Citizens Advisory Committee for Community Development
Wednesday, August 28, 2018
Busch Building – 2 West Conference Room
6:00 P.M.

Members Present:	Angela Dowler-Pryor, Vice Chair; Erin Gray; Earle Doman; Christina Dicken; Kate Stockton; David Carr; and Brandy McShane
Absent	Delilah Jackson, Chair
Staff	Bob Atchley, Planning and Development; Tom Rykowski, Law; Brendan Griesemer, Planning and Development; Glenda Troop, Planning and Development; and Lisa Gateley, Planning and Development
Attendance	Angela Dowler-Pryor called the meeting to order at approximately 6:02 p.m. in the 2nd Floor West Conference Room of the Busch Municipal Building. Attendance was taken.

Approval of Minutes

The Committee reviewed the following draft meeting minutes:
July 24, 2018 – CACCD Meeting

Bob Atchley, Senior Planner advised he had made one revision to the draft minutes and added "Ms. Dowler-Pryor expressed that" in the second paragraph under Discussion and Possible Vote on Draft Amended CACCD Bylaws.

Brandy McShane moved to approve the minutes as presented. Erin Gray seconded the motion, and it was approved by the following vote: Ayes: Angela Dowler-Pryor, Christina Dicken, David Carr, Erin Gray, Brandy McShane, Kate Stockton and Earle Doman. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Delilah Jackson.

Discussion and Possible Vote on Draft Amended CACCD Bylaws

Ms. Dowler-Pryor made the motion to reject the draft amended CACCD Bylaws. There was not a second and the motion failed.

Ms. Dicken requested explanation from Ms. Dowler-Pryor as to why she wants to reject the draft amended CACCD Bylaws. Ms. Dowler-Pryor expressed her concern that they do not coincide with the functions that she feels the CACCD is supposed to fulfill.

Discussion about the tabling of the item at the past meetings. Mr. Atchley provided details about the intent of putting this back on the agenda is so that the Bylaws comply with the Resolution. Ms. McShane expressed concern that if the first five lines in the first paragraph of Article I – Purpose were to not be struck through and kept as shown it would be more in line with how they feel they want them to be, by not striking through the first sentence it doesn't take their power away. Ms. Dowler-Pryor suggested that in lieu of power, purpose. Mr. Doman asked if this is a resolvable issue with City Council guidelines. Ms. Dicken expressed her concern with rejecting the draft amended CACCD Bylaws is not where their concern is, it is with changing the Resolution. Mr. Carr agreed he doesn't see any need in rejecting it as it would just be bringing it current with the Resolution, and if they want to make changes it needs to be done through other avenues not by continuing to reject the Bylaws. Ms. Dowler-Pryor expressed concern that with the City of Springfield having a new City Manager in place and a new City Attorney to be coming on, it would be best to reject the draft amended CACCD Bylaws and then look for a new write. Mr. Atchley advised that the verbiage added is verbatim from the Resolution. Ms. McShane expressed concern that the Resolution doesn't have the same power as Bylaws. Mr. Rykowski provided information that a Resolution is authorized through Council, so it's the authority. Ms. Dowler-Pryor expressed concern that recommended changes would have not come about had they not had the previous events this year. Ms. Gray agreed with Ms. McShane that most of the items on the draft amended CACCD Bylaws look okay, but would like the first sentence under Article I – Purpose to be added back in. Ms. Dowler posed the question that if that first sentence is removed, "why do they come together to meet?" Discussion about the second sentence in the first paragraph under Article I - Purpose that is highlighted coming directly from the Resolution and that being why that wording was added.

Mr. Griesemer advised that in 2010 the Bylaws were amended most likely in error against the Resolution; however, he nor Bob Atchley were not the staff members working with the CACCD at that time. He suggested a letter be written to the Mayor to communicate their concerns. Ms. Gray expressed her concern that if they were to go ahead and accept them now that when they have the opportunity to speak with the Mayor and City Council that they would question the CACCD as to why they would have just passed the draft amended CACCD Bylaws if they are not what they agree with.

Discussion about what they should do as far as tabling, rejecting or amending and then approving. Mr. Rykowski advised they can do whatever they want if they want to accept as is or make amendments then accept it. Ms. Gray recommended changes that she would like to see. Discussion about the draft changes and the CACCD recommended changes and getting into agreement with the Resolution. Ms. Dowler-Pryor expressed concern that in the current Bylaws they do not define by what means they provide comments or recommendations. Their attempt was previously rejected by the City Manager Burris.

