



AGENDA

CITY OF SEASIDE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING
OLDEMEYER CENTER
986 Hilby Avenue
Wednesday, February 4, 2015
6:30 PM

PLEASE TURN OFF YOUR CELL PHONES UPON ENTERING THE MEETING

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **ROLL CALL**

Helen Rucker
Carol Mikkelsen
John Francis
Sue Hawthorne

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Anyone wishing to address the CDAC on matters not on the agenda and within its jurisdiction may come forward to state the matter on which they wish to speak. Matters not appearing on the agenda will not receive action at this meeting, but may be referred to staff or to a future meeting for discussion. Comments will be limited to three minutes, or as otherwise established by the CDAC.

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. **REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 17, 2014**

5. **OLD BUSINESS**

A. **2015-2016 CDBG FUNDING APPLICATION FORM/PROCESS**

i. **APPLICATION RATING TOOL**

B. **PROPOSED MULTI-YEAR CDBG FUNDING CYCLE**

i. **CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

6. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **STAFF TRANSMITTAL OF 2015-16 APPLICATIONS TO CDAC**

B. **MID-YEAR RE-ALLOCATION**

7. **REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

8. **REPORTS BY STAFF**

A. **REVIEW OF 2014-15 LONG RANGE CALENDAR**

B. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT CDAC MEETING: FEBRUARY 25, 2015**

i. **SECOND QUARTER PROGRAM REPORT (OCT-DEC)**

ii. **CDAC TO REPORT OUT ON INDIVIDUAL REVIEW AND RANKING OF APPLICATIONS**

C. **OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting:
February 25, 2015
Oldemeyer Center
6:30 PM

The City of Seaside is an ADA accessible facility and is committed to include the disabled in all of its services, programs and activities. Any person who requires accommodation to be able to participate in this meeting is asked to contact the office of the City Clerk at 899-6707, no fewer than two business days prior to the meeting to allow for reasonable arrangements.

The City Council Chambers is equipped with a portable microphone for anyone unable to come to the podium. Assisted listening devices are also available.

Meetings that are held in the City Council Chambers are broadcast live to all Seaside residents on Comcast Channel 25 and U-verse Channel 99. Meetings are also available through live streaming at: <http://cvp.telvue.com/player?id=T01629&video=52314&noplaylistskin=1&width=400&height=300> Videos of past meetings are available on demand through the City's website: <http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us>

Agenda-related writings or documents provided during public meetings are available for public inspection during the

meeting or from the office of the City Clerk. This agenda is posted in compliance with California Government Code
Section 54954.2(a) or Section 54956.

		MEETING MINUTES																	
			SPECIAL MEETING																
CITY OF SEASIDE			OLDEMEYER CENTER 986 HILBY AVE																
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE			DECEMBER 17, 2014																
			6:30 P.M.																
1.	CALL TO ORDER AT – 6:30 P.M.																		
2.	ROLL CALL – ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM																		
	MEMBERS	Helen B. Rucker, Carol Mikkelsen, John Francis, Sue Hawthorne																	
	PRESENT:	Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne																	
	ABSENT:	Mikkelsen																	
3.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES A. October 15, 2014 & November 19, 2014 <u>On motion by Member Rucker and Seconded by Member Francis and carried by the following vote the CDAC approved the regular meeting minutes for October 15, 2014 and November 19, 2014</u> <table><tr><td>AYES</td><td>3</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne</td></tr><tr><td>NOES</td><td>0</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>None</td></tr><tr><td>ABSENT</td><td>1</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>Mikkelsen</td></tr><tr><td>RECUSED</td><td>0</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>None</td></tr></table>			AYES	3	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne	NOES	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None	ABSENT	1	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Mikkelsen	RECUSED	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None
AYES	3	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne																
NOES	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None																
ABSENT	1	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Mikkelsen																
RECUSED	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None																
4.	PUBLIC COMMENT – Representative from Community Human Services began to bring forth his concerns regarding the asphalt on the property of Genesis House, Consultant Rosa Camacho advised him that his concern is on the meeting agenda, Item 6-B-i.																		
	OLD BUSINESS																		
5.	A. 2015-2016 CDBG Funding Application: Rosa Camacho, PMC, presented the Application Rating Tool to be used to rate and approve applicants. Committee members expressed concerns regarding the wording in the rating tool. Lisa Brinton assured the committee that what has already been printed out is not necessarily finalized and changes could be made to clarify and simplify for a more clear understanding, whereas Consultant Camacho explained the process in further detail. B. Proposed Multi Year Funding Cycle: To reduce the annual demand placed on the CDAC and City staff to achieve greater efficiency, the City has adopted a multi-year funding cycle for the CDBG program.																		
	NEW BUSINESS																		
6.	A.CDBG 2013-2014 Public Service Monitoring Letters: Findings explained in																		

