

HUMAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MAY 13, 2019

A meeting of the Human Affairs Committee was held Monday, May 13, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire, Chairman, presided.

Members of the Committee present: Alderman June M. Caron, Vice Chair  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright

Members of the Committee absent: Alderman Patricia Klee

Also in Attendance: Carrie Schena, UPD Manager

---

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

COMMUNICATIONS

From: Carrie Schena, UPD Manager  
Re: R-19-126 Amended (FY2020 HUD Annual Action Plan)

***There being no objection, Chairman Wilshire accepted the communication and placed it on file.***

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**R-19-138**

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman Jan Schmidt

**RELATIVE TO THE APPROPRIATION OF ADDITIONAL U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUNDS TO NEIGHBORWORKS OF SOUTHERN NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN HARRIOTT-GATHRIGHT TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE**

ON THE QUESTION

Carrie, are you here? Are you going to speak on this this evening, why don't you join us please? Let the record reflect that Alderman Melizzi-Golja has joined us 7:02. Carrie, can you give us a little background on this?

Carrie Schena, UPD Manager

Sure. Carrie Schena, Manager of the Urban Programs Department, thank you for having me.

Chairman Wilshire

Thank you for being here.

Ms. Schena

You're welcome. So NeighborWorks, or a Resolution came before this Committee a few months back to fund a project that they had recently acquired. It is referred to as Ledge McLaren, it's on the corner of Ledge and Central Street, it is 8 housing units that was previously a tax credit and HOME project, going back about 20 years. So NeighborWorks recently acquired it and realized it was in need of some rehab; much like any property after 20 years might be, with multiple tenants rotating through. At the time they were going to address just the exterior and kind of get the enveloped tightened up and piecemeal the other parts.

We went in and did the required inspection according to the HUD standards and if we are going to be doing rehab projects it has to meet a certain standard. As a result of those inspections we realized that there was a bit more work that should be done. Through discussions with them, they went out for bids and updated their construction budget, resubmitted and requested additional funds in the amount of \$110,000.00. What that will cover is 8 units and it will be flooring, kitchens bathrooms, and then some other lighter cosmetic – like sheetrock and painting and things that need to be done.

So the original request was going to cover the roof, the windows, some porches, some landscaping, drainage issues. There is quite a laundry list. So the request is before you and we are working on whether it is going to be the final number of 8 restricted units or 7. We are looking at what other funds are going in to the project. At this time, the HOME funds are at about 60% of those costs. They are doing significant energy upgrades; they have received some grants to do that work. So we are looking at maybe reducing the number of units to 7 so they can have some flexibility of having or if they ever run into an over-income tenant that they have the ability to float those units around and keep in compliance. So that's it. I'll take any questions.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Yes thank you. Just refresh my memory and for those who might not know, what would the breakup be in terms of units based according to income.

Ms. Schena

It would be, in this project, whether we do the 7 or the 8, either way – we would have what they call 2 low home units and those are for tenants who earn 50% or less than the area median income. Those would also be restricted to what they call the Low Home Rent, so it's also a lower rent standard which at this time would be about \$940.00 for a 3-bedroom. And then the remaining units would be what they call the High Home and those tenants would be between 60% and 80%. NeighborWorks I believe wants to target the 60% range, that's what their performer was based on. And those rents would be as much as \$1,722.00. NeighborWorks is not looking at charging that much; they are more in the \$1,200.00 range for those tenants.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Thank you.

Chairman Wilshire

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the motion before is to recommend final passage of Resolution 19-138.

**MOTION CARRIED**

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES – None

TABLED IN COMMITTEE

**MOTION BY ALDERWOMAN MELIZZI-GOLJA TO TAKE FROM THE TABLE R-19-126  
MOTION CARRIED**

**R-19-126**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws  
Alderman Tom Lopez  
Alderman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman Jan Schmidt

**AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO APPLY FOR AND EXPEND THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (“CDBG”) AND HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020**

- Amended & Tabled in Committee – 04/08/2019

**MOTION BY ALDERWOMAN MELIZZI-GOLJA TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE**

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman Wilshire

Alderman Melizzi-Golja has moved for final passage.

Alderman Melizzi-Golja

As amended.

Chairman Wilshire

Of Resolution 19-126 as amended. I will not be voting on this as my employer has applied for money. Discussion?

