



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

Monday, May 4, 2020

Members
Nikayah Walker, Mayor
Sena Magill, Vice Mayor
Heather D. Hill
Michael K. Payne
J. Lloyd Snook, III

5:30 PM

Closed session as provided by Sections 2.2-3711 and 2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia
Virtual / electronic meeting (*Personnel*)

6:30 PM

Regular Meeting (Virtual / electronic meeting)

CALL TO ORDER
ROLL CALL
AGENDA APPROVAL
RECOGNITIONS
ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. CONSENT AGENDA*

- a. MINUTES: April 20 Regular meeting, April 28 Work Session
- b. APPROPRIATION: Domestic Violence Services Coordinator Grant - \$49,336 (2nd reading)
- c. APPROPRIATION: Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) Supplemental Appropriation of FY 2020 Transit Grants - \$2,021,606 (2nd reading)
- d. APPROPRIATION: Appropriation of CARES Act relief fund payment for the Fire Department - \$58,201.02 (1st of 2 readings)
- e. RESOLUTION: Approving retroactive funding for administration of the Charlottesville Supplemental Rental Assistance Program (CSRAP) - \$79,255.94 (1 reading)
- f. ORDINANCE: Rental Relief Program application deadline extension pursuant to City Code Section 25-59 (1 reading requiring 4/5 vote)

CITY MANAGER RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY MATTERS (FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS)

COMMUNITY MATTERS Public comment for up to 16 speakers (limit 3 minutes per speaker). Pre-registration available for up to 8 spaces; pre-registered speakers announced by Noon the day of the meeting. Additional public comment period at end of meeting. Public comment will be conducted through electronic participation as City Hall is closed to the public. Participants can register in advance at www.charlottesville.org/zoom. [Remote participation supported for the duration of the City Manager's Declaration of Emergency issued March 12, 2020.]

ACTION ITEMS

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING/
RESOLUTION*: FY20-21 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)/Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) Action Plan: (1 reading)
 - a. CDBG/HOME FY20-21 Action Plan resolution
 - b. FY20-21 Priority Neighborhood fund allocations resolution
- 3. RESOLUTION*: Action Plan CDBG-CV Covid Amendment - \$246, 699 (1 reading)
- 4. APPROPRIATION*: Approval and Appropriation of CDBG and HOME Budget Allocations for FY 2020-2021 (1st of 2 readings)
 - a. Appropriation of funds for the City of Charlottesville 2020-2021 CDBG - \$419,367
 - b. Appropriation of funds for the City of Charlottesville's 2020-2021 HOME funds - \$127,210.56
 - c. Appropriation amendment to CDBG account reprogramming of funds for FY 20-21 - \$13,324

GENERAL BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS

MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

*Action Needed

NOTE: During the local state of emergency related to the Coronavirus (COVID-19), City Council Chambers are closed to the public and meetings are being conducted virtually via a Zoom webinar. The webinar is broadcast on Comcast Channel 10 and on all the City's streaming platforms. Public hearings and other matters from the public will be heard via the Zoom webinar which [requires advanced registration](#). You may also participate via telephone and a number is provided with the Zoom registration or by asking the clerks for the dial-in phone number for each meeting.

This page intentionally left blank

CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
Monday, April 20, 2020
Council Chamber
6:30 p.m.

The Charlottesville City Council held a virtual meeting for its regular session on April 20, 2020, in an effort to comply with social distancing requirements surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic.

Ms. Walker called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with the following members in attendance: Mayor Nikuyah Walker, Vice Mayor Sena Magill, Ms. Heather Hill, Mr. Michael Payne and Mr. Lloyd Snook.

Ms. Hill moved to amend the agenda, adding an agenda item at the end of the regular agenda to discuss the City's response to COVID-19. By unanimous consent, Council approved the addition to the agenda.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Mr. Snook, Council unanimously approved the meeting agenda as amended.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Ms. Hill announced the new City website being launched on April 27 with website address "Charlottesville.gov", and the Cville360 broadcasts being conducted via Zoom webinar and viewable through City of Charlottesville social media streaming as well as TV Channel 10.

Ms. Walker announce that COVID-19 testing for residents of public housing is being discussed.

Mr. Payne advised of "supportcville.com" as a local resource regarding ways to help and to find help during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Councilors took turns making remarks about COVID-19 and the local response.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Clerk of Council Kyna Thomas read the following Consent Agenda items into the record:

- a. MINUTES: March 12 Budget Work session, March 16 Special and Regular meetings, March 25 Special meeting**
- b. APPROPRIATION: Domestic Violence Services Coordinator Grant - \$49,336 (carried)**

c. APPROPRIATION: Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) Supplemental Appropriation of FY 2020 Transit Grants - \$2,021,606 (carried)

d. RESOLUTION: Service Authorities quarterly update

Ms. Walker opened the floor to the public for comment on the consent agenda.

Mr. Sean Tubbs, Piedmont Environmental Council, spoke about the CAT appropriations document reference to the possibility of public comment at the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) level and advised that of the need to look at the item deeper.

With no further comments, Ms. Walker closed public comment.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Mr. Snook, Council by the following recorded vote APPROVED the consent agenda: 5-0 (Ayes: Hill, Magill, Payne, Snook, Walker; Noes: none).

CITY MANAGER RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY MATTERS:

City Manager Tarron Richardson advised that he wants to convey as much information as possible to the public. He advised of future updates to the public, and shared information about the Cville360 show which provides regular updates.

COMMUNITY MATTERS

Ms. Walker opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Nancy Carpenter spoke about those adversely affected by the housing and health crisis. She asked the City to look at ways to provide grants to landlords, and looking at tenant preservation initiatives.

Mr. Brandon Collins, City resident, representing the Public Housing Association of Residents (PHAR), and Charlottesville Low-Income Housing Coalition (CLIHC), spoke about the public housing crisis further perpetuated by COVID-19.

Ms. Tanesha Hudson spoke about City efforts to alleviate some financial stressors for citizens related to housing and taxes.

Mr. Rory Stolzenberg commended the City for moving to a new website and asked what would happen to the old website.

- Mr. Brian Wheeler, Director for Communications, gave an update on the new City website and advised that the information from the previous website will be maintained by the City.

Ms. Walker closed the public comment period.

RESOLUTION*: Resolution establishing June 30, 2020 as the City’s Fiscal Year 2021 budget adoption deadline

Dr. Richardson introduced the item and shared background for the resolution.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Mr. Snook, Council by the following recorded vote APPROVED the following resolution: 5-0 (Ayes: Hill, Magill, Payne, Snook, Walker; Noes: none).

**RESOLUTION
ESTABLISHING JUNE 30, 2020 AS THE DEADLINE FOR CITY COUNCIL TO
ADOPT A BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021**

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville City Council adopted a Resolution on March 12, 2020, authorizing the Charlottesville City Manager to declare an emergency due to the potential spread of COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville City Council adopted an emergency ordinance on March 25, 2020 pursuant to Virginia Code Section 15.2-1413 which waived statutorily-mandated timeframes created by local laws; and

WHEREAS, the COVID-19 emergency prevented the Council from conducting work sessions and its April 6, 2020 regularly scheduled meeting at which business related to the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 budget was scheduled to be discussed; and

WHEREAS, Charlottesville City Code Section 11-2 states that the fiscal year budget shall be adopted by April 15th of each calendar year.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that pursuant to the emergency ordinance adopted on March 25, 2020, the City will adopt the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 budget by June 30, 2020 and the provisions of Charlottesville City Charter Section 19 are waived for Fiscal Year 2020-2021.

RESOLUTION*: Resolution establishing Calendar Year 2020 tax rates

City Attorney John Blair introduced the item and shared background of the Ordinance currently in place. For purposes of transparency, the following resolution was shared and voted upon.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Ms. Magill, Council by the following recorded vote APPROVED the following resolution: 5-0 (Ayes: Hill, Magill, Payne, Snook, Walker; Noes: none).

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING TAX RATES

WHEREAS, on April 8, 2019, the Charlottesville City Council adopted an ordinance (hereinafter “the ordinance”) establishing the annual tax levy on various classes of property, a copy of which is attached to this Resolution as Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the ordinance was effective for the year beginning January 1, 2019 and ending December 31, 2019 and each year thereafter; and

WHEREAS, the Council does not desire to alter any of the tax rates established by the ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the tax rates established by the ordinance shall remain in effect for the year beginning January 1, 2020 and ending December 31, 2020.

RESOLUTION*: Resolution establishing June 19, 2020 as deadline for real estate, tangible personal property, and machinery and tools tax payments

Dr. Richardson presented the item. He encouraged the public to contact the City Treasurer's Office should there be a financial hardship, and noted that the Treasurer's Office would work with individuals on a case-by-case basis.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Mr. Payne, Council by the following recorded vote APPROVED the resolution: 5-0 (Ayes: Hill, Magill, Payne, Snook, Walker; Noes: none).

**RESOLUTION
ESTABLISHING JUNE 19, 2020 AS DEADLINE FOR REAL ESTATE, TANGIBLE
PERSONAL PROPERTY, AND MACHINERY AND TOOLS TAX PAYMENTS**

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville City Council authorized the Charlottesville City Manager to declare the spread of COVID-19 an emergency on March 12, 2020; and

WHEREAS, Charlottesville City Code Section 30-161 establishes June fifth as the deadline for taxpayers to remit payment for half of their assessed real estate, tangible personal property, and machinery and tools tax payments; and

WHEREAS, Virginia Code Section 58.1-3916 provides that the Charlottesville City Council may extend the due date for taxes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the deadline for taxpayers to remit payment for half of their assessed real estate, tangible personal property, and machinery and tools tax payments is extended to June 19, 2020.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that taxpayers shall not incur the penalties prescribed in Charlottesville City Code Section 30-164 until June 19, 2020.

Ms. Walker recessed the meeting at 7:42 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 8:00 p.m.

Upon reconvening, Mr. Blair read a resolution into the record related to establishing the personal property tax relief rate, which is required in order to print personal property bills.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Mr. Payne, Council by the following recorded vote APPROVED the following resolution: 5-0 (Ayes: Hill, Magill, Payne, Snook, Walker; Noes: none).

RESOLUTION
Establishing 2020 Tax Year Tax Relief Percentage

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the personal property tax relief percentage on up to \$20,000 value for vehicles valued over \$1,000 is set at 42% for tax year 2020.

RESOLUTION*: Resolution establishing a plan for adopting the budget for Fiscal Year 2020-2021 and establishing a budget public hearing date

Dr. Richardson introduced the item, reviewing the Fiscal Year 2020 budget and expected impacts from the Coronavirus pandemic for the remainder of FY2020 and moving into FY2021. He advised that the expectation is to maintain services to the public. Dr. Richardson reviewed FY20 and FY21 General Fund revenue reductions, and advised that FY21 expenditures have been updated to reflect the amounts from the FY20 adopted budget. He emphasized the City's efforts to maintain relationships with community partners such as the University of Virginia, the County of Albemarle, and others involved in emergency management in order to meet the needs of citizens and specifically vulnerable community members.

Dr. Richardson advised that he will begin budget discussions with School Administration and City department heads about the budget planning process going forward and the impact of the reduced expenditures for FY2021.

Ms. Walker asked about requirements for budget public hearings. Mr. Blair advised that one public hearing is required and there is a related time frame for budget approval. He also advised that should revenues exceed 1 percent of the General Fund, a public hearing would be required to expend the funds.

Ms. Walker expressed a desire for pairs of Councilors to meet with the City Manager, department directors and the School Superintendent to discuss their budget priorities. She also shared information about the Vibrant Community Fund and shifting priorities, advising that the needs of the community are shifting and no decisions have been made about how to distribute the funds.

In response to questions from Ms. Hill and Ms. Walker, Ms. Krisy Hammill, Senior Budget and Management Analyst, explained the status of the City's Capital Improvement Projects budget.

Councilors shared thoughts on their priorities, which included community focus, retaining employment for City staff, Schools funding, housing, medical care, safety and food needs of the most vulnerable residents.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Ms. Magill, Council by the following vote APPROVED the following resolution: 5-0 (Ayes: Hill, Magill, Payne, Snook, Walker; Noes: none).

**RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING PLAN FOR CITY COUNCIL TO
ADOPT THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021**

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville City Council adopted a Resolution on March 12, 2020 authorizing the Charlottesville City Manager to declare an emergency due to the potential spread of COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville City Council adopted an emergency ordinance on March 25, 2020 pursuant to Virginia Code Section 15.2-1413 which waived statutorily-mandated timeframes created by local laws; and

WHEREAS, the COVID-19 emergency has and will have significant impacts on the City's revenues thus making the previously FY 2021 Proposed Budget presented to Council on March 16, 2020 no longer viable; and

WHEREAS, Charlottesville City Code Section 11-2 states that the fiscal year budget shall be adopted by April 15th of each calendar year.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that Council will hereby authorize a vote to move forward with the revised budgetary figures provided herein and authorize a public hearing to be held on May 18, 2020.

REPORT: Discussion of the City's Response to COVID-19 – ADDED to Agenda upon agenda approval

Ms. Hill expressed a desire to establish a regular report from staff regarding COVID-19. Dr. Richardson advised of his plans to provide a brief report at City Council meetings as well as continue the use of other outreach avenues such as Cville360 broadcasts with question and answer opportunities.

Ms. Hill asked for clarification on land use decisions. Mr. Blair advised that land use decisions are a discretionary legislative act and therefore do not fall within the emergency nature of the City Manager's Emergency Declaration.

Councilors thanked City staff, teachers and members of the public for their work during the Coronavirus pandemic.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Todd Divers, Commissioner of the Revenue, clarified information about taxes.

Ms. Hill asked about the ability for boards and commissions to meet during the emergency declaration. Mr. Blair advised that normal requirements would need to be met such as a meeting notice to the public, and discussion would need to be related to the City Manager's Emergency Declaration.

MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

Ms. Walker opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Walt Heinecke spoke about meetings of advisory committees, and advised that the Housing Advisory Committee is a place where the public can have input.

Ms. Tanesha Hudson spoke about the possible waiver of tax late fees and about a deferment program for citizens who are out of work.

Ms. Nancy Carpenter spoke about the use of CDBG funds for vulnerable residents and advised that the incarcerated community should be included in that group. She asked Council to strengthen the Human Rights Commission. She also spoke about addressing ancillary services with the Vibrant Community Fund.

The meeting adjourned at 9:42 p.m.

BY Order of City Council

BY Kyna Thomas, Clerk of Council

CITY COUNCIL WORKSESSION
Tuesday, April 28, 2020
Virtual / Electronic Meeting
(broadcast from Council Chamber)
3:00 p.m.

The Charlottesville City Council met in a virtual work session on April 28, 2020, at 3:00 p.m. Ms. Walker called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. and shared a message of thanks to staff as well as comments of assurance to the public of the work being done by City staff.

Clerk of Council Kyna Thomas called the roll and the following Councilors were in attendance: Mayor Nikuyah Walker, Vice Mayor Sena Magill, Ms. Heather Hill, Mr. Michael Payne and Mr. Lloyd Snook.

Ms. Walker turned the meeting over to Dr. Richardson, who gave an overview of the work session, explaining that there would be two groups of department representatives sharing updates related to operations during the Covid-19 pandemic. Presentations were made by the following City personnel:

1. Alexander Ikefuna, Deputy Director for Neighborhood Development Services
2. Andrew Baxter, Fire Chief
3. Chris Engel, Director of Economic Development
4. Diane Kuknyo, Director of Social Services
5. Garland Williams, Director of Charlottesville Area Transit

The meeting recessed at 5:25 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 5:41 p.m.

6. Kaki Dimock, Director of Human Services
7. Lauren Hildebrand Director of Utilities
8. Martin Silman, Interim Director of Public Works
9. RaShall Brackney, Police Chief
10. Todd Brown, Interim Director of Parks and Recreation

Councilors asked questions following each presentation.

Ms. Hill asked about the potential for some boards and commissions to meet electronically.

