

Rochester City Council

Community Development Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Elaine Lauterborn, Chairperson Alan Reed-Erickson, Vice-Chair Brian LaBranche Steve Hervey David Hynes

Meeting Date:	February 28, 2013	
Members Present:	Councilor Lauterborn	Members Absent:
	Councilor Hervey	Councilor LaBranche
	Councilor Hynes	Councilor Reed-Erickson
Guests/Staff:	Samantha Rodgerson, Economic Development Secretary	
	Kenn Ortmann, Director Planning	
	Elena Engle, Community Development Specialist	
	Celeste Plaia	

Councilor Lauterborn called the meeting to order at 7:11PM. Motion was made by Councilor Hervey and seconded by Councilor Hynes, minutes were approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION - CDBG

Councilor Lauterborn asked will the social service agencies be coming to Council meeting? Ms. Engle stated they were certainly welcome on night of public hearing which is set for April 2nd. The meeting to vote is April 16th and public input would be allowed at that meeting as well. The Department will express verbally to the agencies that they are welcome to attend these meetings if they wish but are not required to. Ms. Engle noted that we still have no direction from HUD about our grant amount. Ms. Engle gave the committee an overview of each category for funding. The figure that she is using is a 10% decrease from last year's funding as an estimate. Public Service Agencies would have approximately \$30,505 available to fund requests. Housing and Economic Development has requests totaling approximately \$55,458 but that she is still waiting for information about the JOB Loan need. The estimated balance for facility/infrastructure projects is \$167.377 which includes \$90,648 that is remaining from prior projects that can be reallocated. Ms. Engle explained that this amount can be adjusted if there is a decision to fund the JOB Loan account. She then broke down the potential projects and estimated costs for them to include a 20% admin cost per project. SERVICES: The handouts provide a list of agencies requesting funding broken down by agency category as listed in the consolidated plan such as Safety Net, Basic Needs or Investment. Ms. Engle provided the committee with a brief description of services provided and what services their request would support as well as how many Rochester residents they serve and whether they had a direct or indirect impact on City Welfare. Some brief discussion took place about some of the agencies. Ms. Engle mentioned that staff will be looking at possible evaluation areas for a scoring matrix in the future but at this time, some samples of how

other CDBG cities utilize scoring will be provided to the committee for review and discussion during the summer meetings. In the meantime, for the committee to begin thinking about it, a rating sheet was provided so that the committee could give guidance to Ms. Engle. This will provide an overview of each member's level of support for each applicant. The committee was asked to return this rating sheet to Ms. Engle over the next week or so.

HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Ms. Engle then went over the Housing and Economic Development requests. She explained Community Action of Strafford County (Weatherization Program) was asking for an increase in funding but that it was so that they could assist with manufactured homes not in co-ops that cannot be assisted from grant funding from the Community Loan Fund. Small Business Development Center is requesting the same amount they received last year. Ms. Engle stated she is still waiting for an update on the need for the JOB Loan Program from Economic Development. FACILITY/INFRASTRUCTURE: Ms. Engle then discussed Facility/Infrastructure Projects and first listed those that they reviewed but are not being considered for funding because they either didn't qualify or the timing didn't work out. Ms. Engle then briefly discussed the potential projects. Rochester Common Restrooms with a cost estimate of \$78,000. Rochester Child Care Fencing with a cost estimate of \$6,000 to replace worn out fencing and create a safer area. Historical Society Window and Insulation Upgrades with a cost estimate of \$18,000. This qualifies because it is a City owned building and the city, as a whole, meets the 51% threshold for benefit. Catherine Street Sidewalks (referred to as Sheridan Glen) with a cost estimate of \$65,377 which is the amount remaining for projects once taking into account the above requests. It was explained that this is part of a bigger project. It is hoped the project will move ahead, but if the project were to be pushed out, the funds could be reallocated. Community Center Signage has no estimate amount because staff is still working on getting information together. The committee felt that this should be done in phases rather than all signage at one time – the categories would be Main sign/safety/directional. It was suggested to start with signs that were needed to be in compliance. Mr. Ortmann said that they have been talking with the insurance company to find out the need and will bring that information back to the committee.

Ms. Engle then provided the committee with potential areas of evaluation for future CDBG funding that could be considered when coming up with a scoring system.

Ms. Engle then updated the committee on her position since starting in November 2012. She explained that initially a significant amount of time was spent learning the rules and regulations of CDBG as well as to get all the reporting requirements caught up to date. She gave a list of grant writing opportunities that she has reviewed since December with a brief synopsis of each. Ms. Engle stated that she recently attended a webinar and will be attending a grant writing workshop in April. She is currently working on a Grant Project Worksheet and a Grant Scoring Matrix to be distributed to Department Heads next week. The purpose of which would be to develop an efficient process for seeking out grants that will best fit

	the needs of the City and to cut down wasted time reviewing grants that don't address a priority need of the City. Mr. Ortmann then discussed the TIF Districts and explained that they have a reporting requirement. He stated that Ms. Engle would be handling that reporting as well as participating in Advisory Board meetings and providing support to the Board and the Economic Development Director. He stated that there is an overhead administrative component that can assist with a portion of the salary in lieu of hiring an outside consultant.
DISCUSSION – Stormwater Management	Mr. Ortmann informed the committee that he attended a seminar on Storm Water Management and the new rules & regulations that will be required. He wanted the committee to be aware of the changes and how the City might be proactive to avoid additional costs and burden.
DISCUSSION – Route 11 park access	Councilor Lauterborn highlighted the request for the committee to look into and whether there were plans to control access. There was some brief discussion on how to make it an asset to the City and not a burden for the City. It was suggested to look at the ownership of the property and Pictometry pictures and bring back information in April.
Agenda topics for next meeting	Rochester Main Street and CDBG is to be on the agenda for the March 28 th meeting. Route 11 Park Access update and Conservation Commission on April 25 th .

Motion to adjourn made by Councilor Hynes and seconded by Councilor Hervey. The meeting was adjourned at 9:28pm.

Next Meeting – March 28, 2013 in the Conference Room at City Hall Topics – CDBG and Rochester Main Street