

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

May 14, 2024 – 5:30 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting

I. COMMISSION PRE-MEETING (Agenda discussion(s))

Beginning: 4:30 PM

Location: NDS Conference Room

Members Present: Chairman Mitchell, Commissioner Solla-Yates, Commissioner d’Oronzio, Commissioner Schwarz, Commissioner Joy, Commissioner Roettger, Commissioner Stolzenberg

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Missy Creasy, Sam Sanders, Alex Ikefuna

Chair Mitchell called the meeting to order. Commissioners d’Oronzio, Joy and Schwarz provided grammar/spelling updates to the minutes on the consent agenda. It was noted which commissioners would consider making the motion on the consent agenda in the meeting. Commissioner Schwarz asked if there was clarity that the projects recommended in the CDBG/HOME budget for partial funding would be able to move forward with some of their project. Commissioner d’Oronzio, who is on that Task Force, noted that applicants had to provide information that would answer that question. There was discussion about why this item comes to the Planning Commission. It was noted that that is part of the citizen participation plan, and the applications ask how the project would implement the comprehensive plan. Commissioner Roettger noted there was limited information to review so there was not much for them to go on. It was noted that staff will detail during the presentation.

II. COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING – Meeting called to order by Chairman Mitchell at 5:30 PM

Beginning: 5:30 PM

Location: City Hall Chambers

A. COMMISSIONER’S REPORT

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We had our MPO Tech meeting. The long-range transportation plan is complete. It is out for public comment. There is a public hearing coming up. We are reviewing the draft and giving the ‘go ahead.’ We had a LUPEC meeting where we learned about the Birdwood genealogy project. I attended a UVA land use class to talk about our Comprehensive Plan and Rezoning process.

Commissioner Schwarz – For April’s BAR meeting, we had the First United Methodist Church come back and modify their solar panel application. They want to use a metal roof instead of asphalt shingles under the solar panels. It was a better solution in the end. We had a preliminary discussion about 218 West Market Street, which is the Artful Lodger site for a future hotel. Overall, the BAR was supportive of what was shown. It was basic massing. It is no longer bound by the SUP. It is a by right project now. They are throwing out the old SUP. One of the conditions that was put on it was a pedestrian cut-through for the site. That will not be part of the project. The BAR did not feel that they had the authority to require that. It will be like the Omni. You can walk through the hotel in a semi-public manner. There is going to be a public connection. It won’t be a physical, outside connection.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – I sat in a few student presentations on aging in place and how accessory dwelling units, if they are fronting the street, they provide a base for people to be more involved in their community. Accessory dwelling units are typically hidden in the back for aesthetic reasons. That is conflicting with those

goals. Another presentation was a detailed analysis of our accessory dwelling unit ordinance and the way we are treating it. They were concerned about a detailed issue about how certain buildings, because they are small, they do not allow an accessory structure nearby of a big enough size to be habitable. It is a substantial number of parcels in the city because we have so many small homes. He was recommending a tweak on that.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – The TJPDC met at the beginning of the month. The major piece on the agenda was the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Plan. It was very detailed. There seems to have been a lot of process measuring relative to the product in some ways. It was a detailed analysis. The interesting thing about this is that it is moving towards this super-regionalism idea where we are joint with District 9, which is north of us. It encompasses Culpeper and how the corridor between the 2 of them is going to be the next big thing in some respects. One of the major industries that they put out was Defense and ancillary employment that comes from that. There is a lot of interesting work on the region that isn’t that regional. The HAC is wrapping up its recommendations for the land bank tomorrow. The Community Development Block Grant Task Force made its recommendations.

Commissioner Roettger – I attended the Tree Commission meeting. I was at a sub-committee for the Tree Commission today. They are amazingly energetic. I learned a lot. I have joined the sub-committee on codes. I can look at the new zoning. It is something to do with codes and looking at state and city codes and where there is wiggle room in promoting trees.

