



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

**CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD
NOTES FOR MEETING**

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 08, 2014

SAN DIEGO CIVIC CONCOURSE
NORTH TERRACE ROOMS 207-208
202 'C' STREET
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT	BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Joyce Abrams, Council District 1 representative• Maruta Gardner, Council District 2 representative• Vicki Granowitz, Council District 3 representative• Ken Malbrough, Council District 4 representative• Richard Thesing, Council District 7 representative• Aaron Friberg, Council District 8 representative• Nohelia Patel, Council District 9 representative	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Earl Wong, Council District 6 representative

STAFF PRESENT	ATTENDANCE SHEET
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sima Thakkar, HUD Programs Manager• Eliana Barreiros, CDBG Policy Coordinator• Michele (St. Bernard) Marano, Fair Housing and Special Programs Coordinator• Leo Alarcon, CDBG Project Manager• Abbas Rastandeh, CDBG Project Manager• Lydia Goularte, CDBG Fiscal Unit Project Manager• Kimberly Vance, HUD Fiscal Compliance Analyst	41 people signed the attendance sheet

Call to Order

- Vicki Granowitz called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. with seven Board members present. Quorum was achieved at the same time.

Approval of Minutes

- Ms. Granowitz motioned to have the minutes approved from the Dec. 2013 meeting.
 - Mr. Malbrough motioned to approve minutes, Mr. Thesing seconded. Minutes were then approved, 6-1-0.

Staff Announcements

- Ms. Barreiros introduced new staff members Ms. Kim Vance, Fiscal Compliance Analyst; and, Mr. Hector Guerrero, Project Management Intern.
- Ms. Goularte provided a briefing regarding the results the FY 2015 CDBG Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process. She noted 64 agencies were qualified to participate in the subsequent Request for Proposals process. Ms. Thakkar noted that the process included an appeal period which allowed agencies to correct any issues with their submittal packet.

Board Announcements

- N/A.

Non-Agenda and Agenda Public Comment

- Ms. Lynn Underwood announced that the Commission on Gang Prevention and Intervention could co-sponsor any of the technical assistance workshops (provided by the City's HUD Programs Administration Office to prospective CDBG applicants) during the summer.
- In response to an inquiry from Ms. Kaye de Lancey (representing Jacobs & Cushman San Diego Food Bank), Ms. Thakkar clarified the maximum number of Capital Improvement Projects that could be funded for the FY 2015 CDBG funding cycle, based on the presumed budget and the minimum allocation permitted in accordance with Council Policy No. 700-02.
- Ms. Christina Griffith (representing Senior Community Centers) asked if projects could be "partially funded" if insufficient amount of funds precluded full funding of a project. It was noted that the CDBG allocation procedures do not include a mechanism for partial funding.
- Mr. Robert McNamara recommended adoption of the FY 2015 Review Process

Agenda Item(s)

- Item 6a:
 - **Consolidated Plan Update: *Goals, Anticipated Resources and Projected Outcomes***

Ms. Vicki Joes (with LeSar Development, consultants to the City's HUD Program Office) led a presentation regarding the item.

- It was noted that the FY 2015 City of San Diego entitlement were estimated based on a 5% reduction of the FY 2014 entitlement figures.

- Item 6b:
 - **FY 2014 CDBG Applications: CPAB Review Process**
 - **Action: Selection of Ad Hoc Committees Members**

Ms. Barreiros led a brief presentation of the CPAB review process.

- It was noted that the CPAB members (reviewers of applications in order to arrive at recommendations for funding which are presented to the City Council) will be asked to provide comments as part of their review and scoring of the applications. These optional comments (along with scores assigned by reviewers to each section of the applications) will be made available to applicant agencies (upon their request) following the City Council ratification of the FY 2015 Action Plan. The name of the individual reviewers will be redacted from the forms prior to their distribution to applicant agencies.
- Following a brief discussion, Board members divided themselves into two ad-hoc groups to review and score applications:
 - Ad Hoc Committee 1: Gardner, Thesing, Patel, and Friberg.
 - Ad Hoc Committee 2: Malbrough, Granowitz, Abrams, and Wong.
- Ms. Gardner motioned to approve the composition of the Ad Hoc Committees and Mr. Malbrough seconded her motion. The action was approved unanimously, 7-0-0.

Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 10:35am.



FY 2015 CDBG Applications
Scores and Rankings
CPAB Ratification

Planning, Neighborhoods & Economic Development
Department

03/12/2014 — CPAB HUD Programs Office 1



Framework

- CPAB Review Package
 - CPAB Review Handbook
 - Responses to RFP
 - Conflict of Interest forms
 - RFP Responses: Review and Scoring Criteria
 - Scoring Sheets
 - Points & Optional Comments Sections


1/08/2014 — CPAB HUD Programs Office 2



Framework – Cont.

- February CPAB Meeting
 - Public input
 - No obligatory participation
 - **Not** supplemental to written RFP responses
 - Speakers’ time may be limited

1/08/2014 — CPAB HUD Programs Office 3




Framework – Cont.

- CPAB Review
 - Criteria & scoring system
 - Ad Hoc Committees meetings
 - CPAB members review/score **all** applications
 - Final scoring sheets returned to City on deadline

1/08/2014 — CPAB

HUD Programs Office

4




Framework – Cont.

- Staff averages & ranks scores
 - Two sets of rankings: PS & CIP/ED
 - Tie breaking mechanism
 - Project Outcomes Average Score (RFP Section 3)
 - If tie remains:
 - Budget and Leverage of Funds Average Score (RFP Section 6)

1/08/2014 — CPAB

HUD Programs Office

5



Framework – Cont.

- Scores and subsequent rankings
 - Posted on the City’s CDBG website
 - Notice provided concurrently
- CPAB public meeting (March):
 - Recommendations to CC are ratified based on scores/rankings
- City Council public hearing (March):
 - Rankings determined by CC via Resolution

1/08/2014 — CPAB

HUD Programs Office

6



Tentative Schedule

- *CPAB Review Period:* February 5 – March 5
 - CPAB Public Hearing: February 12
 - Ad Hoc Meetings: February 10 – February 26
- *Scores/Rankings Posted:* March 7
- *CPAB ratifies recommendations to CC:* March 12
- *CC Public Hearing:* March 24 or March 25
- *Action Plan due date:* May 15

1/08/2014 — CPAB

HUD Programs Office

7



Questions?
Comments?

1/08/2014 — CPAB

HUD Programs Office

8



FY 2015 CDBG RFQ: The
Numbers

RFQ Responses Received: 68
Initial Review: 36 Qualified / 32 Not Qualified
Appeals Received: 29
Secondary Review: 28 Qualified / 1 Not Qualified

Total Qualified Agencies: 64

1/08/2014 — CPAB

HUD Programs Office

9

February 5, 2014

CPAB members receive:

- 1) All applications
- 2) Application Summary Sheets prepared by staff
- 3) Official FY 2015 Scoring Sheets
 - a. Each member will be required to submit a signed Scoring Sheet for each application to City staff
 - b. Each Scoring Sheet will include an optional comment section
- 4) CPAB Review Handbook

February 12, 2014

- Regular CPAB Meeting: Public hearing to provide applicant agencies/supporters an opportunity to inform CPAB members of their respective agencies, mission, and projects:
 - Agencies are not required to attend or speak at this hearing
 - **Public comments only** will be received; no additional RFP application material will be received
 - Depending on the number of public speakers, the time allocated to each public speaker OR to each application may be limited
 - CPAB will decide on holding this hearing during its regularly scheduled meeting time or in the evening
 - The length of the meeting will be extended to no more than 4 hours
- Each CPAB member returns to City their signed Conflict of Interests Form identifying any application they will **not** review due to a perceived or actual conflict

February 10 – February 26, 2014

- CPAB members meet at the AD Hoc level (4 members each) to discuss each application:
 - Meeting will be held in the City's offices with staff support
 - Meetings are intended to give CPAB members an opportunity to meet and confer regarding applications
 - Each AD Hoc committee will discuss all application types (meaning all categories of CDBG activities)
 - Each CPAB member is responsible for scoring each application individually and submitting a signed Scoring Sheet to the City
 - Up to two meetings will be scheduled (4 hours maximum will be allocated to each meeting)

- CPAB members are expected to have reviewed all applications prior to the first meeting. Depending on volume of applications received and the date of first meeting, Ad Hoc members review a common subset of the applications (TBD) prior to the first meeting.

