



AGENDA

CITY OF SEASIDE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING
OLDEMEYER CENTER
986 Hilby Avenue
Wednesday, January 17, 2018
6:30 PM

PLEASE TURN OFF YOUR CELL PHONES UPON ENTERING THE MEETING

1. **ROLL CALL**

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

John Francis	Chair
Sue Hawthorne	Committee Member
Rebecca Pieken	Committee Member
Clementine Bonner-Klein	Committee Member
Vacant	Committee Member

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

4. **OLD BUSINESS**

A. **UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF THE REGIONAL COLLABORATION OF
MONTEREY COUNTY ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING**

PURPOSE: The purpose of this item is to update the CDAC on the regional collaboration of the Cities of Seaside, Salinas and Monterey, Monterey County and the Housing Authority of the County of Monterey on the HUD mandated Assessment of Fair Housing.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the CDAC receive the report.

5. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. DISTRIBUTION OF APPLICATIONS AND SCORING MATERIALS TO THE CDAC TO START THE REVIEW PROCESS BEGINNING THE RECOMMENDATION PROCESS FOR FUNDING ALLOCATIONS TO PRESENT TO CITY COUNCIL FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018-2019 AND 2019-2020.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this item is to distribute applications and scoring materials to the CDAC to begin the review process.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the CDAC accept the applications and begin the review process.

B. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FROM THE US DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR THE SEASIDE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM FOR PROGRAM YEARS 2015 AND 2016.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this item is to present the December 29, 2017 report from HUD regarding the performance assessment of the City of Seaside's CDBG program from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2017.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the CDAC receive the report.

6. REVIEW LONG RANGE CALENDAR

A. REVIEW OF THE CDAC LONG RANGE CALENDAR AND DISCUSSION OF SCHEDULING OF POSSIBLE SPECIAL MEETINGS FOR CDBG APPLICATION REVIEW AND/OR SCHEDULING OF CDBG FUNDING APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS AS WELL AS OTHER ADJUSTMENTS AS NECESSARY

7. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

8. REPORTS BY STAFF

9. ADJOURNMENT

Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting:
February 21, 2018
6:30 PM

The City of Seaside is committed to providing accessible facilities and accommodating people with disabilities in all of its services programs and activities. If special considerations are needed by any person to fully participate in this meeting, they are asked to contact the City Clerk at 899-6707 no fewer than two business days prior to the meeting to allow reasonable arrangements. The City Council chamber is equipped with a portable microphone and assisted listening devices are available at all meetings.

City Council 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://cyp.telvue.com/player?id=T01629&video=52314&noplaylists=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.



**CITY OF SEASIDE
STAFF REPORT**

Item No.: 4.A.

TO: Community Development Advisory Committee

BY: Sharon Mikesell, Administrative Analyst

DATE: January 17, 2018

**SUBJECT: UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF THE REGIONAL COLLABORATION
OF MONTEREY COUNTY ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING**

PURPOSE

The purpose of this item is to update the CDAC on the regional collaboration of the Cities of Seaside, Salinas and Monterey, Monterey County and the Housing Authority of the County of Monterey on the HUD mandated Assessment of Fair Housing.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the CDAC receive the report.

BACKGROUND

On July 16, 2015, at 80 FR 42357, HUD published in the Federal Register its Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) final rule. The AFFH final rule provides HUD program participants with a new approach for planning for fair housing outcomes that will assist them in meeting their statutory obligation to affirmatively further fair housing as required by the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. 3608. To assist HUD program participants in meeting this obligation, the AFFH rule provides that program participants must conduct an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) using an "Assessment Tool."

As a result of this, the five agencies in Monterey County receiving HUD/CDBG funding entered into an MOU to prepare the AFH document and have contracted with Veronica Tam and Associates to start that process.

On January 6, 2018, HUD issued a notice that the deadline for the AFH has been extended to consolidated plan participants until the next AFH submission deadline that falls after October 21, 2020. Agencies must continue to comply with the existing statutory obligations to affirmatively further fair housing.

As a result, the agencies must conduct an analysis of impediments to fair housing within the jurisdiction, take appropriate actions to overcome the effects of any impediments identified through that analysis and maintain records reflecting the analysis and actions.

HUD encourages program participants to collaborate to develop a regional AI, as regional collaborations provide an opportunity for program participants to share resources and address fair housing issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries.

During the regularly scheduled conference call on January 10, the agencies agreed that since all the participants will need an updated Analysis of Impediments, we should proceed with the project already underway and Veronica Tam has indicated that although the template to create the report will be different, the outreach efforts are similar and we can proceed with a joint project as we all will still need a report for the next Consolidated Plan.

Note: Seaside's most recent Analysis of Impediments on file with HUD was prepared in 2004, so it is overdue for an update. We are moving ahead with the deadline of October 4, 2019 to have a report completed and submitted to HUD.