Mr. Blair shared information to clarify amendments to legislation at the State level which would allow the Council and other public bodies to consider issues other than those related to essential functions related to the COVID-19 emergency.

Councilors discussed having a more robust conversation at a later date to discuss prioritizing which boards would begin meeting electronically. Ms. Walker asked that the Clerk of Council schedule a work session for discussion of boards and commissions.

Dr. Richardson advised that he would make contact with staff serving as board liaisons to gather information on board and commission priorities. Ms. Thomas advised that she or Mr. Wheeler could provide the list of liaisons.

Ms. Walker opened the floor for public comment.

With no wishing to speak, Ms. Walker closed public comment.

Councilors made closing remarks.

The meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

BY Order of City Council

BY Kyna Thomas, Clerk of Council

This page intentionally left blank

**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**



Agenda Date:	April 20, 2020
Action Required:	Approval and Appropriation
Presenter:	Areshini Pather, Commonwealth Attorney's Office
Staff Contacts:	Areshini Pather, Commonwealth Attorney's Office
Title:	Domestic Violence Services Coordinator Grant - \$49,336

Background:

The Charlottesville/Albemarle Domestic Violence Community Services Coordinator assists in the efficient delivery of services and access to the court process for the victims of domestic violence in both Charlottesville and Albemarle County. Examples include helping in the preparation of domestic violence cases for prosecution and assisting victims in obtaining protective orders. The Coordinator serves as a case manager on behalf of victims in relation to their interactions with community agencies that deliver needed services such as shelter, civil legal assistance, and counseling. No other person in local government fills this specific function on behalf of victims of domestic violence.

Discussion:

The City of Charlottesville has been awarded \$38,336 from the Department of Criminal Justice Services for the Charlottesville/Albemarle Domestic Violence Community Services Coordinator in the City's Commonwealth's Attorney's Office. This grant requires that 25% of project funds must be provided by cash or an in-kind match. The City's Commonwealth Attorney's Office will provide a \$5,000 cash match, and an in-kind match of \$4,213. Albemarle County will provide a \$6,000 cash match, and an in-kind match of \$3,000. Graduate student and intern hours will provide an additional \$1,062 in-kind match. The total anticipated cash and in-kind match of \$19,275 is more than sufficient to meet the minimum requirement.

Alignment with City Council's Vision and Strategic Plan:

Approval of this agenda item aligns directly with Council's vision for Charlottesville to be America's Healthiest City and contributes to their priority to: Provide a comprehensive support system for children.

The program also aligns with Strategic Plan Goal 2: A Healthy and Safe City, Objective 2.2 Meet the safety needs of victims and reduce the risk of re-occurrence/re-victimization and Objective 2.3

Improve community health and safety outcomes by connecting residents with effective resources. The Domestic Violence Coordinator contributes to the health and safety of the community by connecting victims of domestic violence and their children to service providers for emergency shelter, medical and mental health services, housing resources, legal assistance and other services.

Community Engagement:

The Charlottesville/Albemarle Domestic Violence Services Coordinator is a direct service provider and is engaged daily with victims of domestic violence and stalking who access services through referrals from police, court services, social services and other allied agencies. The Coordinator works with over 300 individuals yearly and serves on several coordinating councils: the Albemarle/Charlottesville Domestic Violence Council, the Monticello Area Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team, and the Charlottesville/Albemarle Blue Print for Safety group. The Coordinator has actively been involved in the implementation of the Lethality Assessment Protocol (L.A.P.) used by Charlottesville, Albemarle and University of Virginia Police Departments.

Budgetary Impact:

There is no additional funding required. The grant requires a local match of \$11,000, in which \$6,000 will be provided by Albemarle County and the remaining \$5,000 will be provided through previously appropriated funding in the Commonwealth Attorney's F.Y. 20 General Fund Operating Budget. The funds will be expensed and reimbursed to a Grants Fund.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval and appropriation of grant funds.

Alternatives:

In the event that the grant is not funded or that the funds are not appropriated, this position will cease to exist, as there are no other funds to support it.

APPROPRIATION

Domestic Violence Services Coordinator Grant

\$49,336

WHEREAS, The City of Charlottesville, through the Commonwealth Attorney’s Office, has received the Domestic Violence Services Coordinator Grant from the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services in the amount of \$38,336 in Federal pass-thru funds, Albemarle County is to contribute an additional \$6,000 in local cash match, and the City Commonwealth Attorney’s Office will contribute up to \$5,000 cash match, as needed to meet salary and benefit expenses.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the sum of \$49,336 is hereby appropriated in the following manner:

Revenues

\$38,336	Fund: 209	Cost Center: 1414002000	G/L Account: 430120
\$ 6,000	Fund: 209	Cost Center: 1414002000	G/L Account: 432030
\$ 5,000	Fund: 209	Cost Center: 1414002000	G/L Account: 498010

Expenditures

\$49,336	Fund: 209	Cost Center: 1414002000	G/L Account: 519999
----------	-----------	-------------------------	---------------------

Transfer

\$ 5,000	Fund: 105	Cost Center: 1401001000	G/L Account: 561209
----------	-----------	-------------------------	---------------------

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of \$38,336 from the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, and \$6,000 from the County of Albemarle, Virginia.

This page intentionally left blank

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



Agenda Date:	April 20, 2020
Action Required:	Approve Supplemental Appropriation for Transit Division
Staff Contact:	Garland Williams, Transit Director Ryan Davidson, Budget Office
Presenter:	Garland Williams, Transit Director
Title:	Appropriation of FY 2020 Transit Grants - \$2,021,606

Background and Discussion:

With a Resolution Authorizing the Application for State & Federal Aid to Public Transportation, City Council authorized the local match necessary to apply for Federal and State grants to fund Charlottesville Area Transit expenses, including both Capital and non-Capital projects. The Capital portion of the application will help fund the purchase of one (1) On-Board Surveillance System for CAT’s fleet of 36 buses, (2) Consulting Services to conduct a Review of CAT’s current Transit System and Routes; as well as funds for (3) Purchase and installation of shelter and other transit amenities.

Transit has sufficient funds in the budget for the required match for these projects due to unallocated fund balance held in CIP.

The final Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) operating award, which includes a one-year only “transition assistance” amount of \$64,705, is \$12,056 *less than* appropriated in the FY2020 budget. An additional \$221,227 was received from the State to help in covering COVID-19 Emergency Operational cost during current State of Emergency. The final Federal Transit Administration (FTA) operating award is \$373,405 *greater than* appropriated for in the FY2020 budget. The increase in FTA operating funding is due to CAT recouping 5% of FY18 & FY19 allocated operating funding, which had been withheld from CAT and all Virginia recipients of 5307 funding until such a time as the FTA certified WMATA’s Virginia State Safety Oversight Program. This o FTA is releasing those previously withheld funds.

Additionally, the FTA has awarded \$669,030 to JAUNT (which includes 24% of the total 5% withholding). The City acts as fiscal agent and 5307 funds for JAUNT must pass through the City. A supplemental appropriation is requested for project revenues/expenses that include:

The City of Charlottesville is responsible for a 50% match of all federal operating funds.

Transit Grants by Type	FY 2020 Budget	FY2020 Award	Appropriation
State Operating assistance	\$1,945,749	\$2,154,920	\$209,171
Federal Operating assistance	\$1,637,736	\$2,011,141	\$373,405
TOTAL OPERATING AWARD	\$3,583,485	\$4,166,061	\$582,576
TOTAL JAUNT (Pass-through Funds)	\$0	\$669,030	\$669,030

State Capital award	\$0	106,400	\$106,400
Federal Capital award	\$0	\$584,500	\$584,500
Local CIP match P-00334	-	\$79,100	\$79,100
TOTAL CAPITAL		\$770,000	\$770,000
TOTAL APPROPRIATION REQUEST			\$2,021,606

Community Engagement:

Charlottesville Area Transit utilizes the Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Public Participation Plan to fulfill its public engagement requirements. The MPO’s PPP includes an opportunity for members of the public to request a public hearing on CAT’s Program of Projects. No public hearing was requested.

Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Priority Areas:

Approval of this agenda item aligns directly with Council’s vision for Charlottesville as a Connected Community, where the City is part of a comprehensive, transportation system that enables citizens of all ages and incomes to easily navigate our community. It also aligns with Strategic Plan Goal 3: A Beautiful and Sustainable Natural and Built Environment, Objective 3.3 Provide a variety of transportation and mobility options.

Budget Impact:

There is no impact to the General Fund. The local match requirement for Operating Assistance will be covered through the City’s contribution from the General Fund and Albemarle County’s contribution and was previously appropriated as part of the FY 2020 Adopted Budget. Emergency COVID-19 Funding will have no impact on General Funds as the local match for these funds was at zero percent. The local share for Capital Projects will be covered through previously appropriated funding in the CIP. The pass through of grant funds for JAUNT has no budget impact for the General Fund.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval and appropriation of funds.

Alternatives:

City Council may choose not to appropriate match funds. Without an appropriation, CAT will not receive grants funds to support its operations or planned capital projects.

Attachments:

Appropriation

APPROPRIATION
Transit Division Project Funds
\$2,021,606

WHEREAS, State Operating Grants of \$2,154,920 and Federal Operating Grant of \$2,011,141 have been awarded to the City of Charlottesville, the combined amounts of operating grants are \$582,576 more than previously budgeted; and

WHEREAS, a Federal Capital Grant of \$584,500 and a State Capital Grant of \$106,400 have been awarded to the City of Charlottesville; and

WHEREAS, a Federal Grant has been awarded to JAUNT in the amount of \$669,030 and these funds must pass through the City of Charlottesville; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the following is hereby appropriated in the following manner, contingent upon receipt of the grant funds:

Revenue (Operating)

(12,056)	Fund: 245	Cost Center: 2801003000	G/L: 430080 State Assistance
\$221,227	Fund:245	Cost Center: 2801001000	G/L: 430080 State Assistance
		(2200037 Internal Order Number)	
\$373,405	Fund: 245	Cost Center: 2801003000	G/L: 431010 Federal Assistance

Expenditures (Operating)

\$582,576	Fund: 245	Cost Center: 2801003000	G/L: 599999 Lump Sum
-----------	-----------	-------------------------	----------------------

Revenue (Capital)

\$106,400	Fund: 245	Cost Center: 2804001000	G/L: 430110 St Grants
\$584,500	Fund: 245	Cost Center: 2804001000	G/L: 431110 Fed Grants

Expenditures (Capital)

\$770,000	Fund: 245	Cost Center: 2804001000	G/L: 541040 Acq. Com-Veh.
-----------	-----------	-------------------------	---------------------------

Revenue (JAUNT)

\$669,030	Fund: 245	Cost Center: 2821002000	G/L: 431010 Fed Assistance
-----------	-----------	-------------------------	----------------------------

Expenditures (JAUNT)

\$669,030	Fund: 245	Cost Center: 2821002000	G/L: 540365 JAUNT Payment
-----------	-----------	-------------------------	---------------------------

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of \$2,261,320 from the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation and \$3,264,671 from the Federal Transit Administration.

This page intentionally left blank

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



Agenda Date:	May 4, 2020
Action Required:	Appropriation
Presenter:	Mike Rogers, Deputy Chief – Business Services, Charlottesville Fire Department
Staff Contacts:	Mike Rogers, Deputy Chief – Business Services, Charlottesville Fire Department
Title:	Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) Provider Relief Fund - \$58,201.02

Background:

President Trump is providing support to healthcare providers fighting the COVID-19 pandemic. The President signed the bipartisan CARES legislation that provides \$100 billion in relief funds to hospitals and other healthcare providers on the front lines of the coronavirus response. Recognizing the importance of delivering funds in a fast and transparent manner, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) is distributing \$30 billion of the relief funds immediately. **These are payments to healthcare providers, not loans, and will not need to be repaid.**

Discussion:

Billing entities who received Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) reimbursements in 2019 are eligible for this initial rapid distribution. Providers will receive a portion of the initial \$30 billion distribution based on their share of total Medicare FFS reimbursements in 2019. Within 30 days of receiving the payment, you must sign an attestation confirming receipt of the funds and agreeing to the terms and conditions of payment. Not returning the payment within 30 days of receipt will be viewed as acceptance of the Terms and Conditions.

The Recipient certifies that the Payment will only be used to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus, and shall reimburse the Recipient only for health care related expenses or lost revenues that are attributable to coronavirus.

Alignment with Council Vision Areas and Strategic Plan:

The CARES Act Provider Relief Fund payment helps the department support the City's mission "We provide services that promote equity and an excellent quality of life in our community". With this additional funding being put back into the operational accounts we are better able to prepare and equip our responders to deliver emergency services, students, business community members,

and guests of the City during this pandemic.

The CARES Act Provider Relief Fund payment also aligns with Goal 2.1, Reduce adverse impact from sudden injury and illness and the effects of chronic disease, as well as the elements within Goal 5 - A Well-managed and Responsive Organization.

Community Engagement:

N/A

Budgetary Impact:

There is no impact to the General Fund, as this is a direct relief payment from HHS that does not require a City match or repayment.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval and appropriation of the relief funds.

Alternatives:

If the CARES Act Provider Relief Funds are not appropriated, the Fire Department will not be able to utilize this supplemental funding to cover planning, preparation, and/or equipment costs already incurred or projected for this initial and any subsequent outbreaks of coronavirus.

Attachments:

N/A

APPROPRIATION

Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act)

Provider Relief Fund - \$58,201.02

WHEREAS, the US Department of Health and Human Services has awarded a relief payment to the Fire Department, through the City of Charlottesville, specifically for coronavirus planning and response applications;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that a total of \$58,201.02 be appropriated in the following manner:

Revenues - \$58,201.02

\$58,201.02 Fund: 105 I/O: 2000158 G/L Account: 431130

Expenditures - \$58,201.02

\$58,201.02 Fund: 105 I/O: 2000158 G/L Account: 599999

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of \$58,201.02 from the US Department of Health and Human Services.

This page intentionally left blank

**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**



Agenda Date:	May 4, 2020
Action Requested:	Resolution
Presenter:	Brenda Kelley, Redevelopment Manager
Staff Contacts:	Dr. Tarron Richardson, City Manager Lisa Robertson, Deputy City Attorney Brenda Kelley, Redevelopment Manager, City Manager's Office John Sales, Housing Program Coordinator
Title:	Approving retroactive funding for administration of the Charlottesville Supplemental Rental Assistance Program (CSRAP)

Background:

On June 19, 2017, City Council approved the Housing Advisory Committee's (HAC) recommendation for the creation of a supplemental rental assistance program for the City of Charlottesville. In October 2017, the City Council approved the Charlottesville Supplemental Rental Assistance Program (CSRAP) and funding for the program. The Grant Agreement between the City and the Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA) was executed in January 2018. The first voucher was issued in April 2018.

Currently, City Council has approved total funding for this program in the amount of \$2,595,000 (\$900,000 in FY17/18; \$945,000 in FY18/19; \$750,000 in FY19/20). As continued funding is approved through the annual budget process, this Agreement will need to come back before City Council to extend the program prior to its expiration on June 30th of each year.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which provides funding to the CRHA and regulates administration of public housing and Housing Choice Vouchers, has been working closely with CRHA staff on operational, managerial, and redevelopment functions. HUD identified a concern that federal dollars were being used to administer a city-funded voucher program.

