



CITIZEN'S COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FULL COMMITTEE MEETING

Members of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development will be holding their monthly meeting at the location and on the date indicated below:

**Tuesday, May 17, 2011
1 South Van Ness Avenue
Conference Room 5080 (5th Floor)
5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.**

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

By Chris Block at 5:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Committee: Utuma Belfrey, Chris Block, Peter Cohen, Colin Lacon, Irene Yee Riley, Charlie Sciammas

Staff present: Brian Cheu, Bruce Ito, Pierre Stroud

3. Approval of Minutes of 3/15/11, 4/5/11, 4/19/11

Correction: the committee reviewed minutes of 3/24, 4/5/11 and 4/19/ for approval, 3/15/11 minutes were previously approved.

Motion by Colin Lacon to approve. Motion seconded by Utuma Belfrey. Minutes approved unanimously.

4. 2011-12 CDBG and ESG Allocations

Brian Cheu gave an update on 2011-12 CDGB and ESG allocations (handout). Brian reported that ESG received a 35% increase, and which enabled us to restore funding to agencies that were cut at 20 percent scenario. Based on the actual, 16.54% cut scenario, MOH-CDD cuts were restored, and funding for the wish list projects and providing a minimum of \$50k funding was achieved. OEWD increased funding for high performing

grantees but did not add any new proposals. List of funded projects went to Mayor Lee first. He requested one change, MHDC was restored to \$30,000. At the Budget Committee of Board of Supervisors, 15 agency representatives gave public comment. Of those, 12 conveyed their thanks, two gave thanks but noted they got a cut and one commented on not being funded. No comments from the Budget Committee. Recommendations go to full board as soon as allocation is final at the end of May.

Next week is grantee orientations to prepare agencies for getting into contract July 1. Committee asked about new grantees, Bayview YMCA, CYC for a TAY proposal and DSCS as fiscal agent for African Advocacy Project.

Chris Block commented on the testimony that the CDBG money spent in the Bayview is not working, and that no jobs are created. Chris would like a post-summer report on programs in Bayview, reporting jobs created, guns turned in, etc.

Committee discussed continued funding for agencies versus expecting financial self sufficiency after a certain period of time. CDBG funding is considered continued funding. Some groups with diversified funding complain that their grant monies are leveraged, but they get cut because they have other sources of funding.

Committee discussed shrinking youth employment opportunities, as the number of programs have been drastically reduced over the years. This should impact the committee's funding decisions moving forward.

Committee discussed the shrinking CDBG, WIA and (possibly) HOME funds, and that MOH could become irrelevant as a funder. MOH-CDD and related agencies are unique in that they tap the community/neighborhoods for input on the relevance of funding decisions.

Committee discussed the tension between adding back a low performing agency, while zeroing out high performing agencies. Staff responded that zeroed out agencies were, for example, FRCs and youth employment agencies which were not prioritized service areas. Committee discussed how to, in an era of limited resources, create a scenario/planning process if there was half as much money. This would force the discussion of what are the intractable problems in the City. If the monies go away, it takes away the City's power, then what is the role of the City in community development? Committee would like to determine the knowledge, resources and leverage that the City has.

As an example of community building, Brian discussed how Lariza and Pierre spent time convening groups in the OMI and Western Addition. There was no money attached to it, but the community felt good about it. But money does not fix everything, and there should be strategic thinking, like the process with the SOMA Stabilization Fund. Committee discussed the difference between convening the community and funding organizations.

Committee discussed the priorities that they determined in the “dot” exercise, and these priorities can be brought to the City. Next meeting, the committee would like to discuss the results of that exercise and the community meetings six months ago. Staff will provide the information at the next meeting.

Defining “community development” is important. This definition is approached differently by MOH and OEWD. There needs to be more fluidity between departments. Merging MOH and MOCD allowed MOH housing program grants, ESG and Public Service to be more flexible. CBOs are also employers that provide professional capacity building. There is a difference between a community based organization and a citywide services provider. In evaluating a CBO, employment and professional incubation a factor as well as the value of the service provided. However, CBOs sometimes do not offer the same salary, benefit and job quality.

Committee discussed what role the City can play, as a policy maker and a land owner, not just as a funder. Is affordable housing and living wage jobs more important, which is part of community development? What does the City not do? City is not seen as capacity builder. Community is more open to seeing City in different roles, but this happens over time.

Committee discussed the focus groups conducted six months ago, and the impact of the information gathered and the reasons for the community’s responses.

Brian distributed a HOPE SF summary (handout). Brian and Pierre presented the results. Committee discussed the handout. Westside will not move forward because the project did not pencil financially. Committee encouraged grant managers to have more aggressive targets for next year.