MIG (Veronica Tam's subconsultant) will be coordinating the Community Participation Plan. A copy of the plan is attached to this Staff Report. The CDAC will be involved in the outreach with the role more specifically developed as the process continues. Using the timeline on page 7 of the plan, it is anticipated the Focus Groups and Workshops will be scheduled in the spring and early summer of 2018.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact connected with this report. The Consultant has indicated that although the template of the report will change to a joint Analysis of Impediments, the project will proceed without any cost adjustments.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1.
 1. 2018-00106 HUD MEMO
 2. Monterey County AFH Community Participation Plan_Final
-



DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR-5173-N-15]

**Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing: Extension of Deadline for Submission of
Assessment of Fair Housing for Consolidated Plan Participants**

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice advises that HUD is extending the deadline for submission of an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) by local government consolidated plan program participants to their next AFH submission date that falls after October 31, 2020. Such program participants will not be required to submit an AFH using the current Office of Management and Budget (OMB)-approved version of the Assessment of Fair Housing Tool for Local Governments (OMB Control No: 2529-0054), but must continue to comply with existing obligations to affirmatively further fair housing. Local government program participants that have already submitted an AFH that has been accepted by HUD must continue to execute the goals of that AFH.

DATES: Applicability Date: **[Insert date of publication in the Federal Register].**

Comment Due Date: **[Insert date 60 days from date of publication in the Federal Register].**

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments responsive to this notice to the Office of General Counsel, Regulations Division, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW., Room 10276, Washington, DC 20410-0001. All submissions should refer to the above docket number and title. Submission of public comments may be carried out by hard copy or electronic submission.

1. Submission of Hard Copy Comments. Comments may be submitted by mail or hand delivery.

Each commenter submitting hard copy comments, by mail or hand delivery, should submit

comments to the address above, addressed to the attention of the Regulations Division. Due to security measures at all federal agencies, submission of comments by mail often results in delayed delivery. To ensure timely receipt of comments, HUD recommends that any comments submitted by mail be submitted at least 2 weeks in advance of the public comment deadline. All hard copy comments received by mail or hand delivery are a part of the public record and will be posted to <http://www.regulations.gov> without change.

2. Electronic Submission of Comments. Interested persons may submit comments electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. HUD strongly encourages commenters to submit comments electronically. Electronic submission of comments allows the commenter maximum time to prepare and submit a comment, ensures timely receipt by HUD, and enables HUD to make comments immediately available to the public. Comments submitted electronically through the <http://www.regulations.gov> website can be viewed by other commenters and interested members of the public. Commenters should follow instructions provided on that site to submit comments electronically.

No Facsimile Comments. Facsimile (fax) comments are not acceptable.

Public Inspection of Comments. All comments submitted to HUD regarding this notice will be available, without charge, for public inspection and copying between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Eastern Time, weekdays at the above address. Due to security measures at the HUD Headquarters building, an advance appointment to review the public comments must be scheduled by calling the Regulations Division at 202-708-3055 (this is not a toll-free number). Individuals with speech or hearing impairments may access this number through TTY by calling the Federal Relay Service at 800-877-8339 (this is a toll-free number). Copies of all comments submitted are available for inspection and downloading at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Krista Mills, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Policy, Legislative Initiatives, and Outreach, Office Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW, Room 5246, Washington, D.C. 20410; telephone number 202-402-6577. Individuals with hearing or speech impediments may access this number via TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Relay Service during working hours at 1-800-877-8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On July 16, 2015, at 80 FR 42357, HUD published in the Federal Register its Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) final rule. The AFFH final rule provides HUD program participants with a new approach for planning for fair housing outcomes that will assist them in meeting their statutory obligation to affirmatively further fair housing as required by the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. 3608. To assist HUD program participants in meeting this obligation, the AFFH rule provides that program participants must conduct an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) using an “Assessment Tool.” HUD’s AFFH regulations provide for a staggered AFH submission deadline for its program participants. (See 24 CFR 5.160.)

On October 24, 2016, at 81 FR 73129, HUD published a notice extending the deadline for submission of an AFH for local government consolidated plan participants that received in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015, or receive in a subsequent fiscal year, a CDBG grant of \$500,000 or less, or in the case of a HOME consortium, whose members collectively received a CDBG grant of \$500,000 or less, from the program year that begins on or after January 1, 2018, to the program year that begins on or after January 1, 2019 for which a new consolidated plan is due. By notice published in the Federal Register on January 13, 2017, at 82 FR 4388, HUD announced the

renewal of approval of the Assessment Tool for use by local governments that receive Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG), or Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) formula funding from HUD when conducting and submitting their own AFH, and in some joint and regional collaborations, as explained in that notice. This Assessment Tool is referred to as the Assessment of Fair Housing Tool for Local Governments.

This notice extends the deadline for submission of an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) to all local government consolidated plan program participants until their next AFH submission deadline that falls after October 31, 2020. (See 24 CFR 5.160(a) for information about how to calculate a program participant's AFH submission deadline.) The AFFH rule requires that program participants have no less than 9 months after the publication of the OMB-approved assessment tool to submit their AFH. Therefore, the Department selected the October 31, 2020 date in anticipation that it will complete the Paperwork Reduction Act requirements and receive OMB approval to renew the Assessment of Fair Housing Tool for Local Governments by January 31, 2020. Local government program participants will not be required to submit an AFH using the current OMB-approved version of the Assessment of Fair Housing Tool for Local Governments (OMB Control No: 2529-0054), but must continue to comply with existing statutory obligations to affirmatively further fair housing. (See 42 U.S.C. 3608.) Local government program participants who qualified for an extension under the October 24, 2016 notice are also covered by this notice, extending their deadline for submission of an AFH to their next AFH submission deadline (See 24 CFR 5.160(a).) that falls after October 31, 2020.

