

**City of Lawrence, KS
Community Development Advisory Committee
February 11, 2010 Minutes (City Commission Room)**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Susan Adams, Marci Francisco, Julie Mitchell, Vern Norwood, Brenda Nunez, Aimee Polson, Patti Welty

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chris Marshall, Quinn Miller, Kathy Pryor, Roberta Suenram

STAFF PRESENT: Danelle Dresslar, Margene Swarts

PUBLIC PRESENT: Lonnie Johnson

Chair Welty called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

1. Introductions

Members and staff introduced themselves.

2. Approval of the January 28, 2010 Minutes.

Polson moved **to approve the CDAC meeting minutes from the January 28, 2010 meeting.** The motion was seconded by Nunez and **passed 5-0 with two abstaining.**

3. Election of the Chair and Vice Chair.

Polson **nominated Mitchell for the position of Chair.**

Mitchell declined.

Welty **nominated Norwood for the position of Chair.** The nomination was seconded by Polson.

Norwood explained that her job is requiring her to travel again, and that is not to say that she would be missing meetings, but there may be a few times where she is a late arrival to the CDAC meetings. She told the CDAC if they would like for her to be Chair and the subsequent Vice Chair is apprised of the fact that there may be a few times she is late, then she would accept the nomination.

There being no other nominations, Francisco moved **to close the nominations and appoint Norwood to the position of Chair by acclamation.** The motion was seconded by Polson and **passed 6-0 with Norwood abstaining.**

Mitchell **nominated Welty for the position of Vice Chair.**
Welty declined.

Welty **nominated Mitchell for the position of Vice Chair.** The nomination was seconded by Nunez.

There being no other nominations, Polson moved **to close the nominations and appoint Mitchell the Vice Chair by acclamation.** The motion was seconded by Francisco and **passed 6-0 with Mitchell abstaining.**

4. Staff Response to January 14, 2010 CDBG/HOME Application Questions.

Swarts said that the CDAC had a question about the Ballard Center annual report for 2009. The exclusion of the report was an oversight on staff's part and the website application link will be updated to include this report. The CDAC also had a question about a budget and annual report for the Boys and Girls Club. The budget has been posted online, and the annual report is an extremely large document, so if any members of the CDAC would like to see the report staff can bring it to the next meeting.

Swarts said that there has been no other word on the roof repair project for Ballard Center. The probability is that the finding will be as anticipated, that being the roof itself is not the problem, but it is a component of the roof. Swarts said that staff will let the CDAC know when more information is available.

Adams asked about the project dates for the Boys and Girls Club.

Swarts said that there is a letter attached to the application online that asks the CDAC to consider the application based on the fact that the project can be done on any timeline. Swarts said there was some confusion with the application in when the grant year actually was, and the Boys and Girls Club thought that their project did fall in the proper grant year.

Swarts noted to the CDAC that looking at the budget questions that were asked on the HCCI and DCAP applications she finds that the budgets included in the applications do answer the questions that the CDAC asked. Swarts said that on HCCI the budget listed and the salaries listed are for the Lawrence office. She said that HCCI has several locations and that the CDBG request is only for the Lawrence office. The percentages they listed worked for the budget provided. The fact that they have listed the request as 2% of the agency budget is consistent with the fact that the agency is statewide.

Swarts said that the salary expense includes case management and direct client services. The percentages work for the application as well. The program that

the CDBG request is for a \$12,500 program and they are asking for \$4,000. That works out to 32%.

Francisco said that no one in the Lawrence HCCI office does agency administration. The agency has offices in Lawrence, Topeka, Manhattan, and Wichita. The overall administration is located in the Topeka office. This is an explanation as to why the \$51,808 in salary expenses is almost the entire \$61,000 budget of the Lawrence office.

Swarts noted that the CDAC received copies of the neighborhood performance report activity as well.

5. Begin Deliberations - HOME.

Prior to beginning deliberations, Norwood requested staff add an agenda item to the February 25 meeting to review the "Step Up to Better Housing Strategy" since there are new members to the committee.

