HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND COMMITTEE (UDAG)

Tuesday, April 26, 2022 3:00pm to 4:30m Meeting was held solely via Zoom

| Members Present: | Members Absent: | City Staff: |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Armijo, Frances (Chair) | Colonel, Gwen | Delgado, Omega |
| Lopez, Jesse | Plaza, Andrea | Herrera, Jessica |
| Lopez, Margaret | Vigil, Deacon Robert | Krantz, Yolanda |
| Nelson, Robert | | Lujan, Anna Marie |
| Nordhaus, Richard | | Montoya, Monica |
| Sanchez, Pat | | Padrino, Patricia |
| Senye, Kelle | | Webb, Cecilia |
| | HR&A Staff: | Guests: |
| | | Dorn-Jones, Diana |
| | | Naranjo Lopez, Loretta |

Quorum for meeting was met.

I. <u>Call to order</u>

Meeting was called to order at 3:02 PM.

II. <u>Welcome and Introductions</u>

III. <u>Changes/Additions to the Agenda</u> There were no changes to the meeting agenda.

IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes

A review of the Minutes from the February 22, 2022 found that corrections on number xiv and xvi is needed before approval can be made.

V. <u>Committee Business</u>

a. Review and Discussion of the HNEDF Ten-Year Draft Plan

i. City staff stated a lot of the comments received from the committee and community members have been about having more member representation on the Ad Hoc committee. Based on

comments received the City has increased the amount of HNEDF members on the Ad Hoc committee to one third.

- ii. Frances stated she would like at least two HNEDF committee members at each Ad Hoc committee to be present.
- iii. Robert stated he supports the one third member representation.
- iv. Frances stated she would like to see an adequate representation from committee members added to the Ad Hoc Committee.
- v. City staff requested today's meeting agenda be posted on-line, however it was not. Voting during this meeting cannot take place because the agenda was not posted.
- vi. Comment period ends April 28th, City staff will take all comments received into consideration when updating the plan.
- vii. City Staff presented the next item change of when the City determines another City Department has the capacity to carry out a project utilizing HNEDF funds. This section has been changed to, If a project could be carried out by the City, the city department must submit a written proposal to include a budget, narrative and outcomes. A subcommittee comprised of two HNEDF committee members and two staff members will review the proposal to evaluate the proposal is in alignment with the plan and meets the threshold criteria. The subcommittee will then make recommendation to fund or not fund the proposal.
- viii. Margaret mentioned that at previous meeting there have been concerns from the community that the City would receive preference for projects over nonprofits.
- ix. Richard stated there is an issue with the structure of the review process. He would like to see a full committee have an active and full role to review and recommend projects. City stated that they would bring the proposed project to the full committee, the committee would then develop an Ad Hoc committee to look at the proposal in depth.
- x. Richard again stated it would be important the committee have an active and full roll to recommend projects. City staff clarified that this process comes after the committees input and recommendations have been made on the project and that this is part of the City's RFP process. Richard suggested a revision of wording for this information to be more explicit.
- xi. Margaret is concerned that this is pulling funding from the community. Margaret states what was heard from public comment is that this pulls the ownership of the funds towards the City verses leaving the ownership more towards the community where it seems the intended use should be. Margaret doesn't see a language protection to protect the funding and would like the verbiage to the plan changed. City staff stated it would need to discuss any changes to the language of the plan with the City.
- xii. Robert states that the full committee should review before it would go into any selection committee and that this be made explicit in the wording. Margaret agrees with Robert. Margaret feels that when an RFP or quote/solicitation from the City is out, the community should be the first to be considered for the use of the funds. If there is no response from the community then the City can be considered.
- xiii. After all public comments are made city staff will review comments and revisions made. After final revisions are made the plan will need recommendation by the committee. Once the recommendation has been approved the plan will be sent to City Council for review and approval.
- xiv. Next meeting date has been rescheduled to May 24th at 3:00 PM

VI. Announcements

No announcements

VII. <u>Public Comments</u>

- i. Loretta Naranjo Lopez stated she would like to RFP Ad Hoc committee to be 50% representation of the neighborhood, would like the language "a Department/Division with the City has the capacity to successfully carry out an identified project and it goes all the way to submit an RFP proposal" completely taken out. Would like the number one goal of rehabilitation to be a priority throughout the neighborhood, specifically for the elderly. Wants more partnership between the neighborhood and developer. The City should not have any project that is not approved by the neighborhood.
- ii. Diana Dorn-Jones stated she would like to see how the voting takes place in writing. Would like capacity building, commercial corridors, façade improvements and economic development in the neighborhood. Would like to see preference in scoring for neighborhood driven projects.
- Omega Delgado stated the HNEDF committee might benefit from having a community advisory committee where they would have the opportunity to review projects and provide recommendation to the HNEDF committee, this would help keep the communities involved. If a City department has a project that doesn't meet threshold requirements for an RFP could they include an opportunity for a nonprofit, community or a city department to pitch the project prior to an RFP or it being decided on by the HNEDF committee. This would keep community in the loop. A scoring matrix for projects could be a helpful tool to rank projects.
- ii. A scoring matrix for projects could be a helpful tool to rank projects.
- iii. Richard would like a priority ranking system which is mandated and thinks something that the City, staff and committee need to develop criteria for.
- iv. Frances stated that it is important to be careful about which projects are funded and that the funded projects are benefitting and in the best interest of the neighborhoods.

VIII. Summary of Decisions and Assignments

City staff will wait until the end of the comment period then discuss and make changes to the plan. Next meeting has been changed from May 31st to May 24th. Staff will ensure the next meeting's agenda is posted. Staff will send out an updated redlined draft prior to meeting for review. Next meeting will be May 24th. Once the recommended approval is received, staff will begin the internal process for routing legislation.

IX. Adjournment

With there being no further business meeting was adjourned at 4:27PM

Next Meeting Date: May 24, 2022 at 3:00pm

| | CocuSigned by: |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| | Frances Armito |
| Chairperson's Signature: | J |
| Prepared by: Jessica Herrera | |
| Frepareu Dy: Jessica Hello | |