

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



Agenda Date:	January 19, 2021
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 2021-2022

Background:

This agenda item includes project recommendations 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 2020, the City of Charlottesville advertised a Request for Proposals (RFP) based on the priorities set by Council on September 21, 2020. 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 three applications totaling \$161,594 for HOME housing projects; one application totaling \$57,000 for CDBG housing projects, three applications totaling \$59,000 for public service projects; and two applications totaling \$44,238 for economic development projects. A summary of applications received is included in this packet.

On November 12th 2020, the CDBG/HOME Task Force reviewed and recommended housing and public service projects virtually for funding and the Strategic Action Team reviewed and recommended economic development projects virtually for funding.

CDBG and HOME Project Recommendations for FY 2021-2022:

The CDBG program total has an estimated \$419,367 for the 2021-2022 program year. The CDBG grand total reflects the \$419,367 Entitlement (EN) Grant, and \$0 in previous years' entitlement available. 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. 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 – On May 4, 2020, Council approved Ridge Street to be the rotating Priority Neighborhood in FY21-22 and FY22-23. This helps prevent phasing of a neighborhood project over the course of the three-year period. The Ridge Street Taskforce for the Priority Neighborhood will recommend improvement projects to be carried out with CDBG funds. City Council will review and approve the Ridge Street Priority Neighborhood Taskforce recommendations towards Summer 2021 to be included with the submission of the FY21-22 Action Plan.

Economic Development – Council set aside FY 21-22 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 develop financial management habits through mentorship and technical assistance and fund two staff positions for the assisted home performance workforce development.

Public Service Programs – The CDBG/HOME Task Force has recommended two 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 funding 16 low-income residents with resident involved redevelopment and funding individualized one-to-one instruction to help with workforce development tutoring skills for 30 illiterate City residents.

CDBG Housing Funds: The CDBG/HOME Task Force has recommended one CDBG housing programs for funding. Funds are proposed to be used to provide 20 energy efficient upgrades to qualifying homes within the Ridge Street neighborhood.

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 three programs that support homeowner rehabilitation. Estimated benefits includes one homeowner rehabilitations within the Ridge Street target area, four down payment assistance to low-income homeowners of 0-50% AMI, and providing 20 energy efficient upgrades to qualifying homes.

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 between October 1 2020 and October 16 2020. 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. 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, 2021.

Alternatives:

No alternatives are proposed.

Attachments:

- 2021-2022 Proposed CDBG and HOME Budget
- Appropriation Resolution for CDBG funds
- Appropriation Resolution for HOME funds
- Summary of RFPs submitted
- RFP Rubric
- Minutes from CDBG Task Force meetings

**2021-2022 CDBG and HOME BUDGET ALLOCATIONS
 RECOMMENDED BY CDBG/HOME TASK FORCE and SAT: 11/12/2020
 RECOMMENDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION: 12/8/2020
 APPROVED BY CITY COUNCIL:**

A. PRIORITY NEIGHBORHOOD	
A. Ridge Street Priority Neighborhood	\$150,000.00*
B. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	
A. Community Investment Collaborative – Financial Management Program	\$32,056.28
B. Local Energy Alliance Program – Workforce Development	\$29,238.00
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TOTAL:	\$61,294.28
C. PUBLIC SERVICE PROJECTS	
A. Public Housing Association of Residents – Resident Involved Redevelopment	\$34,000.00
B. Literacy Volunteers – Workforce Development Tutoring	\$25,000.00
SOCIAL PROGRAMS TOTAL:	\$59,000.00 (15% EN)
D. HOUSING PROJECTS	
A. Local Energy Alliance Program – Assisted Home Performance	\$65,199.32
HOUSING PROGRAMS TOTAL:	\$65,199.32
E. ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING:	
A. Admin and Planning	\$83,873.40 (20% EN)
GRAND TOTAL:	\$419,367
ESTIMATED NEW ENTITLEMENT AMOUNT:	\$419,367

* Funding includes reprogrammed funds

2021-2022 HOME BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

A. AHIP – Homeowner Rehab	\$37,352.00*
B. Habitat for Humanity – Down Payment Assistance	\$24,000.00*
C. LEAP – Assisted Home Performance	\$19,242.00*
TOTAL:	\$80,594.00
ENTITLEMENT AMOUNT:	\$80,594.00
ESTIMATED EN AVAILABLE AFTER PI APPLIED:	\$0.00
LOCAL MATCH:	\$20,148.50

* Includes estimated EN available after program income applied

**APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR
THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE'S 2021-2022
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 2021-2022 fiscal year in the total amount of **\$419,367** from HUD.

