Community Development Department

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD (CPAB)

MINUTES

Wednesday, August 12, 2026

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

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT	BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT
• Chair: Nick Gulino, Council District 7 • Vice-Chair: Dr. Abena Bradford, Council District 3 • Judith Eisenberg, Council District 1 • Lauren Garces, Council District 5 • Dr. LaWana Richmond, Council District 6 • Victoria Barba, Council District 8	• Pida Kongphouthone, Council District 4 • VACANT, Council District 2 • VACANT, Council District 9

STAFF PRESENT	ATTENDANCE
• Michele Marano, Assistant Deputy Director • Angela Nazareno-Clark, HUD Program Manager • Amber Joy Weber, Program Manager • Melissa Villalpando, Community Development Coordinator • Nadine Hassoun, Community Development Specialist • Nancy Luevano, Community Development Project Manager • Kristian Castro, Community Development Project Manager • Arden Martinez, Community Development Project Manager • Krissy Maier, Community Development Coordinator • Alicia Martinez-Higgs, Community Development Specialist	*6 members of the public joined the meeting.*

AGENDA

Item 1: Call to Order

Item 2: Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m. by Chair Nick Gulino, after a quorum was reached, with Members Garces, Barba, Richmond, and Eisenberg.

Board Member Announcements:

There were no Board member announcements.

Staff Announcements:

1. Hassoun introduced Amber Joy Weber, Program Manager, to the CPAB as a new member of the CDBG team.

2. Weber shared that she has been employed by the City of San Diego for four years. Weber previously worked with the Promise Zone Initiative and is now working with the HUD team.

3. Luevano provided the following EDD announcements.

   a. **Share Your Feedback on the FY26 CAPER**
   The CAPER provides an annual overview of the City's progress toward its housing and community development goals and details how federal funds were used during the program year. Community members are invited to review the draft report and submit feedback by 5 p.m. on September 15, 2026.

   The report is available online at sandiego.gov/cdbg. Printed copies are also available at select City libraries, including Central, Valencia Park/Malcolm X, San Ysidro, Logan Heights, Linda Vista, and City Heights/Weingart.

   Comments may be submitted by email to cdbg@sandiego.gov

   b. **Capacity Building Grant**
   The Capacity Building Grant provides funding to nonprofit organizations that strengthen small businesses, commercial corridors, and neighborhoods in under-resourced communities throughout the City of San Diego. Through two funding tracks, Small Business Support and Community Growth, the program supports projects that promote economic opportunity, community well-being, and neighborhood vitality in the San Diego Promise Zone, Opportunity Zones, low- to moderate-income (LMI) census tracts, and/or in otherwise under-resourced communities.

   Applicants should review the eligibility requirements and apply for the funding opportunity that best aligns with their organization's mission and proposed project. Funding up to $15,000 is awarded through a competitive application process and is available only to projects serving communities within the City of San Diego. Contract duration is for Fiscal Year 2027, concluding June 30, 2027. More information is available at https://www.sandiego.gov/capacity-building-

c. **Opportunity Zone 2.0 Public Comment Period**
San Diegans now have an opportunity to help shape the future of Opportunity Zones (OZ) 2.0. This is an updated federal program designed to drive long-term investment into under-resourced neighborhoods. Small businesses and organizations located in Opportunity Zones can also benefit from certain City grants and programs.

The City recently released a list of 47 census tracts they recommended to the State for OZ 2.0, which you can find here: sandiego.gov/OZ20

Now through Aug. 28, residents, stakeholders and community organizations have the chance to weigh in on the State's draft recommendations. The draft recommendations include 13 census tracts within city boundaries. This is a key moment to help influence which San Diego communities
are nominated before the State submits its final list to the U.S. Treasury in September.

Your voice matters. Whether you're a neighborhood advocate, business leader, nonprofit or resident, your feedback can help strengthen San Diego's nominations and ensure they reflect community priorities.

d. **Community Town Hall with Congresswoman Sara Jacobs**
A community town hall with Congresswoman Sara Jacobs will take place on Wednesday, August 19, 2026, focusing on San Diego's cost of living, housing, and affordability.

The event will include a housing and cost-of-living presentation, a town hall discussion with Congresswoman Jacobs, federal updates, and an opportunity for community members to share their lived experiences.

Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2026
Time: 5:00 PM–7:30 PM
Location: San Diego, CA
Venue: The specific event location will be emailed to registered attendees 48 hours before the event.

