

**CITY OF GLENDALE, ARIZONA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CDAC)
MINUTES**

**PUBLIC MEETING
Glendale City Hall, Room B-3
5850 W. Glendale Avenue
Glendale, AZ 85301**

**Thursday, December 16, 2010
6:30 p.m.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris Flippen, Chair
Yolanda Hernandez
Pattie Johnston
Randy Miller
Madelin Page

MEMBERS ABSENT: Karen Mankoski, Vice Chair
Sharon Wixon
Mary Jean Eggleston
Shirley Wong
Glenn O'Bannon

STAFF PRESENT: Gilbert Lopez, Revitalization Administrator
Erik Strunk, Community Partnerships Director
Lois Brooks, Community Housing Division
Cathy Gorham, Deputy City Manager
Erin O'Neil, Community Housing Division
Elaine Adameczyk, Community Housing Division
Rebecca Daniel, Community Action Program

I. Call to Order

Chair Flippen called the meeting to order at 6:42 p.m.

II. Business From Floor

None.

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Committee-member Miller motioned to approve the minutes of the November 17, 2010 meeting. Committee-member Johnston made the second. Motion carried 5 – 0.

IV. Business From the Floor

None.

V. Update on New CDAC Scope and Mission

Mr. Strunk noted that on November 23, 2010, the Mayor and City Council expanded the role of the CDAC Committee to include oversight of the City of Glendale Community Housing Division and the City of Glendale Community Action Program. Mr. Strunk added that on that date as well, Council took action to sunset the Housing Advisory Commission.

Mr. Strunk explained that these actions were taken because in March 2010, the State of Arizona recognized the City of Glendale as a Community Action Agency so the City can now directly receive and handle Community Action funds. However, there was a requirement that a “tripartite governing board” be established by the City of Glendale. Additionally, the CDAC will be expanded by two members in order to be in compliance with state rules governing the Community Action Program (CAP). These two new members must represent a geographical area served by CAP.

Mr. Strunk introduced Ms. Lois Brooks, Ms. Erin O’Neil, and Ms. Elaine Adamczyk of the Community Housing Division, and Ms. Rebecca Daniel of the Community Action Program.

Mr. Strunk presented the new CDAC scope and mission as a result of the recent changes in the structure of the Committee.

- New Key Functions
 - Advise and counsel and the City in developing, implementing and evaluating CDBG Program
 - Advise and counsel the City regarding rules and regulations governing the City’s Community Housing Program
 - Advise and counsel the City in developing and implementing the City’s CAP and Community Needs Assessment
- CDAC Mission Before and After including New Tasks
 - A flowchart regarding the CDAC duties was presented to the Committee members.
 - Key changes in the scope and tasks of the CDAC mission, in addition to the current role of advisory of CDBG, HOME and ESG programs, includes the following:
 - Review and approve annual Community Housing Section 8 Administrative Management Plan.
 - Review and approve annual Public Housing Administrative Plan.
 - Review and approve any and all CAP reports, as required by Department of Economic Security (DES).

- Review and approve CAP Annual Community Needs Assessment.
 - Provide policy direction to the Community Revitalization Community Housing and CAP Staff as appropriate.
 - Function as a community resource to outside human/social service agencies seeking feedback and advice.
 - Conduct Public Hearings and Input Sessions on programmatic requirements as needed.
- New Enabling Ordinance and By-laws
 - The new Enabling Ordinance #2753 and By-laws were distributed to the Committee for review. Key By-laws include the following:
 - Establishment of a 13-member Tri-Partite Governing Board which includes one representative from Glendale Elementary School District, five representatives from low-income neighborhoods and seven representatives appointed by Mayor and Council.
 - Regular monthly meetings will be held (currently scheduled for the third Thursday of every month at 6:30 p.m.)
 - Amendments to By-laws must be approved by City Council
 - A quorum of the Committee is not less than seven members
- Meeting Calendar
 - A meeting calendar for 2011 was distributed.

Mr. Strunk explained that the new CDAC will collectively discuss and assist with a variety of social and human service programs in Glendale. Mr. Strunk commented that the various levels of experience and different walks of life represented on the CDAC will prove beneficial to the new scope of the Committee.