Discussion:

At its meeting on March 16, 2020, City Council approved an amendment to the CSRAP program to allow a portion of the approved program funding, allocated by the city for this program, to be used to

cover administrative costs incurred by CRHA to administer this program. However, that approval applied to administration of the current program going forward. HUD still has concerns with previous federal resources being used on prior administering of the program. **Therefore, staff requests that the City Council approve current CSRAP funding allocations to be applied to administration of the program between January 2018 and December 2019.**

CRHA submitted information regarding actual allocations for CSRAP. From January 2018 through December 2019, \$1,056,745.90 in funds were used for housing. 7.5% of those disbursed funds equals \$79,255.94. If approved, the funding will be allocated to CRHA to reimburse for administration of the city-funded CSRAP program, from the existing program funding. Currently, the balances for previous allocations of CSRAP are as follows:

FY18 - \$900,000 allocated - balance of \$83,254.10, which serves as the required reserve balance
FY19 - \$945,000 allocated - balance of \$205,068.55
FY20 - \$750,000 allocated - balance of \$750,000
Proposed FY21 allocation - \$900,000

Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:

The provision of vouchers to subsidize low-income housing opportunities supports City Council’s visions of Quality Housing Opportunities for All; A Green City; Community of Mutual Respect; and Smart, Citizen-Focused Government. In addition, this program supports the following:

Strategic Plan Goals:

- Goal 1.3: Increase affordable housing options
- Goal 2.3: Improve community health and safety outcomes by connecting residents with effective resources (aligning health care with provision of housing for the elderly and disabled)

Comprehensive Plan Goals:

- Goal 3.1: Continue to work toward the City’s goal of 15% supported affordable housing by 2025.
- Goal 5: Support projects and public/private partnerships (i.e., private, non-profits, private developers and governmental agencies) for affordable housing, including workforce housing and mixed-use, and mixed-income developments.
- Goal 5.7: Support housing programs at the local and regional level that encourage mixed-income neighborhoods and discourage the isolation of very low and low income households.
- Goal 7: Offer a range of housing options to meet the needs of Charlottesville’s residents, including those presently underserved, in order to create vibrant residential areas or reinvigorate existing ones.

Community Engagement:

At its February 19th meeting, HAC discussed this item. A recommendation was made by HAC for the City Council to approve additional funding be added to the existing program funding in order to cover administrative costs.

Budgetary Impact:

This request does not encumber any additional funding from the City budget. A portion of the existing program funding will be used to cover costs incurred by CRHA for previous administration of the program.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends City Council approve the attached Resolution.

Alternatives:

City Council could choose to not approve the supporting Resolution which may effectively end this program, and the HUD-funded Housing Choice Voucher program, and negatively affect the provision of housing assistance currently providing relief for some of our most vulnerable families.

Attachments:

Resolution

RESOLUTION
APPROVING RETROACTIVE FUNDING FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE
CHARLOTTESVILLE SUPPLEMENTAL RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
(CSRAP)

WHEREAS, on June 19, 2017 the City of Charlottesville approved the creation of a City-funded Supplemental Rental Assistance Program (“CSRAP”), which will be administered by Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (“CRHA”); and

WHEREAS, on March 16, 2020, City Council approved an amendment to the CSRAP program to allow a portion of the approved program funding, allocated by the city for this program, to be used to cover administrative costs incurred by CRHA to administer this program;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that fees for administration of the program between January 2018 and December 2019 shall be paid to CRHA from the funds previously appropriated to the CSRAP program.

Expense

\$79,255.94 Fund: 426 WBS Element: P-01019 GL Code: 599999

Approved by Council
May 4, 2020

Kyna Thomas
Clerk of Council

This page intentionally left blank

**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**



Agenda Date:	May 4, 2020
Action Required:	Ordinance Enactment
Presenter:	Todd D. Divers, Commissioner of the Revenue John C. Blair, II, City Attorney
Staff Contacts:	Todd D. Divers, Commissioner of the Revenue John C. Blair, II, City Attorney
Title:	Rental Relief Program Deadline Extension

Background:

Charlottesville City Code Section 25-56 et seq. establishes the City’s Rental Relief for the Elderly and Disabled Persons Program (hereinafter “Program”).

In order to qualify for the Program, individuals claiming the grant must fill out an affidavit on an annual basis with the Commissioner of the Revenue. The affidavit must be filed with the Commissioner of the Revenue by May 1 of each calendar year pursuant to Charlottesville City Code Section 25-59.

Discussion:

On March 12, 2020, the Charlottesville City Council authorized Charlottesville City Manager, Dr. Taron J. Richardson, to issue a Declaration of Emergency due to the potential spread of COVID-19. Subsequent to Dr. Richardson’s Declaration of Emergency, Virginia Governor, Ralph S. Northam, issued a series of Executive Orders implementing social distancing practices across the Commonwealth of Virginia.

On March 16, 2020, the Charlottesville City Council enacted an emergency ordinance to extend Charlottesville City Code Section 25-59’s deadline from May 1, 2020 to June 1, 2020.

Commissioner of the Revenue Todd Divers is requesting that Council enact another emergency ordinance to extend the Program’s deadline from May 1, 2020 to September 1, 2020. Additionally, the ordinance states that no medical doctor’s statement shall be required to accompany the affidavit in 2020.

Alternatives:

The Council could decline to adopt the Ordinance.

Attachments:

Ordinance

**ORDINANCE EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED
INDIVIDUALS TO SUBMIT APPLICATIONS PURSUANT TO CHARLOTTESVILLE
CITY CODE SECTION 25-59**

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville City Council authorized Charlottesville City Manager, Dr. Taron J. Richardson, to issue a Declaration of Emergency on March 12, 2020 in order to prevent the spread of COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, Virginia Governor, Ralph S. Northam, issued a series of Executive Orders in response to COVID-19 which implement social distancing practices across the Commonwealth of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the effects of COVID-19 have interrupted the practices of many of the City of Charlottesville's residents including the transaction of government business in a timely manner.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the deadline for elderly and disabled individuals to submit applications and affidavits to the City for the rent relief program is September 1, 2020 pursuant to City Code Chapter 25, Section 25-59. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sec. 25-59(a), the City's Commissioner of Revenue is hereby authorized to extend the deadline for filing applications and affidavits to September 1, 2020, and no medical doctor's statement shall be required to accompany any affidavit received for this year's rental relief applications.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Charlottesville City Code Section 2-97, this Ordinance was passed with the requisite four-fifths votes necessary to adopt an Ordinance on the date of its introduction.

This page intentionally left blank



CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

Agenda Date:	May 4, 2020
Action Required:	Public Hearing and Approval
Presenter:	Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator
Staff Contacts:	Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator
Title:	Approval of FY 2020-2021 Annual Action Plan

Background:

The Consolidated Plan sets forth goals to support our community development needs over a five-year period (2018 – 2022) for low and moderate income individuals in the City and counties that make up the Planning District. The current five year Consolidated Plan was adopted at the May 7, 2018 City Council Meeting.

Discussion:

Each year localities are required to complete an Action Plan that details goals and objectives to be carried out in the upcoming program year. This is the third Action Plan of the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan. This document also serves as the City's application for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District's application for HOME funds. It is due, in its final form, to HUD on May 15th or after the HUD allocations have been published.

Community Engagement:

On February 18, 2020 and March 5, 2020 the proposed FY 20-21 CDBG and HOME budget came before the CDBG/HOME Taskforce for discussion. The CDBG and HOME budget/action plan is planned to have a virtual public hearing at the Water Street Center of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission on May 7, 2020 and an additional virtual public hearing will be held by Council at the May 4th meeting.

The Action Plan has been advertised for a thirty-day comment period (March 26th – April 26th 2020) before being sent to HUD for approval. The Action Plan was sent to Charlottesville Neighborhood community members for comment. The Housing Directors Council had an opportunity to make comments on the Action Plan virtually during the thirty-day comment period. Comments received from Housing Directors will be incorporated into the Action Plan. The plan is in draft form pending approval from Council at the May 4th meeting. Following approval of the

Action Plan, data will be entered in the HUD database (IDIS) which will then create a final formatted version of the Action Plan.

The Participation section of the Action Plan summarizes all community engagement efforts, as well as all comment received and incorporated into the plan.

Alignment with City Council Vision and Strategic Areas:

Approval of this agenda item aligns directly with Council’s vision for Charlottesville to have **Economic Sustainability, A Center for Lifelong Learning, Quality Housing Opportunities for All, and A Connected Community**. It contributes to variety of Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives including: Goal 1: Inclusive, Self-sufficient Community; Goal 3: Beautiful Environment; Goal 4: Strong, Diversified Economy; and Goal 5: Responsive Organization.

Budgetary Impact:

The HOME program requires the City to provide a 25% match. The sum necessary to meet the FY 2020-2021 match is \$20,148.50, which will need to be appropriated out of the Charlottesville Housing Fund (CP-0084) at a future date. The Action Plan will have no additional budgetary impacts.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the 2020-2021 Action Plan of the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan. Funds will not be available or eligible to be spent until HUD releases funds.

Alternatives:

No alternatives are proposed.

Attachments:

Action Plan Resolution
Priority Neighborhood Resolution
2020-2021 Annual Action Plan – Draft <https://www.charlottesville.gov/678/CDBG-HOME-Programs>

RESOLUTION
Approval of FY 2020-2021 Annual Action Plan

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, hereby approves the FY 2020 - 2021 Action Plan of the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan as presented at the May 4, 2020, City Council meeting. All CDBG and HOME project estimates shall be increased or reduced at the same pro-rated percentage of actual entitlement. No agency's EN amount will increase more than their initial funding request.

**A RESOLUTION
PRIORITY NEIGHBORHOOD FUNDS
FOR RIDGE
FY 20-21**

WHEREAS, on September 16, 2019, City Council of the City of Charlottesville recommended Ridge as the priority neighborhood for FY 20-21;

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the funds for FY 20-21 shall be allocated as follows:

- The allocation for FY 20-21 shall be allocated to Ridge.
- The allocation for Ridge Street shall be allocated simultaneously for FY 21-22 and FY 2022-2023.

In total, each neighborhood (Belmont and Ridge) will receive a total of three years of funding respectively.

**FY 20 - 21
ACTION PLAN
for the
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
and the
THOMAS JEFFERSON HOME CONSORTIUM**

**Draft for Public Comment
Comments accepted March 26 to April 26**

**Public Hearing
Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission
Water Street Center, 407 E. Water Street
May 7, 2020, 7:00 p.m.**



**Public Hearing
City Council
May 4, 2020, 6:30 p.m.**



I. INTRODUCTION

The Consolidated Plan for 2018-2022 set forth an overall plan to support community development needs, including housing needs, in the Thomas Jefferson Planning District and in the City of Charlottesville. The Action Plan for FY 2020-2021 re-affirms the goals expressed in the region’s Consolidated Plan, which was developed and adopted in May 2018. The Consolidated Plan is a five-year document that guides the specific activities developed annually through the Action Plan. Both the Consolidated Plan and the annual Action Plan guide the use of federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds received annually by the City of Charlottesville and the federal HOME funds received annually by the Thomas Jefferson HOME Consortium. Consortium members include the City of Charlottesville and the counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa, and Nelson.

The member governments of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District agreed on an equal share basis of HOME funds available to each participating government (with towns included with their respective counties) with the exception of 15% of the total HOME funds, which are reserved for the Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) set aside. The CHDO funds are rotated among the participating localities. The City of Charlottesville has been designated the lead agency for the HOME Consortium and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission the designated Program Manager for the Consortium.

This Action Plan identifies specific activities to be undertaken with the funds during the program year from July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021 as a means of fulfilling the goals stated in the Consolidated Plan. The objectives and outcomes of the Annual Action Plan for 2020-2021 are linked to the priority 5-Year Goals set forth in the Consolidated Plan.

Summary of Local Goals from the 2019 Consolidated Plan and FY 2020-2021 Measurable Objectives

Note: Unless otherwise designated, the Objective for 2021-2021 activities is “Decent Housing” and the Outcome is “Affordability”

Locality: Albemarle			
Housing or Community Development Need Addressed:	5 Year Broad Goal from Strategic Plan:	2020 - 2021 1 Year Measurable Objective from Action Plan:	Source of Funds to Achieve Goal:
Housing conditions are substandard and not energy efficient.	Leverage a variety of funds to rehabilitate 8 to 10 owner-occupied homes per year.	9 (HOME)	HOME (\$58,732) CDBG

Locality: Charlottesville			
Housing or Community Development Need Addressed:	5 Year Broad Goal from Strategic Plan:	2020 - 2021 1 Year Measurable Objective from Action Plan:	Source of Funds to Achieve Goal:
Housing conditions are substandard and not energy efficient.	Provide emergency repairs to 25-30 homes per year.	10 major homeowner rehabilitations.	CDBG \$78,550.12 HOME \$33,507.84
First time HB opportunities, housing cost-burden	Enable 7-10 eligible low/moderate income families per year to become homeowners.	Provide down payment assistance to 14 low/moderate income families	HOME \$47,086.16
Homelessness, discrimination, ex-offender re-entry	Facilitate expansion and coordination of rapid-rehousing, permanent supportive housing, and associated services for the homeless population.	Provide 41 homeless persons access to services through a coordinated entry system	CDBG \$53,354.58
Lack of training provided by employers	Conduct training sessions	Assist 15-20 low/moderate income persons with business development (technical assistance)	CDBG \$15,000
Transportation access barriers	Support Infrastructure Improvements	Provide streetscape improvements to improve pedestrian safety in the Ridge Street neighborhoods	CDBG \$201,912.90
Lack of safe public spaces	Collaborate to Fund Projects Expand Financing Capacity	Provide neighborhood improvements to improve public safety in the Ridge Street neighborhoods	CDBG \$201,912.90
Locality: Fluvanna			
Housing or Community Development Need Addressed:	5 Year Broad Goal from Strategic Plan:	2020 - 2021 1 Year Measurable Objective from Action Plan:	Source of Funds to Achieve Goal:
First-time HB	Enable 3 eligible families to become homeowners	Provide down-payment assistance to 1 family	Program Income: \$4,000
Housing conditions are substandard and not energy efficient.	Rehabilitate 3 homes that are deemed substandard	1 major homeowner rehabilitation	Program Income: \$4,000

Risk of homelessness, housing options	Create new rental units affordable to very-low/low income residents of Fluvanna County or Town of Columbia	Build one new rental unit homes in Fluvanna	HOME: \$80,594 Program Income: \$20,000
Locality: Louisa			
Housing or Community Development Need Addressed:	5 Year Broad Goal from Strategic Plan:	2020 - 2021 1 Year Measurable Objective from Action Plan:	Source of Funds to Achieve Goal:
Housing conditions are substandard and not energy efficient.	Rehabilitate 1-2 homes per year that are deemed substandard	Major rehab on one home	HOME: \$11,614
Risk of homelessness, cost-burden, doubling up	Create 3 new rental units affordable to very-low/low income residents of Louisa County	Purchase lot and build one new rental unit	HOME: \$68,980 Program Income: \$19,000
First-time HB	Enable 3 eligible families to become homeowners	Provide down payment assistance to one family	Program Income: \$4,000
Locality: Nelson			
Housing or Community Development Need Addressed:	5 Year Broad Goal from Strategic Plan:	2020 - 2021 1 Year Measurable Objective from Action Plan:	Source of Funds to Achieve Goal:
Risk of homelessness, cost-burden	Develop 1-2 affordable rental units per year near community services at a scale consistent with the rural character of county.	Develop one additional rental unit on NCCDF land	HOME: \$55,000, Program Income: \$14,000
Housing conditions are substandard and not energy efficient.	Rehabilitate 4-6 substandard owner-occupied homes per year with an emphasis on those without complete indoor plumbing.	Rehabilitate 4-6 substandard owner-occupied homes with emphasis on accessibility and lacking complete indoor plumbing.	HOME: \$25,954: Program Income: \$10,000
First-time HB, cost-burden	Assist 1-2 First-Time Homebuyers with an emphasis on those who have received home ownership counseling.	Assist 1 – 2 First Time Homebuyers with closing cost assistance, home ownership counseling.	Program Income: \$6,000

Locality: Greene			
Housing or Community Development Need Addressed:	5 Year Broad Goal from Strategic Plan:	2020- 2021 1 Year Measurable Objective from Action Plan:	Source of Funds to Achieve Goal:
Housing conditions are substandard and not energy efficient.	Rehabilitate 1 home	Rehab one home in FY21	HOME (\$20,000), State IPR funds, Program Income
First-time HB	Enable 1-2 eligible families per year to become homeowners.	Build and subsidize 1 home for 1 st time homebuyers	HOME: \$21,899; Program Income: \$50,000

The sub-recipients in the HOME Consortium currently have \$143,865.85 in program income on hand. These funds are programmed for PY20 projects as follows.

