



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT COMMITTEE

Thursday, June 2, 2011

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 260 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 5 -

Tim Bruer; Robert M. Hunter; Charlie R. Sanders; Daniel A. O'Callaghan
and Russ Whitesel

Excused: 5 -

Shiva Bidar-Sielaff; Ald. Matthew J. Phair; Monya A. Choudhury; David A.
Smith, Sr. and Justin O. Markofski

STAFF: Clingan, Cothrine, Kenny, Rood, Short, Spears

Sanders called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Bruer moved to approve the April 7, 2011 minutes. O'Callaghan seconded.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals.

AGENCY UPDATE

Dean Loumos and Michael Basford of Housing Initiatives, Inc. (HII) appeared
before the Committee to review their recent award from HUD.

Loumos thanked the Committee and the CDBG staff for their support over
the years and said that the award was as much a tribute to the City's work
and commitment to affordable housing as to HII's work and commitment.
Loumos went over HII's history with CDBG. He said he was very pleased
that CDBG staff had nominated HII for the award. They were one of four
national award winners for constructing a property that provides permanent
affordability to their clients. He said that they all went to Washington, DC to

accept the award. He invited everyone to a celebration of the award on June 16 at 5:00 at their building on Ruskin Street. He said that when they went to Washington DC, they found out that they were doing things that some of the other award winners are not yet doing. They also made a six-minute movie depicting their project on Ruskin Street, and showed the movie to the Committee. He said they have a total of 17 properties with 75 units of permanent housing for people with mental disabilities.

Rood said she got to go to Washington DC to accept the award with Dean Loumos. She said it was a treat to have Loumos and Dr. Robert Beilman, their board president, at the award ceremony. She said it was neat to see all the people asking Loumos about his projects in the Madison area.

Clingan asked the Committee whether they would be interested in a bus or van tour of City projects, and all the Committee members said yes they would. Clingan said he would try to set that up.

ROLL CALL

David Smith arrived at the meeting at 5:25.

Present: 7 -

Tim Bruer; Shiva Bidar-Sielaff; Robert M. Hunter; Charlie R. Sanders; David A. Smith, Sr.; Daniel A. O'Callaghan and Russ Whitesel

Excused: 3 -

Ald. Matthew J. Phair; Monya A. Choudhury and Justin O. Markofski

ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED

1. [21867](#) Amending Resolution RES-10-00642, ID 19049 to expand the planning study area and public participation approach for the Arbor Hills-Leopold Neighborhood Plan.

Sponsors: Tim Bruer

Linda Horvath of the Planning Division gave an overview of the plan for Arbor Hills-Leopold Neighborhood, which is in Alder Tim Bruer's district. She said the resolution establishing this plan came before this Committee back in March and that now they want to expand the plan to include a portion of Fitchburg. She said the City has a collaborative effort with the City of Fitchburg, the Town of Madison, and the school district. Instead of including only CT 14.02, the City of Fitchburg had asked that the plan be expanded to include an area in Fitchburg encompassing a portion of CT 14.03. Nine Mile Springs Golf Course is sort of at the heart of the plan, surrounded by several apartment communities. As a result, quite a bit of population will be added to the area to increase the total to about 6,000 people.

Horvath said they were asking for two things: 1) the approval of expansion of the planning area, and 2) approval of an expanded extensive public participation process in lieu of a mayoral appointed steering committee.

Whitesel asked how the City will work the staffing arrangements with Fitchburg, Town of Madison, and the school district. Are they providing you with staff and support?

Horvath said they provide the City of Madison with support. For instance, we get a lot of data from them, as well as regular contact with staff to find out what their issues are.

Whitesel then asked if the plan has to go to all the jurisdictions separately for approval.

Horvath said that, to her knowledge, they have not decided how they are going to handle the plan, whether to accept it or formally adopt it.

Clingan said that one of the interesting features in this process is that Fitchburg, the Town, and the school district were all interested and agreed to the expectations that they would deliver resources needed. We had a kick-off event about a month ago for the plan, which was kind of a "love fest."

Bruer described the exciting opportunities for collaboration. He said Arbor Hills-Leopold is clearly one of the most fragile neighborhoods, if not the most fragile neighborhood corridor, in the city. Fitchburg had been historically functioning in a vacuum, but a lot of that has changed. He said that CDBG is similar to the marines in that they're the first into a vulnerable neighborhood to see that it doesn't implode. This area has a large concentration of housing units spread over acres and doesn't have the sense of community that other neighborhoods enjoy. There's now a real interest in creating a multi-jurisdictional blueprint here with the mayor of Fitchburg, the Town of Madison chairman, and the principal of Leopold School all on board. Things have changed a great deal in the corridor.

