



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA May 18, 2020

Members

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

5:30 p.m. Closed session as provided by Sections 2.2-3711 and 2.2-3712 of the Virginia Code

Electronic meeting (Legal consultation; personnel)

6:30 p.m. Regular Meeting

Virtual/electronic meeting

CALL TO ORDER

MOMENT OF SILENCE (replaces Pledge of Allegiance during COVID-19 virtual meetings)

ROLL CALL

AGENDA APPROVAL

ANNOUNCEMENTS

RECOGNITIONS

CONSENT AGENDA*

1. Minutes: May 4, 2020 City Council closed and regular meeting; May 6, 2020 budget work session
2. Appropriation: Appropriation of CARES Act relief fund payment for the Fire Department - \$58,201.02 (2nd reading)
3. Appropriation: Appropriation from Department of Human Services Fund Balance for the Pathways/Community Resource Hotline - \$400,000 (1st of 2 readings)
4. Ordinance: Homeowner Tax Relief Grant – 2020 (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.gov/zoom.

ACTION ITEMS

5. Public Hearing: Public Hearing on Budget/First Reading of FY 2021 Budget Appropriation
6. Approval and Appropriation of CDBG and HOME Budget Allocations for FY 2020-2021 (2nd reading)
 - Appropriation: a. Appropriation of funds for the City of Charlottesville 2020-2021 CDBG - \$419,367
 - Appropriation: b. Appropriation of funds for the City of Charlottesville's 2020-2021 HOME funds - \$127,210.56
 - Appropriation: c. Appropriation amendment to CDBG account reprogramming of funds for FY 20-21 - \$13,324

GENERAL BUSINESS

OTHER BUSINESS

7. Report: Boards and Commissions electronic meetings during COVID-19 Declaration of Emergency

MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

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.

*Action Needed

CHARLOTTESVILLE CITY COUNCIL
May 4, 2020 Minutes
Virtual/electronic meeting

5:30 PM CLOSED MEETING

The Charlottesville City Council met in a virtual/electronic meeting on Monday, May 4, 2020, at 5:30 p.m., as permitted during the COVID-19 Declaration of Emergency. The meeting was called to order at 5:33 p.m. with the following members present: Mayor Nikuyah Walker, Vice Mayor Sena Magill, Ms. Heather Hill, Mr. Michael Payne and Mr. Lloyd Snook.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Ms. Magill, Council voted 5-0 (Ayes: Hill, Magill, Payne, Snook, Walker. Noes: none) to meet in closed session as authorized by Virginia Code Sections 2.2-3711 and 2.2-3712, specifically:

- as authorized by Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(1) for discussion of the performance of the Charlottesville City Manager.

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Mr. Snook, Council certified by the following vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Hill, Magill, Payne, Snook, Walker. Noes: none), that to the best of each Council member's knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the Motion convening the closed session were heard, discussed or considered in the closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 6:32 p.m.

6:30 PM REGULAR MEETING

The Charlottesville City Council held a virtual meeting for its regular session on May 4, 2020, in an effort to comply with social distancing requirements surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic Declaration of Emergency.

Ms. Walker called the meeting to order at 6:33 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.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Ms. Hill announced the Wednesday, May 6th budget work session. Ms. Walker added information about the community feedback portion of the work session.

Ms. Walker announced that there was a successful Coronavirus testing event at Crescent Halls on May 1st, a collaborative effort.

CONSENT AGENDA:

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

- a. MINUTES: April 20 Regular meeting, April 28 Work Session
- b. APPROPRIATION: Domestic Violence Services Coordinator Grant - \$49,336 (2nd reading)

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.

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

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 (2200037 Internal Order Number)	G/L: 430080 State Assistance
\$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.

- d. **APPROPRIATION:** Appropriation of CARES Act relief fund payment for the Fire Department - \$58,201.02 (carried)
- e. **RESOLUTION:** Approving retroactive funding for administration of the Charlottesville Supplemental Rental Assistance Program (CSRAP) - \$79,255.94

**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

- f. **ORDINANCE:** Rental Relief Program application deadline extension pursuant to City Code Section 25-59 (1 reading requiring 4/5 vote)

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

CITY MANAGER RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY MATTERS:

City Manager Tarron Richardson shared updates for the following items:

1. Regarding a concern from Ms. Nancy Carpenter about housing initiatives to help the homeless, he advised that Kaki Dimock, Director of Human Services, would continue to provide updates on any CARES Act, FEMA or HUD funding that may become available to help in the effort to provide housing for the homeless. He advised that those funds would be combined with funds already in the City budget for this initiative.
2. Regarding a concern from Ms. Tanesha Hudson about the extension of housing vouchers, he advised that the voucher program is managed by the Housing Authority and Council has provided funding. He advised that the program would be discussed on Friday, May 8th with CRHA at a regularly scheduled meeting.

COMMUNITY MATTERS:

Ms. Walker opened public comment.

Ms. Tanesha Hudson thanked staff member Brenda Kelley for follow-up on the housing voucher program.

Mr. Brandon Collins spoke about having a coordinated response and approach to housing during the pandemic.

Mr. Chris Meyer, of Fry's Spring neighborhood, spoke about recent employment decisions by UVA Health System and the University of Virginia, advising that funds saved by salary cuts and furloughs could be used for low income residents.

Ms. Nancy Carpenter spoke about the new City website and made suggestions for navigation. She also spoke about a strategic use of resources during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Mr. Jay James, City resident and Assistant Director of the Bridge Ministry, spoke about the opportunity for the City to support formerly incarcerated individuals with City funds versus continuing to incarcerate non-violent offenders.

- Ms. Walker responded to Mr. Meyer's comment about the impact of furlough and salary reductions at the University of Virginia and UVA Health System, and advised that the City is unable to take any action regarding the funds related to those decisions.

ACTION ITEMS:

PUBLIC HEARING/ RESOLUTION*: FY20-21 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)/Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) Action Plan: (1 reading)

Ms. Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator, presented the proposed Action Plan, advising of requirements, community engagement, and public comment period. She also reviewed information about the Ridge Street priority neighborhood and the priority neighborhood program history.

Council asked clarifying questions.

Ms. Walker opened the public hearing. The following speakers participated:

- Mr. Brandon Collins
- Ms. Joy Johnson
- Mr. Don Gathers
- Ms. Tanesha Hudson
- Ms. Emily Dreyfus

Ms. Walker closed the public hearing.

Council discussion ensued regarding the following items related to CDBG.

RESOLUTION*: Action Plan CDBG-CV Covid Amendment - \$246,699

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Ms. Magill, Council by the following vote APPROVED the resolution amending the City of Charlottesville FY20-21 CDBG Annual Action Plan to include \$246,699 in CDBG-CV funding: 5-0 (Ayes: Hill, Magill, Payne, Snook, Walker. Noes: none).

**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.

RESOLUTION: CDBG/HOME FY20-21 Action Plan resolution

On motion by Ms. Hill, seconded by Mr. Snook, Council by the following vote APPROVED the resolution approving the City of Charlottesville FY20-21 CDBG Annual Action Plan: 4-1 (Ayes: Hill, Magill, Payne, Snook. Noes: Walker).

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.

