



City of Portland Remote CDBG Priority Task Force Meeting Monday, May 11, 2020 at 5:00 pm

ZOOM MEETING INSTRUCTIONS:

The CDBG Priority Task Force will hold a remote meeting on Monday, May 11, 2020 at 5:00 pm. This meeting will take place remotely using Zoom.

Virtual meetings are allowed using emergency legislation approved by LD 2167; 1 M.R.S. §403-A, that authorizes cities and towns to conduct meetings online.

Allow your computer to install the free Zoom app to get the best meeting experience. If you are not able to attend live, a recording will be uploaded to portlandmaine.gov/livestream the next day.

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82747388833>

For public comment, 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.

To join via Telephone dial:

US: +1 646 558 8656 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 669 900 9128 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799

iPhone one-tap for mobile:

US: +16465588656,,82747388833# or +13017158592,,82747388833#

Webinar ID: 827 4738 8833

1. Introductions
2. Review and Accept Minutes of CDBG Priority Task Force meeting held on April 30, 2020.
 - a. Minutes of CDBG Task Force Meeting of April 30, 2020
3. Set-Asides & Maximum and Minimum Grant Amounts ACTION REQUIRED
 - a. Discuss average grant requests in funding categories outlined in April 30 memo
 - b. Discuss current set-asides outlined in April 30 memo
 - c. Propose changes to both maximum/minimum requests and set-asides
 - d. Vote on changes
4. Next Meeting

- a. May 28, 2020 5:00-7:00 pm, location to be determined
- b. Discussion topics for next meeting: bonus points and penalty points, review these sections in the application
- c. Committee may take action on these topics at the May 28

5. Adjournment

Community Development Priority Setting Task Force

MEETING MINUTES

April 30, 2020 5:00-7:00pm via Zoom

Task Force Attendees: Adam Cohen, Andrew Ouellette, Ben Strick, Brad Hanscom, Chase Hewitt, Don Harden, Grace Brayley, Jim Hall, Julia Sheridan, Lucas Blom, Mark Adelson, Matt Dubel, Phaeng Southsimbath, Sam Heck

City Staff: Mary Davis, Amanda Methot, Kelley Walsh

Zoom Meetings

Staff provided an overview of how zoom meetings work. Staff explained the meeting is open to the public and they will be able to view the meeting but will not be seen. In addition, staff went over the raise hand function.

Co-Chairs

Staff put it out to the group about voting on the co-chairs this meeting even though we would not have the full group in attendance.

Member asked and discussed the pros and cons of voting now or waiting another meeting, staff assured members that we would keep meetings going until co-chairs are selected, but that chairs should be really taking over the process

Member asked for a brief overview of the roles of co-chairs and staff

Staff explained that co-chairs run the meetings and will write the report in the fall. Staff is here to clarify questions for the group, take minutes, set up meetings, and put agenda and agenda packets together.

Member expressed they would like to formally move forward with voting on co-chairs, another member seconded.

J. Hall offered to be a chair, M. Adelson formally nominated, and J. Sheridan seconded the nomination and the vote passed unanimously.

C. Hewitt nominated M. Adelson, J. Sheridan seconded the nomination, M. Adelson accepted the nomination, vote passed unanimously.

Review of Meeting Minutes

Member discussed an edit that was sent to staff in an email, expressed that a formal edit was likely not needed because the outcome was the same

D. Harden made a motion to accept the minutes, J. Hall seconded the motion, vote passed unanimously

Staff Updates

Member asked for a staff update on data collection, staff provided the outreach that has been done and the current survey responses.

Member asked about the April 27th Council meeting and how that will affect their work, staff explained it was the first read for the 2020-2021 allocations and that many applicants will thank the committee and council for funding their project or if they did not get funded explain why the funding is needed.

Members discussed a comment about blight from the April 27 meeting and what does community development really mean and how should that money be put to use.

Two members provided insight about the positives of the application process and often times with other grants there is not as much personal attention to your grant application and rarely is there an opportunity to communicate with the decision makers.

