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I. Statement of Purpose and Problem

A statement of purpose should detail the reason for writing the paper. Clearly state the problem or issue to which the paper is Directed.

II. Political Environment

The section of the political environment should encompass the major factors that have caused the problem or issue. Identify and explain the major variables—both conditional, situational and policy.

III. Filtering Process

How did the environmental factors filter their way into the political decision process? What were the positions or standing of the various actors? What were they trying to accomplish? What potential influence did they have?

IV. Conversion Process

Describe the steps that had to be taken for a policy to be developed within the conversion process. Did laws need to be changed? Did an exception to a zoning ordinance have to be granted? Who was authorized to institute the changes? Was money needed? How was the money to be raised? What did happen?

V. Policy Statement

What policy emerged from the conversion process? Was it clearly identifiable? How could you recognize it? What did it say?

VI. Activities

What actions or activities were generated by the policy statement? What Occurred? Who was responsible for taking the actions?

VII. Activity Outputs

What outputs were generated by the activities?

VIII. Activity Impacts

What impact did the outputs from the activities have on modifying the environment? Did change actually occur?
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STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND PROBLEM

This paper will focus on the Community Development Act Advisory Committee, (CDAAC), for the year 1978-79. This Citizens Advisory Committee is required under the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant, Entitlement Grant Program. The City of Kalamazoo, as an applicant for community development Block Grant funds, must have citizen input on how funds should be spent on the neighborhoods that qualify for assistance. This year there is about $2,323,563 which can be spent to improve the housing and community needs of what the city calls the six comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization Areas or more commonly known as target neighborhoods. These six neighborhoods are: Vine, Edison, Oakwood, Stuart, the Northside and the Eastside. A seventh neighborhood, which qualifies for block grant assistance and is being added to the list of revitalization areas, is the West Douglas neighborhood.

The members on the CDAAC are from the target neighborhoods, community agencies, and the city of Kalamazoo at-large. This thirteen member committee has been working with neighborhood associations, agencies, the city staff, and the general public in compiling a recommended budget. In the beginning of the year, the CDAAC had fifty proposals submitted to it; by the end of the budgeting period, only about thirty-seven proposals were recommended and sent to the city commission. From the commission, the recommended budget was approved and forwarded to HUD.

In order to understand why the CDAAC and the City compiled the budget as submitted to HUD, one has to look at the problems that they are trying to solve. The Vine neighborhood, to date, has a total of 262 substandard
housing units, or 26.8% of the total number of structures surveyed. (Sub-
standard units are those which require at least minor repairs in order to
bring them up to minimum code and or maintenance standards.) There is a need
for greater contact between neighborhood residents and City Hall. The Vine
area is in need of park space. Parking of cars along the streets has created
a need for off-street parking facilities. Area residents feel service pro-
grams are needed to improve communications between neighborhood residents,
provide legal aid (especially on matters related to tenant/landlord dis-
putes), and to prevent and fight street crime in the neighborhood. There are
problems with storm sewers. Curbs and sidewalks need to be improved and
made barrier-free. Many streets are in need of repairing and additional
streetlights.

The Eastside neighborhood to date has a total of 413 substandard
2
housing units or 47.7% of the total number of structures surveyed. There
is a need for a community center and programs to improve communication
among residents, and between residents and City Hall. An additional playlot
is needed in this neighborhood. The area residents feel services are needed
to provide legal aid to ease the problems that the elderly have with housing,
reduce housing related crime and street crime and set up a plan for systematic
code enforcement. There are storm sewer deficiencies in the area which must be
corrected. Curbs and sidewalks require improvements so as to become barrier-
free. Many streets in the area need to be repaved. Several sections of the
Eastside would benefit from landscaping.

The Stuart Neighborhood (and Douglas neighborhood) to date has a total
of 134 substandard housing units or 60.4% of the total number of units sur-
veyed. There is a perceived need by residents for a neighborhood center.
More playlots, a playground and a park are needed in the area. A new fire station is needed to serve not only Stuart, but also the Douglas and the Northside neighborhoods. Residents of Stuart feel services should be provided to reduce and fight crime as well as solve other problems in the area. Sanitary sewer work is needed and also storm sewer work is required to prevent flooding from Arcadia Creek. Some streets need curb and sidewalk improvement and also repaving. Where possible, landscaping would greatly enhance the neighborhood.

The Northside neighborhood has to date a total of 1451 housing units which have been identified as substandard or 36.8% of the total number of units surveyed. There is a need in this area for a neighborhood center and a fire station. Neighborhood residents feel public services should be provided to improve communication among residents and between residents and City Hall and to combat crime and help solve other pressing problems. The sanitary sewer system needs construction work to correct deficiencies. Extensive storm sewer work is needed in several sections of the Northside. Numerous streets are in need of repair and curb and sidewalk improvements. Also landscaping improvements would be beneficial to the neighborhood.

The Edison Neighborhood currently has 936 housing units that have been identified as substandard or 32.0% of the total number of units surveyed. Area residents feel a neighborhood center is needed. Additional playlots are another perceived need. On-street parking is beginning to create problems so that off-street parking facilities are now being studied to see if this can alleviate the problem. Residents feel services should be provided to assist homeowners in legal matters, reduce crime, and in general, improve the quality of life in the Edison area. There are many storm sewer deficiencies in this neighborhood which need to be corrected. Curbs and sidewalks require improve-
ment to become barrier-free. Also, several streets are in urgent need of repair.

The Oakwood neighborhood, at the present time, has no information on substandard housing, however, available information shows the neighborhood is in need of a park and playlot. A new fire station is needed to service the Oakwood area. Sanitary sewers must be built and deficiencies in storm sewers corrected. A number of streets in the Oakwood area are unpaved and have no curbs and sidewalks. Other streets in the neighborhood need to be repaired.

It is the purpose of this paper to examine these problems, and to discuss the relationships between CDAAC and the City of Kalamazoo in exploring solutions. There are other Federal and State programs with which the city is involved to improve residential and business in Kalamazoo, but this paper will not go into detail on those programs. The rationale for excluding these several other programs is the need to concentrate on one program at a time in order to avoid becoming entangled in a very complicated system.
ENVIRONMENT

In order to understand the problems the neighborhoods are having, one has to first look at what has happened to the City of Kalamazoo. In 1976 the total city population stood at 79,472 which is a 7.1% decline since 1970. At the same time, the minority population increased 23.7% to a total of 11,245. The per capita income increased 40.5% since 1969 to about $4,542. The poverty level has been estimated at 13.6% meaning that 11.1% of the population is at or below the 1970 poverty level. Breaking down median family income by neighborhood reveals the following: Vine neighborhood, less than $8,000; Eastside, $8,000 to $9,999; Stuart, $8,000 to $9,999; Northside, less than $8,000; Edison, $8,000 to $9,999; and Oakwood, $8,000 to $9,999. The City-wide employment figures for 1976 estimate total employment at 38,800 and total unemployment at 3,748 or 8.8%. The job lag decline shows retail to be 0.17% and manufacturing to be 17.02%. The housing statistics show that in the area of housing overcrowding there is 1.01 or more persons per room in 1237 units or 4.6% of the housing inventory. Total housing inventory has been estimated at 28,952 of which 28,202 units are occupied. A further breakdown of these figures reveals that there are 14,936 owner occupied houses or 53.0% and renter occupied houses are 13,266 or 47.0%. The vacant housing units figure is above 750 units. There 456 housing units that are vacant and available, and 146 units that are for sale. This shows the homeowner vacancy rate to be 1.0%. The number of units which can be rented is 310 units for a renter vacancy rate of 2.3%. Other vacant housing units stand at 294 units.

What this information reveals is that the City of Kalamazoo is facing major economic problems. Much of the city's attractiveness appears to be gone and an economic decline has set in. The economic base of the City page five
is changing and as a result there is a lack of growth in retail jobs and a decline in blue-collar manufacturing jobs. At the same time there is an increase in commercial service jobs.

New industrial development in the City has been hindered by the lack of large vacant industrial sites. In many of the City's older industrial areas the structures are outdated (many built prior to 1940), some are abandoned and in a state of decay, others are partially demolished. It has become too costly for private investors to clear or rehabilitate these structures, and as a consequence, the City is having problems attracting industrial growth. Also, Consumers Power is limiting natural gas consumption which would force investors to use more expensive energy sources that require conversion or installation of physical plants. The vacant and usable land which the City has, is becoming filled with wholesale warehousing instead of industrial developments. The Central Business District (CBD) is being challenged by the growth of regional and community malls and mini-malls. Whereas the pedestrian mall and the Kalamazoo Center show the CBD is still viable, the area is hindered in its development by the lack of commercial and office space.

These problems which the City has been encountering have a direct impact on the neighborhoods. The community-based businesses are also in a period of decline and abandonment because they cannot compete with the malls in the suburbs. Even though several neighborhoods have sound commercial structures, the businesses here have had a high vacancy and turnover rate. Consequently, the neighborhoods are losing many services.

Furthermore, the deteriorating conditions of the City have caused a movement out to the suburbs by those who can afford it. This has left the
central city area with a high proportion of low and moderate income households. Many elderly, handicapped, and some female-headed households who live in the city are on fixed incomes. Because there has not been enough new replacement housing in the City, the housing which is available is beginning to physically deteriorate.

In looking at the target neighborhoods and how they have changed over time, one finds many problems that are unique to these neighborhoods. Other problems are apparently more common and are shared by the six neighborhoods that qualify for CDAAC funds. (The West Douglas neighborhood was in the process of being officially recognized during the period of this investigation, but it appears to have the same or similar problems that the other target neighborhoods have.)

Whereas many homes in the Eastside neighborhood are in fairly good condition, there are some houses which have been abandoned and consequently vandalized. There are problems with building code violations, junk and abandoned cars, properties that are in a state of disrepair, and streets and sidewalks that have not been maintained. However, the greatest problem this neighborhood faces is that the area is zoned industrially. Already some areas show evidence of mixed land-use and this is undesirable for a residential environment. Consequently, areas that fall within the long range use plan for commercial and industrial development cannot remain residentially stable.

The Northside neighborhood is characterized by very poor housing conditions. The reason for this is many of the structures were built prior to the 1930's. Because of poor soil conditions, the foundations require more frequent and costly repairs. But since this area has a large number of low income owners who cannot afford to pay for repairs, these problems are not being taken care of. Also, there is a problem with absentee landlords who
do very little repair work on the structures they own.

Areas in the Northside which are fairly stable residential communities, with basically sound housing, are threatened by bordering blighted areas. Other sections of the Northside which have only scattered blighted areas stand a good chance of being rehabilitated into a sound residential neighborhood. However, some sections of the Northside, have already become mixed land use areas and the remaining residential structures will have to be cleared because the zoning is for industrial development.

The Stuart neighborhood has an historic district which has created an interest in restoring and maintaining many of the homes in this area. However, many low income families cannot easily afford to bring their homes up to code standards so some housing deterioration is already evident.

The Vine neighborhood has become overpopulated in many areas. A large number of homes which were built as single family homes have been converted to multiple family housing units. The numerous rental units in this neighborhood have mostly been rented to students who chose this area because of the proximity to Western Michigan University and the Central Business District. Because of the high density level of this neighborhood, problems with parking, garbage, and noise have developed.

The Edison neighborhood is entering a transitional phase marked by a decline in the number of houses. Physical deterioration is evident in some structures lying in the outskirts of the neighborhood and there is a changing demographic composition. The reason for this change is that many structures in the area were built prior to 1939. Because some of these older houses are beginning to deteriorate, the property values in turn allow lower income families to move in and these families can only afford to do minor repairs to
their houses. Also, there are problems caused by absentee owners who neglect their rental properties. However, the deterioration of the Edison neighborhood is not evenly spread. The area closest to the City is in the worst condition, while the area farthest out is quite stable.

The Oakwood neighborhood's problem stems from it being annexed to the City in 1956 without prior public improvements. Existing public works are upgraded without assessments but new public improvements are financed by assessing area residents. Because many area residents are of low and moderate incomes, the problem has not been taken care of.

In recognizing the situational variables which cannot be changed, the most obvious is time. It will take years to revitalize the City and the neighborhoods. Consequently, programs will have to be designed to eat away at the problems a little bit at a time while trying to cope with new problems.

There is not enough money available to finance all community rehabilitation projects. The over 2.2 million dollars Kalamazoo will receive from HUD along with past funds will not solve all of the problems. Furthermore, Kalamazoo is only one of many communities in the United States seeking funds and these funds are not unlimited.

The income level of a large proportion of the families who reside in the City is not going to dramatically increase. Consequently, these people are still going to be unable to do property improvements without assistance. Without regular maintenance their homes will begin to deteriorate, adding to the blight of the neighborhood.

The policy variables which can be changed begin with the long range plans of the City. The areas which are to be entirely zoned industrially, thus displacing the residential units there, do not have to become areas for
industrial development. The area along the Kalamazoo River may not be best served by having heavy industry developed there.

