

CDBG

Community Development Block Grant

City of Hot Springs, Arkansas

First Significant Amendment to 2011, 2012 & 2013 Annual Action Plans as Amended

May 2014

Cover Sheet

Name of Jurisdiction:	City of Hot Springs, Arkansas	
Lead Agency:	City of Hot Springs Planning & Development Department 133 Convention Boulevard Hot Springs, AR 71913	
Contact:	Kathleen A. Sellman Planning & Development Director	
Phone:	(501) 321-6855	
Authorized Official:	David Watkins City Manager	
Signature & Date:	David Watkins, City Manager	Date

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Purpose	4
Citizen Participation Overview	4
Project Selection	5
Available Funds	6
Proposed 2011, 2012 & 2013 Amended Projects	7
Monitoring	8
Addendum A: Citizen Participation	9
Introduction	9
Survey	9
Public Hearing: Community Development Advisory Committee January 2, 2014	10
Public Meeting: City of Hot Springs Board of Directors Meeting February 4, 2014	10
Public Meeting: City of Hot Springs Board of Directors Meeting February 18, 2014	11
Applications for Reallocated Funding	12
Public Hearing: Community Development Advisory Committee April 17 & April 22	12
Public Hearing: Community Development Advisory Committee May 1, 2014	13
Public Meeting: City of Hot Springs Board of Directors Meeting May 6, 2014	13
Citizen Survey Results Summary	14
Citizen Comments	15
Addendum B: Resolution	23

Introduction

This proposal includes data to fulfill federal requirements, as well as information of interest to the residents of Hot Springs.

The City of Hot Springs (City) receives funds annually from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) programs. This is the first Significant Amendment to the City's 2011, 2012 and 2013 Annual Action Plans as amended. A Significant Amendment is necessary to allow the change in use of Federal HUD funding as required by Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Section 91.505. The purpose of this Significant Amendment is to describe the City's proposed change in use of the CDBG fund from one eligible activity to others.

Purpose

Under direction from HUD, CDBG grantees are urged to evaluate projects to ensure timeliness of all activities and that activities meet the needs of City residents. The City is proposing a change in the use of \$416,879.54 in CDBG funds from fiscal years 2011, 2012 and 2013 owner-occupied single-family housing rehabilitation activities to other eligible activities. Funds are being transferred to activities that can be spent in a timely manner on projects which are the most feasible, meet federal objectives and the priorities of low- to moderate-income and special needs Hot Springs citizens.

The proposed Significant Amendment reprograms funds from the City's owner-occupied single-family housing rehabilitation program, which provides up to \$25,000 for major and minor home repairs to qualifying low- and moderate-income homeowners. As HUD's annual grant award to the City has decreased, program administrative resources decreased as well. At this time, the housing rehabilitation program does not have full time staff to complete the intensive qualification, assessment, bidding and supervision work required. The housing rehabilitation waiting list will be maintained and continued should funding become available in the future. The City will coordinate with non-profits who provide home improvements.

Citizen Participation Overview

Citizen participation is an integral part of the CDBG program (24CFR91.105). The City executed the Citizen Participation Plan and provided many opportunities for public input throughout the development and approval of the significant amendment with particular emphasis on outreach to low- and moderate-income and special needs residents.

Citizens were engaged in Significant Amendment public comment using surveys, direct mailings, one-page informational brochures, legal and public notices in the Sentinel Record newspaper, press releases to over seventeen (17) media outlets, online via cityhs.net and social media, radio interviews, CDBG representative attendance at neighborhood association and community meetings, monthly Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) public hearings, and City Board of Director meetings. All public meetings were duly advertised and held in fully accessible facilities served by public transit, and included contact information to request bilingual and hearing-impaired accommodations. A detailed report of Citizen Participation activities and public comments is included as Addendum A.

Project Selection

An application period was opened February 19 to April 4, 2014. Applications were available online and in the City Planning & Development office. Legal notices to solicit applications were placed in the Sentinel Record February 23, March 23 & March 30, 2014. A press release was issued to over 17 media outlets on February 24, 2014. Radio interviews were conducted February 21 and April 4, 2014. Twenty-one (21) applications were received from twelve (12) applicants detailing twenty-seven (27) potential projects. Two (2) applications were rescinded on April 8 when alternative funding became available; One (1) application was determined to be ineligible per HUD requirements.

The Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) duly advertised and held a public hearing on April 17 and then continued it to April 22, 2014 to review and recommend applications. A Sentinel Record legal notice was placed April 13, 2014 announcing the CDAC public hearing, publicizing the list of applications and funds requested, and opening the 30-day written public comment period. Press releases were issued on April 11 & 18, 2014. Sixteen (16) residents attended on April 17 and seven (7) residents on April 22. Applicants presented eligible projects and answered questions. Twenty (20) verbal public comments were heard; no written comments were received.

The City Board of Directors duly advertised and held a public meeting on May 6, 2014 to review the recommendation from the CDAC, hear public comment, and approve a Resolution to significantly amend Resolution Nos. 7525, 7771, 7923, 8014, 8081, 8232, and 8399 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) FY2011, FY2012 and FY2013 Annual Action Plans (AAP) as amended to reallocate \$416,879.23 to eligible neighborhood revitalization and new non-profit affordable home building projects.

The projects selected for the Significant Amendment reallocated funding meet HUD national objectives and timeliness requirements, and demonstrate City priorities to address public health and safety, create suitable living environments for low- to moderate-income neighborhoods and those with special mobility needs, influence future public and private development and investment, leverage matching funds and in-kind resources for maximum benefit, and/or increase affordable housing stock for low income residents.