Member asked/discussed using partial funding as a way to fund more projects

Member provided insight to the allocation committee scoring process and that they are unable to partially fund based on the current rules that govern the scoring process. They mentioned that the allocation committee did discuss the pros and cons of partial funding to get more projects off the ground.

Member explained that as an applicant partial funding may not actually benefit the program if they cannot make up the difference with funding from another source, it is potentially setting the program up for failure. Reducing the max request rather than partially fund could be a strategy to fund more organizations, this way organizations can have more certainty and plan out their program cost and goals around the max funding.

Task Force Communication Outside of Meetings

A member asked about the committee's ability to discuss topics outside of the group.

Staff gave guidelines as to what is allowed regarding communication outside the official meeting time as well as communication with staff. Topics that are substantive in nature should not occur outside of the scheduled meeting times in order to comply with the Citizen Participation Plan.

Member gave a potential solution through google docs that another committee they are on uses. It was determined that the committee reference is not a City committee and staff guidance applies.

Set- Asides/ Minimum/Maximum

Member asked for clarification on the set asides versus the percentage of funding allocated to each pot of money

Staff explained that the 20% for admin, 33% to social services and 47% to construction/development are set by HUD. The set aside for community policing and 60% set aside for public infrastructure are the focus of this group.

Staff gave an overview of each set aside as well as the history of how set asides came about

Member put it out to the group about decreasing the maximums and limiting the amount of years a program can be funded.

Staff clarified that the limit on applying for funding is allowed but will be addressed later on in the year

Member asked to see the performance of the set aside programs

Members discussed community policing, there was a majority that felt Community Policing is very beneficial and an important service to the City.

Member brought up the topic of “legacy programs” (i.e. programs that are funded year after year), this was discussed briefly with no action taken

Members discussed that the maximums and minimums for each pot of money should look different. A sidewalk or park project cannot be compared to a food program. The costs to get both of the projects done are different.

Members discussed the City’s use of funds particularly for Community Policing and Department of Public Works projects. The group discussed why CDBG funds were being used rather than the City budget.

Staff explained that the City can apply for this funding for new programs or projects. The City cannot use CDBG to fund already existing programs to get them out of the City budget.

Member asked about the childcare set aside and wanted information on why it was a set side and why it was taken out.

Staff directed members to look at the average grant asks in the memo to determine changes to the maximum and minimums

Member brought up emerging needs from COVID-19 and how they will relate to the task force work moving forward. Member put it out to the group to discuss as well as asked if there is any discussion with City management about how to combat COVID-19 with CDBG funding

Staff gave some guidance on what is happening in the immediacy, but stated it is hard to know what organizations will need years down the road due to the fallout from COVID-19.

Staffer gave information on the amount on aid that is available to the non-profits and community partners currently and that many are getting the funding they need to be made whole.

Member brought up the new homeless service center as another emerging need that will need to be considered.

Staff explained that the homeless service center will likely be a big part of the next 5 years and should be discussed when the group starts talking about needs, goals, and priorities.

Member made a suggestion of creating an emerging needs list and making sure that the changes that group makes does not conflict with the known needs and emerging needs.

Another member agreed, and discussed childcare and the need is even greater during the COVID-19 crisis and will likely continue during the rebuilding period after the crisis is over.

Member discussed that the emergency response is at the county level, and if they should take the lead on pandemic planning. They also offered their view on emerging needs are the needs that have been just under the surface and are starting to become larger needs (i.e. immigration and asylum)

Member mentioned that the organizations are going to know the emerging needs best and we should hear from them on what is needed.

Staff summarized the discussion around emerging needs and discussed where this work should be put in to the work plan as well as the report to council

Member stated that the group should be prepared to take action on the set-asides and maximum and minimums at the next meeting.

Data Collection for Con Plan

Members are wondering how to help spread the word on the Consolidate Plan website.

Staff will send the website and marketing materials to the members and gave ideas on who the website should be sent to

Member brought up getting a story in the paper about the con plan and the website in order to spread the word

Another member mentioned doing a letter to the editor about the plan; it will likely be more successful to get it into the paper.

