Economic Development

Community Development Department

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD (CPAB)

MINUTES

Wednesday, September 11, 2024

1200 3rd Avenue, 14th Floor, San Diego, CA 92101

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT	BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT
• Abena Bradford, Council District 3 • Jordan Beane, Council District 2 • Lauren Garces, Council District 5 • Nick Gulino, Council District 7 • Victoria Barba, Council District 8	• VACANT, Council District 1 • VACANT, Council District 4 • VACANT, Council District 9 • VACANT, Council District 6

STAFF PRESENT	ATTENDANCE
• Nadine Hassoun, Community Development Specialist • Michele Marano, Assistant Deputy Director • Angela Nazareno-Clark, HUD Program Director • Sean Karafin, Interim Deputy Director • Nancy Luevano, Community Development Project Manager • Melissa Villalpando, Community Development Coordinator • Ashley Gain, Community Development Project Manager • Alicia Martinez-Higgs, Project Manager • Emma Mattingly, Community Development Project Manager • Tina Hines, Community Development Compliance Manager	*8 members of the public joined the meeting.*

Call to Order

1. CPAB Co-Chair Dr. Abena Bradford called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Abena Bradford took roll call; five board members were present. Quorum was achieved at the same time.

Board Announcements

2. CPAB member Dr. Bradford invited CPAB members to her commencement ceremony on

Staff Announcements

3. Nancy Luevano, Community Development Project Manager shared that Arden Martinez joined the City of San Diego, Policy Team in June 2024, as a management trainee, under-filling a Community Development Specialist II role. She joins us from the International Community Foundation, where she supported the grant-making program for three years, overseeing 200 grantees and contractors. She is enrolled at Pepperdine University in her final year, in the Social Entrepreneurship and Change graduate program, learning how communities can bring social impact and change, and how different types of leadership and management can bring improved team potential and growth. In her spare time, Arden enjoys walking on the beach, being outdoors, and experiencing new restaurants and coffee shops around the city. We welcome Arden!
4. Ms. Luevano announced that this year marked the 50th anniversary of the federal Community Development Block Grant program. In September, the regional Los Angeles office of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development held an in-person meeting for cities and counties in the Southern California region. Prior to milestonethe meeting, HUD Los Angeles requested highlights of CDBG-funded programs and projects that captured the CDBG program's purpose in celebration of the 50-year .
   The Economic Development Department submitted a summary of our City's relationship with Access Youth Academy, the construction of their facility in the Promise Zone area (supported partially with CDBG funds), and their impactful programming for youth services (supported partially with CDBG funds). Access Youth Academy was one of the seven programs recognized by HUD and received a trophy. This acknowledgment speaks to Access Youth Academy's impactful work for the community and its meaningful role in the lives of so many San Diego youth. We thank them for all that they do!
5. Ms. Luevano shared that the EDD currently has two vacancies for Community Development Specialist IV in the Department for Economic Research Specialist: Strategic Partnership and Research Division and Community Development Specialist – Project Management (Community Development Division). For additional information visit, https://www.govermentjebs.com/careers/sandiego. The posting will close on October 14, 2024.
6. CPAB member Dr. Bradford inquired about additional information regarding the Community Development Specialist IV openings. In addition, Dr. Bradford asked if an email may be forwarded to the board for members to provide the information to community members. Nadine Hassoun, Community Development Specialists will be emailing the board with the information.

Approval of Minutes

7. Motion to approve minutes from the previous meeting on September 11, 2024, by Jordan Beane and seconded by Victoria Barba. Minutes were approved, 5-0.

Non-agenda Public Comment

No non-agenda public comments were received.