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

Commissioner Joy – I have a few UVA project updates that I would like to report on. The first one is second year housing. On April 25th, the University posted an RFP requesting statement of qualifications from development teams for a potential partnership for second year housing. UVA is committed to helping address the housing challenges the community is facing. This development proposes 2000 beds in apartment style units along with associated food service venues at 2 potential sites. The first is at the eastern side of the intersection of Emmet Street and Massie Road. It extends down towards the Lambeth Housing Community. The second one is at the juncture of Emmet Street and Ivy Road. It is part of the 14-acre Emmet-Ivy Redevelopment Site. The proposed site sits at the westernmost parcels closest to Copley Road. These potential sites have been reviewed with the adjacent neighborhood associations from Lewis Mountain, University Circle, and Venable Community. The deadline for the interested parties to submit is May 22nd. A short list of qualified teams will be released on June 12th. At that point, I can come back and report. If anybody is interested in additional details of the RFP, it can be found on the UVA’s facilities maintenance website. The Master Plan sets out massing and heights that are like the Virginia Guest House. The Buildings and Grounds Committee meeting is between this meeting and the next Planning Commission meeting. I will give you a glimpse of what is coming up on the agenda. The first is the Center for the Arts. The B&G will consider the proposed site for this project, which is the easternmost part of the Emmet-Ivy Corridor. This would bookend the eastern side of Emmet. This project will include the following public amenities: performing arts center, musical performance bases, and a fine art museum. The design is in the early stages. There will be ongoing funding efforts, both with the Commonwealth and philanthropic donors. The North Grounds Parking Garage project is going to the Buildings & Grounds Committee for preliminary design review. This is a 1000-parkingspace structured parking deck. It is going to be located at the northwest corner of Massie Road and Copley. This is near John Paul Jones Arena and opposite Palmer Park. It will be adjacent to all the athletic fields and JPJ Arena. This site was selected after years of planning and analysis. The idea is that these parking spaces will allow us to move away from the old surface lots that were associated with University Hall. We can transition to more pedestrian and bike friendly environments. A portion of this new athletics promenade is nearing completion. The idea is that at this time next year the whole promenade will open up. If you are going to an event at Klockner or Davenport, you will no longer have to walk across parking lots. There will be dedicated pedestrian pathways for those destinations. The structure for the North Ground Parking Garage is purposely set back. In front of it, it provides commuter

amenities such as bike storage, e-bike docking, connection to the UTS bus system. These spaces will do double-duty during the football season to help with tailgating and allow mass transit connections to Scott Stadium. To enable this construction, a portion of the 1960s Copley Hill (garden style apartments) will be demolished to make way for this new garage. The housing effort that I mentioned earlier is meant in the large-scale planning to accommodate the loss of these beds but will supplement them with more beds in the style that is wanted by our students. This project has also been presented to the Lewis Mountain neighborhood. The last project is the update on Fontaine. With the garage and Manning Institute of Biotechnology, construction is underway. At this point, we are in a highly disruptive excavation phase. This is projected to last through July. This puts a temporary limit to the amount of available surface parking in this area. The University has asked visitors to contact their providers for more detailed instructions on how best to arrive for appointments during the next 2 months. Once excavation is complete, parking constraints should ease up. The garage structure will be completed in the fall of 2025. That will bring over 2500 spaces online. The University has convened townhalls with the Fontaine community and adjoining neighborhoods to keep effected parties in the loop as the construction progresses. It will have similar commuter amenities as the North Grounds garage.

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

Chairman Mitchell – Parks & Rec are always busy. There are 3 things that you guys might want to be aware of. We got a presentation from Cultivate Charlottesville. One of their taglines in their presentation is that Charlottesville is known as a ‘foodie community.’ It is their objective to make Charlottesville a food equity community. That is a key part of Chapter 7 in our Comprehensive Plan. The way they want to get to food equity in our community is through urban agricultural programs. The first one that they are looking at is hoping that one will be in Washington Park. I sent you guys that presentation. I got a presentation regarding the youth and adult programs. Between last winter and today, we have put on 110 classes and 753 people have participated in that. With the Master Plan Process, we are beginning to start the analysis of the feedback we have received from you guys and going through all the data. The objective is to get this approved by Council in January 2025.

