



14 Dixon Avenue, Suite 102  
Concord, NH 03301  
Tel: 603.226.2170  
Fax: 603.226.2816  
www.nhcdfa.org

## Community Development Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

NH Community Development Finance Authority  
14 Dixon Avenue  
Concord, NH 03301

Thursday May 30, 2023  
1:00 PM

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE PRESENT: Benjamin Gaetjens-Oleson; Elizabeth Fox; Christopher Way; Matthew Walsh; Matthew Sullivan; Carmen Lorentz; Anne Duncan Cooley; and Ignatius MacLellan.

STAFF: Katherine Easterly Martey, *Executive Director*; Kevin Peterson, Molly Donovan, *Director of Economic Development*; Mollie Kaylor, *Director of Housing and Community Development*; Melissa Latham, *Director of Communications and Policy*; George Hunton, *Director of Tax Credit Program*; Chris Monroe, *Community Development Manager*; Priscilla Baez, *Contract Manager – Community Center Investment Program*; and Maureen Quinn, *Board Relations Manager*.

CDFA CONSULTANTS: Shelley Hadfield and Glenn Coppelman.

PUBLIC: Sal Steven-Hubbard, *Lakes Region Community Developers dba Laconia Area Community Land Trust*.

Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson called the meeting to order at 1:05 PM. He welcomed Mr. Chris Way, the designated representative of the NH Department of Business and Economic Affairs (BEA), to the meeting. Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson also thanked CDFA staff for their work on the Community Center Investment Program and noted the challenges in developing guidelines for this new funding source within very limited timeframes. Ms. Easterly Martey also thanked Ms. Shelley Hadfield and Mr. Glenn Coppelman for working alongside CDFA staff to review the first round of applications for this funding opportunity.

Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson acknowledged Ms. Steven-Hubbard. He called for public comment, and none was offered.

Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson reviewed the proposed procedure for application review. He noted based on a thorough review and scoring of all applications in this round that the Committee would vote on the applications in two slates, with applications recommended for funding in one slate and applications not recommended for funding at this time being voted for in a slate. The Committee agreed this approach would be a reasonable way to consider all the applications received.

### Agenda

Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson reviewed the meeting agenda and called for any questions or changes. None were offered. He called for a motion.

### Motion – 1:09 PM

Ms. Lorentz moved to approve the agenda, as presented. Mr. Sullivan seconded and the motion passed with seven (7) yeas of the Committee.

### A. Consent Agenda

Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson reviewed the consent agenda, which included the minutes from the May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Community Development Advisory Committee meeting. She called for questions or comments; none were offered. Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson called for a motion.

**Motion – 1:10 PM**

Ms. Lorentz moved to approve the consent agenda, as presented. Mr. Walsh seconded and the motion carried by a unanimous vote of the Committee.

**B. Community Center Investment Program – Overview**

Ms. Easterly Martey provided an overview of the Community Center Investment Program (CCIP) and the first round of funding requests.

**C. 2023 Community Center Investment Program Update**

Ms. Easterly Martey provided an overview of the first round of Community Center Investment Program. She noted that CDFA relied on its experience and expertise in administering the HUD CDBG program and the State Tax Credit program to develop a review and scoring process for applications. She noted CDFA held multiple workshops designed to disseminate information to a broad audience; feedback and questions from these workshops helped to further develop program guidance.

CFDA staff met with over 70 potential applicants for pre-application meetings. Forty-six applications were received for the first round of funding. Overall, the quality of the applications was strong, reflecting that the application and program guide were used as hoped.

The first round of applications includes 45 applications seeking in excess of \$31 million dollars. Staff will review this round and consider whether modifications or changes should be considered to improve the process, and ultimately applications received. Ms. Easterly Martey stated thresholds were established to ensure alignment with the program goals, and noted some of these thresholds included:

- Entity threshold (eligibility)
- Readiness to break ground in six months
- Have met and complied with CDFA energy policy established in the Application and Program guide
- ADA accessibility at project completion
- Match funds (a minimum of 15% of the award sought) are secured, and
- Multiple needs **(at least two)** are met by the project, including:
  - Community
  - Civic
  - Recreation
  - Social
  - Other

Eighteen (18) of the forty-six (46) applications received passed thresholds; sixteen of the applications are recommended for funding. Two of the applications failed to meet the minimum scoring metric of 100 points and therefore were not included in the slate of recommended applications. The Committee asked what consequence – if any – exists if construction does not begin within six months. Ms. Easterly Martey noted awarded funds will be forfeited and the applicant will have the opportunity to reapply for funding in the second round. Additionally, an Administrative Review process – whereby an applicant may request a second review of their application – will be offered after initial funding decisions are made.