Alderman Caron

Yes could Carrie give us a little background on some of the changes that were made, please?

Ms. Schena

Thank you. Sure so since the last meeting when the Resolution was amended we've received our final

allocations or our true allocations from HUD. I was before Budget Committee last week talking about this as well. The CDBG amount was about 1.7% less than what we were using as an estimate and that could be due to a number of factors. We are a formula-based allocation, so any of the inputs that go into the formula, if our demographics change, then our allocation changes. So although nationally the program was level-funded, we saw a slight reduction. The other piece of that is there are some new entitlement communities in the pot of funding this year so that dilutes the amount that there is to spread out.

The HOME Program, after we started on this process, again we just used level-funding from last year as a starting point. Once the Resolution started working its way through and the Federal Budget passed, we knew that HOME was going to be quite a bit lower but we didn't know the final number. That final amount was 10.6% less than we anticipated so an almost \$40,000.00 reduction there.

In my Communication I stepped through some of the numbers and I know in the last Resolution, I think there was just a mathematical error as it was being carried through that had to be resolved. So in the second paragraph of the Communication, I figured it was just easier to wipe the slate clean and just say you know the total to allocate from CDBG that is available which includes reprogrammed funds that have been discussed. That number of \$791,423.84 and then the HOME Program is \$359,905.00. So I recalculated some of those thresholds that are percentage based and that's within the Memo. So there needs to be reduction somewhere in the amended Resolution as it stands so that to come down and meet the total amount available.

Chairman Wilshire

What is the amount right now in contingency?

Ms. Schena

In the current Resolution – I think it is to be determined so there isn't any in contingency yet.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

I thought at one point we decided 5% was too low and of course my printer like skipped here. I'm looking at contingency. I think we decided 5% was too low but we didn't want to do 10% and I thought we did like 7% or 8% for some reason. I don't remember and I'm looking at what I've printed and it smeared.

Chairman Wilshire

So we have nothing in contingency is there anything – I wasn't at the last meeting so I just wondered if there was anything left to allocate or no?

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

No we were over. We were about \$1,600.00 over that I calculated because we were working off of \$49,000.00 and it was actually \$47,409.00. So we were \$1,591.00 over in what we had allocated.

Chairman Wilshire

So I guess we could look at projects that funding was added, maybe cutting some of those to come down with at least something in contingency and we can't be over. We can't spend more money than we have. So I am just wondering if you discussed any of the projects that were big like the parking lot, the drainage issue; if that much money we have given them is even going to make an impact at all. So I am just throwing that out there a suggestion. I don't know, I mean I don't know if that's enough money for them to do anything because it is a pretty good sized project.

Alderman Caron

Well one of them is the project on Spring Street because that \$75,000.00 just puts a little dip because it was what \$300,000.00 for that particular project. So I agree with you that giving them a little might not do everything they want. The same with PLUS Company because that was a large amount because that was for the HVAC systems that we were having some concerns with.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

And I think also we had talked about the parking lot drainage and I believe when the Boys & Girls Club was in here they were like very aware of these other items.

Chairman Wilshire

And he did say that, he said if he didn't get funded he understood because of the other needs here which I thought was pretty good.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

So exactly how much money do we have to cut?

Ms. Schena

Of all the 40 pages of paper I have in front of me I don't have the spreadsheet but I could go print it out very quick.

Chairman Wilshire

We will wait.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Yes while she's printing that out I guess my other concern is we know that some of these lines that we have to cut because of how they are determined by a percentage, will be impacting salaries in the City. Am I correct?

Chairman Wilshire

I'm sorry?

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Some of these, the CDBG Administration, if we have to cut that, if that's going to be reduced because our grant was reduced, correct?

Chairman Wilshire

Right and they will still get a cap at 20%.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Right, right, I guess my concern is what is the impact of that going to be on the budget, like where does that cap bring us in in terms of ...

Chairman Wilshire

We'd have to ask Carrie that question I can't answer that.

Alderman Melizzi-Golja

Yeah so that would be my other concern because that's usually built into salaries for that group of people.

Chairman Wilshire

Well the max they can take is 20% anyway so that's the max even if no matter what. I don't know if the LEAD Grant feeds into that.

Alderman Melizzi-Golja

Yeah I think the lead grant feeds into one position or part of one position.

Chairman Wilshire

At least 1, maybe 3.

Alderman Melizzi-Golja

Ok.