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

Missy Creasy, NDS Deputy Director – Since the end of March, we have had 15 pre-application meetings with people who are interested in working within our new ordinance. That is just the formal ones. There have been multiple informal discussions that are occurring. We are learning more about the hurdles that remain to move forward with different things. We are learning a lot about what people are putting together for this. We have our first 2 or 3 development plans in. We are hopeful that we will start to see activity. There was a lot of concern that there would be an overrun of activity with this new code. It has followed the path that we anticipated. People would start to learn about it. People would start to see how it might work for them. It would be an incremental change. That is what we are seeing. A lot of our efforts now are still working on the many projects that are under the old code and working to get them to fruition. We have had ground broken on the Belmont Condos property this past week. We are expecting some other projects to get going soon. There is not much coming forward to you all. Commissioner Schwarz provided several items that there was interest from the community in getting some updates on. I have some summary information. I will provide that. Some of these are things that people listening might be interested in. One item is the dockless mobility. That is the scooters and bikes that are around our community that people can rent to get from one destination to another. There has been concern because not all users have been putting vehicles in the proper place when they finish their rides. Our transportation staff has been working together with the company and riders. There is a provision in the contract for fines for vehicles that are placed in the wrong locations. That had not been previously enforced. They wanted to make sure there was an opportunity to do as much as we could before it got to that point. At this point, the riders and company have been on notice for some time. As of June 1st, they are going to begin charging the fines. The fines that get charged work it through the company and some of the funds go back into the program itself. It will be advantageous to have less vehicles put in the wrong location. The company is fined

and pass it onto the user. Usually, the misplacement occurs in the evening. The next morning, it makes it difficult for people who are traveling in those pedestrian areas. The hope is to be able to get that in compliance earlier so that people aren't having that conflict when they are commuting in. Power poles have been another concern. I am sure that people in the community have seen a circumstance where the power pole has a wire on it. As the utilities move to the new pole, the old pole is supposed to be removed. There are a lot of circumstances where that has not been happening. We have had a team with Public Works that has met with Dominion to work through this process and to understand the process that Dominion has for this. It is also an opportunity to work in collaboration. There have been some updates to the ADA requirements, which will require everyone to make sure there is proper spacing for people to move through on sidewalks. We reached out because we want to work in partnership with Dominion to create a better situation for this. Those conversations have started. There are a lot of people on our side who are passionate about trying to get this resolved. Another item had to do with street lighting. Dominion is changing street lighting throughout the whole service area. There is a process of how that is being done. I can give details of what I have from our contacts. The city has somebody in the role of energy management coordinator in the office of sustainability. They have been working with Dominion to understand how this process works. They are doing it on a schedule. They will be able to provide some information about when they are going to do certain things. They were able to provide some information about the type of lighting that they can provide. That will be something coming to the community soon. It has been coming haphazard as something is broken and needs repair. This is going to be a larger effort. We had another question concerning looking at the Standards & Design Manual for updating. Our engineering staff is short-handed right now. They are in the recruitment process for that department. Once we get a few more people onboard, that will be a higher priority.

E. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA

Tyler Miller (1500 Green) – I wanted to reiterate how important the utility pole issue is and how little clarity we have on it. There is no sense of a timeline or when the public can expect changes, particularly for ADA. That is a big part of the problem. We are missing a real opportunity to work with Dominion to promote undergrounding where it makes sense and promote route efficiency where it makes sense. I have a utility pole on every corner of my lot. I can't drive any vehicle of any size on my lot because of the utility lines. Access of all kinds is limited by the way they have laid out the infrastructure. I was speaking to someone who made a FOIA request on the franchise agreement. I don't know how out of date that is. In that agreement with Dominion, there was a fee that was supposed to be assessed per utility pole. I don't think the city has been taking up that fee for some time. Anything you can do to help the urban canopy in town would be greatly appreciated.