Committee-member Page inquired as to how the low-income representatives will be determined. Mr. Strunk introduced Ms. Cathy Gorham, who replied that there are already Committee-members from the Ocotillo District which is classified low-income. Furthermore, the zip code 85301 will be targeted as well as finding neighborhood leaders who would be willing to sit on CDAC. Ms. Gorham also recently sent a letter to the superintendent of the Glendale Elementary School District (GESD) requesting recommendations for a CDAC representative. Mr. Strunk stressed that it is a democratic selection process and is open and broad-based.

Chair Flippen wondered if the new representatives would join the Committee in February, after the CDBG grant process. Ms. Gorham replied in the positive.

Mr. Strunk thanked the Committee-members for their hard work and also for being willing to take on the new role and mission.

VI. Community Action Program

Ms. Rebecca Daniel, of the Community Action Program, provided an overview of the program, the clients served and services offered. Ms. Daniel stated that she was very excited to be contracting directly with DES instead of Maricopa County, who acted as a middleman with DES previously.

Ms. Daniel explained that CAP helps citizens become self-sufficient while they are experiencing a financial hardship or crisis in their lives. Funding is used for rent, mortgage and utility assistance mainly, but there may be other dire needs as well. CAP also serves as a Community Information Services provided and refers to DES, Glendale Community Housing and other service agencies. Ms. Daniel added that CAP also handles the telephone and utility low-income discount programs.

Ms. Daniel announced that the \$408,000 received by CAP from the HPRP (Homeless Prevention and Rapid Rehousing) programs was utilized in one year, instead of the expected two to three years which demonstrates how great the need for assistance is at this time. Ms. Daniel stated that CAP no longer serves mainly 85301, but it also receives many calls from up to zip code 85308.

Ms. Daniel distributed a CAP brochure to the Committee.

Chair Flippen requested more details regarding the Utility Discount Program. Ms. Daniel explained that this assistance comes directly from the state and families must be at 125% of the poverty level or have a specific qualifying medical need. The State sets aside funding for the programs and the utility companies provide a monetary match.

Ms. Daniel noted that CAP also handles the Low-Income Emergency Assistance Program which is state-funded as well. Ms. Daniel stated that of the \$805,000 received for this fiscal year, 40% has already been spent. Again, recipients must meet income requirements.

Chair Flippen wondered if the CAP office was the first call for low-income referrals. Ms. Daniel replied that is sometimes the case, however, other agencies such as Catholic Social Services, GESD, or Saint Vincent De Paul refer to CAP directly. CAP representatives network with 31 different agencies. If CAP cannot help a client directly, other agencies will be contacted and partnered with to assist the client.

Chair Flippen wondered how the CAP office communicates with clients. Ms. Daniel replied that communication is handled via phone calls and meetings. Clients typically meet with CAP representatives on a quarterly basis and at the very least twice a year.

Ms. Daniel complimented the hard working and dedicated team at the CAP office.

Ms. Gorham stated that the CAP office was hosting a holiday event tomorrow. Ms. Daniel explained that the CAP office applied for Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) discretionary funds and received a grant in the amount of \$15,500 to be used for holiday assistance for low-income residents. Ms. Daniel noted that \$5,500 is received each year from a Nina Pulliam grant, so this is quite a bit of extra money this year. Ms. Daniel explained that since October, 150 families who met CSBG federal guidelines were identified and invited to attend this Holiday Assistance Event. Each family will receive a \$10 Fry's gift card, backpacks including supplies will be distributed, bears and books will be distributed by Wings of Love, Glendale's Hope will provide a hot dog lunch and Santa will be on hand as well.

Chair Flippen thanked Ms. Daniel for the presentation and stated that the Committee is looking forward to working with the CAP Office going forward.

VII. Introduction to Community Housing

Ms. Elaine Adamczyk, Community Housing Division Administrator, provided an overview of the Division, including an explanation of Conventional Public Housing and Section 8 Housing.

Ms. Adamczyk presented a Glendale Community Housing Fact Sheet to the Committee. Key points include the following:

- Three conventional public housing rental communities with a total of 155 units are operated within the City of Glendale.
- 1,054 Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers are provided at this time.
- Client profiles for both programs combined are: 4,378 individuals with 2,145 children and 79% of residents are elderly, disabled or working.
- Through the creation of Section 8 "portability", Glendale Community Housing also administers over 450 Section 8 voucher families that moved into Glendale from other housing authority jurisdictions. Whereas, 35 families with Glendale vouchers have moved into other jurisdictions. The city that issues the original voucher continues to administer the voucher, no matter where the family moves.
- Glendale Community Housing assists over 1,600 families with rental assistance in the City of Glendale.
- Over 700 Glendale landlords receive rental income attributable to the Section 8 voucher program.
- Over \$7 million in rental income is paid annually to Glendale landlords on behalf of very low and low-income Glendale families.
- Housing quality standards inspections are done before a unit can be accepted as a Section 8 rental.
- An annual unit review on both the landlord and the family is performed. Issues must be resolved within a specific timeframe.