RESOLUTION: FY20-21 Priority Neighborhood fund allocations resolution

On motion by Ms. Magill, seconded by Mr. Payne, Council by the following vote APPROVED the resolution approving Ridge Street as the priority neighborhood for FY20-21 funding: 5-0 (Ayes: Hill, Magill, Payne, Snook, Walker. Noes: none).

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.

APPROPRIATION: Approval and Appropriation of CDBG and HOME Budget Allocations for FY 2020-2021 (carried to May 18 Regular Agenda)

- 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

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Ms. Hill asked for an update on the budget process, heading into the Wednesday, May 6 Council Budget Work Session. Dr. Richardson provided an overview. Ms. Walker shared parameters for the public work session. Council and the Budget Management staff discussed next steps and budget details related to Schools, the Capital Improvement Program, and potential impacts to equity, revenues and shortfalls.

Ms. Kimberly Powell, Assistant Superintendent for Charlottesville City Schools shared information about school funding, advising that sales tax and lottery revenues have been negatively impacted. Additional financial information was shared by Deputy City Manager Letitia Shelton.

Dr. Rosa Atkins, Superintendent for Charlottesville City Schools, shared information about CARES Act funding and cuts to the City Schools budget.

Ms. Walker left the meeting at 9:17 p.m.

Vice Mayor Magill recessed the meeting at 9:17 p.m.

Vice Mayor Magill reconvened the meeting at 9:28 p.m.

Council and Dr. Atkins continued the School budget discussion.

Mr. Blair provided clarification to City Council on procedures for budget amendments leading up to adoption of the City Budget for FY 2021, and potential actions following adoption.

Council gave guidance to the Budget Management Department for advertising the City Manager's Proposed Budget. Dr. Richardson gave a brief presentation on the City Manager's Proposed FY 2021 Budget.

2. Ms. Hill began a conversation about future meetings of City Boards and Commissions. Dr. Richardson shared information about next steps in gathering information for further input to Council. Councilors discussed information received from boards and commissions related to any pending issues that require urgent attention, and any concerns that they wished to share with City Council and the City Manager. Mr. Payne advised that the consultants working on the City Comprehensive Plan were working along their same timeline. Council discussed the need to replace a representative of the PLACE Committee and Mr. Alex Ikefuna, Director of Neighborhood Development Services, advised that it would not be necessary at this time to appoint a new member.

MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

Ms. Magill opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Walt Heinecke asked about the public being able to view the City Budget prior to the work session on May 6. He asked if budget decisions could be made with an equity lens for lower income residents.

Mr. Sean Tubbs of the Piedmont Environmental Council spoke about boards and commissions meetings and advised of other locality boards moving forward with meetings regarding land use.

Ms. Joy Johnson, City resident, spoke about the Housing Advisory Committee and the intent of CDBG funds to be used for social components and infrastructure.

Ms. Tanesha Hudson spoke about sidewalks and the use of CDBG funds. She suggested that Council talk to the residents about their needs.

Ms. Magill closed public comment.

The meeting adjourned at 10:36 p.m.

BY Order of City Council

BY Kyna Thomas, Clerk of Council

CITY COUNCIL BUDGET WORK SESSION
Wednesday, May 6, 2020 Minutes
Virtual/electronic meeting, 4:00 p.m.

The Charlottesville City Council met in a virtual work session on Wednesday, May 6, 2020, with the following Councilors present: Mayor Nikuyah Walker, Vice Mayor Sena Magill, Ms. Heather Hill, Mr. Michael Payne and Mr. Lloyd Snook.

Ms. Walker called the budget work session to order at 4:07 p.m. and turned the meeting over to City Manager Tarron Richardson.

Dr. Richardson introduced Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Rosa Atkins, who presented the revised Charlottesville City Schools budget proposal. Dr. Atkins shared a revenue estimates summary, and non-discretionary and critical expenses for FY21. The total estimated City funding request was \$1,343,000.

Councilors followed up with questions about funding for pupil transportation, vehicle maintenance, about the use of any CARES Act funds, and about the potential losses from decreased sales tax and lottery revenue. Budget staff and City department directors were present to answer questions.

Dr. Richardson presented the revised City Manager's Proposed Budget for FY21, holding tax rates to the same level as FY20, and projecting revenue decreases related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The presentation included:

- FY 2021 General Fund Expenditures
- FY 2021 Capital Improvement Program, with cash funded projects being deferred with few exceptions
- Vibrant Community Fund still in the information gathering phase
- Budget Amendments (timing based upon the economy)
- Budget Updates to be conducted on a monthly basis and discussed with Council; and internal review of revenues and expenditures to occur on a weekly basis
- Budget calendar

Council discussed the Charlottesville Supplemental Rental Assistance Program with input from Senior Budget and Management Analysts Krisy Hammill and Ryan Davidson, and Ms. Brenda Kelley, Redevelopment Manager. There was also discussion about balancing Council priorities.

Ms. Walker opened the floor for public comment. The following people spoke:

Mr. Peter Krebs spoke about infrastructure for walking and biking and the importance of exercise in fighting COVID-19.

Mr. Brandon Collins spoke about the housing voucher program, rent relief and the need for a coordinated housing strategy.

Mr. Rory Stolzenberg spoke about challenges of the City's virtual meeting platform and the Capital Improvement Program budget, specifically regarding the proposed parking deck.

Ms. Walker advised that she would allow additional public comments during Council discussion should there be interest.

Council gave direction to the City Manager to include the requested funding to City Schools in the amount of \$1,343,000.

In discussion about the Capital Improvement Program as related to City buildings, Ms. Walker disclosed her employment with the Department of Parks and Recreation, pursuant to Section 2.2-3112(B)(1) of the State of Virginia and local government Conflicts of Interest Act.

Council continued to discuss bondable and non-bondable capital projects. Mr. Payne specifically asked that the planned project at Friendship Court be noted for future discussion. Mr. Payne and Ms. Magill expressed dissent about the proposed building of a parking garage downtown.

Ms. Walker asked for public comment. The following people spoke:

Mr. Rory Stolzenberg spoke about the proposed parking deck agreement with Albemarle County, and the Market Street Garage.

- Deputy City Manager Paul Oberdorfer shared background information about existing parking and options reviewed for the proposed parking project.

With no further speakers coming forward, Ms. Walker closed public comment.

Mr. Payne mentioned a concern about Midway Manor. Mr. Alex Ikefuna, Director of Neighborhood Development Services advised that Council may want to start setting aside funds for when the low income tax credit expires in a few years

City Attorney John Blair advised on procedure for the May 18, 2020 budget public hearing.

Mr. Payne advised that the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission would be holding a public forum on May 7 with discussion about Community Development Block Grant funds, which was discussed at the May 4th City Council meeting.

Ms. Magill announced the May 7 School Board meeting and an online COVID-19 Town Hall being conducted on May 8 at 3:00 p.m., with registration at www.charlottesville.gov/zoom.

The meeting adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

BY Order of City Council

BY Kyna Thomas, Clerk of Council



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.