WHEREAS, City Council has received recommendations for the expenditure of funds from the CDBG/HOME Task Force, the SAT, and the Planning Commission; 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	\$150,000.00
------------------------------------	--------------

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Community Investment Collaborative Scholarships	\$32,056.28
Local Energy Alliance Program Workforce Development	\$29,238.00

PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAMS

PHAR – Resident Involved Redevelopment	\$34,000.00
LVCA – Workforce Development Tutoring	\$25,000.00

HOUSING PROJECTS

LEAP – Assisted Home Performance	\$65,199.32
----------------------------------	-------------

ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING:

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

TOTAL	\$419,367
--------------	------------------

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

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.

Approved by Council
January 19, 2021

Kyna Thomas
Clerk of Council, CMC

**APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR
THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE'S 2021-2022
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 2021-2022 fiscal year;

WHEREAS, the region is receiving an award for HOME funds for fiscal year 21-22 of which the City will receive \$80,594 to be expended on affordable housing initiatives such as homeowner rehab, energy efficiency improvements, 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. The total of the HUD money, program income, and the local match, equals \$100,722.48 and will be distributed as shown below.

PROJECTS	HOME EN	MATCH	TOTAL
AHIP-Homeowner Rehab	\$37,352.00	\$6,716.16	\$44,048.16
Habitat for Humanity-DPA FY21-22	\$24,000.00	\$6,716.16	\$30,716.16
LEAP- Assisted Home Performance	\$19,242.00	\$6,716.16	\$25,958.16
Total	\$80,594	\$20,148.50	\$100,722.48

* 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.

Approved by Council
January 19, 2021

CDBG-CV3 + CDBG + HOME RFP Submissions

		Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested	
CDBG-CV3	Public Service	Pearl Transit	Jael Watts	24-hr Transportation and Non-perishable Food Delivery	\$ 132,384.00	
		Habitat for Humanity	Ruth Stone	COVID Response Program	\$ 90,000.00	
		Charlottesville Redevelopment Housing Authority	Kathleen Glenn-Matthews	CRHA Eviction Diversion Program	\$ 320,000.00	
	Econ	Community Investment Collaborative (CIC)	Stephen Davis	COVID Response Microenterprise Assistance	\$ 130,970.00	
	Total Amount of Request (Public Services)		\$ 542,384.00	Total Amount of Request (Econ)		\$ 130,970.00
	Total Projected Budget (Public Services)		\$ 134,009.60	Total Projected Budget (Econ)		\$ 134,009.60
	Request Overage (Public Services)		\$ (408,374.40)	Request Overage (Econ)		\$ (3,039.60)
CDBG	Econ	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested	
		Local Energy Alliance Program (LEAP)	Chris Meyer	Assisted Home Performance Worforce Development	\$ 29,238.00	
		Community Investment Collaborative (CIC)	Stephen Davis	Financial Management Program	\$ 15,000.00	
		Total Amount of Request				\$ 44,238.00
		Total Projected Budget				\$ 61,294.28
Request Overage				\$ (17,056.28)		
CDBG	Public Services (15% Cap)	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested	
		Public Housing Association of Residents (PHAR)	Brandon Collins	Resident Involved Redevelopment	\$ 34,000.00	
		Literacy Volunteers Charlottesville/Albemarle	Ellen Osborne	Beginning Level Workforce Development Tutoring	\$ 25,000.00	
		Total Amount of Request				\$ 59,000.00
		Total Projected Budget				\$ 62,905.05
Request Overage				\$ (3,905.05)		
CDBG	Housing	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested	
		Local Energy Alliance Prorgam (LEAP)	Chris Meyer	Cville Low-Income Assisted Home Performance	\$ 57,000.00	
		Total Amount of Request				\$ 57,000.00
		Total Projected Budget				\$ 61,294.28
Request Overage				\$ (4,294.28)		
HOME	Organization, Program Title	Project Contact	Program Description	Funding Requested		
	Local Energy Alliance Program (LEAP)	Chris Meyer	Cville Low-Income Assisted Home Performance	\$ 57,000.00		
	Habitat for Humanity	Ruth Stone	Affordable Housing Downpayment Assistance	\$ 24,000.00		
	Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP)	Cory Demchak	Charlottesville Critical Rehab Program	\$ 80,594.00		
	Total Amount of Request				\$ 161,594.00	
Total Projected Budget				\$ 80,594.00		
Request Overage				\$ (81,000.00)		

