

City of Muncie ARP Neighborhoods Committee Meeting Minutes

11.11.2021 6:00p - 7:30p, Kennedy Library

Board Present: Jeff Robinson, Heather Williams, Jena Ashby, Eddie Chappell, Ken Hudson, Courtney Marsh, Kourtney McCauliff, Brad Polk, Nora Powell

Board Absent: Lezlie McCrory, Katie Wray

Public Present: ??

Staff Present: Dan Gibson, Megan Orbin

Neighborhood Organization: *What level of development should a neighborhood have reached to be considered organized?*

Criteria Discussed:

- Leadership structure with representation from within the neighborhood
- Bylaws
- Bank account or fiscal agent
- Holding publicized meetings
- An overall goal/mission statement
- Means to reach their neighbors

Proposed criteria will be determined and voted upon at December Meeting.

Funding Allocation:

Options Discussed:

- Even distribution among eligible neighborhoods
- Percentage of size (population, geographic, housing units)
- Need of area
- Weighted based on low MOD [as determined by HUD]
- Project-based decision
- Create a scorecard/matrix/rubric with the above

Committee Chair will create reports for each option discussed and distribute them to the Committee before December Meeting. The allocation process will be determined and voted upon at December Meeting.

Engagement Requirements: *How did the neighborhood decide how to spend the funds available?*

Requirements:

- Meeting minutes capturing the discussion, vote, and attendance
- Notification in the neighborhood - fliers, Facebook posts, email
- Description of how engagement looks in the neighborhood

Proposed requirements will be determined and voted upon at December Meeting.

Various Requirements/Criteria to be considered:

- If a neighborhood is planning to use a fiscal agent, a standard MOU must be signed, and the application must come from the neighborhood, not the fiscal agent on behalf of the neighborhood.
- Neighborhoods must schedule a pre-application conversation with Muncie Action Plan Task Force 2. During this conversation, Task Force 2 Members will discuss the stipulations regarding the use of the funds.
- A description of the neighborhood boundaries must be part of the application submitted.

Proposed requirements and criteria will be determined and voted upon at December Meeting.

Tentative Timeline

12.09.2021 - Second public Committee meeting

12.20.2021 - Policies and Procedures for distribution of funds sent to Committee for review; comments and corrections returned within two weeks

01.03.2022 - Publish Policies and Procedures for public comment

01.17.2022 - Publish Finalized Policies and Procedures

03.01.2022 - Intent to Organize OR Intent to Apply Deadline

05.01.2022 - Deadline to become a qualified Neighborhood

05.01.2022 - Application is available online

**Funding must be obligated by the end of 2024. It is unknown as to when exactly in May funds will be available to distribute.

Public Comment:

Ro Selvy thanked the Committee for the meeting, and she appreciated that the Committee is meeting and trying to make things fair. The Committee should know that what's best for the neighborhoods, regardless of size, is best for the City and she would like to see a fair distribution of the funds. The ultimate goal for the funds should be for neighbors to organize, and she wants to see the number of organized neighborhoods grow from 28 to 48. Success for the Committee should be that all areas that want to become neighborhoods are. Quotes for projects should be required before the money is dispersed.

Seth Rawlins suggested setting a minimum amount of money that each neighborhood would receive regardless of other criteria and then allocating the remaining funds based on the committee's measures. For example, each neighborhood would receive at least \$2,000. The Committee should remember renter areas and how they don't have neighborhoods organized but need attention. He is on the small business Committee, and they are dispersing money but not receiving receipts back. The Committee should set strict accounting guidelines.

Brad Marshall questioned how the Committee determined the number of neighborhoods, 48. In response, Heather Williams shared that the Community Development Department created the map in the 1970s, which is still used. Mr. Marshall asked what should be done if multiple groups claim the same geographical area. The Committee should reallocate the money if a neighborhood cannot complete its project, and all neighborhoods eligible should have access to that money.

Brad King agreed with the Committee that the organization requirements suggested were easy to accomplish for unorganized neighborhoods. It could be stated in the bylaws that the neighborhood is representing different areas to respond to Mr. Marshall's concern. He is concerned about capacity or the ability to carry out the project submitted and making sure the funds are adequately matched to the project and projects should be within eligibility established in the ARP. It doesn't take \$2k to throw a cookout. Suppose the maximum allowable amount of funds will be dispersed. In that case, the neighborhood receiving them should be required to get quotes beforehand. The funds should be available to neighborhoods in portions without losing access to the money they haven't used yet.

Christie Horvath has worked with neighborhoods for years and has seen different dynamics. The Committee should give neighborhoods enough time to organize if they want, but the Committee should be aware this process can become fraught with embezzlement. At some point in the conversation, the Committee needs to include safeguards against that. There should be a requirement that neighborhoods aren't allowed to disband once their project is over.