



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT COMMITTEE

Thursday, March 1, 2012

5:00 PM

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

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 5 -

Tim Bruer; Matthew J. Phair; Robert M. Hunter; Justin O. Markofski and Russ Whitesel

Excused: 3 -

Shiva Bidar-Sielaff; Monya A. Choudhury and Daniel A. O'Callaghan

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Bruer moved to approve the February 2, 2011 minutes. Whitesel seconded. Unanimous approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public Comments are noted later in the minutes.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals.

BUSINESS ITEMS

1. [25442](#) Public Hearing: 2011 Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report

Brenda Konkel of Tenant Resource Center (TRC) said she just got the document yesterday and hasn't had time to finish reading it. Konkel stated that it's really hard to have a public hearing when the information came out so quickly. She said she is concerned about a couple of things. First, homeownership gets a lot more money spent on it than rental. She said the people at the lowest income ranges need the most help, and she doesn't see it being reflected here. She's very concerned about the people who're not making it because so often they end up homeless, and they're not getting back into housing because the housing market is so tight right now. It's very

difficult to get housing right now.

Second, we're not doing as well meeting the goals set forth in rental housing as we're doing in other areas, and she's not sure why that is because she hasn't had a chance to closely read the document. But it seems to her we need to have a bigger discussion about whether or not we need to do something different about affordable housing for renters.

She said that although the maps were interesting, she wasn't sure what they were supposed to represent or why they're important to the document. She said that putting an agency's office location on a map doesn't reflect where people are getting served. Plus, TRC has other offices in the city that are not on the map.

Hunter said he agreed with Konkel in terms of rental housing versus homeownership. Given the way things are right now, rental might be the way to go.

2. [25418](#)

Public Hearing: Substantial amendment to the 2011 Action Plan regarding the use of Emergency Solutions Grant funds

Brenda Konkel of TRC said she doesn't exactly understand what this does or where it goes. She's concerned that we need to have a different kind of conversation about homelessness. Her concern is that who gets funded often depends on what agencies ask for. We're not saying what our needs are, but rather what do the agencies want, and that's how we're making decisions. She's also concerned about how the priorities were chosen. There are a lot of needs in the community, and she said she's not sure this is our highest priority. None of the big issues that are being discussed in the community and in the newspapers are being addressed.

She said the document is getting rushed through really quickly, and it doesn't seem like this was vetted in the community.

Rood said there's 30 days for public comment, so there is more than just this opportunity to weigh in on the document.

Konkel said she wondered how the public would know to comment on it.

Rood said it's on the agenda tonight, plus it's on our website, and we put an ad in the paper for the RFP.

Konkel said she thinks that while a few key people in the community might know about it, a lot of people who might be concerned about it don't know anything about it and won't know about it because the agenda went out so late.

Bruer asked if there was any problem in referring this item and taking action on it at the next meeting, given Konkel's concerns.

Wallinger said no.

Markofski said that means effectively we'd be having a public hearing on it in

April.

Wallinger said the substantial amendment is due in to HUD by March 15, but we could still continue the discussion about what the RFP would be. The substantial amendment really only deals with less than half of the amount of money that we'll be putting in the RFP, so she thinks we can have some further discussion at the April meeting and still meet our deadline.

Whitesel said he is concerned about the tight timeline.

Wallinger said that she would recommend that we continue with the priorities of rapid re-housing and eviction prevention, primarily because that is what HUD is asking us to do. She stated we could push back when we do the RFP, if the Committee would like to have further discussion. Wallinger stated the intent was to have the contract signed by July 1, but we could certainly put that off.

Bruer moved to split the discussion into two tracks and put the \$58,000 forward as required by the deadline, but leave the rest of the money out for public discussion at the next meeting. Hunter seconded.

Bruer said that such action would send a message to the Council and the community at large that we really do want to solicit feedback on the priorities. The motion passed unanimously.