Action: Draft Fiscal Year 2026 CDBG Scoring Criteria: All RFP Categories

1. **Draft Fiscal Year 2026 CDBG Scoring Criteria: All RFP Categories *(Presentation slides***

attached). **Nancy Luevano, Community Development Project Manager, and Ashley Gain, Community Development Project Manager co-presented.**

a. CPAB member Dr. Bradford asked if the collateral materials will be included in the application process for nonprofits to add supplemental information. Dr. Bradford asked if the scoring criteria changes will be reviewed with applicants.
b. Ashley Gain shared that the organizations would have the opportunity to share their collateral material such as a video in the application, attachment section. Ms. Gain clarified that applicants will need to attend a mandatory Request for Proposal (RFP) workshop where the scoring criteria will be reviewed with applicants.
c. Melissa Villalpando, Program Coordinator stated that applicants may also attend a technical assistance appointment of 30 minutes. Ms. Villalpando shared that applicants may attend 2 appointments or email staff questions at http://www.cdbg.org
d. CPAB member Nick Gulino asked why there was a limit on the RFP, Technical Assistance sessions.
e. Ms. Gain shared that due to limited staff, the TA sessions are kept at 2 per applicant. During the TA sessions, 3-10 staff members attend multiple ongoing sessions for two weeks during November/December. Ms. Gain also mentioned that there is a FAQ session on ED Grants where applicants may read answers to Q&A.
f. Sean Karafin, Interim Deputy Director asked if the system (ED Grants) notified where the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) had been updated.
g. Ms. Gain noted that the links to the FAQ's are added in the Community Development newsletter e-blast, emails to applicants, and other resources where applicants may receive information on how to navigate through the site to reach the RFP, FAQ.
h. Ms. Villalpando noted that there are approximately 500 FAQs in the current list of questions and new questions had not been added during the previous two years. In addition, a staff member reviews the questions annually and deletes the ones that are not applicable.
i. CPAB member Mr. Gulino asked how slide 10, Section 2: Project Characteristics, b.i.i. differs from slide 11, Project Goals ci: and c.ii. Mr. Gulino shared that the two sections seemed redundant and may confuse potential applicants.
j. Ms. Gain shared that this section will be revisited after the presentation so that CPAB may vote today on the FY 2026 CDBG Draft Scoring Criteria action item.
k. Correction to Section 3: Project Specifics, a. The paragraph will replace the word quantity with quality and read, "Services to be provided: Applicant provides a listing of the services to be provided and a clear description of each of these services which includes, as applicable, the following details: The ***quantity*** and duration of each of these services and the method of delivery."
l. Correction to Section 3: Project Specifics slide 14, will be changed to ***3i.:*** Applicant provides explanation and justification for the total amount of CDBG funds requested in relation to the services provided should be consistent with the proposed budget section.
m. Correction to slide 16, Section 4: Project Benefits, *a.ii:* Direct Benefit to LMI persons based on compliance with low ***moderate-income*** limits through documented family size and income.

n. CPAB member Mr. Gulino shared that Section 4: Project Benefits, b.ii., "Organizations has a (confirmed)signed MOU with the city of San Diego regarding the Promise Zone," should include information on how organizations may acquire a MOU with the City. Providing the opportunity to organizations on how to apply.
o. Ms. Gain stated that she would like to rephrase this section to say, "partnered with the city Promise Zone organizations and not specifically linked with MOU since there are currently 80 organizations that have an MOU with the City of San Diego.
p. Ms. Villalpando mentioned that organizations that have an MOU with the City of San Diego perhaps should receive 2 points due to the partnership.
q. Mr. Karafin, Interim Deputy Director clarified that for a nonprofit organization for a non-profit in obtaining an MOU would take approximately one month in a half.
r. Angela Nazareno-Clark, Program Director asked Mr. Karafin what would imply giving an extra point to applicants in the Partner List.
s. Mr. Karafin clarified that there is not a formal list with the City of San Diego, EDD. The list consists of organizations the Economic Development Department has engaged with previously. Mr. Karafin suggested that the language be changed to, "Submitting an application for an MOU with the City of San Diego" or "Intent or planning to pursue an application for an MOU."
t. CPAB member Lauren Garces shared that an intent to pursue an MOU application should be added. Ms. Garces commented that Section 4: Project Benefits, b.ii., if applicants have an MOU with the City score 2 points if the organization is planning on pursuing an MOU, 1 point, and a "0" score if the organization is not planning on pursuing an MOU.
u. Ms. Villalpando shared that the scoring points for Section 4, b.i.i. would work since the City staff scores this section.
v. Mr. Karafin shared that for an organization to receive an MOU with the City they must prove that they serve clients in the Promise Zone community not necessarily their administration office.
w. Ms. Gain mentioned that new applicants have signed up for Technical Support sessions for this cycle. She noted that the FY 2026 NOFA – RFQ has been promoted in CDBG newsletters, Promise Zone newsletters/committees, and Councilmember district offices.
x. Question from online participant: Previously Linda Vista was included in question 4b. as a Community Planning area. Will Linda Vista be included since it is not part of the Promise Zone?
y. Ms. Gain clarified that Community Planning areas will not be included in Section 4b: Project Benefits, however, if the organization serves clients from a Promise Zone (PZ), it would be counted towards (PZ) service delivery. Ms. Gain shared that the applicants may schedule a Technical Assistance session or email http://www.cdbg.govn with additional questions.
z. CPAB member Dr. Bradford inquired what was the difference between an Opportunity Zone and a Promise Zone.
aa. Ms. Gain shared that in the City of San Diego, an "Opportunity Zone" is a designated area investing in economically distressed communities, aiming to stimulate economic development through job creation, while a "Promise Zone" is a federally designated area focused on community revitalization through partnerships with local leaders,