Based on the initial AFH reviews, HUD believes that program participants need additional time and technical assistance to adjust to the new AFFH process and complete AFH

submissions that can be accepted by HUD. HUD's decision is informed by the review of AFH submissions received. Based on the first 49 AFH initial submissions that received a determination of accept, non-accept, or deemed accepted from HUD, the Department found that many program participants are striving to meet the requirements of the AFFH rule. In 2017, the Department conducted an evaluation of these submissions and found that more than a third (35%) were initially non-accepted.

HUD's analysis identified several reasons that merit a delay of AFH submission deadlines, including program participants' need for additional technical assistance. HUD determined that many program participants struggled to meet the regulatory requirements of the AFFH rule, such as developing goals that could be reasonably expected to result in meaningful actions to overcome the effects of contributing factors and related fair housing issues. Further, program participants struggled to develop metrics and milestones that would measure their progress as they affirmatively furthering fair housing. HUD determined that program participants' frequent misunderstanding of how to set clear goals, metrics, and milestones that addressed their identified contributing factors and related fair housing issues often resulted in non-accepted AFHs. HUD believes that additional technical assistance may result in program participants better understanding their obligations under the AFFH rule. HUD also believes that by enhancing its technical assistance that resources expended by program participants will be reduced because they are more likely to submit an initial AFH that can be accepted by HUD.

Additionally, HUD determined that significant staff resources are required when deciding that an AFH will not be accepted because it is inconsistent with fair housing or civil rights requirements or substantially incomplete, or both. (See 24 CFR 5.162 (a)(2)(b).) HUD believes that it can reduce the resources expended by program participants by examining and revising its

technical assistance content and methods of delivery so that program participants' AFHs are more likely to meet the regulatory requirements on first submission.

In order to reduce burden for program participants in conducting AFHs that meet the regulatory requirements, HUD, in the AFFH rule, encourages program participants to share resources and to address fair housing issues from a broader perspective by collaborating and submitting a single AFH. Nonetheless, HUD believes that some joint and regional collaborations that were non-accepted on their first submission may have benefited from technical assistance early in the process. For example, the largest regional AFH submitted to HUD consisted of 19 program participants. In its review of the AFH, HUD determined that each of the 19 program participants met the regulatory standards for nonacceptance. HUD believes that improving technical assistance for collaborative AFHs will enable collaborations to more efficiently use their resources to address fair housing issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries.

Based on the initial AFH reviews, HUD believes that local government program participants need additional time and technical assistance from HUD to adjust to the new AFFH process and complete acceptable AFH submissions. HUD also believes it can use this time to improve its Data and Mapping Tool (AFFH-T) and the User Interface (AFFH-UI). The extension period allows HUD to further refine its materials to provide additional guidance to program participants. Finally, this extension allows HUD staff to devote additional time to providing program participants, and program participants in an AFH collaboration, with technical assistance on the legal objective to affirmatively further fair housing.

Consolidated plan program participants must continue to comply with existing, ongoing obligations to affirmatively further fair housing. Until a consolidated plan program participant is required to submit an AFH, it will continue to provide the AFFH Consolidated plan certification

in accordance with the requirements that existed prior to August 17, 2015. See 24 CFR 5.160(a)(3). The requirements obligated a program participant to certify that it will affirmatively further fair housing, which means that it will conduct an analysis of impediments (AI) to fair housing choice within the jurisdiction, take appropriate actions to overcome the effects of any impediments identified through that analysis, and maintain records reflecting the analysis and actions.

For Consolidated plan program participants that are starting a new 3-5-year Consolidated plan cycle that begins before their due date for an AFH, the AI should continue to be updated in accordance with the HUD, Fair Housing Planning Guide (1996), available at <https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/FHPG.PDF> until those consolidated plan program participants submit an AFH after October 31, 2020. HUD encourages consolidated plan program participants to use the data and mapping tool and the AFH Assessment Tool as resources for program participants that are updating their AIs. HUD encourages program participants to collaborate to develop a regional AI, as regional collaborations provide an opportunity for program participants to share resources and address fair housing issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries.¹

Program participants that have already submitted an AFH which has been accepted by HUD must continue to execute the goals of that accepted AFH and are not required to conduct a separate AI. Program participants that are covered by this notice and that may have already

¹ Please refer to HUD's 2017 interim guidance for additional information on collaboration, specifically the Q&A captioned: "How can States Collaborate with Local Governments or PHAs?". The guidance is available at: <https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Interim-Guidance-for-Program-Participants-on-Status-of-Assessment-Tools-and-Submission-Options.pdf>. This guidance is generally applicable to all types of program participants.

begun work on an AFH may continue to do so, as the AFFH rule may provide program participants with a useful framework for complying with their AFFH obligation.

