CDBG Allocation Committee

January 9, 2025
8:00am-9:30am
Remote Meeting via Zoom

In Attendance:
Robby Perkins-High, Chair, Todd Morse, Vice Chair,
Wendy Harmon, Lawson Condrey, Natalie King, Teale Kenneth Smith, Kim Vandermeulen,
Staff: Mary Davis, Rowen McAllister

Meeting 1- Minutes

Roll Call

Discuss open meeting structure and review process
Staff discussed the open meeting procedure and process for Roberts Rules for voting. Staff emphasized respect during deliberations. Staff and Chair discussed how each application discussion would be structured, specifically that each member would be invited to share comments for each application. Staff also clarified that follow up questions to the applicant are allowable but should be only on the occasion where the application did not capture the relevant information necessary to score. Any unaddressed or missing portions of the application on the part of the applicant does not allow for follow up.

Address to the Committee from City Manager, Danielle West
The City Manager thanked the Committee for their time and attention to this important program. She further emphasized the importance of Social Service applications assisting unhoused populations, and the importance of CDBG funds on public projects, like DPW and Parks projects.

Review and Discuss Development Activities

1. COP Public Works Tate St ADA: Members wondered if there were any set asides from nearby projects in the area or other infrastructure projects. Members also wondered if the historic review would require brick sidewalks and what the cost impact would be.
   Teale made a motion to ask the following question. Kim seconded. Roll Call vote was unanimous to ask the following:
   Question: 1) Is there other funding aside from CDBG and CIP funds available for this area (such as various set asides from nearby projects or districts)? 2) What is the budget impact if brick is required instead of concrete?

2. COP Public Works Cumberland Ave ADA: Members identified that this project is very similar to the previous project. Members asked if it would be appropriate to ask DPW to rank the two DPW projects or provide additional info about why these were chosen. Staff responded that given these two were submitted for funding it seems appropriate to see both of these projects as priorities. Further, the application is intended to capture why these projects are necessary and important, so staff would refer the Committee to the

narrative to address these questions. The Committee discussed which project between the two DPW was higher priority. A few members said that this project reached more people and had the greater impact. Staff reminded the Committee that DPW needs to select projects in low income census tracts in order to be eligible, thus informing which applications they chose to submit.

3. COP PRF Tyng Tate Playground: Members noted the amount of neighborhood support in the application. Members also brought up whether there is any handicap accessible street parking near the playground, and whether the group is able to follow up on certain conditions like asking for a parking spot. Staff clarified that the group cannot impose conditions but can ask additional questions as to whether they are intending to offer accessible parking. Teale made a motion to ask the following question to this applicant. Kim seconded. Members discussed whether the answer to this question would inform scoring. Roll call vote was unanimous to ask the following:
   Question: Are there plans to designate street spaces as handicap parking at part of this project?

4. Alpha One: Staff clarified that the budget for this application is for Portland residents, but the applicant receives funding for other ramp projects outside of Portland. Some members didn't feel that this application was as thorough as some of the others, and did not make enough of a case for financial need. Members identified that the impact for these funds are hugely impactful for a few residents.

5. YFO Resource Hub: Staff provided a summary of their comments including Environmental Review timeline, administrative duties, and previous funding award. Staff confirmed that the bulk of the applicant's financing has been received since the submission of the application, specifically in awards from other State and City programs. Members felt it was an ambitious project and wondered if CDBG funding was necessary to move forward with the project. Members also asked how childcare would be provided during construction. Staff responded that the applicant had submitted a Social Service application for operating costs during construction. Members wondered if a project of this scope would be in risk of not moving forward, if problems arose like in the last CDBG award. Some members felt the application did not sufficiently address the qualifications of the applicant to manage a project of this size. Other members, however, addressed that the applicant's partner Developer's Collaborative was an accomplished developer of affordable housing in the state. Since the project has received LIHTC and Maine Housing funds, many stakeholders have an interest in ensuring the project moves forward, which some members feel minimizes the risk that the project would stall or not get built.

   The Committee discussed the structure of their conversation as well as a few usability questions with Neighborly.

Next meeting
Thursday, January 16
Time: 8:00-9:00am
Location: via Zoom