3. [25443](#)

Public Hearing: 2013 - 2014 Community Development Program Funding Goals and Objectives

Howard Mandeville of Movin' Out, Inc., (MOI) thanked the Committee for the thoughtful process carried out for this. He said he was speaking only on behalf of MOI and not Third Sector. He said the distinction made between down payment assistance and development of owner-occupied property makes sense, but what he's concerned about is the capping of the funding for down payment assistance. For practical purposes the amount of down payment assistance available would be \$30,000, which is just half the maximum per unit amount for developing owner-occupied homes. At a time when the community already has too many existing homes with the foreclosure crisis, he said he thinks that City policy should favor the purchase of existing homes. Also, he said the Framework should really include the means as well as the goal of homeownership for very low income households, and by cutting the down payment assistance to \$30,000 we put homeownership out of the reach of very low income households, such as those served by MOI. Having the means to support very low income households to cheap homeownership requires a different subsidy. Some people have suggested that very low income households should be held to a lower purchase price than the HUD maximum, and one way to create a different ceiling for very low income households would be to limit the down payment assistance, but there's the question of equity. To have different expectations simply because of poverty is something that we should look at, particularly in light of the success very low income households have shown with homeownership through MOI's program. Some households, particularly larger households, wouldn't be able to find suitable affordable housing for their families within the constraints of the proposed cap. His suggestion would be to amend that condition of lowering the amount

of down payment assistance so that you allow the deeper subsidy for households that have a median income of 50% or less and apply that cap only to families that are 51-80% or 60-80%. Mandeville handed out his written comments. The other issue he'd like to discuss is that the proposed Framework would not permit the conversion of owner-occupied housing to rental. He said that if it makes sense to convert owner-occupied to rental housing in a project, he would like to see the CDD allow it. He said that some of their purchases of condos for rental housing have strengthened the condo association.

Rita Giovannoni of Independent Living, Inc., (ILI) said she appreciates the opportunity to speak about the Framework. She said she'd like to have further conversation with staff about the shared appreciation policy. She said it's hard to wrap your head around this policy. In one project, ILI received \$900,000 for rental housing from the city to help with initial purchase, rehab, and a fire alarm system. In exchange for this money, Independent Living agreed to abide by some very specific rent limits and set aside periods. She said the period the CDBG Office asked for the reduced rents exceeded HUD requirements. For her, there's an economic exchange in abiding by HOME rents that amounts to roughly a one million dollar loss for them over a 20 year period. If there's a continual sort of payback to the City not only of the original amount invested, but also in the affordable rents, in addition to an amount for shared appreciation, then that seems very onerous for agencies and pretty problematic. After 20 years of lowered rents, Independent Living has already repaid the money from her perspective. She recommends holding off on shared appreciation and discussing it more. She also recommends the Committee consider some forgivable nature of any repayments beyond the period of Federal requirements. It doesn't seem reasonable to her to require full repayment, shared appreciation, or interest payments for projects that are held long-term and meet both the non-profit's and the City's goals.

Whitesel asked if shared appreciation was her only issue, and Giovannoni said that it was a significant issue.

Dave Porterfield of MOI said he had a couple of comments about the rental part of the Framework. Regarding the choice between shared appreciation and the 2% interest, the interest makes a lot more sense from his perspective. He stated it's a lot easier to figure out what the percentage is going to be versus the shared appreciation, and it's a lot fairer. He would ask the Committee to consider the possibility of making grants for some agencies. Madison has a pretty good group of established, mature non-profits. Having grants over time helps build the net worth of these organizations. Having a stronger balance sheet makes a huge difference when you're trying to do larger impact projects.

Regarding not converting owner-occupied housing into rental housing, he heard from staff that that condition is aimed at a couple of issues: conversion of condo projects into rental housing and projects in areas where you don't want to have a higher concentration of rental housing. He said that MOI has successfully done a couple of projects where they've actually acquired condo units in larger condo projects, which has been a very good investment. In the Madison market right now, there's an oversupply of condos. These projects meet our goal of providing integrative housing. He would ask the Committee to consider not having a broad brush on the rental conversion prohibition. He would suggest instead that no more than 25% of a condo project be converted

into rental. That still maintains a good balance.

Regarding the underwriting guidelines and the 15% limit on soft costs, he would suggest changing it to a 12% limit for developer fees and not including soft costs.

Brenda Konkel of TRC said thank you for taking the time to answer her questions, but she never actually received the answers and didn't realize they were in the second link on the agenda. She appreciates the time and effort that went into the answers and the staff who sat down and talked with her. She said that it's interesting to her that the Framework proposes to increase the amount for jobs from \$25,000 to \$35,000 when it looks like CDBG is only spending \$21,000 per job according to the 2011 CAPER.

Konkel referenced the answers to the questions she raised after the February meeting. She referenced question number seven and said CDD should make it a priority to target lower income housing. She stated it looks like CDD removed the 50% AMI target levels from the Framework, but it seems to her that we're not prioritizing. It's easier to create less affordable housing, and if we don't create some incentives to reach down into that lower level, it won't get done. She'd like to see some incentives for creating housing at the lower levels (30% AMI).

