

Community Development Advisory Committee Minutes

Date: May 2, 2016

Member Attendees:

Ms. JoAnne Hanrahan Mayoral Appointee, Chair
Ms. Sharyon Gardiner Mayoral Appointee, Vice Chair
Ms. Mary Ann Callahan, 1st District, Secretary
Mr. John Young, 2nd District
Mr. Sean Massey, 3rd District
Ms. Majeedah Razzaq, 4th District
Ms. Jen O'Brien, 5th District
Mr. Stephen Comency,
Mr. Jerry Kunkle 7th District
Ms. Debra Hogan, Mayoral App.
Ms. Meghan McGuinness, Member At Large

Member Absent: none

Staff Members Attending:

Mr. Stephen Carson, Grants Administrator

The Public Hearing was called to order: 6:00 PM by the Chair in City Council Chambers

Chairwoman JoAnne Hanrahan welcomed the audience and, after calling CDAC member attendance, called the speakers who had signed in to speak.

Ms. Fairlane Repard from the Life Choices Center gave members handouts on the Center's programs and a five minute presentation. See attachment B for full transcript.

Mr. Massey requested permission to ask questions of Ms. Repard regarding the pre-pregnancy, positive choice of the agency's programs. He asked whether Life Choices provided comprehensive sex education programs. Ms. Repard replied that Life Choices did provide sex education on some levels. She also stated that there were other agencies who do risk reduction programs and that Life Choices was primarily a risk avoidance based program.

Mr. Massey then stated that both risk avoidance and risk reduction presented in tandem was best. He then asked Ms. Repard if Life Choices was licensed by the NY State Department of Health to deal with sexually transmitted diseases (STDs).

Ms. Repard replied that the agency did not have that, but would get it.

Mr. Massey asked if Life Choices referred clients to other agencies to provide holistic information.

Ms. Repard replied that Life Choices did and were always looking for appropriate referral sites.

Mr. Kunkle asked how many staff the agency employed.

Mr. Repard replied that the Owego office had 2 staff people and the Binghamton office had 7 paid and 30 volunteer staffers.

Ms. Hogan asked if Life Choices had applied for CDBG funding before.

Ms. Repard replied that this would be the first time Life Choices would be applying,

Ms. Mary Robinson of Family Planning of South Central New York gave a brief presentation concerning the ineffectiveness of risk avoidance program models. See attachment B for full transcript.

Mr. Massey asked Ms. Robinson if Family Planning offered comprehensive sex education.

Ms. Robinson replied that they did and that there is evidence that such comprehensive programs have proven to be more effective. Family Planning teaches life skills along with abstinence as the only sure way to avoid pregnancy. She further stated that the abstinence program was offered with other options.

Mr. Massey then asked if the committee could be provided with the research and evidence that would sustain those claims.

Ms. O'Brien said that that information would be included in the grant application offered by Family Planning.

Chairwoman Hanrahan then stopped the discussion and requested clarification of the content of the presentation by Ms. Robinson and the questions from Mr. Massey. She asked Ms. Robinson if there were any additional comments she would like to make and when Ms. Robinson replied that there were not, she thanked Ms. Robinson for her presentation.

Mr. Massey then requested that it be noted that he still had several questions for Ms. Robinson and was cut off by the Chair

Ms. Nancy Johnson from the YWCA of Binghamton/Broome County presented regarding the Y's programs. See attachment B for full transcript.

There being no more speakers, the Chair then closed the Public Hearing segment of the meeting at 6:26 PM after a motion by Ms. Gardiner, seconded by Mr. Kunkle, passed unanimously.

Mr. Massey then asked if it was the job of the committee to ask questions on certain issues related to the presentations.

Mr. Carson responded that such questions would come up as specific grant applications are reviewed.

Mr. Massey replied that he meant to ask the second agency the same questions he had asked the first and was going to request specific information that the whole committee could benefit from.

Discussion then ensued by various members regarding the protocols of a Public Hearing.

Mr. Massey stated that he personally had acquired professional expertise on the subject and wanted to share it.

Mr. Kunkle stated that the proposal submissions should include the information and that the committee could have the discussion then.

Ms. Razaq stated that years ago proposals were presented by the agencies and then discussions about the specifics took place.

Chairwoman JoAnne Hanrahan stated that the committee could do this in the Fall.

Ms. Gardiner suggested that the committee should have the applications and information in advance of any discussion. She stated that the requests for proposals (RFPs) would be in and then the committee could review and call a Public Hearing.

Ms. O'Brien said that she had grants experience and that with RFPs there is always a time period in which questions and answers are done, with questions being given in advance. She indicated that she would share the information regarding the decision on CDAC protocol.

Mr. Kunkle then stated that he believed that even Mr. Massey's expertise is not as meaningful without having the proposals to refer to.

The Chair then recognized the arrival of another speaker and requested a motion to re-open the Public Hearing. Ms. Gardiner made the motion, Ms. Hogan seconded and unanimously voted on.

The Public Hearing was reopened at 6:35 PM.

Mr. Dana Brown of Community Development presented comments on economic development and Block Grant funding. See attachment B.

There being no questions, the Public Hearing was then closed at 6:40 after a motion by Ms. Hogan, seconded by Mr. Kunkle, was unanimously approved.

It was also noted at this time by the Chair that Ms. Jen O'Brien had joined the group. A new attendance was taken at the re-opening of the regular meeting at 6:42 PM.

The Secretary then approved the minutes. Mr. Kunkle made a motion to accept, Ms. Gardiner seconded and unanimously approved by the committee.

The Chair then turned the discussion to the budget after Mr. Carson stated that the committee had the Draft Action Plan and had had 2 public hearings as prescribed.

The Chair asked of the committee would like to wait until the May 16th meeting to have the full budget discussion.

Mr. Massey stated that the issues he had raised during the budget discussion concerned the milling and paving sections. He stated that it was his understanding that the money is needed [for street repairs] and that CDBG money is there for that but that some of the streets proposed are not in the most

economically distressed zones. He asked if that would be something the committee should consider or should the money be put in something else.

Mr. Carson replied that the roads are in the 51% low and moderate income guidelines and are in primarily residential areas.

Discussion concerning the importance of having the roads repaired. Members cited the damage done to cars of roads are not repaired, but that the point about eligibility of roads in regard to CDBG funding was an important issue.

Ms. Hanrahan then asked a question on the Home Purchase Program and the \$114,000 balance showing for that program.

Mr. Carson confirmed that there is a \$114,000 balance and that the Mayor is considering about another \$100,000 for more home purchases.

Ms. Harahan then asked if the balance automatically goes into the program's budget line or does it have to be added by a specific motion by the committee.

Mr. Carson stated that it does not, that it must be budgeted back into the budget line. He also stated that he was not advocating for additional funding for the Housing Department.

Mr. Young asked if the budget vote would be held at this meeting.

The Chair responded that the final vote would be at the next meeting on May 16th, but that points to be clarified could be discussed now in advance of the next meeting.

Mr. Kunkle asked if the committee should review the milling and paving section.

The Chair pointed out that the committee voted to give the BLDC an extra \$10,000. Should this be reconsidered? She stated that the budget proposals so far were good ones, but that the committee could still review them. For example, could the extra \$10,000 given to milling and paving be put somewhere else?

Discussion then ensued regarding possible funding scenarios to be discussed and finalized at the next meeting.

In response to a question regarding written comment, Mr. Carson stated that Planning had not received any written comment.

Ms. Hogan asked what the comment period was. Mr. Carson replied that it was 30 days.

After further discussion on the voting protocol and meeting schedule, the meeting was adjourned at 7:12 PM.