMMUNITY ROOM, CITY HALL
241 W. SOUTH STREET**

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT
THE COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT AT (269) 337-8044

This meeting is free and open to the public.

CITY OF KALAMAZOO
Regular Meeting
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
6:30 p.m. – February 12, 2015
Community Room
City Hall

TENTATIVE AGENDA

- A. ROLL CALL
- B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - **November 9, 2014**
- D. CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
- E. OLD BUSINESS
 - **PY2016 Application Process Discussion**
- F. NEW BUSINESS
 - **PY2015 Subcommittee Recommendations**
 - **Timeline of Action Plan Development**
 - **Committee Vacancies**
 - **Future Agenda Items**
- G. COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS' REPORTS/STAFF UPDATES
- H. CITIZEN COMMENTS
- I. ADJOURNMENT

FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES:

Questions regarding agenda items may be answered prior to the meeting by contacting the Community Planning and Development Department at 337-8044.

Persons with disabilities who need accommodations to effectively participate in meetings should contact the Community Planning and Development Department at 337-8044 in advance to request mobility, visual, hearing, or other assistance.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(CDAAC)

November 13, 2014

Draft Minutes

**City Hall, Community Room
241 W. South Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49007**

Members Present: Beverly McCall; Amina Shakir; Dana Underwood; Matt Milcarek;
Orlando Little; Eric Cunningham; Kris Mbah; James Valeii;
Jennette Tarver

Members Absent: Bill Wells, Chair; Erica Patton, Vice Chair

City Staff: Dorla Bonner, Community Development Manager; Amanda
Harpe, Recording Secretary

ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON PRO TEM

Ms. Underwood, supported by Mr. Valeii, moved that Matt Milcarek be Chair Pro Tem for the evening. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Milcarek called the meeting to order at approximately 6:35 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Ms. Harpe conducted roll call of CDAAC members and determined quorum existed.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Harpe asked to add a Nominating Committee Update to the agenda under Old Business.

Mr. Valeii, supported by Ms. Underwood, moved approval of the November 13, 2014 CDAAC agenda with amended changes. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Little, supported by Ms. Underwood, moved approval of the October 9th, 2014 CDAAC minutes as submitted. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

CITIZEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

OLD BUSINESS

PY2016 Application Process Discussion

Ms. Bonner addressed the board and spoke about how attendees to the sub-recipient training were polled under the following categories: multi-year funding, and yearly neighborhood focuses. The board was given the results of the polling. Most of the individuals polled had received funding in the past. Ms. Bonner asked the board to review the document she provided them, and starting thinking of what will happen for PY2016, as a decision should be made in January or February. Based on the results there was very little support for yearly neighborhood focuses. Multi-year funding raised some concerns from the sub-recipients; they are concerned about when they will receive the funds for the second year.

Discussion happened between Ms. Bonner and the board about the intended impact of the projects for the upcoming years. As well as the pros and cons of multi-year funding, and neighborhood focuses.

Mr. Cunningham arrives- 6:43 P.M.

Ms. Bonner also brought to the boards' attention that with the Targeted Neighborhood Application, many of the applicants are involving the city in some aspect of their project, because of this the city is involuntarily becoming a partner within the projects. Ms. Bonner stated this puts the city in an awkward position because we have to remain equitable. Ms. Bonner would like the board to discuss if there is a way going forward it does not look like the city is playing favorites, or have any additional interest in the projects. Ms. Underwood stated that the city does not want to have an appearance of impropriety, and this is the major issue. Mr. Milcarek shared that since the individuals associated with the applications do not review those applications there is a level of transparency. Also, the individuals reviewing the applications are not employed or involved with the city or applying organization. Mr. Valeii stated if CDAAC was able to measure the impact of a project that the city is involved in it may have better results since the city would be involved in all major streetscape projects etc. In the future, Mr. Mbah would like to see city staff talk to the applicants of projects where the city is involved prior to the application process, to see where their impact will be targeted so there isn't a surprise when the applications are turned in. An example question Mr. Mbah would like to see asked is, how many new homeowners will be created from your project? Mr. Milcarek would like to the impacts quantified for PY 2016.

Nominating Committee Update

Mr. Milcarek shared with the board that one of the members selected to be on CDAAC, notified city staff he was no longer available to be on the board. There is still an open At-Large Seat available. The nominating committee has two options, they can open the application process up to the public and accept nominations, or they can choose from two previous applicants. The new member will not be a part of this year's application subcommittee due to time constraints. Mr. Cunningham would like to reopen the application process. Ms. Bonner stated that if the nominating committee chooses to reopen the application process they will need to be able to state why they did not choose the previous applicants, per the City Attorney. Mr. Milcarek would like the nominating committee to meet and discuss their options, since there is no pressing need to fill the position. Ms. Harpe will arrange a time for the nominating committee to meet.

NEW BUSINESS

PY2015 Application Process Update

Ms. Bonner gave an update on the application process; at the time of the meeting 4 applications have been submitted. City staff has met with some applicants to make sure all components of their applications were present. The subcommittees will receive the applications by the week of the 17th.