Chairman Wilshire

I think there are more than, I mean that's a good-sized grant. I think there are more than 1, maybe 2 or 3 positions. We should have asked.

Alderman Melizzi-Golja

Well we'll wait when she comes back.

Chairman Wilshire

But I was happy to see the – I had asked her to give us the other outstanding projects which is what she started with in her Memo which I thought was interesting to know what the status was of some of these projects.

Alderman Caron

And to think that they got this money in October and they've really pushed through some of those projects that's really good, you know.

Chairman Wilshire

And the City is sitting on a little bit of money too. They have the Crown Hill Pool money, Ledge Street Basketball Courts, the Salem Street Tot Lot, the Splash pad. I mean they are sitting on a little bit of money. Not that we are taking any of that back I didn't mean it to sound that way.

Alderman Caron

But we have given the City money to put some of these programs together. Do you remember how much money we had in contingency last year? Wasn't it about \$7,000.00 to \$10,000.00? So I mean if we are looking to put the same amount this year and then work from that for the reductions?

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

I was thinking \$7,000.00 to \$8,000.00. I thought it was over \$5,000.00 because I think this year we had started with maybe \$5,000.00 and we were like "ooh that's" you know when you look at the cost of work today \$5,000.00 really isn't much so we decided we should go higher, so \$7,000.00 to \$10,000.00 somewhere on there.

Chairman Wilshire

That makes sense. So I was looking at the Housing Improvement Program, the change that was made there about the emergency work. And that's why I had asked Carrie to bring this income limits so that we could figure out if we are comfortable with the 50% of the area median income for the HIP Program, Housing Improvement Program. So 50% of the area median income for one person is \$36,700.00 for two people it's \$41,950.00. I am going to wait for Carrie because I don't know at what level; I mean it seems like people at the 30% income limits would probably only be collecting social security. Right? The \$22,000.00 and the \$25,000.00 that's what it looks like there would be that population. And the 50% is \$36,700.00 for one and \$41,950.00 that's a big jump. Are we looking at the 30% or the 50% or the 60%, I mean is this what we want to do in here on number 12? I don't know maybe it is and I'm just asking because I wasn't here last meeting.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

We had basically implemented what Ms. Schena had recommended.

Chairman Wilshire

Ok, I'm Ok with that. Thank you.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Before I forget, Ms. Schena we were, while you were gone, what are these cuts going to do in terms of reduction for the administrative costs and you know what has been figured into the budget that won't be there now that needs to be there for your office to run?

Ms. Schena

So the reductions actually impacted the budget that I had to, we couldn't meet the budget basically. Between the contractual increases that are in place with union contracts and fringe costs and then we also cover all of the necessary things such as legal ads, registry of deed recordings, that type of stuff. So we were short, not by much, but about I forget what the final number was. But from last year, it ended up being about a \$14,000.00 reduction from where we were funded last year. And part of that is also the line for project delivery, is included in the overall costs to carry out the Department. That project delivery, it's not admin, that's the cost of the construction manager and a portion of one other person's time.

Only about 5% or 10% and that's directly related, like I said, to carrying out the project, so scope of work, writing contracts, overseeing the construction. So all in total, we ended up being a little short and part of what we ended up figuring out was rather than try to increase that line where everything was already very tight this year with the other requests, because admin can only be what it can be, that's a percentage.

So the only other line was that project delivery and rather than shift costs there we are going to charge part of my salary to some general fund and we are going to work on a project with Director Marchant, the Director of Community Development. So part of my hours will allocate towards that and that's how we were able to fill that gap this year.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Thank you.

Chairman Wilshire

Do you know how much was in contingency last year Carrie?

Ms. Schena

Last year ended up being quite large because we had the opposite thing happen where we estimated a lower number and got more. So that's why we ended up with about \$49,000.00 in contingency. But I think going into it, it has ranged anywhere from the \$5,000.00/\$7,000.00 mark to a planned amount. Sometimes it's been \$10,000.00 or \$12,000.00, it really depends on the year.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Did you want to ask about percent of income.

Chairman Wilshire

Well I did want to mention that. I think Carrie was out the room. And I respect your opinion and that's how the Committee voted on this or decided to carry this out. But how did you arrive at the 50% of the area median income rather than the 30% or the 60%, I'm just curious.