Available Funds

The City's CDBG Annual Action Plans include eligible activities to be funded during a program year. Fiscal year funding is to be expended on activities described in the Annual Action Plan. Per the City's prior plans unspent funds were reallocated to the housing rehabilitation program at the end of each fiscal year. The following table lists funds awarded and activities planned in 2011, 2012 and 2013 Annual Action Plans as amended, and the Significant Amendment's proposed funding to be reprogrammed to eligible activities defined herein.

Fiscal		Annual Action Plan	Amendment	
Year	Annual Action Plan Activity	Funding	Amount	
2013	Unplanned Program Income	0	\$12,407.50	
2013	Planning & Administration	\$53,400.00	\$13,051.49	
2013	Housing Rehabilitation	\$70,485.00	\$70,485.00	
2013	New Home Buyer Education Program	\$10,000.00	0	
2013	Demolition/Nuisance Abatement	\$40,000.00	0	
2013	Whittington City Park Playground	\$40,615.00	0	
2013	Ouachita Children's Center Life Skills Educational Program	\$35,000.00	0	
2012	Planning & Administration	\$40,000.00	\$6,856.06	
2012	Housing Rehabilitation	\$146,961.00	\$146,961.00	
2012	Habitat for Humanity new home building	\$23,000.00	0	
2012	Safe Haven Women & Children's Shelter	\$99,000.00	\$32,000.00	
2012	New Home Buyer Education Program	\$10,000.00	0	
2012	Whittington Valley Sidewalks Over Budget	\$15,000.00	-\$208.00	
2011	Planning & Administration	\$71,721.00	\$1,721.00	
2011	Whittington City Park Improvements	\$65,000.00	\$5.22	
2011	Housing Rehabilitation	\$211,885.00	\$113,285.67	
2011	New Home Buyer Education Program	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	
2011	Unplanned Program Income	0	\$10,314.60	
	TOTALS	\$942,067.00	\$416,879.54	

The City Board of Directors approved Resolution No. 8399 February 18, 2014 to Significantly Amend CDBG 2011, 2012 and 2013 Annual Action Plans (AAP) as amended reallocating an estimated \$404,471.73 balance in funds to neighborhood revitalization and non-profit affordable home building after soliciting eligible applications. Program income of \$12,407.50 was received from the repayment of a lien on a home that benefited from the housing rehabilitation program increasing total significant amendment funding available for reallocation to \$416,879.54.

Proposed 2011, 2012 & 2013 Amended Projects

Proposed activities are eligible per 24CFR 570.201 of the CDBG Entitlement Program regulations and comply with the national objective to benefit low- and moderate-income persons as an area, housing or spot blight benefit, except the removal of architectural barriers for accessibility to the Garland County Courthouse (24CFR 570.207a).

Two (2) ADA accessibility ramps from the street to the sidewalk 319 Church Street	\$10,000
ADA accessibility ramps, sidewalk repairs, new sidewalk installation Langston school to the Dodge store, Silver St to Crescent St to Grand Ave.	\$73,949
ADA accessibility ramps, sidewalk repairs, new sidewalks, curb & gutter Malvern Ave from Convention Blvd to East Grand Ave	\$38,257
ADA accessibility ramps, sidewalk repairs, new sidewalk installation Around Sarah's Precious Daycare and Wade Park, Illinois and Montreal Streets	\$32,732
ADA accessibility ramps, sidewalk repairs, new sidewalks, curb & gutter Vine Street between Convention Blvd and Grand Ave	\$20,370
Intersection, curb and ADA accessibility improvements Hawthorn and Ouachita to access the Garland County Courthouse	\$ 7,407
Sidewalk and ADA accessibility improvements East side of Park Ave from Whittington to Cove	\$74,428
Covered bus shelter for Intra-City Transit and school bus riders Intersection of Mountain Valley and Park Ave	\$ 8,000
Sidewalk, curb & gutter, ADA accessibility and crosswalk improvements Intersection of Glade at Park Ave	\$17,944
City of Hot Springs Nuisance Abatement of condemned structures	\$40,000
Sub-Recipient Projects with a minimum of 1:1 matching funds Concrete pad, picnic tables and sun shade Webb Community Center, 127 Pleasant Ave	\$17,500
Land acquisition and clearance on Oma, Pleasant Valley & Thornton Habitat for Humanity new affordable home building	\$14,600
Land acquisition and sewer extensions on Highland St Habitat for Humanity Highland Phase II new affordable home building	\$21,430

Land acquisition and related surveying in Dierks Hay 2 and Cones Resurvey \$13,850

Habitat for Humanity Banning Project new affordable home building

\$26,000

Habitat for Humanity Highland Church Project new affordable home building

Monitoring

Lot acquisition Forrest Hill

The City Planning & Development Department monitors its CDBG program to ensure compliance with HUD regulations and attainment of Consolidated Plan goals. Annual Action Plan activities are set up and tracked in IDIS and in a shared financial reconciliation spreadsheet to allow ongoing review of activities expenditures.

The Planning & Development Department monitors all projects in the Consolidated Plan/Action Plan to ensure sub-recipients are complying with projected performance standards, contractual requirements, and applicable federal regulations. The standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the Consolidated Plan include: Pre-award conferences to finalize contracts or letters of understanding and post award conferences to discuss and explain in detail the terms of the contracts or terms of the letters of understandings, ongoing technical assistance and at least one (1) monitoring visit.