	detail by Rosa Camacho. B.CDBG 2014-15 Mid-Year Projects update: i. Letter from Community Human Services dated December 6, 2014: CHS received \$10,000 for facilities improvements for work on The Genesis House staircases, however CHS was able to complete one of the staircases through donations and the work of volunteers, therefore, requesting to use the half (\$5000) for the completed staircase for re-paving asphalt on the Genesis House property which have been damaged by tree roots. <u>On motion by Member Francis and Seconded by Member Hawthorne and carried by the following vote the CDAC approved the proposal by Community Human Services to use a portion of their funding to re-pave asphalt on the Genesis House property.</u> <table> <tr> <td>AYES</td><td>3</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne</td></tr> <tr> <td>NOES</td><td>0</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>None</td></tr> <tr> <td>ABSENT</td><td>1</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>Mikkelsen</td></tr> <tr> <td>RECUSED</td><td>0</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>None</td></tr> </table> ii. Proposed additional streets projects: City of Seaside Assistant Engineer, Leslie Llantero, presented and proposed to use the remaining Community Development Block Grant funds to remove and replace deteriorated sections of pavement ranging in size from 60 square feet. -1900 sq.ft. Twenty one (21) dig out locations have been identified. Palm Ave., Elm Ave., Amador Ave., Sonoma Ave., Hamilton Ave., Trinity Ave., Wanda Ave., and Harcourt Ave., bonded by Fremont Blvd. Based upon recent bids, the price per square foot is estimated to be \$9. This will allow approximately 11,000 square feet of dig outs with the \$100,000. <u>On motion by Member Hawthorne and Seconded by Member Francis and carried by the following vote the CDAC approved the proposal of additional streets projects and use of the remaining CDBG funds</u> <table> <tr> <td>AYES</td><td>3</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne</td></tr> <tr> <td>NOES</td><td>0</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>None</td></tr> <tr> <td>ABSENT</td><td>1</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>Mikkelsen</td></tr> <tr> <td>RECUSED</td><td>0</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>None</td></tr> </table>			AYES	3	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne	NOES	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None	ABSENT	1	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Mikkelsen	RECUSED	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None	AYES	3	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne	NOES	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None	ABSENT	1	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Mikkelsen	RECUSED	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None
AYES	3	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne																																
NOES	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None																																
ABSENT	1	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Mikkelsen																																
RECUSED	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None																																
AYES	3	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne																																
NOES	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None																																
ABSENT	1	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Mikkelsen																																
RECUSED	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None																																
	C. Mid-Year Re-Allocation: Quarterly reports will be presented at the January CDAC meeting.																																		
7.	REPORTS FROM CDAC MEMBERS – None																																		
8.	REPORTS FROM STAFF – None																																		

9.	ADJOURNMENT at 7:57 p.m. <u>On motion by Member Hawthorne and Seconded by Member Francis and carried by the following vote the CDAC adjourned the regular meeting at 7:57pm.</u> <table><tr><td>AYES</td><td>3</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne</td></tr><tr><td>NOES</td><td>0</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>None</td></tr><tr><td>ABSENT</td><td>1</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>Mikkelsen</td></tr><tr><td>RECUSED</td><td>0</td><td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</td><td>None</td></tr></table>	AYES	3	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne	NOES	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None	ABSENT	1	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Mikkelsen	RECUSED	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None
AYES	3	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Rucker, Francis, Hawthorne														
NOES	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None														
ABSENT	1	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Mikkelsen														
RECUSED	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS	None														

City of Seaside CDBG Program Application Rating Tool 2015-16

Total Points Earned:

Proposed Project/Activity:

Applicant:

Rating member name:

THRESHOLD CRITERIA

If the activity does not meet all thresholds, STOP. It cannot be funded by CDBG.

- A ☐ **The activity is eligible for CDBG funding:**
Housing rehabilitation
New housing construction (by an eligible CBDO)
Economic development services
Direct economic development assistance
Commercial or industrial rehabilitation
Public services
Historic preservation
Removal of architectural barriers to the disabled and elderly
Improvements to public facilities
Infrastructure improvements
Relocation
Acquisition, clearance, and/or development of real property
Planning and capacity building
Direct homeownership assistance
Code enforcement
- B ☐ **The activity meets one of the three National Objectives.**
- C ☐ **The applicant provided the following items:**
☐ Line-item budget indicating sources and uses of funds
☐ Financial statement for most recent fiscal year
☐ Letter or audit indicating fiscal statement review by CPA
☐ Proof of nonprofit status
- D ☐ **For public services, the service is a new service or an expansion of an existing service.**

RANKING CRITERIA

Max. Pts.

