

Community Development Citizen Advisory Committee (CDCAC) Meeting
 June 5, 2019
 2100 Clarendon Blvd – Room 311

Members Present: Tim Denning, Ken Robinson, Rosemary Leffler, Steven Gallagher, Michael Sampson, Maryclare Whitehead, Larry Withers, Lara Malakoff

Staff Present: Caitlin Jones

The meeting was called to order at 6:34pm.

1. Approval of May 1, 2019 Minutes

The May 1, 2019 minutes were approved by CDCAC unanimously.

2. Summary of FY 2020 Action Plan Changes

County staff reviewed the proposed changes to the FY 2020 Annual HUD Action Plan, based on what was presented to CDCAC and the County Board for approval in April 2019. Because the Federal appropriations process typically lags the County’s budget process, County staff must often make program recommendations based on project funding levels. Staff received its final HUD allocations after the County Board approved its budget in April 2019 and then summarized proposed changes for CDCAC. These below changes were presented to CDCAC and will be included in the Final Action Plan that is approved by the County Board at the September 2019 meeting.

FY 2020 Top-Line Budget Adjustments

CDBG	Estimate	Actual
Public Service Grants	\$247,366	\$304,366
Other Non-Public Service Grants	\$210,000	\$210,000
CDBG Admin & Planning	\$336,243	\$332,715
Multifamily Loan Fund	\$511,920	\$441,152
Falls Church	\$57,791	\$57,025
Total CDBG	\$1,363,320	\$1,345,258
HOME		
Multifamily Loan Fund	\$619,751	\$576,916
HOME Admin & Planning	\$110,222	\$105,227
Falls Church	\$32,242	\$30,129
Total HOME	\$762,215	\$712,272

Other than recommendations related to how the changes were presented, CDCAC members endorsed the proposed budget adjustments.

3. FY 2021 Community Development Fund Notice of Funding Availability Draft and Evaluation Criteria

Staff and CDCAC members walked through the FY 2021 Notice of Funding Availability. CDCAC members made recommendations regarding language used throughout the document, including the following changes:

- 1) Question 11: The subtext of question 11 from the Narratives section was reframed to encourage applications to provide details about how the program will work towards economic self-sufficiency.
- 2) Question 12: CDCAC members approved addition of a question asking applicants to describe precisely what the additional funds will be used for, if requesting additional funds over the previous year.

In addition to approving the above substantive changes to the FY 2021 NOFA, CDCAC asked staff to research the rules for what can be reported as in-kind contributions in program budgets, so that CDCAC can make recommendations related to this for the FY 2022 NOFA.

In addition to a conversation about the FY 2021 NOFA and Narratives, staff and CDCAC also discussed the scoring distribution of CDCAC member scores from the previous funding cycle.

Some general observations included:

- All scores generally skew higher (70-100-point range) as opposed to having larger range of scores (0-100), and there could be several reasons for this. First, there is the potential that the criteria is clear enough to applicants, so they know how to write applications, making it unlikely to receive a lower score.
- The scores for every question generally skew to the higher end of the grading scale, which could mean that each criterion is important and there is enough differentiation among the criteria. In addition, the scoring criteria is explained in a clear enough way that reviewers can differentiate.

In order to potentially provide a little more variation and differentiation between applications, staff encouraged CDCAC members to do the following:

- Use the full range of points to further differentiate between applications.
- Revisit scores often and ensure they are comfortable with scores

CDCAC members provided other suggestions regarding future scoring conversations.

- Ken Robinson recommending including an evaluation criterion that measures degree of difficulty in program execution.
- Ken Robinson recommended including an evaluation criterion that measures sustaining value of the program (i.e. whether there is goodwill from the community regarding the program).
- ~~Steven Gallagher recommended restructuring the scoring criteria entirely to provide fewer gradations in each category to provide a little more consistency among scores by individual reviewers. He questioned whether consistency was possible when selecting, for example, between a score of 6 or 7 or 8 in multiple categories in over 30 proposals over several weeks. Perhaps a system of below average, average, and above average with associated scores would lead to more consistency. Similarly, thought should be given to the relative weights of the categories.~~ Steven Gallagher recommended restructuring the scoring criteria entirely to provide a single score for each application at some point, to provide a little more consistency amongst the variation between scores.

Tim Denning suggested that CDCAC take a deeper look at the evaluation criteria in January.

4. CDCAC Charter Revisions

Tim Denning reported that Matt de Ferranti, CDCAC's new County Board liaison asked the Committee to take another look at the Charter before it is approved.

The newest version of the Charter includes additional language to further define the purpose of CDCAC and to highlight the language around liaising with the community, stakeholders, and other entities on issues that impact community development needs. CDCAC approved these changes.

CDCAC also asked staff to research when a quorum must be present and to better define that in the Charter. Finally, CDCAC requested training on Virginia Open Meeting compliance requirements.

5. Chair Report

Tim Denning met with Housing Commission and Tenant-Landlord Commission chairs recently to discuss policy discussions that are being proposed that would impact source of income discrimination. Tim Denning also made a motion to cancel the July and August meetings, which was approved unanimously by CDCAC.

6. Staff Reports

Nothing to report.

7. Member Reports

Ken Robinson reported that Ft. Myer Heights will be hosting its annual meeting on June 11 at 7pm and invited the rest of the Committee members to participate

The meeting adjourned at 7:52pm.