HUD will discontinue the review of AFHs currently under review and will not render an accept, deemed accepted, or non-accept determination. Program participants that received a non-accept decision from HUD on their AFH submission and are preparing to re-submit an AFH are also covered by this notice and should not submit their revised AFHs. HUD encourages these program participants to use the information contained in their draft AFHs to conduct the required AI analysis. Finally, program participants prepared to submit their first AFH are covered by this notice and should not submit an AFH to HUD. Program participants that have not received an accept or non-accept determination from HUD, or that have received a non-accept but will no longer be required to resubmit their AFH, are still required to prepare an AI, as described above in this notice.

HUD is issuing this notice for applicability immediately upon publication. Program participants must continue to affirmatively further fair housing as required by the Fair Housing Act. 42 U.S.C. 3608.

Although HUD is issuing this notice for applicability immediately upon publication, it also invites public comment for a period of 60-days on the extension. HUD will consider all the comments in its ongoing process of reviewing the Assessment of Fair Housing Tool for Local Governments.

Dated: January 2, 2018

Anna Maria Farías, Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing
and Equal Opportunity

[FR Doc. 2018-00106 Filed: 1/4/2018 8:45 am; Publication Date: 1/5/2018]



Regional Collaboration of Monterey County Assessment of Fair Housing Community Participation Plan

I. Introduction

The Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) is an evaluation of historical and existing fair housing conditions that result in goals that will be used in the development of the Consolidated Plan(s) for the County of Monterey (Urban County), City of Salinas, City of Monterey, City of Seaside, and the development of the public housing authority (PHA) Plan for the Housing Authority of the County of Monterey. The Monterey Urban County covers the unincorporated areas of Monterey County and the Cities of Gonzales, Greenfield and Sand City. This analysis must be completed in accordance with the requirements defined in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) new Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Rule.

Outreach is a key focus of the new AFFH Rule. MIG Inc, in partnership with Veronica Tam and Associates Inc, has designed a robust community outreach program, which will be implemented by MIG. The Community Participation Plan (CPP) describes the activities the Collaborating Parties and consultant team will undertake to engage a diverse cross-section of the County and attract a wider audience to participate in the development of the AFH. The CPP identifies specific outreach approaches, methods, target audiences, key activities and a preliminary schedule for implementation.

II. Outreach Approach

The public engagement program will offer opportunities for the public, local fair housing organizations, public and private housing providers, affordable housing advocates, and other community and civic leaders to be involved in the AFH development. In particular, the community outreach will seek out and consider the viewpoints of hard-to-reach groups such as seniors, youth, people with disabilities, communities of color, and low- and moderate-income residents in the course of conducting public outreach and involvement activities. The CPP is based on the following principles:



- o **Local networks.** The outreach efforts will leverage and tap into the existing networks of local community leaders and tenant organizations to collect input from a wide range of community members in the County.
- o **Authentic community dialogue.** Monterey County has several communities that are experiencing growth within a limited housing market, and this has often been accompanied with an overarching community concern of equity and inclusivity. This outreach effort will generate authentic dialogue, rooted in research and data, on affordable housing issues and opportunities. Local data and key statistics on housing in the County will help ground these conversations.
- o **Inclusive, flexible, and tailored approach.** MIG will proactively reach out to and engage a broad spectrum of stakeholder groups, including community leaders, limited English proficiency (LEP) populations, and low-income residents within the County. The outreach process will accommodate engagement in a variety of settings and will be tailored to match local and cultural preferences to the greatest extent possible.
- o **High touch engagement.** A key component of the outreach process will be personal, face-to-face interactions. Outreach methods such as focus groups and workshops will allow the Project Team to interact with community members in a “high touch” fashion.

III. Methods and Tools

Stakeholder and public input is critical to the AFH process. The CPP encompasses a range of methods and tools to reach diverse audiences. The objective is to make it easy and convenient for people to participate.

Outreach: These tools are used to raise awareness, get people interested and publicize education and engagement opportunities. They include:

- Bilingual flyers (Spanish and English)
- Bilingual e-Blasts (Spanish and English)
- Stakeholder database (to be maintained throughout project)
- Partner communications
- Websites of Collaborating Parties

Educate: These tools are used to inform and educate community members about key fair housing issues, challenges and opportunities across the County.

- Interactive community workshops



- Stakeholder consultation focus groups
- Visuals and maps (e.g. mapping of opportunities/disparities from AFH Tool)
- Website updates
- Social media content
- E-blasts

Engage: These tools are used to obtain input from and foster dialogue between stakeholders. The process will collect input on fair housing issues, ideas, and concerns.

- Key informant interviews
- Fair housing survey
- Stakeholder consultation focus groups
- Interactive community workshops
- Social media engagement through Twitter, Next Door, Facebook, etc.