The concentration of low income families does not have to take place. Plans can be drawn up and action taken to spread these families over a wider area, thus avoiding a concentrated pocket of substandard housing. By having low income families in sound neighborhoods, funds can be directed toward home maintenance instead of being diverted to improve large sections of roads and sewers. Also racial composition can be more evenly distributed over the City to avoid minority concentrated neighborhoods which statistically tend to be in the greatest need of repair.
FILTERING AGENTS

The problems that the various neighborhoods are facing have been recognized by the City of Kalamazoo and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD's Community Development Block Grant, to which the City of Kalamazoo is an applicant, requires a Citizens Advisory Committee to recommend how funds should be spent. Hence, the chief filtering agents are the Community Development Act Advisory Committee and the City staff workers, especially those employees in the Community Development Department. Other City departments that are involved include the Department of Parks and Recreation, the Department of Public Works, the Police Department, and the Office of City Manager. The City Commission is a filtering agent, but to a lesser extent because its only related function is to approve or not approve the recommended budget prepared by the CDAAC. HUD is also a filtering agent in that it establishes guidelines describing the types of projects that are eligible for funding and gives final approval. Other filtering agents are concerned individuals such as Michael Korman; citizen groups including the Oakwood Association, Eastside Block Association, Edison Neighborhood Center, Stuart Area Restoration Association (SARA), Northside Association for Community Development, West Douglas Neighborhood Association, Vine Neighborhood Association, and such associations as the Kalamazoo County Legal Aid Bureau Incorporated, Young Womens Christian Association (YWCA), Kalamazoo Valley Community College, Easter Seal Society of Kalamazoo, Agape Fellowship, Washington Square Business Association, Edison Neighborhood Committee, Incorporated Senior Services Incorporated, Kalamazoo County Human Services Commission, Operation Turn Around, and the Kalamazoo Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council.
The CDAAC has been the focal point of the filtering agents. This thirteen member body is composed of:

...representatives from all community development low and moderate income neighborhood associations, a representative from the joint neighborhood council, representatives from target, population (handicapped and elderly), lending institutions, builders, social services agencies, Planning Commission, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo College, and other impartial institutions.  

Whereas the CDAAC began with six neighborhood representatives and seven members-at-large, the addition of a West Douglas neighborhood representative has temporarily increased the total number of members to fourteen. This neighborhood representative was added after the budgeting process but did have input on the proposals.

The CDAAC reviewed the proposals submitted to it but in compiling a budget the committee basically accepted the City Staff's recommendations. The proposals the CDAAC wanted placed back into the recommended budget, which the City Staff deleted, are the following:

1. A proposal from the Kalamazoo Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council for $33,854 to be used for substance abuse. CDAAC recommended $20,000 for this proposal which the City Commission approved. The reason the City Staff did not recommend funding was because they felt it was not a priority item even though it was a valuable community program.

2. The Community Development Program Division's Communication proposal was placed back into the budget. This proposal asked for $10,000 to establish a communications network in the neighborhood. The City Staff felt carry over funds could be used to finance it, but the CDAAC wanted to make sure this project was not overlooked and so recommended that $1,00 be earmarked for this work to establish its importance within the overall budget.
3. The most controversial proposals CDAAC wanted included in the recommended budget were the part-time administrators for the Vine Neighborhood and Stuart Neighborhood and a full time worker for the Edison Neighborhood. The part-time Vine Neighborhood Association (VNA) Administrator proposal was submitted by the VNA with a request for $9,750 to fund this worker. The part-time Stuart Area Restoration Association (SARA) Administrator proposal was submitted by SARA which requested $9,750 to fund a worker for this neighborhood. The Edison Neighborhood Development Project Proposal, submitted by the Edison Neighborhood Committee Inc., requested $18,505 to fund a full time neighborhood worker. The CDAAC perceived a need for neighborhood workers to work with area residents, the neighborhood Association and the City, and so recommended $7,500 for VNA part-time Administrator, $7,500 for a SARA part-time Administrator and $17,500 for an Edison neighborhood worker. City Manager, Robert Bobb, speaking for the City, said he was opposed to the neighborhood workers because they were not City Staff employees. Bobb felt a City Staff run liaison program, augmented with CDBG funds, could best provide the services to the neighborhoods. City Commissioner Patricia Cayemberg also felt neighborhood workers should not be funded because the City Staff could run a liaison program. In the end, the CDAAC withdrew its recommendation for funding the VNA and SARA administrators, and instead opted for an expanded City Liaison program. However, the CDAAC stood fast on its recommendation of an Edison worker for one year on an experimental basis. This final position by the CDAAC was acceptable to a majority of the City Commissioners, but the City Manager still opposed funding an Edison worker. The general public's stance seemed clearly in favor of neighborhood workers.
The City Manager and his office also made changes in the recommended budget. A rat abatement proposal requesting $20,000 to start eliminating rats in the Edison area was added. The majority of CDAAC opposed this proposal because it was not submitted to the committee for review. The Young Womens Christian Association (YWCA) proposal requesting $31,000 to improve its residence was not seen as a priority project in 1979/80 by both the City Staff and the CDAAC. However, the City Manager's office felt there was a need for transitional housing for low and moderate income women who were in need and so recommended $31,000 for the YMCA project. Also, the City Manager's office added an additional fund request of $31,418 for the foot patrol program and a separate proposal for a foot patrol for the Oakwood area at a single cost of $23,409. The CDAAC came to an agreement in support of additional foot patrol funds because the original proposal was not specific and did in fact underestimate the costs involved. But the Oakwood foot patrol proposal drew a negative response from the CDAAC because it too was considered a new proposal which the CDAAC had not reviewed. Also the Oakwood representative to CDAAC pointed out that the Oakwood foot patrol was not a priority project for his area. The City Manager's office request for $20,000 to be used to fund an Eastside Center Director was acceptable to the CDAAC although the CDAAC had originally recommended a funding of $17,500. The original proposal submitted by the Eastside Block Association asked for $23,450 to fund a Director but was not recommended by the City Staff. The City Manager's reason for funding the Eastside Center Director position was because the City had in the past funded the Center. The person to be chosen Center Director is to be a City Staff worker who will report to the Deputy City Manager. This arrangement was acceptable to the Eastside representative.
The major part of the recommended budget was drawn up by the City Staff workers and amended and approved by the CDAAC and City Manager's Office. The Staff recommendations and rationale for proposals that were accepted are stated below:

The Vine Neighborhood Street Improvement's proposal submitted by the Department of Public Works requested $254,000 to improve fine streets in the Vine area. The recommended funding was $164,000 because proposed improvements are to be done over a two year time period.

The proposal of the Stuart Neighborhood Street Improvement submitted by the Department of Public Works requested $174,700. The staff recommended $174,000 on the basis that this project was part of the City's four-year plan of Public Works Improvement in the Stuart area.

The Edison Neighborhood Center Portage Creek Flood Prevention proposal asked and received $12,000 because this was a priority project in 1979-80.

The most common rationale the Staff gave for recommending project proposals stated that it was a needed activity which helped to accomplish the City's three year Comprehensive Strategy Plan. Also, many of the projects were already in progress and needed additional funds to be completed. The following proposals were recommended under this rationale.

1. The New Housing Capital Improvement Support Fund proposal submitted by the Department of Community Development sought $200,000 to fund new housing development activities in the City. They were only recommended $100,000.

2. The proposal by SARA for $500 for Stuart plantings was recommended without change.

3. The VNA's Vine Neighborhood Plantings Program originally requested and was recommended $6,000 for a landscaping program. But because of budget cuts the final amount was $4,000 future budget with $6,000 currently available.
through carry-over funds.

4. The Community Development Departments proposed Rehabilitation Loans and Grants Program requesting funding of $600,000 was recommended $525,000. (Currently $1.07 million is available) This program is designed to rehabilitate homes in the City of Kalamazoo. This Department also requested $80,000 funding for a free paint program to improve the exterior of homes. They were recommended $60,000 with $20,000 available from carry-over funds.

5. The Easter Seal Society of Kalamazoo requested and was recommended $8,000 to help make buildings barrier-free for the handicapped.

6. The Renovation of the Eastside Center proposal was submitted to the Eastside Block Association with a requested funding of $25,000. This amount was unchanged.

7. The Washington Square Revitalization project proposal submitted by the AGAPE Fellowship/Washington Square Business Association requested and was recommended $36,963.

8. The Emergency Home Repair proposal drawn up by Senior Services, Inc. request for $37,139 was unchanged when recommended.

9. The Community Development Department submitted the following four proposals:

   A. A Housing Program Specialist who will monitor housing related activities.
   
   B. A Neighborhood Improvement Program to study interrelated problems of neighborhoods.
   
   C. A Housing Surveillance Program to inspect housing structures with the greatest need.
   
   D. A Code Enforcement proposal aimed at improving the housing inspection process.
The funding both requested and recommended was $22,000, $10,000, $3,630 and $53,833, respectively.

10. The Community Affairs Division of the City Manager's Office submitted a Neighborhood Liaison Program proposal. The original requested funding and recommended funding was $25,324, but was later expanded to $33,987. The expanded program is designed to provide a city staff worker for the Vine and Stuart neighborhoods. This liaison will help residents communicate with the City on neighborhood related problems and activities.

11. The Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program, submitted by the Kalamazoo Police Department, is designed to continue the six foot patrol officers and expand into other densely populated neighborhoods where crime is perceived as a problem. The requested funding was $249,920 but recommended funding is only $100,000. Later, $31,418 was added along with an Oakwood Foot Patrol Proposal.

12. The Kalamazoo County Legal Aid Bureau, Inc. submitted a Legal Services Program Proposal which is to be funded for $36,560, the amount requested. This program seeks to help target neighborhood residents with legal matters related to housing.

13. The Department of Parks and Recreation submitted the following three proposals:

   A. The acquisition and development of the Northside Center.
   B. Tot/Lot Playgrounds for West Douglas.
   C. The completion of the Davis Street Park.

Both the Northside Center and Tot/Lot proposals were recommended to be funded at $100,000 and $19,000, the amounts each proposal requested. The Davis Street Park Proposal requested $7,500 but was recommended at only $6,000 with $1,322.24 currently available.
14. The City Staff made three further recommendations based on rationales different from that used to justify the above programs.

15. The Kalamazoo County Human Services Commission Weatherization proposal to fund workers who will winterize homes in the target neighborhoods requested and was recommended $40,000. The rationale given was that with higher utility costs, weatherization of homes is a priority project to help low and moderate income families.

16. The Community Development Department's Specification Writer Proposal requested and was recommended $60,844. These two specification writers and one secretary will take code violations and home improvement projects and write building specifications for contractors to follow. The rationale for funding their proposal was that these two positions are essential to the Loans and Grants program.

17. Two projects, Relocation and Demolition, were recommended for funding because they are required by Federal guidelines. Relocation has a recommended funding of $90,000 with $25,000 currently available. Demolition is to be funded at $10,000.

18. The Lockshore Renovation Project was at first not recommended for funding, pending completion of a feasibility study on the Lockshore building site. However, the CDAAC recommended the original requested amount of $250,000 be included in the budget. The feasibility study has been completed although the City still has some questions regarding whether the side chosen is the most feasible. Consequently, there has been no final determination deciding if the Lockshore building will become the Northside Community Center.

The following proposals were not recommended for funding primarily because they were not seen as priority projects in 1979-80. Also, budget restraints
limited how many proposals could be funded. Project proposals not recommended were:

- Rockwell Playground Renovation (Eastside Block Association Proposal)
- Sherwood Park (first proposal)
- Eastside Development of Tot Lots (first proposal)
- Edison Area Improvements
- SARA Snow Clearance
- Rockwell Renovation (City Parks Department proposal)
- Eastside Tot Lots (second proposal)
- Michael Korman's Solar Heater
- Youth Neighborhood/Operation Turnaround
- Neighborhood Tuition for Housing Related Classes
- Home Improvement Program/Boy's Club
- Access to Woods Lake

The City Commission approved the CDAAC and City Staff recommended budget with dissenting votes from Commissioners Samuel Bennett and Caroline Ham. (Commissioner Edwin Walters was out-of-town and so did not participate in the budget voting.) The final approval of the budget must come from HUD, which is the source of the CDBG monies.
CONVERSION PROCESS

This phase of the budgeting process involves the requirements for Community Development Block Grant and the available working funds for the City of Kalamazoo. Both requirements and the amount of funds are determined by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

For the year 1979-80 the approximate funds available are $2,221,568. However, carry-over funds can be used and also other funding sources to improve the quality of the neighborhoods. Consequently, program activities and funds flow from one year to the next.

In order to obtain Community Development funds, the City must submit an application to HUD with the following assurances and requirements:

1. The City, as an applicant, has the legal authority to apply for the Block Grant and is able to carry out the proposed projects and activities.

2. The City Commission, as the governing body, has officially adopted or passed a motion or resolution authorizing the submission of an application, that the Commission has authorized City Manager Bobb to be the official representative of the City and has requested Bobb to gather any additional information that is needed for the application.

3. The City must fulfill all requirements of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-95 as modified by 24-OFR 570.310. The A-95 review is a screening process by the South Central Michigan Planning Council, Region 3, of Applications for Federal Assistance. Also, any comments or recommendations by clearing houses must be attached and considered before filing the application.
4. The City, before it can submit an application must have a citizen participation plan written up. This plan should place emphasis on allowing low and moderate income citizens or residents of blighted neighborhoods a chance to voice their opinions, submit proposals and become involved in the formulation of the application as well as other phases of the program. In order for these citizens to become active, they must be allowed public hearings which should be scheduled in locations which permit participation. These hearings should be scheduled enough in advance so that citizens can give timely and meaningful comments concerning submitted proposals. This plan must allow citizens to comment on the performance of the applicant concerning community development programs and activities.

5. City Manager Bobb must agree to be responsible for any provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which applies to community development activities. Also Bobb, the authorized officer of the City as approved by HUD, agrees to accept the Federal Court's jurisdiction to enforce his duties.

6. The Community Development Program is to be designed around a priority goal of creating activities that will help low and moderate income groups or aid in the prevention of slums in the community. However, this requirement can be suspended if the applicant and the Secretary of HUD determine there are other urgent Community needs that qualify for funds.

7. The application must comply with Office of Management and Budget policies guidelines and requirements concerning the application, acceptance, and use of Federal funds and,
A. HUD regulations and requirements concerning labor standards, programs, special laws, and administrative procedures.

B. Executive Order 11296 pertaining to the evaluation of flood hazards and Executive Order 11288 concerning water pollution control, prevention, and abatement.

C. "American Standard Specification for Making Buildings and Facilities Accessible to and Usable by, the Physically Handicapped." This requires that all buildings except privately owned residences, that are built or modified using Community Development Funds be accessible to the handicapped. The City as the applicant must conduct inspections to make sure contractors are complying with these specifications.

8. Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 must be complied with. This act prevents discrimination, denial of benefits, or exclusion from participation in Federally funded programs on the basis of race, color, or national origin by the City as an applicant for Community Development funds.

9. Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 requires the City to carry out housing and community development programs in a manner which will further fair housing practices. This involves taking action to insure the sale, rental, and financing of housing, and the requirement that brokerage services are handled in such a way as to promote fair housing.

10. A third act which prohibits the City, as a recipient of Federal funds from discriminating on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex, is Section 109 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.
Executive Order 11063, which must be complied with, provides for equal opportunity and nondiscrimination in the sale or rental of housing that is constructed using Federal funding assistance.

11. The following refer to rules, orders and guidelines that relate to employment which the government must comply with:

A. Executive Order 11246 and related regulations stating that no person shall be discriminated against on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in any aspects of employment while carrying out Federal or Federally assisted construction contracts. Also, contractors and subcontractors while performing on these contracts are required to take action to insure fair treatment in employment, recruitment, layoff, transfer, rate of pay or any other conditions of employment.

B. Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act requiring where feasible, that lower-income residents be given the opportunity for training and employment on local projects. Also, work contracts should be awarded to eligible business in the project area or businesses where a substantial part of it is owned by residents in the project area.

12. The provisions of the Hatch Act which limits political activity of employees must be followed.

13. Safeguards must be enacted to prohibit employees from using positions or giving the appearance they are using their position for private gain for themselves, family, friends, business, or others.

14. The requirements that follow pertain to the area of relocation
procedures:

A. Under State law, to the greatest possible extent, comply with Sections 301 and 302 of Title III (Uniform Real Property Acquisition Policy of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 and Sections 303 of Title III and HUD instructions 24CFR Part 42). Basically, this means that the City must inform persons who are going to be affected by Community Development relocation procedures of their rights and acquisition policies and procedures.

B. Comply with Title II Uniform Relocation Assistance by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 and HUD regulations 24CFR Part 42 and Section 570.602 (a). Here the City must help all persons displaced by the acquisition of property for activities that are part of a Community Development Block Grant program. The relocation payments and relocation assistance must be provided in a fair, consistent, and equitable manner so as not to treat people differently on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, and so on. These people who are affected must be informed of the relocation assistance policies.

15. The next section of HUD requirements states that the City must comply with and relate to the environment:

A. The City must insure that the facilities it owns, leases, or supervises as part of the community development program are not listed on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) list of Violating Facilities. Also, the City must notify HUD
of the receipt of any communication from the Director of the
EPA Office of Federal Activities indicating a facility to be
used in the project is under consideration for listing by the EPA
and 103 (a).

B. Sections 102 (a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973
requires the purchase of flood insurance in communities where
it is available in order to receive Federal financial assistance
for projects in areas designated as having special flood hazards
by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

C. The City must, under the National Environmental Policy Act of
1969, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Section
106, Executive Order 11593, and the Preservation of Archaeological
and Historical Data Act of 1966, consult with the State Historic
Preservation Officer to identify properties listed in or are eligible
for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The City
is then required to avoid or temper the adverse effects upon such
properties.

16. The final requirement the City must fulfill is to give HUD and the
Comptroller General, through only authorized representatives, access
to the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents
related to the grant.10

The City of Kalamazoo has created the Community Development Act Advisory
Committee (CDAAC) which meets regularly on the third Thursday of the month at
the City Hall. A citizen participation plan has been drawn up and several
public hearings have taken place during all phases of the application. Notices
of meetings and Community Development Activities have appeared in the Kalamazoo
Gazette, neighborhood newsletters, and other media sources. Thus, the opportunity for citizen input has been strong and it is anticipated that this degree of citizen participation will continue.
STATEMENT OF POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

The City of Kalamazoo has a Comprehensive Plan which states the policies, strategies, and goals of the City. It is towards these objectives that the City staff and the CDAAC have been working during 1978-79. There are also policies which have been created for certain specific areas of the Community Development Block Grant programs. In addition, new policies are being generated each year. The footnoted portions of the following have been excerpted from several relevant sources, including the Annual Plan 1979-80.

General Strategy

One of the fundamental goals as stated in the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Kalamazoo is to 'improve the Residential Environment'. This goal will be attained by a City-wide strategy of upgrading substandard housing, stabilizing residential neighborhoods through effective land development controls, increasing the variety of housing choice, expanding recreation and open space areas, removing incompatible land used from residential areas, prescribing reasonable density required to maintain mental health and prevent overcrowding, reducing traffic volumes on residential streets, providing land use mixture on a planned basis, and encouraging a proper mixture of compatible land uses required to produce and interesting and functional residential living environment.

A pattern has developed within the City of Kalamazoo of low and moderate income concentration surrounding the core of the city combined with inner-city deterioration. To break this present pattern, the City of Kalamazoo has adopted policies and implementation strategies which will either expand the supply of sound low cost housing in dispersed locations throughout the City or make the cost of new and existing housing more affordable for all. The policies and
implementation strategies will assist low and moderate persons and be concentrated in areas targeted for Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization.

**Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy**

The targeted areas for Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization efforts are located in census tract 1, Eastside; 2, 3, and 4, Northside; 5, Stuart/Douglas; 6, Vine; 8, 9, and 10, Edison; and 16.02, Oakwood. These tracts with the exception of 16.02 constitute the core of the City and have the highest incidences of overcrowding, concentration of minority population, concentration of female headed households, and concentration of low and moderate income persons. Census tract 16.02 has a paucity of public work.

The following housing policies have been adopted by the City of Kalamazoo as a strategy for up-grading these areas.

**Long Term Goal:** Improve the quality of the residential environment for Kalamazoo residents.

**Long Term Objective**

1. Preserve the older housing inventory.

**Short Term Objective**

a) Protecting existing housing from premature environmental decay.

b) Encourage maintenance in mature residential neighborhoods.

c) Applying special design requirements in residential areas of historical significance.

**Long Term Objective**

1. Upgrade the deficient housing stock.

**Short Term Objectives**

a) Demolishing severely deteriorated housing structures.

b) Rehabilitating and redeveloping blighted and declining neighborhoods.

c) Repairing occupancy permits for rental units.

d) Strictly enforcing housing and building code requirements.
Long Term Objective

1. Increase and broaden the City's housing supply.

Short Term Objectives

a) Accommodate different income and age groups, household sizes, location, and style preferences.

b) Reduce the proportion of income spent on housing.

c) Widen opportunities for low and moderate income persons and minority groups members to find suitable housing in dispersed locations throughout the City.

d) Serve as replacement units for an agency housing stock.

Efforts will be further targeted within each Comprehensive Neighborhood Revitalization area through the adopted policy of the CDAAC and City Commission to concentrate programs within model areas.11

The City of Kalamazoo Community Development Department Program Division has implemented the following policies concerning Community Development Block Grant Relocation Programs.

Policies

C.D.B.G. rehabilitation loans and grants are available to homeowners who are able to meet eligibility requirements. In the event your property cannot be rehabilitated, the following policies are put into effect.

1. If the property is purchased by the City of Kalamazoo, you will receive a written 90-day notice to vacate the property.

2. If the property is condemned as a result of an inspection by the Loan and Grants Program staff, you will receive a written ninety-day notice of deficiencies in the property and requirement to vacate the property.12

New policies are continually being generated concerning efforts to improve the neighborhood communities. A task force composed of representatives from the Community Development Department, City Attorney's office, Purchasing Division and City Manager's Office has drawn up the policy concerning the Community Development Loans and Grants Program.

General Program Policy
The task force has recommended that the City Commission annually review all policies regarding their program. This should occur when the Community Development Block Grant Application is reviewed.

1. To contribute to neighborhood improvement, houses in community development target areas specifically within census tracts 1-6, 8-10, and 16.02 by the identification and repair of maintenance deficiencies.

2. To rehabilitate residential structures by providing low interest loans and grants to homeowners, as authorized by the City Commission utilizing Title I assistance under the United States Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, and as amended.13

The CDAAC has also drawn up a proposed policy concerning the Loans and Grants Program. This policy statement requests that the City Commission establish a Rehabilitation Appeals Board.

Policy

A Rehabilitation Appeal Board is hereby established in conjunction with the Loans and Grants Program to give financial assistance to homeowners to conduct home repairs and rehabilitation.

I. Membership

The Rehabilitation Appeal Board shall consist of a Community Development Act Advisory Committee member, a citizen-at-large appointed by the City Commission, and a City Staff member.

II. Duties

Matters to be considered shall include reviewing administration decisions and the following:

a. Interpretation of City Commission policy and administration practice in any disagreement over the meaning of a regulation affectin the CDBG Loans and Grants Program.

b. Requests for variance in hardship cases.

c. Establishment of priorities for repairs in cases where estimated costs exceed the cost for repairs as established by City Commission policy.

d. Disputes involving contractors in the matter of work to be done or work that has been done.

e. Appeals of hardship cases of loan default.

Decisions by this Board may be appealed to the Kalamazoo City Commission.14
These are only the stated and proposed policies that have guided the CDAAC and City Staff in their work on the 1979-80 Community Development Block Grant Application budget. There are a number of other policies which are not clearly stated but have activities which have already been stated. Such projects as the CDBG funding of the Eastside Center are being continued without a formulated policy. Also, the Relocation program, at this time, does not have a written policy.

In general, these policies which have been stated, are aimed at improving the quality of life in the more needy neighborhoods of the City of Kalamazoo. By providing fair and equitable programs designed to help people improve their neighborhoods, these communities can become better and more attractive places to live. In the future, more attention will be given to visual appearances of homes as well as the structure of the homes. In the past, the policy has been primarily to bring homes up to code standards.
ACTIVITIES

The activities of the budget that the CDAAC and City Staff worked on is for the year 1979-80. These activities cannot begin until funding of the projects is approved by HUD and funds are sent to the City of Kalamazoo. But because the Community Development Block Grant Program has been in operation since 1974, the year Congress, under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act created the program, there have been a number of activities completed or continually being carried out. Such activities are similar to what is planned for next year or are activities that will be completed next year.

The City of Kalamazoo, Department of Parks and Recreation, began work in 1976-77 on the Davis Street Park. This neighborhood park, the first of its kind in the Vine neighborhood, was the result of a request by the Vine Neighborhood Association. However, the Parks and Recreation Department fell short of the monies it needed to finish the park so it cannot be completed until the Community Development funds for 1979-80 arrived.

The City of Kalamazoo has recently acquired the Lockshore Facility to serve as a Community Center for the Northside. CDBG funds have been spent on the feasibility study and more funds in the future will be spent on improving this building for community use.

A communications system has been set up in the target neighborhoods to distribute such things as newsletters and bulletins. Funds from 1979-80 CDBG and carry-over funds will continue this program next year.

The Kalamazoo Alcohol and Drug Abuse Councils Substance Abuse Outreach program, has been in operation to help people with various problems, particularly
those problems related to drug and alcohol abuse. The Norway House in the City's Northside is one of these Outreach Centers and the operation here will be assisted by 1979-80 CDBG funds.

The Rehabilitation Loans and Grants Program through the Program Division of the Community Development Department is a continuing activity that will be funded next year. Efforts will be made to better coordinate this and other CDBG projects with other programs funded through different sources such as Housing and Urban Development—Federal Housing Administration (FHA), mortgage subsidy and insurance programs, and Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA), Home Improvement Loan Program (HIP), and Neighborhood Improvement Program (NIP).

The Free Paint Program which has already been established will be able to continue with the new funding in the 1979-80 budget. This activity is designed to visually improve the appearance of homes which will result in more attractive neighborhoods. Plans are being made to contract painters to do the work for elderly and handicapped persons.

The Kalamazoo Police Department began a neighborhood foot patrol program in 1978-79. The activities associated with this program are designed to combat a high crime problem in a number of the target neighborhoods. Specifically, 64% of the total City crime is in these neighborhoods, particularly in the problem census tracts 2,3,4,5,6,8,9 and 16.02.15 The current program has mainly been in census tracts 3,6, and 10 but the funds for next year should allow expansion into tracts 2,5,8,9, and 16.02.

The Neighborhood Liaison Program, operated by the Planning Division, will be continued in 1979-80. The new funding year will see an expanded program with a possible change whereby the City Manager's Community Affairs Division will operate this service. The Neighborhood Liaison activities are intended to
improve communications between the City and neighborhood residents.

The Kalamazoo County Legal Aid Bureau, Inc. Legal Services Program has already been operating and will continue to operate next year. Currently this program has been working through the Douglas Community Association and Edison Neighborhood Center. New services will include advice in the area of consumer law.

The renovation of the Eastside Center was not completed last year and so activities will continue until the center is in operating condition. At the present, the building meets City safety standards but not safety standards established by other groups who want to use the building. The reasons for delay are unanticipated expenses which caused costs to exceed the amount of funds set aside for repairs.

The Kalamazoo County Human Service Commission's Weatherization program will continue next year. The main goal of this project is to insulate the older homes in the target neighborhoods. With improved insulation, the cost of heating will be less so the homeowner can save money through lower fuel bills.

The Vine Neighborhood Association's Planting Program was begun in 1978-79 to improve the landscape condition in this neighborhood. It is anticipated that by the end of the 1979-80 funding year, another four continuous blocks can be completed. By improving the visual appearance of the area it will be a more attractive place in which to live.

The Community Development Department has been engaged in numerous activities related to housing which include the Neighborhood Improvement Program, Housing Surveillance Program, New Housing Capital Improvement Support Fund, Specifications-Loans, and Grants Program aimed at improving the housing conditions in the City of Kalamazoo. The promotion of new housing and the maintenance and renovation of older homes is a major goal of the CDBG program.
The activities being done through the Emergency Home Repair Program have been structured to help senior citizens maintain their homes. Without some kind of assistance, many senior citizens could not remain in their homes. Consequently, this is a priority program that will continue next year.