CDBG-CV3	Applicant	Score	Funding request	TF Recommendation 1
	CRHA	37.3	\$ 320,000.00	\$ 91,485.94
	Habitat	37.8	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 45,563.26
	Pearl Transit	26.75	\$ 132,384.00	\$ -
	<i>CIC (ECON)</i>	34.2	\$ 130,970.00	\$ 130,970.00
Total Amount Requested (ps)			\$ 542,384.00	\$ 137,049.20
Total Amount Requested (econ)			\$ 130,970.00	
Total projected Budget (econ)			\$ 134,009.60	
Total projected Budget (ps)			\$ 134,009.60	
Request Overage (ps)			\$ (408,374.40)	
Requested Overage (econ)			\$ 3,039.60	

CDBG Econ	Applicant	Score	Funding request	TF Recommendation 1
	LEAP	29.3	\$ 29,238.00	\$ 29,238.00
	CIC	34.2	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 32,056.28
Total Amount Requested			\$ 44,238.00	\$ 61,294.28
Total projected Budget			\$ 61,294.28	
Request Overage			\$ 17,056.28	

CDBG Public Services	Applicant	Score	Funding request	TF Recommendation 1
	PHAR	39.33	\$ 34,000.00	\$ 34,000.00
	LVCA	39.33	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00
	Total Amount Requested			\$ 59,000.00
Total projected Budget (15%)			\$ 62,905.05	
Request Overage			\$ 3,905.05	

CDBG Housing	Applicant	Score	Funding request	TF Recommendation 1	
	LEAP	36.5	\$ 57,000.00	\$ 65,199.32	
	Total Amount Requested			\$ 57,000.00	\$ 65,199.32
	Total projected Budget			\$ 61,294.28	
Request Overage			\$ 4,294.28		

HOME	Applicant	Score	Funding request	TF Recommendation 1
	Habitat	37.67	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 24,000.00
	AHIP	33.67	\$ 80,594.00	\$ 37,352.00
	LEAP	36.5	\$ 57,000.00	\$ 19,242.00
	Total Amount Requested			\$ 161,594.00
Total projected Budget			\$ 80,594.00	
Request Overage			\$ (81,000.00)	

SCORING RUBRIC FOR CDBG-CV3/CDBG/HOME GRANT PROPOSALS



Name of Applicant:

Name of Project:

	Exemplary (3 Points)	Adequate (2 Points)	Needs Improvement (1 Point)	Missing Information (0 Points)	Score	Comments
Program/Project Description	Provides a clear description and clearly explains how it will address a Council Priority	Provides a description that adequately explains how it will address a Council Priority	Program/project description needs improvement	Proposal does not describe how it will address a Council Priority		
Program/Project Goal	Provides a clear explanation of the goal. Identifies what will be provided to whom, how many. Provides demographic information of the beneficiaries and how they will meet the income guidelines	Provides an adequate explanation of the goal	Program/Project goal needs improvement. Barely identifies what will be provided to whom and how many. Barely provides demographic information and how the beneficiaries will meet the income guidelines	Goal is missing and/or not explained. Identification of beneficiaries, number of beneficiaries, demographic information, and information about how the beneficiaries will meet the income guidelines is missing		
Need	Clearly describes how the program will directly address the needs.	Adequately describes how the program will directly address the needs using some local	Description of need needs improvement. Only state, regional, or national data	Does not describe how the program will directly address the needs and/or		

