

Citizens Advisory Committee for Community Development
Wednesday, April 4, 2018
Busch Building – 2 West Conference Room
5:30 P.M.

Members Present: Tedra Estis, Chair; Angela Dowler-Pryor; Delilah Jackson; Earle Doman; and Erin Gray

*Delilah Jackson arrived at the meeting at approximately 5:55 p.m.

Members Absent: Christina Dicken and Jayne Bullard

Staff: Greg Burris, City Manager; Cora Scott, PIO; Bob Atchley, Planning and Development; Brendan Griesemer, Planning and Development; Rhonda Lewsader, Law; Bob Jones, Planning and Development; Glenda Troop, Planning and Development; and Lisa Gateley, Planning and Development

Attendance Tedra Estis, Chairwoman, called the meeting to order at approximately 5:35 p.m. in the 2nd Floor West Conference Room – Busch Municipal Building.

Welcome and Introductions Introductions were made around the table.

Discussion with City Manager – CACCD – HUD Annual Action Plan Process Greg Burris, City Manager thanked the commission for the time they provide to the commission. Mr. Burris provided a Memo (Exhibit A) to the attendees and requested they read it over before they begin their discussion.

Mr. Burris addressed the discrepancy between the Bylaws and the Ordinance, and advised that the City values public input but now there is a discrepancy that needs to be addressed. He feels this may provide the commission the opportunity to review the process and propose amendments to it within HUD guidelines. The bylaws and resolution needs to get into sync as soon as possible.

Committee members Erin Gray and Angela Dowler-Pryor expressed concern that comments and recommendations were provided as an advisory group and that their comments do not get translated to Council. Ms. Gray expressed concern regarding the evaluation process and how the funding base is evaluated and suggested that it would be helpful for the financial data of the applicants to be used in the evaluation. Ms. Dowler-Pryor expressed concern regarding controversial applicants and the evaluation process as well as the special meeting from the previous summer and the \$4 million of HUD money that had to be used. Ms. Gray suggested that the specific group in question not be funded at \$0, but was told they had to pick A or B. Specific funding base questions were asked at the last meeting and the organization has other funding so Ms. Gray expressed the opinion that the funding amount be shared and perhaps not all given to one organization.

Earle Doman suggested that the criteria be looked at and address some of the issues in the evaluation process. Ms. Gray expressed concern that some of the applicants are the same ones each year to receive the largest amount of funding, and wouldn't want the smaller applicants to quit applying or feel as though they will not be able to receive the larger fund amounts. Ms. Dowler-Pryor provided some of her volunteer experience with

Veterans Coming Home and expressed concern that the amount of people helped daily at some of the other organizations is the same as Life House has helped in four years time. Her first year on the CACCD was also the first year Life House was funded and the funding for after school snacks for school children fell off for funding.

Ms. Gray expressed concern about state tax credits that Life House receives come directly from TANF and takes away from local families, and the kids are being hit twice. House Bill 2005 in 2016, \$4 million plus taken from TANF. Would like to know if HUD allows this financial data to be a part of the evaluation process when evaluating the applicants. Mr. Doman feels comfortable with the way the staff evaluated the applicants and would like to see the evaluation process reviewed and updated. Ms. Estis advised that the criteria have been reviewed extensively previously and they stand the way they do today because they meet the HUD criteria. Discussion about housing issues versus safety issues when they meet the criteria. Mr. Griesemer addressed the concern about the applicants having too much money to receive a grant. The organizations receive additional points for having financial stability. Discussion about how this can be a positive and a negative for the applicants.

City Manager Burris suggested to Ms. Estis, Chair that the staff delineate the flexibility that staff has for criteria that may go to City Council for approval versus what HUD requires to be done a specific way. Mr. Griesemer provided the City Council criteria:

- Leveraging
- Cost Benefit
- Targeting
- Citizen Involvement
- Self Sufficiency
- Project Implementation
- Project Readiness
- Red Flags Focus Report

Question if state legislative policies are something that may be allowed to be evaluated on applications came up and is something that will need to be researched. Discussion on different services and how they serve a different amount of individuals/families and how difficult it is to score.

Ms. Lewsader advised that faith based organizations applying for money may not be discriminated against in receiving funds, but they do have to use the funds for non-religious purposes and may not use federal dollars for religious purposes. Discussion about how HUD verifies that the funds are not used for religious purposes. Mr. Atchley provided example of how of a previous complaint had been handled and researched to determine how funds were being used.

Mr. Burris proposed the idea of working with the committee at reviewing the criteria and determining if there are some changes that could go back to Council for approval, reviewing the process and possibly beginning the process earlier along with starting with an orientation for new members. Mr. Atchley addressed the idea of holding a training session with the committee around the same time frame as when the training is held for the applicants.

Ms. Gray expressed concern that they are still unsure of what is expected of them as a committee at this time with approval/disapproval of recommendations. Ms. Estis reiterated that the ordinance does not coincide with their bylaws and that this problem

just came to light. Comments are wanted from the CACCD members to pass along to Council with the staff recommendations.

Ms. Dowler-Pryor expressed her concern for the flow of meetings from the past year and how the CACCD has been expected to vote on funding at the meetings and not had adequate time to hold a second meeting for further investigation or review. A few citizens came to a previous meeting and they're interaction enabled change and Ms. Dowler-Pryor doesn't feel as though the committee members are being heard.

Ms. Lewsader and Mr. Atchley are currently working on updating the bylaws to bring them into compliance as well as provide a clear guide of what is expected and able to do.

Ms. Gray made a request to not use Council Chambers for the meetings in the future or if doing so to pull chairs down to front and not have such formal setting. Mr. Atchley explained that the City Council Chambers were reserved at the request of Ms. Dowler-Pryor requesting a larger room due to the number of citizens that may attend.

Mr. Burris followed up with the following items to be completed:

- Training session for the committee
- Begin the process earlier to avoid a rush
- Revisit the City Council criteria
- Bylaw revision
- Make sure the members are heard

Mr. Burris is going to recommend the staffs recommendation to City Council, as well as concerns expressed by the committee. The minutes from the prior meetings will be provided to the members for review and then any additional comments from the minutes as well as the minutes will go to Council with the staff recommendation for review.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

Prepared by Lisa Gateley

Tedra Estis, Chair

The minutes of the April 4, 2018 meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee for Community Development were approved at the June 26, 2018 meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee for Community Development.