

City of Portland

CDBG Priority Setting Task Force:

Meeting 6



Wednesday, July 1, 2026 at 8:00 AM Zoom

To submit written public comment on an agenda item, email cgeorge@portlandmaine.gov. Submissions must be received by 12:00 pm the day before the Priority Setting Task Force meeting to guarantee their inclusion in the agenda packet. All submissions must include the commenter's name and legal address. To help ensure your comment is submitted for the correct item, please include the name of the agenda item (see below).

REMOTE ACCESS INFORMATION:

The CDBG Priority Setting Task Force (PSTF) will conduct this meeting remotely via Zoom pursuant to the Remote Meeting Policy adopted by the CDBG PSTF. Allow your computer to install the free Zoom app to get the best meeting experience. If you are not able to attend live either in person or via Zoom, a recording will be available in the Agenda Center following the meeting.

For public comment via Zoom, you will need to use the "raise your hand" feature. To raise your hand via the telephone, please hit *9. You will be unmuted by the host when it is time for public comment.

You are invited to a Zoom webinar!

When: Jun 3, 2026 08:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Jun 3, 2026 08:00 AM

Join from PC, Mac, iPad, or Android:

<https://portlandmaine-gov.zoom.us/j/84398845920?pwd=x46c5hLRwObPWWWhOMlo1oayF2WymV3.1>

Passcode:460875

Phone one-tap:

+13017158592,,84398845920# US (Washington DC)

Join via audio:

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

Webinar ID: 843 9884 5920

International numbers available: <https://portlandmaine-gov.zoom.us/u/kb2QvOXTUI>

1. Introductions and Roll Call
2. Review and accept Minutes of CDBG Task Force from the June 17th, 2026 meeting.
 - a. June 17th, 2026 Meeting Minutes
3. Review & Amend Language for CDBG Scoring Sections

City of Portland
CDBG Priority Setting Task
Force: Meeting 6

Wednesday, July 1, 2026 at 8:00 AM
Zoom

- a. Guiding Principles
 - b. Capacity to Deliver
 - c. Collaboration
4. Next Meeting: July 15, 2026 at 8AM - 10AM, on Zoom
- a. Review CDBG Scoring

Meeting Minutes: Priority Setting Task Force with the CDBG Program

Date: June 17, 2026

Meeting Number: 5 of 10

Attendees

PSTF Attendees

- Tae Chong (Co-chair)
- Kristen Dunphey (Co-chair)
- Teale Smith
- Gwendolyne Tuttle-Beaudoin
- Jill Johanning
- Carly Lappas
- Miyabi (Abbie) Yamamoto
- Colleen Cooper
- Barbara Ginley
- Stephanie Miller

Public Attendee

- Bill Higgins

City of Portland Staff

- Mary Davis (HCD Division Director)
- Laken Chapin (CDBG Program Manager)
- Cameron (Compliance Officer - HCD)

Actions Taken & Decisions

Item	Action / Decision
Meeting Minutes	Approved minutes from the previous meeting unanimously.
Employment Navigation	Agreed to place as an example subset under "Shelter Services".
At-Risk Youth Services	Moved to High Priority under Neighborhood Investment and Infrastructure.
Senior Services & Disabilities	Moved from Medium to High Priority under Neighborhood Investment and Infrastructure.
Fair Housing, Tenant/Landlord Counseling, Legal Services	Moved to High Priority under Housing Availability.
Facade Improvements	Moved from Low to Medium Priority under Economic Opportunity.
Financial Stability Services	Moved to High Priority under Economic Opportunity.
Rental Assistance	Removed from "Addressing the Needs of the Unhoused" to avoid redundancy (kept under Housing Availability).
Multi-Language Communication	Agreed this should serve as an overarching principle rather than a standalone activity code.

Major Discussion Points

1. Process Snapshot and Timeline

Cameron outlined the meeting schedule leading up to the end of July. The focus of the upcoming sessions will shift to finalizing guiding principles, developing the scoring matrix, and revising the CDBG application. The committee reviewed the standard application lifecycle: staff review for feasibility, Allocation Committee scoring, appeals, and final City Council allocation vote.

2. Structuring Broad HUD Categories vs. Specific Local Needs

A recurring debate centered around how specific the priority list should be. Staff members Mary Davis and Cameron emphasized that HUD matrix codes (like "Shelter Services" or "Economic Opportunity") are intentionally broad. They advised the committee not to get mired in specific line items (e.g., "fundamental furniture" or "transportation vouchers"), but instead treat them as subsets or examples that applicants can elaborate on in their narratives. Teale Smith supported this, warning against drilling down into overly specific minutiae that could complicate the scoring process.