	Provides local data to describe the needs of the community <u>and</u> the beneficiaries	data to describe the needs of the community <u>and</u> the beneficiaries	provided, data not specific to clients	does not provide data to describe the needs of the community and the beneficiaries		
Outcomes	Clearly explains how proposed outcomes will be meaningful, client-focused and related to the service	Adequately explains how proposed outcomes will be meaningful, client-focused and related to the service	Explanation of how proposed outcomes will be meaningful, client-focused and related to the service needs improvement	Does not explain how proposed outcomes will be meaningful, client-focused and/or related to the service		
Strategies	Provides evidence-based strategies for how the program/project will address the need	Adequately describes how strategies address need using researched best practices strategies at a minimum	Describes how strategies address need without information about best practices or research	Does not identify how strategies directly address need		
Implementation Timeline	Timeline is detailed and realistic	Timeline is adequate	Timeline is limited or not realistic	No timeline provided and information is missing		
Evaluation Plan	Provides a rigorous evaluation plan which informs ongoing work, explains metrics and why they are used	Provides a solid evaluation plan	Evaluates some elements of its work, but the evaluation is not thorough	Proposal does not provide an evaluation plan or the plan is insufficient		
Demographic Verification	Proposal clearly describes how the agency will collect and verify <u>all</u> required information	Proposal adequately describes how the agency will collect and verify all required information	Proposal describes how the agency will collect and verify <u>some</u> required information	Proposal does not describe how the agency will collect and verify any required information		

Financial Benefits	Proposal describes how the program fully meets two financial benefits	Proposal describes how the program fully meets one financial benefit	Proposal describes how the program <u>partially</u> meets one to two financial benefits	Proposal does not describe how the program will provide a financial benefit		
Collaboration	Proposal describes how the program collaborates with other organizations to achieve a common goal using defined deliverables and metrics (ex. Clear accountability, shared management, such as MOU's or formal partnership agreements)	Proposal describes formal agreements with more than two organizations describing how they cooperate, but does not share common deliverables or metrics.	Proposal describes collaboration informally with other organizations (ex. information sharing, resource sharing)	Proposal does not describe collaboration with other entities		
Engagement/ Outreach Strategy	Proposal describes complete outreach and engagement strategies and explains how it will serve needy and underserved populations	Proposal describes some outreach and engagement strategies and how it will serve needy and underserved populations	Proposal explains that services are available to needy and underserved populations but program/project does not conduct outreach or engagement	Proposal does not provide strategies for outreach and engagement to needy and underserved populations		
Priority Neighborhood Ridge Street	Proposal describes complete outreach strategies and program/project serves residents in the Priority Neighborhood	Proposal describes some outreach and program/project serves residents in the Priority Neighborhood	Proposal explains that services are available to priority neighborhood residents but program/project does not conduct outreach	Proposal does not provide strategies for outreach to priority neighborhood residents		

Organizational Capacity (STAFF ONLY – not included in scoring)	Organization demonstrated sufficient capacity and fully met projected outcomes in previous grant year	Organization demonstrated adequate capacity and almost met projected outcomes in previous grant year	Organization capacity needs improvement, did not meet projected outcomes	The organization demonstrated a lack of a capacity		
Outstanding Funding (STAFF ONLY – included in scoring)	Organization expended all previous grant funding or is a new applicant with no prior CDBG/HOME/CDBG-CV dollars unspent.			Organization has been awarded grant funding from prior fiscal years and has been unable to spend all the funding.		
Organizational Capacity	Proposal provides clear evidence of the capacity and ability to ensure timely performance and reporting	Proposal provides adequate evidence of the capacity and ability to ensure timely performance and reporting	Evidence of capacity and ability needs improvement. Does not address the question fully	Proposal does not provide evidence of the capacity and ability		
Budget	Proposal clearly demonstrates: A. How requested funds will be applied to expense line items B. How the amount requested is reasonable C. That the overall program budget shows a direct	Proposal provides an adequate budget. Adequately addresses A, B, and C	Proposed budget needs improvement and barely addresses A, B, and/or C. Proposed budget needs improvement.	The proposal does not demonstrate how the requested funds will be applied to expense line items, how the amount requested is reasonable, and does not show a direct relationship with proposed service items		

	relationship with proposed service items					
TOTAL SCORE (MAX SCORE = 45 PTS)						



