

City of Muncie ARP Neighborhoods Committee Meeting Minutes

12.09.21 6p-7:30p, Minnetrista Gathering Place

**Present:** Jeff Robinson, Heather Williams, Jena Ashby, Eddie Chappell, Ken Hudson, Courtney Marsh, Kourtney McCauliff, Brad Polk, Nora Powel, Katie Wray

**Absent:** Lezlie McCrory

**Staff Present:** Dan Gibson, Megan Orbin

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

Criteria Discussed at the prior meeting:

1. Leadership structure with representation from within the neighborhood
2. Bylaws
3. Bank account or fiscal agent
4. Holding publicized meetings
5. An overall goal/mission statement
6. Means to reach their neighbors

An adjustment was made to point 3. EIN number and/or bank account in the name of the association OR a fiscal agent  
There were no other questions. Ms. Powell moved to accept the criteria outlined above in regards to what determines an organized neighborhood. Mr. Polk seconded to motion. A vote was taken with ayes winning.

**Funding Allocation:**

Options Discussed:

- ~~1. Even distribution among eligible neighborhoods — \$20,833.33~~  
\*\*This option was removed after an initial vote.
2. Percentage of size (population, geographic, housing units)  
\*\*This option was added to other equations.
3. Need of area - 18 neighborhoods fall below Muncie's median household income level (\$33,944), 30 neighborhoods are above the income level.
4. Weighted based on LOW/MOD [as determined by HUD] The modifier is 1.5. Below neighborhoods would receive \$26,315.79/neighborhood. Above income level neighborhoods would receive \$17,543.86.
- ~~5. Project based decision~~  
\*\*This option was removed after an initial vote.
6. Create a scorecard/matrix/rubric with the above  
\*\* This option was added to other equations
- ~~7. Consider each neighborhood receives a base amount and then use an equation to disperse the rest of the funds.~~  
\*\*This option was removed after an initial vote.

Discussion: Ms. Marsh stated option 2 will be difficult due to such a discrepancy with sizes of neighborhoods; it limits the smaller groups from doing something great. She brought up these concerns: too much money to spend, time available, oversight, logistics. Mr. Polk questioned the multiplier of 1.5. He wanted to see the distribution if it was changed to 1.4, to allocate less money based on size versus need.

Committee voted without full consensus on any one funding allocation.

Discussion: Ms. McCauliff would like to see more weight put on the need versus population, removing the most fluctuations from populations in option 1. The neighborhood with more need AND a large population should have access to funds before others. Ms. Williams offered to compute the numbers switching to \$400,000 allocated to size and \$600,000 allocated based on need. Ms. Asby and Mr. Polk want to know how many neighborhoods are considered organized and how

close others are to being organized. Ms. Ashby asked if students were being included in population numbers. Ms. Williams stated if students responded to the latest census, they were counted. There were no more questions.

A second vote was taken with the edits of the above options:

1. \$400,000 allocated to size and \$600,000 allocated based on need, use a 1.5 multiplier for need

Mr. Polk moved to accept \$600,000 of the funds should be allocated based on need as determined by the median income levels and \$400,000 of the funds should be allocated based on the population of a neighborhood. A multiplier of 1.5 will be used to determine the ranges. Ms. McCauliff seconded the motion. A vote was taken with ayes winning.

A chart attached to the minutes shows the funds available to each neighborhood if all 48 currently mapped neighborhoods apply for funding.

#### **Review Documents:**

Ms. Orbin requested feedback from the Committee regarding the below documents. Hearing no changes requested, the documents will be used in the grant process.

- Intent to Organize
- Intent to Apply
- Neighborhoods ARP Funding Application

Ms. Orbin and Ms. Williams presented the tentative timeline below. Changes are in bold.

#### **Tentative Timeline:**

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

01.03.22 – Publish Policies and Procedures for public comment

**01.17.22 - Outreach begins to all neighborhoods**

01.17.22 – Publish Finalized Policies and Procedures

02.26.22 – MAP Report to the Community @ Muncie Central HS

03.01.22 – Intent to Organize or Intent to Apply Deadline

03.01.22 – 04.15.22 – All neighborhoods intending to submit an application must meet with MAP Neighborhoods Coordinator

03.05.22 - IDEA Conference

04.30.22 – Deadline to become a qualified Neighborhood (funding amounts are determined based on # qualified neighborhoods)

**05.01.22 - Pre-Application due for newly organized neighborhoods**

05.22 – Application is available online, previously organized neighborhoods,\*Funding must be obligated by the end of 2024. It is unknown as to when exactly in May funds will be available to distribute.

**Funding Eligibility:** Ms. Powell moved to allow MAP and City/City Council Attorney to determine eligibility based on federal ARP guidelines. Ms. McCauliff seconded the motion. A vote was taken with ayes winning.

#### **Public Comment:**

Ro Selvy thanked the Committee for the work they have done and how fair the process is going to be.

Lynn Witty asked for clarification regarding the “need” of a neighborhood relates to COVID. It was clarified that “need” is based on the median income levels determined by HUD. This decision was made because income levels are a number that we can quantify.

Lucas Pint asked about who within MAP would be making determinations. It was explained that the process will be similar to how project grants are distributed to neighborhoods currently – voted on by Task Force 2, but ARP funding would require full board approval based on TF2 recommendations.