

**THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING LOAN COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, January 8, 2014**

**Greenville, North Carolina**

---

**Present:**

Alice Brewington  
 Howard Conner  
 Jackie Parker

Kevin Fuell  
 Lovella Perkins  
 Melissa Grimes

R. J. Hemby  
 Walt Kitchin

**Absent:**

Alice Brewington  
 Howard Conner  
 Jackie Parker

Kevin Fuell  
 Lovella Perkins  
 Melissa Grimes

R. J. Hemby  
 Walt Kitchin

**Staff:**

Merrill Flood  
 Niki Jones  
 Gloria Kesler

Sylvia Brown  
 Betty Moseley  
 Marion Blackburn (City Council Liaison)

---

**A. Roll Call**

**B. Approval of Agenda**

Motion was made by Mr. Kitchen and seconded by Ms. Perkins to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

**C. Approval of meeting minutes from October 9, 2013**

Motion was made by Ms. Perkins and seconded by Mr. Kitchen to approve the meeting minutes for October 9, 2013 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

**D. Old Business**

None

**E. New Business**

**1. Sub-recipient Applications and Scoring Process**

Mr. Jones gave a brief overview of Sub-recipient grants and HUD guidelines.

The process for the sub-recipient applications is:

- A sub-recipient workshop was held in September 2013
- Applications are due on January 9, 2014 at 5:00pm
- Staff will review all applications
- Eligible agencies will be contacted in mid-January concerning their presentation to the AHLC
- AHLC members will receive a summary of each eligible agency prior to the February meeting

- Agencies will give 10 minutes presentations to the AHLC members at the February 12, 2014 meeting
- AHLC members will score each agency and make recommendations to City Council at the March 12, 2014
- At the March 20, 2014 City Council meeting, Council members will approve the funding recommendations

Scoring Process and Evaluation Criteria:

1. Need for Service – 30 points  
Does the program address a priority need spelled out in the City’s Consolidated Plan?
2. Internal and External consistency – 10 points  
Can the program be implemented easily?  
Do the goals and outcomes appear to be achievable?  
Are the expectations realistic?
3. Leveraging – 15 points  
Does the agency receive funding from sources other than CDBG?  
If so, how many?
4. Self-Sufficiency – 10 points  
Does the program empower the low-moderate income population?  
What type of independence will the participants achieve upon completion of the program?
5. Innovation and Partnerships – 10 points  
Is the program a new or creative approach to addressing a priority need?  
Is the program duplicating a same program within in the community/neighborhood?  
Is the agency working with other agencies to become more effective and efficient in program delivery?
6. Financial Feasibility – 5 points  
Do program costs seem reasonable and necessary?  
Does the agency have enough funds to provide the services they have proposed?
7. Performance – 10 points  
How accurate was the agencies submission?  
Did the agency understand the issues and trends of their target population?
8. Direct Benefit – 10 points  
Does the agencies proposed program benefit low-moderate income households?

In regards to item 3, Ms. Grimes asked if agencies where going to be penalized if they had additional sources of funding.

Mr. Jones replied no, that in fact, an agency may be ranked higher if they are leveraging funds as opposed to an agency with no additional funding sources.

Mr. Kitchen asked if staff knew the amount of funding that the committee would be awarding.

Mr. Jones replied that the amount was close to \$75,000. The cap for sub-recipient funds is 15% of the City's CDBG funding.

Mr. Kitchen asked if this was more or less than last year.

Mr. Jones replied that it is the same amount.

Mr. Hemby stated that in February the terms of three senior committee members would be expiring. He asked if the scoring and recommendation process was going to fall on the remaining members.

Mr. Flood stated yes, that it would not be fair to new committee members if they were asked to do the scoring without understanding the process. Also, it would not be fair to the agencies to receive a score from new members that were not present for the training.

## **2. Approve meeting time change for February 12, 2014**

Mr. Hemby stated that the meeting in February would be longer due to the sub-recipient presentations, therefore he would advise the committee to change the meeting time to 3:00 PM on February 12, 2014/

Motion was made by Ms. Perkins and seconded by Ms. Grimes to approve changing the Affordable Housing Loan Committee meeting time on February 12, 2014 to 3:00 PM. Motion carried unanimously.

## **F. Staff Report**

Mr. Jones stated that the AHLC presentation to City Council is in March and will be presented by the new Chair.

A handout was given to the members outlining the dates and times of 2014 AHLC meetings.

Mr. Jones stated that at the February meeting, the committee will hear the proposals for the Multi-family rental project. The city has \$150,000 set aside for construction costs. These funds come from two budget years. The committee will have the option to either award all the funds to one developer or to split the funds between agencies.

Mr. Hemby asked what was meant by "split it up."

Mr. Jones replied that if two developers present viable projects, the committee may recommend an award of \$75,000 for each developer. Or the members may wish to award the entire \$150,000 to one developer.

Mr. Flood stated that the members could set a time limit for presentations to ensure a timely meeting.

Mr. Hemby stated that the committee would review the meeting minutes from 2013 and use the same presentation guidelines.

**G. Other**

None

**H. Adjournment**

Motion was made by Mr. Kitchen and seconded by Ms. Perkins to adjourn the AHLC meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Signature on file

R. J. Hemby, Chairman

Signature on file

Sylvia D. Brown, Staff Liaison