She agreed with what Dave Porterfield said about the issue of conversion of owner-occupied to rental housing, particularly because we have such a glut of owner-occupied condos. She stated people aren't building new housing; it's all in the current rental stock. She doesn't think it's so bad to convert owner-occupied housing into rental housing, even though it's been a long-standing goal with the City to have homeownership to increase stability in the neighborhoods.

As to inclusionary zoning, yes, they got rid of the IZ fund, but IZ created 40 units of affordable housing. Konkel stated it would be a shame to let them become unaffordable because we're not paying attention. It would be a shame to not purchase those homes back and keep them affordable.

As to the plan to affirmatively further fair housing, Konkel stated please get it done soon. It needs to be a higher priority. Non-profits need it to write grants and do other things. It's not just for you guys; it's for others as well.

4. [25446](#)

Homebuyer funding appeal to waiver underwriting asset limitation.

Rhodes gave a background saying that CDBG has set underwriting guidelines that the Committee approves each year, and that's how CDD determines if a homebuyer needs our funds. In this situation, the homebuyer is asking that we waive those requirements that we look at each year. In his letter he lists those reasons why.

Whitesel asked if we've done this sort of thing before. Rhodes said that since she's been on staff, no one's ever asked to waive the underwriting guidelines. Whitesel suggested that Operation Fresh Start (OFS) help the applicant get his savings money into a CD that would not be as accessible.

Whitesel moved approval of the waiver. Hunter seconded.

Gregory Markle of OFS said that the applicant wants his savings to be available for his medical issues. If he had put all that money into an IRA over the years, the waiver wouldn't be necessary, but he chose to keep it in a more liquid form. He's facing some severe health issues, and he likes the house because it's easily accessible. He is income-qualified. OFS has had this house for a while, and it's a good fit for an older person. We haven't had a whole lot of interest in this house otherwise.

Hurie said the Committee needs to be very careful in setting a precedent and that the Committee should probably tighten up the motion to include rationale.

Bruer said he agreed with Hurie.

Whitesel said the letter pretty well established that the circumstances were unique and extraordinary. He modified his motion to state that this is a very limited use of a waiver under the circumstances where the person needs the funds and hasn't put his money in an appropriate safe haven, given his medical issues and other physical challenges. Hunter agreed and said that added to those circumstances was the fact that the house has sat on the market for four years.

Markle asked if this had to go through Council. Bruer said yes. Hunter asked for documentation for the basis for the request. Markle said we can try to get something together before it goes to Council.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. [25477](#) Authorizing Wisconsin Partnership for Housing Development (WPHD) to use returned Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) program income funds in the amount of \$14,520.65 under the same terms as the current NSP contract between WPHD and City of Madison Community Development Division (CDD).

Rhodes said this was our last NSP project. She also said that the \$14,520.65 was the only money to be returned to the CDD, and we want to put it toward the WPHD project.

Alder Bruer move to approve the recommendation from staff, Alder Phair second. This resolution was return to lead with the recommendation for approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES

6. [25455](#) Authorizing the subordination of previously approved loans to Common Wealth Development and authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to sign agreements to subordinate the loans.

Spears explained CWD's need for the subordination. She said the request was needed because at the time CWD closed on the property, they weren't in the position to close on their first mortgage and construction financing and permanent financing. Now that they have their AHP funds in place and the bids for construction, they are ready to close on the construction and permanent financing. CDD was always intending to be in second position to CWD's other loan, so this is just a cleanup of that position.

Paul Jasenski of CWD said we didn't think of subordinating the loan when we took out the CDD mortgage, so that's why we're here now.

Hunter noted that not too long ago, we were burned on a subordination.

Alder Phair move to approve the recommendation from staff, R. Whitesel second. The motion passed unanimously. This resolution was return to lead with the recommendation for approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES

7. [25416](#)

Adopting the Community Development Program Funding Goals and Objectives as a guide to the CDBG Committee for the development of its funding recommendations for the 2013 - 2014 budgets.

Rood said that in the memo she sent out, the Committee can see that a lot's happened since we introduced the Framework at the last meeting. There's been a lot of discussion. As far as the timeframe of this document, it's all hinging on our upcoming funding process, which we are heading into shortly.