The Planning & Development Department conducts on-site monitoring visit for each sub-recipient of CDBG funds. A notification letter is sent to each agency concerning the time and date of the monitoring visit. At the time of the visit, a standard report is completed to monitor compliance in the following areas: management training and operations of the agency, records, contract compliance, recipients and eligibility, financial records/audits, and property inventories. Monitoring results indicate the agencies receiving CDBG funds are performing in compliance.

Each contract and Letter of Understanding receives on-going monthly monitoring through review of monthly reports submitted by each sub-recipient. Through this process, potential problems can be identified early in the program year and technical assistance and/or on-site visitation can be conducted as well. This process also allows staff to properly manage timeliness of expenditures and have the sub-recipient make adjustments accordingly for compliance.

Addendum A: Citizen Participation

Introduction

Substantial amendments are subject to a citizen participation process 24CFR91.505(b) in accordance with the citizen participation plan 24CFR91.105. The purpose of this addendum is to detail actions taken to encourage citizen input and comments received throughout the development of this Significant Amendment.

Survey

- A citizen survey was conducted between November 12 and December 23, 2013.
- The purpose of the survey was to determine how residents preferred to allocate approximately \$400,000 of unspent CDBG Annual Action Plan funds from fiscal years 2011, 2012 and 2013.
- The one (1) page survey consisted of a mandatory question, optional demographic information and space for comments. Responses were anonymous.
- Surveys were created in both English and Spanish, online and in hard copy.
- Online surveys were promoted via six (6) methods including the City website and social media.
- Hard copies and drop boxes were provided in thirteen (13) public locations and distributed at seven (7) neighborhood/non-profit organization meetings.
- The survey and a request to update records were direct mailed to 90 affected households on the housing rehabilitation waiting list November 20, 2013.
- Press releases were issued in both languages to seventeen (17) media outlets on November 22 and December 2, 2013.
- A paid advertisement was placed in the local newspaper on December 8, 2013.
- One (1) hour radio interview broadcast on (KZNG) December 9, 2013.
- 353 survey responses were received; 78% of respondents preferred neighborhood revitalization and nonprofit new home building over housing rehabilitation activities.
- Surveys results were published on the cityhs.net website and made available for review in the City Planning & Development office on December 26, 2013.

Public Hearing: Community Development Advisory Committee January 2, 2014

- Results of the survey were reviewed and public comment heard at a regularly scheduled CDAC meeting January 2, 2014.
- An invitation to the public hearing and written public comments were requested in two (2) Sentinel Record legal notices on December 29, 2013 and January 2, 2014.
- A press release to seventeen (17) media outlets requesting public comment was issued on December 30, 2013.
- A letter was mailed to 89 households on the housing rehabilitation waiting list on December 26, 2013 requesting written comments by mail or email and an invitation to the January 2, 2013 Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) public hearing.
- Seventeen (17) residents attended the public hearing.
- Surveys results, funding alternatives, and one (1) written comment received prior to the meeting were presented.
- Verbal comments were heard: Three (3) in favor of housing rehabilitation funding, and three (3) in favor of neighborhood revitalization and affordable housing initiatives.
- One (1) written comment supporting housing rehabilitation was received following the meeting.
- RECOMMENDATION In a unanimous vote (3 in favor; no abstains; 1 absence Grant) CDAC made the following recommendation: Based on the results of the Citizen Participation Survey in which 78% of respondents preferred neighborhood revitalization over housing rehabilitation funding it is recommended to the City Board of Directors that an estimated \$400,000 in unspent CDBG funds from FY2011, FY2012 and FY2013 be reallocated to neighborhood revitalization and affordable housing projects as described in the pending 2014-2018 Consolidated Plan. Neighborhood revitalization projects incur no additional staff or administration costs and would be furthered with available in-kind estimating, oversight, and labor services from current City department staff.

Public Meeting: City of Hot Springs Board of Directors Meeting February 4, 2014

- Cancelled due to inclement weather and potentially dangerous driving conditions.
- The meeting was scheduled to review survey results, CDAC recommendation, hear public comment, and pass a resolution to approve a resolution that would significantly amend 2011, 2012 and 2013 Annual Action Plans as amended.
- An invitation to the public hearing and written comments were requested in a Sentinel Record legal notice on February 2, 2014.
- A press release requesting public comment was issued on January 29, 2014.
- A letter requesting written comments by mail or email, and an invitation to make public statements at the meeting was mailed to 88 households on the housing rehabilitation waiting list on January 28, 2014.
- Households on the housing rehabilitation waiting list with valid phone numbers on file were called when the February 4, 2014 Board of Directors meeting was cancelled.
- A press release and city-wide Code Red automated phone/text announcement was issued regarding the cancelled meeting.
- The meeting was rescheduled until the next regularly scheduled City of Hot Springs Board of Directors Meeting.

Public Meeting: City of Hot Springs Board of Directors Meeting February 18, 2014

- An invitation to the public meeting and written comments were requested in a Sentinel Record legal notice on February 15, 2014
- A press release requesting public comment was issued on February 17, 2014.
- A letter requesting written comments by mail or email, and an invitation to make public statements was mailed to 83 households with valid addresses on the housing rehabilitation waiting list February 12, 2014.
- The meeting was listed online at cityhs.net meeting and events calendar released weekly to the media, advertised on public TV channel 12, and included in the City Services guide.
- A front page article regarding the resolution to significantly amend prior Annual Action Plans during the Board meeting ran in the Sentinel Record on February 17, 2014.
- Full survey results and written comments received on or before January 22, 2014 were provided to the City Board of Directors and the public as part of the meeting agenda packet.
- An estimated fifty (50) residents attended the meeting. The meeting was broadcast live on public TV Channel 12 and streamed online at cityhs.net.
- Verbal comments were heard: Two (2) in favor of housing rehabilitation, and two (2) in favor of neighborhood revitalization and new affordable housing initiatives.
- A recording of the meeting can be viewed at (52 minute mark):
 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7eyl6AlMtWs&feature=share&list=PLMp4G53QmJe0h-SJJH6sHHdy2tcO8YNps
- RESOLUTION 8399: In a unanimous vote (7 of 7 in favor) the City Board of Directors approved a resolution to amend the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) 2011, 2012 and 2013 Annual Action Plans (AAP) reallocating approximately \$404,471.73 in funds from housing rehabilitation to neighborhood revitalization and non-profit affordable housing activities after soliciting eligible applications.