CDBG Taskforce and SAT Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Thursday, November 12th, 2020

3:30-5:30 PM

Virtual Meeting

AGENDA

1. Introductions/Housekeeping/Minutes
 - a. SAT Committee 3:30-4:15pm
 - b. CDBG Taskforce: 4:15-5:30pm
2. Review Application Scores & Create proposal budget.
 - a. CDBG-CV3 2020-2021
 - b. CDBG 2021-2022
 - c. HOME 2021-2022
3. Other Business
4. Public Comment

Staff Contact:

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

CDBG Strategic Action Team (SAT) Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Taskforce Member	Present	Absent
Sue Moffett	X	
Kelley Logan	X	
Letitia Shelton		X
Gretchen Ellis	X	
Diane Kuknyo	X	
Erin Atak	X	

SAT Minutes

Grants Coordinator Erin Atak (EA) outlines the pre-application technical assistance process for the CDBG, HOME, and CDBG-CV3 grants. All applicants underwent an application workshop and a CDBG/HOME grant workshop session to review how to complete the web application, and the federal requirements for CDBG/HOME/CDBG-CV3.

12 applicants were met with during the mandatory technical assistance pre-application submittal phase, 8 applications were submitted for review.

EA states that one change was made to the coring rubric for all applications. This was to address the HUD timeliness requirement, (24CFR 570.902(a)). Applicants were told during the technical assistance meetings that applicants with outstanding CDBG and HOME funds may not be receiving as strong of a consideration in this review process. This change helps the City and subrecipients stay in compliance with HUD timeliness requirements and promote new applicants to join the CDBG and HOME application process.

EA states to the SAT members that they have the option to fully fund the CDBG econ applications, partially fund the applications, fund one application or not the other, or fund none of the applications.

Gretchen Ellis (GE) asks if the committee can fund an applicant more than what was requested.

EA: Yes – the Taskforce can check with Community Investment Collaborative and Local Energy Alliance Program staff in the audience to see whether they would be able to manage additional funds.

GE: Poses the question of whether the grants being awarded to microenterprises through CIC's application could be increased as we have been in this COVID state for an expended period of time – increasing the grant among would benefit businesses more.

CIC Staff member Anna speaks with the Taskforce and states that CIC would be able administer larger grants and could manage extra funding and could also help more businesses at the same small grant threshold depending on how the Taskforce decided.

GE makes a recommendation to move some of the CDBG econ overage funding into the CIC econ funding recommendation.

Sue Moffett (SM) states that she had difficulty with the LEAP application as there was an absence of data making it hard to measure effectiveness of the project aside from reviewing the purpose of the project.

GE: Poses a question for LEAP about whether that have previous experience with working with previously incarcerated individuals transition to the workforce. GE also mentions that LEAP's application is more focused in the target neighborhood.

Chris Meyer from LEAP addresses GE's questions, states they have experience with working with Home to Hope individuals. States that this is one strategy to build a workforce.

Diane Kuknyo (DK) asks Chris Meyer about whether the homes benefiting from the program will be rental properties with wealthy homeowners or low-income homeowners.

Chris Meyer from LEAP addresses DK's concern and states that this program will benefit low-income homeowners.

GE moves to fully funding LEAP and to funding CIC at the full amount along with adding the \$17,000 overage to CIC so that CIC could increase the number of microloans to the proposed businesses.

Kelly Logan (KL) seconds.

Moving to CDBG-CV3 Econ category

EA explains that the SAT members only review the economic development applications while the CDBG/HOME Taskforce review the public service and housing applications in accordance to the CDBG Citizen Participation Plan.

GE moves to fund CIC CDBG-CV3 application at the full \$130,970.00

SM seconds.