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



Agenda Date:	May 18, 2020
Action Required:	Appropriation
Presenter:	Kaki Dimock, Director, Department of Human Services
Staff Contacts:	Kaki Dimock, Director, Department of Human Services
Title:	Appropriation from Department of Human Services Fund Balance for the Pathways/Community Resource Hotline - \$400,000

Background:

Department of Human Services is seeking an appropriation of \$400,000 from the Department of Human Services Fund Balance to provide emergency finance assistance to community members through the Pathways/Community Resource Hotline. This hotline is maintained by the Department of Human Services in order to provide immediate financial relief to community members experiencing a financial crisis.

Discussion:

Due to the pandemic crisis, requests for financial assistance through the resource hotline have increased dramatically, resulting in the full distribution of previously appropriated funds from City Council. Most callers are seeking assistance with rent or housing costs which are paid directly to the landlord.

At this writing, there are approximately 500 requests for financial support from the city pending and every expectation that this need will continue over the next few months.

The department seeks to use \$50,000 of these funds to provide one-time financial assistance to people ineligible for the Federal stimulus due to their designation as undocumented, immigrant, migrant or domestic worker as a match to the \$250,000 grant to the community from the Open Society Foundation's Emma Lazarus Campaign on Cities. \$350,000 will be used to fund emergency financial relief payments as described above.

Alignment with City Council's Vision and Strategic Plan:

This appropriation request is aligned with city council's vision; specifically the areas of 'economic sustainability' and 'quality housing opportunities for all'.

Community Engagement:

The Department of Human Services is in regular contact with community members in need, community partners addressing financial needs, and partners in Albemarle County to ensure that we are able to be responsive and comprehensive, particularly during this health and economic crisis. Hotline operators have engaged with over 4,000 community members in need as part of the partnership with the Charlottesville Area Community Foundation and United Way of Greater Charlottesville.

Budgetary Impact:

Funding for this expenditure will be transferred to the General Fund from the Department Human Services Fund balance. This transfer still leaves sufficient funding in the Department of Human Services fund balance should funding be needed to manage unexpected changes in state or federal funding in the coming months.

Recommendation:

Staff recommend approving the appropriation.

Alternatives:

Should council decide not to appropriate funds, community members will not receive assistance from the city to address their financial need.

Attachments:

APPROPRIATION

APPROPRIATION

Appropriation of Human Services Fund Balance for the Pathways/Community Resource Hotline

\$400,000

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the sum of \$400,000 in Department of Human Services fund balance, is hereby appropriated in the following manner:

Expenditures - \$400,000

Fund: 213 Cost Center: 3411001000 G/L Account: 561105

Transfer From:

Fund: 213 Cost Center: 3411001000 G/L Account: 561105

Transfer To:

Revenue:

Fund: 105 Cost Center: 974302008000 G/L Account: 498010

Expense:

Fund: 105 Cost Center: 974302008000 G/L Account: 599999

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the amount above appropriated from the Human Services Fund balance for the Pathways/Community Resource Hotline shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby automatically appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

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



Agenda Date:	May 18, 2020
Action Required:	Approval of Homeowner Tax Relief Grant Program
Presenter:	Todd D. Divers, Commissioner of the Revenue
Staff Contacts:	Todd D. Divers, Commissioner of the Revenue John C. Blair, II, City Attorney
Title:	Homeowner Tax Relief Grant – 2020

Background:

Attached is an ordinance for Council’s consideration for the Homeowner Tax Relief grant program for low-and moderate-income homeowners for Calendar Year 2020. The program allows the owners of eligible homeowner-occupied properties grant amounts applied to real estate taxes due on the property for the second half of calendar year 2020.

Discussion:

Enabling language for the CHAP Program is found in Sec. 50.7 of the City’s Charter, which requires that in determining who are “low and moderate income persons” the City must apply the income guidelines issued by the VHDA for use in its single-family mortgage loan program. Those guidelines also contain limitations on the value of the home in question. Current VHDA guidelines stipulate a maximum income threshold of \$90,000 and a maximum home value of \$375,000. Though FY21 budget discussions are not over and the FY21 budget has not been adopted, Council has agreed to leave the grant and income parameters that were used in 2019 in place for the 2020 CHAP Program:

2020 CHAP				
Applicant Income	\$0 - \$25,000	\$25,001 - \$35,000	\$35,001 - \$45,000	\$45,001 - \$55,000
Grant Amount	Full Relief	\$1000	\$750	\$500

Any remaining grant amount in excess of what is owed on the taxpayer’s second half bill, but not to exceed the entire annual tax due, shall be remitted to the taxpayer.

Maximum value for a qualifying home is \$375,000

Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Priority Areas:

This aligns with the City Council’s Vision “...to be flexible and progressive in anticipating and responding to the needs of our citizens.”

Budgetary Impact:

Cost of this program is funded with the annual budget appropriation for Fiscal Year 2021 once approved by Council.

Recommendation:

Approve proposed ordinance

AN ORDINANCE TO ESTABLISH A GRANT PROGRAM TO PROMOTE AND PRESERVE HOMEOWNERSHIP BY LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME PERSONS WITHIN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

WHEREAS, effective July 1, 2006, §50.7 of the Charter of the City of Charlottesville authorizes City Council to make grants and loans of funds to low- or moderate-income persons to aid in the purchase of a dwelling within the City; and

WHEREAS, this City Council desires to offer a monetary grant for Fiscal Year 2020-2021, to aid low- and moderate-income citizens with one of the ongoing expenses associated with the purchase of a dwelling, i.e. real estate taxes; and

WHEREAS, public funding is available for the proposed grant;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it ordained by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, effective July 1, 2020 and for calendar year 2020:

Grant—provided.

(a) There is hereby provided to any natural person, at such person's election, a grant in aid of payment of the taxes owed for the taxable year on real property in the city which is owned, in whole or in part, and is occupied by such person as their sole dwelling. The grant provided within this section shall be subject to the restrictions, limitations and conditions prescribed herein following.

(b) If, after audit and investigation, the Commissioner of Revenue determines that an applicant is eligible for a grant, the Commissioner of Revenue shall so certify to the City Treasurer, who shall implement the grant as a prepayment on the applicant's real estate tax bill due on December 7, 2020.

(c) The amount of each grant made pursuant to this ordinance shall be equal to the total 2020 real estate taxes owed by taxpayers with a household income less than or equal to \$25,000; \$1,000 for taxpayers with a household income of \$25,001-\$35,000; \$750 for taxpayers with a household income of \$35,001-\$45,000; and \$500 for taxpayers with a household income from \$45,001-\$55,000, to be applied against the amount of the real estate tax bill due on December 7, 2020. Any remaining grant amount in excess of what is owed on the taxpayer's second half bill, but not to exceed the entire annual tax due, shall be remitted to the taxpayer.

Definitions.

The following words and phrases shall, for the purposes of this division, have the following respective meanings, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning:

(1) *Applicant* means any natural person who applies for a grant authorized by this ordinance.

(2) *Dwelling* means a residential building, or portion such building, which is owned, at least in part, by an applicant, which is the sole residence of the applicant and which is a part of the real estate for which a grant is sought pursuant to this ordinance.

(3)*Grant* means a monetary grant in aid of payment of taxes owed for the taxable year, as provided by this ordinance.

(4)*Spouse* means the husband or wife of any applicant who resides in the applicant's dwelling.

