

**MEETING SUMMARY OF THE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (CDC) MEETING
TUESDAY, January 29, 2013 – 6:00 P.M.
CONFERENCE ROOM 303-THIRD FLOOR- CITY HALL**

Present: Daniel Nyquist, Bill Kimbler, Justin Perpich, John Evans, Barbara Carr and Kristi Gordon

Absent: Debra Branley, Michael Ramsey, Daryl Yankee, Jim Gaylord

Staff: Keith Hamre, Karen Olesen and Jade Seelye (CD Intern)

Others Present: None

Roll Call: A quorum was present. Chair Kimbler called the meeting to order.

1. Update on FY 2013 Funding Awards

Hamre related the City Council had approved the CD Committee funding recommendations with no changes. He then provided information on the possible sequestration of federal funds, and what that could mean to the FY 2013 HUD allocation. If there is an across the board cut of 8%, that would reduce CDBG by approximately \$171,000; HOME Program by \$41,500; and ESG by \$17,700. Hamre also talked about recent notification by HUD of a timeliness problem. The City should have no more than one and one half times our CDBG allocation unspent. We are just over that amount when the balances of the revolving loan funds are added to the unspent CDBG grants. With sequestration a possibility, some of these funds might be used to lessen the cuts. Hamre said to expect this to be a topic of discussion at the next meeting.

2. Review FY 2014 Action Plan Timeline and Meeting Calendar

Hamre reviewed the timeline for the upcoming application process, as well as the calendar for CD Committee meetings.

3. Discussion of Application Scoring and Review Process

Jade Seeley, CD Intern, presented the findings of a survey of the Committee members on the new scoring tool. In general, members liked the format, preferring this tool to the one used the past few years. They liked the additional criteria, and the 100 point scoring. Suggestion was made to have staff “do the math” for the calculation questions, such as number of persons/households to benefit. Another suggestion was to include minus points along with the bonus points. Staff was encouraged to make it clear to applicants the importance of covering everything in their written application, and not to assume people are familiar with their program.

There was some confusion on what applications deserved collaboration bonus points, the Committee asked that the term collaboration be further defined,

perhaps requesting evidence such as a MOU or letter of commitment, shared staff or resources, or joint applications for other funding. There was agreement that with fewer dollars available, agencies need to work together to find efficiencies. Even with different target populations, agencies could share intake, or accounting services. In particular, Duluth at Work needs to do a better job of describing the role of SOAR versus what the other agencies provide. The collaboration should be defined, as well as what is unique about each program. There was discussion on whether applicants should be asked to provide their agency budgets, as well as the budget for the project seeking to be funded. Another request was to put like scoring criteria together, such as timely completion and past performance. Applicants should meet their goals.

When asked about the overall application process, members felt the staff reports and presentations were helpful; the pre-application process has cut down on the workload; and to consider requiring new applications to meet with staff on their proposal, rather than just offering this assistance.

4. Consolidated Plan Goals and Unfunded High Priorities

Hamre related that the 2014 program year is the last of the Consolidated Plan. When an activity has been categorized as a high priority, the intention is to fund a project. There are a few activities that haven't been funded to date, like transportation services. HUD expects high priorities to be addressed during the five year Consolidated Plan period; alternatively they can be lowered to a medium or low priority or an explanation has to be made why they weren't funded. With decreased allocations, this is the time to review Plan priorities, and think about what the Committee would like to encourage, discourage, or where to focus funds. Hamre stated this was the start of the discussion, staff will bring additional information to the next meeting, and decisions will be made then.

5. Other

Dan Nyquist had talked with staff about approaching the Duluth American Indian Commission to talk about the mission of the CD Committee, to reach out to the Native community, and perhaps to recruit members to serving on the Committee. There was consensus that this was a great idea. John Evans volunteered to attend the DAIC March meeting with Nyquist. Staff will send out the DAIC meeting notice and agenda to all the members of the CD Committee.

6. Announce Election of Officers

Next meeting, the CD Committee will hold an election of officers.

Meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Submitted:
Karen Olesen