MINUTES
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the City Planning Commission meeting held June 30, 2022, in the City Council Auditorium, City Hall, 212 SW 9th Street, Lawton, Oklahoma.

The agenda for the meeting was posted on the bulletin board in City Hall in compliance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act.

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Chairman David Denham.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	David Denham John Jones Ron Jarvis David Davison Darren Medders Michael Logan Neil Springborn
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Shelli Fox Deborah Jones
ALSO PRESENT:	Richard Rogalski, Deputy City Manager Janet Smith, Director Planning and Community Services Greg Gibson, Assistant City Attorney Kameron Good, Planner Paul Martin, Planning Administrator Charlotte Brown, Code Plans Supervisor Cindy Augustine, Legal Denise Ezell, Recording Secretary

---

2. Verify posting of meeting.

Recommended Action: Verification of posting time and date.

Posted on 6/28/2022 at 1:30 P.M. by Tammy Anderson

3. Establish Quorum.

Recommended Action: Establish that a quorum is present.

There were Seven (7) of the nine (9) members present.

Denham asked did we hear from Shelli and DJ.

Ezell stated yes.

Denham stated let the record show that they are both excused.

4. Approval of Minutes.
Recommended Action: Motion to approve minutes from the June 16, 2022, meeting.

Motion by Medders, **Second** by Springborn, to approve the minutes of June 16, 2022 as written. **Aye**: Denhan, Jones, J, Jarvis, Davison, Medders, Logan, Springborn. **Nay**: None. **Motion Passed**.

New Business

5. Review Funding Request Applications submitted through the Housing & Community Development (HCD) Office for the upcoming FFY 2022 Annual Action Plan (AAP) and approve a draft version of the FFY 2022 AAP that includes Public Service Organization (PSO) Funding recommendations, and HCD Policy Manual Changes recommended by Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
Action:Review PSO Funding Request Applications for the upcoming 2022 Annual Action Plan, review FFY 2022 Action Plan with recommended changes, and provide a recommendation for approval to the HCD Administrator to post the Draft AAP at for Citizen Comments.

Brooks stated good afternoon. There was a slide left out of the Powerpoint presentation, so I made hard copies for everyone that includes all the slides. This is laid out in the order in which they appeared in the Action Plan. We found there were some mistakes on our formula and spreadsheet, so we went back through the packets. We found that some of the needs were met but wasn't listed on their application. Some of the organizations moved up, some went down, and others stayed in the middle. All the organizations worked together, and we meet the needs. We had a meeting with all the organizations to discuss all the issues with the screening. My office suggested we take the $108,240 and divide it equally between the organizations. Each organization will receive $13,528.75. All eight (8) organizations were represented, and all agreed this was good for this year. We are not certain this will happen from year to year, but it certainly worked for this year. It was as real pleasure for me to see all these organizations work together and their interaction with each other. It was quite uplifting. Part of our recommendation is for the commission to approve the division of funds. Most of the Action Plan is required by HUD. Those are the grant allocations for the current year. There has been a slow incline but for the most part it stays the same from year to year. In the CAPER in the First Time Home Buyers agreement there was a recapture provision. It read differently than the application package. We went back and found the best version and made certain to incorporate the HUD language. We used the same language throughout all the documents. We also have to amend the Consolidated Five (5) Year Plan to reflect the change. When I submitted the agreement for their review, they asked what we did with the $14,999 assistance that we provided for closing cost and down payment. Those monies were half forgivable for a period of affordability, which was five (5) years. The other half would be paid out over time. There is also a requirement their house payment can't be more than 30% of their income. That 30% was causing our office to extend the payments for as long as ten (10) years. The HUD Director feels that was an erroneous number and flies in the face of what we were trying to do. It is also a reflection on our office. We are collecting money for a lot of people over a long period of time. They asked if we could forgive the entire $15,000. I felt that we could and that is the recommendation we are seeking. We don't have to but it was strongly recommended that we do. The asset consideration is more information. It was worded if a low-income family or household had $5,000 or more in a checking account they were excluded from applying. That is not what the HUD language says. I replaced our language with the HUD language. The money we were collecting we were applying in a strict fashion. We were suppose to figure what the interest income and add it to their annual income. It was unfair to families or households that managed a low-income situation who sat money back for hard times. We were doing our calculations off the wrong information. We will change the manual to reflect the CFR. The Action Plan is basically the same as last year. The only difference is some of the amounts. Our Home allocations we up. Some of the amounts increased percentage wise. The only change in programs is we shifted some money around. We are going to try and improve the bus stops this year to make them handicapped complaint. We took $20,000 from demolitions and $40,000 from sidewalks and sewer reconstruction for bus stops. We will start in the three (3) lower income areas and do as many as we can. We want to make sure they have wheelchair access, seating and lighting.