Ms. Easterly Martey noted a broad range of applications were received from traditional (bricks and mortar) community centers, but there are also applications for construction/renovation of outdoor spaces and from

groups working with target populations. The Committee noted the demand for this funding reflects the scarcity of resources typically available for these types of organizations.

**Recusals:** Ms. Lorentz, Ms. Fox, Mr. Sullivan, and Mr. Walsh all indicated they will recuse from consideration and vote on all applications. Each of these Committee members is from an organization which has submitted an application for funding in this round.

**Ms. Lorentz, Ms. Fox, Mr. Sullivan, and Mr. Walsh left the meeting at 1:28 PM**

#### **D. 2023 Community Center Investment Program – Recommendations for Funding**

Ms. Easterly Martey noted she, Ms. Hadfield and Mr. Coppelman would be presenting brief summaries of each application recommended for funding.

##### **Jaffrey Civic Center – Jaffrey Civic Center Improvement Project**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center has, or will have upon completion of the project, multiple services including Community and Social Services.

The project scored 100 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$402,572.32.

##### **Town of Peterborough – Peterborough Community Center Renovation**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Recreation and Community.

The project scored 100 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$1,000,000.

##### **City of Keene – Brian A. Mattson Recreation Center**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Recreation and Community. Total project cost is \$940,000.

The project scored 105 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$801,250.

##### **Hannah Grimes Center, Inc. – Energy Efficiency & HVAC Improvements**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Community and Social Service - Workforce Development. Total project cost is \$750,445.

The project scored 105 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$576,338.

##### **Gibson Center for Senior Services – Gibson Senior Center**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center provides multiple services including community and social services for seniors.

The project scored 105 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$180,265.

**Town of Exeter – Exeter Multi-Generational Community Center**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Recreation and Community. The total project cost is \$996,240.

The project scored 105 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$841,240.

**City of Laconia – Leavitt Community Center**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Recreation and Community. Total project cost is \$462,200.

The project scored 115 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$392,870.

**G.A.L.A. Community Center – GALA Community Center Phase Two at Makers Mill**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The application includes evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Community services and Social Service - Workforce Development.

The project scored 115 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$994,500.

\*This project is approved with an additional condition, as follows: the project administration costs including builder administration do not exceed the program guidance of 10%

**Monadnock Area Peer Support Agency – Monadnock Peer Support Community Facility**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant includes evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Social Service and Community. Total project \$1,742,753.

The project scored 120 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$992,753.

**Town of Wakefield – Wakefield Community Pavilion Project**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Recreation and Community. Total project cost \$317,000.

The project scored 125 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$240,000.

**City of Nashua – Arlington Street Community Center**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Recreation and Community. Total project cost is \$1,150,000.

The project scored 125 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$1,000,000  
**Squam Lakes Association – Squam Lakes Association Community Facilities**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Recreation and Community. Total project cost is \$2,230,353.

The project scored 130 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$998,947.

**Claremont Learning Partnership – One-4-All Outdoor Playspace**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant include evidence that the Community Center will have upon completion of the project provide multiple services including providing a social services including childcare, educational services and community services.

The project scored 135 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$213,822.

**Tapply-Thompson Community Center – A Safe Place to Call Home**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Social Service - Youth and Community. Total project cost \$1,150,000.

The project scored 145 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$1,000,000.

**Town of Whitefield – Whitefield Public Library and Expansion**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant included evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Community and Social Services. Total project cost is \$1,072,400.

The project scored 150 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$911,400.

**Tamworth Community Nurse Association – Building for Accessible Rural Health Care**

The project is recommended for funding due to an alignment with the threshold criteria, a strong demonstration of community benefit, project support and capacity to carry out the project. The applicant includes evidence that the Community Center has or will have upon completion of the project multiple services including Social Service - Healthcare and Community. Total project cost is \$1,286,470.

The project scored 170 points and is recommended for an award of up to \$1,000,000.

Ms. Easterly noted that all projects recommended for funding have the following staff recommended conditions:

- Sufficient funds are available and allocated to the program;
- All other usual and customary CDFA contract terms; and
- The use of funds conforms with State, Federal regulations and CDFA guidance.

Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson called for any additional questions or comments. None were offered.

**Motion – 2:30 PM**

Mr. MacLellan moved to approve the slate of applications presented and reviewed, with all staff recommended conditions. Mr. Way seconded. The motion passed with four (4) yea votes and four (4) recusals due to Committee members' conflicts.