- The City is responsible for the maintenance, move-ins, evictions, housekeeping and unit inspections for the conventional public housing. Five inspections a year are performed.
- Every two years, HUD performs a physical property review for conventional public housing.
- The City of Glendale is a high-performer in both programs which means the City exceeds HUD standards. This can result in more HUD funds received and also frees the office from additional HUD monitoring.
- Participants in both programs receive a small utility subsidy.

Ms. Adamczyk stated that the Community Housing Office must prepare an Agency Plan Policy Update which needs to be reviewed annually. Ms. Adamczyk noted this plan is over 300 pages long and the completed document must be sent to HUD by April 17, 2011. Ms. Adamczyk explained that this year, staff would like to make a change to the Agency Plan Policy.

Ms. Adamczyk explained that the HUD program regulations allow for “local preferences” to address the needs of the jurisdiction. Glendale’s preferences are as follows:

- Residency (in Glendale)
- Working (in Glendale)
- Elderly/handicapped/disabled
- Active duty military personnel
- Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking
- Displaced homemakers
- Glendale residents displaced by government action or disaster
- Glendale residents who are high-risk homeless

Ms. Adamczyk announced that the office is seeking to request an approved change in the “local preferences.” Currently, Glendale residents who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking can apply for conventional public housing or Section 8 as long as the waiting list is open. They currently receive the same point value as a Glendale resident who is employed. The proposed change is to open the waiting list process at all times for Glendale residents who are victims of domestic violence and to give them an extra point to move them to the top of the waiting list. They must be referred by a local domestic violence support program. Ms. Adamczyk explained that the goal is to give victims of domestic violence more access to the program. Ms. Adamczyk stressed that this segment of the population is in great need of assistance and approximately 98% have children. Ms. Adamczyk explained that in Glendale, there are 16 emergency beds available for domestic violence victims with 64 transitional beds. Last year, 86 victims were turned away from domestic violence shelters due to lack of emergency space/beds.

Ms. Adamczyk stated that HUD is currently making a concentrated effort to implement the provisions of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

Glendale Housing has fully implemented the requirements of the Act, but a change to the local preferences will allow Community Housing to assist Glendale residents who are in need of affordable housing upon completion of a domestic violence support program. This does require HUD approval via inclusion in the Annual Action Plan.

Chair Flippen wondered if the domestic violence policy change will increase the demand for housing services. Chair Flippen also wondered if a study was done to determine what segment of the population will be affected by this change. Ms. Adamczyk said that in 2010, one person was accepted by public housing out of a domestic violence shelter which is very low compared to the amount of victims. Ms. Adamczyk stated that statistics on who is not applying for help is not known. Ms. Adamczyk also suggested that one possibility could be to set aside a certain number of vouchers for this preference as to not under serve the other segments of the population.

Mr. Strunk stressed that it was important to provide the client housing along with wrap-around services. In this manner, the client has a better success rate of remaining independent, finding employment and maintaining a house.

Ms. Adamczyk stated that the Committee will be involved in the Action Plan process and looked forward to working with the newly formed CDAC.

VIII. Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) III Update

Neighborhood Stabilization Program I:

Mr. Lopez explained that the original NSP was designed to address housing foreclosure issues and this program was first introduced in 2008 through the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA). Under this program, the City was awarded \$6.4 million in March 2009.

- Of these funds, \$3.3 million is being spent for the acquisition and rehabilitation of 29 foreclosed/abandoned homes in 85301 and 85308 (target areas required by HUD). Habitat for Humanity acquired 10 properties, Chicanos Por La Causa acquired 10 properties and Community Revitalization acquired 9 homes via partnership with Habitat.
- \$2.88 million is being allocated towards the total cost of two separate “senior-only” housing campuses to be constructed in partnership with Native American Connections (Laurie and 59th Avenue) and National Farmworkers’ Service Center (Montebello and 67th Avenue).