5. New Business

N/A

6. Public Comment

Chris Jackson of Visitacion Valley Community Center commented that at the Sunnydale planning session of the 40-50 people there, only five or six were residents. At the Potrero planning session, out of 200 participants, 12 were residents, of those eight were paid, four were unpaid. Residents are not connected with planning process.

Chris discussed a letter regarding VVCDC. Committee noted that this issue will be agendized in the future if necessary. Chris represents 10-12 community groups. At the 1099 site, VVCDC moved out, the agency had capacity issues. Chris recommends that an indigenous community based group should operate the site, and would like to be part of the planning process, including decisions on tenants. The site is on a former public housing site. Area has a 60% unemployment rate. There is a need to get the site operating.

Committee discussed the 1099 site. It is a City owned property; the building was paid for by City and is under the control of the Real Estate Department. The site is the former Geneva Towers housing project; the village was built as a multi-use facility. The former Geneva Valley tenants' association became VVCDC. The former managing operator was VVCDC. City gives nonprofits a master lease, with nominal rent, but is responsible for maintenance. It is difficult to raise capital to maintain the facility. Does this model make sense if the nonprofit cannot maintain site? City owned properties finally put in master capital plan, but there is no money for it, master lease says nonprofit is responsible. Nonprofit rents space, operating plan has a built in assumption of rents, but if renting nonprofits can't pay, then the site can't be maintained. It is difficult to get foundations to pay for capital improvements in City-owned building. City forgave loan and it became a grant. Nonprofits can't be expected to build a capital reserve for a building they couldn't afford in the first place. Operations are the issue with the Village. Village was built by Mercy Housing. Rent is very low. Site is two blocks away from a development in 2014. Site currently houses, a health clinic, tenant counseling agency, and a parent support group. Boys' and Girls' club moved out so the 2nd floor is empty. Mercy Housing has no responsibility for Village.

Responsibility for being master lessee is great, part of package should be capacity building for that lessee. Build in soft investments to help build lessee's capacity over time. Hire a 3rd party property management because it is hard to get a nonprofit to get rent from nonprofit. Ventura Partners was original lessee, then handed lease over to VVCDC. Land has been entrusted to RE division and is intended for community development. Discussion is between City departments, like DCYF and MOH. How can community be involved in the process? This committee's purview does not cover the Village, as it does not receive CDBG funds.

Committee discussed their role and MOH staff's role in soliciting community input and transmitting it to other departments like RE. Want space populated as soon as possible.

Chris commented that the community has identified Brian as the point person for this process. Urges the recycling of dollars back into the community. VVBoom and Boys' and Girls' club wants to move back. The One Stop wants to move back. Rumor is Bayview Y will be brought in to run site. Coalition would like to run its own site. It's a part of the community benefits agreement.

Brian commented that he is not responsible for the disposition of the site. RE owns the building. Brian committed to working with Chris to create a line of communication to decision makers. What is RE's commitment to community input? Should the committee make a recommendation to RE to have a community meeting? Departments that would fund CBOs, such as Workforce, DCYF, Economic development, public health and MOH will have investment. Also potentially OAA and First Five. It is unclear who has current leases or if the Boys and Girls Club would be coming back. The decision of who will run the site is still being made. If rents don't add up to maintenance costs, who will pay the difference? What is the true cost? What would the City's subsidy be?

Brian described who is currently at the table: DPH, DCYF, RE, MOH, workforce development and economic development. Josh Keene of RE is a point person.

Committee discussed creating resolution in support of the points in Chris' letter. This would involve working with community benefits agreements, which the committee does not have purview over. AAACC and YCD also lease space from the City. Should committee expand its scope?

Chris commented that the community sees a new facility, but it's padlocked. The community needs tangible activity.

Chris Block made a resolution: in order to preserve the original intent of the community development process, that resulted from the repurposing of Geneva Towers, the committee: support the three principles in Chris' letter, and that inherent in those principles is community input. Committee supports a community meeting for site planning. Resolution will be forwarded to DPH, DCYF, RE, MOH, workforce development and economic development

Utuma Belfrey made a motion to approve Chris Block's resolution, and to add comments made by committee members. Motion seconded by Charlie Sciammas. Motion passed unanimously.

Colin Lacon proposed a letter to RE, stating the above. Committee concluded that a resolution would move faster. Letter would have to be drafted and brought back to committee.

Chris thanked committee and will bring back the committee's interest in this issue to community.

Chris Block will not be at next meeting. Will of group is to cancel June meeting.

Brian will provide an annotated meeting schedule to committee.

7. Adjournment

By Chris Block at 7:01.

NEXT MEETING DATE: July 19, 2011

The meeting room is wheel chair accessible. If you need translation services, a sign language interpreter, or any other accommodations, please call 415-701-5598 at least 72 hours in advance. For speech/hearing impaired callers, please call TYY/TDD 415-701-5503. For information on MUNI routes, please call 415-673-6864.