These are only some of the activities that were conducted in 1978-79. All of these projects are a part of existing programs that are generally continued each funding year. Many new programs like street and sewer repair comprise a number of activities undertaken using CDBG monies but are of the kind of project that is completed (generally) in one year. Because of CDBG funded activities that have been underway for several years, there are many types of activities that have been done in the past. However, most activities are usually quite similar to the activities which will be funded in 1979-80.
OUTPUTS

The outputs like the activities can only be viewed in retrospect. With the 1979-80 CDBG funds not yet available, new activities and their outputs cannot be assessed. However, by looking at past outputs one can get an idea of what future outputs will be.

The activities of the Department of Parks and Recreation has created a Davis Street Park out of what used to be a driving range for driver education classes in Kalamazoo. Whereas more work needs to be done, the park is far enough along to be able to say that it will be completed in the near future.

The acquisition of the Lockshore facility is evidence that the efforts to establish a Northside Center are producing results. With more time and money, the building can be redesigned to meet the needs of area residents. Already plans have been drawn up to convert the facility into a usable Community Center.

The Communication Program has helped some groups to publish newsletters about events happening in the Community. Other groups have printed posters conveying information of local events. The small changes in the program next year will probably see a wider variety of informational material disseminated.

The Kalamazoo Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council Program, particularly the Norway House Outreach Center, has been very beneficial to the community. The Northside CDAAC representative, the Reverend Philbert, voiced the need for continued sustance abuse funding to support the Norway House. It is expected that next year the services provided by Norway House will continue.

The Relocation Loans and Grants Program has had some problems. Funds that were set aside for relocation when homes were determined to be not economically worth rehabilitating have not been spent. The Loans and Grants
program has not been operating at its maximum potential in terms of improving housing. Former Program Division Head, Preston D. Wiley, felt the program has been a bit too cautious in the past. However, it is believed that many of the problems can be corrected in the program for next year so that CDBG funds can be better utilized to improve housing.

The Free Paint Program spent most of the funds allocated to it on paint. Because so many people in the target neighborhood painted their homes and were reimbursed for it, the program could not meet the demand. The reason for such a large turnout was that any income level homeowner, in the target neighborhood, could apply for reimbursement of paint.

The foot patrols that are walking the neighborhood beats have accomplished their goals of improved relations between police and area residents. The Police are also creating a feeling that the neighborhoods are safer places in which to live. Because of this success in the past, the foot patrol program is going to expand in the future to include more sections of the target neighborhoods.

The Neighborhood Liaison Program has not been working as well as it should. This is evident by the requests from several neighborhood associations asking for workers that will operate out of neighborhood centers or meeting places. However, the City is trying to correct some of the problems by moving the program from the Planning Division to the City Manager's Office. One of the problems with the past activities seemed to be that the city employees were not able to interact with neighborhood residents as much as the Neighborhood Associations wanted.

The Legal Aid Services program is apparently producing results since the 1979-80 program is a continuation of the programs of four previous years. However, some changes are needed to better accomplish the goal of helping individuals
with housing related problems. These changes include expanding services and having neighborhood offices place attorneys into these neighborhoods.

The Eastside renovation project shows, at least, that there is a neighborhood center for this area. This building can be repaired since it already meets City code standards. With the repairs to be done next year, the building will most likely meet other code standard demands by such groups as Headstart.

The Human Services Weatherization program has not been able to generate either the activities or outputs that it can. This project has been plagued with a high turnover rate of workers because these workers have been employed under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA). With additional funds, it is felt that the program will no longer be dependent on CETA and thus will be more able to complete the task of insulating homes.

The Vine Neighborhood Plantings Project has been progressing several blocks at a time. Evidently this program is having the desired impact since Vine Representative, Kevin McCall, worked assiduously this past year to make certain that adequate funds would be set aside to continue this program. At the present time, these plantings are mainly being placed only along major thoroughfares.

The Community Development Department's housing related programs have been steadily producing many outputs upon which other activities are being built. The Housing Surveillance exterior survey of housing in specified census tracts is almost finished. New funding would complete the survey of the City of Kalamazoo. The Neighborhood Improvement Program last year completed studies on the Vine, Edison, and Stuart neighborhood areas. The New Housing Capital Improvement Support fund has been looking for low and moderate income housing projects.
One possible housing project area that is being considered is located on West Michigan Avenue, west of the Ridgeview Manor Nursing Home. The Code Enforcement Program has systematically been conducting studies in the neighborhoods. This past year the City Inspection Program proceeded into the Vine area and next year will inspect the Stuart neighborhood.

The Emergency Home Repairs activities and output have been very successfully done. The chairman of the CDAAC and Northside Representative, the Reverend Mr. Philbert and other CDAAC members commended Senior Services on their efficiency in getting repairs completed. Because this program has worked so well in the past, it is to be funded next year.

This is not an exhaustive study of past outputs, but it does give an idea of the accomplishments that can be expected next year. Only after the 1979-80 funds arrive, and the new activities are undertaken, can their outputs be empirically examined; however, a look at past efforts reveals that there have been many tangible outputs. This means that the activities and what has been accomplished as a result of the activities are producing results. Without results, there could be no impact on the environment sufficient to warrant federal approval of the budget.
IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT

The Community Development Block Grant has had a very definite positive impact on the target neighborhoods in the City of Kalamazoo. Many homes have been both structurally and visually improved through the CDBG funds. Valuable services have been established and expanded to meet the needs of neighborhood residents. Parks have been upgraded and added to the neighborhoods. Several streets have been repaved, curbs replaced, and sewers repaired through the use of grant monies.

It appears that citizens of the City of Kalamazoo will continue to be involved in determining the directions that their neighborhoods will go. With the aid of CDBG funds, the neighborhoods and their associations can strengthen their organizations and more effectively disseminate information. However, improving and rehabilitating these target neighborhoods is no small task. It will take continual coordination and fine tuning of local, regional, State and Federal programs to achieve the City's goal of an "improved residential environment".16

Because the Community Development Program encompasses a sizeable area of Kalamazoo, there has been a problem of how to implement the various projects. The City has suggested concentrating on one area at a time, but the CDAAC members feel that this will not work for housing related problems, but will place an added burden on those people waiting for neighborhood improvements projects. So the CDAAC has recommended implementing projects in several small areas simultaneously.

There have been problems with programs not being able to function at their optimal levels because of difficulties with obtaining and processing
information, a high turnover rate of working crews, and so on. Yet, these past activities and outputs have had an impact on the environment and it can be expected that the 1979-80 activities and outputs will have a positive impact as well. The following attached tables best summarize the impact that several different program projects have had on residents (by year).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Households Benefiting</th>
<th>% Lower Income</th>
<th>Source or Scale</th>
<th>Minority Households Benefiting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish Amer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1976</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Census Tract #3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Census tracts 8-10, 16.02)</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Census Tract #1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Davis Street Park</td>
<td>2,346</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Census Tract #6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Beautification</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Census Tract #5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Island</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Census Tract #5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Winterization</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Winterization Record #71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1977</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside Center</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Census Tract #1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizon</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Census Tract #14.01</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Block Improvement</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Census Tract #3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Census Tract #1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCrone Park</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Census Tract #2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Census Tract #3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Census Tract #4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Census Tract #5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>Census Tract #1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upjohn Park</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Census Tract #8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwell Park</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Census Tract #1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Recharge</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Census Tract #16.02</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation of Eastside Center</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Census Tract #1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1978</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Improvements</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Census Tract #16.02</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside Improvement</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Census Tract #1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany Tot Lot</td>
<td>2,418</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Census Tract #10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Tot Lot</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Census Tract #3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Population Benefiting</td>
<td>Minority Population Benefiting % of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total % Male % Female % Lower Income</td>
<td>Black Male Female Span.Am. Male Female Am.Ind. Male Female Oriental Male Female All Other Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Male Female Span.Am. Male Female Am.Ind. Male Female Oriental Male Female All Other Male Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and Grants</td>
<td>103 44 56 100</td>
<td>20 22 6 6 No information available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Winterization</td>
<td>47 34 66 100</td>
<td>13 30 8 8 No information available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Paint</td>
<td>242 44 56 69</td>
<td>4 7 0 1 No information available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Home Repair</td>
<td>690 31 69 100</td>
<td>12 19 3 2 No information available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Information Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td>147 37 63 100</td>
<td>20 29 .01 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>1,507 43 57 100</td>
<td>33 40 .01 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Communication</td>
<td>25,626 47 53 75</td>
<td>5 5 No Information Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Information Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Improvement</td>
<td>216 43 57 100</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Information Available in Minority Population Benefiting % of Total:

<p>| Black Male | Female | Span.Am. Male | Female | Am.Ind. Male | Female | Oriental Male | Female | All Other Male | Female |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Population Benefiting</th>
<th>Minority Population Benefiting % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and Grants</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Loneliness</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Legal Assistance</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Communication</td>
<td>25,626</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Winterization</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and Grants</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Loneliness</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assistance</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Neighborhood Improvement</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Communications</td>
<td>25,626</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EPILOGUE

On Friday, May 18, 1979 it was announced by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development in Washington, D. C. that a $2,201,000 federal grant was approved for the Kalamazoo Community Development Block Grant program. This grant will allow the City of Kalamazoo to continue the Community Development program for the fifth year. With the approval by HUD, the 1979-80 projects included in the application submitted in January 1979 can be started June 1.
APPENDIX A
BRIEF HISTORY OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

On August 22, 1974, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 was enacted by President Ford. This Act created the community development block grant (CDBG), a new program for community development. Previously, there were seven federal programs: Model Cities, water and sewer facilities, Open Spaces, Urban Renewal, rehabilitation loans, neighborhood facilities, and public facility loans. This act combined all of these into one grant. At first, the block grant program was authorized for three years but it was extended for three additional years in 1977.

This block grant, as a part of the Nixon Administration's New Federalism, was designed to create a broader, more flexible program that was less conditional than the earlier Federal categorical grants-in-aid. In this way, State and Local governments could have more input into deciding what needed to be done and how Federal funds should be spent to improve their communities. However, Congress has added restrictions on the use of these funds, requiring planning procedures and reviews by the state and regional councils and by HUD. A block grant is a broad functional type of grant that has fewer federal restrictions or conditions that have to be met. The previous categorical grants could be used only for a specific type (category) of project which had to meet certain conditions and requirements.
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APPENDIX B
PUBLIC MEETINGS

CDAAC

Dates:      October 5, 1978
            October 19, 1978
            November 14, 1978
            November 21, 1978
            December 7, 1978
            December 21, 1978

CITY COMMISSION

Public Hearing No. 1               Review of preliminary draft of the application
January 2, 1979                  and tentative approval.

Public Hearing No. 2               Review of final draft of application and final
January 8, 1979                  approval.

Public Hearing No. 3               Final action taken on application.
January 15, 1979
DEFINITION OF LOW INCOME

Low income, as defined by the federal regulations from HUD, is 80 percent of the median income of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (S.M.S.A.).

The median income for this area is $11,037, based on 1970 census data. Therefore, 80 percent of this is $8,000.

By counting the number of families with income below this figure, and then dividing by the entire population of each census tract, we can get a good estimate of the percent of lower income by census tract.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract Number</th>
<th>Number below 8,000</th>
<th>Total Number of Families</th>
<th>Percentage of Lower Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPLETED ACTIVITIES

1) Upgrade LaCrone Park (1975, 1977)
2) Upgrade Rockwell Park (1975)
3) Upgrade Verberg Park (1975)
4) Upgrade Krom/Prouty Park (1975)
5) Upgrade Princeton Tot Lot (1975)
6) Establish 5 Mini Parks (reprogrammed 1977-78) (1975)
8) Rehabilitation Through Loans and Grants (1975, 76)
9) Home Winterization (1975)
10) Counter Loneliness Program (1975, 76, 77)
11) Substance Abuse (1975, 76, 77)
12) Neighborhood Legal Assistance (1975, 76, 77)
13) Northside Community Center ($12,000 of the original allocation was reprogrammed in 1977-78). Balance currently being utilized on a Feasibility Study.) (1975)
14) Management Development (1975)
15) Oakwood Sewer Study (1975)
16) 131 By-Pass Study (1975)
17) Oakwood Recharge Study (1975)
18) Public Works (Census Tract 8, 10 and 16.02) (1976)
19) Gateway Beautification (1976)
20) Traffic Island (1976)
21) Eastside Center (Balance transferred to Rehabilitation of Eastside Center) (1976)
22) Model Block Improvement ($90,000 transferred to various projects – $56,500 reprogrammed in 1979-81. Individual census tracts 1, 2, and 16.02) (1977)
23) Edison Neighborhood Improvement (Census tracts 1-10 and 16.02) (1977)
24) Housing Surveillance (Census tracts 1-10 and 16.02) (1977)
25) Refine Land Use (1977)
26) Historic Inventory (1977)
27) Specification Writer (1977)
28) Free Paint (1978)
29) New Horizon (1977)
30) Upjohn Park (1977)

Note: Reprogramming means reprogrammed into another program or year. In this way funds are allocated for something else.
ACTIVITIES IN PROGRESS

1) Northside Center (1978)
2) Oakwood Improvements (1978)
3) Eastside Improvements (1978)
4) Neighborhood Demonstration (1978)
5) New Housing Support (1978)
6) Oakwood Tot Lot (1978)
7) Bethany Tot Lot (1978)
8) Simpson Tot Lot (1978)
9) Loans and Grants (1978)
10) Home Winterization (1978)
11) Free Paint (1978)
12) Barrier Free (1978)
13) Emergency Home Repair (1978)
14) HIP, NIP (application submitted to MSMDA) (1978)
15) Neighborhood Foot Patrol (1978)
16) Legal Aid (1978)
17) Substance Abuse (1978)
18) Neighborhood Communication (1978)
19) Neighborhood Liaison (1978)
20) Edison Home Improvements (1978)
21) Neighborhood Improvements (1978)
22) Housing Program Specialist (1978)
24) Code Enforcement (1978)
25) Administration (1978)
26) Contingency (1978)
27) Rehabilitation of Eastside Center (1977, 1978)
ACTIVITIES THAT HAVE BEEN DROPPED

1) Citizen Training (1977)


3) Oakwood Community Center (reprogrammed 1977–78) (1975)

4) Establish five Small Parks (transferred to other 1975–76 program activity) (1975)

5) Acquisition for Demolition (transferred to other 1975–76 program activity) (1975)

6) Upgrade Springmont Tot Lot (1975)

7) Lead screening (1975)

8) Neighborhood Skills Program (1975)
APPENDIX E

(Maps, graphs, and other types of data reproduced with the permission of the Community Development Department and the City of Kalamazoo)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority Percent</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>16.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>982</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Head Male</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment, 1970 Male</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Households**</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>9,418</td>
<td>1,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority (Number) Households**</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = 1970 Census Data
** = 1974 Polk Data
MAP P4
LOCATIONS AND SERVICE AREAS OF
BLOCK GRANT FUNDED PROJECTS

Preliminary
- - - - - CDBG Model Areas
- - - - - - CDBG Target Census Tracts
- - - - Model Area Expansion

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 44

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY
LOCATION OF CERTAIN COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL AREAS

NOTE: Not all neighborhood and community commercial areas

* CDBG Target Neighborhood; Commercial Nodes requiring action.