Applications for Reallocated Funding

- An application period for eligible neighborhood revitalization and non-profit new affordable home building projects was opened between February 19 and April 4, 2014.
- Applications, instructions and a list of municipal resources were posted online at cityhs.net and made available at the City Planning & Development office.
- An email notification regarding the application period and available resources was sent to eligible low- and moderate-income neighborhood associations, new affordable home building non-profits, and City Departments on February 19, 2014.
- Three (3) legal notices to solicit applications were placed in the Sentinel Record on February 23, March 23 and March 30, 2014.
- A press release was issued to over seventeen (17) media outlets February 24, 2014.
- Radio interviews were conducted on KZNG AM1340 on February 21 and April 4, 2014.
- Twenty-one (21) applications were received detailing twenty-seven (27) potential projects from twelve (12) different applicants on April 4, 2014.
- Copies of <u>all</u> applications were provided to the Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC), the
 City Board of Directors, and were made available to the public in the City Planning & Development office
 on April 8, 2014.
- Applications were reviewed and applicants informed of all decisions and progress:
 - Two (2) applications were rescinded on April 8, 2014 after funding became available from other sources.
 - o One (1) application was determined to be ineligible per HUD guidelines.
 - One (1) application funding request was reduced by 50% when it was determined that 1:1 matching funds would be needed under the City's CDBG requirements for sub-recipient applicants.
 - Each eligible project was reviewed, discussed and scored by City staff members based on HUD
 national objectives, 2014-2018 Consolidated Plan objectives, Directors and CDAC priorities. Scores
 were used as a guide only.

Public Hearing: Community Development Advisory Committee April 17 & April 22

- A public hearing was held on April 17 and then continued to April 22, 2014 to review and recommend applications to the City Board of Directors.
- A Sentinel Record legal notice was placed April 13, 2014 announcing the public hearing, inviting attendance, publicizing the list of applications and funds requested, and opening a 30-day written public comment period.
- Press releases were issued on April 11 & 18, 2014.
- No written comments had been received by mail or email at the time these meetings were held.
- Nineteen (19) residents attended on April 17; seven (7) on April 22.
- Applicants presented eligible projects and answered questions.
- Twenty (20) public comments were heard in support and opposition to various projects.
- One (1) written comment was received following the meetings.
- RECOMMENDATION By unanimous vote (4 0) CDAC recommended fifteen (15) eligible neighborhood revitalization and new affordable non-profit home building projects to the City Board of Directors for consideration.

Public Hearing: Community Development Advisory Committee May 1, 2014

- The First Significant Amendment to 2011, 2012 and 2013 Annual Action Plans as amended was presented at a regularly scheduled CDAC public hearing on May 1, 2014.
- Copies of the Significant Amendment were provided at the meeting, posted online at cityhs.net and made available in the City Planning & Development office.
- A Sentinel Record notice was placed April 28, 2014.
- A press release was issued on April 25, 2014.
- No written comments were received by mail or email before the meeting.
- Two (2) residents attended the meeting.
- One (1) verbal statement was made.
- No written comments were received following the meeting.

Public Meeting: City of Hot Springs Board of Directors Meeting May 6, 2014

- A Resolution to Significantly Amend Resolution Nos. 7525, 7771, 7923, 8014, 8081, 8232 and 8399 to Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Fiscal Years (FY) 2011 -2012 -2013 Annual Action Plans (AAP) As Amended to Reallocate \$416,879.54 to Eligible Projects was presented at the City Board of Directors meeting May 6, 2014.
- A Sentinel Record notice was placed April 28, 2014 announcing the meeting and inviting public participation.
- The meeting was listed online at cityhs.net meeting and events calendar released weekly to the media, advertised on public TV channel 12, and included in the City Services guide.
- No written comments were received by mail or email before the meeting.
- An estimated forty (40) residents attended the meeting. The meeting was broadcast live on public TV Channel 12 and streamed online at cityhs.net
- Eight (8) public comments were heard.
- A recording of the meeting can be viewed at: http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLMp4G53QmJe0h-SJJH6sHHdy2tcO8YNps
- In a unanimous vote (7-0) City Board of Directors amended Section 2 of the resolution regarding contingency projects to read: Any allocation payable to the Hot Springs Housing Authority must be reviewed by the board for approval prior to any funding decision.
- RESOLUTION 8399: In a unanimous vote (7 0) the City Board of Directors approved the resolution as amended to Significantly Amend Resolution Nos. 7525, 7771, 7923, 8014, 8081, 8232 and 8399 to Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Fiscal Years (FY) 2011 -2012 -2013 Annual Action Plans (AAP) As Amended to Reallocate \$416,879.54 to Eligible Projects.
- A front page article summarizing the resolution and public comment ran in the Sentinel Record on May 7, 2014.

Citizen Survey Results Summary

CDBG Citizen Surveys were made widely available between November 12 and December 23, 2013. The purpose of the survey was to determine how residents would like to allocate \$400,000 of unspent CDBG Annual Action Plan funds from fiscal years 2011, 2012 and 2013.

