CDBG Allocation Committee
January 16, 2025
8:00am-9:30am
Remote Meeting via Zoom

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

Meeting 2- Minutes

Roll Call

Follow Up from Previous Meeting

Staff provided an overview of the responses from the applicants to the questions that the Committee had asked last week. Staff also spoke about a question that they received regarding the stability of the funding for the YFO project. Confirmed that staff could provide further financial documents and other items from the City's file that may help clarify the funding status of the project. Lastly, staff identified that one application was removed from reviewers queue as they were unable to provide the necessary documents to demonstrate their non-profit status. Staff offered to work with them to assemble necessary documents for the next application cycle.

Review and Discuss Development Activities

1. HEDD Microenterprise Program: Staff acknowledged that this application was submitted by a colleague in the same department. Members were generally supportive of this application but questioned the longevity of the businesses supported. The program appeared to be a smaller scale than the proposed Business Assistance Program, since that program supports both employer and employee. Members discussed how to measure success and if the group wanted to reach out to ask about metrics of past success. The Committee decided that the applicant provided information in the application that spoke to the measurable impact, and would not reach out for further information.
2. HEDD Business Program: Staff acknowledged that this project was just recently funded with contingency funds that through the process outlined in the Citizen Participation Plan was reallocated to this project. Members discussed the longevity of the impact of the business or job. Specifically, they discussed how reliable it is that the job created through the program will stay available to LMI employees. Generally, the Committee appreciated the large impact this project could have.
3. Upwards, BOOST: Staff reviewed this project for eligibility, since it is a for-profit business. Members expressed that the objective of this project is commendable but questioned the impact of the for-profit status of the applicant. Members also raised concerns of the locality and the success rate of not being in person, as well as financial stability of the applicant. Many members spoke to the importance of the scope of the program but felt unsure about the other aspects of the proposal.

4. CMDN Ramp Renovation: Staff identified that they asked the applicant to establish eligibility, and the applicant showed they will serve 51% LMI Portland residents. Members questioned the level of impact and the actual safety concerns of the ramp. Members were not clear about the actual wear on the structure based on the pictures and narrative. Many felt the ramp seemed usable, but not perfect, in its current state. Acknowledging the importance of the voucher program and the critical need of child care, members felt this intervention may not be as high of a priority as others, and chose not to reach out for more information.
5. Port Resources: Members felt the impact of this project would be smaller than other applications due to the number of people served. Members also noted that CDBG funds are proposed to be 100%. Members questioned why reserve funds could not be used over a few years. Members expressed that the need and scale of the work is important but the impact is quite low in comparison to other applications.

Review Scoring Categories and Procedure

The Committee discussed the different sections of the scorecard. The group discussed specific scoring categories and broadly reviewed how to measure different aspects of a proposal using the scorecard. Staff and members talked through each section raising questions about scoring intent, such as how to balance the “Financial Need” section and “Leveraged Funds” section without the scores resulting in an inverse of each other. Staff reminded scorers of the deadlines and offered support if needed.

Next meeting
Thursday, January 23
Time: 8:00-9:00am
Location: via Zoom