SAT recommends the final budget:

CDBG Econ
LEAP \$29,238

CIC \$32,056.28

CDBG-CV3

CIC \$130,970

SAT Committee is Adjourned.

CDBG/HOME Taskforce Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Taskforce Member	Present	Absent
James Bryant	X	
Taneaia Dowell	X	
Howard Evergreen	X	
<i>Belmont Rep: VACANT</i>		X
Nancy Carpenter		X
Emily Cone-Miller	X	
Matthew Gillikin	X	
Kem Lea Spaulding	X	
Helen Kimble	X	
Erin Atak	X	

CDBG Minutes

Grants Coordinator Erin Atak (EA) outlines the pre-application technical assistance process for the CDBG, HOME, and CDBG-CV3 grants. All applicants underwent an application workshop and a CDBG/HOME grant workshop session to review how to complete the web application, and the federal requirements for CDBG/HOME/CDBG-CV3.

12 applicants were met with during the mandatory technical assistance pre-application submittal phase, 8 applications were submitted for review.

EA states that one change was made to the coring rubric for all applications. This was to address the HUD timeliness requirement, (24CFR 570.902(a)). Applicants were told during the technical assistance meetings that applicants with outstanding CDBG and HOME funds may not be receiving as strong of a consideration in this review process. This change helps the City and subrecipients stay in compliance with HUD timeliness requirements and promote new applicants to join the CDBG and HOME application process.

EA states that the SAT committee members made the funding recommendations for the econ applications.

CDBG Taskforce begins to review the CDBG public services applications

Howard Evergreen (HE) asks about how the taskforce can allocate the overage in public services

EA states that the overage can be directed toward another application in housing that may need it or be directed toward the Ridge Street Priority Neighborhood budgeted at \$150,000.

Kem Lea Spaulding (KLS) asks what is needed of the taskforce today.

EA explains that the Taskforce has the option to either fully fund, partially fund, or not fund the applicants, funds can also be moved to the Ridge Street priority neighborhood taskforce and to housing as needed.

Matthew Gillikin (MG) makes a funding recommendation to fully fund PHAR (\$34,000) and LVCA (\$25,000). MG states both applicants received the same score and fit within the 15% funding cap.

Taneaia Dowell (TD) seconds.

HE, KLS, and James Bryant (JB) also agreed.

KLS asks whether all the applications presented today are providing services only for the Ridge Street priority neighborhood.

EA explains that the grant is not exclusive to the Ridge street priority neighborhood. Some applicants are providing services within the target neighborhood, and others are providing services to City residents. The Ridge Street Priority neighborhood portion of the CDBG grant focuses solely in Ridge Street.

Emily Cone Miller (ECM) and MG make a funding recommendation to fully fund LEAP (\$57,000).

JB, TD, and HE second.

KLS asks whether LEAP is hiring Ridge Street residents for the job training program.

Chris Meyer from LEAP addresses this question, staff members come through the Home to Hope program. LEAP is asking for various funds from the CDBG econ and CDBG housing and HOME to service homes with energy efficiency improvements.

MG asks whether funds from the CDBG-CV3 could be moved to different funding categories.

EA answers that CDBG-CV3 is a separate grant and that those funds would need to remain separate from the CDBG and HOME.

HE and MG discuss briefly that Habitat for Humanity submitted two different applications for CDBG-CV3 and HOME, unlike LEAP who submitted the same application for multiple sources of funding. HE explains that Habitat applied for down payment assistance through the HOME grant and applied for a COVID relief rent/mortgage relief program through CDBG-CV3.

TD states a concern that she believes Habitat recruited only members through the Homeownership program.

Ruth Stone from Habitat addresses TD's question and states that the pathways to housing program through Habitat produces an applicant pool that needs financial empowerment that can be aided with CDBG and HOME.

MG makes one funding recommendation to fully fund Habitat (\$24,000) and give the remainder of the budget to AHIP.

HE ask if Habitat has outstanding funds.

EA states that a reasoning would need to be given to HUD as to why the City continues to re-award organizations with outstanding funds dating back to 2018. EA states that Habitat has outstanding down payment funds totaling \$14,813.52.