- 1 ☐ **5 The activity meets one of the three National Objectives:**
5 The activity principally benefits low- and moderate-income persons.
0 The activity prevents or eliminates slum or blight.
0 The activity addresses an urgent need or problem in the community.
- 2 ☐ **10 Serving Priority Services and Populations**
The activity will serve how many of the following targeted priority public services?
substance abuse treatment, legal services and conflict resolution, recreation and after-school enrichment, crime prevention and gang intervention, healthcare and counseling, job training/job readiness
☐ 5 Two of the targeted priority services
☐ 3 One of the targeted priority services
☐ 0 None of the targeted priority populations
The activity will serve how many of the following targeted priority populations? very low-income households, children and households with children, seniors, homeless persons, disabled persons, mentally ill persons, persons recently incarcerated or on parole
☐ 5 Two of the targeted priority populations
☐ 3 One of the targeted priority populations
☐ 0 None of the targeted priority populations
- 3 ☐ **15 Activity Need and Justification**
☐ 6 The applicant has demonstrated that the problem or need being addressed is significant in scope and intensity and is likely to cause numerous major problems in the community within the next 5 years.
☐ 3 The applicant has demonstrated that the problem or need being addressed is moderate in scope and intensity and is likely to cause some problems in the community within the next 5 years.
☐ 0 The applicant has not demonstrated that the problem or need being addressed is likely to cause problems in the community within the next 5 years.
☐ 4 The proposed project will completely solve the problem or need for at least 5 years (15 years for capital projects).
☐ 2 The proposed project will solve a significant portion of the problem or need for at least 5 years (15 years for capital projects).
☐ 0 The proposed project is unlikely to solve the problem or need it is intended to address (15 years for capital projects).
☐ 3 At least 60% of the activity beneficiaries are extremely low- or very low-income persons.
☐ 2 All of the beneficiaries are low-income persons (below 80% of area median income).
☐ 1 At least 80% of the beneficiaries are low-income persons.
☐ 0 Between 51% and 80% of the beneficiaries are low-income persons.
☐ 2 CDBG funds are an appropriate source of funds for the proposed activity.
☐ 0 There are other funding sources that would be more appropriate to fund the proposed activity.

Proposed Project/Activity:

4 0

17 Readiness to Proceed

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <div style="background-color: #a6c9ec; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 4 | All predevelopment steps necessary have been completed. |
| | 3 | Some predevelopment steps have been completed, with all steps likely to be completed by July 1, 2015. |
| | 1 | Predevelopment steps are in process but unlikely to be completed by July 1, 2015. |
| | 0 | Predevelopment has not been adequately considered. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #a6c9ec; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 6 | Project will begin after July 1, 2015, and end on or before June 30, 2016. |
| | 3 | Project will begin after July 1, 2015, and end on or before December 31, 2016. |
| | 0 | Project will be completed on or after January 1, 2017. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #a6c9ec; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 4 | Project timeline is realistic, with potential delays built into the schedule. |
| | 2 | Project timeline is realistic, but may not adequately account for delays. |
| | 0 | Project timeline is unrealistic. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #a6c9ec; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 3 | Project will be completed fully without further funding commitment. |
| | 2 | Project is likely to be fully completed, but depends on funding commitments from other organizations. |
| | 0 | Project may not be fully completed. |

5 0

20 Cost Reasonableness and Effectiveness

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <div style="background-color: #ffff00; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 5 | Project costs are fully justified and within an expected range. |
| | 3 | Project costs are somewhat justified and are slightly above what is expected. |
| | 0 | Project costs are excessive, are unrealistically low, or are not justified. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #ffff00; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 4 | Proposed costs are supported by previous actual budgets, surveys of similar organizations, or independent cost estimates. |
| | 2 | Proposed costs are supported by internal cost estimates. |
| | 0 | Proposed costs are not supported. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #ffff00; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 3 | The organization is, with the exception of capital funds, self-sustaining. |
| | 2 | The organization has a realistic plan to become self-sustaining. |
| | 0 | The organization would likely need ongoing CDBG funding to continue this activity. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #a6c9ec; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 3 | Payment of prevailing wage, if applicable, was considered in the budget. |
| | 0 | Payment of prevailing wage, if applicable, was not considered in the budget. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #a6c9ec; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 2 | Relocation costs, if applicable, were considered in the budget. |
| | 0 | Relocation costs, if applicable, were not considered in the budget. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #a6c9ec; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 3 | The per capita CDBG funding level is less than \$100 per person. |
| | 1 | The per capita CDBG funding level is between \$100 and \$400 per person. |
| | 0 | The per capita CDBG funding level is more than \$400 per person. |