Rood said the changes were put into a chart format as recommended by Whitesel just to give everyone an idea of why staff wanted to make the changes they're recommending. She said some HUD changes have happened, and some rules have been changed. For the last two years, we've had some pretty significant cuts from HUD, and going into 2013 we are anticipating some additional cuts. So, all those factors coming into play is why we're presenting the Framework as it is today. There have been some changes since CDD introduced the document to the Committee. The yellow highlighted items show that as CDD met with Third Sector and various other groups, CDD did listen to what they had to say, and CDD did add some things back into the document. So, CDD did hear what Third Sector folks were saying in a number of areas.

Bruer asked to what extent the neighborhood indicators have been factored into the document. The concern is that a lot of time, energy, and effort went into putting that together as a tool that would be driving our spending priorities and our focus, and he didn't see a lot of that reflected.

Rood said we didn't use neighborhood indicators as much as we probably could have.

Bruer explained the neighborhood indicators project as it began and evolved and said that it would be helpful for Planning staff to give an overview to this Committee about the value of that data and how it could be used to establish our spending priorities. Hurie said the best way we can use neighborhood indicators and the updated census data is in terms of Objective L, The Revitalization of Selected Areas. The closer we get to the timing of the release of the census data and the updated indicators, the better knowledge base we're going to have to do that. Bruer asked if the Committee could get a packet of information related to neighborhood indicators and maybe have a brief presentation on them for future funding decisions. Bruer said he thought the indicators would be much more aggressively incorporated than they were.

Whitesel asked if we should add some language to Objective L to reflect this discussion.

Bruer said yes. So, on page ten, the Committee agreed by consensus to have staff add language to reflect this discussion under Objective L.

Whitesel asked if staff have any comments or does the document speak for itself?

Charnitz spoke to the issue of conversion of owner-occupied housing to rental. She said that although she agreed with the speakers that there were some occasions when that would be appropriate to do, what CDD wanted to do was to send a message that as a standard we were not going to convert units, recognizing that there's always options for bringing exceptions if they merit it. She stated the Committee can always make exceptions to the Framework, but there is a need to set out what our broad parameters are, and that would be one we support.

Whitesel asked if you would avoid having misunderstandings if it was reframed to say that as a general rule it would not be done unless there were extenuating circumstances.

Charnitz said she would find it acceptable.

Markofski said that the statement is on page 8, Item 11.

Whitesel moved to add language that as a general rule, the Committee would not consider converting owner-occupied units to rental units unless there were extenuating circumstances.

Bruer said he would speak very strongly in support of staff's Framework language. He said if you look at my district you'll see what has happened and how many decades it's taken to reverse poor public policy and land use. You need only to look at my district to see how it was done all wrong, and we've spent the last two decades attempting to reverse that. The Burr Oaks area hits all those buttons in terms of disproportionately utilizing government dollars and tools to layer program after program and where it's been a major challenge to reverse, particularly our rentals to owner-occupied.

Whitesel withdrew his motion due to Bruer's argument against it.

Alder Bruer move to approve the recommendation, R. Hunter second. The motion to adopt the Framework passed unanimously. This Resolution was return to lead with the recommendation for approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES

8. [25444](#) Affordable Housing Trust Fund RFP

Dave Porterfield of MOI said it's really great that the RFP is prepared. He said he had a couple of comments on it. Overall, he thinks it's a good RFP. One issue is with the 10-year term for the rental. That term is kind of a funny term, and he's not sure it could be used with tax credit projects, so it's most likely to be used for construction financing. Although that's a good use, it would not have as high an impact as if you allowed financing for 16 years. You may be asked to change the interest rate depending on the year because WHEDA and

the IRS look at the applicable federal rate, and you have to be below that rate in order to have it count for points. He would also suggest changing the soft cost and developer fee cap from 15% to a 12% developer fee cap and not have soft costs included. He doesn't know how projects that are not tax credit projects would work for 10 years with a 30-year period of affordability.