Ms. Schena

Initially I recommended 30% as the target. The only reason to change that was feedback from the community. 30% my rationale at the time for choosing that was because it is going to be given out as a grant and it is really those lower amounts, it's only the under \$5,000.00 projects. So those are the critical emergency, we have to fix this now type of thing. And if we were going to be giving it out as grants and not having that money come back I felt it should be targeted to the lowest income home owners that we deal with.

And again, the only reason to go up to the 50% mark which is still a very low income household was based on some of that community feedback that we had received over the last few meetings. So I think, I ran numbers and we I would say the majority of homeowners that we have assisted in the last few years have been in the 50% to 80% but we've not taken on this type of need at this point. And I feel that the people who are least likely to come up with the funds at that lower dollar value are probably the lowest income people.

Chairman Wilshire

So that would be the 30%.

Ms. Schena

It would be.

Chairman Wilshire

It seems like those people are just collecting social security and probably nothing else. And that's what they live on.

Ms. Schena

At least 30% it's either you are on public assistance or some type of social security. Any kind of wages would put you about that 30% mark. And it's not to say that people over that income level wouldn't be assisted, it's just that it would be in the form of a loan rather than a grant. So who do you want to target the grant funds to?

Chairman Wilshire

I would think you'd want to target the grant to the 30%, the lowest income and then as it goes up, or maybe up to \$5,000.00 half of it is a loan half of it is a grant. I don't know, I don't want to really muddy the waters that much I guess.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Yes I was just looking here and I don't have the Memo you sent us, you sent us a Memo for our last meeting and it's one of the things I didn't print. We talked about this and you had put something in there about reviewing things at the 50% level I thought. I know there was more around at the 50% level.

Ms. Schena

So it wasn't a Memo, I mean it ends up being a communication but it was an e-mail when I realized I wasn't going to be able – so I don't have a printed copy either. But I do recall that I felt like those two topic points might be raised at the last meeting and just wanted to provide a little bit of input. So the discussion point was that there had been some, again, community input that number should come up from the 30% to the 50% and you know it's, I think either way would honestly be ok. I still lean toward the 30% mark if it's going to be a grant and again it's not a lot of money. So the people who are most cash-strapped are going to be the lowest income people. And again it's not that we are not going assist the people at 50%, it is just going to be in the form of a loan.

The other discussion point in that where I think you are recalling is the floor, having there be a bottom number as far as what we should assist and not assist. If it is under a certain dollar amount and you know the conversation around that is there has to be kind of a bottom line somewhere and whether that it is a set line in our policies or if it is something that we review on a case by case basis. But we don't want to get into doing maintenance so we don't want applications coming saying "my faucet is broken I can't use my kitchen sink" that's maintenance; versus "I've had a pipe that's burst open and have no water supply".

Chairman Wilshire

So are you suggesting that in this legislation, this would be the place to add like a minimum of \$1,000.00 or \$1,500.00 or something like that or did you have a number in mind?

Ms. Schena

Was it at \$1,000.00 originally?

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

I have it here and this is again the e-mail that you sent because you wouldn't be here. "We could remove

the lower end threshold altogether since construction work will rarely be less than \$1,000.00 anyway.” The concern was that lower dollar amounts may be dipping into maintenance. However, we could make the determination internally using the published HUD guidelines. That was regarding that and then the next paragraph was, “the other issue is whether the grant should be for those earning 30% or less. I am comfortable pushing that to 50% but would not agree to owners at 80% AMI since these grants are up to \$5,000.00 it should be restricted to the most vulnerable owners”. So that’s what we had worked from.

Chairman Wilshire

I personally feel that 50% is a little high for a grant a little it’s not like these people are well off or anything but I like the 30% as a grant and the 50% as a loan. I mean they don’t even have to pay it back until they sell the house, unless they have the means to. What does anyone else think?

Alderman Caron

I have to agree, I think the fact that money comes back and we can push it back out again for someone else who needs help; I think is very important for the community-at-large. I think that a lot of this can be done internally, case by case, I think that’s important because they are looking at these things every day. I like the idea that if we can give someone with 30% income that we give them a grant; but I think we should have \$1,000.00 or \$1,500.00 so we are not looking at maintenance, that this is a major problem. You know maybe a water heater burst or something like that but I think it’s important that money is revolving for the community-at-large. If we give all of it as grants we are not going to have anything to help the next person within our community.

Chairman Wilshire

Do you want to make a motion to do that?