Dan Miller (1107 Avon) – I want to throw 'my weight' behind the undergrounding issue. I just returned from Alexandria. It is nice to walk around some of those neighborhoods. I have a couple mature sycamores in my yard. One of them is getting more and more sent to the side by Dominion. Given the generous dividend that I receive as a shareholder of Dominion, it is interesting that it is put out there as financially impossible for this corporation to do some undergrounding in town. If you are paying a dividend, you are saying we have done enough investment in the infrastructure. We see the most efficient thing to return shareholder value is to give money back. I don't think that is true in this town. I think that relationship can be thought of in a different way. As I understand it, they should be operating in our interest.

Frankie Allen (1500 Green) – I am here emphasizing the importance of powerlines in terms of accessibility and walkability of our city. I care a lot about making our city one that facilitates and empowers people to walk and be a part of our neighborhoods. The powerlines limit egress but also prohibiting things like shade trees on our major roads are the places people want to commute.

F. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Minutes – April 11, 2023 – Regular Meeting
2. Minutes – April 14, 2024 – Regular Meeting

Motion to Approve – Commissioner d’Oronzio – Corrections by Commissioners Joy and d’Oronzio on the approved minutes – Motion passes 6-0.

III. PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARINGS

Beginning: 6:00 PM

Continuing: Until all public hearings are complete

Format: (i) Staff Report, (ii) Applicant, (iii) Hearing, (iv) Discussion and Motion

1. **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) Funding** – Draft Program Year 2024-25 Annual Action Plan for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Programs. The Planning Commission will be considering projects to be undertaken as part of the proposed PY2024 -25 Annual Action Plan for the CDBG and HOME programs. Staff from the Office of Community Solutions (OCS) and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) will be presenting funding recommendations for activities designed to address a wide range of community development goals, including economic and workforce development, public service projects that benefit low- and moderate-income citizens, improvements to public facilities and infrastructure, and fair and affordable housing. The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has not yet informed the City of funding to be made available for these programs but based on program year 2023-24 funding, the City anticipates approximately \$410,000 in HUD funds for CDBG and approximately \$98,000 for HOME. A 30-day period for public comment will commence on May 1, 2024, and run through June 1, 2024. The draft Annual Action Plan is also scheduled to be presented at public hearings before City Council on Monday, May 20, 2024, and Monday, June 3, 2024. Members of the public can provide written comment on the proposed PY24-25 Annual Action Plan in writing to: CDBG/HOME Taskforce, City of Charlottesville City Hall, P.O. Box 911, Charlottesville, Virginia 22902. Report prepared by Anthony Warn at warna@charlottesville.gov

i. Staff Report

Anthony Warn, City Staff – I am here to talk to you about the work of the CDBG and HOME Task Force and to present the funding recommendations that the Task Force has come up with and allow you to consider them. The city participates in 2 programs funded through the US Department of Housing and Urban Development through their office of Community and Planning Development. You might hear them as CPD Programs. The first is the Community Development Block Grant Program, which is entitlement funding that comes through HUD to the city to use for a variety of purposes around impacting our community positively. The other program is the Home Investments Program. That is to support housing opportunities. Both programs, because they are community and planning programs, benefit the members of the community who HUD refers to as low and moderate income, which is typically under 80 percent of the median family income or the median income of the regional metropolitan area. The city has taken it on to commit to bringing those impacts as far down the income scale as we can; typically, 50 percent or below the median income of the area. Those numbers are set by HUD based on their national analysis. They are available on HUD’s website. They are presented in a format that is not reader friendly. I have done this for 2 planning cycles. I have converted it to a different format that I find easier to understand. With the Community Development Block Grant, the city is an entitlement community. We received those funds for use as the elected officials see fit according to specific HUD guidelines. The Home Program is a larger area. To qualify, the city doesn’t qualify on its own. Around 2001, the city entered a consortium partnership with 5 surrounding counties (Albemarle, Fluvanna, Louisa, Greene, and Nelson). With the Home Program, the money comes in, gets passed through to the Thomas Jefferson Planning District