Brenda Konkel of TRC said she has several comments. She's concerned that we need to help the lower income people especially with this money, since it's local money and doesn't have to follow all the federal guidelines. This was our opportunity to help non-profits with less restrictions on the money to assist lower income individuals. This money was supposed to be more flexible. She stated that's what the Council was thinking when they wrote the original ordinance. As to the "purposes," she's a little concerned about how some of this is written, particularly for reducing the number of foreclosed properties. She said she's really worried that Apex would apply for this money with its properties in foreclosure, so that the money would then go to help student housing instead of going to help low income housing. As to the scoring, she can't figure out how that relates to some of the language in the beginning of the RFP. She's also worried about the assisting and creating affordable workforce housing part of it because when she reads that, the first thing that pops into her mind is University Research Park II, and she hopes the AHTF isn't going to fund that type of housing. She would like to see the fourth bullet point be made a stronger priority, especially with all those people in the men's homeless shelter, plus the women's shelter, and all those staying at Occupy.

She asked whether or not the Committee really wanted to do \$1.5 million right away since this is the first time the City is going out with an RFP. She wondered how long we would be waiting for the money to come back. She would rather see a smaller amount go out the first time, and then based on that experience, modify the RFP in a second round.

Regarding preferences on pages 4 and 5, these points don't get to what the ordinance had intended with its list of preferences. She thought the way the preferences were going to be used was if you have 2 projects before you and they were both fairly equal but one meets those preferences, then that would be the proposal you'd choose. She's not sure that's going to show up in the points system, and she's not sure that you'd even want to do points in there for that. That's where your judgment would come into play based on those projects. She also had a real hard time with the evaluation of programs based on the proposed system.

Konkel said her main points are to lower affordability in the priorities and also make sure that developers like Apex and University Research Park II are not where this money goes. Also, she's not sure the scoring system will work, and she recommends not going with as big a chunk of money in the RFP right away.

CDD staff, Mary Charnitz said she would go through some of the main points of the RFP and address some of the comments the Committee just heard. The document was trying to incorporate some of things that the Committee discussed at their last meeting. The Mayor's Office had interest in setting preferences, but also in being broad enough so as not to eliminate proposals. A lot of the information given in the RFP, such as the minimum income guidelines, was incorporated straight from the ordinance itself. The preference

objectives on the bottom of page 1 are the preferences CDD heard most often through the Mayor's Office, various groups, and the CDA, and it seemed that these were the kinds of things we were most interested in. Within that interest we're going to have to evaluate the proposals.

Whitesel said he was troubled by the reference to high cost housing. He doesn't understand the qualifier. Charnitz said there are certain neighborhoods that only have housing that is high cost and it eliminates certain populations and income groups from ever entering those neighborhoods. So it might be the kind of area where we want to do a project to integrate the area. That's really the intent of it.

Whitesel said that he would agree with Konkell as to the goals that are stated in the ordinance and he would put those way up front because those were written as part of the ordinance. Putting them later in the process and giving them three points sort of diminishes them rather than making them an overarching factor. He said his preference would be to move them up to the preference phase. Charnitz said we could consider moving it up. She said that what we're trying to articulate in the first page with the two statements under "purpose" are the two goals that the trust fund establishes. And then we try to focus that down and say within that there are certain objectives we're trying to meet. Then within those objectives, there are certain qualities that a proposal might have that allow for some additional points. As far as the points, the strategy is that you evaluate proposals based on the 100 points that are listed here and that you'll get a score, and then the preference points are an additional 25 points. But it's not that you evaluate 110 versus 112; it's that you evaluate how many preference points you got. Did you get no preference points because you didn't address any of the preferences? Or did you get 25 preference points because you addressed them all? Your first benchmark is within the first 100 points, and then there are the additional points. So you're not mixing the two point systems for a total point value. You're looking at them as two separate evaluation techniques.

ROLL CALL

Dan O'Callaghan arrived at the meeting.

Present: 6 -
Tim Bruer; Matthew J. Phair; Robert M. Hunter; Daniel A. O'Callaghan;
Justin O. Markofski and Russ Whitesel

Excused: 2 -
Shiva Bidar-Sielaff and Monya A. Choudhury

[25444](#) Affordable Housing Trust Fund RFP

Whitesel still expressed concern about the scoring system.

Charnitz said the next section talks about how much funding is available and the funding parameters. She said Konkell's comment about not putting out the entire \$1.5 million was a good one. She said we talked about this issue and the thought was to have it all be available, but if we don't get good projects, we certainly don't want to allocate it just because we feel we have to. It will only be

allocated up to the amount that good projects are available. If we don't get good projects through the RFP, we'll continue to take applications through our monthly application process. And then after September 1st when the ordinance stipulates that the reservation for non-profits expires, we'll go out with another notice explaining the monthly process and how developers can apply for the funds..