3. Addressing At-Risk Youth

There was extensive discussion regarding the categorization of At-Risk Youth Services. Teale strongly advocated for giving youth, particularly those aging out of foster care, high priority to intervene early and prevent future homelessness. Tae Chong expressed concern that keeping this solely under "Addressing the Needs of the Unhoused" might dilute its impact or force it to compete against broader shelter services. Ultimately, the committee reached a consensus to place At-Risk Youth Services as a High Priority under "Neighborhood Investment and Infrastructure."

4. Public Comment

Bill Higgins, a board member for the National Coalition for the Homeless, provided public comment. He suggested Portland look at how cities like Kansas City and Chicago utilize their CDBG funds and offered to assist the committee. Mary Davis responded by confirming the city's active participation in the National Community Development Association to share best practices nationwide.

5. Guiding Principles and Capacity to Deliver

In the final portion of the meeting, the committee reflected on the "Guiding Principles" used in the scoring rubric. Reviewers like Kristen Dunphey and Carly Lappas noted that previous principles were too vague, leading to inconsistent scoring interpretations among reviewers. Teale highlighted the importance of applicant financial viability, particularly for smaller organizations operating in challenging economic climates. However, Abbie and Barbara cautioned against overly stringent financial documentation requirements, warning they could inadvertently penalize smaller, community-based organizations in favor of well-funded legacy nonprofits.

6. Homework Assignment

Cameron assigned homework to the task force: review the guiding principles' definitions and propose language changes to add specificity. The goal is to agree upon clearer metrics for the scoring committee to ensure fair, consistent evaluations. Cameron will send the PSTF the homework and accompanying documentation.

This attachment covers the Guiding Principles, Capacity to Deliver, Partnerships & Outreach, and the Scoresheets CDBG Allocation Committee members use to score CDBG applications. Please refer to the [2025 CDBG Policies](#) document (pgs 9 - 11) for additional information.

Guiding Principles

Applications will be reviewed by staff to establish eligibility with the federal eligibility criteria outlined in the above sections. If staff determines an application to be ineligible, the applicant will be notified and the CDBG Allocation Committee will be made aware. Staff will review all eligible applications and provide comments on the organization's capacity to deliver proposed services.

All eligible applications will be evaluated by the CDBG Allocation Committee, who will generate scores and award recommendations, which in collaboration with the City Manager will then be presented to the City Council, for final review and approval.

Funding recommendations will be determined by utilizing the following guiding criteria:

- **Consistent**** - All projects and programs will be reviewed with respect to the Consolidated Plan and other HUD requirements; City goals, priority impact levels, and other CDBG or HOME investments. Proposals should be coordinated with relevant City Departments where appropriate and align with City initiatives.
- **Measurable Community Impact** - Programs and projects will be evaluated based on how well they create a significant and measurable community impact.
- **Diversity and Inclusiveness** - Programs and projects shall address the community's diversity and create a culture of belonging.
- **Priority to Lower Incomes** - Priority will be given to projects and programs that serve the lowest income persons.
- **Location*** - Project benefits the targeted LMI area or neighborhood and considers other nearby improvements.
- **Sustainability*** - Project demonstrates benefit to the environment through energy efficiency or similar considerations, as well as demonstrates economically sustainable practices.

**Applies to Construction Projects, not Social Service projects.*

*** Not included in the current CDBG Scoring point system.*

The CDBG Allocation Committee will score each application based on the criteria above. Each Committee member will rate how the application addresses each scoring category using one of

the following: Absent, Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Outstanding. There will be corresponding point values for each rating which will total a maximum of 100 points.

Capacity to Deliver

The Capacity to Deliver is a section within the Scoring Template. The Capacity Deliver Scoring Category is comprised of 5 subcategories:

- **Financial Need** - Applicant demonstrates how CDBG funds are necessary to the program. If Applicant is requesting an increase in funding from the previous year, they sufficiently demonstrate a need and expansion of service.
- **Leveraged Funding** - Project demonstrates other sources of funding in addition to the CDBG request.
- **Experience providing service** - Applicant demonstrates sufficient experience in delivering and managing this or similar projects.
- **Readiness to proceed** - Applicant demonstrates sufficient staff and organizational capacity to implement project promptly.
- **Financial Stability** - Applicant demonstrated sufficient nonprofit status (if applicable), agency operating budget, and recent audit (if applicable).

Partnerships & Outreach

Partnerships and Outreach includes the Memorandum of Agreement, Letters of Support, and Demonstrated Outreach.