(5)*Real estate* means a city tax map parcel containing a dwelling that is the subject of a grant application made pursuant to this ordinance.

(6)*Taxes owed for the current tax year* refers to the amount of real estate taxes levied on the dwelling for the taxable year.

(7)*Taxable year* means the calendar year beginning January 1, 2020.

(8)*Household income* means (i) the adjusted gross income, as shown on the federal income tax return as of December 31 of the calendar year immediately preceding the taxable year, or (ii) for applicants for whom no federal tax return is required to be filed, the income for the calendar year immediately preceding the taxable year: of the applicant, of the applicant's spouse, and of any other person who is an owner of and resides in the applicant's dwelling. The Commissioner of Revenue shall establish the household income of persons for whom no federal tax return is required through documentation satisfactory for audit purposes.

Eligibility and restrictions, generally.

A grant awarded pursuant to this ordinance shall be subject to the following restrictions and conditions:

(1)The household income of the applicant shall not exceed \$55,000.

(2)The assessed value of the real estate owned by the applicant shall not exceed \$375,000.

(3)The applicant shall own an interest in the real estate that is the subject of the application (either personally or by virtue of the applicant's status as a beneficiary or trustee of a trust of which the real estate is an asset) and the applicant shall not own an interest in any other real estate (either personally or by virtue of the applicant's status as a beneficiary or trustee of a trust of which the real estate is an asset).

(4)As of January 1 of the taxable year and on the date a grant application is submitted, the applicant must occupy the real estate for which the grant is sought as his or her sole residence and must intend to occupy the real estate throughout the remainder of the taxable year. An applicant who is residing in a hospital, nursing home, convalescent home or other facility for physical or mental care shall be deemed to meet this condition so long as the real estate is not being used by or leased to another for consideration.

(5)An applicant for a grant provided under this ordinance shall not participate in the real estate tax exemption or deferral program provided under Chapter 30, Article IV of the Charlottesville City Code (Real Estate Tax Relief for the Elderly and Disabled Persons) for the taxable year, and no grant shall be applied to real estate taxes on property subject to such program.

(6)An applicant for a grant provided under this division who is delinquent on any portion of the real estate taxes due on a property to which the grant is to be applied, must be in good standing on a payment plan with the Treasurer’s office with the aim of paying off said delinquency.

(7)Only one grant shall be made per household.

Procedure for application.

(a)Between July 1 and September 1 of the taxable year, an applicant for a grant under this ordinance shall file with the Commissioner of Revenue, in such manner as the Commissioner shall prescribe and on forms to be supplied by the city, the following information:

(1)the name of the applicant, the name of the applicant’s spouse, and the name of any other person who is an owner of and resides in the dwelling.

(2)the address of the real estate for which the grant is sought;

(3)the household income;

(4)such additional information as the Commissioner of Revenue reasonably determines to be necessary to determine eligibility for a grant pursuant to this ordinance.

(b)Changes in household income, ownership of property or other eligibility factors occurring after September 1, but before the end of the taxable year, shall not affect a grant once certified by the Commissioner of the Revenue, in which case such certified grant shall be applied to the subject real estate.

(c)Any person who willfully makes any false statement in applying for a grant under this division shall be guilty of a Class 3 misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not less than \$25 nor more than \$500 for each offense.

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



Agenda Date: May 18, 2020

Action Required: Approval and Appropriation (1st Reading)

Staff Contacts: Ryan Davidson, Sr. Budget and Management Analyst
Krisy Hammill, Sr. Budget and Management Analyst

Presented By: Dr. Tarron Richardson, City Manager

Title: Public Hearing on Budget/First Reading of FY 2021 Budget Appropriation

Background:

The proposed FY 2021 Budget Appropriation reflects revisions that were made to the Proposed FY 2021 City Manager’s Proposed Budget that was presented to Council on March 2, 2020, due to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Discussion:

The final Council Adopted Budget and the Appropriations ordinance for FY 2021 will be approved on June 1, 2020.

Community Engagement:

Tonight’s meeting includes a public hearing on the budget, continuing a series of public engagement opportunities around the budget.

Alignment with City Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan:

This budget aligns with Council’s Vision and Strategic Plan and is detailed in the budget document.

Budgetary Impact:

This is the first of two readings required to adopt the final budget for Fiscal Year 2021.

Recommendation:

Receive public comment on the proposed FY 21 Budget and Appropriation

Alternatives:

N/A

Attachments:

1. FY 2021 Budget Appropriation
2. Amendments to the FY 2021 City Manager's Proposed Budget

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE BUDGET FOR THE
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR
BEGINNING JULY 1, 2020, AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2021
AND PROVIDING FOR THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS
FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR.

I. ADOPTION OF BUDGET

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 19 of the City Charter and Section 15.2-2503 of the Code of Virginia, the City Manager has caused to be prepared and presented to City Council a proposed budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020, and ending June 30, 2021; and

WHEREAS, a synopsis of such proposed budget has been published in the Daily Progress, a newspaper of general circulation in the City, and notice duly given in such newspaper and public hearings held thereon on March 16, 2020 and May 18, 2020, and the estimates of revenues and expenditures therein debated and adjusted by City Council in open public meetings, all as required by the City Charter and Section 15.2-2506 of the Code of Virginia.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville that such document, the statements of fiscal policy set forth therein, and the estimates of revenues and expenditures therein proposed by the City Manager and debated and adjusted by the City Council, are hereby adopted as the annual budget of the City of Charlottesville, for informative and fiscal planning purposes only, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020, and ending June 30, 2021; and that a true and correct copy of the same, as adopted, shall be kept on file in the records of the Clerk of the Council.

II. GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville that:

A. The sums hereinafter set forth are estimated as General Fund revenues for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020.

Local Taxes

Real Estate Taxes	\$78,353,270
Personal Property Tax	9,800,000
Public Service Corporation Tax	1,459,389
Penalty/Interest on Delinquent Taxes	415,000
Utility Services Consumer Tax (Gas, Water, Electric)	5,024,112
Virginia Communications Sales and Use Tax	2,600,000
Tax on Bank Stock	1,200,000
Tax on Wills and Deeds	625,000
Sales and Use Tax	11,504,331

Rolling Stock Tax	19,319
Transient Occupancy (Lodging) Tax	6,282,721
Meals Tax	11,842,493
Short-Term Rental Tax	60,000
Cigarette Tax	575,000
Recordation Tax Receipts	205,223
Vehicle Daily Rental Tax	82,500
Total Local Taxes	\$130,048,358
Licenses and Permits	
Business and Professional Licenses	\$6,225,000
Vehicle Licenses	900,000
Dog Licenses	10,000
Electrical and Mechanical Permits	250,000
Building and Plumbing Permits	450,000
Temporary Parking Permits	150,000
Site Plans	75,000
Other Permits	140,500
Total Licenses and Permits	\$8,200,500
Intergovernmental Revenue	
<i>Revenue from State Agencies</i>	
PPTRA Revenue (State Personal Property Tax)	\$3,498,256
State Highway Assistance	4,291,324
Reimbursement/Constitutional Offices	1,698,184
State Aid for Police Protection	2,077,468
Trailer Title	1,200
DMV Select Office Commissions	35,000
Other State Assistance: Misc. Rev	50,000
<i>Revenue from Other Intergovernmental Sources</i>	
School Resource Officers (City Schools)	301,231
Regional Library Administrative Fee	117,144
Crisis intervention Team Revenue	105,910
Fire Department Ops (Albemarle County)	195,000
Fire Department Ops (UVA)	353,000
Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court (Albemarle County)	63,760
Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court Building Maintenance (Albemarle County)	57,913
Magistrate's Office (Albemarle County)	4,575
Payments In Lieu of Taxes (Housing Authority)	25,000
Service Charge (UVA)	46,000
Property Maintenance (UVA)	63,455
Total Intergovernmental Revenue	\$12,984,420
Charges for Services	
Property Transfer Fees	\$1,000
Zoning Appeals Fees	1,100
Court Revenue (Circuit/General District Courts)	500,000

