

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



Agenda Date:	February 16, 2021
Action Required:	Appropriation and Resolution
Presenter:	Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator Tim Motsch, Transportation Project Manager
Staff Contacts:	Erin Atak, Grants Coordinator
Title:	FY2020-2021 CDBG Substantial Action Plan Amendment and Reprogramming 2019 CDBG funds for COVID-19 Public Services.

Background:

This agenda item includes a substantial action plan amendment, a public hearing, and corrected budget for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), received from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The CARES Act modifies some CDBG program rules and authorizes the Secretary of HUD to grant waivers and alternative requirements. Accordingly, FR-6218-N-01 describes how requirements of the CDBG program are modified for CDBG-CV grants, fiscal year 2020 CDBG grants, and fiscal year 2019 CDBG grants under the Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act.

On January 14, 2021, the City of Charlottesville was found to be noncompliant, for the second consecutive year, with the CDBG timely expenditure requirements. Nevertheless, in accordance with the Federal Register Notice FR-6218-N-01, Section IV. B. 1., HUD suspended effective January 21, 2020 all corrective actions for timeliness in fiscal year 2020. This suspension has recently been extended through December 31, 2020, and the first three months of the 2021 fiscal year. Based on government restrictions, closures, shelter-in-place orders, and social distancing guidance related to coronavirus, HUD has determined that all entitlement grantees have factors beyond their reasonable control that, to HUD's satisfaction, impact the carrying out of CDBG-assisted activities in a timely manner. Therefore, HUD has determined that corrective actions related to timeliness are not appropriate at this time.

HUD has noted that the City of Charlottesville's lack of timely performance as a deficiency. On January 30, 2020, it was calculated that the City had an adjusted line of credit balance of 2.06 times the annual grant. The City is now subject to the Department's timeliness sanctions policy. HUD will conduct its final timeliness test on the City of Charlottesville on May 2, 2021. HUD and City Staff conducted a concurrent audit of the City CDBG program. HUD has recommended resources to assist the City to reach the May 2, 2021 timeliness deadline.

Discussion:

City staff has identified an immediate program for funding to solve the City's timeliness concerns by May 2, 2021. The City has unexpended 2019 CDBG entitlement funds totaling \$244,950.82

from the delayed Belmont Franklin St Sidewalk activity. These funds can be reprogrammed back into the 2020-2021 CDBG program budget to fund a COVID related public service activity. Future CDBG funding sources can later repay the Belmont Franklin St. Sidewalk construction activity.

To meet timeliness deadlines by May 2, 2021, reprogrammed funds must be spent down within the next three-month period. Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority's (CRHA) CDBG-CV3 previously partially funded application requested \$320,000 CDBG-CV3 dollars to fund a COVID rental relief program for CRHA residents. Staff and HUD have identified CRHA's covid rental relief application as an eligible activity for the City to quickly spend funds to meet timeliness requirements. CRHA's application went through the public participation process, received recommendation for funding from the CDBG/HOME Taskforce and Planning Commission, which allows the City to save time from having to undergo a new round of request for proposals.

City Staff has confirmed with CRHA staff on CDBG timeliness requirements to ensure HUD federal requirements will be met. Funds are proposed to provide immediate COVID-19 rental assistance to public housing residents to cover rental payments for a three period.

Community Engagement:

Members of the public were given the opportunity to voice their opinions during the HUD authorized expedited 5-day public comment period between February 1, 2021 through February 5, 2021; and at the virtual public hearing at City Council on February 16, 2021. HUD authorized an expedited 5-day public comment period on April 2, 2020 to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus with the goal to quickly appropriate funds to eligible activities.

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. There will be no impact to the City of Charlottesville budget.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the CDBG budgets, as well as approval of the substantial 2020-2021 Action Plan Amendment of the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan.

Alternatives: No alternatives are proposed.

