

## **ARPA Committee Meeting**

**September 13, 2022**

### **Fire Training Room**

In Attendance: Bill Wade (Chair), Ben Herman (Vice Chair), Linda Taylor, Estrella Ruiz, William Findlay, Raul De Villegas Decker, Cindy Enos-Martinez, Diane Schwenke, Laurel Cole, Gary Schroen

City Council Representatives in Attendance: Abe Herman, Dennis Simpson

Not In Attendance: Randall Reitz, City Council representative

City Staff: Greg Caton, City Manager; Jodi Welch, Finance Director; Tamra Allen, Community Development Director; Sara Spaulding, Communications Director; Johnny McFarland, Asst. to the City Manager; Andrea Brush, Best and Brightest Fellow

### **Agenda**

#### **General Report on process to Date**

Bill Wade started the meeting by indicating that the committee does not plan to finalize decisions quite yet as there are still a couple questions needing answers on some applications. A second meeting would be needed to allow each subcommittee to review all applications as opposed to only those relevant to their subcommittee.

It was suggested that maybe one way to do this is for the subcommittees to see the selected applications by the subcommittees as opposed to reviewing those that are not recommended.

Bill indicated that if subcommittees are willing to move forward and are willing to present their top three recommendations, this would work. It was recommended that the ARPA Committee make it clear that the top three recommendations are preliminary and not indicative of a final set of recommendations.

A committee member asked if there should be a distinction made between nonprofit and for-profit requests. It was suggested that this should be noted if a for-profit was a top three recommendation and it would be important to understand the nature of the for-profit organization. However, it was also suggested that “scope of impact” was a key factor in the decision-making process and if a for-profit can have a significant impact, that should be considered above their status.

#### **Interim Report from Subcommittees**

*Housing Subcommittee* – The subcommittee provided an overview of their top three recommendations. 11 projects were received, one was withdrawn.

1. Land Bank application submitted on behalf of the ARPA Committee for \$3 million
2. Housing Resources application for \$1 million: this is a revolving loan fund for down payment assistance. Funding would begin the program and as it moves forward, the funding would be recycled in perpetuity.

3. Housing Authority application for 1.8 million: the project would purchase existing units and deed-restrict them, preserving affordable housing units that would otherwise be sold as market-rate units.

A committee member asked if the project would dislocate present tenants. The subcommittee was unsure. Another member asked how the funding would be used; for purchase of the building, or renovations? The funding would be used for purchase. A member asked if the rest of the funding was in place for the property purchase. City staff answered, indicating their belief is that funding is currently being assembled.

*Mental/Behavioral Health* – The subcommittee provided an update on their top three choices.

1. Counseling and Education Center for programming and capita \$996,000: They provide counseling and are looking for a building to continue to grow which is where most of the funding would go. They serve low-income individuals and families and are currently located in a small house off 12<sup>th</sup> and Patterson. One item the committee likes is they are utilizing CMU interns for the operations which helps to train future professionals in the field.
2. Altitude Pediatrics \$244,000 over three years: to provide increased integrated care to patients. They serve 3,000 patients and 49% are Medicaid insured.
3. School District 51 \$100,000: To continue its trauma-informed classrooms program for students in the district.

*Homelessness*: The subcommittee presented their top three and indicated their discussion was to focus on capital projects to build something that endures with these one-time funds.

1. Catholic Outreach Mother Teresa Place \$1-\$3 million: this would build 40 unit for homeless individuals; they have about 2/3 of the total funding needed and the subcommittee settled on a \$1 million dollar total.
2. Homeward Bound Pathways: Build out of modular shelters (pallet homes) 8x8 prefab units \$2.3 – \$2.9 million: There are two caveats to this recommendation. First it is a significant ask but does serve roughly 100 total units and they're not leveraging additional dollars. Second, is that siting is unclear. The proposal is to place it on 9.8 acres of city land but there is no formal commitment from the city at this time. It could cost another \$300 to \$600k if they do not get the site.

Some committee members felt there were still too many questions on this one, Ben suggested the ranking still make sense given the impact and present need in the community. It was also brought up that the project does include wraparound services and is designed to specifically address the homeless population, so the expense is higher than a housing ask given these other necessary services.

3. Mutual Aid Partners, direct support services for \$30,000: this was chosen because it's focused on relief of suffering in a cost-effective manner.

It was suggested by a committee member that the funding should really go to long-lasting projects, despite the great work Mutual Aid does in the community.

The total cost of all recommendations from the subcommittees is \$11.9 million. It was brought up that not all three projects in each subcommittee must be funded, and a mixture to get down to the \$9 million in available funding will be necessary.

The committee decided they wanted to only review the top three from each subcommittee in the interim to gain further insight into the project recommendations.

There was continued discussion on the HomewardBound project including project zoning issues, feasibility without secured land, and no other identified funding sources at this time. One point in support of the project is the organization's track record. A member asked the council representatives if council had discussed the city-owned parcel and they confirmed there has been no formal discussion yet.

### **Possibility of Final Report Meeting Next Week**

The Chair suggested the committee convene after everyone has a chance to review the nine recommendations and meet again in the following week. The committee generally agreed. One member suggested they would like to independently score the top three applications but there was some disagreement from other members. The goal of reviewing the applications is really just for the subcommittees to better understand the applications and identify any potential follow-up questions, not necessarily rank them independent of the subcommittee. The member asked then how the committee would chisel down the applications to get to \$9 million and the general belief was that one or two may drop away from the recommendations based on full committee consensus.

Overall, the committee felt strongly there was no need to rank the remaining applications.

A date was set for the next meeting at 1:30 pm on September 20<sup>th</sup> (subsequently changed to 2:00 pm post-meeting).

### **Adjourn**