February 28, 2014

- Each CPAB member submits a signed Scoring Sheet for each application to City staff **on or before noon**
 - City staff can pick up at a place that is convenient to CPAB members
- City staff compiles all eight individual scores for each application to arrive at an average score for each application.
- City staff will determine funding recommendations based on:
 - Each application's average score by CDBG eligibility category
 - CDBG funding considerations which includes estimated entitlement allocation, HUD maximum caps, and policy directives
 - Applications are segregated into two groups (based on HUD's regulations which limit the amount of funds that may be allocated to Public Service projects):
 - Public Service Projects
 - Capital Improvement & Community Economic Development Projects
 - One ranking is completed for each of the two preceding project "groups" based on the average score of each application
 - In the event of a tie score for two or more applications the ranking of these applications will be determined by:
 - The highest averaged score for Section 3 of the affected applications (Project Outcomes)
 - If a tie remains, the ranking is based on the highest averaged score for Section 6 of the affected applications (Budget Justification & Leverage of Funds)

March 5th, 2014

- City staff posts results of both rankings on the CDBG webpage
- City staff provides notice of said posting via the CDBG distribution list

March 12, 2014

- Regular CPAB meeting: CPAB meets to ratify rankings after discussion and public input

March 24 or 25, 2014: City Council meets to discuss CPAB recommendation and determine final ranking

Five Year Consolidated Plan Goals, Anticipated Resources, and Projected Outcomes

Goal	Anticipated Resources	Projected Outcomes
Meet the needs of persons with HIV/AIDS and their families through the provision of housing, health, and support services	<p>HOPWA: \$11,717,712 five years 1st Year (FY15): \$2,589,905</p> <p>CDBG (Public Services): \$712,648 five years 1st Year (FY15): \$296,073.65</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Assistance • Supportive Services • Information and Resources
Improve housing opportunities by creating and preserving affordable rental and homeowner housing in close proximity to transit, employment, and community services	<p>HOME: \$18,521,974 five years 1st Year (FY15): \$4,093,814</p> <p>CDBG (non-PS): \$31,646,497 five years 1st Year (FY15): \$6,994,657</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition • Homebuyer assistance • Homeowner rehab • Multifamily rental new construction • Multifamily rental rehab • TBRA
Assist individuals and families to stabilize in permanent housing after experiencing a housing crisis or homelessness by providing client-appropriate housing and supportive service solutions	<p>ESG: \$3,356,076 five years 1st Year (FY15): \$741,776</p> <p>CDBG (Public Services) Set Aside: \$6,590,390 1st Year (FY15) \$1,318,078</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client-appropriate housing • Rapid Rehousing • Supportive Solutions
Invest in community services and non-profit facilities that maximize impact by providing new or increased access to programs that serve highly vulnerable populations such as youth, seniors, and food insecure households	<p>CDBG (Public Services): \$712,648 five years 1st Year (FY15): \$296,073</p> <p>CDBG (non-PS): \$31,646,497 five years 1st Year (FY15): \$6,994,657</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public services • Non-profit facilities
Strengthen neighborhoods by investing in the City's critical public infrastructure needs	<p>CDBG (non-PS): \$31,646,497 five years 1st Year (FY15): \$6,994,657</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public improvements • Public facilities • Public Infrastructure
Enhance the City's economic stability and prosperity by increasing opportunities for job readiness and investing in economic development programs	<p>CDBG (Public Services): \$712,648 five years 1st Year (FY15): \$296,073</p> <p>CDBG (non-PS): \$31,646,497 five years 1st Year (FY15): \$6,994,657</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job training • Placement services • Training for potential entrepreneurs • Assistance to microenterprises • Technical assistance to increase capacity