6 0

20 Activity Management and Implementation

The organization:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <div style="background-color: #ffff00; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 3 | Has sufficient management resources available. |
| | 0 | Does not have sufficient management resources available. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #a6c9ec; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 3 | Displays a commitment to operating and managing their activity according to CDBG regulations. |
| | 0 | Fails to display adequate commitment to operating and managing their activity according to CDBG regulations. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #a6c9ec; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 3 | Has a record of proper management of all relevant activities. |
| | 0 | Has had some problems with managing activities properly. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #ffff00; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 2 | Has the appropriate resources readily available to support the activity. |
| | 0 | Will require more than 2 months to obtain the resources necessary to perform the activity. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #ffff00; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 3 | Provided a realistic estimate of the number of persons who will benefit from the activity. |
| | 0 | Provided an estimate of the number of beneficiaries that was inflated, as compared to past performance or similar activities. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #a6c9ec; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 3 | Has a viable method for ensuring beneficiaries are low- and moderate-income persons. |
| | 0 | Does not have a method for determining beneficiary income, or does not have sufficient resources to implement it. |
| | | |
| <div style="background-color: #ffff00; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> | 3 | The financial statement shows sufficient resources to support the organization. |
| | 1 | The financial statement raises concerns for the organization's long-term stability. |
| | 0 | The financial statement indicates significant problems with expenditures or oversight. |

Proposed Project/Activity:

7

8 Experience

- Based on the qualifications of staff and prior experience, the applicant has:
- 8 Extensive experience undertaking and managing similar projects.
 - 5 Limited experience undertaking and managing similar projects.
 - 3 Sufficient resources to undertake and manage the project, but little experience with similar projects.
 - 0 No experience undertaking and managing similar projects.

8

10 Past Performance

In the past 5 years, the applicant:

- 5 Expended funds received according to the schedule in their contract.
- 3 Expended funds received within 6 months of the expenditure deadline.
- 0 Has unexpended funds that are more than 18 months old.

Note: Applicants who have not received City grants in the past 5 years are awarded all 5 points.

- 3 Turned in all required reports fully completed and on time.
- 1 Made an effort to improve reporting performance and exhibited a significant improvement.
- 0 Turned in required reports uncompleted or late and showed little improvement in reporting compliance.

- 2 Sufficiently completed all activities in their scope of services.
- 1 Completed most of the activities in their scope of services.
- 0 Exhibited serious issues in adhering to their scope of services.

9

15 Matching Contributions

The applicant:

- 4 Made an effort to secure other funding for the activity.
- 0 Did not clearly make an effort to secure other funding for the activity.
- 3 Has all other funding sources committed, as indicated by commitment letters.
- 2 Has at least 75% of other funding committed and evidenced by letters.
- 1 Indicates other funding is available, but did not submit commitment letters.
- 0 Has no other funding sources.

The ratio of eligible matching funds to CDBG funds is:

- 8 1.1 or more
- 6 .75-1
- 4 .5-1
- 2 .25-.5
- 0 Less than .25

10

5 Application Completeness

- 5 The application is complete; all parts of the application, including any requested attachments, are included, complete, and organized as requested.
- 0 The application is incomplete.

--

[illegible]

**City of Seaside
2015-16 CDBG
Request for Proposals**

Type of Activity	Agency Name	Activity	FY2015-16 Requested Amount	FY2016-17 Requested Amount
Public Service	Central Coast HIV/AIDS Services	Admin Building Rent - 780 Hamilton Ave	\$5,000	\$5,000
	Community Human Services	Genesis House	\$30,000	\$30,000
	Community Partnership for Youth	HS Leadership Program	\$15,000	\$15,000
	Food Bank for Monterey County	Emergency Food Assistance Program (EFAP)	\$15,000	\$15,000
	Girls Inc. of the Central Coast	Afterschool Leadership Mentoring Programs	\$8,000	\$0
	Legal Services for Seniors	Legal Services for Seniors	\$15,000	\$15,000
	Meals on Wheels of the Monterey Peninsula	Senior Meals Program	\$10,000	\$10,000
	Seaside Youth Resource Center	Youth Violence Prevention Program	\$50,000	\$0
	Seaside High School	High School Robotics Program	\$30,000	\$30,000
	The Village Project, Inc.	Education & Cultural Enrichment Academy	\$12,000	\$14,000
subtotal	10		\$190,000	\$134,000
Capital Improvement/ Public Facility Project		Seaside Clubhouse Facility Improvements 1332 La Salle Ave. - community room, floor and door replacements, & roof repairs.	\$133,210	\$130,000
	Boys & Girls Club of Monterey County	Genesis House Facility Improvements 1152 Sonoma Ave. - landscaping, grounds work, lighting	\$10,000	\$10,000
	Community Human Services			
subtotal	2		\$143,210	\$140,000
TOTAL	12		\$333,210	\$274,000