Results													
Neighborhood Revitalization						77.8%							
Housing Rehabilitation								1	9.1%				
Both / Split	Funding (not	provided a	s an opti	on)				3	3.1%				
353 Total Re	sponses												
Hard-copy								(63%				
Online								3	37%				
Respondent	Location (82.	2% disclos	ed)										
City of Hot S	prings Reside	nt						(90%				
District 1	District 2	2 Dist	trict 3	Dist	trict 4	District 5		5 [District 6		lot Sure		
26.6%	9.3%	5	.5%	1	.7%	22	2.4%	4.5%			20.0%		
Garland Cou	nty Resident	(outside c	ty limits)						10%				
Applied for	or received ho	ousing reh	ab assista	ance –c	or- knows	someor	ne wh	o has					
Yes		85		37.4%		No)		142		62.6%		
Surveys mai	led to the 90	applicants	on the h	ousing	rehab w	aiting lis	t						
49% (44) F	Returned Com	pleted	9%	(8) Retu	urned to	Sender		42	2% (38) No I	Respo	onse		
Respondent	Total Househ	old Incom	e (63.7%	disclos	ed)								
<\$10,000	\$10,000-	\$15,000	- \$25,	\$25,000 - \$35,000 - \$50,000 - \$49,999 \$74,999		\$50,000 - \$75,000 -		خ	¢100.000.				
<\$10,000	\$14,999	\$24,999				\$99,999	\$100,000+						
8.9%	12.0%	27.1%	16	.6.0%		9.3% 12		2.0%	0% 7.1%		7.6%		
Low- to Mod	lerate Income	(59.8% di	sclosed e	nough	informat	ion to de	eterm	ine)					
Yes		58.3%			N	0			41.7%				
Respondent	Age (49.4% d	isclosed)											
<19	20-29	30-39	40)-49	50	62-64		2-64	65-75		75+		
0.6%	7.6%	14.0%	14	1.5%	36	36.0%		7.0%	14.5%		5.8%		
Household S	ize (50.1% dis	closed en	ough info	rmatio	n to dete	rmine)							
Single Household Small Family			Family (2	(2-4) Large Family (5+)									
44.1%			52.5%				3.4%						
Race / Ethnicity (65.4% disclosed)													
White	Black / African American	Asian		cific nder	Indian/	American dian/Alaskan Native		n/Alaskan Hispanic /			Other	M	lore than 1
68.4%	58.4% 19.5% 0.0% 1.3%				2.2	2%	4.3% 2.6% 1.7				1.7%		

Citizen Comments

Residents were given many opportunities to submit written comments and make public statements. All written comments are listed here as they were received; Verbal comments have been summarized. Spelling was corrected in certain cases, but no other changes have been made. Where helpful, clarification has been added in italics.

Survey Comments Supporting Housing Rehabilitation

Doing the houses improve looks of neighborhood and instigates contagious pride. I love the Park Ave area and have often wished I had a magic want to make all of the houses shine.

My home is in need of repair of roof where tree fell on it and outside underpin with floor has soft spot and back porch needs removed and redone. Door replaced where broken.

The housing rehab is a great program. It helps neighborhoods to improve. Some people (including me) would never be able to afford improvements and our homes would just rot. I personally would be homeless if that happened.

The lead *<based paint>* abatement should be put last on the list after the basics of plumbing, electric and roofing *<referring to housing rehabilitation activities>*

Because I believe funds will be spent on unnecessary projects such as the 2 wheelchair access at my corner of Summer & Greenwood, which I personally witnessed unnecessary # of workmen and too much time spent on a project that is NEVER and has never been used by anyone except bicycles.

I own my home which was built in the 1920's and is in dire need of a new roof, new windows, central AC/heat along with insulating the attic. Bills are very high in the winter and home is very hot in the summer because the windows are not sealed and are very old.

Not to be greedy, but our neighbors all have fairly new houses and their windows are insulated. We don't even have screens on all of our windows. We did buy a storm door.

July 2012 my dream house was totally burned inside was demolition in July by the city now I am back home on same property. Need all things that u would do that is *<on housing rehab>* list repair and get up to code my back home. Thank u. *<physical addresses were included in this comment, but omitted here to protect privacy>*

Which everyone that's needed done on a person home. If it can be repair good if it needed constructed help with that as much as you can too.

My house is in need of many repairs and updates.

I really appreciate you all. Thank you so much!

There are lots of low income families that need home improvements but just cannot afford it.

You need to help the ones who need it before you start making it pretty for everyone else.

Survey Comments Supporting Neighborhood Revitalization & New Affordable Housing

Community re-development comes before economic re-development.

Revitalization of our neighborhood is the highest priority of our community association (Park Ave.)

Neighborhood movement is best by total work on whole neighborhood - then whole neighborhood will progress.

Sidewalks

Park Ave needs as much revitalization as we can get.

Land donation for acquisition to build affordable housing units to replace deserted and/or boarded up buildings and homes currently on the land

Please spend some or all of the \$300,000 CDBG on neighborhood resources (such as sidewalks, bike lanes, street lights, etc.) that will benefit all members of the community and make park ave safer, and more conducive to business.

Sidewalks

Green spaces, drainage, demolition.

We do not inherit the earth, we borrow it from our children.

You only get one chance to make a first impression.

Help. The neighborhood needs help.

Road. Running trails. Playgrounds. Bike trails and lanes for eco-friendly riders.

Bike lanes

Specifically Park Avenue with its increased pedestrian use.

Neighborhood seems more fair over certain houses unless you can tear some down that need it.