**2020-2021 HOME Projects
Projected Use of Program Income**

Project	Program Income on hand
Albemarle Rehabilitation	\$3,965.85
Charlottesville First-time Homebuyers	0
Charlottesville Substantial Rehab	0
Fluvanna Rehab	\$6,100.00
Fluvanna New Rental Units	\$20,000.00
Fluvanna Assistance to First Time Homebuyers	\$4,000.00
Greene Rental	\$50,000.00
Louisa Assistance to First Time Homebuyers	\$4,000.00
Louisa Rehabilitation	\$6,800.00
Louisa New Rental Units	\$19,000.00
Nelson Assistance to First Time Homebuyers	\$6,000.00
Nelson Rehabilitation	\$10,000.00
Nelson Rental Development	\$14,000.00
TOTAL	\$143,865.85

II. RESOURCES

A. Federal

This plan is based on allocations for 2020-2021 (July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021): Charlottesville's FY 20-21 CDBG Entitlement Grant is \$419,367 and HOME funds for the region are \$644,752. The breakdown of Consortium estimated funds by locality, and by eligible Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs) is as follows:

Administrative Funds: (10%)	\$64,475.20
HOME Program Funds:	\$644,752.00
Albemarle:	\$80,594.00
Charlottesville:	\$80,594.00
Fluvanna:	\$80,594.00
Greene:	\$80,594.00
Louisa:	\$80,594.00
Nelson:	\$80,594.00
CHDO Set-Aside (15%)	\$96,712.80
Total:	\$644,752.00

The sub-recipients in the HOME Consortium currently have \$143,865.85 in program income on hand. These funds are programmed for PY19 projects as follows.

2020-2021 HOME Projects Projected Use of Program Income

Project	Program Income on hand
Albemarle Rehabilitation	\$3,965.85
Charlottesville First-time Homebuyers	0
Charlottesville Substantial Rehab	0
Fluvanna Rehab	\$6,100.00
Fluvanna New Rental Units	\$20,000.00
Fluvanna Assistance to First Time Homebuyers	\$4,000.00
Greene Rental	\$50,000.00
Louisa Assistance to First Time Homebuyers	\$4,000.00
Louisa Rehabilitation	\$6,800.00
Louisa New Rental Units	\$19,000.00
Nelson Assistance to First Time Homebuyers	\$6,000.00
Nelson Rehabilitation	\$10,000.00
Nelson Rental Development	\$14,000.00
TOTAL	\$143,865.85

III. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTS

The following list of proposed projects details the proposed projects to be undertaken using HOME funds beginning in fiscal year 2020-2021 (beginning July 1, 2020). These projects reflect a one-year implementation plan consistent with the five-year goals approved in the 2018 Consolidated Plan, which are included above in the Introduction to this Action Plan.

Albemarle County

- Rehabilitate 9 owner-occupied homes. Estimated Home Investment: \$58,732. Program Income: \$3,965.85.

Charlottesville

- Complete 10 housing rehabilitation projects for low to moderate-income homeowners in substandard housing in the City of Charlottesville and provide 14 low/mod income families with down-payment assistance. Estimated HOME investment: \$80,594. Program Income: \$18,593.91. CDBG projects are listed in the attached budget.

Fluvanna

- Perform major rehab on one home. Estimated Program Income: \$4,000
- Provide down-payment assistance to 1 family. Estimated Program Income: \$4,000
- Build one new rental home. Estimated HOME Investment: \$80,594. Estimated Program Income: \$20,000.

Greene

- Develop one affordable home for purchase. HOME funds \$58,695. Program Income: \$50,000
- Rehabilitate one home: HOME funds \$21,899
- Assist two 1st time homebuyers with down payment and/or closing cost support: \$8,000

Louisa

- Perform major rehab on one home. Estimated HOME Investment \$11,614. Estimated Program Income: \$6,800.
- Provide down-payment assistance to 1 family. Estimated Program Income: \$4,000
- Purchase lot and build one new rental unit: Estimated HOME Investment: \$68,980. Estimated Program Income: \$19,000.

Nelson

- Develop one additional rental unit on NCCDF land. Estimated HOME Investment: \$55,000. Estimated Program Income: \$14,000
- Rehabilitate 4-6 substandard owner-occupied homes with emphasis on accessibility and lacking complete indoor plumbing. Estimated Home Investment: \$25,954. Estimated Program Income: \$10,000 Provide
- Provide assistance to 1-2 First Time Home Buyers with closing cost assistance and home ownership counseling. Program Income: \$6,000.

CHDO Set-aside: Build one new homeownership unit in Albemarle County: Estimated HOME Investment: \$118,524.50.

Annual CHDO set-aside funds are used in just one of the six localities with the CHDO funds rotating through all six localities over a six-year period. This allows for an equal share distribution of CHDO funds and provides sufficient funding for a bigger project in each locality. Funds can be used flexibly (loans, grants, or a combination of the two) at the discretion of the

locality and the non-profit. Based on the rotation schedule and project readiness, Albemarle County is the next locality in the CHDO rotation for 2020-2021, but may not have a project ready to move forward.

IV. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

HOME funds will be distributed throughout the entire planning district, which includes the Counties of Albemarle, Greene, Fluvanna, Louisa, and Nelson and the City of Charlottesville. The CHDO project is assigned to localities on a rotating basis, based on an established rotation schedule. Remaining HOME project funds available are allocated to the six localities in equal amounts. Each locality retains its own Program Income, so amounts vary among the localities.

In Charlottesville, the CDBG Priority Neighborhood for FY 20-21 is Ridge for its first year. Potential projects include pedestrian and accessibility improvements. All other CDBG projects will be focused citywide.

V. HOMELESS AND OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS ACTIVITIES

The annual Homeless Strategy is derived from the revised Community Plan to End Homelessness. The Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homelessness (TJACH) adopted a revised plan on March 25, 2015. The revised plan provides a broad strategic vision for TJACH and the homelessness system of care including specific target reductions in homelessness subpopulations. TJACH's primary mission is to make homelessness rare, brief and nonrecurring in this community. Guiding principles identified in the revised plan include a) focusing on the most vulnerable homeless population, b) adopting and implementing housing first strategies, c) using best practices, d) making decisions based on community-level data, e) advocating for a broad and effective system of care beyond housing and homelessness services, f) increasing housing options for the very poor and people with barriers, and g) providing strong regional leadership.

ONE-YEAR GOALS AND ACTIONS FOR REDUCING AND ENDING HOMELESSNESS

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs:

The Haven operates a low-barrier day shelter open seven days a week as a resource and respite center for people experiencing homelessness. Coordinated assessment is provided every day at The Haven to assess housing barriers and needs, make appropriate referrals, and connect people to prevention, rapid re-housing and permanent supportive housing resources. A PATH Street Outreach program is well-established in this community, which provides two outreach workers, one at Region Ten (full-time) and the other at On Our Own (32 hours per week). These PATH workers are responsible for conducting outreach on the streets, at soup kitchens, and at campsites where people experiencing homelessness congregate in order to assess and provide resources for people with untreated mental health issues. The PATH program participates in the bi-weekly Community Case Review to accept referrals from partner agencies and conducts weekly outreach at the local low-barrier, day shelter, The Haven. In addition, The Haven supports an outreach worker that specializes on substance abuse assessment and referral, conducting outreach at the day shelter and in public places. TJACH uses the Vulnerability Index Service Provision Decision-Making Tool (VI-SPDAT) to determine eligibility and priority for rapid re-housing resources and a brief pre-screener developed by Andrew Greer and Marybeth Shinn to determine eligibility and priority for prevention resources. In addition, a vulnerability index is used to assess medical vulnerability for prioritized access to permanent supportive housing resources.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

This community maintains four emergency shelter programs including a high barrier shelter at the Salvation Army, a low barrier seasonal shelter at PACEM, a domestic violence shelter at Shelter for Help in Emergency and a small shelter dedicated to homeless and runaway youth. As documented in the Needs Assessment and Market Analysis, emergency shelters are currently adequately providing for the needs of homeless individuals. However, the number of homeless families is increasing, and the plan calls for increased resources to meet these changing needs. Specifically, these needs could be met by converting existing transitional housing beds to dedicated emergency shelter beds for families and by expanding access to emergency financial assistance programs. In the meantime, this community uses funds from the Virginia Homelessness Solutions Program administered by the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development to provide emergency hotel/motel vouchers to families experiencing literal

homelessness that are unable to access shelter through the Salvation Army. Transitional housing needs will be met predominantly through rapid rehousing programs. The CoC receives funding from the state's Virginia Homelessness Solutions Program grant to support an effective rapid rehousing program, based at The Haven. Support for a Housing Navigator position has been provided by the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County human services funding process. The Salvation Army's transitional program is not currently in operation. The Monticello Area Community Action Agency (MACAA) provides transitional housing through their Hope House. Both MACAA and the Salvation Army are seeking private funds for ongoing operations. A primary goal of the system of care is to reduce the amount of time individuals and families experience homelessness and stay in shelters. Data is actively collected and reviewed on average lengths of stay in all shelters.

Helping homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

Integrating housing opportunities with ongoing case management support has been identified as a priority for this CoC. Funding support for housing-focused supportive services has been requested from local funders in order to improve this community's capacity to provide housing stabilization services. With the support of a Community Case Review process, we will work to build a pathway from shelters or street to stable housing and build an inventory of participating landlords. A primary goal for the following year is to assess local data to determine a more strategic way to use public resources, integrate a rapid re-housing triage methodology and reduce shelter stays. Early efforts have yielded a significant increase in the amount of rapid re-housing funding from the state and from local government.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless

Prevention strategies include interventions immediately prior to homelessness occurring, adequate case management during the transition out of homelessness to prevent relapse, and support during a discharge from institutional housing. The State's Virginia Homelessness Solutions Program has provided funds for homelessness prevention. Local prevention funds prioritize households with a previous experience of homelessness. The Jefferson Area OAR have recently been trained to assist their clients with securing SSI/SSDI support rapidly to have sufficient income to prevent recidivism, and this form of counseling will be practiced over the following year. City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County Departments of Social Services leadership serve on CoC governance and actively work to improve access to mainstream resources for people experiencing housing crisis. This fiscal year, the prevention program has served 122 people with a short-term subsidy to get into or remain in stable housing. 100% of these households have successfully avoided homelessness as a result. The community recently partnered together to create an Emergency Assistance line for people to call when they are experiencing a housing crisis.

VI. NEEDS OF PUBLIC HOUSING

Introduction

Public housing is owned and operated by the Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA) and all units are contained within the City limits of Charlottesville. This section outlines plans to provide this resource and improve the current stock of housing.

Actions planned during the next year to address the needs of public housing.

The Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA) provides housing and tenant support to the City's lowest income population; however, given dwindling HUD resources, CRHA has been forced to concentrate efforts on landlord / tenant responsibilities, with limited resources for public outreach, advocacy and social supports. CRHA relies heavily on community partners to provide on-site and other opportunities for youth and adults in public housing. The agency's overall goal with supporting such programs is to facilitate and encourage residents' efforts towards success and independence. CRHA continues to work closely with the Charlottesville Public Housing Association of Residents (PHAR) in their efforts to provide resident outreach, resident leadership development / capacity building, and resident advocacy.

More recently, in conjunction with PHAR and a committee of community stakeholders, CRHA has embarked on significant redevelopment planning efforts. In support of these efforts, the City of Charlottesville has recently approved funding for assistance to support CRHA with operations and redevelopment. This funding includes support for Redevelopment Project Coordinator and Relocation Specialist positions; redevelopment activities associated with Crescent Halls; professional surveying and environmental survey services; relocation and moving services for Crescent Halls residents; "parallel track"/repairs and rehab at other sites; redevelopment legal counsel redevelopment admin/overhead costs; funding to support TING providing free installation of internet services to public housing residents; and miscellaneous redevelopment planning expenses. The goal of redevelopment is to transform the public housing sites into vital mixed-income and mixed-use (where appropriate) communities to the greatest extent possible, while maintaining a respectful relationship with the surrounding neighborhoods. The City has also proposed \$15 million in funding over the next five years to continue to support public housing redevelopment efforts.

The Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund has reserved funds (and proposed future funding) for a Supplemental Rental Assistance Program administered by CRHA. This voucher program provides approximately 75 vouchers, annually, for households who are homeless and for Housing Choice Voucher Program eligible households.

CRHA has recently hired staff to specifically focus on Section 3 initiatives. This work will assist public housing residents with job training and direct participation in redeveloping CRHA's own properties.

Actions to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

The Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA) continues to examine the potential to sell off its inventory of individual houses to current occupants or other CRHA residents. Dependent upon funding restrictions and implications for the release of the HUD

declaration of trust, CRHA may like to potentially sell one or more of these units to facilitate homeownership opportunities while also helping stabilize the organization's financial situation.

CRHA continues to work with Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville and Piedmont Housing Alliance to help public housing residents and other interested eligible households identify and locate other housing options. Working to develop these public and private partnerships helps to provide the community with greater housing choices and better quality of life.

The Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA) continues to give preference to homeless individuals in its public housing and housing voucher programs, as a way of helping local residents transition to permanent housing. Since many formerly-homeless individuals require a range of support services to keep them stable in their housing, CRHA is now working with a coalition of local organizations, City officials and Virginia Supportive Housing to develop a second Permanent Supportive Housing facility for our community, building on the success of the first such property (the Crossings at Fourth and Preston). Approx. 40 units at this second facility would be reserved for the chronically homeless, which would go a long way toward ending chronic homelessness in Charlottesville. A potential location and some potential funding sources have already been identified for this new facility and, if this planning process bears fruit, construction could be underway as soon as 2022.

VII. BARRIERS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Introduction

This section describes actions planned to remove or ameliorate barriers to affordable housing in the one year period. The one-year actions described in this section are intended to fit within the 5-year strategy to remove or ameliorate barriers to affordable housing.

The Charlottesville City Council has approved approximately \$900,000 to complete the update of its Comprehensive Plan, Affordable Housing Strategy as well as re-write its Zoning Ordinance. The City has retained the services of RHI Consultant Team to assist staff in completing the projects. These initiatives are now underway and are designed to provide policies that would spur creation of more affordable housing in the city. The recently completed Housing Needs Assessment would inform the development of the Affordable Housing Strategy Plan. Additionally, the City has been increasing its funding commitment to affordable housing development. In 2019, the City allocated \$3.4 Million to capitalize its Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF). In FY 2020, the City Council allocated more than \$10 million to support creation of affordable housing, and Council is proposing to continue its investment in the affordable housing creation in the 2021 budget. The current COVID-19 situation has affected the City's revenue stream and may delay the City's ability to meet its affordable housing priorities. The fund would provide financial support for the Phase I of the Piedmont Housing Alliance's (PHA) Friendship Court Redevelopment project, and Charlottesville Redevelopment Housing Authority's (CRHA) redevelopment activities, among other projects. The current PHA's 11.75 acre site has 150 units and after the redevelopment plan is fully implemented, there will be 450 to 480 units, most of which would be affordable largely to households at 30 to 80% AMI. The City will continue its financial support for first time home buyers and owner-occupied rehabilitation assistance through its nonprofit partners, and Supplemental Rental Assistance Program via the CRHA. Approximately, \$2,595,000 has been appropriated by the City over the last 3 program years to assist low income households and homeless persons with their rental assistance needs.

The City provided \$75,000 split over two years for a full-time Self-Sufficiency position for PHA to enable the organization to improve the capacity of their residents to effectively seek economic opportunities that would enhance their self-sufficiency. This is now underway.

Analysis of Impediments to Affordable Housing Update

The City's Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing requirements has been postponed until October 2022. The Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) has been updated and approved by the City Council in May 2020, as a supplement to the Consolidated Plan. Actions in FY 20-21 to address impediments identified in the AI are included as an attachment to this plan.

Albemarle County – Resolution in Collaboration with Habitat for Humanity

The County of Albemarle received two planning grants funded through CDBG to assist Habitat for Humanity in community organizing and developing plans for the first phase of the Southwood Mobile Park redevelopment. An action plan has been developed with steps leading to

construction beginning in late 2019.

Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission Regional Housing Partnership

The Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) has been working with local housing partners and coalitions to launch a Regional Housing Partnership (RHP) and conduct a Regional Housing Study. TJPDC is committing staff time toward the project and partnering with Albemarle County and the Virginia Housing Development Authority (VHDA) to fund and carry out a regional housing study. Regional strategies will be developed during the year.

City - Comprehensive Plan Updates

The City staff is currently working with the RHI Consultant Team to update the Comprehensive Plan, which provides a vision for the City's future growth and specific guidance on land use policies, development patterns, and infrastructure and public facility investments. The Plan update and wholesale Zoning Ordinance rewrite will be informed by the City's affordable housing strategy, policy and program recommendations.

City Affordable Housing Policy/Program Recommendations

The City underwent a major planning effort in response to findings from a consultant-developed Housing Study and Analysis for the City and the urban ring in Albemarle County. The City's Housing Advisory Committee (HAC) has been developing and refining recommendations that consist of a compilation of tools/developer incentives to be used for supporting affordable housing development.

City - Comprehensive Housing Strategy

The City of Charlottesville, in partnership with the HAC, RHI Consultant Team and Comp Plan Steering Committee affordable, is working to develop a comprehensive affordable housing strategy for the City. The overall goals of the housing strategy are to 1) identify specific targets and means to meet affordable housing unit production and preservation based on household income, 2) identify specific regulatory tools and developer incentives to support and encourage the provision of new affordable housing units within the City, and 3) ensure equitable development throughout the City's neighborhoods.

City of Charlottesville's Strategic Investment Area and Form-based Code

The City adopted the Strategic Investment Area (SIA) Plan in February 2014. The City completed the Form-Based Code designed to implement the SIA Plan, and is currently under review. The recommendations include incentives for inclusion of affordable housing units in new developments.

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

The provision and retention of affordable housing is a central theme of the 2022 Consolidated Plan. The City of Charlottesville and the Consortium will approach the issue of affordable housing from a variety of pathways, including direct provision of new affordable units, tenant-based assistance, and removal of barriers currently in existence. These barriers may be regulatory, in which case those that are within the purview of localities will be reviewed as described in this plan, or they may be cultural. Many of the goals of the plan are educational in

nature, with the purpose of ameliorating community resistance to affordable housing and generating social momentum for grassroots community development.

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

The Consolidated Plan contains several goals that address lead-based paint hazard through the rehabilitation of existing substandard homes. The overwhelming majority of homes that undergo rehabilitation were built before 1978 and can be considered high-risk for hazard. Rehabilitation activities will include abatement of lead-based hazards in compliance with federal law. Detection and removal of lead-based paint in residences constructed before 1978 is to occur while rehabilitating homes when there are children present under the age of 7 years.

The Fluvanna/Louisa Housing Foundation has a certified lead-based paint hazards trainer to assist the region's non-profit providers. Houses being purchased with the down payment and closing cost assistance program to first-time homebuyers also must be reviewed for lead based paint.

Training has been provided to building inspectors and local housing rehabilitation agencies to allow them to evaluate, treat and/or remove lead paint hazards in our communities. Inspectors evaluate each job before the rehabilitation begins. Grant funding is used to pay for removal of lead based hazards, which will continue to reduce the lead paint concerns. The notification, Watch Out for Lead-Based Paint Poisoning is given to all persons assisted, even if the residence was constructed after 1978, since it serves as a good information and educational tool.

In terms of increasing access to housing without LBP, all of the housing goals in the plan can be considered strategies toward this end. All housing units receiving assistance with CDBG or HOME funds will meet housing quality standards, and thus not contain any lead hazards. The City of Charlottesville, with its down payment and closing cost assistance program to first-time home buyers, will not approve a home if peeling paint is in evidence until it is repaired satisfactorily. This situation is identified through the Section 8 inspection.

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

Many affordable housing and community development activities have the objective of increasing and maintaining self-sufficiency for poverty-level families. The priorities and goals identified in the Action Plan are geared toward increasing the self-sufficiency and financial independence for poverty-level families as it relates to housing/homelessness, workforce development, and economic development. The City's \$15 minimum wage is in effect and serves as an anti-poverty measure.

The primary anti-poverty agency serving the region is the Monticello Area Community Action Agency (MACAA), which serves Charlottesville, Albemarle, Fluvanna, Louisa and Nelson. The Skyline Community Action Program (Skyline CAP) serves Greene County in the Thomas Jefferson Planning District, and also Orange and Madison Counties in Planning District 9. Each of these agencies operates the Head Start pre-school program, a fundamental part of the regional anti-poverty strategy. Each social service agency operates the family self-sufficiency program.

Other organizations and programs in the region including the Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority, Fluvanna/Louisa Housing Foundation, and the Nelson County Community Development Foundation all administer Housing Choice Voucher Programs for low-income families. Additionally, organizations like these as well as the Albemarle Housing Improvement Program and others also provide assistance to low-income families in making household repairs and installing indoor plumbing.

Finally, the region has a strong, locally administered Social Service/ Welfare Departments operating in each locality. Acting as the primary provider of state funded programming and service delivery, these local government offices help implement the regional strategy by administering strong programs with a coordinated, comprehensive approach.

The City of Charlottesville's Strategic Action Team, comprising key staff from the Departments of Economic Development, Neighborhood Development Services, Social Services, Human Services and the City Manager's Office developed the Pathways to Self Sufficiency: Growing Opportunities Report with action strategies to increase job opportunities through workforce development efforts and to reduce barriers to assist residents with retaining jobs with the ultimate goal of reducing the number of families living in poverty in the City. The report serves as an action plan for prioritizing funding for programs, including CDBG and HOME funding.

In addition to other efforts, the City has initiated effort designed to provide affordable internet access to the residents of public housing. Discussions with potential service providers is in progress. Several goals in this Consolidated Plan address the needs of people in poverty beyond their immediate housing needs. There are goals to increase job training and recruitment services, in order assist people entering the labor force and, as a result, reduce household poverty. Educational campaigns, such as fair housing law and awareness of the unique needs of people with disabilities, may open up opportunities for advancement for groups that had previously been obstructed.

The City of Charlottesville Pathways to Self-Sufficiency: Growing Opportunities Report contains a chapter that addresses affordable housing. Further, the report will help serve as a funding priority guide to ensure the City's CDBG and HOME funds are awarded in coordination with the goals set forth in the report and the Consolidated Plan.

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

The Housing Directors meet regularly to coordinate the housing programs in the region. The TJACH Governance Board and its Service Providers Council meet monthly to address the needs of the homeless and special needs populations.

The Regional Housing Partnership Advisory Board will meet twice each year, with the Executive Committee meeting bi-monthly. The RHP will also offer two housing summits each year. The RHP will focus on housing production, diversity, accessibility, cost, location, design, and

increasing stability for the region's residents.

The City of Charlottesville's current Comprehensive Plan was adopted in August 2013. A broad-reaching update is underway, addressing findings from the City's Housing Needs Assessment. The Albemarle County Board of Supervisors adopted their current Comprehensive Plan on June 10, 2015, including an updated Affordable Housing Policy. The updated policy highlights the dispersal of affordable units throughout a development and adherence to the counties design standards for development areas. State legislation that took effect on July 1, 2016 prevents the County from accepting proffers for affordable housing.

The regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice was updated in 2019. This assessment engaged decision-makers and the general public with the ongoing disparities that exist within the region. It is the intent of the City of Charlottesville and the HOME Consortium to utilize this growing institutional capacity and leverage it toward meeting the goals of this plan. A table of actions to address impediments to fair housing choice is included in Appendix A.

Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies:

There are a few umbrella organizations in the region that serve to bring together housing providers and human services and health agencies.

- *Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless (TJACH)*: a non-profit organization that serves as the lead for the region's Continuum of Care. The TJACH Governance Board includes housing providers, representatives from Departments of Social Services, and other human services and health agencies.
- *Housing Directors Council*: includes representatives from all HOME sub-recipients
- *Jefferson Area Board for the Aging (JABA)*: JABA is working with Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA) on a plan for continuing to keep Low-Income Housing Tax Credit properties affordable beyond the end of their affordability period.
- *Housing Advisory Committee (HAC)*: Provides City Council with recommendations regarding housing policy and affordable housing funding priorities; researches and discusses trends and ideas in affordable housing across the state and nation and ways Charlottesville can implement some of those new ideas.

The consortium will continue to collaborate with community partners that provide housing and social services to the community. The City will continue to coordinate efforts through subrecipient partners who are internal and external to local government. The agencies listed under the consultation section of the Consolidated Plan will be included in the citizen engagement process for future action plans.

VIII. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Citizen participation was a central component of the Consolidated Plan update, completed in August 2018. This process established the goals and priorities for the Consolidated Plan, which continues to inform the annual Action Plans. For this Action Plan, a draft for public comment was made available on March 26, 2020 for a 30-day public comment period. An advertisement on the availability of the draft and the comment period appeared in the Thursday, March 26, 2020 issue of the Daily Progress, the newspaper of general circulation in the region. The draft plan for public comment was also distributed by e-mail: Agencies and Organizations - The Charlottesville Health Department of the Thomas Jefferson Health District, United Way, Independence Resource Center, County of Albemarle, Salvation Army, Region Ten Community Services, Monticello Area Community Action Agency, Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority, Albemarle Housing Improvement Program, Piedmont Housing Alliance, Jefferson Area Board For Aging, County of Albemarle Housing Office, Public Housing Association of Residents, On Our Own-Drop-In Center, and Charlottesville/Albemarle Legal Aid Society; Local Media - The Daily Progress, Fluvanna Review, Greene County Record, The Central Virginian, and Cville Weekly; Neighborhood Associations – Belmont-Carlton, Blue Ridge Commons, Burnett Commons, Fifeville, Forest Hills, Fry’s Spring, Greenbrier, Jefferson Park Avenue, Johnson Village, Kellytown, Lewis Mountain, Little High, Locust Grove, Martha Jefferson, Meadows, Meadowbrook Hills/Rugby, North Downtown, Orangedale, Ridge Street, Rose Hill, Starr Hill, University, Venable, Westhaven, Willoughby, Woodhaven, Woolen Mills and 10th and Page.

A public hearing is scheduled for the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission’s (TJPDC’s) regular meeting on May 7, 2020. The draft plan will be posted on the TJPDC web site and an article on the availability of the plan will be included in TJPDC’s April 9 News Brief, reaching an audience of approximately 1,200 people across the region. The Regional Housing Directors Council is a major partner in the development of the Action Plan, provided input on actions to be undertaken and reviewing the plan at its regular monthly meetings during plan development. The City Council will hold a public hearing and consider adoption on May 4, 2020.

Comments received were:

- To be itemized here, when received.

The following notice appeared in the Daily Progress on Thursday, March 26, 2020:

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
DRAFT YEAR 2020-2021 ACTION PLAN OF THE CONSOLIDATED PLAN FOR THE CITY OF
CHARLOTTESVILLE AND THE
THOMAS JEFFERSON PLANNING DISTRICT
30-DAY COMMENT PERIOD: March 26 - April 26, 2019**

The City of Charlottesville and the TJPDC invite all interested citizens to comment on the 2020-2021 (July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021) Draft Action Plan of the Consolidated Plan. The Consolidated Plan and the Action Plan guide the use of federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds in the City of Charlottesville and federal HOME funds in the Thomas Jefferson Planning District (City of Charlottesville and counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa, and Nelson). Funding levels from the current year are being used for planning for the 2019-2020 year, assumed to be \$419,367 for CDBG and \$644,752 for HOME. The City Council will hold a public hearing on May 4, 2020 at 6:30 pm in City Council Chambers, 605 E Main St. A public hearing will also be held in TJPDC's Water Street Center, 407 E Water St., May 7, 2020, at 7:00 pm.

The Action Plan is available at www.tjpd.org/housing or by contacting Erin Atak, City of Charlottesville at (434) 970-3093 or Shirese Franklin, TJPDC, at (434) 422-4080. Reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities and non-English speakers will be provided if requested.

HOME funds will be distributed throughout the entire planning district, which includes the Counties of Albemarle, Greene, Fluvanna, Louisa, and Nelson and the City of Charlottesville. The CHDO project is assigned to localities on a rotating basis, based on an established rotation schedule. Remaining HOME project funds available are allocated to the six localities in equal amounts.

I. PROGRAM SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

A. Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)

The activities that will be undertaken with CDBG funds are all described in the Listing of Proposed Projects. Estimated available funding includes:

2020-2021 Entitlement	\$419,367
Estimated Program Income and Reprogramming	\$13,324
TOTAL	\$432,691

Other CDBG Requirements

1. The amount of urgent need activities 0

2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan. 100.00%

Proposed CDBG Projects

Project	CDBG Fund
PRIORITY NEIGHBORHOOD	
Ridge St. Priority Neighborhood	\$201,912.90
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	
Community Investment Collaborative	\$15,000
PUBLIC SERVICES	
TJACH – Coordinated Entry Services	\$53,354.58
HOUSING PROJECTS	
AHIP – Homeowner Rehab	\$78,550.12
ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING	\$83,873.40
City CDBG Total	\$432,691

B. HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME)

Other Types of Investment

The Thomas Jefferson HOME Consortium does not intend to use forms of investment other than those described in 24 CFR 92.205(b).

Resale/Recapture Guidelines

All members (sub-recipients) of the Consortium have elected to use recapture provisions. The original homebuyer is permitted to sell the property to any willing buyer during the period of affordability although Consortium sub-recipients will be able to recapture the entire amount of the HOME-assistance provided to the original homebuyer that enabled the homebuyer to buy the unit. Recapture provisions are triggered by any transfer of title, either voluntary or involuntary, or if the property is no longer used as the owner's primary residence during the established HOME *period of affordability*.

The *period of affordability* is based upon the *direct HOME subsidy* provided to the homebuyer that enabled the homebuyer to purchase the unit. Any HOME program income used to provide direct assistance to the homebuyer is included when determining the *period of affordability*. If the total HOME investment in the unit is under \$15,000, the *period of affordability* is 5 years; if the HOME investment is between \$15,000 and \$40,000, the period of affordability is 10 years and if the HOME investment is over \$40,000, the period of affordability is 20 years.

Direct HOME subsidy includes the total HOME investment (including program income) that enabled the homebuyer to purchase the property. This may include down payment assistance, closing costs, or other HOME assistance provided directly to the homebuyer. The amount of recapture is limited to the *net proceeds* available from the sale of the home. *Net proceeds* are defined as the sales price minus superior loan repayment (other than HOME funds) and any closing costs.

Recapture of initial HOME investment shall be secured by note and deed of trust for a term not less than the applicable period of affordability. Consortium subrecipients will also execute a HOME written agreement that accurately reflects the recapture provisions with the homebuyer before or at the time of sale. A clear, detailed written agreement ensures that all parties are aware of the specific HOME requirements applicable to the unit. The written agreement is a legal obligation. The HOME written agreement is a separate legal document from any loan instrument.

Refinancing Existing Debt

The TJ HOME Consortium does not intend to use HOME funds to refinance existing debt secured by multifamily housing that is rehabilitated with HOME funds.

This page intentionally left blank

**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**



Agenda Date:	May 4, 2020
Action Required:	Resolution Approval
Presenter:	Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator
Staff Contacts:	Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator
Title:	Amendment to 20-21 CDBG and HOME Annual Action Plan

Background:

The Consolidated Plan sets forth goals to support our community development needs over a five-year period (2018-2022) for low- and moderate-income individuals in the City and counties that make up the Planning District. The current five-year Consolidated Plan was adopted the May 7, 2018 City Council Meeting.

Discussion:

Each year, localities are required to complete an Annual Action Plan that details goals and objectives to be carried out in the upcoming program year. The Action Plan serves as the City's application for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District's application for HOME funds. It is due, in its final form, to HUD on May 15th or after the HUD allocations have been published.