To register, visit: https://mailchi.mp/housingsandiego/townhall26

Item 3: Approval of April 6, 2026, Meeting Minutes
Member Richmond moved to approve the April 6, 2026, meeting minutes. Member Eisenberg seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0, with Members Eisenberg, Gulino, Garces, Barba, and Richmond voting in favor

Item 4: Non-Agenda Public Comment
No public comments were received.

Item 5: Discussion: Fiscal Year 2028 CDBG Scoring Criteria
Martinez, Community Development Project Manager, presented the FY2028 CDBG Scoring Criteria. *(Slides attached)*

a. Member Eisenberg asked whether the following question would be added to the application: "If your organization is awarded funding for two categories (Public Service and Community Development), which grant do you prefer to receive?"

   i. *Staff Response:* Hassoun responded that the question will not be added to the application to help prevent bias. However, applicants will be asked this information prior to applying, and outlined in the workshop and application guidelines.
   ii. *Staff Response:* Villalpando added that applicants will be notified if they receive a high ranking in both grant categories (Public Service and Community Development). Applicants will then need to select which project to fund through CDBG.

b. Member Gulino asked whether the proposed changes to the scoring criteria were staff recommendations. Gulino referenced the question asking for a success story and shared that a 3-point allocation would be too many points for this section. Gulino proposed changing the point allocation to 1 point.

   i. *Saff Response*: Hassoun shared that the proposed changes to the scoring criteria were based on recommendations from the CPAB Ad Hoc Committee and staff. Additionally, Hassoun also explained that the success story question requires applicants to connect their success stories to the measured outcomes of the proposed project.
   ii. Member Eisenberg commented that she enjoyed reading the success stories because they highlight the impact organizations have on their clients. She noted that the stories help humanize the application and demonstrate the meaningful impact of an organization's work. Eisenberg shared that allocating three points to this question seemed fair.
   iii. Member Richmond agreed that the question valuable, noting that applicants are able to choose what they would like to share, which makes the responses subjective.

c. Member Gulino asked about the last sentence of the Project Activity questions, which asks applicants to indicate whether each activity will be funded by CDBG or leveraged funding. Gulino inquired whether the question regarding leveraged funding should instead be included in the Budget section, where applicants indicate the amount of leveraged funding they will receive toward the proposed project.

   i. *Staff Response*: Nazareno-Clark shared that leveraged funding is an important part of the application process, as it demonstrates that organizations have the capacity to operate a program effectively without relying solely on CDBG funding.

   ii. Member Eisenberg shared that the leveraged funding question had been discussed previously, when applicants were asked to provide information regarding the service, project duration, and leveraged funding.

iii. *Staff Response*: Villalpando commented that the leveraged funding question is very important. Applicants provide this information in their Scope of Work (SOW) to ensure that the proposed activities align with what they plan to execute.

iv. Member Gulino shared that the leveraged funding is important; however, proposed moving all leveraged funding questions to the Budget section to consolidate financial information in one place, making it easier for the applicant to provide information and for the reviewers to evaluate the overall funding structure of the proposed project. Moreover, the Project Activity question should include only questions pertaining to the project, not funding.

v. *Staff Response*: Villalpando shared that the leverage funding points could be allocated to the Budget section of the application.

vi. Member Eisenberg commented that she agreed with the language as stated in the Draft Scoring Criteria, as it clearly connects the project activities and leveraged funding, allowing reviewers to evaluate both components together.

vii. Member Garces shared that she did not have a preference either way, noting that EDD staff asked about leveraged funding in the Budget section. As a result, applicants are required to provide the same information in different sections of the application, including in the Project Activity section.

viii. Member Barba agreed that either way was fine. She proposed that, if the points were moved to the Budget section, they be placed under question #2, Budget and that the total amount of CDBG funds be justified.

ix. *Staff Response*: Hassoun noted that question #3 on the Budget section identified how non-CDBG funding will support the proposed project, so the points could be allocated there instead.

d. Member Gulino had a question regarding the Project Impact section. Gulino asked whether the Board was comfortable scoring this section *(previously scored by EDD staff)* as proposed during an Ad Hoc Committee meeting.

   i. Member Eisenberg shared that she agreed with this approach, as CPAB has greater discretion in allocating points during the scoring process.

e. Member Gulino clarified that projects serving the Promise Zone (PZ) area, as well as projects located within the PZ-designated area, will now receive points during the scoring process.

f. Member Gulino asked for clarification regarding the NCIP (Capital Improvement) “shovel-ready” projects and inquired whether the seven points assigned to this section were previously scored by EDD staff.