IV. Key Audiences

The Project Team will engage community leaders, the general public and other stakeholders across the County to collect their input on fair housing issues. The key audiences below will be targeted through the appropriate engagement methods. **This is a “living list” and MIG will continue to add stakeholders/ audiences to the list to ensure strong representation from City of Salinas, Monterey, Seaside and other areas in the County.**

1. Monterey County residents
2. Monterey County Department officials and staff
 - a. Housing and Planning Departments
3. Housing Authority of the County of Monterey (HACM)
4. Community organizations
 - a. Veterans Transition Center
 - b. San Andreas Regional Center
 - c. Community Alliance for Safety and Peace
 - d. American Red Cross (Monterey Chapter)
 - e. Cesar Chavez Foundation
 - f. Communities for Sustainable Monterey County
 - g. First Mayor’s House
 - h. Food Bank for Monterey County
 - i. Meals on Wheels of the Salinas Valley
 - j. Non-profit Alliance of Monterey County
 - k. Building Healthy Communities initiative



- I. COPA
 - m. Center for Community Advocacy /Centro de Abogacía de la Comunidad
- 5. Affordable housing developments
 - a. Las Casas de Madera
 - b. Dai-Ichi Village Senior Affordable Housing
 - c. Northridge Park
 - d. Catalyst Apartments
 - e. Steinbeck Commons Apartments
 - f. Lupine Gardens Apartments
 - g. Mariposa Apartments
- 6. Affordable and fair housing advocates and organizations
 - a. Housing Development Corporation
 - b. CHISPA
 - c. Coalition of Homeless Services Providers
 - d. Mid-Peninsula Housing Corporation
 - e. Legal Services for Seniors
 - f. Eden Housing (absorbed South County Housing)
 - g. Habitat for Humanity
 - h. Interim
 - i. ECHO Housing
 - j. Housing Choices
 - k. Project Sentinel
- 7. Tenant organizations
 - a. Housing Resource Center
 - b. Salvation Army - Good Samaritan Center
 - c. Tenants Together - Tenant Foreclosure Hotline
 - d. Access Support Network (took over for John XXIII AIDS Ministry)
 - e. Central Coast Foreclosure Collaboration
- 8. Faith-based organizations
- 9. Educational institutions and young people
 - a. Administration of Hartnell College
 - b. Alisal Campus
 - c. Central Coast College
 - d. Cal State Monterey Bay
 - e. Steinbeck Innovation Cluster
 - f. Local high schools
 - g. Boys and Girls Club of Monterey County



10. Advisory Committees and social service agencies
 - a. Monterey County Department of Social and Employment Services
 - b. Seaside Community Development Advisory Committee
 - c. Monterey County Equal Opportunity
 - d. Monterey County Migrant Seasonal Head Start Office
11. Realtors and Business Organizations
 - a. SUBA
 - b. Monterey County Association of Realtors
 - c. Shankle Real Estate
 - d. Century 21
 - e. Central Coast Properties
 - f. The Jacobs Team
12. Local Farm Worker Organizations
 - a. Monterey County Farm Bureau
 - b. Rural Development Center (ALBA)
 - c. United Farm Workers
 - d. Center for Community Advocacy
 - e. California Rural Legal Assistance
 - f. California Institute of Rural Studies
 - g. California Coalition for Rural Housing
 - h. Farmworker Institute of Education & Leadership Development
13. Seniors and older residents
 - a. A. Alliance on Aging
14. Youth
 - a. Rancho Cielo
15. People with disabilities
 - a. Central Coast Center for Independent Living
 - b. Veteran Transition Center
 - c. Gateway Center of Monterey County
 - d. Interim, Inc

V. Metrics of Success

The public engagement program will be assessed according to its ability to reach specific participant groups and achieve particular outreach targets and measurements.



Accessibility

- Engagement activities will be held in a variety of locations and formats to accommodate hard-to-reach groups such as youth, seniors, minorities, low-income families, and people with disabilities.
- All formal meetings will be held in ADA accessible locations.
- All formal meetings will be held at venues with access to public transit.
- Bi-lingual staff will be assigned to events in areas likely to attract Spanish speaking residents.
- Engagement activities are scheduled at varying times to accommodate the needs of area workers in the 24 hour economy.

Extent, or reach, of the process

- Community workshops, surveys and focus groups will be publicized broadly using an array of methods that allows residents and stakeholders to participate in some outreach activity throughout the AFH process.
- The process will also include highly targeted activities designed to reach those who traditionally don't participate or respond to the County's communications materials.
- Participation goals will be set for reaching individuals from specific demographic groups for the following individual methods:
 - Print and online survey
 - Community workshop attendance
 - Focus group attendance

Diversity of participants

- Outreach efforts will be designed to reach participants that are reflective of the demographics of the County including age, ethnicity, income and neighborhood.
- Outreach activities will routinely collect participant data to help assess how well we are reaching a socio-economically diverse population of residents and on what issues their perspective may differ from the broader public.
- Outreach efforts will include a variety of groups and organizations that are representative of the County geography, interests, and constituencies.



VI. Preliminary Timeline

We understand the Collaborating Parties have coordinated to set a deadline for October 4, 2019 for the AFH Plan. The following timeline for major outreach tasks will allow ample time for completing the AFH Plan.

Task	Tentative Timeline
Kick-off Meeting	November 2017
Community Participation Plan	December 2017
Fair Housing Survey	November 2017 – June 2018
Key Informant Interviews (10)	January – February 2018
Community Outreach Materials	March 2018
Stakeholder Consultation Focus Groups (2)	April – May 2018
Community Workshops (4)	May- July 2018



**CITY OF SEASIDE
STAFF REPORT**

Item No.: 5.A.