Welty moved **to fully fund 15a, Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority Homeless Transitional Housing Program (TBRA) in the amount of \$270,000.** Polson seconded the motion, **which passed 7-0.**

Adams asked if the committee wished to increase an award can it be done at a later date.

Norwood said that no decisions made at this point are set in stone. All items can be revisited at any time prior to the recommendations submitted to the City Commission for the Action Plan.

Welty moved **to fully fund 17b, Tenants to Homeowners CHDO Project Funds in the amount of \$100,000.** Mitchell seconded the motion, **which passed 7-0.**

Welty moved **to fund 17a, Tenants to Homeowners CHDO Operating Funds in the amount of \$34,795.** Polson seconded the motion, **which passed 7-0.**

Welty noted that the spreadsheet said that Tenants to Homeowners asked for \$35,000 in CHDO operating costs, but the cap on funding for CHDO operations is 5% of the grant, which is where she took \$34,795 from.

Swarts said that in looking at the spreadsheet, the same rules apply to the CHDO Project Funds in that there is a minimum amount of the grant that is required to be set aside for this category. The minimum that can be allocated is 15% of the grant which would be \$104,385.

Welty moved **to fully fund 17b, Tenants to Homeowners CHDO Project Funds in the amount of \$104,385**. Nunez seconded the motion, **which passed 7-0**.

Welty said that as she saw it the best thing to do would be to give what they have left to the First Time Homebuyer Program. In doing this they cannot fund Habitat. Welty asked Swarts how many homeowners will benefit from the remaining funding in the First Time Homebuyer program.

Swarts said that the balance at this point is \$286,725, although they have not taken out the City of Lawrence HOME administration or the LDCHA TBRA administration. After those have been taken out of the total the balance is \$217,135. As far as that amount in the First Time Homebuyer program, the funding will benefit approximately eight or nine first time homebuyers.

Adams asked about the administration for the HOME program for the City and how it is different from the Program Delivery that is included in the Capital Improvement request for the Comprehensive Housing Rehabilitation Program.

Swarts said that the HOME admin goes toward salary costs, and Program Delivery is the actual delivery of the program to clients by the Projects Specialists.

Welty moved **to fully fund 15b, Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority Administration in the amount of \$30,000 and 18f, The City of Lawrence Community Development Division Administration in the amount of \$39,590**. Mitchell seconded the motion, **which passed 7-0**.

Francisco said that with the information on how many first time homebuyers that \$217,135 would benefit, it would be possible to partially fund Habitat for Humanity in the amount of \$25,000, which is the equivalent of one homebuyer assistance payment. The remainder could then go to the First Time Homebuyer Program. In disbursing the funding in this way, it keeps the same number of families in the assistance category. It says that the CDAC recognizes that this will help with the first time homeowner in the Habitat House and gives them an opportunity to raise the rest of the funding, which is what they have been doing up until now. If they cannot use the money then it can go back to the First Time Homebuyer Program. Habitat for Humanity has made a lot of effort in the Lawrence community.

Francisco moved **to fund 16a, Lawrence Habitat for Humanity in the amount of \$25,000 and 18c, First Time Homebuyers Program – Lawrence Community Housing Land Trust in the amount of \$192,135**. Polson seconded the motion, **which passed 7-0**.

Norwood asked if there was any public comment regarding the HOME allocations. There was none.

Lonnie Johnson said that he was very interested in homeless issues. He asked if the homeless shelter would be moving.

Swarts said that the Community Commission on Homelessness is the body that primarily works with the homeless issues in Lawrence, although some CDBG allocations do go to homeless issues. Currently, the Lawrence Community Shelter has withdrawn their application for the former Don's Steakhouse location as a possible relocation site. They have since applied for a location on Franklin Circle close to the Douglas County Jail. The new proposed site is an existing building that will need renovations to allow for the overnight accommodations of guests. Swarts told Johnson that the Planning Commission will consider the application in March and she can provide him with a phone number to the Planning Office so he can discuss the public comment feature of those meetings with that staff.

Polson asked Swarts about the CDBG-R money and the CDBG contingency money that the CDAC allocated to the Community Shelter for their relocation process.