The City of Charlottesville, on behalf of HUD, has been awarded an allocation of \$419,367 in Community Development Block Grant funds (CDBG) and \$80,594 in HOME funds to provide assistance for housing, community and economic development activities, and assistance for low- and moderate- income persons and special needs populations within the locality. The funding aims to provide decent housing and suitable living environments while expanding economic opportunities for low- and moderate-income and special needs populations, including people living with HIV and AIDS.

Additionally, the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) makes available \$5 billion in supplemental CDBG funding for grants to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus (CDBG-CV grants). The City of Charlottesville has been authorized an allocation of \$246,699 by the CARES Act to respond to the growing effects of the historic public health crisis (COVID-19).

To meet HUD requirements, CDVG-CV activities must be formally selected by the CDBG/HOME Taskforce and Strategic Action Team by July 30, 2020. Public service assistance and economic development assistance are eligible activities under CDBG-CV, meet council priorities, and are consistent with the Consolidated Plan. In order for the use of funds to be committed and expended

within HUD deadlines, City Council needs to approve the change of the 20-21 Annual Action Plan to incorporate this use of funds.

In the best interest of the City's CDBG-CV Program, staff recommends approval of incorporating CDBG-CV activities into the FY20-21 Action Plan. CDBG-CV funds can then fund activities to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus.

This one change to the current action plan is needed to facilitate the expenditure of funds in a timely manner.

Alignment with Council Vision Areas and Strategic Plan:

Approval of this agenda item aligns directly with Council's vision for **Smart, Citizen Focused Government, America's Healthiest City, and Economic Sustainability**. Expected outcomes include assistance to businesses, including special economic development assistance, building and public facility improvements, and increased public services in response to the Coronavirus. The project also will help realize the following Strategic Plan objective: *2.3 Improve community health and safety outcomes by connecting residents with effective resources, 1.4 Enhance financial health of residents, and 1.3 Increase affordable housing options,*

Community Engagement:

A request for proposals was held for CDBG-CV projects. As required by the Citizen Participation Plan, applications received were reviewed by the CDBG Task Force and Strategic Action Team (SAT). A 5-day public comment period was also held. The CDBG Task Force and SAT will review and provide support for eligible CDBG-CV activities. As required by the HUD Citizen Participation Plan, a 5-day public comment period was held.

Budgetary Impact:

The proposed addition of the CDBG-CV program will leave no budgetary impact for the CDBG and HOME funds and activities, nor City funds.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the action plan amendment appropriation of funds for the CDBG-CV program.

Alternatives:

No alternatives.

Attachments:

FY 20-21 Action Plan Amendment
FY 20-21 Action Plan Amendment Resolution

FY 20-21 Action Plan
Amendment to Amend Existing HOME Project
Public Comments accepted February 20 through March 5, 2016.

AP-26 ADMINISTRATION

Amending Existing Plan

The Draft FY2020-2021 Action Plan will be amended to include the CDBG-CV funding for coronavirus response. No budgetary impact will occur to the CDBG and HOME allocations as recommended by the CDBG/HOME Taskforce. The City of Charlottesville will be receiving a total CDBG-CV allocation of \$246,699, which will be divided into three pots of coronavirus funding categories: public services, economic development activities, and administrative/planning. CDBG-CV public service activities will receive a total of \$98,679.60; economic development projects will receive a total of \$98,679.60, and administrative/planning activities will receive a total of \$49,399.80.

Citizen Participation

This amendment to the Action Plan was made available for public comment for 5 days, April 28, 2020 through May 5, 2020.

The following notice appeared in the Daily Progress on Tuesday, April 28, 2020.

<p>NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD DRAFT AMENDMENT TO 2020-2021 ACTION PLAN FOR THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND THE THOMAS JEFFERSON PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION 5-DAY COMMENT PERIOD: 4-28-20 through 5-4-2020</p>
<p>The City of Charlottesville and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission invite public comment on the Draft Amendment to the 2020-2021 Action Plan to provide further details on the addition of Community Development Block Grant Coronavirus (CDBG-CV) activities to the 2020-2021 Action Plan. The CARES Act made available \$5 billion in CDBG-CV funds. HUD is immediately allocating \$2 billion based on the fiscal year 2020 CDBG formula. Given the immediate needs faced by the Charlottesville community, HUD has announced an allocation of \$246,699 to the City of Charlottesville. The City of Charlottesville will coordinate with state and local health authorities before undertaking any activity to support state or local pandemic response. Eligible activities funded with CDBG-CV will prevent, prepare for, and respond to Coronavirus. The FY2020-2021 Action Plan will be amended to include the emergency CDBG-CV funding to fund projects supporting pandemic response. One virtual Public Hearing will be held at the following time and location: Charlottesville City Council, Monday, May 4, 2020 at 7:00pm in City Council Chambers, 605 East Main Street. Copies and additional information may be obtained at https://www.charlottesville.gov/678/CDBG-HOME-Programs or by contacting Ms. Erin Atak, City of Charlottesville, at (434) 970-3093. Reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities and non-English speakers will be provided if requested.</p>

**A RESOLUTION
AMENDING THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE'S
FY 20-21 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN**

WHEREAS, the City of Charlottesville must submit Annual Action Plans to the Department of Housing and Urban Development describing the use of Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment funds;

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the FY 20-21 Annual Action Plan be amended as follows:

FY 20-21 Action Plan - CDBG-CV funds totaling \$246,699 will be awarded to activities supporting economic development and public service projects in response to coronavirus. CDBG-CV funds will be divided into three broad categories: economic development activities, public service activities, and administrative/planning support.

This page intentionally left blank

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



Agenda Date:	May 4, 2020
Action Required:	Appropriation and Approval
Presenter:	Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator
Staff Contacts:	Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator
Title:	Approval and Appropriation of CDBG & HOME Budget Allocations for FY 2020-2021

Background:

This agenda item includes project recommendations, action plan approval, and appropriations for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) funds to be received by the City of Charlottesville from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Discussion:

In Fall 2019, the City of Charlottesville advertised a Request for Proposals (RFP) based on the priorities set by Council on September 16, 2019. The priorities were for affordable housing (priority for persons who are 0-50 percent AMI, including but not limited to low income housing redevelopment), support for the homelessness and those at risk of homelessness, workforce development (including but not limited to efforts to bolster section 3 training opportunities and partnerships with the City's GO programs, support for programs that aid in self-sufficiency, including but not limited to quality childcare), microenterprise assistance, and mental health and substance abuse services. The City received two applications totaling \$143,000 for HOME housing projects; one application totaling \$45,500 for CDBG housing projects, three applications totaling \$109,000 for public service projects; and three applications totaling \$69,140 for economic development projects. A summary of applications received is included in this packet.

In February 2020 and March 2020, the CDBG/HOME Task Force reviewed and recommended housing and public service projects for funding and the Strategic Action Team reviewed and recommended economic development projects for funding.

CDBG and HOME Project Recommendations for FY 2020-2021:

The CDBG program total has an estimated \$419,367 for the 2020-2021 program year. The CDBG grand total reflects the \$419,367 Entitlement (EN) Grant, \$13,324 in Reprogramming, and \$0 in previous years' entitlement available after program income has been applied. The HOME total

consists of an estimated \$80,594 which is the City's portion of the Consortium's appropriation, in addition to \$20,148.50 for the City's 25% required match, \$0 in Reprogramming and \$26,468.06 in program income. Minutes from the meetings are attached which outline the recommendations made. It is important to note that all projects went through an extensive review by the CDBG/HOME Task Force as a result of an RFP process.

Priority Neighborhood – The FY 2020-2021 Priority Neighborhood is Ridge Street (for the first cycle), however, staff recommends to Council to designate Ridge as the Priority Neighborhood for FY 21-22, and 22-23 Priority Neighborhood (for the second and third continuous year) to prevent phasing the project over two to three years, which will increase the cost of the project. The Taskforce for the Ridge Street Priority Neighborhood will recommend improvement projects to be carried out with CDBG funds. Staff will request that Council identify how the funds will be allocated to Ridge Street Priority Neighborhood upon review of the Priority Neighborhood Taskforce recommendations.

Economic Development – Council set aside FY 20-21 CDBG funding for Economic Development Activities. Members of the Strategic Action Team reviewed applications for Economic Development and made a recommendation.

Funds are proposed to be used to provide scholarships to assist 15-20 entrepreneurs launch their own micro-enterprises and develop financial management habits through technical assistance.

Public Service Programs – The CDBG/HOME Task Force has recommended several public service programs. Programs were evaluated based on Council's priorities for affordable housing (including but not limited to low income housing redevelopment, priority for households at 0-50% of the area median income) support for the homelessness and those at risk of homelessness, workforce development (including but not limited to efforts to bolster section 3 training opportunities and partnerships with the City's GO programs, support for programs that aid in self-sufficiency, including but not limited to quality childcare), microenterprise assistance, and mental health and substance abuse services. Programs were also evaluated based upon metrics included in the RFP evaluation scoring rubric. Funding will enable the organizations to provide increased levels of service to the community.

Estimated benefits include housing rehabilitation for 10 beneficiaries of the Ridge Street target area; and increased capacity of a coordinated entry system for homeless services which will benefit 41 homeless persons.

Administration and Planning: To pay for the costs of staff working with CDBG projects, citizen participation, and other costs directly related to CDBG funds, \$83,873.40 is budgeted.

HOME Funds: The CDBG/HOME Task Force recommended funding to programs that support homeowner rehabilitation. Estimated benefits includes ten homeowner rehabilitations within the Ridge Street target area and down payment assistance to 14 low-income homeowners of 0-50% AMI.

Program Income/Reprogramming: For FY 2020-2021, the City has \$0 in previous CDBG EN that has been made available through the application of received Program Income (PI) to be circulated back into the CDBG budget. The City has \$26,468.06 in HOME available after PI was applied to

be circulated back into the HOME budget. There are also completed projects that have remaining funds to be reprogrammed amounting to \$13,324 CDBG and \$0 HOME. These are outlined in the attached materials.

Adjusting for Actual Entitlement Amount: Because actual entitlement amounts are not confirmed at this time, it is recommended that all recommendations are increased/reduced at the same pro-rated percentage of actual entitlement to be estimated. Should the total actual amount of entitlement received differ from the appropriated amount, all appropriated amounts may be administratively increased/reduced at the same pro-rated percentage of change between the estimated entitlement and the actual entitlement. The total appropriated amount will not exceed 2.5% total change, nor will any agency or program increase more than their initial funding request, without further action from City Council.

Community Engagement:

A request for proposals was held for housing, economic development, public facilities, and public service programs. Applications received were reviewed by the CDBG Task Force or SAT. Priority Neighborhood recommendations will be made by members who serve on the Priority Neighborhood Task Force.

Alignment with City Council's Vision and Strategic Plan:

Approval of this agenda item aligns directly with Council's vision for Charlottesville to have **Economic Sustainability, A Center for Lifelong Learning, Quality Housing Opportunities for All, and A Connected Community**. It contributes to variety of Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives including: Goal 1: Inclusive, Self-sufficient Community; Goal 3: Beautiful Environment; Goal 4: Strong, Diversified Economy; and Goal 5: Responsive Organization.

Budgetary Impact:

Proposed CDBG projects will be carried out using only the funds to be received by the City of Charlottesville from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the City's CDBG program. The HOME program requires the City to provide a 25% match (HOME match equals ¼ of the EN amount). The sum necessary to meet the FY 2020-2021 match is \$20,148.50, which will need to be appropriated out of the Charlottesville Housing Fund (CP-0084) at a future date.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the CDBG and HOME projects as well as the reprogramming of funds. Staff approval of the proposed budget with any percent changes to the estimated amounts being applied equally to all programs and approval of the appropriations. Funds included in this budget will not be spent until after July 1, 2020.

Alternatives:

No alternatives are proposed.

Attachments:

2020-2021 Proposed CDBG and HOME Budget

Appropriation Resolution for CDBG funds

Appropriation Resolution for HOME funds

Appropriation Resolution for CDBG & HOME reprogrammed funds

Summary of RFPs submitted

Minutes from CDBG Task Force meetings

**2020-2021 CDBG and HOME BUDGET ALLOCATIONS
RECOMMENDED BY CDBG/HOME TASK FORCE and SAT: 3/4/2020, 3/5/2020
APPROVED BY CITY COUNCIL:**

A. PRIORITY NEIGHBORHOOD		
A. Ridge Street Priority Neighborhood		\$201,912.90*
B. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS		
A. Community Investment Collaborative – Entrepreneur Scholarships		\$15,000
	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TOTAL:	\$15,000
C. PUBLIC SERVICE PROJECTS		
A. TJACH - Coordinated Entry System		\$53,354.58
	SOCIAL PROGRAMS TOTAL:	\$53,354.58 (15% EN)
D. HOUSING PROJECTS		
A. AHIP – Homeowner Rehab		\$78,550.12
	HOUSING PROGRAMS TOTAL:	\$78,550.12
E. ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING:		
A. Admin and Planning		\$83,873.40 (20% EN)
	GRAND TOTAL:	\$432,691
	ESTIMATED NEW ENTITLEMENT AMOUNT:	\$419,367
	ESTIMATED EN AVAILABLE AFTER PI APPLIED:	\$0.00
	REPROGRAMMING:	\$13,324

* Funding includes reprogrammed funds

2020-2021 HOME BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

A. AHIP – Homeowner Rehab		\$33,507.84*
B. Habitat for Humanity – Down Payment Assistance		\$47,086.16*
	TOTAL:	\$127,210.56
	ENTITLEMENT AMOUNT:	\$80,594
	ESTIMATED EN AVAILABLE AFTER PI APPLIED:	\$107,062.06
	PROGRAM INCOME:	\$26,468.06
	REPROGRAMMING:	\$0.00
	LOCAL MATCH:	\$20,148.50

* Includes estimated EN available after program income applied

**APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR
THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE'S 2020-2021
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT - \$419,367**

WHEREAS, the City of Charlottesville has been advised of the approval by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development of a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) for the 2020-2021 fiscal year in the total amount of **\$432,691** that includes new entitlement from HUD amounting to \$419,367, and previous entitlement made available through reprogramming of \$13,324.

WHEREAS, City Council has received recommendations for the expenditure of funds from the CDBG/HOME Task Force, the SAT; and has conducted a public hearing thereon as provided by law; now, therefore;

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the sums hereinafter set forth are hereby appropriated from funds received from the aforesaid grant to the following individual expenditure accounts in the Community Development Block Grant Fund for the respective purposes set forth; provided, however, that the City Manager is hereby authorized to transfer funds between and among such individual accounts as circumstances may require, to the extent permitted by applicable federal grant regulations.

PRIORITY NEIGHBORHOOD

Ridge Street Priority Neighborhood	\$201,912.90
------------------------------------	--------------

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Community Investment Collaborative Scholarships	\$15,000
---	----------

PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAMS

TJACH – Coordinated Entry System	\$53,345.58
----------------------------------	-------------

HOUSING PROJECTS

AHIP – Homeowner Rehab	\$78,550.12
------------------------	-------------

ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING:

Admin and Planning	\$83,873.40
--------------------	-------------

TOTAL

\$432,691

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of \$419,367 from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Should the total actual amount of entitlement received differ from the appropriated amount, all appropriated amounts may be administratively increased/reduced at the same pro-rated percentage of change between the estimated entitlement and the actual entitlement. The total appropriated amount will not to exceed 2.5% total change, nor will any agency or program increase more than their initial funding request, without further action from City Council.

The amounts so appropriated as grants to other public agencies and private non-profit, charitable organizations (sub-recipients) are for the sole purpose stated. The City Manager is authorized to enter into agreements with those agencies and organizations as he may deem advisable to ensure that the grants are expended for the intended purposes, and in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and regulations; and

**APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR
THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE'S 2020-2021
HOME FUNDS \$127,210.56**

WHEREAS, the City of Charlottesville has been advised of the approval by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development of HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) funding for the 2020-2021 fiscal year;

WHEREAS, the region is receiving an award for HOME funds for fiscal year 20-21 of which the City will receive \$80,594 to be expended on affordable housing initiatives such as homeowner rehab and downpayment assistance.

