



## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

# AGENDA

**Monday, March 17, 2025**  
**12:00 p.m.**

This meeting includes in-person and virtual participation.  
Santiam Room

333 Broadalbin Street SW

Or join the meeting here:

<https://council.albanyoregon.gov/groups/cdc/zoom>

Phone: 1 (253) 215-8782 (Long distance charges may apply)

Meeting ID: 894 5923 3401; Passcode: 498781

Please help us get Albany's work done.

Be respectful and refer to the rules of conduct posted by the main door to the Chambers and on the website.

1. Call to Order (Chair)
2. Roll Call (Staff)
3. Approval of February 24, 2025, minutes [Pages 2-3] (Chair)
4. Scheduled Business (Staff)
  - 2025 Application Evaluation cont. [Pages 4-6]
5. Business from the Public (Chair)
6. Business from the Commission (Chair)
7. Next Meeting Date: Monday, April 21, 2025, at 12:00 p.m. in Santiam Room
8. Adjournment

*This meeting is accessible to the public via video connection. The location for in-person attendance is accessible to people with disabilities. If you have a disability that requires accommodation, please notify city staff at least 48-hours in advance of the meeting at: [cdaa@albanyoregon.gov](mailto:cdaa@albanyoregon.gov) or call 541-917-7550.*

*Testimony provided at the meeting is part of the public record. Meetings are recorded, capturing both in-person and virtual participation and are posted on the City's website.*

[albanyoregon.gov/cd](https://albanyoregon.gov/cd)





**MINUTES**

February 24, 2025

12:00 p.m.

Hybrid – Santiam Room

Approved: **DRAFT**

Call to Order

Chair Bessie Johnson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Members present: Jim Cole, Larry Timm, Ron Green, Courtney Stubbs, Robyn Davis, Bessie Johnson, John Robledo (arrived at 12:15 p.m.)

Members absent: Alex Johnson II, Emma Deane

Approval of Minutes for February 10, 2025

**12:01 p.m.**

**Motion:** Commissioner Davis moved to approve the February 10, 2025, meeting minutes as presented. Commissioner Cole seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Scheduled Business

**12:03 p.m.**

- 2025 CDBG Applicant Evaluations

Anne Catlin began with the Scoring Matrix providing averaged commission scores and reviewed potential options for determining award amounts. She reported that they don't know when they will find out the total funds they will receive and so it will be a quick turnaround to be ready when those figures are available. She emphasized that they should reaffirm priorities for the community and consider how well the organization aligns with Consolidated Plan Goals. Catlin reminded members that ultimately their decisions must be based on the application and evaluation criteria.

Chair Johnson opened the table for discussion.

Commissioner Davis suggested that they should focus on smaller organizations that may not have the same opportunities for funding than bigger, more established organizations leveraging funds.

Commissioner Cole noted that all applicants scored between 87 to 91, all scoring above the bar so their evaluation should focus on matching specific priorities and needs.

Commissioners debated the merits of each application and how each matched the priorities and objectives. Commissioner Cole continued that some may have a higher cost/person but if the program is reducing homelessness that carries a greater overall value to the community. Commissioners recognized the importance not just of shelter but case management in helping people be successful in finding housing. They agreed that the funding needed to be specific to Albany residents rather than those who aren't tied to the community.

The commission discussed the asks for case management or staff overhead versus funding direct client benefit. Catlin reminded the commissioners that sometimes asks for case management or staff overhead is something that other grants may not cover but are necessary to provide services and data management while essential for any organization to do required reporting or apply for grants does not provide a direct benefit in itself to the clients. Catlin then summarized options for distributing the funds and asked whether commissioners would leave any applicants out of consideration or pick a couple of the strongest applications to fully fund and then distribute the balance either by percentage or equally. Commissioners shared their preferences and most were in agreement.

Commissioner Timm suggested, and others agreed on prioritizing programs that have a direct correlation to homelessness. Putting energy towards the two shelters that are directly going to help those in need. Catlin calculated some draft numbers for the top public services applications and noted the balance left to distribute and that most applications were scalable for receiving less. Catlin asked the commissioners to review the applicant presentations and prepare to finalize their recommendations at the next meeting.

Business from the Public

None.

