

# City of Worcester, Massachusetts

Edward M. Augustus, Jr.  
City Manager

Michael E. Traynor  
Chief Development Officer  
Executive Office of Economic Development



Gregory J. Baker, Director  
Neighborhood Development Division

**Community Development Advisory Committee**  
**City Hall, Room 401**  
**455 Main Street**  
**Worcester, MA**  
**Wednesday, January 13, 2016**  
**6:00 PM**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

CDAC present: Edward Moynihan (Chair), Mark Borenstein (Vice Chair), Martha Assefa, Ariel Lim, Dana Strong, Paula Stuart, Daniel Whalen, Matthew Yalouris

CDAC absent: Tracey Pakstis

City Staff: Greg Baker, Steve Hill, Anthony Miloski

### **1) Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Ed Moynihan at 6:02 P.M.

### **2) Review and Approval of 11/24/15 CDAC Meeting Minutes**

There were no changes suggested to the 11/24/15 CDAC meeting minutes, and a motion was seconded and passed to vote for their approval. The CDAC voted 7-0 for their approval.

### **3) Review of schedules for Year 42 CDBG process & CDAC meetings**

- The City of Worcester Year 42 / FY 2017 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG Year) Annual Action Plan Request for Proposals (RFP) & Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) Schedule was distributed to all CDAC members.

The importance of keeping to the schedule of proposed meetings and the need for members to achieve maximum attendance was stressed, so quorum requirements would be met, and the city would be able to complete and submit its Annual Action Plan on time to HUD (due May 15, 2016).

#### 4) Year 42 CDBG Applications

- **Binder handout / overview of applications**
- **Review scoring / ranking system**

In addition to the distribution of Year 42 CDBG Applications in binders to each CDAC members, the following handouts were also provided to each CDAC member:

- CDBG Year 42 Requests,
- Public Hearing #1 Community Needs Assessment Meeting Results (December 17, 2015 – Levi Lincoln Room, City Hall)
- City of Worcester CDBG Program FY 17 / Yr. 42 Application Scoring Sheet
- FY17 CDAC CDBG Proposal Ranking System.

Highlights from the discussions among CDAC members and the City staff regarding the distribution of Year 42 CDBG Applications and the above handouts are presented below.

A review of CDBG Year 42 requests received showed that there were 21 public services proposals (worth \$1,117,948), 9 public facilities' proposals (worth \$701,904), and three inter-departmental proposals (worth \$1,875,000). It was anticipated that HUD funding levels would be 3% - 5% lower for Year 42 compared with Year 41. Thus for example, it was noted that public services allocations which in Year 41 amounted to \$605,720 would thus have to be adjusted in proportion to the final HUD allocation for Year 42 given that such funds are limited to 15% of the overall CDBG allocation.

The CDAC members were informed that a decision had not yet been made by the administration as to standing of three proposals that were submitted after the RFP deadline. These proposals included a public facilities proposal received from Veterans Inc. (15 minutes late), and two public services' proposals on behalf of the Oak Hill Community Development Corporation and the Southeast Asian Coalition of Central Massachusetts (both of which were received a day late).

It was observed that while one of the Year 41 public services applicants did not re-apply for Year 42 funds (Straight Ahead Ministries), there were nine new public service proposals that had not been funded in Year 41.

There was some discussion regarding the eligibility of public facilities proposals particularly with regard to a proposal by the South Middlesex Opportunity Council to rehabilitate a sober house as to whether it should be considered an affordable housing project. Likewise it was questioned whether some elements of the Oak Hill CDC public service proposal would be eligible under the affordable housing development category.

Relative to the Inter-departmental category, it was explained that the City's Inspectional Services Division did not apply for Year 42 funds for Enhanced Code

Enforcement or Demolition/Board-ups, given that they still had sufficient unexpended balances from current and prior year allocations. CDAC members were reminded that Affordable Housing Development projects were being funded through a separate RFP process (the results of which and the status of housing development projects was to be reported to the CDAC on a quarterly basis).

The administration reported that some of the public services RFP's contained an incorrectly numbered question which had been double counted as #12 instead of #12 and #13. Also some RFP's incorrectly referred to FY 2017 as FY 2016. In response to the RFP question requesting the consistency of proposals with the City's Consolidated Plan, several applicants incorrectly related their proposal to the old Consolidated Plan which had been in effect from 2010-15, rather than to the current one that's been in effect since July 2015.

There were some questions from CDAC members as to how to tie in the scoring of the Year 42 RFP's with the findings of community needs determined from this year's public hearing (held on December 17, 2015 at City Hall) and as a result of last year's Consolidated Planning process. As part of this process, the administration reviewed the FY17 CDAC Proposal Ranking System (which serves as a guide to the City of Worcester CDBG Program FY 17 / Yr. 42 Application Scoring Sheet). The only change from last year was some modifications to the question and point scoring relative to tie in with community needs. In response to CDAC requests, the elements of a separate proposed scoring system for the Interdepartmental RFP's were shared with members. Also in response from CDAC requests a fillable pdf scoring form had also been developed by the City to assist in the scoring of RFP's.

As a result of these discussions, in response to CDAC requests, the City administration agreed to provide the following items.

- CDBG expenditures relative to last year's allocations
- Goals & Objectives from the city's old 2010-2015 Consolidated Plan
- Website link to the city's current 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan
- Website link to the CDBG Technical Assistance Training Session materials from Dec 10, 2015.

## **5) Prepare for 1/27/16 mandatory Applicant Presentation session**

- **Review of agenda and process**

The was discussion among CDAC members and City staff with regard to the proposed Mandatory Applicant Presentation Session (scheduled for January 27, 2016), including with regard to the session format, time allowed for questions and answers, and the process whereby CDAC members who had a conflict of interest would be recused from participation.

Agreement was reached the committee would be able to accommodate all of the applicant presentations in one night and that the format and time allowed for

questions and answers would be similar to last year's schedule. There only recommended change was a proposal to allow the Interdepartmental RFP presentations to be first on the schedule. A session start time of 5:30 p.m. was agreed upon. It was also noted that a snow back-up date of Monday, February 1, 2016 had been reserved.

There was some discussion about whether CDAC members should in an attempt to consolidate questions and avoid duplication, email their questions for the upcoming session through the Chairman into the administration. In the end it was decided that only questions relating to technical aspects of RFP's that might have been confusing would be accepted.

## **6) Adjournment**

As there were no more items for discussion, the meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.