HE states that AHIP's proposal is to complete one home. Partially funding this application might make this hard to accomplish. He adds that LEAP's application aims to help more people with the funding requested.

TD agrees with HE's comments, and states that Habitat has not spent all the prior funding and is leveraging to complete said projects with some of the other projects that were funded earlier.

Cory Demchak from AHIP typically helps 10-20 homes with federal funds and assisting 1 home eliminates a lot of the admin work.

HE asks LEAP how partially funding their HOME application would affect their program.

Chris Meyer from LEAP states that a partial funding would reduce the number of homes that would get addressed.

The Taskforce moves to vote fully funding Habitat for Humanity (\$24,000).

HE asks EA whether this will work with the unspent funds.

EA states that if the Taskforce moves to recommend fully funding an application, an explanation will be given to HUD. The main concern is addressing the unspent funds with HUD and avoiding having subrecipients having to pay back HUD.

TD asks whether COVID-19 has affected projects.

EA states yes.

Emily Cone Miller (ECM) asks whether HOME funds could get moved to another funding category.

EA states that HOME funds need to remain in HOME (No).

MG makes a funding recommendation to fully fund Habitat (\$24,000) again. MG points out that the AHIP total rehab costs was over \$200,000 and that funding the proposal regardless of the amount would only assist partially.

ECM proposes funding LEAP the remaining 1/3 of the funds, and AHIP with the remaining 2/3 funds.

HE asks if AHIP received partial funding, would this affect the project?

Cory Demchak from AHIP states that receiving partial funding could affect this project specifically, but AHIP could switch to providing homeowner rehabs within the Ridge Street Neighborhood if that was the case.

Helen Kimble (HK) makes a funding recommendation to fund AHIP at 2/3 of the remaining HOME funds and fund LEAP with 1/3 of the remaining funds.

HE adds that the taskforce move to take the overage from the public services and housing category and place it into the LEAP application as they are not receiving full funding in the HOME category.

Taskforce approves: AHIP (\$37,352), LEAP (19,242) for HOME.

Taskforce begins to review CDBG-CV3

MG states that based on the scoring the fund should be divided between CRHA and Habitat. Pearl Transit's application scored significantly lower than the other two.

Members of the Taskforce state that the lack of clarity within the application poses concern.

MG asks if CRHA would be able to accomplish their activity on partial funding.

Kathleen Glen Matthews from CRHA states that the organization can scale back the scope of work offered within the application and pursue other sources of funding.

MG states that the rental assistance portion of the CRHA application was the most appealing given the current health crisis.

John Sales from CRHA speaks with the Taskforce about the eviction diversion program.

JB asks John about the role of the Housing Stabilization Coordinator.

John states that this role would work directly with families to work on repayment agreements and affordability.

JB states that homeowner eviction education during this time is a priority.

The Taskforce discusses on the CRHA application and the Habitat for Humanity covid application.

EA reminds the Taskforce that splitting up funds between organizations means less of the scope of work for both organizations would get accomplished, regarding CRHA and Habitat's application.

HE proposes splitting the funds between the two organizations (CRHA and Habitat). The funding recommendation is made that Habitat and CRHA both receive \$67,004.80.

ME mentions that he does not mind splitting the funds between the organizations and suggests that CRHA prioritize emergency rental relief.

Taskforce members discuss whether the funding recommendation should change.

TD proposes of funding CRHA with 2/3 of the public services covid funding, and the remaining 1/3 of the funding would be recommended to Habitat. TD explains that Habitat received funds in the HOME category.

TD also proposes to move the overage of econ funds to CRHA CDBG-CV3 application as there are no outstanding grant funds unspent with this applicant.

HE agrees.

Taskforce discusses on whether to split the public services funding evenly between CRHA and Habitat, or to divide it into thirds.

EA reminds the Taskforce that HUD needs justification from the Taskforce as to why the committee is recommending awarding an organization with outstanding grant funds.

Taskforce members move to fund CRHA with \$91,485.94 and fund Habitat \$45,563.26. CRHA was recommended to receive the funding overage.

Meeting Adjourned.