Business from the Commission

None.

Next meeting date

March 17, 2025, at 12:00 p.m. in the Santiam Room.

Adjournment

Chair Johnson called the meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Reviewed by,

Susan Muniz  
Recorder

Anne Catlin  
Comprehensive Planning Manager

*\*Documents discussed at the meeting that are not in the agenda packet are archived in the record. The documents are available by emailing [cdaa@albanyoregon.gov](mailto:cdaa@albanyoregon.gov).*

CDBG activities must comply with CDBG program objectives to develop viable urban communities by providing the following, principally for the benefit of low- and moderate-income (LMI) residents:

- Decent housing,
- A suitable living environment,
- Eliminate slums and blight, and
- Expanded economic opportunity.

CDBG activities must support one or more of the following Albany 2023-2027 Consolidated Plan goals.

2023-2027 CONSOLIDATED PLAN PRIORITIES: The following goals and objectives were identified and developed through agency consultations and citizen participation.

**PRIORITY 1:** Support affordable housing in Albany.

**PRIORITY 2:** Reduce homelessness.

**PRIORITY 3:** Increase availability of needed services for low- and moderate-income residents.

**PRIORITY 4:** Expand economic opportunities for low- and moderate-income residents.

**PRIORITY 5:** Strengthen and revitalize low- and moderate-income neighborhoods.

## Funding Decision Method Options

Historically, the CDC has used the evaluation criteria to determine how to award funds. Sometimes this has resulted in lower scoring applicants not receiving any funding or a lower percentage of their funding request.

PUBLIC SERVICE APPLICATIONS: Due to the high demand for these limited funds, this year we requested public service applicants to limit their request to \$30,000. However, this amount is still high given the city is likely to receive around \$50,000 to \$55,000 total.

### **Concept: Percentage of Request**

This method favors applicants that apply for larger sums. For example, if the top scoring applicant requested \$10,000 and receives 80% of their funding request they would receive \$8,000. Meanwhile, a lower scoring applicant who is awarded only 50% of their funding request but requested \$30,000 will receive \$15,000 just by virtue of applying for more funding. The amount of the funding request should be weighed as a part of the evaluation and funding decision making process, but not more so than the quality of the application and fulfillment of evaluation criteria. As such, the CDC may want to consider other methods for determining how funding is awarded. Below are a variety of options to consider.

### **Concept: All applicants are awarded funding in about the same amount or their full request if below the average.**

Example: (If total award is \$52,500 and there are 7 applicants)

1. All applicants receive \$7,500
2. Applicants applying for less than \$7,500 receive their full amount and the remaining applicants split the rest evenly.

### **Concept: Top applications receive more than bottom applications.**

Example: Top applicants receive \$10,000 each and other applicants receive \$5,000 each.

### **Concept: Applications are ranked, and the top gets most with each subsequent getting less.**

Example: The strongest applicant receives \$18,000, and subsequent applicants receive \$14,000, \$10,000, \$6,000, and so on.

### **Concept: Top applicant(s) is fully funded up to a cap and rest is split among remaining applicants.**

Example: A cap is set at \$20,000 and the top applicant receives \$20,000. The remaining applicants receive the difference (ex. \$5,500 each).

\*\*These are potential options. The CDC may decide to use any method it sees fit so long as decisions are made based on the applications and evaluation criteria.