Regional Suburban Malls
Community Mini-Malls

East-Central Industrial District

CBD

Prepared by the Planning Division, 1977.
MAP P3
EXTENT AND LOCATION OF HOUSING UNITS WITH STRUCTURAL DEFICIENCIES*

Percentages

- 81% to 100%
- 61% to 80%
- 41% to 60%
- 21% to 40%
- Not completed

* Includes data for structures in Census Tracts 1-10 inspected in Exterior Survey, Fall, 1977. Survey results in C.T. 3 may be distorted due to coding errors.

Source: Planning Division
MAP P2

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME BY CENSUS TRACTS

Dollars

- 12,000 & over
- 10,000 - 11,999
- 8,000 - 9,999
- Less than 8,000

* Kalamazoo State Hospital

1970 Census

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP P1
EXTENT AND LOCATION OF MINORITY POPULATION*

*Delineates data on black population only; data unavailable on other minority groups.

Source: 1970 Census Planning Division 12/1/77
CITY OF KALAMAZOO INDUSTRIAL REDEVELOPMENT AREA
EAST-CENTRAL DISTRICT

Prepared by the Planning Division
City of Kalamazoo
January, 1977
Development Designation:

Sub-Area I - Stabilization with spot upgrading through Capital Improvements

Sub-Area II - Rehabilitation with spot upgrading through Capital Improvements

Sub-Area III - Industrial Redevelopment
Development Designation:

Sub Area I - Stabilization with spot Residential redevelopment
Sub Area II - Stabilization with spot Rehabilitation
Sub Area III - Stabilization

Planning Division
12/1/77
Development Designation:

Sub Area I - Stabilization
Sub Area II - Rehabilitation
Sub Area III - Industrial Redevelopment
Development Designation:

Sub-Area I - Residential rehabilitation with spot residential redevelopment
Sub-Area II - Industrial Redevelopment
Sub-Area III - Stabilization

MAP 3

NORTHSIDE

Planning Division
12/1/77
Development Designation:
Upgrade through Capital Improvements
Development Designation:

Preservation with spot Residential redevelopment

MAP 5

STUART

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 5

STUART/W. DOUGLAS NEIGHBORHOOD

DEVELOPMENT DESIGNATION THROUGH REHABILITATION AND SECTION 8 NSA

Sub-area 1: Section 8 NSA
Sub-area 1: Spot Rehabilitation

Sub-area 2: Rehabilitation
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
PROPOSED STORM AND SANITARY SEWERS

VINE

Preliminary

Model Area Boundary

Storm Sewers

Model Area Boundary Expansion

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 9
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
CURB AND GUTTER DEFICIENCIES

VINE

Preliminary

Model Area Boundary

Immediate Need

Longer Range Need

Model Area Boundary Expansion

Planning Division

12/1/77
MAP 10
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
SIDEWALK DEFICIENCIES

Preliminary

Model Area Boundary

Immediate Need

Longer Range Need

Street Signs

Model Area Boundary Expansion

Planning Division

12/1/77
MAP 11
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STREET PAVING DEFICIENCIES

VINE

Preliminary
- - - - - Model Area Boundary
- - - Immediate Need
- - - - Longer Range Need
- - - - - Model Area Expansion

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 13
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
PROPOSED SANITARY AND STORM SEWERS

Model Area Expansion

Preliminary
Model Area Boundary

Sanitary Sewers

Storm Sewers

EASTSIDE

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 14
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
CURB AND GUTTER DEFICIENCIES

Model Area Expansion

Preliminary

Model Area Boundary

Immediate Needs

Longer Range Needs

EASTSIDE

Planning Division
12/1/77

102
STUART

- Model Area Boundary
- Proposed Storm Sewers
- Proposed Sanitary Sewers

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 19
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
CURB AND GUTTER DEFICIENCIES

STUART

- Model Area Boundary
- Immediate Needs
- Longer Range Needs

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 20

CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT

SIDEWALK AND STREET PAVING DEFICIENCIES

STUART

- Model Area Boundary
- Immediate Sidewalk and Paving Need
- Longer Range Sidewalk Needs

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 12

CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESMENT

SANITARY AND STORM SEWER NEEDS

STUART/WEST DOUGLAS

- - - - PROPOSED SANITARY SEWERS
- - - - MODEL AREA BOUNDARY
- - - - PROPOSED STORM SEWERS
MAP 13

CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT

SIDEWALK AND STREET PAVING DEFICIENCIES

STUART/WEST DOUGLAS

- - - - - - MODEL AREA BOUNDARY

- - - - - - - LONG RANGE SIDEWALK NEEDS

- - - - - - - - IMMEDIATE SIDEWALK AND PAVING NEEDS
MAP 14
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
CURB AND GUTTER DEFICIENCIES

STUART/WEST DOUGLAS

- - - - MODEL AREA BOUNDARY
■ ■ ■ ■ IMMEDIATE NEEDS
- - - - - LONG RANGE NEEDS
MAP 21
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STREET LIGHT AND
STREETScape DEFICIENCIES

STUART

Model Area Boundary

Street Light Needs

Landscape Needs

Street Signs

Planning Division
12/1/77

109
MAP 22
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STORM SEWER DEFICIENCIES
SANITARY SEWER SUSPECTED INFILTRATION

Model Area Boundary

Storm Sewer
Sanitary Sewer
Model Area Expansion

NORTHSIDE Planning Division 12/1/71
MAP 24
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
CURB AND GUTTER DEFICIENCIES

Preliminary

- - - - - - Model Area Boundary

- - - - - Immediate Needs

- - - - - Long Range Needs

- - - - - Model Area Expansion

NORTHSIDE
Planning Division
12/1/71
MAP 27
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STREET LIGHTS AND
STREETSACE DEFICIENCIES

Preliminary

- Model Area Boundaries
- Landscaping Needs
- Street Lights
- Street Signs
- Model Area Expansion

NORTHSIDE
Planning Division
12/1/71
MAP 15
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STORM SEWER DEFICIENCIES
SANITARY SEWER SUSPECTED
INFILTRATION:

- Model Area Boundary
- Storm Sewer
- Sanitary Sewer
- Model Area Expansion

NORTHSIDE
Planning Division 12/1/71 114
MAP 16
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
PROPOSED STORM AND SANITARY SEWERS

Preliminary

- Model Area Boundaries

- Sanitary Sewer

- Storm Sewer

- Model Area Expansion

NORTHSIDE
Planning Division
12/1/71
MAP 18
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
SIDEWALK DEFICIENCIES

Preliminary

Model Area Boundary
Immediate Need
 Longer Range Need
 Model Area Expansion

NORTHSIDE
Planning Division
12/1/71
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CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STREET PAVING DEFICIENCIES

Preliminary

- Model Area Boundary
- Immediate Need
- Longer Range Need
- Model Area Expansion
MAP 20
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STREET LIGHTS AND
STREETScape DEFICIENCIES

Preliminary
- Model Area Boundaries
- Landscaping Needs
- Street Lights
- Street Signs
- Model Area Expansion

Planning Division
12/1/71
MAP :21
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STORM SEWER DEFICIENCIES
SANITARY SEWER -
SUSPECTED INFILTRATION

Preliminary
Model Area Boundary

Storm Sewer
Sanitary Sewer
Model Area Expansion

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 22
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
PROPOSED SANITARY
AND
STORM SEWERS

Preliminary
Model Area
Boundary

Sanitary Sewers
Storm Sewers
Model Area Expansion

Planning Division
12/1/77  121
MAP 23
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
CURB AND GUTTER DEFICIENCIES

Preliminary
Model Area Boundary

Immediate Needs

Longer Range
Needs

Model Area Expansion

EDISON
Planning Division
12/1/77 122
MAP 26
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STREET LIGHTS AND
STREETSCAPE
DEFICIENCIES

- - - - - - - - - Model Area Boundaries

Landscaping Needs
Street Lights
Street Signs
Model Area Expansion

EDISON
Planning Division
12/1/77 125
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STORM SEWER DEFICIENCIES
SANITARY SEWER - SUSPECTED INFILTRATION

Preliminary
Model Area Boundary

Storm Sewer
Sanitary Sewer
Model Area Expansion

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 27
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STORM AND SANITARY SEWER NEEDS

STORM SEWER NEEDS
SANITARY SEWER NEEDS/E.P.A. FUNDING AVAILABLE
SANITARY SEWER NEEDS/NO FUNDING AVAILABLE

12/8/78 Programs Division

OAKWOOD
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT

STREET PAVING NEEDS

IMMEDIATE PAVING NEEDS

PAVING NEEDS

12/8/78 Programs Division

OAKWOOD
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
PROPOSED STORM AND SANITARY SEWERS
STORM SEWER DEFICIENCIES

-- Model Area Boundaries
------ Proposed Sanitary Sewer
-------- Proposed Storm Sewer
------------- Storm Sewer Deficiencies

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 35
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
CURB AND GUTTER DEFICIENCIES

Model Area Boundary
Immediate Needs

OAKWOOD

Planning Division
12/1/77
Model Area Boundary

Immediate Need

OAKWOOD

Planning Division
12/1/77
CDBG PUBLIC WORKS ASSESSMENT
STREET PAVING DEFICIENCIES
STREET LIGHTS AND STREETSCAPE DEFICIENCIES

Model Area Boundary
Immediate Paving Need
Street Signs
Street Lights

OAKWOOD

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 38

HOUSING DEFICIENCY INDEX:
MEDIAN STRUCTURAL CONDITION RATING
OF HOUSING STRUCTURES PER BLOCK

VINE

Sound

Substandard

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 39
HOUSING DEFICIENCY INDEX:
MEDIAN STRUCTURAL CONDITION RATING
OF HOUSING STRUCTURES PER BLOCK

EASTSIDE

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 40

HOUSING DEFICIENCY INDEX:
MEDIAN STRUCTURAL CONDITION RATING
OF HOUSING STRUCTURES PER BLOCK

Substandard

STUART
Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 41
HOUSING DEFICIENCY INDEX:
MEDIAN STRUCTURAL CONDITION RATING
OF HOUSING STRUCTURES PER BLOCK

Sound
Substandard

NORTHSIDE Planning Division
129 12/1/77
MAP 42

HOUSING DEFICIENCY INDEX:
MEDIAN STRUCTURAL CONDITION RATING
OF HOUSING STRUCTURES PER BLOCK

Sound

Substandard
MAP 31

HOUSING DEFICIENCY INDEX:

MEDIAN STRUCTURAL CONDITION RATING

OF HOUSING STRUCTURES PER BLOCK

VINE

- Sound
- Substandard

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 32

HOUSING DEFICIENCY INDEX:
MEDIAN STRUCTURAL CONDITION RATING
OF HOUSING STRUCTURES PER BLOCK

Sound

Substandard

EASTSIDE

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 33

HOUSING DEFICIENCY INDEX:

MEDIAN STRUCTURAL CONDITION RATING

OF HOUSING STRUCTURES PER BLOCK

Substandard

STUART  Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 34

HOUSING DEFICIENCY INDEX:
MEDIAN STRUCTURAL CONDITION RATING
OF HOUSING STRUCTURES PER BLOCK

- Sound
- Substandard

NORTHSIDE

Planning Division
12/1/77
MAP 35
HOUSING DEFICIENCY INDEX:
MEDIAN STRUCTURAL CONDITION RATING
OF HOUSING STRUCTURES PER BLOCK

Sound
Substandard
MINUTES
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1978-7:30 P. M.
3RD FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM-KALAMAZOO CITY HALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rev. Philbert
R. Roosenberg
M. Grimes
K. McCall
D. Lanphear
K. Cummings
R. Passero
J. Bowen
E. Hagerty
J. Michael

MEMBERS ABSENT:

P. Todd
N. Belenky
E. Krogh

ALTERNATES PRESENT:

J. Bright for SARA

CITY STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

P. D. Wiley, Program Division Head
E. LeDuc, Planning Division Head
J. Layne, City Manager's Office
O. Harbin, Community Affairs Department

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Ray Purdin, Parks & Recreation Dept.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Lance Potter, Human Services Commission
Doug Baker, West Douglas Neighborhood Association
Grace Davis, Eastside
Rose Van Atti, Eastside
Lillian Brennan, Eastside
Sarah Adams, P.T.O.
Lester Long, Northside
Liz McCracklin, Eastside
Willie Turner, Eastside
Loel Lanphear, Eastside
Chris Cottrell

Chairman Philbert called the meeting to order at 7:40 P. M.
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of October 26, 1978 were corrected to show that Mrs. Deldee Herman was present as alternate for R. Passero.