Denham asked do you have a list of priorities of those stops.

Brooks stated yes. I believe there are forty-three (43) total and eighteen (18) in the low to middle income areas.

Denham asked are these sidewalks in addition to the city's plans of doing sidewalks. I hope that you are coordinating with them.

Brooks stated yes and we are.

Smith stated everything presented here today we have worked together to refine. I'm very proud of the project list that we have come up with.

Brooks stated are there any questions, suggestions or recommendations.

Denham asked are there any questions of Brooks. Congratulations on the PSO. Is that going to be a standard going forward or will we go back to the formula.

Brooks stated I don't see our group changing due to what is required to become a PSO. We will need a needs assessment and application. At the end of the day I don't see it changing.

Davison asked is the Patterson Center bathroom renovation finished.

Brook stated no, it is a project for the upcoming fiscal year. We do one (1) public facility project out of CDBG funds every year. This was a priority for Parks and Recreation. Last year we did the HC King kitchen and the year before the Patterson Center roof.

Denham stated every year we have this Section 108 loan payment. If you can next year, will you give us the balance of the loan. That was used for 2nd Street. I know we still have a lot of years left but it would be nice to know the final years.

Brooks stated I think the final year is 2027 or 2028. There is $500,000 that has been set back and they will use that to make the payment for the last five (5) years. That should start in the next year or two (2).

Denham stated thank you. Are there any other questions. Good job, congratulations, and thank you for the update. Members of the commission what is your pleasure.

Motion by Medders, **Second** by Logan, to approve the Funding Request Applications submitted through the Housing & Community Development (HCD) Office for the upcoming FFY 2022 Annual Action Plan (AAP) and approve a draft version of the FFY 2022 AAP that includes Public Service Organization (PSO) Funding recommendations, and HCD Policy Manual Changes recommended by Housing and Urban Development (HUD). **Aye**: Denham, Jones J, Jarvis, Davison, Medders, Logan, Springborn. **Nay**: None. **Motion Passed**.

11. Commissioner's Reports or Comments.

Denham stated I would like for us to go back the alternating the order of calling for a vote. I would like for everyone to have a change to the be first vote.

12. Secretary's Report.

Smith stated I would add to the bus stops the contract for the stops and awning will be ending in about a year and a half. We anticipate it might end sooner with a mutual decision to do so. We want to work with LATS and the city on this project. I'm excited it is a part of the project list. I think there are a lot of good things happening. It is nice to see lots of departments working together.

Davison stated didn't I see where LATS was moving their central station by the new public safety building.

Smith stated yes. We are working on the new transfer center/station. The location will be presented to City Transit Trust in a couple of weeks. We are working on a proposal on a building site. We anticipate it will be on Railroad Street between A & B and maybe as far as D. We will have to have a couple of different areas to accommodate charging stations, maintenance, and those type of things. We are working on that now and should have something in a month or so that we can share with the public.

Denham asked are we looking at an analysis of the actual routes.

*****Smith stated yes. It is time to do a Master Transit Plan Review and we are in the process of that now. Some of that is based on the location of the new transfer center. We are leaning more towards calling it Grand Central Station because we want a big concept. We think this will be much better. We are trying to include retail as well, but yes we are re-evaluating the bus routes and stops because we need to be sure that we are accomodating the people that need the transportation the most.

Denham stated reason for asking is we don't want to redo a stop and then it move due to a route change.

Smith stated you are correct. We don't need to spend money twice. You will probably see some of the stops that are currently there go away. We will have some public meeting to get imput from the ridership. We have surveys that are going out asking what the primary reason is for using the bus system. Do your children use it for school. What areas of town are you in. There are about fifteen (15) questions on a survey that will help us to evalute whether we are locating in the right places.

Davison asked is the Grant Central still looking at being by the mall.

Smith stated no, at this point we are proposing that it shift more across from the public safety center. Just as the name denotes "public safety". People feel safer whenever they are stopping or letting their children go to a bus area that is located near a police and fire protection. We have proposed that it go closer to the public safety center.

Denham stated thank you.

13. Comments from the Public.

Rogalski stated some of you may have heard that I'm retiring. I will be retiring from the City of Lawton. My last day here will be July 22nd. I have worked with some of you for my entire time and what an honor that it has been to work with you. I have learned so much over the years. I appreciate all of you and thank you very much.

Denham stated congratulations. We are going to miss you. Are you staying in the area.

Rogalski stated we will be here for a while. Kim is going to stay at her job for now.

Denham asked are there any other comments from the public. That one will be hard to beat.

14. Adjournment.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Motion by Springborn, **Second** by Medders, to adjourn. **Aye**: Denham, Jones J, Jarvis, Davison, Medders, Logan, Springborn. **Nay**: None. **Motion Passed**.