Staff Response: Martinez-Higgs shared that applicants should have construction plans in place before applying for a CDBG grant. Applicants should either be in the permitting process with the Development Services Department (DSD) or ready to apply for permits. This is what is meant by "shovel-ready." The requirement helps ensure that projects are ready to begin on time and can be completed within the 24 month project period.

i. *Staff Response*: Nazareno-Clark added that the reason for the staff review is that each project's construction plans are reviewed closely to ensure they are appropriate and ready to proceed. She noted that, in some instances, staff have contacted the DSD office to inquire about the anticipated timeline for obtaining the required permits.

ii. *Staff Response*: Maier also shared that staff work internally with other departments to verify an applicant's permitting status and confirm where the applicant is in the permitting process.

g. Member Gulino clarified that NCIP projects that are ready to begin construction should be prioritized for funding. However, he had a question about the seven-point staff allocation, noting that every point counts when determining which projects receive funding. He wanted to clarify the distinction between the criteria scored by staff and those scored by the CPAB Board.

i. Staff Response: Villalpando noted that during the Ad Hoc Committee meetings, it was discussed that the Board would score the majority of the points to help determine which projects receive funding.

Gulino expressed a preference for keeping the scoring binary and using percentages rather than awarding points within a range. Gulino asked for clarification on how the seven points are scored.

ii. Staff Response: Martinez-Higgs confirmed that EDD staff use a scoring range matrix to evaluate this section.

iii. Staff Response: Nazareno-Clark shared that a checklist will be developed to clearly indicate how the seven points will be allocated to applicants, ensuring consistency and fairness across all applicants and reducing subjectivity in the scoring process. The checklist will be shared with the Board.

h. Member Richmond moved to approve the Scoring Criteria as amended. Member Eisenberg seconded the motion. The motion passed (5-0) with Members Gulino, Garces, Eisenberg, Richmond, and Barba voting in favor.

Item 6: Action: CDBG Funding Request Cap

Board Members Gulino and Garces led the discussion.

a. Member Garces proposed establishing a 10% cap on the budget allocation per project in order to fund up to 10 organizations in the Public Service category, which is constantly oversubscribed.

i. *Staff Response:* Villalpando confirmed that the **$1.7 million amount** is an estimated FY 2028 budget for Public Service, as HUD does not distribute the final allocations until early spring of the following year. By that time, applicants will have completed the first phase of the application process, the Request for Qualifications

Staff Response: Marano shared that the estimate is very conservative, assuming an annual 5% decrease and a minimum ROPS (Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule) payment. Historically, the estimate has been lower than the actual amount received from HUD.

b. Member Richmond asked whether the cap should be based on the estimated allocation, since the presumed final allocation could be higher. Richmond also asked whether applicants typically request the maximum amount available.

c. Member Gulino commented that if the estimates were accurate, a percentage-based cap would be appropriate. However, given the uncertainty surrounding federal funding, he expressed concern that a percentage-based cap could disadvantage organizations if the estimate is lower than the actual allocation. For example, if the estimated allocation were $150,000, an organization could be limited to that amount even if the final HUD allocation were higher.
   i. *Staff Response*: Villalpando shared that, if the cap were established at $150,000, the cap would remain at the same amount once the HUD entitlement amounts are confirmed. Organizations requesting more than the established cap would not qualify for funding for that amount.

      Gulino reiterated his concern that if the estimated amount is lower than the actual allocation, organizations could be disadvantaged.

d. The Board discussed the advantages of establishing a 10% cap on funding the Public Service category and agreed to move forward with the proposal.

e. Member Gulino moved to institute a cap of 10% of the current estimated budget for the Public Service Category of the Community Development Block Grant administered by the Economic Development Department.

Gulino clarified that the motion would cap funding for Public Service projects for the upcoming Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) at 10% of the estimated budget. If the estimated budget is reduced when the projects are finalized, projects will be awarded based on their scores, subject to the 10% cap of the final approved budget.

Member Garces moved to approve. Member Eisenberg seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0, with Members Gulino, Eisenberg, Richmond, Barba, and Garces voting in favor.

Item 7: Action: CPAB Onboarding Materials

Member Gulino moved to table the CPAB Onboarding Materials until the September meeting. Member Barba seconded the motion. The motion passed (5-0) with Members Gulino, Eisenberg, Richmond, Barba, and Garces voting in favor.