The minutes of November 2, 1978 were corrected to show Mr. David Hunt representing Agape Fellowship and presenting proposal #45 — Washington Square Revitalization.

Mr. E. Hagerty moved that the minutes be approved as corrected. M. Grimes seconded and the motion carried.

MEMBERSHIP REPORTS

Margaret Grimes from the Edison Neighborhood reported that Edison has totaled up the expenses for proposal #45, with the help of the City Planning Commission. An additional $6,000 is needed. Edison also has a grant from the Urban Development Action Program which would cover improvements for the front of the building and renovation. The City Planning Commission advised them to use different type of materials, which is the reason for some of the additional $6,000 cost.

OLD BUSINESS

Renovation Status of the Eastside Center

In response to the Committee's request for a progress report on the renovation of the Eastside Center, Mr. Ray Purdin, Director, Parks and Recreation Department, was on hand to answer the questions the Committee had. A written report was presented to the Committee indicating the dispensation of funds, and the balance of the original allocation. Mr. Purdin stated that work is being done on the portion of the building that does not leak, and a great deal of progress is expected on the inside of the building within the next month. Electrical, plumbing, modernization of the kitchen are still to be completed. The Parks & Recreation Department estimates ninety days to complete all work that has not been started yet. The building is considered to be safe in its present condition by the City, however, it was pointed out that the Eastside Executive Committee had decided against using it until the entire building was completed. The building will be barrier free upon its completion.

Winterization Program

Lance Potter from the County Human Services, Winterization Program, gave a detailed report on the current status of the Winterization Program, which he directs. The Program, he said, is geared to train people to winterize homes, and weatherize homes. Labor crews come from Youth Opportunities Unlimited. There are two supervisors and six full time fieldworkers, which form two complete crews.
The Program is now more technical and the turnover of staff is due to the various sources of funding for labor, such as the CETA Program.

CDBG Policy Regarding Barrier Free

Preston D. Wiley, Head, Program Division, provided a summary regarding regulations covering CDBG funding for barrier free buildings. Mr. Wiley advised that there was no existing Federal requirement that buildings which are already built and seeking CDBG funding be barrier free. A written summary of this report was submitted to the Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

Review of 1979-80 CDBG Application and HAP with the Inclusion of West Douglas Area

Evan LeDuc, Planning Division Head, presented a summary of changes recommended to be included in this year's CDBG application. The changes were requested by the Federal Government, and the application will be submitted on new forms. The Committee will be advising the City Commission through its budget recommendations and it will be making a recommendation as to the grant application form. The application will include a Community Development and Housing Strategy similar to last year's, a summary of Community Development & Housing needs, a Comprehensive Strategy, taking CDBG funding and fitting it into the overall programs that are being promoted by the City, and a three year budget summary consisting of a list of projects which have been approved by CDAAC and a timetable in covering the implementation of those programs and their actual dollar amount.

Mr. LeDuc discussed the recommended actions necessary to meet the Housing Assistance Plan Goals. He went over all the programs under this plan, giving options and recommendations to the Committee, for the participation of the programs in the 1979-80 Program Year.

There was lengthy discussion regarding the Loans and Grants Program and several members offered suggestions concerning operations. Mr. McCall moved that the staff draft a letter from the CDAAC to the City Commission indicating that last year, a commitment had been made for reserving $150,000 for the Loans & Grants Program and since MSHDA is back in operation they propose to avail themselves the opportunity to participate in it. They would like the City Commission to issue a strong statement indicating the Committee's interest. Mr. Cummings supported this motion and it was carried.

Mr. Cummings requested that Ms. Eileen Davis be asked to give a short presentation regarding the HIP/NIP Programs and other Joint Financing ventures. Mr. LeDuc agreed to have this done at a subsequent meeting of CDAAC.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 P. M.
MINUTES
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1978-7:30 P. M.
CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS-KALAMAZOO CITY HALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rev. Philbert
R. Roosenberg
M. Grimes
P. Todd
K. McCall
K. Cummings
J. Bowen
E. Hagerty
J. Michael

MEMBERS ABSENT:

R. Passero
D. Lanphear
N. Belenky
K. Krogh

ALTERNATES PRESENT:

J. Bright

CITY STAFF PRESENT:

P. D. Wiley, Program Division Head
J. P. Layne, City Manager's Office
P. Giem, Program Division
J. Thompkins, Citizen Participation Officer
E. Hoben, Program Specialist
E. Davis, Housing Specialist
B. Gumbis, Public Works Department

OTHERS PRESENT:

D. Wotalewicz, West Douglas Neighborhood Association
D. Baker, West Douglas Neighborhood Association
C. Cottrell

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: D. Swets, Director of Public Works

Chairman Philbert called the meeting to order at 7:45 P. M.

An attendance roster was passed for everyone present to sign-in.

No minutes were available from the last meeting as this is a continuation of the meeting of November 14, 1978.
Mr. Roosenberg moved that item "A" under New Business follow item "A" under Old Business. Supported by Mr. Michael, the motion passed.

OLD BUSINESS

Discussion on Public Works Projects - Budget Carry Overs

Mr. Donald Swets, Director of Public Works, gave the Committee an overview report of how CDBG funds have been used in previous years. He stated that the City is making greater commitments for street improvements in 1979 than it has in previous years, in addition to CDBG funding. He said CDBG monies are not being used to supplant, but rather to augment the City's efforts in street improvements and maintenance. He recommended that funding be provided out of CDBG 1979-80 monies earmarked for Public Works Projects be used for surveying and inspecting work projects prior to the actual commencing of work. This would eliminate existing problems and provide a smoother operation of work performance. Other recommendations will be presented at the meeting of November 21, 1978.

Joint Financing Report - HIP/NIP

Eileen Davis, Housing Specialist from the Planning Division, handed out a brochure and supplementary material on the Joint Financing and HIP/NIP Programs. She discussed these programs thoroughly with special emphasis to the HIP/NIP Program. She answered questions and addressed various concerns brought up by the Committee during her presentation.

Chairman Philbert read to the CDAAC, a letter drafted by staff, to be submitted to City Commission soliciting their support for housing programs which involve local lending institutions in the Loans and Grants Program.

Mr. McCall moved approval of this letter and requested that this letter be submitted to the City Manager, from CDAAC, for submission to the City Commission, requesting necessary action be taken to support Joint Financing of local housing. Supported by Mr. Todd, this motion was carried.

Selection of Proposal Requests for Inclusion in the 1979-80 CDBG Application

Program Division Head, Preston D. Wiley, initiated discussion on the staff prepared summary. He pointed out that the staff made their recommendations consistant with the Plan, on the proposals that they believed should be funded. The Committee's duty is to take that into consideration and then determine whether or not they wish to make these recommendations, or alternates to the City.

Mr. Todd offered his comments on various items that the staff had recommended and also on items he felt were necessary for the safety,
health, and well being of the neighborhoods. Other members expressed their views on some of the items that Mr. Todd pointed out.

The Committee requested a figure on the total amount requested from both City and Neighborhood/Agency Proposals received. The Committee further requested that the staff provide information on all the programs proposed for funding and at what level. They want to know how many projects are going to be continued through budget carry overs and how much money was left over for them. They also requested that staff members be prepared to offer their comments and rationale for not recommending certain proposals and their reasons for allotting the amount they did on other proposals. Mr. Wiley agreed to provide the CDAAC with a comprehensive staff recommendation report at the scheduled meeting on Tuesday.

Chairman Philbert suggested that the representatives from the various neighborhoods meet with the neighborhood people and discuss these recommendations with them and then bring back their comments to the next meeting. Chairman Philbert noted that the Committee should take into consideration the "Tentative Timetable" and the deadline for submitting their recommendations to the City. He reminded the CDAAC that this timetable could be amended if it was necessary to have more time to work out the recommendations and proposed budget. The current CDBG Tentative Timetable calls for CDAAC to prepare its recommendations by Tuesday, November 21, 1978. The CDBG Budget is scheduled to be presented to the City on November 24, 1978.

The meeting adjourned at 10:16 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Roosenberg,
Recording Secretary

Distribution:

All CDAAC Members
City Clerk
City Manager
Ex Officio Members
Community Organizations and Area Newsletters
AGENDA

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1978 - 7:30 P. M.
THIRD FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM - CITY HALL

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

III. MEMBERSHIP REPORTS

IV. OLD BUSINESS
    A. Discussion of Relocation Policy and Procedures
    B. Approval of 1979-80 CDBG Application for Submission to the City Commission
    C. CDAAC Annual Report to City Commission

V. NEW BUSINESS

VI. ADJOURNMENT
MINUTES
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1978 - 7:30 P. M.

Members present
Rev. Philbert
P. Todd
E. Hagerty
M. Grimes
R. Roosenberg
D. Lanphear
R. Passero
K McCall
J. Michael
E. Krogh
K. Cummings*

Members Absent
N. Belenky
J. Bowen

Staff members present:
P. D. Wiley, Head, Program Division
J. Layne, City Manager's Office
E. Hoben, Program Specialist
E. LeDuc, Community Development Department Acting Director
J. Thomkkins, Citizen Participation Officer

Others present:
C. Cottrell
L. Lanphear
D. Baker
D. Gardner
D. Anderson

Rev. Philbert called the meeting to order at 7:40 P. M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Todd moved that the minutes of the meeting of December 7, 1978 be approved as distributed. Mr. Hagerty seconded this motion. The minutes were approved.

DISCUSSION ON SUBCOMMITTEES

Chairman Philbert suggested that the order of the meeting be changed so that Mr. LeDuc could speak and answer questions on the subject of establishing a subcommittee to advise and oversee the Loans and Grants Program.

Mr. Todd moved that this item of the Agenda be considered at this time. Supported by Mr. McCall and carried.

Mr. LeDuc responded to a request made by the CDAAC at their last meeting regarding the formation of subcommittees and guidelines. Such committees Staff distributed a report pertaining to implementation of the Loans and Grants Program.

* Arrived at 8:55 P. M.
There are numerous lessons to be learned from the existing Loans and Grants Program. At this time, staff would like to recommend for the consideration of the CDAAC the establishment of a CDAAC subcommittee to conduct a review of Kalamazoo's Loans and Grants Program and to serve as a review or appeal body.

This subcommittee, he said, would provide a forum to discuss concerns and solicit information relative to housing rehabilitation policy and subsequently, to make specific recommendations to the City Commission regarding the Program's reorientation.

Mr. LeDuc stated that he had discussed this matter with the City Manager and that the manager strongly supports the idea of the formation of a Loan/Grant Review Board and would like to see the subcommittee formed as soon as possible.

The subcommittee should include representation from the CDAAC, the lending institutions, the building trades, and program recipients, and might meet on a weekly basis until committee structure and functions are finalized. This subcommittee would have to report back to the CDAAC and the CDAAC would then vote on the issues presented to them.

Mr. David Anderson, a local contractor addressed the participation of minority contractors on the subcommittee. He suggested that a contractor be part of the subcommittee as a non voting member. He cautioned that the subcommittee should not be given too much power and that CDAAC retain responsibility for decisions pertaining to the Loans and Grants Program.

Chairman Philbert requested the Committee's take action on this item of discussion.

Mr. McCall suggested that the Committee take no action on this issue at this time, but rather have it brought up at the
first meeting of next year along with any other recommendations that Committee members might have.

Mr. Michael inquired as to the urgency of the matter and Mr. LeDuc responded that the staff felt that the sooner action was taken, the better it would be for the loans and grants program because a current assessment of the program had shown that a number of procedures and policies must be changed in order to continue processing and releasing properties for bids. Timely action by CDAAC would aid the program staff by indicating to the City Manager and City Commission that this type of concerned citizen support is forthcoming from the Committee.

After more discussion, Mr. McCall moved that CDAAC put as a first item on the agenda of the regular meeting; a serious proposal to form a subcommittee regarding the Loans and Grants Program. Mrs. Lanphear seconded this motion. Discussion for and against followed. Mr. Roosenberg amended the motion to read "that we favor the creation of such a subcommittee and that CDAAC is very much interested in the policies of the Loans/Grants Program, and is doing something about it." Mr. Michael supported this amendment to the previous motion. Further discussion followed. The amendment to the motion was carried as follows: For: 9 against: 1. The motion as a whole was then voted on as follows: for: 8 and against: 2.

Mr. Todd moved that the Chairperson work with the staff to draft a proposed change to this and all other subcommittees, and outline what the composition of the subcommittees might be. Mr. Krogh seconded this motion. Discussion followed. The motion carried unanimously.
Mr. Todd moved that the Chairperson and the Program Division Head ask an opinion of the City Attorney on the appointment of members and non-members to subcommittees of CDAAC. Supported by Mr. McCall the motion carried.

Mr. Todd moved that the staff be requested to notify the news media by Friday January 12, 1979 of the upcoming meeting, specifying what we are doing involving the Loans and Grants Program. Mr. McCall supported and was carried unanimously.

MEMBERSHIP REPORTS
No membership reports were forthcoming at this meeting.

OLD BUSINESS
Discussion of Relocation Policy and Procedures

Mr. Wiley acknowledged Mr. Warner,s absence. Mr. Warner, Head of the Building Division, was asked to attend tonight,s meeting but had a previous engagement that he could not break.

Mr. Krough moved that this item of business be carried to the next meeting. Supported by Mr. Roosenberg, the Motion carried. Mr. Warner will be asked to be present for the next regular CDAAC meeting.

Mr. Krough moved to approve the CDBG application and forward it to the City Commission as the 1979-80 Community Development Block Grant Application. Mr. Todd seconded this motion. Discussion followed.

Mr. Wiley stated that at the two Public Hearings coming up on January 2, and 8, 1979 the Committee and the general public would have time to review and make any appropriate amendments to the application if necessary.
Questions were asked on the changes and modifications that the CDAAC had requested on the first draft. Elise Hoben assured the members that all corrections had been made and everything was consistent with Committee decisions. She covered the major parts of the application and answered specific questions pertaining to the target neighborhoods.