Ms. McShane asked if it would be possible to make a motion proposing that they adopt the Bylaws as presented with the exception of the changes to the first five lines of Article I – Purpose. Ms. Dowler-Pryor advised she didn't think that would address all of Ms. Grays concerns, and Ms. McShane thought the first five lines revision would. Ms. Gray advised that she would like to add that first sentence back in. Ms. Dowler-Pryor pointed out that they still do not have any sort of outline as to how they achieve this. Mr. Carr suggested that these may be changes that need to be made to the Resolution. Further discussion that both the Resolution and Bylaws need to be updated and the changes they would like to make to the Bylaws. The CACCD will revise as to how they feel it should be.

Angela Dowler-Pryor moved to table the draft amended CACCD Bylaws and request an appointment with Mayor McClure to discuss with him their concerns and requested changes. Christina Dicken seconded the motion, and it was approved by the following vote: Ayes: Angela Dowler-Pryor, Christina Dicken, David Carr, Erin Gray, Brandy McShane and Kate Stockton. Nays: Earle Doman. Abstain: None. Absent: Delilah Jackson.

Reminder to Please Respond to Outlook Invitation for Tours of CDBG

Mr. Atchley requested any members that have not responded to please do so.

Funded Organizations

Staff Report – Synopsis of CDBG Public Service Funding Processes HUD Entitlement Communities

Mr. Atchley provided a second handout (Attachment A), a chart with condensed information. Ms. McShane thanked Mr. Atchley for putting this together and how interesting it is. Mr. Atchley reached out to 42 communities, every community in HUD Region 7 as well as Little Rock, but has not heard back from them yet. Also reached out to some communities in Illinois that are of comparable size to Springfield. The responses vary greatly, some sent just a simple email with their process and some sent 25 plus pages of documentation.

Approximately 90% of the different cities fund public service projects. Two that do not; St. Charles County and Lincoln, NE.

Mr. Atchley advised that the process for Columbia is similar to Springfield but a little more participation with the committee. The committee makes a recommendation and a staff report that goes with it and it is the Advisory Committees report that goes to Council.

Mr. Griesemer advised that Jefferson City adopted the City of Springfield's CDBG Project Evaluation Criteria, the Community Development Objectives and the Community Development Priorities.

Discussion about Columbia and their housing stock.

Mr. Atchley advised that approximately 62% have an advisory committee, but with a lot of variances. HUD does not require an advisory committee, but it is best practice. Most of the communities have criteria or a scoresheet but all varied with who does the scoring.

Mr. Atchley provided a page from the CDBG Funding Proposals (Attachment B) and provided details about how the staff confirms that it is an eligible project and sites the specific HUD Regulations. HUD provides a matrix code.

New Business

Mr. Griesemer thanked the members for their attendance at the solar panel homes tour and advised they will be receiving an invitation for a SCLT fully accessible home tour.

Ms. Dicken inquired on behalf of a citizen about the CAPER and why it will not be available until the day of the September 11 Public Hearing? Mr. Griesemer advised that the HUD Regs say that we must present the report to HUD within 90 days of the closing of our fiscal year, which closes June 30, so it must be turned into HUD by September 30. The City of Springfield doesn't close the books until August 30 or 31, so it cannot be started until after that time. Ms. Dicken asked if there is a way to build a cushion in to provide time between the CAPER completion and when the Public Hearing is held. Mr. Griesemer advised that the staff would like to be able to do that; however not sure how to do so. There is a Public Hearing for review and comment, then there is a 15-day comment period. Ms. Dicken expressed concern that dialogue is diminished when not able to discuss in person.

Ms. Gray advised that she is happy to help assist with getting the CAPER out to the Library locations.

Public Comments

None

Next Meeting: September 11, 2018, 6:00 p.m. Busch Municipal Building – Scheduled for the 1st Floor Conference Room, but looking for alternative location.

Adjournment: Acting Chair Dowler-Pryor thanked everyone for their meeting attendance.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:07 p.m.

Prepared by Lisa Gateley

Angela Dowler-Pryor, Acting Chair

The minutes of the August 28, 2018 meeting of the Citizens' Advisory Committee for Community Development was approved at the September 11, 2018 meeting of the Citizens' Advisory Committee for Community Development.