**Mr. Sullivan and Ms. Lorentz returned to the meeting.**

**E. 2023 Community Center Investment Program – Not Recommended for Funding**

Ms. Easterly Martey summarized applications submitted in this round of funding and not recommended for funding. She stated twenty-eight applications failed to meet the program's basic thresholds; two applications passed thresholds, minimally, but scored less than 100 points out of a maximum of 200 points, the minimum required to receive an award. Ms. Easterly Martey noted many of the applicants failed to offer more than one type of community service/impact; the application required a project satisfy at least two (2) of the five (5) eligible community activities. The Committee was informed that an Administrative Review process available to applicants not funded. Applicants not funded include the following organizations:

| <u>ORGANIZATION</u>                            | <u>PROJECT TITLE</u>              | <u>AMOUNT</u> |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| • City of Laconia                              | Leavitt Community Center          | \$392,870     |
| • Friends of Pop Whalen                        | Friends of Pop Whalen             | \$964,245     |
| • Friends of Moultonborough Community Ctr      | Moultonborough Community Ctr      | \$1,000,000   |
| • Granite State Adaptive                       | STRIDES II                        | \$1,000,000   |
| • Keene Family YMCA                            | Keene Family YMCA                 | \$340,000     |
| • Town of Atkinson                             | Atkinson Community Center         | \$130,050     |
| • City of Berlin                               | Berlin Library & Community Room   | \$816,000     |
| • Langdon Congregational Church                | Langdon Congregational Church     | \$296,285     |
| • Bedford Historical Society                   | Stevens-Buswell Community Ctr     | \$350,000     |
| • Friends of Greenfield Community Meetinghouse | Restoring the Greenfield Mtghse   | \$1,000,000   |
| • Lil' Iguana's Children's Safety Foundation   | Lil' Iguana Family Resource Ctr   | \$520,989     |
| • Littleton Community Center                   | Retrofit for Energy, Internet     | \$850,000     |
| • Touchstone Farm                              | New Construction of the Lodge     | \$850,000     |
| • Town of Marlborough                          | Frost Free Library Community Ctr  | \$750,000     |
| • Vaughan Community Services                   | Vaughan Community Services        | \$156,207     |
| • Kimball Jenkins, Inc.                        | Community Cultural Center         | \$639,290     |
| • Lakes Region Model Railroad Museum, Inc.     | Visitor and STEM Learning Ctr     | \$400,000     |
| • Town of Hebron, NH                           | Hebron Community Ctr              | \$1,000,000   |
| • LACLT dba Lakes Region Community Developers  | LRCD – Gale School Renovation     | \$1,000,000   |
| • Town of Newport                              | Newport Community Center          | \$1,000,000   |
| • Willing Workers Society                      | Willing Workers Hall Restoration  | \$125,000     |
| • New England Pentecostal Ministries           | Bishops Wellness & Recreation Ctr | \$1,000,000   |
| • Rochester Opera House                        | ROH Fly House Improvements        | \$200,000     |
| • City of Concord                              | Penacook Recreation Ctr           | \$1,000,000   |
| • Town of Belmont                              | Town of Belmont Mill Renovation   | \$850,000     |
| • Town of Effingham                            | Effingham Historic Town Hall      | \$621,660     |
| • Town of Hudson                               | Freedom Field Rehabilitation      | \$475,000     |
| • Town of Swanzey                              | Town of Swanzey                   | \$850,710     |
| • Pelham NH Council on Aging Corps             | Outdoor Accessible Park           | \$400,000     |
| • Newmarket Housing Authority                  | Community Center Improvements     | \$135,700     |

The Committee asked whether CDFA will be tracking these awards to ensure the project meets the stated objectives represented in the application. Ms. Easterly Martey noted this would be challenging as these are federal funds and CDFA cannot put performance liens in place. Additionally, these funds need to be deployed quickly and there would be little opportunity to monitor outcomes.

The Committee discussed the applications not being recommended for funding and asked whether the applicant can apply in the second round of funding. Staff noted any applicant not funded in this round is welcome to submit a new application in the second round; applicants' original applications will not be carried forward. Ms. Easterly Martey stated staff is prepared to provide technical assistance to these organizations to help them prepare an application which is consistent with program requirements and thresholds. The timing for the second round has not yet been finalized.

**F. Adjourn – 3:00 PM**

Mr. Way moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. MacLellan seconded, and the motion carried with a unanimous vote of the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Maureen Quinn, Board Relations Manager



---

Benjamin Gaetens-Oleson, Committee Chair