A copy of the application, along with all the proposals submitted and a list of the Committee's recommendations will be submitted to the City Commission for their approval.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY to forward the 1979-80 CDBG Application to the City Commission. Mr. Krough urged all members to attend the Public Hearing of January 2, 1979 and be prepared to respond to any matter of discussion that might require clarification, etc. Mr. Krogh moved that if the application is one of the first items dealt with at the Public Hearing and if there are any matters that must be taken care of, that the Committee be prepared to meet immediately to deal with this matter that same night.

Mr. Todd moved that the Chairperson give a brief oral presentation on the major recommended funded programs and the reasons for doing so and an outline of the committee selection process. Mr. McCall mentioned that it should be noted that the application was a result of a unanimous agreement between the Committee. Mr. Passero stated that it should be pointed out to the City Commission that this was a compromise and not everyone was in total agreement from beginning to end. Mr. McCall seconded Mr. Passero's motion, and it carried unanimously.

CDAAC Annual Report to City Commission

Mr. Wiley stated that every Board and Committee of the City
of Kalamazoo is asked to submit an annual report to the City Clerk due on December 31, of each year. The report should include the functions of the Committee, accomplishments, and what it plans to do in the future plus any other information they may consider useful and appropriate. The Mayor and City Commission rely on such annual reports in making appointments to Public Boards and Committees.

Mr. Todd moved that the staff be requested to prepare an annual report for the Chairperson's signature and submit it to the City Commission. After further discussion the Committee decided that due to the short time, the Chairperson forward a letter to the City Clerk advising that The CDAAC Annual Report will be forwarded later. The Chairman will take responsibility for the report and Staff will assist.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Todd moved that we place on the agenda of the next regular meeting the questions of possible representation on the Committee for the West Douglas Association for discussion. Discussion followed. Mr. McCall moved to amend the motion to say "that we discuss the CDAAC's role in determining what the committee will and will not do in recommending membership to the Committee." Mr. Krogh seconded this amendment and it carried as follows: For: 9 and against: 1. The Matter will be an agenda item for the first CDAAC meeting in January. The Chairman extended Holiday Greetings and the meeting adjourned at 9:10 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Roosenberg,
Recording Secretary to CDAAC

Distribution:
City Clerk
City Manager
CDAAC Members
C. B. Director
Ex officio Members
A regular meeting of the Community Development Act Advisory Committee (CDAAC) will be held Thursday, January 18, 1979 at 7:30 P. M. in the Third Floor Conference Room of City Hall.

Please notify Sylvia Pahl at 385-8225 or at 385-8040, Community Development, Programs Division, before January 18, 1979 if you cannot attend the meeting. Your cooperation will be very much appreciated.

The meeting is open to the public.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROPOSAL FORM

APPLICANT (AGENCY)

NAME Community Development-Program Division

ADDRESS 241 W. South
Kalamazoo, MI

PHONE: 385-2225
ZIP 49007

NAME OF PROPOSAL: Communication

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF NEED: (confine to space allowed)
This Communication system will be used to establish an effective overall communication system for all the six target neighborhoods. It will give local methods to distribute news letters and give people a way to voice needs. It will be used to inform residents of community activities, to establish inter-relationship and foster positive use of the community.

Other items of communication may also be established, i.e. card files, skill bank operation, a community directory, etc.

METHOD OF MEETING NEEDS: (Services you will provide)
Method of meeting the needs will be through the Community Development Block Grant Funds.
BUDGET

List Salaries and Major Equipment Cost Below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There will be no direct salary expense.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG funds will be used only for purchase of printed material/printing services.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 10,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Applicant [signature]  Date [date]
Signature of Staff Reviewer [signature]  Date [date]

Please forward to: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
PROGRAMS DIVISION
CITY OF KALAMAZOO
241 W. SOUTH STREET
KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN 49006
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROPOSAL FORM

APPLICANT (AGENCY)

NAME Community Development Department

ADDRESS 241 South Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49007

PHONE: 385-8225

NAME OF PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation Loans & Grants Program

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF NEED: (confine to space allowed)
There is a need in the City of Kalamazoo for housing rehabilitation Loans and Grants. The housing goal adopted in the Comprehensive Plan is to "protect, preserve, and improve the quality and quantity of housing, ensuring availability and choice for area residents." In order to meet this goal CDBG monies must be coordinated with other funding sources in order to maximize comprehensive housing conservation. These funding sources include, HUD-FHA mortgage subsidy and mortgage insurance programs as well as Section 8 funding, MSHDA Home Improvement Loan Program Neighborhood Improvement Program, maximize local institution, mortgage commitments, and local foundations for rehabilitation and housing development related activities.

METHOD OF MEETING NEEDS: (Services you will provide)

Long Term Objectives:
1. Interest Reduction Deferred Payment
   (See attached sheet)
2. Loan Guarantee Program
   (See attached sheet)
3. Principal Reduction Grants
   (See attached sheet)
4. Rehabilitation Loans and Grants
   (See attached sheet)

Short Term Objectives:
BUDGET

List Salaries and Major Equipment Cost Below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $ 600,000

Signature of Applicant [Signature]

Date 10/16/78

Signature of Staff Reviewer [Signature]

Date 10/16/78

Please forward to: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
PROGRAMS DIVISION
CITY OF KALAMAZOO
241 W. SOUTH STREET
KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN 49006
APPLICATION (AGENCY)

NAME Community Development Department
Program Division
ADDRESS 241 W. South Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49007
PHONE: 385-8225
ZIP

NAME OF PROPOSAL: Free Paint

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF NEED: (confine to space allowed)
In many cases homes display outward signs of deterioration though the structures are basically sound. In these cases cosmetic types of home improvements can result in great changes in the visual appearance of neighborhoods.

METHOD OF MEETING NEEDS: (Services you will provide)
To address the need for a cosmetic face lift a free paint program for target neighborhood residents would serve to improve the visual quality of the neighborhood without exacting expenses that low and moderate income persons can sorely afford in these periods of spiraling inflation in housing cost. Provision will also be made to contract the work for the actual cost of painting elderly and handicapped persons' homes.

Statement of Need:

Long Term Objectives:

Short Term Objectives:
## BUDGET

List Salaries and Major Equipment Cost Below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
$80,000

Signature of Applicant  
Date 10-16-78

Signature of Staff Reviewer  
Date 10-16-78

Please forward to:  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
PROGRAMS DIVISION  
CITY OF KALAMAZOO  
241 W. SOUTH STREET  
KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN 49006
APPLICANT (AGENCY)

NAME Oakwood Neighborhood Association

ADDRESS

PHONE: 

NAME OF PROPOSAL:

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF NEED: (confine to space allowed)
To provide a vehicular access drive off from Oakland Dr. to the beach area on Woods Lake owned by Oakwood, Inc. The purpose of the access drive is to provide a means of police surveillance to protect the beach area from vandalism. This drive will also serve as means of access for maintenance and litter control.

METHOD OF MEETING NEEDS: (Services you will provide)
Construction of 450 l.f. of 12' wide, 2" thick bituminous drive with a turnaround. Construction of storm sewer to discharge into Woods Lake for the purpose of controlling erosion. Installation of lighting on existing power pole.

Statement of Need:

Existing Program
New Program
Eligible Activity
Ineligible Activity

Long Term Objectives:

Short Term Objectives:
BUDGET

List Salaries and Major Equipment Cost Below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bituminous Drive (450')</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granular Fill</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewer (150')</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion Control (Sod)</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,560</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Applicant ___________________________ Date ____________

Signature of Staff Reviewer _________________________ Date ____________

Please forward to: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
PROGRAMS DIVISION
CITY OF KALAMAZOO
241 W. SOUTH STREET
KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN 49006
There are several things I would like to bring to your attention. First of all I strongly believe that our community organization should direct a strong voter registration drive in our neighborhood to get unregistered citizens registered. We have far too many people in our community not registered to vote, according to the last statistics. I seriously urge all eastside citizens to put forth more effort to get registered voters out to vote on election day. Each citizen should exercise their constitutional right to vote for a candidate of their choice. Our organization should not become involved with a political party, but we should be concerned about public officials with our interest at heart. We should "only praise the bridge that carry us across!" A well organized community should not underestimate the importance of a heavy voter turnout on election day, because politicians seem to favor the neighborhoods that get out and vote, and the eastside needs all the favors we can get. At the present time we have a good working relationship with State, County and City elected officials. We must continue to establish logical connection between our community and public officials. I also believe it is time for us to start looking for candidates from our own community to seek public office.

There is a tremendous need for our community to take advantage of the Kalamazoo Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council. Everyday we see people in our neighborhood that could use the service of that organization. Alcohol and drugs are not prejudice, because they affect people of all races, age, sex, and economic status. On September 20, Mr. Robert H. Ellis, Operations Manager for the Kalamazoo Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council, spoke at the Eastside Block Association Meeting and was very informative concerning this operation. You may be able to help a friend or member of your family with a drug or alcohol problem by encouraging them to get in contact with the Kalamazoo Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council, at 614 West Kalamazoo Avenue, telephone 345-2139.

A few weeks ago I was elated to receive a call from the Department of Health Education and Welfare in Washington, D.C. concerning our Neighborhood Watch Program. They seem to think that we are doing a better job than we are doing. There are some areas on the eastside that needs improvement and need to take the neighborhood watch program more seriously.

Willie W. Turner, President, Eastside Block Association.

Please note: Representative from League of Women Voters will brief us on the ballot proposals, such as The Headlee amendment, the Voucher Plan, and the Tisch amendment. Push for Voter Participation and Renovation of the Eastside Center will be discussed.

Tuesday, November 7; or don't complain on Wednesday November 5. Use your most important freedom right.
Community Development Act Advisory Committee (CDAAC)

The Community Development Act Advisory Committee (CDAAC) is currently preparing its 1979-1980 budget schedule for the Community Development Block Grant Program.

Citizens participation in this program is vital and it is hoped that citizens of the eastside would attend the regular meeting of the Eastside Block Association on October 16th to express their views.

Citizens involvement would be to influence and shape the city plan and to assure that the plan is realistic in terms of the needs of the people.

Edward C. Hagerty, Eastside representative on the Community Development Act Advisory Committee.


VETERANS

Notes from John Ceru:

All veterans and widows of veterans receiving non-service connected benefits will receive an Income Questionnaire Card with their November check, if over 72 years of age.

Please call John Ceru at 342-2626 for assistance. Do not try to fill this questionnaire out yourself. John is at VFW, 627 North Church Street, every Tuesday evening and will make home calls for those unable to get out.

Liaison SWITCH

John Thompkins has been reassigned as Liaison to the Eastside. Elise Hoben has been switched to the Stuart Neighborhood. Thanks, Elise. Welcome, John.

love is ... PENNY COLLINS......Another switch. Penny’s Ceta term as our Outreach worker has run out and she is now a Head Start teacher at Lincoln School......We miss you already, Penny. Boo hoo!

PUSH FOR LEARNING CALENDAR

Inserted are the October and November months of the Push for Learning Calendar. We believe it is a worthwhile educational tool for our community. Let us know, please, 342-6914 or 343-5139, if you would like continuing months included in our newsletter?

MARK YOUR CALENDAR:

EASTSIDE BLOCK ASSOCIATION MEETING: WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 541 PHELPS. CONFUSED ABOUT THE BALLOT PROPOSALS? THEY WILL BE EXPLAINED AT THE MEETING.
HOME REPAIRS NO LONGER MEAN HIGHER TAXES

"Boy, I'd like to fix those front steps and paint my house this year, but you know if I do, my taxes are sure to go up!!! And when I do some work, you can bet I won't take out a permit. Permit means inspection and inspection means higher assessment."

How often have you heard a neighbor make such a statement? It is a popular belief that property assessments are based primarily on the outward appearance of a home — that is, if the house is freshly painted and the hedge immaculately trimmed, surely the home's interior must be equally maintained, resulting in a high assessment. Property taxes for such a home, being based on property assessment, must also be sky-high. Well, that's not the case, at least not any more. The Michigan Legislature has come to the assistance of the homeowner in recent years.

Michigan Complied Laws of 1970 being Section 211.27 as amended by Act 25 PA of 1978 requires that,

"The assessor, beginning December 31, 1976, shall not consider expenditures for normal repairs, replacement, and maintenance in determining the true cash value of property for assessment purposes until the property is sold."

Basically, what that means is that a homeowner should not, and by law cannot, have his property assessment increased for normal maintenance of his home. What, then, constitutes "normal Maintenance"? According to Harry Jepkema, City Assessor, the following repairs or maintenance expenditures must not be considered as property improvements that would result in a higher assessment. Those marked with an asterisk (*) do require a building permit (leading to inspection).

Outside painting; Repair or replace siding*, roof*, porches*, steps* and sidewalks; Repaint, repair or replace existing masonry*; Replace awnings; Add or replace gutters and downspouts; Replace storm windows or doors; Insulation or weatherstripping; Rewiring*; Replace plumbing fixtures and light fixtures; Replace furnace*; Repair plaster*, Inside painting and other decorating; Replace ceiling*, walls*, and floor surfacing*; Remove partitions*; Replace water heater*; Replace dated interior woodwork*; and other related items.

In short, all the above-listed types of home maintenance cannot be considered as a basis for a raised assessment. Before you embark on any such improvement, visit the Buildings Department of City Hall to:

1) obtain a building permit for those jobs requiring one, and

2) fill out a "Request for Non-Consideration of Normal Repair and Maintenance Expenditures" for all above-listed work.

The "Request for Non-Consideration..." form enumerates which aspects of your intended work are to be viewed as repair or maintenance and not improvement.