Further Discussion:

Bidar-Sielaff had four quick comments:

1. The other jurisdictions are not planning any financial support for the plan.
2. There's a high percentage of Spanish-speaking families in the area, and she wanted to make sure there are extraordinary efforts to hear the Latino community's thoughts on the plan.
3. It's important to update the city Board of Education on the work that is being done since the core of the plan has to do with Leopold School.
4. It would be good to have some rules of the game in writing regarding what the other jurisdictions are planning to do with this plan, whether they will adopt it and implement it.

Bruer thanked staff for the plan. He said it's been ten years in the making. It's our responsibility to engage the neighbors in the process. He's cautiously optimistic that Fitchburg would be engaged in implementing the plan.

Bruer moved to accept the resolution amending Resolution-10-00642, ID 19049 to expand the planning study area and public participation approach for the Arbor Hills-Leopold Neighborhood Plan. Whitesel seconded., to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

2. [22634](#) Authorizing the extension of use of currently allocated funds to Movin' Out Inc. for the provision of Rental Housing from December 31, 2011 to December 31, 2013.

Sponsors: Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, Tim Bruer and Matthew J. Phair

Rood introduced two new CDBG staff members both of whom have been on board for about a month now, Julie Spears, who came from the Department of Commerce, and Teresa Cothrine, who did some CDBG accounting work in the cities of Beloit and Rockford. These two women will be taking over some of the duties formerly performed by Barb Constans, who retired last year, and Audrey Short, who is retiring this year. Spears will be working with Movin' Out, Inc. (MOI) in place of Short.

Dave Porterfield gave a brief description of the project for which MOI is seeking an extension. The project is an acquisition of eleven units that will be financed primarily by HUD 811 Funds on a 40-year mortgage with 0% interest that will be forgiven at the end of 40 years, so essentially it's a grant. We want to provide housing opportunities for people with disabilities with this funding. We want to purchase condominiums with it to provide integrated housing for that population to the extent possible. This project will be modeled after our Stonebridge Condominiums project. We need to supplement the HUD 811 funding with HOME funds at about \$30,000 per unit. This HUD resource also comes with a project-based rental subsidy so that the tenant only pays 30% of their income for their total housing costs. We work in partnership with Dane County to make sure that people have all the wrap-around services they need to live independently. Right now, we have about 65 units of housing that have either been built or are under construction. We need additional time to get this project under way. Closing will occur late summer of 2012. We're excited about doing the work. This money has already been appropriated for the project; we're just asking that it be reserved and held for us until we can utilize it. Realtors statewide have been strong supporters of our organization.

Whitesel asked if this was just an extension of time with no extra funding being allocated, and Rood said yes.

A motion was made by Bidar-Sielaff, seconded by Hunter, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval. Sent to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

3. [22638](#) Evaluation of 2 Year Funding Process

Clingan reviewed the two-year funding process that took place last summer and said that the Community Development Division did a survey of stakeholders about the process using Survey Monkey. We sent the evaluation out to different groups, including alders who were not on any of our committees, committee members, service providers, and staff. What you have before you are results of the surveys from service providers, committee members, and staff. We had a very meager response from council members not on our committees. However, the response rates for agencies, staff, and committee members were pretty good, and you have those responses

before you tonight.

To date, we've brought the results to the Community Services Committee and the Childcare Committee, and we're bringing it to the CDBG Committee tonight. We'll bring it to the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee at their next meeting. We've had a management team debriefing also. We have a date scheduled in late June to bring in service providers here, and we'll break up into four or five facilitated dialogue groups to get remarks. Then we'll come up with a list of things learned through the process.

Clingan then went through the results of the committee members. On the comments section, he said he eliminated particularly snarky remarks and names that were mentioned. He also eliminated redundancies.

Whitesel asked about the scoring, and Clingan explained how the four categories worked for ranking satisfaction levels, which were very satisfied, satisfied, neutral and not satisfied. "Very satisfied" and "satisfied" were scored together.

Clingan said that "transparency of the process" received good results. With respect to the time the process took, the results indicated that all three groups felt the process took a lot of time with a lot of meetings.

With respect to the blog to answer questions, some people liked it, while some people wanted more one-on-one conversations with staff. One problem faced with one-on-one conversations, however, is the appearance of helping one person/agency more than another, and the question becomes one of how to help without showing favoritism. The blog put the questions agencies had and the answers they received out to everyone.