WHEREAS, it is a requirement of this grant that projects funded with HOME initiatives money be matched with local funding in varying degrees;

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that the local match for the above listed programs will be covered by the a surplus of match from previous appropriations from the Charlottesville Housing Fund (account CP-0084 in SAP system) in the amount of \$20,148.50. Project totals also include previous entitlement made available through program income of \$26,468.06. The total of the HUD money, program income, and the local match, equals \$127,210.56 and will be distributed as shown below.

PROJECTS	HOME EN	PI	MATCH	TOTAL
AHIP-Homeowner Rehab	\$33,507.84	\$13,234.03	\$10,074.25	\$56,816.12
Habitat for Humanity-DPA	\$47,086.16	\$13,234.03	\$10,074.25	\$70,394.44
Total	\$80,594	\$26,468.06	\$20,148.50	\$127,210.56

* includes Program Income which does not require local match.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of \$80,594 from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Should the total actual amount of entitlement received differ from the appropriated amount, all appropriated amounts may be administratively increased/reduced at the same pro-rated percentage of change between the estimated entitlement and the actual entitlement. The total appropriated amount will not to exceed 2.5% total change, nor will any agency or program increase more than their initial funding request, without further action from City Council.

The amounts so appropriated as grants to other public agencies and private non-profit, charitable organizations (subrecipients) are for the sole purpose stated. The City Manager is authorized to enter into agreements with those agencies and organizations as he may deem advisable to ensure that the grants are expended for the intended purposes, and in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and regulations; and

The City Manager, the Directors of Finance or Neighborhood Development Services, and staff are authorized to establish administrative procedures and provide for mutual assistance in the execution of the programs.

The City Manager, the Directors of Finance or Neighborhood Development Services, and staff are authorized to establish administrative procedures and provide for mutual assistance in the execution of the programs.

**APPROPRIATION
AMENDMENT TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACCOUNT
Reprogramming of Funds for FY 20-21**

WHEREAS, Council has previously approved the appropriation of certain sums of federal grant receipts to specific accounts in the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds; and

WHEREAS, it now appears that these funds have not been spent and need to be reprogrammed, and therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that appropriations made to the following expenditure accounts in the CDBG fund are hereby reduced or increased by the respective amounts shown, and the balance accumulated in the Fund as a result of these adjustments is hereby re-appropriated to the respective accounts shown as follows:

Program Year	Account Code	Purpose	Proposed Revised Reduction	Proposed Revised Addition	Proposed Revised Appropriation
19-20	1900330	OED GO Utilities	\$13,324		
20-21		Priority Neighborhood		\$13,324	\$13,324
		TOTALS:	\$13,324	\$13,324	\$13,324

CDBG/HOME FY20/21 RFP Submissions

CDBG: Public Services	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested
	United Way of Greater Charlottesville	Ingrid Chalita	Early Learners Scholarship Program	\$25,000
	Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless (TJACH)	Anthony Haro	Coordinated Entry System	\$50,000
	Charlottesville Public Housing Association of Residents (PHAR)	Brandon Collins	Resident Involved Redevelopment	\$34,000
	Total Amount of Request			\$109,000
	Total Projected Budget			\$58,950
	Request Overage			\$50,050
CDBG: Econ	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested
	Office of Economic Development (OED)	Hollie Lee	GO Catering	\$18,000
	Community Investment Collaborative (CIC)	Stephen Davis	Entrepreneurship Program	\$15,000
	Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA)	Erica Johnson	Section 3 Coordination	\$36,140
	Total Amount of Request			\$69,140
	Total Projected Budget			\$45,000
Request Overage			\$24,140	
CDBG: Housing	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested
	Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP)	Jen Jacobs	Block by Block Charlottesville - Ridge Street	\$45,500
	Total Amount of Request			\$45,500
	Total Projected Budget			\$45,500
Request Overage			0	
HOME	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested
	Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville	Ruth Stone	Habitat Down Payment Assistance	\$70,000
	Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP)	Jen Jacobs	Block by Block Charlottesville - Ridge Street	\$73,000
	Total Amount of Request			\$143,000
	Total Projected Budget			\$73,600
Request Overage			\$69,400	



CDBG/HOME Taskforce

Tuesday, February 18, 2020

4-5PM

Neighborhood Development Services (NDS) Conference Room
City Hall, 605 E. Main Street

AGENDA

1. Introductions/Housekeeping/Minutes
2. CDBG/HOME Basic Introduction
3. Application Scoring
 - a. Next meeting date:
4. Other Business
5. Public Comment

Staff Contact:

Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator (atake@charlottesville.org), (434) 970-3093

CDBG/HOME Taskforce
 Minutes – February 18, 2020
 4PM – 5PM

ATTENDANCE:

Taskforce Member	Present	Absent
James Bryant		X
Taneaia Dowell	X	
Howard Evergreen	X	
Olivia Gabbay	X	
Nancy Carpenter	X	
Emily Cone-Miller	X	
Matthew Gillikin	X	
Kem Lea Spaulding		X
Helen Kimble	X	
Erin Atak	X	

AGENDA

1. Introductions/Housekeeping/Minutes

The meeting began at 4:00 PM. Taskforce went around the Neighborhood Development Services (NDS) Conference Room and gave introductions. Sign-in sheet was passed around, along with the agenda packet.

2. CDBG/HOME Basic Introduction

Erin Atak (EA), City Staff, went over the CDBG/HOME Technical Assistance Packet within the agenda materials. EA alerted the Taskforce that all applicants did receive the CDBG/HOME Technical Assistance Packet and did have a mandatory technical assistance meeting covering CDBG/HOME program basics prior to applying.

EA reviewed with the Taskforce the CDBG/HOME introduction. CDBG has the national objective component that all activities are required to meet. HOME has similar requirements with the goal of funding a wide range of activities (i.e., down payment assistance, housing rehabilitations, etc.). EA went over examples of eligible activities for CDBG/HOME and passed around a matrix sheet outlining additional activities covered in the program.

EA mentioned that all applicants were instructed to include the following withing the application. The first was to include goals from within the City’s Consolidated Plan. The second, was to make sure the proposed activity related to one of the City Council FY19-20 Priorities. Finally, to make sure the proposed activity meets the program requirements of CDBG/HOME.

EA discussed that HUD does not release the official award amounts to the City until the summer, but assumptions from previous year’s funding can help us guesstimate what next

year's funding should look like. EA went over the Federal and local requirements that subrecipients are required to follow once they are chosen for the award (subrecipient contract, reporting, monitoring, CDBG timeliness requirements, and additional requirements like the environmental review record).

Howard Evergreen (HE): Were any of the applicants that were submitted this year have trouble meeting their timeliness requirements? Because if so, that can affect our scoring

EA: I can provide an update on how applicants have met their timeliness goal in the past.

EA: All CDBG/HOME applications were submitted online through the City Website. All applications were time-stamped upon submission. No late applications were received this year.

3. Application Scoring

Discussion opened on how scoring shall proceed.

HE: With the previous Taskforce, we came to the decision to fully fund the applications that we thought were good and scored well through the grading process. It did not make sense to disperse the funds to every single applicant when we are already dealing with a small amount of funds to begin with.

Taneaia Dowell (TD): (Agreed with HE's statement). Additionally, what I would like to see is additional information on how funds/budgets are being expended from each applicant. Not all were clear with how funds are going to be used within their program. For example, AHIP's budget was clearer, they outlined the labor/materials... the budget gave substance. Meanwhile TJACH's budget did not give much outline.

Olivia Gabbay (OG): I also had frustration with reading these applications. While reading through them, I noticed the answers were too general. The City is here to help fund these programs, but I would like to see more detail on what the potential program is that we may be selecting to fund.

Helen Kimble (HK): In my past reviewing grant applications, we would focus on looking at the outcomes of the program. I was searching for the outcomes within the applications and noticed that they were vague.

HE: CDBG/HOME does have the federal requirements attached to the when reviewing the applications. We need to look at whether they meet the criteria.

HK: It would be also helpful to focus in on what the projected outcomes are of these applications.

EA: Moving forward, would it be helpful to get some clarification from the applicants before creating the proposed budget?

HE: Can we get questions to you?

EA: Yes that can work. I can have the applicants give responses ASAP.

HK: Should we email them to you separately or in the group email?

EA: Lets submit questions in the group email. This can eliminate any repeat questions.

HE: This can also spark up new ideas when looking at an application, seeing everyone's questions on hand.

The Taskforce agrees on a schedule moving forward:

Follow up questions to applicants submitted to EA by: February 25

Question Response Deadline for Taskforce: March 2nd

Scores due to EA: March 3rd.

TD: It is also important to score off the information you have based on what is in the packet. Regardless of what you know about an organization personally, you need to go off of what is in the application at-hand.

Matthew Gillikin (MG): It is also important to note whether the applicants made improvements from previous applications.

HE: This year's applications had improved.

TD: Agreed.

EA: During the 1-on-1 technical assistance meetings, I did provide feedback on what the previous Taskforce comments were about the applications to the applicants.

- a. **Next meeting date:** In person will be March 5th, NDS Conference Room at 3PM.

4. Other Business

N/A

5. Public Comment

No public was in attendance. Meeting adjourned 4:45PM.



CDBG/HOME Taskforce

Thursday, March 5th, 2020

3-4:30PM

Neighborhood Development Services (NDS) Conference Room
City Hall, 605 E. Main Street

AGENDA

1. Introductions/Housekeeping/Minutes
2. Review Application Scores & Create proposal budget.
3. Other Business
4. Public Comment

Staff Contact:

Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator (atake@charlottesville.org), (434) 970-3093

CDBG/HOME Taskforce
Minutes – March 5, 2020
3PM – 4:30PM

ATTENDANCE:

Taskforce Member	Present	Absent
James Bryant		X
Taneaia Dowell	X	
Howard Evergreen	X	
Olivia Gabbay		X
Nancy Carpenter	X	
Emily Cone-Miller	X	
Matthew Gillikin	X	
Kem Lea Spaulding		X
Helen Kimble	X	
Erin Atak	X	

AGENDA

1. Introductions/Housekeeping/Minutes

The meeting began at 3:00PM.

No changes or additions were made to the minutes from February 18, 2020. The Taskforce approved the minutes as is.

2. Review Application Scores & Create proposal budget.

Erin Atak (EA), City Staff, asks the Taskforce whether they had a chance to review the applicant timeliness spreadsheet prior to submitting scores. The timeliness spreadsheet covers the audits on applicant performance from the previous program year. The audit goes over grant timeliness, program performance, spending, and financial management through the scope of what HUD is looking for in a CDBG/HOME program.

Howard Evergreen (HE) said that the spreadsheet looked good.

Helen Kimble (HK) asked for a point of clarification: looking over the rubric, she through the spreadsheet was in relation to the organizational capacity from staff,

EA replied saying yes.

EA also mentioned that the SAT committee also preferred having the audit information beforehand before submitting scores. Moving forward, an audit will be performed before scoring. The SAT committee reviews applications applying for CDBG economic development funds.

Taskforce agreed.

Scoring

EA: All scores were submitted except for 3 people. We will have to keep moving forward at this point of the timeline without their scores.

Taneaia Dowell (TD): Is the average that you are reporting including your organizational capacity score?

EA: Just the scores that were provided by the Taskforce.

Points out of 42:

AHIP average: 23.94

United Way: 19.89

PHAR: 19.89

TJACH: 21.39

Habitat: 21.61

HE: These are low scores.

Matthew Gillikin (MG): We do not have great Grant writers

TD: Agreed, and I was about to say United Way's application did not even have a timeline, so how can you give points when there is nothing there.

MG: Several the applicants did not mention Ridge Street.

HE: Well if the program is city wide, they will not be able to get points for providing a service to everyone.

MG: You could at least explain how with this money, residents from Ridge Street can benefit from this program, etc. There is a criterion for data collection, I am sure all the applicants have data on people who have connections to Ridge Street.

Emily Cone Miller (ECM): It was not clear to me where in the application they would have given that information, because it was not explicitly asked.

TD: It was a question

HE: Yes under the prioritizing section and priority neighborhood.

TD: We had one applicant refer to the SIA.

HE: Next year, please help the applicants answer the questions more directly. Well we got the points.

MG: AHIP had the best score.

EA: During my audit visit, my concern with AHIP and Habitat was that they did not have any of the required federal documents on hand. If HUD were to come down for a random audit site visit, that would be a finding. United wad was fine in all aspects, but wad missing one invoice. That was noted as a concern, not a finding. A concern can lead to a finding. Habitat was missing the Environmental Review (finding), PHAR had a lot of staff turnover which is cause for concern, and their applications from previous years did not meet up to Taskforce standards. TJACH had everything up to standards, a couple of policies and procedures manuals were missing (concern). The SAT group funded the CIC application fully.

Econ scores

OED 22.1

CIC 27.3

PHA 14.5

HE: What happens to the leftover funds from the econ category?

EA: A couple things can happening depending on how today's allocation goes.

HE: It could shift to a different category?

EA: Yes - to CDBG Housing and priority neighborhood. It depends. The SAT agreed with the CDBG Taskforce with fully funding on the applications that had the high scores and performed well.

MG: Is part of the rational only funding the projects that we know are going to be successful because otherwise we can run into issues that result into reduced funding in the future?

EA: Yes

Nancy Carpenter (NC): Makes sense.

HE: I would like to say that I was worried both about PHAR's application and about TJACH's application, because I worry about an organization where all the money is going towards staffing, versus providing services to somebody. Both applications showed that they would be hiring the main person in charge of supervising the program with the CDBG funds. TJACH for example, the

person oversees coordinated entry services. In my mind, we gave the funds last year to help get the program started, but this is a bad way to run a program every year from my perspective. Having to come back and hope that the money arrives in a timely way, is not a sustainable model. I am not sure whether I would want to support that. The same goes for PHAR. I like the model where the money goes to help a family or person directly – which is why United Way has been funded by us in the past because funds go directly to a family for direct needed services.

ECM: I do not have any experience in the non-profit world at all, which makes me an interesting person to have at the table. As an outsider, I think to counter this position, I would say that organizing people is very labor-intensive and important. All these things, to me, seem like very worthwhile enterprises. I am less interested in giving money to well established organizations like United Way and Habitat where the money gets transferred over to another entity because I presume, that they can make up the loss of the money by other means if they do not get money from the City. PHAR probably has very limited means for raising funds and the work they do will not show results as it is much harder to demonstrate impact when you are talking about funding organizers. Giving people a mortgage is easier to demonstrate or that a child went to preschool – both which are worthwhile expenses. But as I was reading the proposals, I noticed that some organizations are going to have a much harder time showing how to demonstrate impact than others and that we should take that into account. They may not have other sources of funding. You cannot quantify the impact of organizing. I was more interested in funding the things that seemed harder to pull off than the ones that seemed easier to pull off.

NCM: I can speak a little to Coordinated Entry, that is where I started. The way that we get grants from HUD and other agencies is through our data entry through Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS), and so by having good quality data to go with the grants or the NOFA's, we can better create monies that go to direct services. Everything is data drive, and someone must do it. I was critical of Anthony, and that person does maintain data for other service providers. Hopefully, other service providers will be brought in and will conduct outreach. It was hard to evaluate these organizations.

HE: My criticism was not of the importance, but if they are going to every year come back to CDBG to try to fund this position, it's like on thin ice all the time. It is not a great way to run an organization. We did fund it last year.

MG: Was that the first year it (TJACH) had been funded?

HE: First year it had been funded by CDBG. It may have been funded by other ways in the past, I think it was. Federal funds are going to come and go, there are going to be all kinds of crazy time schedules. To me it is a really important position.

ECM: Yeah, agreed.

HE: But to fund it through this mechanism; even the answer to the question I asked. I do not know, it would worry me if I was a board member of that organization.

