



OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Sandra Warren
Community Development Coordinator

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***Planning Office 496 Ocean Street- Planning Conference Room
Wednesday January 23, 2019
6pm-7:30pm***

Attendees: Anton Hoecker (chair)
Mike Taylor
Richard Rottkov

Matthew Gilbert
Mike Fletcher
David Wedick

Other Attendees: Eli Rubin

City Staff attendees: Sandra Warren Bill Mann

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Meeting was called to order at 6:10pm.
3. Motion to accept meeting minutes from the October 24, 2018 meeting motion by Mike F and seconded by Mike T, discussion requested by Richard, noting that the spelling of Century was incorrect, it should read Sentry. Sandy noted the change and will make the correction, hearing this motion was granted by Richard for approval.
4. Sandy asked the group their thoughts on the scorecard. Some admitted they did not fill out the card. David Wedick noted he felt the scoring does not allow you to fully consider the benefits a program or project might have. Some of the applications submitted this year lacked details and appeared rushed. Sandy asked the committee to instead go over the applications and discuss pros and cons, questions and concerns.
5. Chair Anton Hoecker asked the committee to begin this process by speaking about the application that members felt stood out to them either positively or negatively. Anton stated he preferred the Sunset application to Thornton Heights, as it would be working with Habitat for humanity and this would allow members of the community to purchase homes that otherwise would not be able to do so, in today's harsh market. Mike Taylor asked the committee what the benefits of Broadband would be, indicated he did not know much about Broadband and would like to know how this will benefit the community. Bill Man Economic development director for the city spoke to this and explained some of the benefits of broadband to both local business and local residents. Overall, the committee felt the Point application stood out and raised a few questions for some members. First, the amount requested took most of the committee by surprise; given the recent remold of the Redbank Kitchen only amounting to around \$60,000.00. As such, members were taken aback by the \$438,061 requested by the Point. This large amount is more than the program receives in a year. Sandy indicated that she had spoken Don

Community Development Office
496 Ocean Street, 04106
South Portland, ME 04116-9422
Telephone: 207-347-4139
Fax: 207-767-7629
E-mail: swarren@southportland.org

Ballute and would clarify with him as she felt maybe he was confused by how she explained the different funding categories versus our overall amount received. Richard Rottkov brought up the concern over separation of Church and State. Richard questioned if the federal funds could be used to support a Church group. Richard also noted that a different committee he was on had experienced some negative feedback on Facebook when the group had proposed meeting at the Point. David Wedick asked Richard if this was the Church directly or Facebook members. Richard indicated it was not the Church but feedback from other Facebook users. Richard went on to say, he wanted to ensure that everyone would be welcome at the Point. Sometimes churches will oppose a certain viewpoint a person might take and we as committee should make sure this is not the case. Anton agreed with this and wants to make sure that no one group or groups of people would be alienated by the Church. The question again arose should federal funds be provided to a Church. Eli suggested the committee should also be fair to the Church and allow the faith-based organization equal opportunity to compete for funding. Sandy also spoke to this and stated that the CDBG funds can be used to provide funding, to a Church or faith based organization as long as the organization keeps the religious activities and the engagement of such activities separate both in time and location. Sandy also stated that while touring the facility this topic was brought up to Don Ballute and he assured her that services are kept separate both in time and location. The church would not use this as a means to retain parishioners. Members were also concerned with the handwritten cost estimate provided in the application. The committee agreed they would like to see quotes from a least three contractors. David Wedick indicated he was concerned with the ask being of CDBG to support 90% of the remodels budget, David also noted we did not get any kind of financial statement that can convey the financial stability of the organization. Committee directed Sandy to speak to The Point and address some of the committees concerns with them. Sandy indicated she would follow up with the Point. Another project that stood out to the group was the Redbank fields. Mike Flechter felt it might not be a good idea to invest such a large amount of money towards a property we do not own. Sandy told the group that the City is working with the current property owners to review the term of the lease and extend this to a 15-year period with the option to buy the land. Bill Man also stated that the city could discuss putting a lien on the property should funds be given and this would allow CDBG to retain recapture fee's if sold prior to the city purchasing the property.

6. Under the Social Services category, the Recreation Van was an application that most of the committee felt would be better for the rec departments CIP versus the CDBG funds. This is due to the nature of the Van and it's intend uses. The committee directed sandy to suggest the possibility of getting a local business to pay for advertisement on the bus to help fund this. The committee also discussed some of the reoccurring applicants lacking detailed information in their applications. Some examples included: total number of applicants the program services, and with that, the number of children or families served. Overall more data about the benefits of their program. Sandy notified the committee she will send applicants a follow up message regarding the committee's comments and questions and ask the applicants to provide this information to the committee either via email or at the Open Mic Night.
7. **Contingence plan for funding:** David Wedick asked Sandy Warren how confident she was that the CDBG program would receive level funding or equivalent to what we received last year. Sandy indicated she was very confident we should not see a decrease but we never know what we will receive until we get our final numbers from HUD. That being said, Sandy asked the committee, to decide ahead of time what we would like to have in place should we receive a decrease. Sandy suggested to the committee that we start by reducing the funding of projects in order of the applications ranking. Meaning the application with the lowest score would loss funding first and so on in descending order until funding is fully expended. Motion by Anton and seconded by Matt, all in favor. As of the November 23, 2019 meeting the lowest ranked applications in the Infrastructure/housing category were the Point and the Redbank fields. Under the Public Services category fuel assistance followed by Rec scholarships were ranked the lowest due to lack detail, the committee as a whole agreed these applicants she be the first to receive cuts.

8. **Adjournment:** Motion by David and Seconded by Mike, Meeting adjourned at 7:33pm.