Charnitz said that as to the terms of the loan, CDD initially met with the Comptroller's Office, and the initial suggestion was a 5-year loan with a 2.75% interest to turn the money around as quickly as possible, but when we looked at that, it seemed to be fairly onerous for developers, so we extended it to 10 years thinking they could have reserves built up at that time and would have a fairly stable rental project. Charnitz said there is one change suggested from the Attorney's Office that we'd like the Committee to consider. In the last paragraph under funding where it says payments will be due annually, clarify that it's principle and interest payments. So it'll say, "Payments will include principle and interest and will be due annually."

Charnitz said that the next section talks about the Scope of Service. Almost all of these come from the ordinance or from Framework discussions, such as securing with a promissory note and mortgage and keeping a maximum investment of \$60,000. The Submission of Proposals section is about administrative rules and should be changed to Number IV.

Charnitz explained the review process. The proposals will come in, and staff would review them, and then they would come to the Committee for recommendations. One of the things CDD would like the Committee to consider is whether they'd like to appoint a subcommittee to review proposals or have the whole Committee do it. As to the evaluation, there are some basic guidelines where the initial 100 points look at all the things that make a good proposal and strong development. A lot of this was vetted through the CDA staff, the Attorney's Office, and others in the City before it became part of the RFP.

Whitesel said the initial points add up to 115. Charnitz said we listed the preferences stated in the ordinance in the preference points. The preference points become really important to look at when we have proposals that are somewhat equal in the first set of points.

Whitesel said it appeared that they had additional criteria for rental projects. Charnitz said that the rental points would only be used to compete with other rental projects. Whitesel said so it's not a preference for rental, and Charnitz said correct.

Whitesel asked Charnitz about the soft costs, and she said what you adopted in the Framework is appropriate here.

Charnitz said that the original ordinance had specific language that targeted certain funds to lower income groups, but that language was removed, and the new ordinance states homeownership would target 80% and below and rental would target 60% and below.

Markofski stated that right now there's \$1.548 million in the fund. As of January 1, 2011 there was \$3 million or more. He said that the ordinance reads that the

amount spent in a calendar year can't be any more than half of what was in the fund in the previous January. Charnitz said that the \$1.5 million is the number we were given by the Finance Department.

Whitesel asked for explanation for the approval process by us and then Council. Charnitz said the RFP needs to go through the Council, and then once we have an approved RFP, we will send out the RFP. People will then apply, and we'll do sorting and review, and then the Committee will make recommendations. Those recommendations will go to the Council and through the BOE.

O'Callaghan asked how the proposals would be selected after they're evaluated. Charnitz said that would be the Committee's recommendation. The Committee would look at the scoring and the preference points to make their recommendations. O'Callaghan said it's possible that we may not award any funds during this first round if we don't have high quality proposals. Charnitz said that is true, numerical ranking is important to the process.

O'Callaghan said this seemed a subjective way to award the funds. Markofski asked if the highest scored would get accepted. Hurie said one source of guidance might be that they're individual proposals and they're ranked individually, but at the end of the day you're going to be looking at a portfolio of investments for the fund, so there's a portfolio balance that has to go on in addition to ranking individual proposals. Hunter said the numerical ranking is almost for staff purposes as a gatekeeper function. O'Callaghan asked how we would choose a 92-point proposal over a 112-point proposal. Hunter asked if he were missing something in that wouldn't we just choose the 112 point proposal? Markofski said the question on the table is how to award the funds after the proposals are scored. Hunter says he sees the scoring as a pass/fail test. Markofski asked for staff's intention. Charnitz said the intent is to use the ranking criteria and the points assigned to help you make decisions and to send signals to people that this is what we're going to rank your proposals on. The right to reject any and all proposals was put in the RFP in case the City deems no proposals are acceptable.

Whitesel asked what happens with an RFP evaluation in a committee like this. Charnitz said that as Hurie expressed it earlier, the points become very important when you're reviewing the proposals and giving them that rating, because when you have 2 proposals meeting an objective, the points become very critical.

Under "Evaluation of Proposals," Hurie suggested adding, "Staff will evaluate applications based on these criteria." That gets it off the Committee's shoulders. He said then down on the bottom add the same to "applications will be further evaluated." And then after Number 7 at the end, add a sentence that suggests that the Committee will consider those evaluations or those ratings and may use other additional criteria to come to a full complement of recommendations. O'Callaghan said that makes a lot of sense that staff is going to score the proposals and that the Committee will then review the scored proposals. So, staff would score the applications and present them for evaluation by the Committee. Whitesel says he'd prefer it that way. This also takes care of his other major problem of how to compare rental and owner-occupied projects.