providing technical assistance and access to various federal programs without direct funding. Both are aimed at improving underserved neighborhoods. On the database, there is a mapping tool where applicants may enter their zip code to check if their organization is in a Promise Zone area.

bb. Ms. Nazareno Clark clarified that the Promise Zone points will be determined by City Staff.

cc. Mr. Karafin shared that Amber Weber, Promise Zone & Special Projects Program Manager will be in the scoring of the RFP process if needed. Currently, the Promise Zone has an active list of nonprofit organizations that are in the Promise Zone area.

dd. CPAB member Mr. Gulino proposed the following changes to simplify and clarify Section 2: Project Characteristics, b.i.i. "Applicant explains the rationale, including metrics and available data, used to make the above determination to continue, substantially expand, or provide a new service (e.g., evidence of unmet needs). "Score: 3 points (*previously 4 points).* Omit the sentence, "Applicant provides a thoughtful description of the impact or potential impact of the services for the surrounding community" since it is asked on Project Goals, c.i. section. Scoring change to 2. c.ii. Applicant includes information on associated monitoring systems and procedures, score: 3 points.

ee. Ms. Nazareno Clark suggested adding 1 additional point to Section 2: Project Characteristics, c. ii. "Applicant includes information on associated monitoring systems and procedures. Score 3 points.

ff. Correction: Section 4: Project Benefits, a., i: Direct Benefit to LMI persons based on compliance with *low-to-moderate* income limits through documented family size and income.

gg. Ms. Gain reviewed the changes made by CPAB to the FY 2026 Scoring Criteria to include:
Section 2: Project Characteristics, 2: b.i.i. The score will decrease to 3 points (originally 4 points). Applicant explains the rationale, including metrics and available data, used to make above determination to continue, substantially expand, or provide a new service (e.g. evidence of unmet needs). Next, delete the sentence, "Applicant provides a thoughtful description of the impact or potential impact of the services for the surrounding community."
Section 2: Project Characteristics, 2: c.ii. Applicant includes information on associate monitoring systems and procedures. The score will increase to 3 points.
Section 3: Project Specifics, a. The paragraph will replace the word *quality* with *quantity*, "Services to be provided: Applicant provides a listing of the services to be provided and a clear description of each of these services which includes, as applicable, the following details: The quantity and duration of each of these services and the method of delivery."
Section 3: Project Specifics 3i.: Applicant provides explanation and justification for the total amount of CDBG funds requested in relation to the services provided should be consistent with the proposed budget section.
Section 4: Project Benefits, a.ii: Direct Benefit to LMI persons based on compliance with low (replace HUD) ***moderate-income*** limits through documented family size and

income.

Section 4: Project Benefits, b.ii., Organization has a confirmed or pending MOU application with the City of San Diego regarding the Promise Zone. Applicants will receive 2 points if confirmed and 1 point pending, or intent to pursue, 0 points if they do not obtain an MOU nor intent to pursue an MOU with the City of San Diego. (*Note: Section 4.bii, will be scored by City Staff).*

ii. Motion to approve the Draft FY 2026 Scoring Criteria with modification and revisions. The motion to approve with the recommended revisions was made by Nick Gulino, seconded by Victoria Barba. (Approved, 5-0).