Commission, which manages that program. The city is the financial agent for those programs. There are some programmatic takeouts. The bulk of the share is divided equally among the counties. It is divided up 6 ways. They refer to it as your pie-share. We get to control how we can impact the community. There is a special set aside that is a bigger piece of the pie that is rotated annually among the different counties for community housing development organizations. We were the recipients last year. The Task Force is entirely volunteer. They come together and review all the requests for funding. They try to figure out where that money can make the maximum impact. We are not talking about huge pots of money on the HOME side. Our HOME share is always under \$100,000. It does not go far. That money is used as gap funding for projects that are already in operation. On the Community Development Block Grant side, there are some major categories of activities that we invest in. We can work with public facilities and infrastructure programs, economic development programs, public services programs, and housing opportunities through the CDBG fund often in support of the investment made through the HOME program as well. With the applications that are received, most of the applications come in for these public service programs. HUD has capped the money that you are allowed to invest in those programs every year at 15 percent of the overall allocation. We follow it. A lot of the applications come in and are competing for smaller pieces of the pie. When it comes to making the funding decisions, I am not involved in those. My role is to facilitate the Task Force and provide the information. The Task Force must make the difficult decisions. The consensus from the Task Force is that they would love to fund all applications at 100 percent. That is not possible. That often leads to having to make difficult choices. In some cases, programs may not be recommended for funding. It is not an indication that the application wasn't strong. It is trying to figure out how we can maximize the number of people that can benefit from this limited pot of money. Sometimes, there will be a program where if they don't get full funding, they may not be able to bring it to fruition. The Task Force might back away from that one, put it on the back burner, and see if they can come back to it after they fund these other programs. Both programs were never meant to be permanent funding sources for different programs. There is nothing to stop a locality from funding the same programs every year. It is not recommended because they are trying to build up strength throughout the community.

The funding recommendations from HUD usually come through in January or February. They came through about 1.5 weeks ago. HUD's pool of money to reward out to states and localities is determined by Congress. Nobody knows why it took so long. It has caused a lot of problems for people across the country. It made the work of the Task Force harder. The CDBG program saw a nominal increase in funding this year a little over 6 percent. The Home consortium funds were cut by close to 20 percent. Those are formula grants. There is no judgment for any different localities across the board. The cut to the 6-member Home Consortium was \$134,175 this round. I know if people are interested in increasing the amount of money, they should contact their congressional representatives, state representatives. You have a summary of the funding recommendations. A lot of the work of the Task Force in evaluating the current applications was somewhat theoretical. We didn't have real numbers to work with. We took the numbers from last year and used those numbers. We broke up the 'pie' among the applicants. I presented the funding recommendations differently this year. We gave the funding recommendation numbers. We also gave the percent that was requested. What you will notice when you look at the funding recommendations, in some cases, they are over 100 percent of what they asked for, especially on the HOME side. There were 3 applications for HOME funding. The Task Force worked through those applications. They decided to fund 2. When the final numbers came in and those were the 2 programs recommended and we took the percentages that you have, the final number was more than what their application was for. There was some discussion about putting that extra money into the 3rd application. The 3rd application requires a big pot of money to pull off. It doesn't mean the application wasn't worthy. It doesn't mean the application group wasn't worthy. That applicant group has received money from these programs recently for another project that they are going ahead with. In some cases, an application is recommended to not be funded. One of the factors might be that there is other money coming in from the city that might be from another source. I have several pots of money that can support these programs. If there were some programs that were only eligible for city funds through CDBG Program, and we knew that they were likely to get or approved for money through the Affordable Housing Fund, the Housing Operations Program Support, Vibrant