Charnitz said she would like to see some people from the Committee actually doing the evaluating of applications, as opposed to just leaving it up to staff. After some discussion, Markofski asked if there were any members who wanted to be part of that process. Hunter said we should cross that bridge once proposals start to come in.

O'Callaghan moved to approve the RFP with additional revisions suggested throughout the discussion by staff. Hunter seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

9. [25448](#)

Neighborhood Center Study

Wendorf-Corrigan said we're progressing on the neighborhood center study, and the attachment that was included in your packet was a flier that has gone out. This is going to be our mechanism for getting resident input. She owned that it is inadequate for getting terrific input, but because of limited staff capacity, we figured one session per geographic area of the city. We met with center directors, and they suggested having these meetings at neighborhood centers to accommodate low income people. Staff agreed that that would be ideal, but didn't feel we have the capacity to do thirteen different input sessions. Wendorf-Corrigan then discussed the three questions they intend on asking at the input sessions.

O'Callaghan asked if we are going to tell people how their input will be used and what they can expect, and Wendorf-Corrigan said yes.

She said there would also be a quick turn-around, with the sessions held in March and a report with recommendations going out in May.

Phair asked how they had been promoting this. Wendorf-Corrigan said they have utilized list serves, planning councils, newsletters, neighborhood centers, all alders, La Sup, and the libraries.

Whitesel said he also noticed it in the newspaper.

Wendorf-Corrigan gave the Committee some other updates. She has talked to the police command staff, and they're still deciding whether they want her to have a session for neighborhood police officers. She met with Health Department staff and said they're thrilled we're doing the study. One of their concerns was whether the focus was still going to be to serve low income individuals. They are also exploring another model called neighborhood houses, not to be confused with our Neighborhood House, but rather as settlement houses. Wendorf-Corrigan said she talked with City Planning about getting some of their data mapped. She also talked with Dane County Human Services about how to align our systems better.

Phair asked about the fact that the superintendent and mayor are working on lighted school houses.

Wendorf-Corrigan said the goal was to work together with achievement issues among students.

Phair asked how this fit in with the neighborhood center study, and

Wendorf-Corrigan said the lighted school house is one model. Community Services currently funds two, one at Orchard Ridge and one at Leopold.

10. [25447](#)

Select 2 representatives to serve on the Conference Committee for the upcoming funding process.

Wendorf-Corrigan said that since we're one division now, we created a Conference Committee of 2 representatives from this Committee and 2 from the Community Services Committee to look at all the proposals that come in under the neighborhoods category. Our workload for this year, though, is going to be considerably lower since we're not having neighborhood centers apply, but what still exists in that neighborhoods category are all the adult employment applications, the three planning councils, and the grassroots leadership college. We anticipate fewer than 10 applications and only 1 meeting of the group.

Whitesel asked if neighborhood centers could apply for any new programs other than what they're funded for already, and Wendorf-Corrigan said no.

Whitesel asked what happens if the money for centers is cut below this year's level. Wendorf-Corrigan said we will know in November what their allocations will be, and based on that, we would adjust their funding for 2013.

Markofski asked if any of the Committee members wished to commit to the Conference Committee.

Whitesel said he would, based on the fact that they're having a limited meeting schedule.

Wendorf-Corrigan said that the Conference Committee would meet in July.

Phair also said he would be on the Conference Committee.

11. [25449](#)

CDBG 2012 March Staff Report

Rood said that staff put together a list of all the funding meetings this summer, and she passed out the calendars. Rood also said that in the Committee's packet there is a letter from Goodwill notifying the Committee that they're returning \$200,000 of unspent funds from the previous summer process. Because we got that paid back, we don't have to make any cuts to any of the current contracts.

Rood said that Charnitz will be taking over as staff to the Committee on a temporary basis since Rood has resigned, and that any questions Committee members may have should go to Charnitz. Rood also thanked the group for volunteering and for their good work on the Committee. She said she would miss seeing the Committee every month.

12. [25450](#)

Report from committees with CDBG Committee representatiuon.

There were no reports from committees.

ADJOURNMENT

Whitesel moved adjournment in honor of Pam Rood at 7:40 p.m.; O'Callaghan seconded. Unanimous.

Anne Kenny, recorder