If any can be allocated to Kimmery Park, please consider.

Focus on improved green spaces, i.e. community gardens and other functional, sustainable, community initiatives - instead of developing vacant lots, cultivate green spaces for specifically low-income communities.

Research and development for solar powered parks or general community services (like electric bikes) would be highly beneficial for those who lack better transportation. Also, restoration for sidewalks or bike lanes would be a great improvement for community conditions.

Inadequate! <referring to neighborhood infrastructure>

Working to revitalize the Webb Center.

This includes housing and other resources.

Bus shelters for passengers.

Clean up Park Avenue!

SIDEWALKS: Spring Street 400 Block, Laurel Street 200 Block, Reserve Street.

Thank you so much for asking the community for their input.

We need footpaths, mainly within the 2 mile radius, where the buses won't collect kids.

SIDEWALKS!!!

As much as I would appreciate an AC unit, I think the money would best be spent on sidewalks in school neighborhoods. The Hot Springs buses will not pick up within 2 miles of schools, which is fine, walking to school is good exercise - but walking on roads is dangerous. Sidewalks in all directions, but particularly along high traffic roads like Main, Freida, 7th, the one the high school is on, West St. Louis, etc. are the only responsible alternative. Even along just one side of the road would greatly improve the safety of our children, as well as reduce congestion & carbon emissions from people being forced to drive their children a few blocks & sit in car lines to pick them up because the bus won't stop at their house & the roads are unsafe to walk on.

This money may not be available in the future. It should be spent where the greatest number of people are benefitted by it. Would like to see it spent on sidewalks, perhaps sewer hookups to the unbelievable number of properties IN the city still on septic. Not a fan of improving individual houses. Not fair nor prudent use.

PARK AVE!

Some small parks

To help the Quapaw and Prospect Avenue relocate the run-down boarding houses occupants. Crime is a magnet at these boarding houses.

Park Avenue / Whittington Avenue area seems to have the most momentum and potential, and really would help with downtown momentum for further improvement because of proximity. Improved neighborhoods, close to downtown, is sustainable and will promote private investment.

Survey Comments Requesting Both Housing Rehabilitation & Neighborhood Revitalization *<The survey specifically instructed residents to choose 1, but 3% of respondents chose both>*

It is so difficult to choose only one option. My hope is that the \$ will be spent wisely between neighborhood & housing.

Would like to see future granting to better this area and simply keep growing towards an impeccable neighborhood area. Thank you!! Let's do it.

I could only choose one of the above. Why can you not allow me both choices and a percentage of funds for each issue listed. Both are important. Both are permitted under the grant application. Why restrict choices?

There is a need for improvements in both neighborhood revitalization and housing rehabilitation. It would be nice to have the option to split the funds and have flexibility to make improvements in both areas, if needed.

Would be great if I could choose BOTH options. However, if we improve the neighborhoods, maybe folks would take more pride in their neighborhoods and be more alert to and active in the decision-making process. If folks are more proud of their neighborhoods, and are given places (parks?) to connect with each other, then crime levels tend to decrease.

I think it would be good to do some of both.

There are so many vacant houses here in Hot Springs, I'd like to see some of them renovated and rented to folks who need reasonable rent for the unreasonable wages that are paid in our area.

I would like to see a portion of it be available to residents in need *<of housing rehab>* that are unable to get help from another entity.

Both are worthy.

Written Comments Received Prior to the CDAC Meeting January 2, 2014

To whom it might concern. I don't feel like it fair for you to approve a person for 25,000 job to repair their home and take it away from when some houses you used 80,000 thousand one on Grove Street and she's in the nursing home. The other is up Park Ave. Even after you froze it you did repairs. That just not fair. *You did <name omitted to protect privacy>* last year on Walnut St the last up her lone. Going to call Sentinel Record or 7 on your side – gov fund and approved.

I received this letter 12-31-13! Are you serious?! Obviously, my concerns do not interest you. I just feel when we pay for work or jobs, there should be someone to make sure there aren't pointless handicap ramps with 7 street dept workers taking 4 or 5 days! Such a total waste of \$ and materials and time.

As the founder of Hot Springs first community garden network, I strongly urge the city to consider supporting a "garden city" vision by incorporating community gardens, urban edible forests, edible landscaping, and neighborhood gardens wherever possible. Our garden was previously a trash-filled vacant lot.

Verbal Statements Made at the CDAC Public Hearing January 2, 2014

2 residents from Greenwood and 1 from Walnut spoke in favor of housing rehabilitation projects expressing that major home repairs such as electrical, plumbing, HVAC, insulation and window replacement are unaffordable for some working families and it can be dangerous living in an unrepaired home.

2 residents from Park Avenue and 1 from Whittington spoke in favor of neighborhood revitalization projects such as infrastructure improvements to meet the mobility needs of elderly & disabled residents, solving drainage and potential flooding issues, and increasing home ownership in the area, and added that the survey results were clear.

Written Comment Submitted at CDAC the Meeting January 2, 2014

Previous problems with heating and air unit. Air unit stopped working in August (2013). I then bought 1 air conditioner for a 1,500 sq ft home. I also need a new roof for my carport because when I had my home's roof done I didn't have enough for the carport which is in bad shape. Also need a dog fence.