TO: Community Development Advisory Committee

BY: Sharon Mikesell, Administrative Analyst

DATE: January 17, 2018

**SUBJECT: DISTRIBUTION OF APPLICATIONS AND SCORING
MATERIALS TO THE CDAC TO START THE REVIEW PROCESS
BEGINNING THE RECOMMENDATION PROCESS FOR FUNDING
ALLOCATIONS TO PRESENT TO CITY COUNCIL FOR FISCAL
YEARS 2018-2019 AND 2019-2020.**

PURPOSE

The purpose of this item is to distribute applications and scoring materials to the CDAC to begin the review process.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the CDAC accept the applications and begin the review process.

BACKGROUND

The application period for Seaside's CDBG funding subrecipients for the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 cycles ended on Friday, January 12 at 5pm.

All applications received by the deadline are being distributed to the CDAC at this time to begin the review process. All applications will also be posted online on the City website.

In order to ensure transparency, the CDAC should score ALL items on the scoring sheet. The items in yellow total 100 points and will be scored by the CDAC only. The items in blue total an additional 55 points and will be scored by the CDAC as well by Staff to assure agreement with the HUD goals of the CDBG program.

Preliminary scoring may be done on the provided worksheets as notes for an upcoming CDAC meeting when the CDAC members will be asked to provide their scores to be tabulated during the public meeting. CDAC members will not be asked to provide their scores electronically or outside of a noticed public meeting.

Should the CDAC wish to request any (or all) of the applicants to make a presentation regarding their application, Staff suggests scheduling presentations at a meeting to be determined during the review of the long range calendar.

FISCAL IMPACT

The CDAC should keep in mind that Public Service applicant funding is limited to 15% of the total award plus prior year program income. Program administration funds are capped at 20% of total award plus anticipated program income. There are no current outstanding Program 108 loans or other long term obligations involving Seaside's CDBG funds. Therefore, the CDAC can anticipate allocations of the balance of remaining funding to be used for projects/programs. The grant award is determined by the Federal Government and is contingent on the government's continuation of funding the CDBG program.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1.
 1. Application Rating Template 2018-2020
-

City of Seaside CDBG Program Application Rating Tool 2018-2020

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 OR
- 5 The activity prevents or eliminates slum or blight OR
- 5 The activity addresses an urgent need or problem in the community.

Proposed Project/Activity:

- 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
- a 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
- b 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**
- a 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.
- b 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).
- c 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.
- d 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 **17 Readiness to Proceed (consider both years of two year cycle)**

- a
- 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, 2018.
- 1 Predevelopment steps are in process but unlikely to be completed by July 1, 2018.
- 0 Predevelopment has not been adequately considered.
- b
- 6 Project will begin after July 1, 2018, and end on or before June 30, 2019.
- 3 Project will begin after July 1, 2018, and end on or before December 31, 2019.
- 0 Project will be completed on or after January 1, 2019.
- c
- 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.
- d
- 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 **20 Cost Reasonableness and Effectiveness**

- a
- 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.
- b
- 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.
- c
- 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.
- d
- 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.
- e
- 2 Relocation costs, if applicable, were considered in the budget.
- 0 Relocation costs, if applicable, were not considered in the budget.
- f
- 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.

Proposed Project/Activity:

6		20	Activity Management and Implementation
			The organization:
	a		3 Has sufficient management resources available. 0 Does not have sufficient management resources available.
	b		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.
	c		3 Has a record of proper management of all relevant activities. 0 Has had some problems with managing activities properly.
	d		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.
	e		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.
	f		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.
	g		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.
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.

Proposed Project/Activity:

- 8 **10 Past Performance**
In the past 5 years, the applicant:
- a 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.
- b 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.
- c 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:
- a 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.
- b 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.
- c 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.
- 11 **10 Potential Benefit to Target**
1 to 10 Benefit to the target clientele
0 No benefit to their clients
- 12 **20 Potential Benefit to City of Seaside**
1 to 20 Benefit to the community as a whole
0 No benefit to Seaside



**CITY OF SEASIDE
STAFF REPORT**

Item No.: 5.B.

TO: Community Development Advisory Committee

BY: Sharon Mikesell, Administrative Analyst

DATE: January 17, 2018

SUBJECT: **ANNUAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FROM THE US
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR
THE SEASIDE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
PROGRAM FOR PROGRAM YEARS 2015 AND 2016.**

PURPOSE

The purpose of this item is to present the December 29, 2017 report from HUD regarding the performance assessment of the City of Seaside's CDBG program from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2017.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the CDAC receive the report.

BACKGROUND

HUD assesses the performance of its grant recipients on a yearly basis. As the CDAC is aware, the City's CDBG program has participated in a repayment/reprogramming agreement as well as a timeliness work plan since 2013.

The report received December 29 indicates that the City has complied with the requirements for program year 2015 and 2016. In 2016, it was noted that the city far exceeded the minimum of 70% of expenditures for low and moderate income persons and maintained its strong performance regarding timeliness, which is measured by expending CDBG funds in a prompt manner so that the amount 60 days prior to the end of the program year does not exceed 1.5 times the annual allocation. For the 2016 test on May 2, 2017, Seaside had 0.50 times its allocation.