Alderman Caron

So I’ll make a motion that the grants are for income of 30%.

Chairman Wilshire

For 30% of the AMI which is the area median income.

Alderman Caron

Right and that it would be loans at the 50%. I think that in order to make sure we are not doing maintenance that we should have a minimum of at least \$1,500.00 or do you think \$1,000.0 would be, I don’t know, I’m thinking \$1,500.00.

Ms. Schena

I never suggested the original number but it was \$1,000.00 I think at one point.

Alderman Caron

Well then I would say leave it at \$1,000.00.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

I guess I am comfortable with the \$1,000.00 because I think nothing is going to be that well anyway if it’s really beyond maintenance. But I guess with the grants my only concern is I am looking at these numbers

and I understand what Alderman Caron is saying in terms of the money coming back at a certain point. But I am just feeling uncomfortable with going only to 30% and not including 50%.

Chairman Wilshire

Well I think we take baby steps. I mean this is our first time doing grants, I think we ought to give it the neediest of our citizens and loans to those who don't even have to really pay it off unless they sell their house and they come into a little bit of money. I think that would work. Only my opinion.

Alderman Harriott-Gathright

I have a question and it might not be this is what we were talking about. But Mr. Teeboom came to our last meeting? That's what I thought. Didn't we talk about something being \$500.00. I am just asking because I am trying to remember that meeting.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

I didn't print out everything from the end of the minutes, his comments were in there. His comments very closely mirrored the, well I shouldn't say his comments, Ms. Schena's communication with us was very similar to what he had asked us to consider. So it was the 50% not 30% to extend it to 50% and I think he had asked for no lower limit rather than keeping it at \$1,000.00.

Chairman Wilshire

That just opens us up to doing more maintenance rather than home repairs.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CARON TO AMEND SECTION 12 EMERGENCY WORK COSTING UP TO \$5,000.00 MAY BE OFFERED IN THE FORM OF A GRANT RATHER THAN A LOAN TO OWNERS AT OR BELOW 30% OF THE AMI AND LOANS AT 50% OF THE AMI WITH A \$1,000.00 MINIMUM.**  
ON THE QUESTION

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Yeah I guess we do it this year at 30% and we just collect some data and see what we have in terms of people coming in at 50% and you know, again being cognizant of the fact that costs are going up. So even though they are at 50%.

Chairman Wilshire

But the grants aren't going up.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Right, right. But in terms of the hit they take personally to have it done to have work done. So I would just like us to come back next year and have some sense of how this gets rolled out this first year. And of course next year we will be doing our 5 year plan so we will have some data to consider.

Alderman Caron

Right I agree I think that we have to take baby steps on this because we want to make sure we have money to continue this and if you give everything out as a grant you won't have anything to work with. And if we lose funding again next year it could be a problem. There's always room to add.

Chairman Wilshire

So are you going to amend your motion to add the \$1,000.00 minimum?

Alderman Caron

I thought I did. Yeah I said that's what it was, let's leave it at the \$1,000.00.

Chairman Wilshire

Ok so you've all heard the motion. Is there any more discussion on that?

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairman Wilshire

There's a motion on the floor to recommend final passage of Resolution 19-126 as amended. Further discussion that?

ON THE QUESTION

Ms. Schena

I just wanted to note that what I stepped out to print and handed out and I have given an extra copy for the record as well is just a spread sheet of the breakdown that actually shows from the first meeting all the way through to the actual allocation amounts. So if you go down about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the page the amount that the existing resolution is over \$8,903.50.

Chairman Wilshire

Oh so we haven't taken care of that yet. I was jumping the gun.

Alderwoman Caron

No we had \$1,600.00 to cut and now this additional so \$9,000.00 basically so we can't pass it until we do that because it won't balance.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Well I'm looking at the drainage at the Boys & Girls Club and my first inclination is to just take it off of there. It's \$8,903.50. But I feel like already what are giving them is not sufficient so do we zero that out and then re-allocate what is left which would be about \$11,000.00 to some of these other items here? I was looking at the Children's Home and I was looking at the PLUS Company for their air conditioners. And I guess I am looking at the items here thinking what do we need to do to maintain buildings and maintain them so the clients or the individuals who are using these facilities are comfortable and also the energy costs for some of these buildings are addressed. So I am just talking out loud.

