

## **CDBG TASK FORCE**

### **Minutes**

Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room, City Hall

Thursday, January 19, 2017

2:00pm – 3:30pm

#### **Attendance:**

<b>Task Force Members</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Tanea Dowell	X	
Howard Evergreen	X	
Kathy Johnson Harris	X	
Joy Johnson		X
Sherry Kraft	X	
Kelly Logan	X	
Sarah Malpass	X (via phone)	
Megan Renfro		X
Matthew Slaats		X
Tierra Howard (staff)	X	
<b>Others:</b>		

The meeting began at 2:00pm. Tanea Dowell (TD) suggested that staff provide the Task Force (TF) with a map of the SIA next year.

#### **Review of Preliminary Scores for Public Service Proposals**

Tierra Howard (TH) reviewed the preliminary scores. After discussion, the scores were as follows:

United Way 86  
City of Promise (CoP) 86  
OAR 84  
PACEM 71

TD stated that she struggled with the identifying answers to the budget-related questions. TD expressed that some of the proposals did not provide a clear/detailed line item budget. Howard Evergreen (HE) stated that United Way's budget is straightforward because they are requesting funding for childcare scholarships. HE agreed that it was difficult to identify what the CDBG funding would be used for in many of the proposals. HE stated that he could not identify what PACEM wanted the funding for other than to use CDBG to supplement the organizational budget. Sherry Kraft (SK) questioned if CDBG funds are supposed to target a discrete activity and if it is legitimate to fund a position for "X" number of hours with CDBG funds. TH stated that using CDBG funds to fund a position that is providing a direct service to eligible beneficiaries is an eligible activity under the HUD regulations. HE stated that he would be more inclined to fund applicants who can demonstrate specifically "how" the CDBG funds will be used.

SK stated that the scoring criteria related to outreach and services provided to residents within the Strategic Investment Area (SIA) puts CoP at a disadvantage because their services are limited to a specific geographic area. SK suggested that maybe the request for proposal should state that the City will not provide funding to organizations that do not serve or do outreach to residents within the SIA. TH explained that the application was not limited to only those serving or doing outreach to residents within the SIA, however, the evaluation tool allowed for an applicant to gain additional points. HE explained to SK that the scoring criterion allows the applicant to gain bonus points. Sarah Malpass (SM) asked TH if she could elaborate on City Council's push for targeting funds to SIA residents, which she explained is different from how applications were evaluated last year. She stated that in previous years, applicants were encouraged to target funds towards residents who live in the 10<sup>th</sup> & Page Neighborhood which was the current priority neighborhood. TH stated that City Council sets the CDBG & HOME priorities every year and that for FY 17-18, Council set a priority that emphasized the targeting of economic development and workforce development activities to CRHA and PHA residents that live in the SIA. TH explained that the priorities are used as directives/guidance that the TF must follow.

Kelly Logan (KL) stated that it appears as though the scores reflect expectations of where each of the applicants should have scored. She stated that she felt as though PACEM did not meet the requirements, therefore the TF should not recommend funding for PACEM. She suggested that the TF should focus on funding amounts for the top three scoring organizations (United Way, CoP, and OAR). The TF agreed with KL. Kathy Johnson Harris (KJH) and HE agreed with KL and stated that they also felt like the scores came out as expected.

HE stated that PACEM's application indicates that the organization has \$175,000 in cash. HE also stated that PACEM had the lowest scoring application. SK agreed that PACEM's application was an outlier. The TF agreed to not consider PACEM's application for funding.

SK inquired about the number of beneficiaries to be served by United Way. TH explained that initially, United Way proposed to serve over 20 beneficiaries by subsidizing childcare costs for each child, however United Way could fully fund three scholarships for three beneficiaries if they received the requested amount.

TH explained that she had one concern with CoP being able to expend the amount of requested funds (\$20,000) within the required timeframe. She stated that CoP had funds leftover from FY 15-16 and unlike other CDBG categories, public services funds cannot be rolled over to the following year due to the annual budget cap on public service activities. TH stated that she was unclear on how many total hours would be charged to CDBG within the fiscal year. TH explained that she sent a question to CoP requesting that they outline the details on total CDBG hours, however, she did not receive the appropriate response.

HE stated that he feels that if CoP cannot explain how they will budget to expend the full funding request at \$20,000, then perhaps the reduction from CoP could be used to increase the funding amount for United Way.