Attachments:

- A. HUD's *Quick Guide to Eligible CDBG Activities to Support Coronavirus and Other Infectious Disease Response*
- B. HUD's *Second Year Noncompliance with Timely Expenditure Requirements; Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program*
- C. Appropriation: Reprogramming 2019 CDBG Funds
- D. Resolution: Substantial Action Plan Amendment

- E. Summary of CDBG-CV3 RFPs submitted
- F. CDBG-CV3 RFP Scoring Template
- G. Minutes from CDBG Task Force meetings

**APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR
THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE'S 2020-2021
CDBG COVID RENTAL RELIEF**

WHEREAS, the City of Charlottesville 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 in a timely manner and need to be reprogrammed as measured by the rate of expenditure of funds from the grantee's line of credit (LOC) in accordance to 24 CFR 570.902(a); and

WHEREAS, the City Manager is hereby authorized to transfer funds between among such individual accounts as circumstances may require, to the extent permitted by applicable federal grant regulations; and

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 reappropriated to the respective accounts shown as follows:

Fund	Internal Order	Program	Proposed Revised Reduction	Proposed Revised Addition	G/L Account
218	1900332	Belmont 19/20	\$244,950.82		530670
218	1900399	CRHA Covid Rental Assistance		\$244,950.82	530670

Approved by Council
February 16, 2021

Kyna Thomas, CMC
Clerk of Council

RESOLUTION
Approval of FY 2020-2021 Substantial Action Plan Amendment

BE IT RESOLVED that the Charlottesville City Council hereby approves the FY 2020 - 2021 Minor Action Plan Amendment of the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan. The reprogrammed 2019 CDBG budget will be added into the 2020-2021 Annual Action Plan for covid relief public service activities. No changes to the HOME budget will be made at this time.

Approved by Council
February 16, 2021

Kyna Thomas, CMC
Clerk of Council

Quick Guide to CDBG Eligible Activities to Support Coronavirus and Other Infectious Disease Response

REVISED April 6, 2020

Grantees should coordinate with local health authorities before undertaking any activity to support state or local pandemic response. Grantees may use Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for a range of eligible activities that prevent and respond to the spread of infectious diseases such as the coronavirus.

Examples of Eligible Activities to Support Coronavirus and Other Infectious Disease Response

<i>For more information, refer to applicable sections of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (for State CDBG Grantees) and CDBG regulations (for Entitlement CDBG grantees).</i>	
Buildings and Improvements, Including Public Facilities	
Acquisition, construction, reconstruction, or installation of public works, facilities, and site or other improvements. <i>See section 105(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(2)); 24 CFR 570.201(c).</i>	Construct a facility for testing, diagnosis, or treatment.
	Rehabilitate a community facility to establish an infectious disease treatment clinic.
	Acquire and rehabilitate, or construct, a group living facility that may be used to centralize patients undergoing treatment.
Rehabilitation of buildings and improvements (including interim assistance). <i>See section 105(a)(4) (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(4)); 24 CFR 570.201(f); 570.202(b).</i>	Rehabilitate a commercial building or closed school building to establish an infectious disease treatment clinic, e.g., by replacing the HVAC system.
	Acquire, and quickly rehabilitate (if necessary) a motel or hotel building to expand capacity of hospitals to accommodate isolation of patients during recovery.
	Make interim improvements to private properties to enable an individual patient to remain quarantined on a temporary basis.
Assistance to Businesses, including Special Economic Development Assistance	
Provision of assistance to private, for-profit entities, when appropriate to carry out an economic development project. <i>See section 105(a)(17) (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(17)); 24 CFR 570.203(b).</i>	Provide grants or loans to support new businesses or business expansion to create jobs and manufacture medical supplies necessary to respond to infectious disease.
	Avoid job loss caused by business closures related to social distancing by providing short-term working capital assistance to small businesses to enable retention of jobs held by low- and moderate-income persons.
Provision of assistance to microenterprises. <i>See section 105(a)(22) (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(22)); 24 CFR 570.201(o).</i>	Provide technical assistance, grants, loans, and other financial assistance to establish, stabilize, and expand microenterprises that provide medical, food delivery, cleaning, and other services to support home health and quarantine.