Alderman Caron

I agree with some of yours, but don't we still have to put some money into contingency, right? We have to put money; so if you were looking to eliminate the \$25,000.00 from the Boys & Girls Club you could put that balance of \$11,000.00 into the contingency program and you wouldn't be touching anybody.

Chairman Wilshire

Well there's \$25,000.00 in that line.

Alderman Caron

But you've got to take \$8,900.00 anyway.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

No there's \$20,000.00 in the Boys & Girls Club.

Alderman Caron

No \$25,000.00.

Chairman Wilshire

25.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Oh I'm looking at what I have here.

Alderman Caron

It was \$25,000.00 so then if you took the \$8,900.00 that we have to, to balance us out.

Chairman Wilshire

So that leaves \$16,097.00 that we can reallocate somewhere.

Alderman Caron

So put half of it into contingency.

Chairman Wilshire

Divided by 2 that would be \$8,048.00 in contingency.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

\$8,048? Ok, and I would suggest then maybe splitting that and putting half of it into the Children's Home and half of into PLUS Company.

Chairman Wilshire

Ok so that would be \$4,024.00 to each of the aforementioned organizations. Does that even us out Carrie?

Ms. Schena

I actually didn't my calculator back when I ran back to print. But if I may make a comment on the PLUS Company, could that be rounded to whole dollars for their award and I know that is going to make the math crazy but maybe the change amount could go into contingency.

Because it makes it difficult when we do the agreements with the agencies if there's not whole dollars.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

So we put \$4,012.00 in there but we take the \$.84 cents out and put it into contingency?

Ms. Schena

Yes.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Or \$4,024.00.

Ms. Schena

Was the \$.50 cents so the amount that the Resolution was over was \$8,903.50. Was that in your math as well?

Chairman Wilshire

No I don't like dealing with anything less than a dollar either.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Let's put the \$.50 cents in contingency too.

Chairman Wilshire

That works.

Ms. Schena

And then the HOME Funds need to be adjusted in the Resolution as well too. There's a breakdown in the Memo.

Chairman Wilshire

So the HOME Grant activities will be carried out with an estimated annual grant of \$398,000.00. HOME Grant Administration is \$39,800, CHODO or Community Housing Developing Organization Reserve is \$59,700.00 and then number 3 – Affordable Housing Development is \$298,500.00. And that's the HOME Funds.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

So Ms. Schena if I am following correctly we need to amend those numbers then?

Ms. Schena

Correct.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

To reflect the \$4,000.00, April 15, 2019 Allocation amounts. So the HOME Grant will be \$359,905.

Ms. Schena

Correct.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Administration will be \$35,991. CHODO \$53,986. and Affordable Housing Development \$269,929.00 and I'm assuming your calculator was used here for a total HOME of \$359,905. So we will amend the previous numbers with those numbers in the grant.

Chairman Wilshire

Ok I was looking at this that you sent. I didn't realize you were talking about this sheet.

Ms. Schena

I believe the numbers you read were in the Resolution from the last meeting. And since then the grant amount came in and it was less.

Chairman Wilshire

Any further discussion? The Motion before us is for final passage of Resolution 19-126 as amended. Any further discussion?

**MOTION CARRIED**

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES - None

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Thank you once again Ms. Schena and thank you for, although we have all these sheets you always seem to help us bring it all together so we can figure out from one meeting to the next where we should be focused. So thank you very much, especially with the allocation coming in lower and helping us make sense of that and what it means for the community and the grants that we are looking at here.

Alderman Caron

Yes I agree, I want to thank Carrie for all she's done for both this and the CAC Group with the allocations of their funding as well. She does a good job and keeps us on our toes with the numbers.

Chairman Wilshire

Yes thank you Carrie for everything.

Ms. Schena

You're welcome.

