Citizens Advisory Committee for Community Development
March 23, 2021
Held Virtually via Zoom Technology
6:00 P.M.

Members Present Trish Hubbell, David Carr, Kate Stockton, Angela Dowler-Pryor, and Brandy McShane

Absent Abby Rea, and Alexandra Sheppard

Staff Bob Atchley, Senior Planner, Planning and Development; Bob Jones, Grants Administrator, Planning and Development; Judy White, Executive Secretary, Planning and Development; and Kyle Tolbert, Assistant City Attorney, Law Department

Attendance Trish Hubbell called the meeting to order at approximately 6:04 p.m. Attendance was taken by Ms. White.

Welcome and Introductions Welcome by Ms. Hubbell

Approval of Minutes The Committee reviewed the following draft meeting minutes:

January 26, 2021 - CACCD Meeting

Kate Stockton moved to approve the minutes of the January 26, 2021 –CACCD Meeting. Trish Hubbell seconded the motion. The motion passed.

February 23, 2021 - CACCD Meeting

Trish Hubbell moved to approve the minutes of the February 23, 2021 –CACCD Meeting. Brandy McShane seconded the motion. The motion passed with amendment to Page 3, Paragraph 4 per Kate Stockton's recommendation of adding "In the past".

Discussion of Proposed Revisions to City Council Resolution 8720, CACCD Bylaws, and Citizen Participation Plan

Ms. Hubbell asked about the numbers being different in the proposal that was submitted. Mr. Jones explained that the staff uses an estimate of what the grant amount will be. HUD provided the actual grant award final amount which was $70,000 more than received last year. The allocations are based on the percentage on what was requested, therefore totals changed.

Ms. Hubbell shared her screen, displaying a PowerPoint presentation (see attached) to keep the flow of the operational documents the committee is working on.

The Citizen Participation Plan is the first document looked at. Paragraph 1, Line 2 changes are based on previous CACCD conversations. Paragraph 2, Line 4 was from a message that requested an amendment in March 2020. The CACCD membership is looking to gain clarity and agreement in which direction they are headed with this document.

Mr. Atchley recommended that the suggested Citizen Participation Plan amendments should be sent to the HUD representative first for approval, before being taken to City Council for adoption.

For the resolution, Mr. Tolbert suggested that the Committee draft a letter to the Council at Large requesting changes to the resolution. If someone on Council is willing to sponsor an amended resolution, then the membership can direct City staff to draft a resolution that takes the proposed changes in account. If there is an alternative path, Mr. Tolbert will let the Committee know. He also mentioned that the one thing that needs to be done beforehand is an explanation sheet. A member of the Committee could list out objectives to aid Mr. Tolbert in the drafting of the resolution so nothing is missed.

Ms. Stockton went over the resolutions draft. Purpose #1 is to adopt a resolution to establish the role of CACCD, that the Committee would participate in the assessment and recommendation of CDBG funding. Reasonings behind this would be that the Committee represents the citizen's voice and the current resolution is 21 years old. Ms. Dowler-Pryor believes that there is a need to evaluate the efficacy of the non-profits that are being served with this money on a regular basis. Mr. Carr mentioned the need of getting more non-profits to participate as well as going on tours of the non-profits. Mr. Tolbert added that the review of staff denials could be added as a third point for first purpose. Mr. Carr pointed out the need to focus on and tour the non-profits that get denied rather than just the ones that are approved for funding. Mr. Jones stated that the third point seems to be that the Committee should be a marketing tool for outreach to market the availability of this grant program. Mr. Carr suggested having a list of all the non-profits that would qualify for CDBG funds to be able to go have a face-to-face visit them as members throughout the year. Ms. Stockton and Mr. Tolbert agreed that there would be four points with the addition of reviewing staff denials and use the Committee as a marketing tool.

Purpose #2 is to establish a procedure for evaluation of applications. The points of this purpose include to specify when and how other funding groups will be engaged, adding a risk category to the rating, and clarifying the hearing process for challenges to applicant merits. Mr. Atchley referenced the point of adding a risk category. He wanted to clarify that when the staff looks at the capacity of the organization, they factor in multiple things such as if the agency has had prior issues and keeping a proper accounting log of the beneficiaries. There is potential risk of the agency not being able to expend the funds timely and risk of not having the capacity to properly account for beneficiaries as required by HUD. Under the capacity scoring category, the City staff looks at risk quite a bit to see if the agency has done well previously, demonstrated that they have the ability to perform the mission, and keep proper accounting paperwork of the beneficiaries. Ms. Dowler-Pryor stated that based on her experience, her interpretation is that the City staff focuses a lot on the functionality of the administrative ability of agencies as it is their job to track and document the dispersed funds. If there are deep concerns with the agency's abilities, then it will affect their score. It should not just be a merit of their ability to process paperwork in a timely and correct manner. It should also be the merit of the program that they are offering, to whom they are helping, and the measure in which they are doing it. Mr. Jones mentioned that one of the hardest things they do is to turn someone down for funding via this program, as all the applicants are providing an essential service in the community. The current evaluation criteria has been driven by experience in what works and what doesn't work. One of the risks the City takes on when funding these agencies is if it doesn't work, the City may have to pay back the funding to HUD via other funding sources. Therefore, they must consider all aspects. Ms. Dowler-Pryor disagreed with Mr. Jones' statement of all applicants having great merit and mentioned concern of the scoring received based on their administrative abilities. Ms. Stockton read over the CDBG project evaluation criteria for everyone and used LifeHouse as an example, discussing the risks and the standards put out from the Federal Government. Her take away is that the national objectives come loud and clear and should be stuck to first and foremost. If any it doesn't strongly check off one of those, then the agency has to be considered at risk and their capacity questioned. Ms. Hubbell said putting a blanket statement regarding some sort of process for challenges to applicants is necessary, and then spelling out the details can come at a later time. Mr. Atchley addressed that whenever the Staff Review Committee is scoring the proposals, if the agency can't meet one of the three national objectives, then they simply can't move forward and aren't considered at all for funding consideration.

Ms. Hubbell moved on to the CACCD Bylaws and stated that the committee is currently operating with an amended version from October 26, 2018 as Rhonda Lewsader, City Attorney, made the recommendation to amend. The one area of the Bylaws that they will focus on is Article I – Purpose. This states that the Committee participates in assessment recommendations of funding the CDBG program and proposes allocation to City Council with staff. The committee shall base recommendations solely on an objective basis. The approval of the Resolution is needed before the Bylaws can be finalized. If their Resolution doesn't come to fruition for any reason, then they would need to go with the changes that were suggested back in 2018 to align them with the current resolution. A conflict of interest addendum is included as well, which is the same verbiage as in the Citizen Participation Plan.

Mr. Tolbert mentioned if an appeal process from programs that were not selected ends up being a power granted to the Committee, then the Bylaws would need an in-depth procedure in place for handling such appeals. There could potentially be an issue with the Committee taking part of the assessment of programs as well as hearing appeals from programs that weren't selected. It isn't fair for a program to be denied by a group and then the appeal going straight back to that group. He suggested that the Committee decide which part is more important should this end up being an issue.

Public Comments None

New Business None

Next Meeting CACCD Meeting – April 27, 2021, 6:00 p.m. Virtually via Zoom Technology

Adjournment Ms. Hubbell thanked everyone for their meeting attendance.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:18 p.m. with a motion from Ms. Dowler- Pryor and Ms. Stockton seconding the motion.

Trish Hubbell, Chair