Circuit Court - Online Land Records Subscription Revenue	30,000
Internal City Services	1,882,925
Utility Cut Permits	185,000
Recreation Income	1,335,824
Reimbursable Overtime/Public Safety	331,579
Payment in Lieu of Taxes: Utilities	6,091,667
Indirect Cost Recovery	125,000
Waste Disposal Fees	1,115,000
Emergency Medical Services (Ambulance) Revenue Recovery	1,300,000
Other Charges for Services	125,000
Total Charges for Services	\$13,024,095
Miscellaneous Revenue	
Interest Earned	\$706,000
Rent	194,956
Refund of Prior Years' Expenditures	50,000
Other Miscellaneous Revenue	613,000
Total Misc. Revenue	\$1,563,956
Transfers from Other Funds	
Landfill Reserve Fund	\$250,000
Parking Enterprise Fund	1,200,000
Total Transfers from Other Funds	\$1,450,000
City/County Revenue Sharing: Operating Budget	\$13,289,313
Total Operating Revenue	\$180,560,642
Designated Revenue	
City/School Contracts: Pupil Transportation	\$2,972,130
City/School Contracts: School Building Maintenance	3,816,780
City/County Revenue Sharing: Transfer to Capital Improvement Fund	900,000
Transfer to the Capital Improvement Fund - Mall Vendor Fees	93,750
City/County Revenue Sharing: Transfer to Facilities Repair Fund	400,000
Transfer to Debt Service Fund: Meals Tax Revenue	2,452,571
Total Designated Revenue	\$10,635,231
Total General Fund Revenue	\$191,195,873

B. The sums hereinafter set forth are hereby appropriated from the General Fund of the City for the annual operation of the City departments, other agencies and non-departmental accounts so set forth, beginning July 1, 2020.

Operating Expenditures

Management

Mayor and City Council	\$572,629
Office of the City Manager/Administration	1,536,483
Office of the City Manager/Communications	552,602
Office of the City Manager/Economic Development	1,129,622
Office of the City Attorney	1,030,055
Office of General Registrar	671,840

Contributions to Organizational Memberships and Workforce

Development Programs

Virginia Municipal League	16,820
Chamber of Commerce	2,000
Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission	86,454
Piedmont Workforce Network	7,971
Virginia Institute of Government	2,500
Alliance for Innovation	2,550
Virginia First Cities Coalition	18,000
Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development	24,640
Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District	13,049
Central Virginia Small Business Development Center	19,200
Rivanna Conservation Alliance	11,000
National League of Cities	5,000
Center for Nonprofit Excellence	600

Non Departmental Activities

City Strategic Plan/P3: Plan, Perform, Perfect	105,000
Participatory Budgeting	15,000
Virginia Juvenile Community Crime Control Act (Local Match)	108,415
Citizen Engagement Opportunities	15,000
Food Equity	155,000
Citizen Review Board (CRB)	150,000
Innovation Fund	20,000
Performance Agreement Payments to CFA	250,000
Citywide Reserve - Economic Downturn	7,525,437
Ivy Landfill	210,000
Transfer to Debt Service Fund	8,560,788
Transfer to Fund Balance Target Adjustment Fund	481,905
Employee Compensation and Training	1,926,887

Internal and Financial Services

Finance Department - Administration/Purchasing/Assessor	2,544,984
Human Resources	1,215,923
Commissioner of Revenue	1,344,901

Treasurer	1,356,697
Information Technology	2,996,483

Healthy Families and Community

Transfer to Children's Services Act Fund	2,004,722
Transfer to Social Services Fund	3,602,777
Transfer to Human Services/Community Attention Fund	641,280
Neighborhood Development Services	2,406,657
Office of Human Rights/Human Rights Commission	238,438
Parks and Recreation	11,535,820
Transfer to Convention and Visitors' Bureau	1,212,691

Unallocated Agency Funding

Unallocated Vibrant Community Funds	2,104,683
Unallocated Arts and Culture Funding	154,446

Contributions to Children, Youth, and Family Oriented Programs

Virginia Cooperative Extension Program	52,297
Thomas Jefferson Health District	612,708
Region Ten Community Services Board	1,180,092
Jefferson Area Board for Aging (JABA)	319,192
United Way - Thomas Jefferson Area	192,504

Contributions to Education and the Arts

Jefferson Madison Regional Library	2,015,037
City Center for Contemporary Arts	47,970
Piedmont Virginia Community College	12,317
McGuffey Art Center	24,035
Historic Preservation Task Force	5,000

Contributions to Housing Programs

Rent Relief for Elderly, a sum sufficient estimated at	20,099
Rent Relief for Disabled, a sum sufficient estimated at	219,133
Tax Relief for Elderly, a sum sufficient estimated at	130,738
Tax Relief for Disabled, a sum sufficient estimated at	61,542
Homeowners Tax Relief Program	1,443,488
Stormwater Fee Assistance Program	20,000

Infrastructure and Transportation

Public Works: Administration, Facilities Development, Facilities Maintenance	3,258,129
Public Works: Hedgerow Properties	49,820
Public Works: Public Service	9,199,706
Transfer to Charlottesville Area Transit Fund	2,513,651
JAUNT Paratransit Services	1,744,416

Public Safety and Justice	
City Sheriff	1,275,198
Commonwealth's Attorney	1,155,259
Clerk of Circuit Court	749,452
Circuit Court Judge	88,864
General District Court	21,143
Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court/Court Services Unit	415,260
Magistrate	8,500
Fire Department	12,539,795
Police Department	18,017,555
Contributions to Programs Supporting Public Safety and Justice	
Regional Jail	4,316,546
Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Center	576,870
Emergency Communications Center	1,510,827
Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	282,415
Public Defender's Office	59,512
Local Contribution to Public Schools	
Operational Support	57,834,623
Total Operating Expenditures \$180,560,642	
Designated Expenditures	
City/School Contracts: Pupil Transportation	\$2,972,130
City/School Contracts: School Building Maintenance	3,816,780
Transfer to Capital Projects Fund	900,000
Transfer to Capital Projects Fund - Mall Vendor Fees	93,750
Transfer to Facilities Repair Fund	400,000
Transfer to Debt Service Fund - Meals Tax Revenue	2,452,571
Total Designated Expenditures \$10,635,231	
<hr/>	
Total General Fund Expenditures	\$191,195,873
<hr/>	

C. Of the sum of \$14,589,313 to be received in the General Fund from the County of Albemarle under the revenue sharing agreement of May 24, 1982, \$400,000 shall be transferred to the Facilities Repair Fund.

