



## Housing Advisory Board

# Minutes

Vacant – Chair

Linda Starr – Vice Chair

Diana Yazzie Devine

Christian Karas

Heather Kay (absent)

Siri Amrit Kaur Khalsa (absent)

Thomas Mace

Steve Schild (absent)

Jon Scott Williams

## Thursday, November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2011

6:00 p.m.

Mesa City Plaza Building, Room 170

20 East Street

Mesa, Arizona, 85201

### I. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting convened at approximately 6:02 p.m. In addition to the Board, staff attending the meeting included: Scott Clapp, Tammy Albright, Kathryn McClelland, and Maribel Flores.

### II. Approval of Minutes from the August 4<sup>th</sup>, 2011 HAB Meeting

Tom Mace made a motion to approve the minutes from August 4<sup>th</sup>, 2011 as presented. Jon Scott Williams seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

### III. Items from Citizens Present\*

There were no items from citizens present.

### IV. Action Items

- A. Discuss and Take Action on a Motion Recommending a Chair of the Housing Advisory Board.** Tom Mace made a motion to nominate Christian Karas for a second term as chair of the Housing Advisory Board. Diana Yazzie Devine seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

Mr. Karas' term will begin immediately and expire on June 30, 2012. This is his 2<sup>nd</sup> term as Chair of the Board.

## V. Discussion Items

- A. Discuss a Potential Merger of the Housing Advisory and Human Services Advisory Boards.** Tammy Albright expanded on the current developments regarding a potential merger of the Housing Advisory and Human Services Advisory Boards. Ms. Albright explained that this proposal to merge the Boards was brought before a council subcommittee that was in full support of moving forward with the merger. The new Board will more than likely be a larger Board that would be called Housing and Community Development. The Board would deal with both Housing and Human Services issues and the funding allocations for both Human Services and the grant entitlement programs such as CDBG, HOME, and ESG. This would provide a holistic view of the funding cycle. At this time, however, there is not enough time to proceed with a combination of the Boards prior to this year's funding cycle. Therefore, this year's funding process will be similar to last year's and conducted by both boards separately. Economic Development applications will continue to go through the Economic Development Advisory Board.
- B. Discuss the CDBG, HOME, and ESG funding/application process for FY 2012-13.** Mr. Clapp proceeded to explain the CDBG, HOME, and ESG funding/application process for FY 2012-13. The rating process used to evaluate the applications is going to differ significantly from last year. First, the Board is only going to rate the presentations of each applicant for each project. This will comprise approximately 30% of the applicant's total score. Second, applications are going to be rated by staff on their technical merits utilizing a far more thorough and comprehensive rating tool. The staff evaluation will comprise approximately 70% of the applicant's total score. Once all applications have been rated by staff and the Board, the ratings will be forwarded to the Council Subcommittee so they can select the projects they want to fund.

Evaluations by staff will be done by committee and no single staff member will be responsible. Financial staff, project managers, etc. will be involved.

On a separate track, the Economic Development applications will be forwarded to the Economic Development Advisory Board (EDAB) where they will undergo a similar rating process by staff and the EDAB. Once these projects have been rated, they will be forwarded along with all of the other applications to the Council subcommittee for funding consideration.

Board members will still receive the application binder containing a complete copy of each application.

Training classes in mid-December will be conducted with non-profit agencies and city departments who are interested in applying for CDBG, HOME, and ESG funds.

- C. Discuss the meeting schedule for FY 2011-12 and the CDBG, HOME, and ESG funding schedule for FY 2012-13.** Highlights from the schedules include: Training in mid-December for non-profit agencies; application deadline on January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2012; public hearings on February 1<sup>st</sup> and February 2<sup>nd</sup>; three council subcommittee meetings possible. The Human Services funding schedule is going to be run concurrently with this one. Ms. Devine made a request to see a copy of the Human Services funding applications especially if the Boards are going to be combined next year.

Mr. Mace made a request to have training for the Board regarding the application process and the programs. Mr. Clapp indicated the training could occur at the December 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. Ms. Devine suggested that the Board be provided clear direction regarding the purpose and intent of the funds.

Ms. Starr made a request to see a copy of the Human Services rating tool as well if the Board was going to look at those applications also.

## **VI. Staff Reports and Announcements**

- A. Status Update on the Housing and Community Development Department.** Ms. Devine made a request to add Escobedo as an Agenda Item for the next meeting. Apparently there's some renewed interest in developing this property. A meeting is scheduled for Saturday, and there may be something new to report by the next meeting.

Ms. McClelland reported on some changes regarding the Section 8 program. Changes in processes have made the program more customer-friendly. Staff is preparing a newsletter for the participants.

Ms. Devine asked if Ms. McClelland was familiar with project-based vouchers. Changes to the Consolidated Plan are necessary to be able to use these type of vouchers. Of course, vouchers would also need to be available to use them as project-based. These vouchers would need to come from the City's overall allocation of 1524 vouchers. The vouchers would be tied to the property, and the City would need to be careful in its implementation to

avoid having participants circumvent the Section 8 Waiting List through the use of these vouchers.

Ms. Devine commented that project-based vouchers are preferred by many communities because they are usually allocated to some of the neediest individuals that are putting a strain on other parts of the system. Project H3 individuals who have been identified as "medically needy, chronically homeless" have typically been the benefactors of project-based vouchers.

Ms. Devine offered to meet with Ms. Albright at a future date to discuss Project H3 and how it could be implemented in Mesa.

The City did change its homeless preference to try and work with Project H3; but, HUD made the city change the preference to align with its definition of homeless individuals. The City did, however, house 2 individuals when this preference was in effect.

Further discussion on this topic has been requested at a future meeting.

**VII. Adjourn**

Mr. Mace made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Devine seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

**\*Members of the audience may address the Board on any item. State statute prohibits the Housing Advisory Board from discussing an item that is not on the agenda; however, the Board does listen to your concerns and has staff follow up on any questions you raise.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Clapp, Management Assistant I

December 1, 2011