Note: Upon further investigation, Memorandum of Agreement, Letters of Support, and Demonstrated Outreach are not detailed in the [2025 CDBG Policies](#). Given this, please suggest definitions, supporting documentation, or other ideas which would provide clarity for the reviewer and applicant.

This represents a basic overview of the 2025 Development Scoring Template. Be advised, the 2025 Social Services has the same Scoring Categories as the Development Scoring Template with the exception of Location* and Sustainability*. To make up for the lack of these Scoring Categories, the three Social Service Scoring Categories remaining (Community Impact, Diversity & Inclusiveness, and Priority to Lower Incomes) received a higher maximum score.

The CDBG Applications are scored on a 100-point scoring system. The scoring values have been removed as the CDBG PSTF has not discussed scoring values (as of 6.17.2026).

A: GOAL/PRIORITY IMPACT/COMMUNITY NEED	AVAILABLE POINTS
Goal – Applicant demonstrates consistency with Consolidated Plan, city goals, priority impact initiatives , and other CDBG/HOME investments. Not at all (0 Points) Fair (Points) Very Poor (Points) Good (Points) Poor (Points) Excellent (Points)	X
Priority Impact Level –	X
Community Need – Applicant demonstrates sufficient community need through reference of plans, reports, data, or past experience. Not at all (0 Points) Fair (Points) Very Poor (Points) Good (Points) Poor (Points) Excellent (Points)	X
Section Total	X
B: GUIDING PRINCIPLES	AVAILABLE POINTS
Measurable Community Impact – Applicant demonstrates a significant and measurable community impact. Not at all (0 Points) Fair (Points) Very Poor (Points) Good (Points) Poor (Points) Excellent (Points)	X
Diversity & Inclusiveness – Project addresses the community’s diversity and creates a culture of belonging. Not at all (0 Points) Fair (Points) Very Poor (Points) Good (Points) Poor (Points) Excellent (Points)	X

<p>Priority to Lower Incomes – Priority should be given to projects that serve the lowest income persons.</p> <p>Not at all (0 Points) Very Poor (Points) Poor (Points)</p> <p>Fair (Points) Good (Points) Excellent (Points)</p>	X
<p>Location - Project benefits the targeted LMI area or neighborhood and considers other nearby improvements. *(Not a Scoring Category for Social Service grants.)</p> <p>Not at all (0 Points) Very Poor (Points) Poor (Points)</p> <p>Fair (Points) Good (Points) Excellent (Points)</p>	X
<p>Sustainability - Project demonstrates benefit to the environment through energy efficiency or similar considerations, as well as demonstrates economically sustainable practices. *(Not a Scoring Category for Social Service grants.)</p> <p>Not at all (0 Points) Very Poor (Points) Poor (Points)</p> <p>Fair (Points) Good (Points) Excellent (Points)</p>	X
Section Total	X
C: CAPACITY TO DELIVER	AVAILABLE POINTS
<p>Financial Need – Applicant demonstrates how CDBG funds are necessary to the program. If Applicant is requesting an increase in funding from the previous year, they sufficiently demonstrate a need and expansion of service.</p> <p>Not at all (0 Points) Very Poor (Points) Poor (Points)</p> <p>Fair (Points) Good (Points) Excellent (Points)</p>	X
<p>Leveraged Funds – Project demonstrates other sources of funding in addition to the CDBG request.</p> <p>Not at all (0 Points) Very Poor (Points) Poor (Points)</p> <p>Fair (Points) Good (Points) Excellent (Points)</p>	X
<p>Experience Providing Service – Applicant demonstrates sufficient experience in delivering and managing this or similar projects.</p> <p>Not at all (0 Points)</p> <p>Fair (Points)</p>	X

Very Poor (Points) Poor (Points)	Good (Points) Excellent (Points)	
Readiness to Proceed – Applicant demonstrates sufficient staff and organizational capacity to implement project promptly.		X
Not at all (0 Points) Very Poor (Points) Poor (Points)	Fair (Points) Good (Points) Excellent (Points)	
Financial Stability – Applicant demonstrated sufficient nonprofit status (if applicable), agency operating budget, and recent audit (if applicable).		X
Not at all (0 Points) Very Poor (Points) Poor (Points)	Fair (Points) Good (Points) Excellent (Points)	
Section Total		X
D: PARTNERSHIP/COLLABORATION/OUTREACH		AVAILABLE POINTS
Memorandum Of Understanding, Letter of Support, Demonstrated Outreach		X
Not at all (0 Points) Very Poor (Points) Poor (Points)	Fair (Points) Good (Points) Excellent (Points)	
Section Total		X
E: POINT DEDUCTION		AVAILABLE POINTS
Errors that result in a Point Reduction. Set by staff. Please do not edit.		0
Section Total		0