Provision of New or Quantifiably Increased Public Services	
<p>Following enactment of the CARES Act¹, the public services cap² has no effect on CDBG-CV grants and no effect on FY 2019 and 2020 CDBG grant funds used for coronavirus efforts.</p> <p><i>See section 105(a)(8) (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(8)); 24 CFR 570.201(e).</i></p>	Carry out job training to expand the pool of health care workers and technicians that are available to treat disease within a community.
	Provide testing, diagnosis or other services at a fixed or mobile location.
	Increase the capacity and availability of targeted health services for infectious disease response within existing health facilities.
	Provide equipment, supplies, and materials necessary to carry-out a public service.
	Deliver meals on wheels to quarantined individuals or individuals that need to maintain social distancing due to medical vulnerabilities.
Planning, Capacity Building, and Technical Assistance	
<p>States only: planning grants and planning only grants.</p> <p><i>See section 105(a)(12).</i></p>	Grant funds to units of general local government may be used for planning activities in conjunction with an activity, they may also be used for planning only as an activity. These activities must meet or demonstrate that they would meet a national objective. These activities are subject to the State's 20 percent administration, planning and technical assistance cap.
<p>States only: use a part of to support TA and capacity building.</p> <p><i>See section 106(d)(5) (42 U.S.C. 5306(d)(5)).</i></p>	Grant funds to units of general local government to hire technical assistance providers to deliver CDBG training to new subrecipients and local government departments that are administering CDBG funds for the first time to assist with infectious disease response. This activity is subject to the State's 3 percent administration, planning and technical assistance cap.
<p>Entitlement only: data gathering, studies, analysis, and preparation of plans and the identification of actions that will implement such plans. <i>See 24 CFR 570.205.</i></p>	Gather data and develop non-project specific emergency infectious disease response plans.

Planning Considerations

Infectious disease response conditions rapidly evolve and may require changes to the planned use of funds:

- CDBG grantees must amend their Consolidated Annual Action Plan (Con Plan) when there is a change to the allocation priorities or method of distribution of funds; an addition of an activity not described in the plan; or a change to the purpose, scope, location, or beneficiaries of an activity (24 CFR 91.505).
- If the changes meet the criteria for a "substantial amendment" in the grantee's citizen participation plan, the grantee must follow its citizen participation process for amendments (24 CFR 91.105 and 91.115).
- Under the CARES Act, CDBG grantees may amend citizen participation and Con Plans concurrently in order to establish and implement expedited procedures with a comment period of no less than 5-days.

Resources

The Department has technical assistance providers that may be available to assist grantees in their implementation of CDBG funds for activities to prevent or respond to the spread of infectious disease. Please contact your local CPD Field Office Director to request technical assistance from HUD staff or a TA provider.

- Submit your questions to: CPDQuestionsAnswered@hud.gov
- Coronavirus (COVID-19) Information and Resources: <https://www.hud.gov/coronavirus>
- CPD Program Guidance and Training: <https://www.hudexchange.info/program-support/>

¹ On March 27, 2020, President Trump approved the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (Public Law 116-136) (CARES Act). The CARES Act makes available \$5 billion in CDBG coronavirus response (CDBG-CV) funds to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus.

² Section 105(a)(8) of the HCD Act caps public service activities at 15 percent of most CDBG grants. Some grantees have a different percentage cap.

U. S. Department of Housing & Urban Development



Richmond Field Office
Community Planning & Development Division
600 E. Broad Street, 3rd Floor
Richmond, VA 23219-1800
1-800-842-2610

January 14, 2021

Mr. Alexander Ikefuna
Director
Department of Neighborhood Planning and Development
City of Charlottesville
P.O. Box 911
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Dear Mr. Ikefuna:

SUBJECT: Second Year Noncompliance with Timely Expenditure Requirements;
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program