Subcommittees for PY2015 Application Process

Two subcommittees need to be created for application review. The first subcommittee is Targeted Neighborhood and the second is Affordable Housing. Five members will be on each committee with Chair Wells not being on a subcommittee. Ms. Patton shared with Ms. Harpe she would like to be on the Targeted Neighborhood subcommittee due to a conflict of interest with applicants for the Affordable Housing grant. Ms. Underwood would like to be on the Affordable Housing subcommittee since she is on the board of an applicant for the Targeted Neighborhood grant. Mr. Milcarek has a conflict of interest which causes him to have to be on the Targeted Neighborhood subcommittee.

The members of the Affordable Housing subcommittee are: Dana Underwood, Kris Mbah, James Valeii, Orlando Little, and Jennette Tarver.

The members of the Targeted Neighborhood subcommittee are: Matt Milcarek, Beverly McCall, Amina Shakir, Eric Cunningham and Erica Patton.

Mr. Mbah, supported by Mr. Valeii, moved to approve the membership of the Affordable Housing and Targeted Neighborhood Subcommittees. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS' REPORTS/STAFF UPDATES

Ms. Bonner shared with the board that HUD is now allowing the Action Plan to be turned in once funding is awarded. Previously, the Action Plan had been created based on estimates from the previous year.

Ms. Bonner also asked if the board members would like to cancel the December CDAAC Meeting because of the subcommittees meeting. Mr. Milcarek shared that in the past when the subcommittees are meeting there is no meeting with the whole board.

Mr. Mbah, supported by Mr. Valeii, moved to cancel the December CDAAC Meeting. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Bonner stated that an agency wanted to come tonight and speak regarding their application. She asked the board if they have allowed this in the past. Mr. Milcarek said previously this has not been done, but if the agency wanted to come and speak during the public comment period they could. The agency would have three minutes to speak.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Little, supported by Mr. Cunningham, moved to adjourn the November 13, 2014 CDAAC meeting. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Milcarek adjourned the meeting at 7:49 p.m.

Submitted by: _____ Dated: _____
(Recording Secretary)

Reviewed by: _____ Dated: _____
(Staff Liaison)

Approved by: _____ Dated: _____
(CDAAC Chair/Vice Chair)

CDAAC

Explanation of Determined Funding Levels

Affordable Housing – Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

The Affordable Housing Sub-committee proposes to split the funds 60/40 with the two highest scores recommended to receive 60% of the requested amount and the two remaining scores recommended to receive 40%. Both high scores were recommended to be funded at 60% due to having scored in the top 20 percentile. Scores listed within the 40% category were divided in half. The funding recommendation was then calculated to show the percentage of the overall requested amount.

Agency	Average Score	Requested Amount	Funding Amount	Split	Percentage of Amount Requested	Recommended CDBG Funding	
KNHS	84.8	\$150,000	\$365,000	60%	60%	\$90,000	
Community Homeworks	83.0	\$250,000			60%	\$150,000	
Housing Resources	76.0	\$75,000		40%	1/2 Split	83%	\$62,500
Senior Services	74.3	\$110,000				56%	\$62,500
						\$365,000	

Affordable Housing – Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)

The Affordable Housing Sub-committee proposes to split HOME funds 62/38 with the two highest scores recommended to receive 62% of the requested amount and the two remaining scores recommended to receive 38%. Both high scores were recommended to be funded at 100% due to having scored in the top 20 percentile. Scores listed within the 38% category were recommended to be funded according to being in the top 30% or 40% percentile. The funding recommendation was then calculated to show the percentage of the overall requested amount.

Agency	Average Score	Requested Amount	Funding Amount	Split	Percentage of Amount Requested	Recommended HOME Funding
College Town	98.0	\$78,745	\$450,000	62%	100%	\$78,745
KNHS - LP CHDO	86.0	\$200,000			100%	\$200,000
Housing Resources	76.0	\$125,000		38%	83%	\$104,721
Land Bank	61.0	\$233,812			28%	\$66,534
						\$450,000

Targeted Neighborhood Project - CDBG

Agency	Average Score	Requested Amount	Recommended CDBG Funding	Split	Percentage of Amount Requested		Recommended CDBG Funding
GFM Synergy Center	56.8	\$50,000	\$150,000	25%		75%	\$37,500
Portage Streetscape	53.4	\$150,000		75.0%	1/2 Split	37.50%	\$56,250
Douglas Firehouse Renovation	48.8	\$150,000				37.50%	\$56,250
							\$150,000

The Targeted Neighborhood Project Sub-committee proposes to split funds 75/25. Although GFM Synergy had the highest score, recommended funding for GFM Synergy Center is at 25% of the total allocation because it requested the smallest amount.

The balance of the funding is recommended to be split 50% between the Portage Streetscape Project and the Douglas Firehouse Renovation. Several sub-committee members indicated scoring these two projects was challenging because the application template did not work well for city-owned projects. It was difficult for committee members to gauge applicant capacity and experience for projects that would ultimately be managed by the city. As these projects both include city-owned property, it is recommended that the funds remain with the City of Kalamazoo. If the grants are ultimately awarded, city staff would work in partnership with neighborhood associations to implement these priority projects.

The sub-committee has requested that staff provide a revised scope of work for each project based on the proposed funding level. Staff expects to share the revised scopes at the February 12 Community Development Act Advisory Committee (CDAAC) meeting.