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

REMARKS BY THE ALDERMEN - None

POSSIBLE NON-PUBLIC SESSION - None

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CARON TO ADJOURN  
MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Committee Clerk

**FY18 CDBG Potential Activities**

<b>CDBG Sources</b>	<b>Jan-19</b>	<b>2/11/2019 R-19-126</b>	<b>4/8/2019 R-19-126 A</b>	<b>04/15/2019 Allocation Amt</b>
Entitlement Award (estimated)	\$658,000	658,000.00	658,000.00	646,750.00
Estimated program income	\$30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
Available for reprogramming:				
FY18 Salvation Army balance	3,656.68	3,656.68	3,656.68	3,656.68
FY18 Admin	624.50	624.50	624.50	624.50
FY18 Contingency	118.62	118.62	118.62	118.62
FY18 Project Delivery	1,080.15	1,080.15	1,080.15	1,080.15
FY19 Contingency	47,409.00		47,409.00	47,409.00
FY18 HIP		61,784.89	61,784.89	61,784.89
<b>Total Available</b>	<b>693,479.95</b>	<b>755,264.84</b>	<b>802,673.84</b>	<b>791,423.84</b>
<b>Requests:</b>				
Public Services estimated	\$98,700	98,700.00	98,700.00	\$97,013
UPD Project Delivery	\$115,000	115,000.00	115,000.00	115,000.00
UPD, Administration (20% cap)	\$137,600	137,600.00	137,600.00	135,350.00
Boys & Girls Club-drainage	\$80,000	20,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00
E for All - microenterprise	\$40,000	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
Children's Home - windows	\$45,600	25,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00
PAL - fire related impvts	\$30,050	20,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00
Soup Kitchen - asbestos	\$330,550	75,000.00	75,000.00	75,000.00
Opportunity Networks - flooring, ada door, bath	\$82,453	40,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
PLUS Company - HVAC units	\$77,500	29,070.84	39,070.84	39,070.84
Dan Stevens - roof	\$27,660	0.00	0.00	0.00
Youth Council - heat sys, carpeting	\$57,806	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00
City of Nashua - Court St roof	\$250,000	0.00	0.00	0.00
Owner Occ Housing Improvement	\$75,000	75,000.00	89,000.00	89,000.00
Rental Rehab		54,894.00	54,894.00	54,894.00
Contingency				
<b>Subtotal Requests</b>	<b>\$1,447,919.00</b>	<b>755,264.84</b>	<b>804,264.84</b>	<b>800,327.34</b>
Over/Under funding available	\$ (754,439.05)	0.00	-1,591.00	-8,903.50
<b>HOME Grant (estimated)</b>	<b>\$398,000</b>	<b>398,000.00</b>	<b>398,000.00</b>	<b>\$359,905</b>
Administration	\$39,800	39,800.00	39,800.00	\$35,991
CHDO	\$59,700	59,700.00	59,700.00	\$53,986
Affordable Housing Development	\$298,500	298,500.00	298,500.00	\$269,929
<b>Total HOME</b>	<b>\$398,000</b>	<b>398,000.00</b>	<b>398,000.00</b>	<b>359,905.00</b>

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HUD  
STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

----- 2018 ADJUSTED HOME INCOME LIMITS -----

PROGRAM	1 PERSON	2 PERSON	3 PERSON	4 PERSON	5 PERSON	6 PERSON	7 PERSON	8 PERSON
<b>Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH HUD Metro FM</b>								
30% LIMITS	22650	25900	29150	32350	34950	37550	40150	42750
VERY LOW INCOME	37750	43150	48550	53900	58250	62550	66850	71150
60% LIMITS	45300	51780	58260	64680	69900	75060	80220	85380
LOW INCOME	56800	64900	73000	81100	87600	94100	100600	107100
<b>Lawrence, MA-NH HUD Metro FMR Area</b>								
30% LIMITS	19950	22800	25650	28500	30800	33100	35350	37650
VERY LOW INCOME	33250	38000	42750	47500	51300	55100	58900	62700
60% LIMITS	39900	45600	51300	57000	61560	66120	70680	75240
LOW INCOME	50350	57550	64750	71900	77700	83450	89200	94950
<b>Western Rockingham County, NH HUD Metro FMR</b>								
30% LIMITS	22400	25600	28800	31950	34550	37100	39650	42200
VERY LOW INCOME	37300	42600	47950	53250	57550	61800	66050	70300
60% LIMITS	44760	51120	57540	63900	69060	74160	79260	84360
LOW INCOME	50350	57550	64750	71900	77700	83450	89200	94950
<b>Portsmouth-Rochester, NH HUD Metro FMR Area</b>								
30% LIMITS	20850	23800	26800	29750	32150	34550	36900	39300
VERY LOW INCOME	34750	39700	44650	49600	53600	57550	61550	65500
60% LIMITS	41700	47640	53580	59520	64320	69060	73860	78600
LOW INCOME	50350	57550	64750	71900	77700	83450	89200	94950
<b>Manchester, NH HUD Metro FMR Area</b>								
30% LIMITS	17400	19850	22350	24800	26800	28800	30800	32750
VERY LOW INCOME	28950	33050	37200	41300	44650	47950	51250	54550
60% LIMITS	34740	39660	44640	49560	53580	57540	61500	65460
LOW INCOME	46300	52900	59500	66100	71400	76700	82000	87300
<b>Nashua, NH HUD Metro FMR Area</b>								
30% LIMITS	22050	25200	28350	31450	34000	36500	39000	41550
50% VERY LOW INCOME	36700	41950	47200	52400	56600	60800	65000	69200
60% LIMITS	44040	50340	56640	62880	67920	72960	78000	83040
80% LOW INCOME	50350	57550	64750	71900	77700	83450	89200	94950
<b>Hillsborough County, NH (part) HUD Metro FM</b>								
30% LIMITS	18450	21100	23750	26350	28500	30600	32700	34800
VERY LOW INCOME	30750	35150	39550	43900	47450	50950	54450	57950
60% LIMITS	36900	42180	47460	52680	56940	61140	65340	69540
LOW INCOME	49200	56200	63250	70250	75900	81500	87150	92750