Written Comments Received Prior to the Board of Director's Resolution February 18, 2014

<name omitted to protect privacy>. I am 65 years old and have been a life-long resident of Hot Springs, Arkansas. I worked as a printer at my family's printing business, which I worked faithfully for many years. I have been a member of society and have always strived to give back to the community in any way I can. I love Hot Springs and have always been quite civic minded. Unfortunately, I had a life-changing event that took place in the early 1990's. I was doing what I loved best, which was walking in the Gulpha Gorge one early evening, when everything in my life suddenly changed. My knee gave out and I found myself flat on the ground and not knowing what had just transpired. Thankfully, a park ranger came to my rescue and helped as I was not able to move or bend my leg in anyway. After several days at the old St Joseph's Hospital, I was faced with some decisions that needed to be made very quickly. The orthorpedic surgeon explained to me that my fall had occurred due to a tumor that had cracked my knee cap. To make a long story short, I was transferred to Presbyterian Hospital in Dallas, Texas where I underwent the first of 5 major orthopedic surgeries. This was not just a typical knee replacement surgery, but rather an extensive procedure whereby replacing 18 inches of bone with forged steel. This ordeal rendered me disabled, as you can surely imagine. I've lived in this home since 1993 and have grown attached to it and the area around me. I'm on a fixed income and the idea of repairs and essential upgrades is far out of my reach. We have a wonderful neighborhood with many kind folks and I really enjoy being part of the area. We pride in taking care of what we have and want to keep it that way and always keep it beautiful with curb appeal. It would mean a great deal to me if I were chosen for this project/initiative and to have my house undergo some maintenance, etc. Please consider my home for your project and I appreciate your taking the time to read my request for assistance with housing repairs.

It is so important to have homes brought up to code and I know for a fact that the working people cannot afford to do this on their own. Especially the HVAC and electric codes are so strict with the GFCI's and ark fault. At least GFCI's have receptacles and can be bought for around \$13.00 but they have not took all the bugs out of the ark fault so you have to buy breakers around \$40.00 a piece. To do the electric heat and air, windows and roof. The upgrade helps the neighborhood and city. I believe the program that helps the houses should stay. It helps all individuals within the city.

I am writing because I won't be able to make it to the meeting but I just want to say I just think it no more than fare I we get what we was approved for spent on our home. I had been waiting all this time I get my house. I was told how much I had left and that my restroom was going to be next to be fixed. I know of some repairs was done while I was waiting. Am sorry it no fare. I had to go through a lot of changes to get what I got. They had my house tied up with another person name <name omitted to protect privacy>, and that was a delay for a while.

Verbal Statements Made at Board of Director's Public Meeting February 18, 2014

A resident from Malvern Avenue spoke on behalf of her mother and elderly residents who worked hard their whole lives but are now unable to care for their homes and need assistance.

A resident representing the Greater Gateway Community Association, formerly known as the Pleasant Street Neighborhood Association, spoke on behalf of the association in support of neighborhood revitalization funding.

President of the Whittington Valley Neighborhood Association spoke in favor of reprogramming funds for neighborhood revitalization, noting that these types of projects build partnership through parks, new affordable housing, safe sidewalks, and creates elements of excitement in neighborhoods.

An Eddy Street resident requested that funds be used for housing rehabilitation, adding that this is the only place for many people to turn for repairs. She also commented that lead-based paint abatement should not be a requirement of the housing repair program because it consumes a majority of the funds that would be better used for code compliance and structural repairs to keep the home livable. <HUD regulations regarding lead-based paint abatement were discussed with the resident over the phone following the meeting>

Written Comments Received After the Board of Director's Resolution February 18, 2014

I feel if our Code Dept for the City would keep codes met that this would be like cleaning an old, dirty house/yard. It doesn't make things new, or necessarily repaired but can certainly improve the overall appearance. And maybe w/ the improved appearance of areas, this would improve and influence the people that have interest in living in these areas. Also this Code Compliance issue would make owners of rental property realize that owning isn't all about their monthly income! As for sidewalk repairs? When my sidewalk was busted-up for City upgrades... Well, I did what I could to fix the damages, but even to this day the damage still shows. Also, those handicap ramps to my sidewalks still have not been used by anyone except bicyclers and skateboarders (which is fine by me). At least they're being used – occasionally. Yard Sales? They're great. But the signs typically are abandoned. They fade and fall to the ground where they become litter... Why do we post signs discouraging litter, if we are encouraging litter? Maybe we could ask volunteers to bring old signs (each sign must be dated to do this and that rule enforced, yet their signs may be removed too soon) to Code Dept, or at least remit outdated sign info, so Code Dept can acknowledge the violations. Aren't the street sweepers supposed to clean curbs? Many times it will be noticed that different places along curbs have been obviously and deliberately missed... Not to mention the blocked/clogged street overflows. F.Y.I: I dirt, soil, rotting leaves and/or branches are left undisturbed, the seedlings from yards take root. Eventually... we have large, unsightly growths destroying sidewalks and clogging overflows. Seriously, this is awful. My leaf blower helps me to keep this problem resolved at my intersection. Property owners should be held responsible for "Their" property; after all they profit from their property. Right?! I realize that there is a fine line when it comes to codes and people, but if code violations are left unresolved, the violations grow, and grow, and grow. On a personal note: I would so appreciate having some improvements on my little home, or trees in my yard. I've lived in my little corner of the world for 25 years, and have always done my best to keep it eye appealing, and over the years, noticed my efforts have been contagious. (Short lived, but still contagious). My home has been on the market for more than 2 years, it's true, but my goal is Not to leave my

neighborhood, but to be near my grandchildren. No one that would love my little home, can buy a home. I must apologize for my writing as I have problems w/ my hands. Just know I appreciate this opportunity.

Written Comments Received During 30-Day Advertised Public Comment Period: None to date

Verbal statements made at Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) April 17, 2014

A Pleasant Street resident spoke about the good things they are doing at the Webb Center such as math tutoring, community meetings and food distribution programs.