Synopsis of CDBG Public Service Funding Processes HUD Entitlement Communities

HUD Entitlement Community	Fund Public Service Projects	Appointed Advisory Committee	Type of Appointed Advisory Committee	Criteria / Score Sheet	Type of Criteria / Score Sheet
MISSOURI					
Columbia	Yes - Competitive Process	Yes	Advisory Committee Appointed by Council	Yes	Scoring Criteria (9 items)
Independence	Yes - Competitive Process	Yes	Area Group Representatives	Yes	No Score Sheet / Criteria (6 items)
Jefferson City	Yes - Competitive Process	Yes	3 Person Committee - Legal / Social Service Background	Yes	Adopted City of Springfield's Criteria
Lee's Summitt	Yes - Competitive Process	No	City Council Subcommittee	Yes	Staff Internal Administrative Criteria
St. Charles	Yes - Competitive Process	Yes	Fair Housing Commission	Yes	CDBG Sub-Recipient Mgmt. Handbook (9 Items)
St. Charles County	No	Yes	Community Assistance Board	No	Must Meet Minimum Requirements in RFP
St. Louis	Yes - Competitive Process	No	Board of Alderman Subcommittee	Yes	Subcommittee uses Scoring Criteria (11 Items)
St. Louis County	Yes - Competitive Process	No	Staff Evaluation	Yes	Staff Score Sheet (4 Items)
KANSAS					
Johnson County	Yes - Competitive Process	Yes	Subcommittee of Advisory Committee	Yes	Scoring Criteria (4 Items)
Lawrence	Yes - Competitive Process	Yes	Advisory Committee Appointed by Council	No	No Formal Ranking or Scoring System
Leavenworth	Yes - Competitive Process	Yes	Advisory Committee Appointed by Council	Yes	Scoring Criteria (6 Items)
Overland Park	Yes - Competitive Process	Yes	Advisory Committee Appointed by Council	Yes	Scoring Criteria (6 Items)
Shawnee	Yes - Competitive Process	No	City Council Evaluation	No	Reviewed for Compliance with Con. Plan Goals
IOWA					
Council Bluffs	Yes - Competitive Process	Yes	Advisory Committee Appointed by Council	Yes	Staff & Advisory Committee Score Sheet (15 Items)
Davenport	Yes - Competitive Process	Yes	Advisory Committee Appointed by Council	Yes	Scoring Criteria (5 Items)
Dubuque	Yes - Competitive Process- Very small amounts	Yes	Advisory Commission Appointed by Council	Yes	Scoring Criteria (have not yet received)
Sioux City	Yes - Competitive Process- Very small amounts	No	City Council Evaluation	No	No Formal Ranking or Scoring System
NEBRASKA					
Bellevue	Yes - Competitive Process	Yes	CDBG Committee Appointed by Council	Yes	Scoring Criteria (have not yet received)
Lincoln	No - Focus on Housing	No	None	No	City does not fund Public Services
Omaha	Yes - Competitive Process	No	City Council Evaluation	Yes	Review Guide - (8 categories)
ILLINOIS					
Springfield	Yes - Competitive Process	No	Staff Evaluation	Yes	Staff Score Sheet (6 Items)
21 of 42 communities	90% Fund PS Projects	62% Yes		76% Yes	

FUNDING PROPOSAL
CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI
2018 – 2019 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

PROJECT REF NO.:	PS-4
NEW PROJECT: Yes	**No** X
ELIGIBILITY:	570.201(e)
NATIONAL OBJ:	570.208(a)(2)
MATRIX CODE:	05
(For CD Office use only)	

SECTION ONE – PART I
PROJECT CRITERIA

PROJECT NAME:	Empowering Youth 2018-2019		
SPONSOR:	Great Circle – formerly Boys & Girls Town of Missouri		
ADDRESS:	1212 W. Lombard Street, Springfield, MO 65806		
CONTACT PERSON(S): Grant Writer / Program Coordinator	Holly Hunt, Program Coord. Michelle Whitesell, Grant Mgr.	**Phone:** 417-983-7658 417-983-7672	**Email:** Holly.Hunt@greatcircle.org Michelle.Whitesell@greatcircle.org
AMOUNT OF CDBG FUNDS REQUESTED:	**$24,900**		
	Tax ID #: [redacted]	**DUNS #:** [redacted]	

Has the organization expended at least $750,000 total in Federal Grants annually? Yes **X** No

SUBMIT LATEST AUDIT & DATE OF MOST RECENT AUDIT: December 31, 2016 for year ended Dec. 31, 2015

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STMT: Yes ☐ No **X** — **See definition: If yes, explain:**

Definition:
(b) Conflicts prohibited. The general rule is that no persons described in paragraph (c) of this section who exercise or have exercised any functions or responsibilities with respect of CDBG activities assisted under this part, or who are in a position to participate in a decision making process or gain inside information with regard to such activities, may obtain a financial interest or benefit from a CDBG-assisted activity, or have a financial interest in any contract, subcontract, or agreement with respect to a CDBG-assisted activity, or with respect to the proceeds of the CDBG-assisted activity, either for themselves or those with whom they have business or immediate family ties, during their tenure or for one year thereafter. For the UDAG program, the above restrictions shall apply to all activities that are a part of the UDAG project, and shall cover any such financial interest or benefit during, or at any time after, such person's tenure.

(c) Persons covered. The conflict of interest provisions of paragraph (b) of this section apply to any person who is an employee, agent, consultant, officer, or elected official or appointed official of the recipient, or of any designate public agencies, or of subrecipients that are receiving funds under this part.