2015-16 Uses of Funds Estimate

Obligatory Expenditures	\$281,387
Planning and Admin.	\$95,000
Public Services ✓	\$71,400
Eligible Projects ✓	<u>\$27,213</u>
Approximate Total Funds	\$475,000
<i>plus any Carry Forward</i>	



CITY OF SEASIDE
Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC)
Long Range Calendar
July 2014 – June 2015

July CDAC Meeting	July 16, 2014
- 2013-14 CDBG Subrecipient Monitoring Schedule - Recruitment & Appointment of CDAC members - Long-term calendar	
Staff draft Consolidated Annual Performance & Evaluation Report (CAPER)	July, all month
Staff conduct annual subrecipient monitoring	July, all month
CAPER and Annual Community Assessment (ACA) Workshop Notice	August 7, 2014
August CDAC Meeting and Community Workshop	August 20, 2014
- Fourth Quarter (Apr-Jun) and Annual Program Reports - ACA Workshop	
Draft CAPER publication	August 28, 2014
Annual Planning Notice	August 28, 2014
- initiate planning process - notice of community workshop - publish application dates and deadlines	
September CDAC Meeting and Community Workshop	September 17, 2014
- Five-year consolidated planning process orientation - Annual Community Needs Assessment Workshop - CDBG application form/process review	
City Council public hearing	September 18, 2014
- present the CAPER	
CAPER due to HUD	September 29, 2014
October CDAC Meeting	October 15, 2014
- Annual Priority Needs - CDBG application form/process draft	
City Council	November 6, 2014
- informational item to present the needs identified at the 10/15 workshop and discuss the five-year and annual process	
NOFA and Applications Released	November 14, 2014
November CDAC Meeting and Proposal Workshop	November 19, 2014
- mandatory for all interested applicants - First Quarter Program Report (Jul-Sep)	
December CDAC Meeting	December 17, 2014
- mid-year re-allocation (moved to next meeting) - 2013-14 public service monitoring letters	
Applications due	January 16, 2015
January CDAC Meeting	January 21, 2015
- summary of applications received - mid-year re-allocation	(cancelled; quorum)
Staff reading of applications received, check threshold requirements, review background materials, questions for applicants.	January 19-30, 2015
Special CDAC Meeting	February 4, 2015
- Staff transmits applications to CDAC with summary review, questions and responses. - Staff provides instructions for review and ranking of applications.	

- Mid-year re-allocation - Multi-year funding cycle	
CDAC reading applications	February 5 – 25, 2015
February CDAC Meeting (no meeting)	February 18, 2015
Special CDAC Meeting - Second Quarter Program Report (Oct-Dec) - CDAC to report out on individual review and ranking of applications.	February 25, 2015
CDAC Work Sessions - interviews, ranking and recommendations	February 26 – March 17, 2015
March CDAC Meeting - CDAC recommendations on annual funding	March 18, 2015
Administrative draft annual Action Plan to CDAC	March 26, 2015
Special CDAC Meeting - Review draft Action Plan	April 1, 2015
Publish annual Action Plan for comment and open 30-day public comment period	April 9, 2015
April CDAC Meeting - if needed	April 15, 2015
City Council - present CDAC recommendations and draft annual Action Plan	April 16, 2015
City Council – public hearing - adopt final Action Plan	May 7, 2015
Action plan due to HUD	May 15, 2015
May CDAC Meeting - Update on Annual Action Plan submitted to HUD - Third Quarter Program Report (Jan-Mar)	May 20, 2015
<i>Conditional notice of awards to Subrecipients</i>	<i>May</i>
June CDAC Meeting - if needed	June 17, 2015

W:\Seaside, City of\CDBG\2013-14\CDAC\CDAC Long Range Calendar.doc
rev. 2015-01-26