There was a disconnect when we offered workshops on filling out the application. Service providers didn't find it as helpful as we thought it was.

Whitesel said the survey is useful to a point, but he thinks you could correlate a lot of the answers to how much funding an agency received in the process. The real question for us is how we are going to allocate scarce resources. The real question on the survey should be how well you think the allocation decisions were made given the level of resources. The survey questions seem so micro-level that the macro-level is lost. Evaluation based on these smaller questions is misleading.

O'Callaghan said that what stood out to him on the agency responses was the overwhelming dissatisfaction with the process despite the transparency of the process. The highest marks went to staff for their technical assistance. Also, he said it seems that a lot of agencies didn't understand the rationale for the decision making process.

Clingan said that the numbers are higher than the comments would indicate. The written comments are more reflective of those who were dissatisfied with the process. Scored answers showed general satisfaction.

Bidar-Sielaff said she thought that people rated the process pretty highly overall. She said it was good to see that people thought the process was transparent. The reality of the decision making process is it's all subjective. She said she thought we gave mixed-messages about the scientific nature of the decision making process. There were inconsistencies in the message.

Hunter asked about the difference between the scores on questions 7 (the level of involvement in the decision making process) and 8 (the decision making process resulted in good decisions).

Clingan said that in spite of not liking the process, they felt good decisions were made.

Smith asked Clingan to summarize the process, and Clingan described the process from start to finish. He said the first step was defining the program areas across the division. Another phase was designing the application. Agencies had six weeks to complete the application. Staff sorted them and then evaluated them. Committees scored the applications, and then agencies were invited into hearings to provide answers to questions from committee members. And then the committees had a decision making process based on priorities.

Clingan said that this was the first process in which we had an ad hoc committee of members from both the CDBG Committee and the Community Services Committee to make the decisions on funding the neighborhood centers.

Whitesel said the objective was to work out the differences in the ad hoc committee.

Bidar-Sielaff said that she thought the Conference Committee on neighborhood centers was a winner. It was definitely a process that worked well.

Bidar-Sielaff said the different committees dealt with the priorities differently, which created a struggle in her opinion.

Clingan said that we could have seen good applications for bad programs and vice versa.

Clingan said that we want to come back after we have all the other input and tell you what everyone else has said. Each committee has given us good thoughts.

O'Callaghan asked what the overall timeframe start to finish was for this process.

Clingan said anywhere from a year to a year-and-a-half.

O'Callaghan asked what the amount of money was that got allocated through that process.

Clingan said about \$7 million.

O'Callaghan asked what percentage of the division's budget that amounted to.

Clingan said he didn't have that percentage precisely but would come back to the committee with a number.

O'Callaghan said that the process seems to consume too many resources and too much time.

Clingan said he would like to find a way to make the process sleeker and smarter.

Bidar-Sielaff said that the Council goes through the same difficulties with the budget process.

This Discussion Item was Discuss and Finalize

REPORTS

4. [22642](#) CDBG April/May 2011 Staff Report

Clingan introduced Julie Spears and Teresa Cothrine once again. He said the division also hired two new childcare specialists.

Clingan and Rood went over the monthly financial spreadsheet.

Clingan gave some brief updates about staff. He said that Hardy Garrison is going on vacation to Bavaria and that Lorri Wendorf recently got married.

Clingan said that the City is working on the capital budget and will be working on the operating budget soon. Bidar-Sielaff described the budget process of the Common Council with respect to priorities.

Clingan said we had committed through our process around \$95,000 to Garver for next year, but Common Wealth is no longer going forward with Garver.

Bidar-Sielaff said that Garver may go forward separately.

This Report was Discuss and Finalize

5. [22639](#) Report from committees with CDBG Committee representation and designation of Commission representatives.

1. Gardens Committee (Sanders)

2. Martin Luther King Humanitarian Award Committee
3. Committee on Office of Neighborhood Support (Sanders)
4. Community Development Authority (Bruer)
5. Other Commission representation or relationships

Community Development Authority (Bruer)

Bruer said that given the new administration we need to come back and talk about Allied Drive again with respect to TIF.

Badger Senior Housing opens in August and is 70% leased up.

This Report was Discuss and Finalize

ADJOURNMENT

Bidar-Sielaff moved adjournment at 7:45 p.m.; O'Callaghan seconded.

**Respectfully submitted by,
Anne Kenny**