A Pleasant St resident spoke about the personal significance of the Webb Center since she is restoring the Webb home, and its importance to the community.

A Whittington Valley resident commended Gateway on their near miraculous effort to revitalize membership and create a shared common vision for the community.

A Whittington Valley resident said he felt all 6 Gateway projects were worthy of funding and deserved consideration. He added that if the Majestic was not funded there would be enough money for all projects.

A resident stated that all projects are an advantage to the Gateway area and P.H.O.E.B.E. The neighborhood is historic and many residents are senior citizens. If one or two projects were funded it would empower the people and lead to further preservation.

A Park Avenue resident reiterated the need for improvements at the intersections of Mountain Valley and Glade streets, and supported the addition of a bus shelter.

In regard to the Contingency Fund for Majestic: A Whittington Valley resident acknowledged that it was an important situation that must be resolve and it was the owner's responsibility to do so. He stated that it made him angry that Whittington Valley Neighborhood Association, Gateway Community Association and Park Avenue Community Association are expecting CDBG funding to jump start neighborhood revitalization, and the Majestic property owner is being irresponsible

A Park Avenue resident stated that it makes her angry that the Majestic is an eyesore in her neighborhood and gateway into the City. CDBG funding is vital to the neighborhood's revitalization efforts and east Park Avenue was 78% low/mod income.

A Whittington resident and Gateway Community Association member added that if CDBG funding was diverted to the Majestic clean-up it would be devastating to neighborhood residents who won't be able to see the result of their efforts to prepare applications.

A Whittington resident agreed that the Majestic is a tragedy as would be a lack of funding for neighborhood revitalization to the people who worked on neighborhood revitalization plans. He also stated that the Majestic is comprised of 3 lots. A lien would be placed against only the lot where CDBG funds were used for clearance of the burned portion.

A Whittington Valley resident clarified that unspent Planning & Administration funds are reprogrammed to neighborhood revitalization at the end of the year per the 2014-2018 Consolidated Plan.

Habitat for Humanity Executive Director stated that Habitat for Humanity works with the City to acquire such cleared lots for new affordable home building.

In regard to nuisance abatement demolition and clearance application, a Whittington Valley resident remarked that the City budgeted \$40,000 in general funds for such activities, yet the total cost to complete all work is \$80,000. He recalled that in a prior year CDBG funding was approved for nuisance abatement as a one-time request.

A Whittington Valley resident added that he remembered the nuisance abatement funding as a single request and that if additional funds for these activities are continually needed the money should come from the City budget instead of CDBG. <The application request is an entirely different request that stands on its own.

Residents expect the City to abate derelict property nuisances such as condemnations.>

In regard to Hot Springs Housing Authority applications, a Whittington Valley resident read a portion of the front page article appearing in the Sentinel Record newspaper dated April 17, 2014, which included a statement from the HUD Regional Director advising the Hot Springs Housing Authority against seeking additional funding until after the federal investigation of finances was resolved.

Written comments received at/after the Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) April 17 & April 22, 2014

Excellent run meeting. Thank you for all of your work. Gave great clarity about the monies, their use, when and where. This is important to new people in the process. So the next proposed time to request based on HUD will be February 2015 ending in April 2015 with projects able to be finished by November 2015?

Verbal statements made at Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) May 1, 2014

A Whittington Neighborhood resident emphasized selecting projects that focused on low- to moderate-income areas and funding projects submitted by neighborhood associations to energize residents to continue seeking other funding opportunities. If a neighborhood does not get some support after submitting a CDBG funding proposal it is easy for the neighborhood to get discouraged. He added that spending \$13,000 per lot for Habitat for Humanity land acquisition was too high and some homes will not be completed until 2015 or 2016 <land acquisition for the purpose of new affordable home building recommended for CDBG funding would be completed in 2014>. Decisions to fund projects in an amendment should have broad support in the community.

Verbal statements made at City Board of Directors public meeting May 6, 2014

The Whittington Valley Neighborhood Association president emphasized the importance of CDBG funding of neighborhood applications <over City applications > because of the strong resident support, particularly Whittington, Gateway and Park adjacent to the downtown district and with large low- to moderate-income populations.

A citizen spoke briefly to support the resolution as described.

A Whittington Valley resident spoke against the application for contingency funds for environmental testing and abatement of the Majestic Hotel <not included in the Significant Amendment recommendation or resolution>, and the City Manager discretionary funds for infrastructure improvements <also not included in the Significant Amendment or resolution>. She spoke in opposition of the Habitat for Humanity Highland Church Project land acquisition cost of \$26,000 at \$13,000 per lot <later clarified that it is 3 vacant lots for home building plus a potential future community center or additional new home building>.

Habitat for Humanity Executive Director clarified that the Highland Church Project would provide sites for 3 homes on vacant lots adjacent to the church. The church may serve as a future community center for 25 completed and 5 future Habitat homes and other neighborhood residents depending on the cost of renovations.

A Park Avenue resident provided a letter of support from other Park Avenue residents to the Board of Directors, and described the extensive involvement of Park residents in project selection and prioritization.

A Pleasant Street resident spoke briefly in support of the resolution.

The Vice President of the Gateway Community Association stated that needs exceed funding and Gateway residents, businesses and other partners focused on accessibility improvements to meet the needs of elderly, disabled and other residents who walk to goods and services.

A resident commended City Board and staff for their continued support of non-profits in their efforts to increase affordable housing for low income residents citing Neighborhood Services staff assistance in identifying vacant lots for acquisition, and the City's reduced permitting fees for non-profit home building.

Addendum B: Resolution