2025 CDBG Scoring Matrix (Average Scores)			Public Service Applications									Other Apps	
Applicants:			OCWCOG	Boys and Girls Club	YMCA	COAT (CHC)	CARDV	CHANCE	Jackson Street YS	Albany Prtnrshp	Habitat	ESTIMATE	
Description:			Senior Companion	Summer Programs	B4 After Schl care	Unhoused Services	Case Mgmt	Shelter Staffing	Case Mgmt	Housing Rehab	Housing Rehab	Available	
Grant Requests:			\$4,300	\$10,800	\$18,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$130,000	180,000	\$143,100	\$52,500 37%
<b>Activity need, consolidated plan and CDBG award policies and priorities</b>													
Q1	The proposed activity clearly addresses one or more priorities in the 2023-2027 Consolidated Plan.	5	4.5	4.1	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	\$310,000	\$227,500 73%
Q2	The applicant describes a clear need in the community that they will address.	5	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.6	5.0	4.9	4.6		
Q3	The proposed activity is an effective strategy to address the identified gap in needs.	5	5.3	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6		
Q4	The proposed activity satisfies one of the CDBG National Objectives. (Yes/No)	5	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9		
Q5-6	The project and agency promotes inclusivity and diversity.	5	3.5	4.3	4.4	3.9	3.5	3.9	4.9	3.1	3.5		
Total for section		25	22.5	22.2	21.4	20.6	20.8	22.3	24.1	22.1	22.2		
<b>Benefit to low-income Albany residents, performance objective (# served)</b>													
Q7	The activity will primarily serve low/moderate income or presumed benefit Albany residents	10	8.5	8.4	7.9	9.4	7.4	9.0	8.4	8.0	8.0		
	The number of beneficiaries from this activity (higher score for those serving more people)	10	6.3	7.5	8.4	9.6	6.6	8.6	6.4	7.3	5.3		
Q8	The applicant provided clear and compelling accomplishments for this project and they are achievable.	5	4.9	4.9	4.5	4.0	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.9		
Total for section		25	19.6	20.8	20.8	23.0	18.8	22.1	19.5	20.0	18.1		
<b>Readiness to proceed, ability to complete in 12 months</b>													
Q9	The applicant provided a complete and realistic schedule which illustrates that the activity will be completed within the program year.	5	4.9	4.9	4.7	3.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4		
Q10	The applicant demonstrates readiness to implement the activity and any issues that would impede implementation have been resolved.	5	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.6		
Q11													
Total for section		10	9.9	9.9	9.6	8.9	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.3	8.9		
<b>Agency capacity, experience w/ fed \$, agency inclusivity</b>													
Q12	The agency has experience and demonstrated success implementing the proposed activity or project and using CDBG or other federal funds.	5	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.3	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.6	4.9		
Q13	The agency has demonstrated success meeting federal requirements or has otherwise illustrated their ability to meet federal requirements.	5	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.1	4.6	4.3	4.9	4.7	4.8		
Q15	If partnerships are necessary for the proposed activity, the agency has already developed those partnerships and there are clear roles for any partnering organizations.	5	5.0	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.5	4.3	4.8	4.0	4.8		
Sec. 5	Staff have the experience and qualifications to ensure the activity is successful.	5	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.5	4.9	5.0	4.6	4.1	4.9		
Total for section		20	19.5	19.3	18.8	16.8	18.9	18.3	19.1	17.4	19.2		
<b>Financial: project expenses are reasonable</b>													
Budget	The applicant provided a complete and realistic budget for the activity or project.	5	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.6		
	Activity expenses are reasonable and necessary.	5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.6	4.9	4.3	4.8	4.7	4.9		
Q17	CDBG funds are appropriate for this activity and will address a gap in funding.	5	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.9	4.6	4.6		
	The agency maximizes other funding sources to support this activity or project when possible.	5	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.1	4.9	4.0	4.6		
Total for section		20	19.0	19.0	18.1	18.3	18.8	17.3	19.1	18.0	18.6		
<b>Total Overall (Average)</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>90.5</b>	<b>91.1</b>	<b>88.6</b>	<b>87.4</b>	<b>86.8</b>	<b>89.6</b>	<b>91.4</b>	<b>86.8</b>	<b>87.1</b>		
<b>New Average with Commissioner Stubbs</b>			<b>91.6</b>	<b>92.1</b>	<b>89.9</b>	<b>87.7</b>	<b>86.6</b>	<b>90.7</b>	<b>92.4</b>	<b>87.2</b>	<b>88.5</b>		

Applicants:			OCWCOG	Boys and Girls Club	YMCA	COAT (CHC)	CARDV	CHANCE	Jackson Street YS	Albany Prtnrshp	Habitat	ESTIMATE	
Grant Requests:			\$4,300	\$10,800	\$18,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$130,000	180,000	\$143,100	\$52,500 37%
	evenly split options		4000	8080	8080	8080	8080	8080	8080				
	Percentage (37%)		1591	3996	6660	7400	11100	11100	11100	94900	131400	73%	
	Priority Needs/Outcomes		3000	4000	6000			15000	25000				