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HUD  
STATE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

		----- 2018 ADJUSTED HOME INCOME LIMITS -----							
PROGRAM	1 PERSON	2 PERSON	3 PERSON	4 PERSON	5 PERSON	6 PERSON	7 PERSON	8 PERSON	
<b>Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH HUD Metro FM</b>									
30% LIMITS	22650	25900	29150	32350	34950	37550	40150	42750	
VERY LOW INCOME	37750	43150	48550	53900	58250	62550	66850	71150	
60% LIMITS	45300	51780	58260	64680	69900	75060	80220	85380	
LOW INCOME	56800	64900	73000	81100	87600	94100	100600	107100	
<b>Lawrence, MA-NH HUD Metro FMR Area</b>									
30% LIMITS	19950	22800	25650	28500	30800	33100	35350	37650	
VERY LOW INCOME	33250	38000	42750	47500	51300	55100	58900	62700	
60% LIMITS	39900	45600	51300	57000	61560	66120	70680	75240	
LOW INCOME	50350	57550	64750	71900	77700	83450	89200	94950	
<b>Western Rockingham County, NH HUD Metro FMR</b>									
30% LIMITS	22400	25600	28800	31950	34550	37100	39650	42200	
VERY LOW INCOME	37300	42600	47950	53250	57550	61800	66050	70300	
60% LIMITS	44760	51120	57540	63900	69060	74160	79260	84360	
LOW INCOME	50350	57550	64750	71900	77700	83450	89200	94950	
<b>Portsmouth-Rochester, NH HUD Metro FMR Area</b>									
30% LIMITS	20850	23800	26800	29750	32150	34550	36900	39300	
VERY LOW INCOME	34750	39700	44650	49600	53600	57550	61550	65500	
60% LIMITS	41700	47640	53580	59520	64320	69060	73860	78600	
LOW INCOME	50350	57550	64750	71900	77700	83450	89200	94950	
<b>Manchester, NH HUD Metro FMR Area</b>									
30% LIMITS	17400	19850	22350	24800	26800	28800	30800	32750	
VERY LOW INCOME	28950	33050	37200	41300	44650	47950	51250	54550	
60% LIMITS	34740	39660	44640	49560	53580	57540	61500	65460	
LOW INCOME	46300	52900	59500	66100	71400	76700	82000	87300	
<b>Nashua, NH HUD Metro FMR Area</b>									
30% LIMITS	22050	25200	28350	31450	34000	36500	39000	41550	
50% VERY LOW INCOME	36700	41950	47200	52400	56600	60800	65000	69200	
60% LIMITS	44040	50340	56640	62880	67920	72960	78000	83040	
80% LOW INCOME	50350	57550	64750	71900	77700	83450	89200	94950	
<b>Hillsborough County, NH (part) HUD Metro FM</b>									
30% LIMITS	18450	21100	23750	26350	28500	30600	32700	34800	
VERY LOW INCOME	30750	35150	39550	43900	47450	50950	54450	57950	
60% LIMITS	36900	42180	47460	52680	56940	61140	65340	69540	
LOW INCOME	49200	56200	63250	70250	75900	81500	87150	92750	