KJH explained that she feels that OAR is going to receive funding no matter what. She stated that the funding should be divided in three ways in accordance with the ranking scores.

HE stated that according to the application, the CoP did include other funding sources (other than CDBG) for the Enrolled to Launch Program. He stated that OAR may be able to find other funds, however, for CoP, he does not know how they would be able to function if their funding amount was reduced by \$4,000 or \$5,000.

KL stated that she would like to fully fund United Way because there is a high need for childcare. TD stated that if you don't have childcare, then you are unable to work and childcare is tied to workforce development. She stated that she feels like OAR may be able to identify alternative funding. KJH stated that she feels like United Way can find alternative funding (not OAR - as she previously suggested). HE stated that United Way always has a waiting list and if the TF makes a recommendation to fully fund United Way, then it's possible that they will be able to serve three more beneficiaries from the waiting list. KL stated that the Department of Social Services (DSS) has a waiting list for childcare assistance as well and that if clients can't get the childcare assistance from DSS, then United Way is the only other option.

TD stated that if you invest into childcare, then you are preventing the need for OAR services in the long run. HE asked the group about the average cost of childcare. The TF stated that it is very expensive. TD stated that childcare costs more than college tuition. KJH stated that she believes that childcare is very important.

SM stated that she agrees that United Way can find alternative funding sources. She stated that she scored OAR as the highest because they had a good application. She stated that all of the services by each of the applicants are valuable to the community. She added that when she looks at the difference between fully funding United Way and CoP, that she would be inclined to fully fund CoP because wrap around services are so important and that if the TF does not recommend fully funding United Way, United Way will most likely be able to still fully fund the scholarships.

TH reviewed CoP's outcomes from previous years in relation to the proposed outcomes and the amount of requested funding for FY 17-18. TH explained that if the group decided to reduce the funding amount for CoP, then CoP would probably still be able to operate the program, but may not be able to serve as many beneficiaries as proposed. KL stated that she feels like CoP did not demonstrate the need in the application and did not report on outcomes.

SK stated that she feels that the three proposals have worthy requests and that we should fund them to some extent. SK stated that CoP is trying to grow with the Enroll to Launch program, OAR is trying to sustain their services, and United Way has been a great asset with providing childcare scholarships.

SK suggested that the TF consider not fully funding all of the requests, but reducing the requests by some amount. TD stated that she recalls a discussion from last year about fully funding requests and KL added that the discussion was about whether or not organizations can provide the proposed service with reduced funding.

TH suggested that the group come up with options for voting on how to divide the funding amounts.

- TH asked the group to raise hands and/or vote yes if they would like to equally divide the \$55,696 by three and each agency would receive \$18,565. There were no “yes” votes out of six votes for this option.
- TH asked the group if the top two scoring agencies should be fully funded. There were two “yes” votes out of six votes for this option.
- TH asked the group to vote on a proportional reduction with some reduction for the top two agencies and more of a reduction for the lowest scoring organization. There were three “yes” votes (HE, SM, SK) out of six for this option.

KL stated that the scores are so close that she suggests splitting the funding equally amongst the three. SK stated that the group would be eliminating more funding from United Way if the group decided to equally divide the funding.

TD asked if the TF recommends reducing funding from CoP, then would CoP be able to still operate the Enroll to Launch program. TH suggested that the TF review CoP’s budget. She stated that if the TF recommends reducing CoP’s request, then, there would be a reduction of CDBG hours for the Enroll to Launch coach and/or the community connections coordinator.

On a motion by SK, seconded by TD, the CDBG Task Force unanimously approved the CDBG public services funding recommendations as follows:

- Fund United Way at \$24,000; and
- Fund CoP at \$17,000; and
- Fund OAR at \$14,696.

TH stated that if the City receives less funding than estimated, then, each organization’s funding recommendation will be reduced equally (proportionately). The TF agreed.

TD suggested that staff inform each applicant that it is very important for them to answer the questions. TD stated that the TF puts a lot of hard work into the applications to make funding recommendations. KJH asked TH if she could help the applicants by providing technical assistance. She also suggested that staff provide helpful grant writing tips to the applicants. TH mentioned that she provided a mandatory technical assistance workshop to all of the applicants. HE suggested that TF members attend the mandatory workshop and provide feedback about their experience.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.