D. The amounts hereinabove appropriated for salary accruals, education, training and employee benefits, or portions thereof, may on authorization from the City Manager, or his designee, be transferred by the Director of Finance or the Deputy City Manager to any departmental account, and notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution to the contrary, be expended for salaries or employee benefits in such account in the manner as sums originally appropriated thereto.

E. The portions of the foregoing appropriations to individual departments or agencies intended for motor vehicles and related equipment shall be transferred to the Equipment Replacement Fund for expenditure as hereinafter provided.

F. The amount above appropriated for Debt Payment shall be transferred to the Debt Service Fund. In addition, an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the meals tax rate will be deposited into the Debt Service Fund.

G. The amount above appropriated as Council Strategic Initiatives shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

H. The amount above appropriated as Ivy Landfill Remediation shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, and any unspent funds are hereby transferred to the Landfill Reserve account in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council. Further, any amount in the Landfill Reserve may be immediately appropriated for use to cover costs associated with the landfill remediation budget in the current fiscal year.

I. The amount above appropriated as Hedgerow Properties shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but is hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

J. The proceeds of the sale of any real property shall be appropriated to the Strategic Investment Fund.

K. The amount received for \$4-For-Life revenue shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year and will be appropriated into the Fire Department budget, unless altered by further action of City Council.

L. Of the above amount of funding appropriated to the Fire Department budget for Emergency Medical Services (EMS), \$450,000 is the City's contribution to the Charlottesville Albemarle Rescue Squad (CARS). In addition, a 10% contingency of \$91,064 for the EMS System shall be set aside per the agreement between the City and CARS. Any contingency funds remaining unexpended at the end of the fiscal year shall be transferred into a separate EMS Equipment Replacement Fund to be used for future EMS equipment needs to support the provision of emergency medical services in the City of Charlottesville.

M. The amount above appropriated as Historic Resources Task Force shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but is hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

N. The amount received as drug forfeitures and seizures revenue collected by the Police Department and Commonwealth Attorney's Office shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but is hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

O. The amount received as Courthouse Security Revenue is hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year and appropriated into the Sheriff Office budget to be used for court security related expenses (personnel and equipment) per the Code of Virginia. Further, any unspent funds in the Court House Security account shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless further altered by Council.

P. Funds from the Citywide Reserve account may be transferred to other funds at the discretion of the City Manager for the purpose of addressing unforeseen expenditures in those funds. Any amount remaining in the Citywide Reserve account shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but is hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

Q. The amount above appropriated as Corporate Training Fund, within the Employee Compensation and Training funds, shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but is hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

R. The amounts received unspent for donations and grants in the General Fund received for specific purposes shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year and hereby are appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year.

S. The amounts above appropriated as Sister City Commission shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

T. Sums appropriated for the Stormwater Assistance Program shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

U. The amounts above appropriated funds for the City Strategic Plan - P3: Plan, Perform, Perfect shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

V. The amounts above appropriated funds for the Innovation Fund shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

W. The amounts above appropriated funds for the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

X. Sums appropriated in the General Fund which have not been encumbered or expended as of June 30, 2021, shall be deemed to revert to the unassigned balance of the General Fund, unless Council by resolution provides that any such sum shall be a continuing appropriation.

Y. Sums appropriated in the General Fund which have not been encumbered or expended as of June 30, 2021 and are in excess of 17% of General Fund expenditures for the next fiscal year shall be deemed to revert to the Capital Fund contingency account for future one-time investments in the City’s infrastructure as part of the year-end appropriation, unless further altered by Council with year-end adjustments.

III. SCHOOL OPERATIONS APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville:

The sums hereinafter set forth are hereby appropriated for the annual operation of the school operations, effective July 1, 2020; the City contribution to the School operations having hereinabove been appropriated from the General Fund.

School Budget (All Funds)	
Local Contribution	\$57,834,623
State Funds	21,014,925
Federal Funds	5,280,802
Fund Balance	720,649
Misc. Funds	3,167,089
Total School Operations Budget	\$88,018,088

A net increase in the School Operations general fund balance at June 30, 2021 shall be deemed to be allocated as follows:

- Surplus operating budget up to \$100,000 will be allocated to the School Facility Repair Fund, however Charlottesville City Schools will be required to commit \$100,000 of their annual budget to the Facility Repair Fund
- Funds in excess of \$100,000 up to \$200,000 will be retained by the City of Charlottesville School Division
- Funds over \$200,000 will be shared equally (50/50) between the City and Charlottesville City Schools

IV. HEALTH BENEFITS FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville:

There is hereby appropriated from the Health Benefits Fund sums received by said Fund from individual departments and agencies for the payment of health and medical benefit program costs, and for insurance covering such costs, and in addition, for the accumulation of a reserve for future expenditures to pay for such health and medical benefit program costs. This appropriation shall be effective during the fiscal year ending June 30, 2021, but shall not be deemed to expire at the end of that year. Instead, it shall continue in effect unless altered by further action of City Council.

V. RETIREMENT BENEFITS FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville:

There is hereby appropriated from the Retirement Benefits Fund sums received by said Fund from individual departments and agencies for the payment of retirement benefit program costs, and for insurance covering such costs, and in addition, for the accumulation of a reserve for future expenditures to pay for such retirement benefit program costs. This appropriation shall be effective during the fiscal year ending June 30, 2021, but shall not be deemed to expire at the end of that year. Instead, it shall continue in effect unless altered by further action of City Council.

VI. TRANSIT FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, that there is hereby appropriated from the Transit Fund, for the operation of the transit bus system during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021, the sum of \$8,982,666 or the amount of revenue actually received by such fund, whichever is the greater amount. Such appropriation shall be effective July 1, 2020.

Except as is otherwise expressly provided herein, the balance of any General Fund contribution to such funds not expended or encumbered as of June 30, 2021 shall be deemed to revert to the unassigned balance of the General Fund, unless the Council by resolution provides that any such sum shall be deemed a continuing appropriation.

VII. RISK MANAGEMENT APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, that all sums previously appropriated to the Risk Management Fund, all sums received by such fund as payment from other City funds, are hereby appropriated for the uses prescribed for such fund, pursuant to the terms of, and subject to the limitations imposed by Article V of Chapter 11 of the Code of the City of Charlottesville, 1990, as amended.

VIII. EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville:

There is hereby appropriated from the Equipment Replacement Fund other sums received by such fund as payment from the General Fund and vehicle sales, and proceeds from vehicle loss insurance settlements for the lease, financing or purchase of motor vehicles and related equipment and for accumulation of a reserve for future equipment purchases during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021. Such appropriation shall be effective July 1, 2020; provided that such appropriations shall not be deemed to expire at the end of such fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council. Of the sums received

by the Equipment Replacement Fund, a sum sufficient to service the debt on any pieces of general governmental equipment obtained under a master lease, credit line, or an installment purchase agreement shall be transferred to the Debt Service Fund.

IX. FACILITIES REPAIR FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville:

The sum of \$400,000 transferred to the Facilities Repair Fund from the General Fund, and such sums as may be transferred to the Facilities Repair Fund from other funds during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 are appropriated for carrying out the purposes of this fund during that fiscal year. However, such appropriation shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of this Council.