Communities Fund, or some other money, that was a factor in there. You might see some that are very worthy programs that we have funded in the past that we have loved to have funded at 100 percent; it is a limited amount of money in trying to maximize impacts. I did have another sheet that did have the gap between the funding requests and the amount of money that we have available. If you added up the money requested between the 2 programs and if you subtracted the amount of money available to us, it was a little over \$1 million gap. If the applications reflect community need, the amount of money coming in is inadequate.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – There is a new item on here CRHA Economic Program Coordinator. Is that a new position? Can you give a brief introduction as to what that is?

Mr. Warn – It is a new position. It is related to some of the larger work that CRHA is trying to do around family self-sufficiency.

Alex Ikefuna, Office of Community Solutions Director – With the CRHA, there have been massive development initiatives. One of the aspects of that is the need to improve the skill levels of the residents of CRHA so they will be able to seek jobs that pay a living wage. Currently, CRHA has a robust family self-sufficiency program. They are seeking funding to develop some of those programs so they will be able to provide economic development skills or training for the residents. This funding will help hire somebody to help them fulfill that need. Even though the city has a financial investment in CRHA, most of those are LI HTC projects. With LI HTC, the money must be paid back to the investors. With the tenants, if your income is below 0 percent, 0 to 30 percent, or 0 to 50 percent, you must pay your due rent so that the CRHA will be able to meet its financial obligations in terms of paying its debtors. This funding is critical in terms of CRHA being able to fulfill that purchasing power. That is why they are seeking the funding.

Commissioner Roetgger – Will that help with Section 3 in training specifically to work with the companies doing redevelopment?

Mr. Ikefuna – That is part of the process. It is something they haven't done well in the past.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Do we know how many residents are employed in Section 3 programs?

Mr. Ikefuna – That is information that we can get. We will get that information from the past couple of years and send to the Commission.

Mr. Warn – With Section 3, nationally one of the challenges with different organizations fulfilling that requirement is the availability of certified and trained people to fill those positions. Within our office, that is one of the things that we are trying to explore and whether we can fund or find ways to create subsidized apprenticeship programs. The city gives money to different organizations that do critical repairs on homes, energy efficiency work on homes, and mainly focusing on the interior. One of the ideas that we are talking about is whether we can do something like Hampton Roads where they fund exterior work. If we are going to explore something like that, we would want there to be a Section 3 apprenticeship program. In previous years, we funded a program through the Local Energy Alliance Project (LEAP) where they did that. They hired people to apprentice on the job. While they were doing some of their energy efficiency home repairs and trying to give those people the opportunity to work for LEAP or energy provider like Dominion eventually, there has been some interest from groups who are operating here. We would love ideas about how to support that apprenticeship program. One of the things I would love to see is for people to get experience and help with that licensing fee. You must purchase the materials and pay the licensing fee.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – I am happy to get into where we ended up where we are. That was the bulk of my work whereas Mr. Warn was trying to count money. I would like for you to speak on the Beacon Shared Use

Kitchen. These applications were made towards the end of the year facing some nasty grams from HUD on funding from prior years that was still around. Mr. Warn went to Council with Beacon Shared Use Kitchen and received a substantial piece of funding at the end of the year. The opinion of the Task Force was that although there was a Council priority to spend \$90,000 in this category for it. They have done so. If they want to go back and plug that in, that is their lookout. From our point, that freed up funds that we can use elsewhere. Most of those funds ended up going to CRHA for their roofs. They wanted \$150,000 to replace some roofs at Dogwood. They are getting \$154,000. I am sure that everyone here has no doubt that they will spend \$154,000 on these roofs instead of \$150,000. We did not overfund initially. It was 100 percent. When we came back around, it kicked over. We did that because Mr. Warn assigned the percentages of the original and carried those over with the new numbers. Since it is replacing roofs, they are going to spend that \$4000. Similarly with 6th Street, the soft cost for Habitat development, I am certain that the \$2000 that we overfunded is going to go into soft cost with no problem. We based some other decisions that way.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – For other programs that were fractionally funded, for example, the CRHA Economic Program Coordinator is being funded at 80 percent. Do they list that job at the lower salary? Do they make up that money from somewhere else?