HUD has determined that the City has the continuing capacity to administer the CDBG program and the activities undertaken are consistent with the HUD approved Consolidated Plan.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact to the City's general fund regarding this item.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1.
 1. HUD Annual Performance Report
-



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

San Francisco Regional Office - Region IX
One Sansome Street, Suite 1200
San Francisco, California 94104
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

DEC 29 2017

The Honorable Ralph Rubio
Mayor, City of Seaside
440 Harcourt Avenue
Seaside, CA 93955-4708

Dear Mayor Rubio:

SUBJECT: Annual Performance Assessment
Community Development Block Grant
Program Year: July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017 (2016)
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016 (2015)

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD or the Department) Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) assesses the performance of its grant recipients on an annual basis. This letter conveys the results of the evaluation for the 2016 program year. Additionally, this letter transmits the final results of the 2015 program year, as tentative conclusions were presented last year.

A principal report utilized by CPD to assess performance is the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER), submitted by grant recipients within 90 days of the completion of each Program Year. The CAPER provides important information on the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds in meeting specific housing and community development goals and addressing the needs of the homeless, as identified in the grantee's Five-year Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan. Additionally, this assessment takes into consideration information collected from other financial and performance reports, correspondence, and monitoring documentation.

Program Year 2016 marked the second year of Seaside's 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan. Through the Plan, the city established five-year goals to benefit its low- and moderate-income residents by supporting public services, particularly those for youth and seniors, improving public facilities, infrastructure, and accessibility for persons with disabilities, addressing blight and nuisance, and rehabilitating existing housing. In this second year of the Consolidated Plan, improvements to public facilities were the focus, with the city continuing to work on projects from the previous year, including the Community Human Services' Genesis House, the Boys & Girls Club of Monterey County's Seaside Clubhouse, and Seaside Library accessibility projects. As it has in previous years, Seaside continued to address the needs of youth, older adults, and persons who are homeless by funding a variety of non-profits as public services.

As presented in the enclosed 2016 report, the city complied with certain key requirements which measure capacity. The CDBG program limits the amount of funds obligated for public

services to 15 percent or less and for administration and planning activities to 20 percent or less of the annual grant amount. The enclosed 2016 report shows that the city's public services obligation met the cap at 15 percent, and the administration/planning obligation was under the cap at 15.28 percent. The city expended 100 percent of its funds for activities for the benefit of low- and moderate-income persons, far exceeding the minimum of 70 percent for that purpose.

Seaside maintained its strong performance regarding timeliness, which is measured by expending CDBG funds in a prompt manner so that the amount on hand 60 days prior to the end of the program year does not exceed 1.5 times the annual allocation. For the 2016 test on May 2, 2017, Seaside had 0.50 times its allocation.

Based on this analysis, HUD has determined that the city has the continuing capacity to administer the CDBG program. The activities Seaside has undertaken are consistent with its HUD-approved Consolidated Plan, and the city is making progress in meeting its community development goals.

In accordance with the Consolidated Plan regulations described at 24 CFR §91.525, if the city has comments regarding the enclosed reports, please submit them to this office within 30 days of receipt of this letter. This office may revise the report(s) after considering the city's response. If the Department does not receive comments within the 30-day time period, this letter and the attached reports can be made available to the public.

This Office appreciates the partnership with Seaside staff and looks forward to continuing to support the city's efforts to meet the goals of the Consolidated Plan. If there are any questions or if there is a request for technical assistance, please do not hesitate to contact Alice Walkup, Senior Community Planning and Development Representative, at 415-489-6584 or Alice.Walkup@hud.gov.

Sincerely,



Kimberly Nash
Director
Community Planning and
Development Division

Enclosures

cc:

Craig Malin, City Manager

Sharon Mikesell, Administrative Analyst, Economic Development

**Annual Performance Assessment
Seaside
Program Year 2016**

Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report

Program Year End: June 30, 2017
Report Due: September 30, 2017
Report Received: September 25, 2017

Funding Covered by CAPER
CDBG: \$363,306.00
Program Income: \$146,878.89
Unexpended funds from prior year: \$291,343.36

Summary of Program Compliance

Community Development Block Grant Program

- Public Services Obligation [24 CFR 570.201(e)(1) or (2)]
 - Standard: <15% of Allocation plus Program Income received in prior year
 - Actual %: 15.00 %
 - Obligated as reported in CAPER: \$69,885.00
- Administration & Planning
 - Expenditure [24CFR 570.200(g)(1)]
 - Standard: <20% of Origin Year Allocation excluding Program Income
 - Actual %: 1.52%
 - Expenditure as reported in CAPER: \$5,525.00
 - Obligation [24CFR 570.200(g)(2)]
 - Standard: <20% of Allocation plus Program Income received in current year
 - Actual %: 15.28%
 - Obligated as reported in CAPER: \$77,967.22
- Benefit to Low- to Moderate-Income Persons [24 CFR 570.200(a)(3)]
 - Standard: At least 70% of the aggregate amount of CDBG funds received by the recipient shall be used for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons as reported in the CAPER.
 - Actual %: 100 %

- Timeliness of Expenditures [24 CFR §570.902]
 - Standard: The regulations require that 60 days before the end of the program year, the city have no more than the equivalent of 1 ½ years-worth of CDBG grant funds available in its U.S. Treasury account. A ratio at or below 1.50 is acceptable.
 - Actual ratio: 0.50
 - Balance: \$179,994.34
 - Test date: May 2, 2017

Comments: HUD has concluded that the city of Seaside has complied with the listed requirements for the Community Development Block Grant program during program year 2016.