HK: The department for aging and rehab services pulls down CDBG money to have help fund their TANF case manager, and every year of course have a lot of turn-over in that position because people were nervous. "Is it going to be funded next year"? Even though for the past 20-30 years the position was funded, and they finally let the position go, but that was after 30 years of running it that way. So, I do not think that it is just small non-profits that are saying that they will want to draw-down this money.

HE: No, it's a different pool of CDBG money.

HK: It is a different pool, but I am speaking more to your argument about how that is not sustainable ongoing because a lot of people fund parts of their programs that way.

HE: But not funding the entire position.

HK: Well it was 50%, but without that money the position would not exist.

TD: I thought this was for the second Coordinated Entry position? I misread that.

HE, NC: No, it's just got the one.

TD: Right, but isn't this for an additional one? Don't they already have one?

HE, NC: This is to keep the position going.

TD: Okay. I do not know why I was thinking it was for a second position. Maybe because we funded it last year. Sorry about that.

HK: Actually, I will admit too, I thought that this was funding the second half of one position. I thought that maybe it was making a part time position a full-time positions.

ECM: I think he said that if they did not get the funds, then it would become a part-time position.

HK: I see

HE: Yeah, that was the answer to the question.

TD: I guess I was thinking two positions because I was under the impression that the need for a second person was mentioned because of the wait time. So, they would try to reduce the wait time of people trying to see the Coordinated Entry person to increase the level of services.

HK: Well if you are only there 20 hours a week, you must schedule your appointments twice as far in advance.

ECM: They may not be helpful, and we don't have to talk about it, but what is a sustainable model?

HE: Every nonprofit must figure out their own method of how they are going to function over a 5, 10-year plan. I know for example, I was on the housing authority board for a while. And we finally after many years got the City to provide support to the housing authority, but that was one way of getting more money. In this case, it may be the City has to step up more. It may be that churches, who say they care about homelessness, must provide more support. There are a variety of ways to do it, but this is a pretty challenging way to do it. I cannot come up with a direct solution. It is the thing that all nonprofits must deal with.

HK: It is sort of hard to write up a proposal because what you are trying to do is reduce homelessness. So if you see it as a crisis, you know here is something that we are dealing with that is crisis driven, then you write a proposal: “20 years from now it will be growing even bigger because there will be even more homeless”, you know what I am trying to say. One thing you are growing like a child care program, the other you are trying to reduce the need in the community. So you wouldn’t necessarily put as much of an emphasis on long term viability of the project.

MG: How significant is it to these types of grants of how this fit into their funding model. It probably ties into the funding capacity of these funds somehow. How much should we weight that? It’s not like this is the 15th time they have come back asking for CDBG funds, this is the 2nd or 3rd time right? Maybe that is some feedback we can give them for next year?

HE: This has been going on for 10 years. It is not a new thing; it has been building. I am not even saying not to fund them, it is just worrisome to me that they see this to continue funding this position. And this is an essential piece to what they do.

TD: Here is what is interesting to me though, they had the highest average score. And so, if we are going based on our rubric, don’t you think we should go based on the score? Not that I do not love our conversation, but we are not going to get through. At some point we have to say “hey, what are we going to do? Who are we going to fund”? Because typically what we have done is we have taken the average scores, and whoever got the top averages, typically were funded. And even though we do see some holes and flaws in this application which – to me – a lot of them were flawed in different ways. Even with the flaws, they got the highest average score. We have roughly 58 thousand we can distribute.

EA: Yes

ECM: And we potentially have \$30,000 that can be moved around?

EA: Yes

MG: You (EA) had mentioned AHIP’s capacity to, I think they only did 4?

EA: Yes that was one concern I had. This year, AHIP’s projected goal was to rehab 4 homes, but have only invoiced me for 1. Next year they are projecting to do 10 home rehabs.

HK: What are your scores for the organizational capacity category? Are those built into the scoring rubric?

EA: Based on the spreadsheet created by the previous Grants Coordinator, the Staff organizational capacity scores were not included. However, my score for AHIP would be 0.

ECM: That is helpful to know.

HE: Did you ask why AHIP was so far behind on projects?

EA: I did

HE: What did they say?

EA: The current FY budget is because of the delay in Environmental Review Work. Home rehabs done in the historic district take longer to get approval for. And last year's audit, AHIP was missing their Environmental Review Records for each project which is contractually required. They were given 30 days to find them.

HE: Right, I see. So, they are so far behind on projects because the Environmental Reviews are not done. So, they cannot go ahead.

EA: Right. So, they are trying to get those done right now.

ECM: For our benefit, can you (EA) give your scores for the other applicants? We don't need to do all the averaging, but it would be helpful to know. For me, this is a crazy system. As an outsider, I find this process really upsetting. The money is just sitting there.

TD: I am just going to say personally, if my kid was going to a school that was not educating them, I would not pump money into that school. I probably would switch my kid out.

ECM: But that is how problem schools arise. If you are a city or an entity that is running the school, then you need to give that school more resources.

HE: But you need to look at why the school is not doing well.

ECM: Yes. It is hard, for me, to interpret, what the cause of the problem is, based on the grant application. If they have more funding would the program work better or would the same problem still exist?

HK: Few of these organizations showed budgets that are significant. Shifting one decimal over from the operating funds would yield the funding request.

ECM: To me that is meaningful. Why is that not part of the rubric? Because that seems to be so important. The difference between Habitat, PHAR, and United Way – I assume – is vast.

EA: We can definitely add that into the application. Okay the following staff's organizational capacity score:

AHIP: 0

United Way: 3

TJACH: 2

PHAR: 0

Habitat: 1

OED: 1

CIC: 3

PHA: 0

ECM: I mean I totally understand the concern about future funding being threatened by people not complying. That seems like a real concern since we don't want to reduce our funding in the future for other projects.

EA: We can add that into the application next year.

HE: It is interesting because of the discussion we have here penalizes the organizations that are doing well and are relatively wealthy. And in some ways, are helping more people. United Way has a formula for how much they put into their daycare programs (for example). If we can help those extra 10 families, it may be a big deal for those 10 families.

HK: It's a very tangible/measurable thought effect. Mentoring residents (PHAR), trying to bring someone to change processes and interphase between residents and housing,

HE: This person is not mentoring the residents. They are managing the program

HK: ...Making it possible for that program to happen.

HE: If they had asked for money to pay the mentors to go in, I would feel different. They were very clear that they had money to do that, but they did not have the money to go pay the person who was going to supervise the operation.

ECM: I did not get that impression...

HK: I feel like we are arguing about whether the grant proposal is very meticulous and has numbers, how are you going to create that if you do not have that person who is keeping track of that data for the organization?

TD: I still go back to the rubric. Why fill this out if we are not going to look at this

Everyone laughs

HK: I was looking at the 90 proposals document that came out for the Vibrant Communities fund. I thought that this why we were talking about the rubrics. Whether to fully fund, fund partially, is that what you were thinking?

TD: Yes, I will be honest, I though the scoring portion was going to happen last time because we got the notebooks in November. So, for me today it was “we already submitted the scores, we take the highest averaging scores, and decide whether we fully fund, not fully fund”. Typically, we have said that we want to fully fund programs so that they can fully be able to do what they want to do. I want us to move forward. We could go on for days with our conversation. We need this coordinated entry person because we have a housing crisis on our hands and homelessness is part of that housing crisis. If we do not have this person and we cannot get these people to the resources they need, are we making any progress on assisting the housing crisis? That is my opinion.

HK: I respect that, but what surprised me was how close these scores were to each other. It seemed like one random change could have ruined scores. I was expecting much different results based on my reading.

HE: That is why we have this diverse group.

ECM: There is not a huge difference

HE: I am going to make a quick suggestion so that we can maybe go ahead. This is a funding suggestion; and that is to fund AHIP under the HOME program. Not fund Habitat. AHIP had a higher score than Habitat did. To take that \$45,000 from CDBG Housing into the public services section, which will increase that amount of money to almost fund everyone fully. And then figure out how to adjust the finding slightly for those three public services activities.

ECM: I don't think the averages are right for the scores”

EA: The scores are being totaled over an average of 9 people. Anyone who did not submit their application scores in, the scores were imputed as zero.

HE: Oh, I see.

ECM: Can you give us the scores based on the average of people who only submitted the scores?

EA: Yes. But it will not change the score differences.

HE: Right, they are going to still have the same spread.

EA: The following are the new averages:

OED, CIC, and PHA stays the same
AHIP 35.91
United Way 29.83
TJACH 32.08
PHAR 29.83
Habitat 32.41

TD: Makes us feel better

Everyone laughs

ECM: Then it looks like we don't fund PHAR or United Way. I would say let's fund PHAR.

HE: I think we should fund all three public service activities

MG: Are we in agreement that TJACH gets the full amount?

ECM: Tentatively yes.

Everyone else nods yes

NC: We are still doing the HOME AHIP at full?

ECM: Tentatively yes, there needs to be a discussion.

ECM: So we can move the CDBG money around, but not the HOME money. Is that correct?

HE: Yes

HK: I guess I am confused about why we are moving money between funding pots?

EA: It may be better to look at the individual sections first.

MG: In the Public services section, If we fund TJACH fully, that leaves \$8,950. So should we split the remaining proportionally for PHAR and United Way?

TD: Here is the thing though, would they be able to accomplish their program objectives with roughly \$4,000?

MG: Right, but there is the extra \$30,000 from econ. I mean it is a good point because PHAR it seems like you fund a position, or nothing happens whereas in United Way you reach fewer.

ECM: yeah you reach fewer beneficiaries. With PHAR it is either program or no program, meanwhile in United Way, we reach fewer people.

HE: When these categories were broken up, was it by formula?

EA: Yes, CDBG is broken down federally into categories by percentages.

HE: But they can be reconfigured?

EA: Yes, but the public services activity can not exceed more than 15% of the HUD entitlement amount.

HE: Oh, so we cannot move that around them. What does 15% mean?

EA: Based on my projections, it becomes the \$58,000.

NC: The reason I like PHAR is that United Way is only talking about 10 people, not necessarily from the Ridge Street neighborhood. PHAR is talking about their ongoing redevelopment going house to house to house to house, touching all residents at various times. They are continuing to build resilience, connect with each other, to have a neighborhood rely on. I support fully funding them if there is money available.

ECM: I feel like with United Way maybe if we don't give them the money those people don't go to school, but they can get the money from somewhere else. It also seems more indirectly related to the City council priorities. Like its true, its related to professional development, but it is going to help kids for going to school to help parents professionally. I wish we had more funds to help everyone.

MG: Sounds like we want to fund PHAR, we need to give the full amount.

HE: You know there is a reason why she (EA) gave PHAR a zero, and it has been pretty consistent from over the years. They lack the ability to manage. Just giving them money does not solve the issue that they are not able to handle it.

NC: I want to counter that argument with the South First Street women who came together on their own with no funding to decide how they want their neighborhood to look like. To me that is managing neighbors and coming up with a program to show the City and CRHA. That would be cool to see how this funding could help change PHAR.

TD: Well, the women of South first street were completely in it. Like how many rooms/units, how the entry way should look. They did a great way and should be an example of how citizens should be involved in public housing. They designed the parkway, where they wanted to community center, access, and lighting. Citizen involvement should be incorporated going forward.

NC: the details were impressive. They were not developers.

EA: The one issue I had with their application was, correct me if I am wrong, but they were going to measure feelings? I am not entirely sure how that is done on this scale.

HK: Asking whether they felt served, heard, etc. Feelings can be subjective. It is hard for me to look at the overall budget of United Way and see how they are not able to make up the funding for the program.

ECM: I strongly concur with the view of the United Way program

MG: To bring it back to the numbers, what should we do with the \$30,000?

EA: I would select from each category first, before moving money around.

ECM: It sounds like we are fulling funding TJACH, leaving about \$9,000.

EA: Okay, and then for CDBG Housing, it sounds like we are not funding AHIP?

HE: That was my suggestion, and to fund them in the HOME section since they have been falling behind. The same argument for United Way can apply for Habitat. The way that they do their moneys, they don't have to do down payment assistance they way normal people do it, and can stretch it out. I do not think they need extra HOME funds. Whereas AHIP will only fix homes with the awarded funds.

TD: So, are we funding AHIP in Housing?

HE: In HOME but not CDBG?

HK: So 100% AHIP funding under HOME, none for Habitat, and none for AHIP under CDBG.

HE: Yes.

TD: So, if I understand you correctly, we are not funding Habitat?

HE: Yes.

EA: Keep in mine the 15% cap on the HUD entitlement for public services projects.

TD: Then I would say I don't think we need to the direct door knocking in the neighborhoods, but the \$8,950 will not be enough for PHAR. Versus, United Way, may be able to serve 2-3 families.

ECM: Why don't we take some of the funding back from TJACH?

TD: Why should they get penalized for having the better application?

ECM: They are still getting more money than other people.

TD: I would move that we fully fund TJACH and give United Way the remaining funds. Because I do not think PHAR will be able to do much with that little funding.

ECM: I would still give it to PHAR.

MG: How about splitting between the two?

TD: I do not think if an organization is asking for \$34,000 that 8,950 will be enough to sustain their operation.

HE, MG: Right that is reasonable.

HE: You (TD) feel strongly that the highest point total should get the funding.

TD: I do because this is my 3rd or 4th year doing this and this is what we have the rubric for.

HK: I am still struggling with how close the scores are with one another. I think we are trying to find the best way to make sure CDBG dollars best serve the community.

ECM: The rubric is not the same as a stopwatch.

TD: The rubric helps us gauge how an organization will perform. If you do not complete the application efficiently then one will get penalized.

ECM: The rubric is going to always be an imperfect mechanism for gauging merit.

HE: What about giving thirds to the public service applicants? Or \$20,000, \$20,000, and \$8,950? As a committee, we need to fully come to a consensus.

TD: As a taskforce in the past, we have met to discuss the validity of the rubric and whether or not to fully fund an organization. We also took into assessment the Staff's take on organizational capacity. If we do not fully score TJACH, are they able to fully conduct their service?

HE: They will move it to part time.

MG: TJACH scored the highest, we should fund them fully. PHAR and United Way creates a tangible benefit on both ends. Ultimately this is turning into a discussion which organization do we like the best.

NC: Right.

MG: Let's split the funding.

NC: I could agree with that.

HE: 25, for TJACH, 17 for PHAR, and the balance would go to United Way.

EA: Is this what the CDBG/HOME Taskforce is recommending?

TD: I do not totally agree. Now when she (EA) goes back to the applicants, they were under the impression that they were going to be fully funded if scored well.

EA: They were told that the highest scoring applicant would be funded.

NC: I see well we need to adjust.

ECM: Agreed.

TD: This is what is frustrating because this process has been decided last year.

HK: I think when we have new people come in, there is going to be a learning curve.

HE: There is a term limit with serving on the CDBG/HOME Taskforce.

ECM: So, lets give TJACH full funding. I would advocate for giving the remainder to PHAR.

EA: Both United Way and PHAR fit council and CDBG priorities. For me it comes down to who is filing the HUD paperwork correctly. Based on the last audit from PHAR in 2011, the HUD paperwork was not there. Each year PHAR's application scored poorly. United Way's HUD paperwork was there in their last 2018 paperwork.

HK: Why are we disbursing all the funds for the Public Services pot?

EA: We do have the option to not allocate all the funding since we do not know exactly what the HUD funding will be.

HE: So, the same would be true then for AHIP under CDBG Housing and HOME. We should fund them

MG: What about shifting the \$30,000? Could we shift that into the housing and then award Habitat HOME funds?

ECM: Oh yeah divide HOME between AHIP and Habitat, and then award AHIP the extra from CDBG. But then would we give them equal funding in HOME?

MG: No, we give AHIP \$43,000; and Habitat gets the remaining balance. Then move the \$30,000 to CDBG Housing.

HE: I agree to that.

Everyone nods.

EA: So we are all in agreement to fully fund TJACH for public services, give AHIP the \$30,000 for CDBG Housing, and to split the HOME funding between AHIP and Habitat.

Everyone Agrees.

3. Other Business

None

4. Public Comment

No members of the public were present. Meeting dismissed 4:30 PM.