Commissioner d’Oronzio – They make it up. They have made that clear.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Have we talked to the other applicants? Does everyone think their programs are divisible enough that they can do things with that money?

Commissioner d’Oronzio – The short answer is yes. There was a question on there with what to do if given less. We have given the answer that we are proportionally going to have to cut back, or we will find the money. We are reaching out in a lot of directions. The IRC thing is an ongoing fundraiser for their project there.

Mr. Warn – One of the things that I did when I revisited the IRC application, I tried to rework it a little bit to aim for concision but to clarify what the outcomes were. One of the questions that we ask is what they will do if they get less than 100 percent of your ask. Nobody says, ‘if you can’t give us 100 percent, don’t give it.’ You need to read between the ‘tea leaves’ and see whether they can do it. My job was, while the Task Force was deliberating these, to give them background information of how these different organizations have been funded in the past through these programs but also from other sources. In several of the cases, they are getting money from other sources to fill similar purposes. At the end of it, the Task Force members believed even if not funded at 100 percent, it was enough to ‘push the ball forward’ for each of these programs.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I have questions about specific programs. The Haven is funded at 0 and AHIP is funded at 0. What was the decision-making process there?

Commissioner d’Oronzio – The Haven has funded a couple of salaried positions from HOPs money. This is like a program that was funded in HOPs. They have hind’s coordinator, which is adjacent to this system. There was a feeling that you don’t want to make this a permanent funding source. Even though we were pushed that way, we cede money for salary and go find the rest of the money. The Haven received quite a lot of funding from the HOPs round. It was the same thing for AHIP. AHIP received \$117,000 on this program from the CAHF. We didn’t want to double-dip on that. I believe that AHIP has quite the positive balance with the city in terms of money allocated that they have not yet spent.

Mr. Warn – In terms of that program, their projects often work with older homes. They still require a more extensive environmental review and a lot of background. A lot of their projects are funded between a complex network of city money, these federal funds, philanthropy, and other grant funded programs. Each comes with their own strings. That was one of the programs, considering how many other funding sources there were for

them with a balance in a couple of their programs they are trying to work through. Some programs have a big reserve to get them through whereas other programs are leaner.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Can you speak to the makeup of the Task Force?

Mr. Warn – The work that the Task Force does to inform these funding recommendations benefits from many voices. We have had people from a variety of different backgrounds in the past. Everybody’s contribution is valuable. Historically, this Task Force has never had a complete slot of their 10 seats. One of the challenges is that slots are broken down by priority neighborhoods in some cases. There are people within those neighborhoods, who might want to serve. If that slot is filled, they may not realize there are unfilled seats. One of the next pieces of work is for us to update our citizens participation plan that governs the work of the Task Force, the membership, and the composition. We are going to try to explore having other public agencies and other groups involved. Representation matters. We would love to have more people. We went into this work with a couple members who had to withdraw. The Clerk of Council has advertised the vacancies.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – The Task Force has had a conversation about changing some of those slots. A lot of that reflects 2004 priorities, not 2024 priorities. The way we are looking at neighborhoods is different. It needs a relook and re-presentation to Council.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Can you speak to our role in the process? Does HUD mandate that the Planning Commission make a recommendation? Is that a Council requirement?

Mr. Warn – You are here tonight as knowledgeable and interested members of the community. HUD’s main goal in this is to foster community involvement. I believe that was the initial impetus for involving the Planning Commission one more opportunity to put things before the public, get feedback and input before it went to City Council.