Item 8: Action SDHC NOFA Document

1. Member Gulino shared the memo drafted to the SDHC regarding the CPAB questions raised during the April 8 meeting. Member Gulino moved to share the memo with the SDHC to help guide them in preparing their presentation to the CPAB in September. The motion passed unanimously (5-0), with all members voting in favor.

Item 9: Other Items

There were no other items discussed.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: September 9, 2026

Fiscal Year 2028 CDBG Scoring Criteria

Economic Development

Consolidated Plan Advisory Board

August 12th, 2026

Agenda

- Council Policy 700-02
- CDBG Award Categories
- Overview of the Revised FY 2028 Scoring Criteria

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.

RFP Categories for FY 2028

Public Services

Community and Economic Development - Microenterprise Technical Assistance

Nonprofit Capital Improvement Projects - Facilities

The City of SAN DIEGO

RFP Budget for FY 2028 *(tentative)*

Category	Estimated Budget
Public Services	$1,109,520
Community & Economic Development	$986,220
Nonprofit Capital Improvement Projects	$2,465,640

The City of SAN DIEGO

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions

Overview of the Revised FY 2028 Scoring Criteria

- Updated language
- Reduction of staff points
- Elimination of Promise Zone Project Location & MOU and Non-Profit Academy questions

The City of SAN DIEGO

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions – PS/CED/NCIP

Section 1: Organization Experience

- Summary of Proposed Project Description – *moved to the top of the application.*
- Updated language on the Organization's Experience serving LMI or presumed LMI populations.
- Updated language on the Organization's Success serving LMI or presumed LMI populations.

The City of SAN DIEGO

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions – NCIP ONLY

Section 1: Organization Experience

- Updated language on the Organization’s experience in implementing construction projects.
- Updated language on the Organization’s staff experience overseeing construction projects – including third-party construction managers.

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions – PS/CED

Section 2: Project Activities

- Updated language on the description of proposed services to be completed during the project period.

- Modification on the confirmation of continuation, provision, or expansion of services for the proposed project – Points have been reduced from 1 to 0.

The City of SAN DIEGO

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions – NCIP ONLY

Section 2: Project Activities

- Updated language on the proposed improvements or renovations to be completed by the organization (Decreased from 15 to 10 points).

- Updated language on the completion of activities and funds expended within the required 24-month timeline (Increased from 3 to 8 points).

The City of SAN DIEGO

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions – NCIP ONLY

Section 2: Project Activities

- Updated language on the Organization's status of existing construction/architectural plans with the applicable permits for the proposed budget.
- Updated language on the confirmation of the proposed project would result in a new facility, improvement or expansion, or ADA accessibility improvements – Points have been reduced from 1 to 0.

The City of SAN DIEGO

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions – PS/CED/NCIP

<u>Section 4: Project Impact</u>

- Elimination of project location confirmation within the Promise Zone/Opportunity (1 CDD Staff Point).

- Elimination of the agency's signed MOU with the City of San Diego Promise Zone (1 CDD Staff Point).

- Elimination of the Nonprofit Accelerator Program participation (1 CDD Staff Point).

The City of SAN DIEGO

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions – PS/CED/NCIP

Section 4: Project Impact

- Updated language on the Expected Impact of the proposed project. *(Increased from 5 to 7 points)*

- Organization's collaboration/coordination with partners and other agencies within the Promise Zone/Opportunity Zone. (*Increased from 1 to 3 points*)

- Organization's priorities with target communities across the Promise Zone/Opportunity Zone. (*Increased from 1 to 3 points*)

The City of SAN DIEGO

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions – PS/CED

Section 5: Budget

- Determination of cost per beneficiary and justification of requested CDBG amount for the proposed project was moved from Project Activities to Budget section.

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions – NCIP ONLY

Section 5: Budget

- Execution and justification of cost estimate for the proposed construction project was moved from Project Activities to Budget section.

Scoring Criteria Recommended Revisions – PS/CED/NCIP

Section 6 : Project Eligibility Staff-Related Questions

- Modification of the Scope of Work and Budget demonstrating compliance with CDBG eligibility requirements – Points have been reduced to 0.

- Modification of the Scope of Work and Budget demonstrating compliance with National Objectives and other HUD/City requirements – Points have been reduced to 0.

The City of SAN DIEGO

Action Requested:

The Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) is asked to approve the recommended revisions to the Fiscal Year 2028 CDBG Request for Proposal Scoring Criteria.