Another member volunteered to write a letter to the editor

Staff Data Gathering for the May 11 Meeting

Members requested

- Marketing materials for con plan website
- History of child care set aside
- Performance reports of set aside
- Send out contact list

Meeting adjourned at 7:03pm

MEMORANDUM

To: CDBG Task Force

From: Amanda Methot, HCD Compliance Officer

Dated: May 4, 2020

Re: CDBG Set-Asides & Minimum/Maximum Grant Requests

Introduction

The purpose of the following memo is to inform the taskforce on the history of set-asides and maximum/minimum grant requests. You will find 3 sections; history, set-aside impact, and average grant requests. The history will show that there have been many changes over the years both by taskforces and the City Council, ultimately the City Council can invoke changes at any time. The set aside impact section will show how the current set asides affect the allocation over the last 5 years. The tables in this section should be used to inform your decisions regarding the use of set-asides (revise the current set-asides, establish new ones, or remove set-asides). Lastly, the average grant request shows the average amount requested for construction/development as well as social services and the impact of those average requests on the total allocation. These table should be used to inform your decisions regarding the maximum/minimum grant requests in both funding categories.

History of Set-Asides & Minimum/Maximum Requests

There are set-asides for both the construction and social service categories. The history of set asides are set forth below:

2008 Priority Setting Task Force

Recommendations:

- Set-aside of 10% of the total grant for basic needs. Basic needs was described as; *Programs that respond to an acute need where no other options exist and such a response is temporary in nature. 1) Short term shelter, a place people can go when they have no other options to stay, including shelter operation and staff, excluding casework. 2) Emergency food, food for persons when they have no other options to eat, including food, food service operations and support services for persons limited to 18 months. 3) Emergency Heat assistance.*
- Capacity Building Set-aside. The set-aside would be determined after a community needs assessment to define the need in the community.
 - The need was not determined before the Council vote, therefore this set aside never came to fruition.
- \$20,000 minimum grant request for all applicants, with the exception of \$7,500 minimum in social service for capacity building and for technical assistance to microenterprises.

Council Action (October 20, 2008 by Council ***Order 91-08/09, see attached***):

- 10% basic needs set aside
- Minimum grant requests: \$20,000

2011 Council review of 2008 Task Force

Council Action (*See attached Order 46-10/11*)

- Eliminated the social service 10% basic needs set aside.
- Created a \$100,000 set aside for job creation programs.
- Capped cumulative grant allocations for City applications at 45% of the funding for Social Services and 85% of the funding for Development/Construction activities respectively.
- Lowered the minimum grant request from \$20,000 to \$10,000 and eliminated the smaller \$7,500 minimum for capacity building and technical assistance to microenterprises.
- Created maximum requests of \$150,000 for social service applicants and \$250,000 for development/construction applications.

2012 Priority Setting Task Force

The Task Force did not make any changes to the 2011 Council decision regarding set-asides and cumulative grant allocations for City Applications.

2014 Minor Adjustments

The Council made minor adjustments to the CDBG Allocation process, including \$150,000 set aside for Community Policing; *see attached Order 71-14/15*

2016 Minor adjustments

The council added a public infrastructure set aside of up to 60% of the maximum cumulative request allotted to the city in the Construction/Development category. In addition, the council added a set-aside of \$90,000 for childcare vouchers in the social service category. *See attached Order 91-15/16.*

2017 Minor Adjustments

The Council removed the \$90,000 childcare voucher set-aside, the Community Policing and Public Infrastructure set-asides remained in place, *see attached Order 197-15/16.*

Set- Aside Impact

Below shows that impact of set-asides on the amount of funding available for applicants over the last 5 years.

Community Policing is the only current social service set aside, and it is capped at \$150,000. Typically, this accounts for 25% of the social service funding.