Swarts said that the contingency funding went to renovations at their existing site to accommodate for the larger population when the Salvation Army closed and the ensuing colder weather. Those improvements are completed. The \$78,789 that was allocated using CDBG-R funding was originally intended for the Massachusetts Street location, but that project did not move forward. The money was set aside for LCS, so staff is waiting on the Planning Commission and City Commission recommendations before pursuing the Substantial Amendment that will be necessary for that funding to be approved for a new location. Assuming the Planning Commission approves the SUP, the City Commission will then be asked about the consideration of the CDBG-R funding and reallocating it to the new LCS project. The money is still set aside for LCS, but since a project has not been approved as of yet it has not been committed to a specific project. If the Planning Commission approves the SUP in March the City Commission should hear it at an April meeting.

Norwood suggested the CDAC move along to Capital Improvements deliberations as the HOME allocations are complete.

Welty moved **to fully fund 12a, Independence, Inc. Accessible Housing Program in the amount of \$33,000.** Mitchell seconded the motion, **which passed 7-0.**

Polson moved **to fully fund 14a, the Social Service League of Lawrence 905 Rhode Island Permanent Wood Awning in the amount of \$5,000.** Francisco seconded the motion, **which passed 7-0.**

Francisco moved **to fully fund 11a, The Boys and Girls Club Building Weatherization Project in the amount of \$57,576.** Adams seconded the motion, **which passed 7-0.**

Adams moved **to fully fund 3b, North Lawrence Improvement Association CMP Installation Project in the amount of \$1,000.** Welty seconded the motion, **which passed 7-0.**

Welty said that this area is causing a dangerous situation in the neighborhood as the road gets narrow and then drops off into an embankment. There are lots of kids that walk along there and it is in real need of this project.

Swarts noted the balance for Capital Improvement allocations was \$778,510.

Welty moved **to fund the following:**

18a, CDD Comprehensive Housing Rehabilitation - \$400, 000.

18b, CDD First Time Homebuyer's Rehab Program/Lawrence Land Trust - \$100,000

18d, CDD Energy Savings Improvements, Exterior Weatherization - \$80,000.

18e, CDD Furnace and Emergency Loans - \$35,000.

Norwood seconded the motion.

Adams asked if there could be a higher amount allocated to the Weatherization project.

Swarts said it was possible; staff already doubled the weatherization request this year as 2009 brought about double the amount of houses done in the program.

Francisco said that the State has received additional ARRA funding in the area of weatherization as well and it is a program for those who would like to take out loans for weatherization improvements.

Swarts noted that the program Francisco is referring to is Efficiency Kansas. Everyone in Kansas is eligible for Efficiency Kansas. The City of Lawrence weatherization program is geared towards low- moderate income owner-occupants in Lawrence. This program is a grant. This year the program had the added benefit of the utilization of energy audits on three of the houses. There were 68 homes completed in the program year and of those 68, staff chose three homes to perform before and after energy audits on. The homes chosen were in different parts of town and were different house types. The audit used

both infrared scanning and blower door tests before any improvements were made. The homes then had completed weather stripping of doors, attic insulation, and storm windows replaced. The auditor provided a post-improvement audit as well. One thing that the audit showed staff was that instead of just saying that someone's bills are lower or their house is warmer, it could actually be quantified this year. Staff is looking at incorporating energy audits into the Comprehensive Rehabilitation Program this year also to see what other improvements can help homeowners. Swarts said that staff will send out an RFP and do the energy audits as contract work so the same auditors will likely work with the program through the entire grant year, very similar to how the department currently does lead based paint testing.

Norwood said that was in line with State and Federal Government initiatives looking for performance outcome in their funding programs.

Francisco said that was a very interesting report.

The motion passed 6-0.

Adams moved **to fully fund 13b, City of Lawrence Public Works sidewalk project in the amount of \$150,000.** Welty seconded the motion.

Mitchell left the meeting at 6:45 pm.

Francisco asked to discuss the Lighted Pathway Project.

