City of Worcester, Massachusetts

Edward M. Augustus, Jr.
City Manager

Michael E. Traynor, Esq.
Chief Development Officer
Executive Office of Economic Development

Gregory J. Baker
Director
Neighborhood Development Division

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
01/18/2017
City Hall, Levi Lincoln Chamber
455 Main Street
Worcester, MA
6:00pm

MEETING MINUTES

CDAC present: Edward Moynihan (Chair), Paula Stuart (Vice-Chair), Doug Arbetter, Nicola D'Andrea, Martha Assefa, Dana Strong, Daniel Whalen

CDAC absent: Matthew Yalouris

City Staff: Greg Baker, Steve Hill, Anthony Miloski

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Ed Moynihan at 6:02pm. The chairman reminded members that all CDAC meetings would henceforth be "streamed live" on the City's government cable channel.

He stated that it was crucial that all CDAC meetings continue to be administered in conformance with the rules that govern open meetings.

He had copies of Disclosure Conflict of Interest forms available for those CDAC members who have conflicts of interest with regard to agency proposals to be reviewed.

2) Review and Approval of 12/14/2016 CDAC Minutes

There were no changes suggested to the 12/14/2016 CDAC meeting minutes, and a motion was seconded and passed to vote their approval. The CDAC voted 6-0 for their approval.

3) Review and Discussion of City FY18 / Yr. 43 CDBG RFPs for Public Services

- **Applicant organizations starting with the letter "A" thru "F" only**

The following 10 RFP applications were reviewed and discussed by the CDAC members:

African Community Education (ACE) – After School Program
Centro Las Americas – Case Management
Centro Las Americas – Emergency Food Pantry
City of Worcester Elder Affairs – Healthy Aging Club 60+
The Community Builders - Future Leaders of Worcester (FLOW)*
Dismas House – Bar None
Family Health Center of Worcester – Emergency Dental Services
Friendly House – Case Management
Friendly House – Youth Services
Friendly House – Quinsigamond Village Services

*Chairman Ed Moynihan recused himself during the CDAC review and discussion of The Community Builders – Future Leaders of Worcester (FLOW) proposal.

CDAC members noted that many of the proposals were renewals of programs currently being funded through CDBG such as through African Community Education (ACE), Centro Las Americas, Family Health Center, and Friendly House, and as such garnered less discussion given that they had already been extensively reviewed and discussed during last year's process.

There was more discussion among CDAC with regard to first-time program applicants. After some CDAC questioning about whether the City of Worcester Elder Affairs proposal was seeking CDBG funds for a pre-existing program, it was reported that during their presentation on 01/11/17, the applicant presenter had stated their proposal would be an expansion of an existing program. There were some questions with regard to the number of people to be served through the CDBG funded proposal relative to the overall number that the Senior Center serves. There was some discussion among members with regard to the fact that in absence of evidence to the contrary, elderly persons were categorically presumed by HUD to be eligible for CDBG funded services based on the CDBG National Objective criteria.

There were some questions from a member as to why the Community Builders (TCB) was seeking CDBG funds for a CDBG funded Public Service whereas in prior years they had sought CDBG Public Facilities funds. While it was noted that it was common for large housing project management entities such as TCB to also administer human services programs that benefit their resident populations, there was concerns among some CDAC members that there was a continuing trend among large organizations to directly administer their own service programs, thus limiting the funds that might be available for smaller community-based organizations to provide such services. A member further added that this trend was also exemplified by the City of Worcester's recent CDBG proposals to directly

administer public services such as the above Elder Affairs proposal and last year's After School Youth program. It was requested of staff to ask if the TCB proposal had prior been implemented by TCB itself, or through a sub-contractor.

Eligibility concerns arose regarding TCB's proposal to use CDBG to pay direct client stipends. On one hand, it was noted there was some uncertainty of eligibility regarding the use of CDBG to pay direct client stipends, and that it had negatively impacted the review of similar CDBG funding proposals in the past. On the other hand, some CDAC members were interested to know if analysis of program data by TCB suggests actual programmatic outcome benefits to the use of stipends. It was requested of staff to seek clarity from the applicant with regard to the amount of CDBG funds proposed to be used for stipends as part of the program.

CDAC members looked more favorably upon this year's Public Service proposal from Dismas House as compared to that submitted last year. It was stated that a weakness in last year's proposal was the perception that CDBG was to help replace funding received from agency fundraising in the hopes of freeing up staff capacity to pursue other objectives.

In response to CDAC questions regarding the funding of two case management programs from Friendly House, it was explained by City staff that in addition to direct operation of their own case management program, Friendly House serves as a fiscal conduit for the case management program operated by the Quinsigamond Village Community Center.

There was some discussion among CDAC members and city staff with regard to improving the impact of CDBG case management programs stemming from member concerns that as a result of past requests by City staff to have tangible client outcomes associated with "case management", food distribution was absorbing a disproportionate share of case management program outcomes.

City staff also mentioned that CDBG subrecipients are required to increase the number of clients that they serve if they expect to receive the same or increased CDBG funding.

Next Steps:
Following conclusion of the review and discussion of the above RFP applications, discussion among the CDAC and City Staff turned to next steps. It was agreed that the remaining scheduled CDAC meetings would start at 6 PM in order to ease the after work transportation concerns of some members. The following schedule was agreed upon:

- CDAC Meeting, Wednesday, January 25, 2017 – Review the remaining public services RFPs
- CDAC Meeting, Wednesday, February 1,2017 – Review public facilities and inter-departmental RFPs
- CDAC RFP Scores due to the CDAC Recorder by Friday, February 3, 2017
- CDAC Meeting, Wednesday, February 8, 2017 – Review of CDAC scoring of RFPs and discussion of content of draft letter to the City Manager from CDAC

Chairperson with regard to this year's CDAC RFP review process and recommendations.

4) Adjournment

As there were no more items for discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 6:58pm.