What if you feel you have been unjustly assessed in the past? Visit the City Assessor's Office and ask to see the card for your property. The Assessor's reason for each assessment increase is clearly spelled out. If you and the Assessor disagree about the card notation, an annual Board of Review is available to all citizens for an unbiased hearing of the case.
In this issue of the "Oakwood Knothole," there will be items of interest for all, the youth, the middle aged and for our elderly. And please take note that the Oakwood area is changing and that some of the paragraphs will be dealing with some very important topics that will affect all our residents.

RESULTS OF LAST SURVEY

1. All of the residents agreed that property taxes were too high, only one would go along with the idea of less property tax and more income tax. Most expressed distrust of the powers-that-be in that if the income tax was raised to offset property tax, it would only be a short time before the property tax would be back up to new heights.

2. On vandalism, it was expressed that there was a lack of discipline by parents and of course by the schools too.

3. On school buses or busing being a problem, the comments were to the effect that buses were traveling too fast as well as other vehicles and that our streets were becoming a race way. (City officials have been contacted and requested to post speed limit signs in the school areas and also to have more police patrol action)

4. Another comment, action is too slow on condemned property and that too many residences are heavily littered, mostly rental property. The city commission has been slowly revising some of its ordinances and adding personnel to its inspection staff to enforce compliance of the law. But please be aware of the fact that the officials only react to the pressure that interested citizens demand!

5. Other; some senior citizens would like a grocery delivery. Well, the younger element of our neighborhood are going to do something about it. The Hardings Market say they would accept phone orders if someone else would do the delivery. So our youth with Greg Howard acting as leader is going to arrange for some service on perhaps one or two days a week. There could be a small delivery charge. He's available by phone after 6 p.m., phone 381-7822. Also Greg is attempting to organize the youth to do occasional jobs for the elderly at nominal rates. This youth group are having regular meetings at the Oakwood United Methodist Church on Parkview Ave. at 1 p.m. on Saturdays. They have just had a big success in arranging a Halloween party. There were 170 people there at the church that night. Let's all support them by encouraging the youths we know to join them.
Desde el 1 de agosto de este año se inició la posición de consejero vocacional en la oficina de United Migrants for Opportunity, Inc.

El Senior Leo Arellano está encargado de esta posición. Sus deberes son y serán los siguientes:

1. Establecer mejores relaciones con los departamentos de empleo de compañías en Kalamazoo.
2. Establecer relaciones con agencias que pueden ayudar a los clientes de U.M.O.I. con recursos soportivos.
3. Ayudar al cliente que establezca una mejor idea sobre cuáles son sus intereses.

Si desean más información favor de ponerse en contacto con:

Leo Arellano
United Migrants for Opportunity, Inc.
912 North Burdick
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007
De teléfono 343-7126

U.M.O.I. A.B.E.

U.M.O.I. (United Migrants for Opportunity, Incorporated) located at 912 N. Burdick in Lincoln School has an Adult Basic Education Program. This program serves relocated migrant farmworkers who qualify.

The instructor is Gail Wellenkamp. Her aid is Bill McNeill. They work with Basic English language acquisition skills, mathematics and preparation for taking the G.E.D. test for a high school diploma.

The main purpose of the Adult Basic Education program is to strengthen a person's skills to point that he or she may be more employable in today's job market.

We have had several students receive their G.E.D. Also some of our students have received scholarships for further study and/or training.

Other students have found employment in the area through the help of U.M.O.I.

El A.B.E. De U.M.O.I.

U.M.O.I. (Los Migrantes Unidos para Oportunidad Incorporado) localizada en 912 N. Burdick en la escuela Lincoln tiene un programa de Educación Basica para Adultos. Este programa sirve a los trabajadores de labor quienes son migrantes relocalizados y quienes califiquen.

La profesora es Gail Wellenkamp. Su asistente es Bill McNeill. Trabajan con inglés básico, matemáticas, y la preparación para tomar los exámenes del G.E.D. que es el diploma equivalente de escuela secundaria.

El propósito principal del programa es mejorar las habilidades del estudiante para que hallen un trabajo mejor.

Varios estudiantes han recibido su G.E.D. También algunos estudiantes han obtenido becas para continuar su educación o han entrado a tomar algún entrenamiento. Otros estudiantes han hallado empleo en esta área con la ayuda del U.M.O.I.
I. Background Data

1. What is your age? ______

2. Are you
   a. ______ Female
   b. ______ Male

3. What is your marital status?
   a. ______ Single
   b. ______ Married
   c. ______ Divorced
   d. ______ Widowed

4. Are you a member of any voluntary association(s)?

   Yes _____   No _____

   (If yes, please list)

   ______________________

   ______________________

   ______________________

5. Do you tend to vote in (check as many as appropriate)

   National _____   State _____   Local elections _____

6. Are you presently employed?

   a. If yes, as:
      (1) _____ Professional
      (2) _____ Technical
      (3) _____ Manager, Official, Proprietor
      (4) _____ Clerical
      (5) _____ Sales
      (6) _____ Foreman
      (7) _____ Craftsman
      (8) _____ Operative
      (9) _____ Non-farm laborer

   b. If no, are you
      (1) _____ Housewife
      (2) _____ Student
      (3) _____ Retired
      (4) _____ Welfare group
      (5) _____ Other, please specify ______________________
8. Please check as many categories as appropriate from the following:
   a. ___ Rent apartment
   b. ___ Own home
   c. ___ Rent home
   d. ___ Own business building
   e. ___ Rent business building
   f. ___ Own other real property

9. Ethnicity
   a. ___ American Indian
   b. ___ Oriental
   c. ___ Spanish American
   d. ___ Black
   e. ___ White
   f. ___ Other (please specify) _________________________

10. On what income level would you place yourself?
    a. ___ Less than $6,000
    b. ___ $6,000 - $15,000
    c. ___ $15,000 - $30,000
    d. ___ $30,000 and above

11. What level of education have you completed?
    a. ___ Grade School
    b. ___ High School
    c. ___ Trade School
    d. ___ Junior College
    e. ___ College
    f. ___ Post-graduate

12. Do you reside within the
    a. ___ City of Kalamazoo (proper)
    b. ___ County

II. Advisory Committee Experience

1. How long have you been a member of the committee on which you are now serving?
   a. ___ Less than a year
   b. ___ 1-2 years
   c. ___ 3-4 years
   d. ___ 5-6 years
   e. ___ More than 6 years

2. How did you become a member of this advisory committee?
   a. ___ By submitting an application
   b. ___ Appointed without an application

3. Who selected you to become a member of this advisory committee?
   a. ___ Mayor
   b. ___ City Commission
   c. ___ Committee Chairman
   d. ___ Committee itself
4. What membership restrictions are there for your committee?
   a. _____ Occupational
   b. _____ Neighborhood
   c. _____ Ethnic
   d. _____ Income level
   e. _____ Group membership
   f. _____ Age
   g. _____ None

5. How many advisory committee meetings were scheduled during the last 3 months? ___

6. How many advisory committee meetings did you attend in the last 3 months?
   a. _____ All of them
   b. _____ All but one
   c. _____ All but two
   d. _____ None of them

7. Are you a member of a subcommittee of this advisory committee?
   Yes _____   No _____
   a. If yes, please identify ___________________________
   b. How many scheduled meetings were there during the last 3 months _________
   c. If yes, how many subcommittee meetings did you attend in the last 3 months.
      1. _____ All those scheduled
      2. _____ All but one
      3. _____ All but two
      4. _____ None of the scheduled meetings

III. Tasks of Advisory Committees

A. 1. To whom (mayor, city commission, agency head) does this advisory committee normally report?

    2. Does your committee exchange information with any state, or national organizations or conferences? Yes _____   No _____
       a. If yes, please identify organization or conference ___________________________
       b. How often does this exchange of information occur? (Please specify for each organization or conference listed.)
3. Do you exchange information with any local organizations or associations in Kalamazoo? Yes _____ No _____
   a. If yes, please identify
   b. How often does this exchange occur. (Please specify for each group listed).

4. Is your committee related in any way to any Federal government programs? Yes _____ No _____
   a. If yes, please specify.

5. Is your committee related in any way to any State government programs? Yes _____ No _____
   a. If yes, please specify.

B. Committee Purposes

1. What is the main purpose of this advisory committee?

2. What specific problem(s) has this advisory committee been most concerned with in the last 6 months?

IV. 1. Please rate the following:

   1 - satisfied; 2 - fairly satisfied; 3 - somewhat satisfied; 4 - minimally satisfied; 5 - dissatisfied

   a. Are you satisfied with your committee's meetings? 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Are you satisfied with your committee's recommendations? 1 2 3 4 5
   c. Are you satisfied with what happens to these recommendations? 1 2 3 4 5
2. What has been your committee's most successful project in the last 6 months?

3. What has been your committee's least successful project in the last 6 months?

4. Does it make a difference to you whether this advisory committee exists or not?
   Yes _____  No _____
   a. If yes, please explain

5. Do you intend to seek reappointment?  Yes _____  No _____
   a. If yes, please explain

V. Specific Tasks

Please rank each of the following, using:

1 - very important;  2 - fairly important;  3 - somewhat important;
4 - minimal importance;  5 - unimportant;  N/A - not applicable

1. Committee collects its own information by:
   a. Conducting formal surveys  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   b. Consulting public records  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   c. Attending conferences  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   d. Consulting experts  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   e. Consulting groups  1  2  3  4  5  N/A

2. Committee receives information from staff:
   a. As written reports at the meeting  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   b. As written reports prior to the meeting  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   c. Verbally at meetings  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
   d. Verbally prior to meetings  1  2  3  4  5  N/A
3. Committee consults with agency staff in order to make recommendations:

a. Modifying staff proposals 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
b. Vetoing staff proposals 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
c. Suggesting alternatives to staff proposals 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

4. Committee has in the past been asked to make policy, subject to the approval of the city commission about:

a. New programs 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
b. Changing present programs 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
c. Ordinances 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
d. Budgets 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
e. Agency structure 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
f. Administrative regulations 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
g. Staffing 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
h. Public relations 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
i. Zoning and/or land use 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
j. New public facilities (buildings & land) 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
k. Maintenance of public facilities 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
l. Usage of public facilities 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
m. Fees for public facilities (e.g. parks or golf courses) 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
n. Equipment (buses, park equipment etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
o. Maintenance of equipment 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
p. Usage of equipment 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
q. Fees for equipment 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
r. Federal grant possibilities 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
s. State grant possibilities 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
t. Private funding possibilities 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

5. Committee initiates recommendations about:

a. New programs 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
b. Changing present programs 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
c. Ordinances 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
d. Budgets 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
e. Agency structure 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
f. Administrative regulations 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
g. Staffing 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
h. Public relations 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
i. Zoning and/or land use 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
j. New public facilities (buildings & land) 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
k. Maintenance of public facilities 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
l. Usage of public facilities 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
m. Fees for public facilities (e.g. parks or golf courses) 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
n. Equipment (buses, park equipment etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
o. Maintenance of equipment 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
p. Usage of equipment 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
q. Fees for equipment 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
r. Federal grant possibilities 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
s. State grant possibilities 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
t. Private funding possibilities 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

6. Committee solicits support for its recommendations by:
   a. Holding public hearings 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   b. Talking to individual friends 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
c. Speaking, officially at meetings of affected groups 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
d. Writing articles for the press 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
e. Meeting with the city commission 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
f. Meeting with the city manager 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
g. Meeting with affected groups 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

7. Committee provides information to the public by:
   a. Formal press releases 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
   b. Meetings covered by and reported in the press 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
c. Radio coverage 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
d. Hold special public hearings 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
e. Speak at other organizations' meetings 1 2 3 4 5 N/A
f. Indirectly through other individuals (If so, please specify) 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

VI. Organizational

1. Do you have
   a. An agenda? _____ Yes _____ No
   b. Formal minutes? _____ Yes _____ No
      (1) If yes, are these minutes complete & self-explanatory?
          _____ Yes _____ No
2. What is the chairperson's role?

3. How many people from Kalamazoo usually attend the committee's meetings?

   ____ None  ____ 1-5  ____ 6-10  ____ More than 10

4. What are some of the short-comings of the advisory committee on which you are seated?
   a. ____ Lack of attendance
   b. ____ Members not sufficiently informed
   c. ____ Lack of active participation
   d. ____ Too much time spent on unimportant issues
   e. ____ Too much dissension
   f. ____ Other (specify)
   g. ____ None

5. Do you find that one person on the committee is dominating the meeting?
   Yes ____  No ____  If yes, who __________________

6. Are there any external influences which make your advisory committee's job difficult to do?
   Yes ____  No ____  If yes, please identify.

7. Is there any duplication of organizational issues or goals with other advisory committees?
   Yes ____  No ____  If yes, please specify.

8. In your opinion what can be done to improve the effectiveness of your advisory committee?
VII. This section is designed to obtain a profile of the average committee member's attitudes.

A. Please rate the following using SA - Strongly agree; A - Agree; N - Neutral; D - Disagree; SD - Strongly disagree.

1. I don't think public officials care much what people like me think.
   SA A N D SD

2. Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things.
   SA A N D SD

3. People like me don't have any say about what the government does?
   SA A N D SD

4. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.
   SA A N D SD

B. Please answer the following Yes or No.

1. Do you make your own decisions regardless of what other people say?
   _____ Yes _____ No

2. If something goes wrong do you usually attribute it to bad luck rather than bad management?
   _____ Yes _____ No

3. Do you set out to get what you want with a clear course of action rather than trusting to luck?
   _____ Yes _____ No

4. Do you often feel that you have little influence over the things that happen to you?
   _____ Yes _____ No

5. Are you easily persuaded by the arguments of other people?
   _____ Yes _____ No

6. Do you find it a waste of time planning ahead because something always turns up that causes you to change your plans?
   _____ Yes _____ No

7. Would you prefer a job in which somebody else made the decisions and told you what to do?
   _____ Yes _____ No

8. Do you usually have clear-cut goals and a sense of purpose in life?
   _____ Yes _____ No

9. Do you often have the feeling that other people are using you?
   _____ Yes _____ No
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