X. JOINT HEALTH DEPARTMENT BUILDING FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville:

The amounts received as Health Department Building Account revenue during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 are appropriated to the Joint Health Department Building Fund to be used for general improvements, maintenance and small capital projects related to the Thomas Jefferson Health District building. Further, any unspent funds in the Health Department Building account shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless further altered by Council.

XI. DEBT SERVICE FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville:

A. The Debt Service Fund shall serve as a permanent reserve for the payment of principal and interest of bonds, notes and other evidences of indebtedness and the cost of issuance thereof issued by the City pursuant to its Charter and/or the Virginia Public Finance Act.

B. The sum of \$8,560,788 transferred to such fund by Part II of this resolution, as well as the designated Meals Tax transfer (estimated at \$2,452,571), or as much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to pay such debt service expenses during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021.

C. Appropriations in the Debt Service Fund shall be deemed continuing appropriations, and balances remaining in such fund at the end of each fiscal year shall be carried forward to pay principal and interest due on City obligations and costs associated with the issuance of those obligations in future years.

XII. SPECIAL REVENUE FUND APPROPRIATIONS

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, that the following appropriations are hereby approved for agency expenditures accounted for as separate funds of the City, for their respective programs during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021; the City contribution to each such fund having hereinabove been appropriated from the General Fund:

A. There is hereby appropriated from the Human Services/Community Attention Fund, for the operation of the Community Attention Homes and related programs during such fiscal year, the sum of \$6,784,014, or the amount of revenue actually received by such fund, whichever shall be the lesser amount.

B. There is hereby appropriated from the Social Services Fund, for the operation of the Department of Social Services during such fiscal year, the sum of \$14,981,907, or the amount of revenue actually received by such fund, whichever shall be the lesser amount.

C. There is hereby appropriated from the Children's Services Act Fund, for the operation of the Children's Services Act entitlement program, the sum of \$8,444,864, or the amount of revenue actually received by such fund, whichever shall be the greater amount.

Each such special revenue fund appropriation shall be deemed effective July 1, 2020. Except as is otherwise expressly provided herein, the balance of any General Fund contribution to such funds not expended or encumbered as of June 30, 2021 shall be deemed to revert to the unassigned balance of the General Fund, unless the Council by resolution provides that any such sum shall be deemed a continuing appropriation.

XIII. INTERNAL SERVICES FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville that the following appropriations are hereby approved for internal services accounted for as separate funds on the books of the City, for their respective programs during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021; the payments of individual departments and agencies to each such fund having hereinabove been appropriated in the General Fund and other applicable funds:

A. There is hereby appropriated from the Information Technology Fund, for the operation of the various functions within this fund during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020, or the amount of revenue actually credited to such fund from other City departments and agencies, whichever shall be the greater amount:

1. For the operation and infrastructure of City Link, the sum of \$1,200,000. However, such appropriation shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year,

but is hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year into the City Link Infrastructure cost center unless altered by further action of this Council.

2. For Technology Infrastructure Replacement, the sum of \$291,900. However, such appropriation shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but is hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of this Council.

B. There is hereby appropriated from the Warehouse Fund, for the operation of the Warehouse during such fiscal year, the sum of \$163,218, or the amount of revenue actually credited to such fund from other City departments and agencies, whichever shall be the greater amount.

C. There is hereby appropriated from the Fleet Maintenance Fund, for the operation of the Central Garage, Vehicle Wash and Fuel System during such fiscal year, the sum of \$1,169,528 or the amount of revenue actually credited to such fund from other City departments and agencies, whichever shall be the greater amount.

D. There is hereby appropriated from the Communications System Fund, for the operation of the citywide phone system and mailroom operations during such fiscal year, the sum of \$273,587, or the amount of revenue actually credited to such fund from other City departments and agencies, whichever shall be the greater amount.

XIV. CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND APPROPRIATIONS

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that:

A. The following are hereby designated as revenue of the Capital Projects Fund:

1. The sum of \$900,000 shall be transferred from the General Fund.
2. The sum of \$93,750 collected as mall vendor fees will be transferred from the General Fund and used to fund infrastructure repairs for the Downtown Mall.
3. The proceeds of the sale of any real property, as prescribed by resolution of this Council adopted November 3, 1986.
4. The proceeds of the sale of any real property to be used for housing shall be appropriated to the "Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund" account in the Capital Fund.
5. Funds received as donations and/or contributions for sidewalks shall hereby be appropriated into Sidewalks account (P-00335) to be used for the replacement, construction or repair of sidewalks. These funds shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year and shall be hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council

B. The sums hereinafter set forth are hereby appropriated from the Capital Projects Fund of the City for the respective capital purchases or projects so set forth, effective for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020; provided that such appropriations shall not be deemed to expire at the end of such fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of City Council.

C. The Capital Projects Fund Fiscal Year 2021-2025 will reflect the budget delineations set forth below for Fiscal Year 2020-2021.

The Capital Projects Fund grouped by area:

<u>Revenue</u>	
Transfer from General Fund	\$900,000
Transfer from General Fund - Mall Vendor Fees	\$93,750
Contribution from Albemarle County	500,000
Contribution from City Schools	200,000
VDOT Revenue Sharing	200,000
PEG Fee Revenue	40,000
CY 2021 Bond Issue	23,861,092
TOTAL REVENUE	\$25,794,842
<u>Expenditures</u>	
Education	\$3,400,000
Public Safety and Justice	1,295,500
Facilities Capital Projects	4,120,491
Transportation and Access	14,445,101
Parks and Recreation	93,750
Affordable Housing	2,400,000
Technology Infrastructure	40,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$25,794,842

XV. GAS FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, that there is hereby appropriated from the Gas Fund, for the operation of the gas utility during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021, the sum of \$27,837,698 or the amount of revenue actually received by such fund, whichever is the greater amount. Such appropriation shall be effective July 1, 2020. However, the appropriations for the Vehicle Replacement Program, the Gas Fund Capital program, the Thermostat Program the Strategic Energy Initiatives program and the Gas Assistance Program shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of this Council. The Gas rates for our customers indicated in the Utility Rate Study are reviewed and approved by Council each year. At that time the Gas operations budget, including any new programmatic requests, and the Gas capital improvement program budget are reviewed and may be amended.

XVI. WATER FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, that there is hereby appropriated from the Water Fund, for the operation of the water utility during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021, the sum of \$17,272,327, or the amount of revenue actually received by such fund, whichever is the greater amount. Such appropriation shall be effective July 1, 2020. However, the appropriations for the Vehicle Replacement Program, Water Fund Capital program, Water Conservation Program, Water Assistance Program, Rain Barrel Program and the Toilet Rebate Program shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of this Council. The Water rates for our customers indicated in the Utility Rate Study are reviewed and approved by Council each year. At that time the Water operations budget, including any new programmatic requests, and the Water capital improvement program budget are reviewed and may be amended.