Mr. Ikefuna – The Planning Commission must review the CDBG and HOME application recommendations to City Council. There are 3 review processes for \$410,000 in CDBG every year. It is not practical. The primary function of the Planning Commission is land use and transportation. In between, environmental. The Planning Commission review of CDBG recommendations and related activities has been going on for at least 30 years. We are looking at proposing streamlining that process so that when the CDBG Task Force makes a recommendation, instead of coming to the Planning Commission, it goes directly to City Council. That is the way I look at it. Sometimes, it prolongs the review process. There might be a need to do some kind of amendment. Staff is wondering how we can take this to City Council. It is already in the code that you must route it through the Planning Commission for a recommendation to City Council.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – As this body is the Entrance Corridor Review Board, would it make sense to call the CAHF Committee the CDBG Task Force? Is there anything stopping us? One of the reasons I sit on the CDBG Task Force is that I also sit on the CAHF Committee. I am an anti-silo force there. Is there a reason that we can’t call the CAHF Committee the CDBG Task Force?

Mr. Ikefuna – As we initiate the revisions, that is something that staff needs to discuss. If that becomes the case, after the discussion with the City Manager and Deputy City Manager, we can take it to City Council as part of the amendment. We need to look at that.

Mr. Warn – HUD’s guidance on citizen participation is at times very specific and generally very broad. They have outlined an essential goal facilitating the greatest degree of community involvement as possible especially from populations that are most likely to benefit from these programs. Those are often the least represented groups for a variety of different reasons. We would love to do what we can to encourage that participation. We

are open to considering anything that can help us achieve our goal. There is nothing specific in the HUD guidance or in the code of regulations that specifies the exact nature of the formal review process. You must have a volunteer task force. You must follow certain rules. You must make funding recommendations to an elected body. That elected body has the final approval to appropriate the funds. You must have a period of public comment on those recommendations, which is open for this month. The draft plan is available on the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission website. We have a link to it from our city website at the Office of Community Solutions. We have a lot of leeway in terms of how to craft the most efficient and effective structure to get through this work.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – Are we allowed to pay people for their time?

Mr. Warn – We are not allowed to pay people. I think the answer is yes if you use local funds. You are not allowed to use federal funds to provide salaries. There are certain cases where you can provide stipends. I believe that they are narrow. I don't think there is any prohibition in using local funds if they are not reimbursed from the federal money. When I first came into the program and started learning about it, it was described as a reimbursement program. It is a double reimbursement program. We get a line of credit from HUD to the city. We give some recipients the ability to spend money for eligible activities. We approve a scope of work, and they go do those things. They must pay for those out of pocket. They are reimbursed from city funds on the CDBG side and from funds at the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission controls and their financial system on the HOME side. Our 2 entities go to HUD to get made whole again through reimbursements. For some of these organizations going out of pocket is a challenge.

ii. Public Hearing

No Public Comments

iii. Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I don't feel strongly that the Planning Commission needs to be involved in this process. I don't feel strongly against it or for it. Now, we are in that role. I don't feel, as a commissioner, that I have had enough information to exercise that oversight role. It seems that we were given the final output of the recommendations of the Task Force. In the past, we have received the minutes of the Task Force and applications. While I appreciate the work of the Task Force and staff, I don't feel that I have any information to make an informed decision. I will be abstaining tonight.

Chairman Mitchell – I have had the opportunity to chair the Task Force 3 times. There is a lot of work that goes into what they do. Knowing the work that they put into this and knowing the heart and soul to making the right decisions, I am not about to second guess the work that the Task Force does.

Motion to Approve – Commissioner Solla-Yates – Second by Commissioner Roettger – Motion passes 5-0 with 1 abstention (Commissioner Stolzenberg)

IV. Commission's Action Items

Continuing: until all public hearings and action items are completed.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:52 PM.