Welty said that she weighed the two projects and was leaning towards the sidewalk project because the Lighted Pathway Project may receive the TE grant. Welty said it was important for her to know where the funding is going. With the Lighted Pathway project the CDAC cannot be sure if it is going to Phase One or Phase Two. There is no real way to determine where this funding will be going in the scheme of that project.

Francisco said that one of the main concerns that she had has to do with the neighbors that will be affected by the pathway have not all been contacted. The proposal came to the neighborhood, and the HRC meeting was where it was covered. There have been changes in the project since it was first presented to the neighborhood, and the 12th Street alignment would be required to have pedestrian lights to cross Tennessee and Kentucky Streets. The way it is presented, both pathways will intersect with regular lighting. Francisco also said that the Traffic Safety Commission has yet to approve the additions of the new lights. There are some opportunities for additional lighting on Massachusetts between 11th and 14th Streets and in South Park. This would make it a worthy proposal for the neighborhood.

Norwood said it comes down to which project the Committee wants to fund if they had to pick one or the other.

Adams said that if the request for the Lighted Pathway was altered, there could be funds available for both projects. This would entail meeting a broader need for Oread Neighborhood. There were several robberies around South Park last year. The lights will be utilized by students going downtown and neighborhood people. In the Lighted Pathway project, not that many homes were affected by the pathway. Adams said she spoke with several stakeholders in this project, and the project did come forward very quickly without much support from the neighborhood. Neither the lighting nor the route were decided upon in the beginning. The lighting problem is true but this way it affects less homes. Adams said that she would be willing to change her motion from fully funding the sidewalk project if the allocated Lighted Pathway funding would go to lighting in the Oread neighborhood.

The motion failed 1-5

Francisco moved **to fund 6b, The Ballard Community Center Early Education Building Roof Repair project in the amount of \$5,600, 13a, the City of Lawrence Public Works Sidewalk Project in the amount of \$100,000, and 13b, the City of Lawrence Public Works Lighted Pathway Project in the amount of \$60,000 for use of lighting in the area adjacent to and within South Park in the Oread Neighborhood.** Adams seconded the motion.

Francisco said that the neighborhood association and the Public Works department can talk about the plan since the funding allocation has been limited to the area in or adjacent to South Park. This is not to say to Public Works that they have been allocated \$60,000 for their Lighted Pathway Project. It is a specific piece of the overall project that this funding is allocated.

The motion passed 6-0.

Francisco said that the project that they put forth does talk about a connection between South Park and Vermont and North Park Street. At this time it is unknown if the TE grant will be coming through. If it does then the first phase of the project can link up. If the TE grant is not forthcoming and the project cannot move forward, there is enough funding available for the City to make expenditures along Massachusetts at 11th to 14th Streets or through South Park. It does not make sense to have lights running through the park if the traffic signals do not go through. The City picked 12th Street for that because they have the right-of-way. South Park is involved because the City owns it. Clearly it is a great project for the students to be able to use it to walk.

6. Miscellaneous/Calendar

There were no miscellaneous items or calendar items.

7. Public Comment.

Lonnie Johnson commented that he does feel strongly about the lighting situation in the South Park area in terms of the safety of those who walk in that area at nighttime.

8. Adjourn.

Francisco moved **to adjourn the February 11, 2010 meeting of the CDAC.** The motion was seconded by Welty and **passed 6-0.**

Attendance Record

Members	Jan 14	Jan 28	Feb 11	Feb 25	Mar 11	Mar 25	Apr 8	Apr 22	May 13	May 27	Jun 10	Jun 24	July 8	July 22	Aug 12	Aug 26	Sept 9	Sept 23	Oct 14	Oct 28	Nov 11	Nov 25	Dec 9	Dec 23
Susan Adams	+	+	+																					
Marci Francisco	+		+																					
Chris Marshall	+	+	E																					
Quinn Miller	+																							
Julie Mitchell	+	E	+																					
Vern Norwood	+	+	+																					
Brenda Nunez	+	+	+																					
Aimee Polson	E	+	+																					
Katherine Pryor	+	+																						
Roberta Suenram	+	+																						
Patti Welty	+	+	+																					