Discussion: HUD updates

1. **Angela Nazareno Clark, HUD Program Director provided a presentation regarding the HUD updates regarding CFR Part 200.** *(Handouts were provided).*
   a. CPAB member Dr. Bradford asked if nonprofit organizations with a fiscal sponsor may apply for the FY 2026 CDBG application.
   b. Nadine Hassoun, Community Development Specialist confirmed that organizations that had a fiscal sponsor were not eligible for funding. This is a City policy regulation, not by HUD.
   c. Ms. Nazareno Clark clarified that during the RFQ phase, nonprofit organizations have to submit single audits and financial entities. Fiscal sponsorship may make it difficult to find a sponsor with the right resources and expertise. It may also be too risky for the organization. In addition, Ms. Nazareno Clark noted that fiscal sponsors may affect the completion of a specific project and potentially impact timeliness in the CDBG Programs.
   d. Sean Karafin, Interim Director shared that there are additional resources in the community to assist nonprofit organizations in strengthening their organization and prepare them for applying for federal funding. The Capacity Building Program at USD assists organizations with their Scope of Work and teaches the financial capacity of a nonprofit organization. Mr. Karafin mentioned that he would be glad to arrange a presentation regarding a Capacity Building Program that is offered by the City Staff. Staff work with the nonprofit organization by providing them step-by-step instructions in preparing them to be self-sufficient as a nonprofit organization.
   e. Ms. Gain shared that organizations that are not ready to apply for CDBG funding are provided resources to assist them in preparation for the federal funding process and provide education on how to apply. The Nonprofit Accelerator program at USD also assists organizations in preparing if they are ready to begin a nonprofit organization.

Discussion: Items for Future Agendas and Comments

1. CPAB member Dr. Bradford asked if community resources for nonprofit organizations may be provided to CPAB members. Dr. Bradford would like to share information about how to become a nonprofit organization with the community.
2. Ms. Gain mentioned that she would present in a future meeting if time permits, a list of community resources for nonprofit organizations, information on how to partner with the City of San Diego, and grants including their requirements available.

3. CPAB member Lauren Garces shared that the information that Ms. Gain mentioned would be very useful and inquired if she would be able to email it to CPAB members. In addition, Ms. Garces thanked City staff for creating a well-informed Community Development Division newsletter. Ms. Garces mentioned that she has been forwarding the newsletter to organizations and community members regarding the NOFA process, RFQ and the RFP cycle, etc.
4. Nadine Hassoun mentioned that she will be emailing CPAB a link to sign up for the CDBG newsletter.
5. Ms. Gain reminded CPAB there will be Ad Hoc Committee meetings for scoring the applications.

Adjournment

1. The meeting ended at 11:00 am.

Economic Development

Draft Fiscal Year 2026 CDBG Scoring Criteria: All RFP Categories

Consolidated Plan Advisory Board
October 9, 2024

The City of SAN DIEGO

1

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria

- Council Policy 700-02, Item 18 states the following:

> 18. The CPAB shall annually review and approve a set of criteria to be used by the CPAB for scoring CDBG competitively-awarded funding applications, including, but not limited to, an evaluation of past performance and regulatory compliance (if applicable), how the proposed project will address areas of the City identified to have the highest levels of need, eligibility of proposed expenditures and budget, and the amount or percentage of leveraged funding contributed to the proposed project.

sandiego.gov 2

2

Economic Development

RFP Categories for FY 2026

- Public Services
- Community and Economic Development: Microenterprise Technical Assistance
- Nonprofit Capital Improvement Projects: Facilities

3

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions

- Objective: To revise the FY 2026 Scoring Criteria to include City staff and CPAB's Ad Hoc Committee recommendations to improve the application process.