XVII. WASTEWATER FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, that there is hereby appropriated from the Wastewater Fund, for the operation of the wastewater utility during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021, the sum of \$17,203,764 or the amount of revenue actually received by such fund, whichever is the greater amount. Such appropriation shall be effective July 1, 2020. However, the appropriations for the Vehicle Replacement Program, the Wastewater Fund Capital program, and the Wastewater Assistance Program shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of this Council. The Wastewater rates for our customers indicated in the Utility Rate Study are reviewed and approved by Council each year. At that time the Wastewater operations budget, including any new programmatic requests, and the Wastewater capital improvement program budget are reviewed and may be amended.

XVIII. STORMWATER FUND APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, that there is hereby appropriated from the Stormwater Fund, for the operation of the stormwater utility during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021, the sum of \$2,794,572 or the amount of revenue actually received by such fund, whichever is the greater amount. Such appropriation shall be effective July 1, 2020. However, the appropriations for the Stormwater Fund Capital program shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of this Council.

XIX. UTILITIES FUNDS DEBT SERVICE APPROPRIATION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, that there is hereby appropriated from the Utilities Funds (Gas, Water, Wastewater and Stormwater) for the payment of principal and interest of bonds, notes and other evidences of indebtedness and the cost of issuance thereof issued by the City pursuant to its Charter and/or the Virginia Public Finance Act., during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021, or as much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to pay such debt service expenses during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021. However, such appropriation shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but is hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of this Council.

A. There is hereby appropriated from the Gas Debt Service Fund, the sum of \$300,000 as revenue (transfer from Gas Fund) and \$133,166 in principal and interest payments or as much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to pay such debt service expenses during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021.

B. There is hereby appropriated from the Wastewater Debt Service Fund the sum of \$3,000,000 in revenue (transfer from the Wastewater Fund) and \$2,731,162 in principal and interest payments or as much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to pay such debt service expenses during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021.

C. There is hereby appropriated from the Water Debt Service Fund the sum of \$1,800,000 in revenue (transfer from the Water Fund) and \$1,696,008 in principal and interest payments or as much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to pay such debt service expenses during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021.

D. There is hereby appropriated from the Stormwater Debt Service Fund the sum of \$129,683 in revenue (transfer from the Stormwater Fund) and \$119,039 in principal and interest payments or as much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to pay such debt service expenses during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021.

XX. PARKING FUND

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, that there is hereby appropriated from the Parking Fund, for parking operations the sum of \$3,657,155, or the amount of revenue actually received by such fund, whichever is the greater amount.

1. The Parking Operation budget includes a budgeted transfer to the General Fund in the amount of \$1,200,000 or the actual net revenues received from public serving parking facilities, permits, meters and fines, whichever is the lesser.
2. Revenue received for parking development contributions shall not be deemed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, but are hereby appropriated in the ensuing fiscal year unless altered by further action of this Council.

XXI. PAY PLAN APPROVAL

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville that the Employee Classification and Pay Plan for the City of Charlottesville dated July 1, 2020 and effective on that same date, which assigns salary ranges to each class or position in the City service is hereby approved pursuant to Section 19-3 and 19-4 of the City Code, 1990, as amended and a copy of the same shall be kept on file with the records of the meeting at which this resolution is approved.

XXII. GOLF FUND

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Charlottesville, that there is hereby appropriated from the Golf Fund, for the operation of the golf courses during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 the sum of \$989,940 or the amount of revenue actually received by such fund, whichever is the greater amount.

**City Council Amendments to the
FY 2021 Proposed General Fund Budget**

Manager's Recommended FY 21 Expenditures	\$ 191,195,873
Amendments to FY 21 Expenditures	
<i>Decrease Expenditures</i>	
Non Departmental	
Citywide Reserve - Economic Downturn	(875,000)
<i>Increase Expenditures</i>	
Contribution to City Schools	
City Contribution to Schools	875,000
Total Expenditure Amendments	\$ -
Total Amended FY 21 General Fund Expenditures	\$ 191,195,873

**City Council Amendments to the
FY 2021 Proposed Social Services Budget**

Manager's Recommended FY 21 Revenue Estimates	\$ 14,981,907
Amendments to FY 21 Revenue Estimates	
<i>Decrease Revenues</i>	
State Assistance and Grants	(173,239)
Total Revenue Amendments	\$ (173,239)
Total Amended FY 21 Social Services Fund Revenue Estimates	\$ 14,808,668
Manager's Recommended FY 21 Expenditures	\$ 14,981,907
Amendments to FY 21 Expenditures	
<i>Decrease Expenditures</i>	
Purchased Services	(173,239)
Total Expenditure Amendments	\$ (173,239)
Total Amended FY 21 Social Services Fund Expenditures	\$ 14,808,668

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
Taneia 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.

	Description	Goal	Need	Outcomes	Strategies	Implement	Eval	Demogr	Financial	Collab	Engage	PN	Org Capa	Budget	Subtotal	
AHIP																
	TD	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2.5	36.5
	ECM	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	40
	HE	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	40
	JB															0
	HK	2	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	1	2	3	3	2	34
	MG	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	1	34
	NC	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	31
	OG															0
	KLS															0
																215.5
																23.94444
U. Way																
	TD	3	3	2	3	2	0	3	3	3	3	2	1	1	1	30
	ECM	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	36
	HE	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	39
	JB															0
	HK	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	0	2	3	26
	MG	0	3	3	1	3	1	2	3	2	2	2	0	1	1	24
	NC	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	2	24
	OG															0
	KLS															0
																179
																19.88889
TJACH																
	TD	2	2	1.5	2	3	1	3	3	2	3	3	1	3	1	30.5
	ECM	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	41
	HE	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	3	0	3	3	0	2	1	22
	JB															0
	HK	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	38
	MG	1	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	2	3	3	0	3	1	32
	NC	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	3	2	29
	OG															0
	KLS															0
																192.5
																21.38889
PHAR																
	TD	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	35
	ECM	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	36
	HE	2	2	2	0	2	1	1	1	0	2	3	3	2	2	23
	JB															0
	HK	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	40
	MG	1	3	2	1	0	3	0	3	3	0	3	2	0	0	21
	NC	2	2	0	1	1	2	1	2	3	0	3	3	2	2	24
	OG															0
	KLS															0
																179
																19.88889
Habitat																
	TD	3	3	3	2.5	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	36.5
	ECM	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	39
	HE	3	3	1	2	2	1	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	1	28
	JB															0
	HK	3	3	3	3	1	2	2	3	3	1	2	0	3	3	32
	MG	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	0	2	2	34
	NC	2	3	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	25
	OG															0
	KLS															0
																194.5
																21.61111
Econ Scores below																
OED																
	EG	3	1.5	1	0	1.5	3	2	3	1	1	3	0	0	2	22
	KL	3	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	34.5
	SM	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	25
	DK	2	2	0	1	1	1	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	29
	LS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
																110.5
																22.1
CIC																
	EG	3	3	2	1.5	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	0	0	3	31.5
	KL	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	39
	SM	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	1	3	1	3	0	3	3	33
	DK	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	0	2	3	1	3	3	33
	LS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
																136.5
																27.3
PHA																
	EG	1.5	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	1	3	0	0	1	15.5
	KL	2	3	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	0	3	1	21
	SM	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	1	0	2	0	2	1	27
	DK	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	9
	LS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
																72.5
																14.5