Neighborhood Stabilization Program II:

Mr. Lopez stated that NSP II allowed non-profit agencies to apply for the same type of grants as NSP I. Chicanos Por La Causa applied for NSP II and received some funding.

Neighborhood Stabilization Program III:

Mr. Lopez announced that the City of Glendale has been allocated \$3.7 million in new funds to assist in addressing foreclosed and abandoned properties. Mr. Lopez shared a PowerPoint presentation regarding NSP III. Highlights include the following:

- Basics of NSP III
 - Authorized in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act in 2010
 - \$970 million nationally (one-time allocation)
 - Continued assistance for the redevelopment of abandoned and foreclosed homes and residential properties.
- Glendale is receiving \$3,718,377.
- Guidelines for Use
 - Activities must be concentrated in areas of greatest need.
 - City must apply for funds by March 1, 2010.
 - Funds must be used on abandoned and foreclosed residential homes/properties.
 - 50% of the funds must be spent within two years of receipt.
 - All funds must be spent within three years.
 - Staff is working with Glendale Neighborhood Partnerships Office to partner on improving targeted neighborhoods as a whole.
- Beneficiaries/NSP III Income Limits
 - 100% must be used for households at or below 120% Area Median Income (AMI).
 - 25% must be used for households at or below 50% Area Median Income.
- Potential Uses:
 - Acquisition/rehabilitation program for homeownership
 - Rental housing (50% AMI requirements)
 - Lease-to-own as part of homebuyer program
 - Homebuyer down payment assistance program
 - Demolition of blighted structures
- Staff Recommendations
 - \$1,296,540 for the Foreclosed Property Acquisition and Rehabilitation Program to fund the purchase of vacant, in foreclosure/foreclosed homes, rehabilitate them or demolish/rebuild and resell them to qualified homebuyers earning at or below 120% of the AMI.
 - \$250,000 to demolish blighted structures in targeted areas.
 - \$1,800,000 for Multi-Housing Acquisition and Redevelopment to purchase underperforming foreclosed rental property, or foreclosed vacant property, benefiting citizens at or below 50% of AMI.
 - \$371,837 for project/program oversight to provide monitoring and administration with unused funding going into NSP III activity.
- What's Next?
 - Continue identification/collaboration with potential partners

- Complete targeting/mapping assessment (consider East Catlin Court, Orchard Glen and Heart of Glendale neighborhoods)
- Obtain citizen input
- Obtain Council approval
- Complete/Submit HUD application by 3/1/2010

Committee-member Johnston wondered how staff found the chosen properties for rehabilitation. Mr. Lopez replied that staff does not want to compete with investors for specific properties and instead is focusing on properties that the market is ignoring. Initially, staff was seeking properties and now that word has spread of the program, staff is receiving recommendations from various partners, city departments and real estate agents.

Committee-member Miller noted that NSP III funds must be spent within three years, but wondered if the profits from a property sale were subject to the same restriction. Mr. Lopez replied in the negative and stated that the beauty of the program is that profits can be used at anytime and for the City to possibly create a self-sustaining program in the future.

Chair Flippen requested that Agenda Item X be addressed prior to Agenda Item IX. No objections were made.

X. Request for a Conflict of Interest Exception from HUD

Mr. Lopez explained that a staff member is applying for federal funds for a roof repair due to the recent hail storms. Mr. Lopez commented that a Conflict of Interested Exception Request must be filed with HUD. Mr. Lopez added that that this staff member is receiving no special treatment and the application will be processed in the same manner as the general public.

Committee-member Miller motioned to approve the request to HUD for a Conflict of Interest Exception for a staff member as explained by Mr. Lopez. Committee-member Hernandez made the second. Motion carried 5 – 0.

IX. Review of CDBG Council Funding Priorities for FY 2011-2012

Mr. Strunk played footage of the September 21, 2010 Council meeting that Ms. Gorham, Mr. Lopez and Chair Flippen attended.

The footage included information from Council regarding its CDBG funding for the upcoming fiscal year. Specific priorities include the following: keeping people in their homes, keeping neighborhoods stabilized, providing emergency home repairs, assistance with core needs such as food, utilities and shelter.

Chair Flippen stated that it was very beneficial to attend the Council meeting and that CDAC will utilize the Council priorities when reviewing CDBG grant applications.

XI. Adjournment

Committee-member Miller motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m. Committee-member Johnston made the second. Motion carried 5 – 0.

Respectfully Submitted,
Denise Kazmierczak