**Annual Performance Assessment
Seaside
Program Year 2015**

Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report

Program Year End: June 30, 2016
Report Due: September 30, 2016
Report Received: September 19, 2016

Funding Covered by CAPER
CDBG: \$379,027.00
Program Income: \$102,600.00
Unexpended funds from prior year: \$392,019.34

Summary of Program Compliance

Community Development Block Grant Program

- Public Services Obligation [24 CFR 570.201(e)(1) or (2)]
 - Standard: <15% of Allocation plus Program Income received in prior year
 - Actual %: 14.92 %
 - Obligated as reported in CAPER: \$72,303.50
- Administration & Planning Obligation/Cap [24 CFR 570.200(g)]
 - Standard: <20% of Allocation plus Program Income received in current year
 - Actual %: 12.15 %
 - Obligated as reported in CAPER: \$58,517.62
- Benefit to Low- to Moderate-Income Persons [24 CFR 570.200(a)(3)]
 - Standard: At least 70% of the aggregate amount of CDBG funds received by the recipient shall be used for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons as reported in the CAPER.
 - Actual %: 93.52 %
- Timeliness of Expenditures [24 CFR §570.902]
 - Standard: The regulations require that 60 days before the end of the program year, the city have no more than the equivalent of 1 ½ years-worth of CDBG grant funds available in its U.S. Treasury account. A ratio at or below 1.50 is acceptable.
 - Actual ratio: 0.64
 - Balance: \$243,864.58
 - Test date: May 2, 2016

Comments: HUD concluded that the city of Seaside complied with the above requirements for the Community Development Block Grant program during program year 2015.



CITY OF SEASIDE
Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC)
Long Range Calendar
July 2017- – June 2018

July CDAC Meeting Orientation Presentation Elect Officers Status of AAP	July 19,2017
Staff draft Consolidated Annual Performance & Evaluation Report (CAPER)	July and August
AAP Due to HUD with appropriate attachments/certifications	August 15, 2017
Funding Approval Document received and contract documents to sub recipients	August-upon HUD approval of AAP
August CDAC Meeting - CAPER preview - Discuss 2016-2017 CDBG Subrecipient Monitoring Schedule - Fourth Quarter (Apr-Jun) and Annual Program Reports	August 16, 2017
Annual Planning Notice & Notice of CAPER Publication - notice of community workshop	August 31 2017
Draft CAPER publication (15 day comment)	September 6, 2017
September CDAC Meeting and Community Workshop - Annual Community Needs Assessment Workshop - There WILL be a FULL application process this year	September 20, 2017
City Council public hearing CAPER	September 21, 2017
CAPER due to HUD	September 30, 2017
October CDAC Meeting - Annual Priority Needs - Update of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing/Countywide Collaboration efforts	October 18, 2017
City Council - informational item to present the needs identified at the September workshop and discuss the annual process/two year cycle	November 2, 2017
NOFA announcement in Monterey County Weekly	November 2, 2017
November CDAC Meeting/MANDATORY PROPOSAL WORKSHOP Also: First Quarter Program Report (Jul-Sep) Review Plans regarding public service monitoring	November 15, 2017
December CDAC Meeting (if needed)	December 20, 2017
PROPOSALS DUE FOR 2018-2020 Public Service and City/Subrecipient Projects	January 12, 2018 at 5PM
January CDAC Meeting - Discuss mid-year re-allocation (if needed) - Distribute Proposals	January 17, 2018
February CDAC Meeting Second Quarter Program Report (October-December) Review of ranking of applications for 2018-2020	February 21, 2018
Administrative draft Annual Action Plan to CDAC	March 16, 2018
March CDAC Meeting	March 21, 2018

Review AAP and recommend to start Public Comment Period/City Council approval process NEW in 2018-ANNUAL WORK PLAN to present to City Council (must be approved by CDAC by April 1-City Council will review/approve in May)	
Advertisement to run for Annual Action Plan/Public Hearing for AAP	April 6, 2018,
April CDAC Meeting (likely to be cancelled)	April 18, 2018
City Council - present CDAC recommendations for annual Action Plan	April 19, 2018
City Council – public hearing - adopt annual Action Plan	May 3, 2018
Action Plan Due to HUD	May 15, 2018
May CDAC Meeting - 3rd Quarter sub recipient reports - Update on CDBG program/AFH	May 16, 2018
June CDAC Meeting (if needed) - Elections	June 20, 2018
<i>Conditional notice of awards to Subrecipients</i>	<i>TBD</i>