The purpose of this letter is to advise you that the City of Charlottesville is not carrying out its Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program in a timely manner and is non-compliant, for the second consecutive year, with the CDBG timely expenditure requirements. Nevertheless, in accordance with the Federal Register Notice FR-6218-N-01, ***Program Rules, Waivers, and Alternative Requirements Under the CARES Act for Community Development Block Grant Program Coronavirus Response Grants, Fiscal Year 2019 and 2020 Community Development Block Grants, and for Other Formula Programs***, (hereinafter, the "Notice"), Section IV. B. 1., HUD suspended, effective January 21, 2020, all corrective actions for timeliness in fiscal year 2020. This suspension has recently been extended through December 31, 2020, the first three months of the 2021 fiscal year. Based on government restrictions, closures, shelter-in-place orders, and social distancing guidance related to coronavirus, HUD has determined that all entitlement grantees have factors beyond their reasonable control that, to HUD's satisfaction, impact the carrying out of CDBG-assisted activities in a timely manner. Therefore, HUD has determined that corrective actions related to timeliness are not appropriate at this time.

The remainder of this letter will detail this condition and recommended actions for the City of Charlottesville to take to address this noncompliance.

City of Charlottesville has a July 1, 2020 Program Year Start Date. When the 60-day test was conducted on December 3, 2020 it was calculated that your community had an adjusted line of credit balance of 2.50 times its annual grant. In accordance with the Notice, HUD is noting

this lack of timely performance as a deficiency. HUD did, however, send a CDBG timeliness warning letter to the City of Charlottesville in fiscal year 2019. When the 60-day test was conducted on January 30, 2020, it was calculated that your community had an adjusted line of credit balance of 2.06 times its annual grant. In that February 4, 2020, HUD found the City of Charlottesville to be in non-compliance with the CDBG program timely performance requirements and stated that it was now subject to the Department's timeliness sanctions policy. While HUD is suspending all corrective actions and sanctions pursuant to the Notice, continued noncompliance in succeeding program years may result in a sanction based on the February 4, 2020, warning letter. Before December 31, 2020, HUD will determine whether to further extend this corrective action suspension for all or additional portions of fiscal year 2021. HUD may consider regional and local conditions when determining when to begin scheduling informal consultations.

As before, HUD wants to alert you to the following four resources, a technical assistance video along with three brochures located on the HUD Exchange website, that are available to assist you in your efforts to comply with HUD's timeliness standards:

- **[“CDBG Timeliness and Best Practices to Achieve Timely Performance,”](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6z4wdiKJPG8&feature=youtu.be)**
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6z4wdiKJPG8&feature=youtu.be>
- **[“Developing and Implementing a CDBG Workout Plan,”](https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/developing-and-implementing-a-cdbg-workout-plan.pdf)**
<https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/developing-and-implementing-a-cdbg-workout-plan.pdf>
- **[“Keeping Your CDBG Funds Moving,”](https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Keeping-Your-CDBG-Funds-Moving-Guide.pdf)** and <https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Keeping-Your-CDBG-Funds-Moving-Guide.pdf>
- **[“Ensuring CDBG Subrecipient Timeliness.”](https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Ensuring-CDBG-Subrecipient-Timelines.pdf)**
<https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Ensuring-CDBG-Subrecipient-Timelines.pdf>

These resources provide guidance for keeping your CDBG program timely and will strengthen your community's program management capacity.

By way of final reminder, HUD notes, pursuant to Section III.B.7. (b) of the Notice, that CDBG-CV funds are not included in determining compliance with CDBG timely expenditure requirements. Pursuant to Section III.B.6. (a) of the Notice, however, program income generated by the use of CDBG-CV funds is treated as program income to a grantee's annual formula CDBG program. Therefore, program income generated from CDBG-CV activities will be included in timely expenditure compliance determinations for each grantee's annual formula CDBG program. Grantees should consider the potential effects of additional program income on compliance with timeliness requirements applicable to their annual formula CDBG grant program when they select, and design CDBG-CV assisted activities.

HUD appreciates the many efforts made by our grantees to continue carrying out their programs during this challenging time. My staff and I remain available to assist you in any way possible to help you achieve the timeliness standard in the future. Should you have any questions pertaining to this matter, please contact me at 202 422-0021. Staff requiring any technical assistance should contact Carolyn Meyers, Senior CPD Representative, at (804) 822-4828.

Sincerely,

Ronnie J. Legette
Director

cc:
Erin Atak
CDBG Grants Coordinator

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.