Changes include:

- Changes in the sequence to be clearer and more concise
- Some questions were split into two or three for clarity
- A few questions had minor changes in the points scale
- Adjustments made to the Promise Zone scoring

5

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions

Section 1.c. Organization Capacity

- c.i.: Organization Experience with LMI clients: Applicant has experience in providing services to LMI residents or presumed LMI CDBG beneficiaries. *(Score: 3, previously 5 points)*
- c.ii.: Applicant provides proof of positive impact through testimonial(s) or a success story that speaks to their past work with similar populations. *(Score: 2)*
- c.iii: Applicant explains how experience is applicable and beneficial. *(Score: 2)*

6

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions

Section 1.e.: Organization Capacity

- **Collateral Material:** Applicant provides proof of positive impact through collateral material such as; annual reports, photos/videos, social media or website postings, and/or marketing/promotional materials. Applicant shares materials that speak to their impact in the community. *(Score: 2)*

7

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions

Section 1.f.: Organization Capacity

- **Resiliency:** Applicant describes the organization's ability to anticipate, prepare for, respond, and adapt to unexpected changes or sudden disruptions in order to continue to serve their clients. Disruptions or changes can include a significant event in the national or international economy, a downturn in a particular industry, or an external event such as a natural disaster or pandemic. *(Score: 2, previously 1 point)*

8

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria: Performance Indicators

Section 2: Project Characteristics

- b.i. Applicant selects whether the proposed project will result in either the continuation of an existing service, the substantial expansion of existing services, or the provisions of a new service. *(Score: 1, previously 5 points)*

9

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria: Performance Indicators

Section 2: Project Characteristics

- b.i.i. Applicant explains the rationale, including metrics and available data, used to make above determination in section. Applicant provides a description of the impact or **potential impact** of the services for the surrounding community. *(Score: 4)*

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria: Performance Indicators

Section 2: Project Characteristics

- Project Goals c.i.: Applicant identifies the goal(s) and anticipated impact of the project and describes how these goals will be met. *(Score: 5)*
- c.ii. Applicant includes information on associated monitoring systems and procedures. (*Score: 2*)

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria: Performance Indicators

Section 2: Project Characteristics

- d.i.: Applicant includes the number of unduplicated City Of San Diego (COSD) individuals, total number of LMI anticipated to be served below 80% AMI. *(Score: 2)*
- ii. Applicant provides clear methodology on determining anticipated outcomes. (*Score: 1*)

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria: Performance Indicators

Section 3: Project Specifics

- a.: Services to be provided: Applicant provides a listing of the services to be provided and a clear description of each of these services which includes, as applicable, the following details: The quality and duration of each of these services and the method of delivery.
  (Score: 10)

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria: Performance Indicators

Section 3: Project Specifics

- ii: Applicant provides explanation and justification for the total amount of CDBG funds requested in relation to the services provided and any fees charged. Information provided should be consistent with the proposed budget section. *(Score: 5, previously 4)*

14

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria: Performance Indicators

Section 3: Program Specifics

- b.i.: Project Schedule: Applicant describes how the project will be implemented and completed within the required 12-month timeline with specific milestones and estimated expenditures per month/quarter. *(Score: 3, previously 4 points)*

15

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria: Performance Indicators

Section 4: Project Benefits

- a: Proposed project services how moderate-income individuals by serving one of the following:

  i: Presumed LMI clientele as defined by HUD; or

  ii: Direct Benefit to LMI persons based on compliance with HUD income limits through documented family size and income. *(Score: 8, previously 9 points)*

16

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria: Performance Indicators

Section 4: Project Benefits

- b.i: Federally Designated Promise/Opportunity Zone location: Applicant's office(s) providing project services is located in at the Opportunity Zone or Promise Zone. *(Score: 1, previously 2 points)*

- b.ii: Organization has a (confirmed) signed MOU with the City of San Diego regarding the Promise Zone. *(Score: 2)*

17

Economic Development

Scoring Criteria: Performance Indicators

Section 4: Project Benefits

- c: Federally Designated Promise/Opportunity Zone **service location**: Applicant indicates service delivery will occur to clients residing in the Opportunity Zone or Promise Zone. (*Score: 2, previously 3 points)*

- Remove d: Collateral Material: Applicant provides proof of positive impact through testimonial(s), annual report, photos/videos, social media or website postings, and/or marketing/promotional materials. Applicant shares materials that speak to their impact in the community.

Economic Development

Action Requested

The Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) is asked to approve the recommended revisions to the Fiscal Year 2026 CDBG Request for Proposal (RFP) Scoring Criteria.