Year	Program	Set-aside	Social Service Allocation	Percentage of Allocation
2016-2017	Community Policing	\$150,000.00	\$625,397.00	24%
2017-2018	Community Policing	\$150,000.00	\$611,451.00	25%
2018-2019	Community Policing	\$150,000.00	\$606,954.00	25%
2019-2020	Community Policing	\$150,000.00	\$649,998.00	23%
2020-2021	Community Policing	\$150,000.00	\$644,347.00	23%

There is a cap of “up to 60%” of the development funding for public infrastructure projects. The 2016-2017 years was disproportionately high because of a joint application from DPW and Planning. Historically the DPW projects do not account for 60% of the development funding with the exception of program year 2016-2017.

Year	Department	Award	Development Allocation	Percentage of Allocation
2016-2017	COP Public Works	\$638,361.00	\$760,861.00	84%
2017-2018	COP Public Works	\$205,352.00	\$806,533.00	25%
2018-2019	COP Public Works	\$369,515.00	\$789,418.00	47%
2019-2020	COP Public Works	\$415,476.00	\$864,855.00	48%
5 year average	COP Public Works	\$407,176	\$805,417	51%

Average Grant Request

Below shows the average grant request in construction/development and social service. It also showed as a percentage of the total allocating funding.

Construction/Development:

The average request is below a quarter of the funding allocation. There have been 5 applicants that requested the \$250,000 maximum over the last 5 years, and they all received funding. A majority of those requests were for Department of Public Works projects.

Year	Number of applicants	Average Request	Allocation	Percentage of allocation
2016-2017	14	\$141,785.00	\$760,861.00	19%
2017-2018	17	\$134,056.00	\$806,553.00	17%
2018-2019	6	\$165,217.00	\$789,418.00	21%
2019-2020	11	\$90,734.00	\$864,855.00	10%
2020-2021	21	\$104,605.00	\$902,098.00	12%
5 Year Cumulative		\$127,279	\$824,757	15%

Social Services:

The average social service request is around 10% of the annual allocation amount. With the exception of the \$150,000 set aside for community policing, only two organizations over the last 5 years have requested the \$150,000 maximum, neither were fully funded.

Year	Number of applicants	Average Request	Allocation	Percentage of allocation
2016-2017	17	\$63,688.00	\$625,397.00	10%
2017-2018	20	\$58,960.00	\$611,451.00	10%
2018-2019	24	\$64,274.00	\$606,954.00	11%
2019-2020	20	\$55,227.00	\$649,998.00	8%
2020-2021	16	\$74,387.00	\$644,347.00	12%
5 Year Cumulative		\$63,307	\$627,629	10%



Housing & Community Development Committee

Minutes of September 30, 2015 Meeting

A meeting of the Portland City Council's Housing and Community Development Committee (HCDC) was held on Wednesday, September 30, 2015 at 5:30 p.m. in Room 209 on the second floor of Portland City Hall. Present from the HCDC was its Chair Councilor Kevin Donoghue, and members Councilors David Brenerman, David Marshall, and Nick Mavodones. City staff present included Housing & Community Development Division Director Mary Davis, Planning and Urban Development Director Jeff Levine, Housing Planner Tyler Norod, and HCD Program Manager Kristin Styles.

Item 1: Review and accept Minutes from previous meeting held on September 9, 2015.

On motion made and seconded, the Committee voted unanimously 3-0 to accept the minutes as published. Councilor Marshall was not present at the time of the vote.

Item 2: Review and Recommendation to City Council re: HUD 5-Year Consolidated Plan Goals and Priorities.

Mary Davis, Division Director of the Housing and Community Development Division, and Kristin Styles, the HCD Program Manager introduced the item. Ms. Davis said that HUD requires communities who receive HUD funding such as CDBG, HOME or ESG funds to develop a consolidated plan every 3-5 years. These proposed goals were initially presented in the spring and are designed to be an update to the existing priorities and goals of the City. Councilor Donoghue suggested referring to these as Community Development Policy Goals which can be utilized as a tool for prioritizing City needs and distribution of funds. Ms. Davis

began with the area of need entitled Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure. She noted that there may be geographic priority areas associated with the process and traditionally the city has focused on the areas with the highest percentage of low-moderate income residents. Councilor Donoghue asked if this geographic priority is going to be implemented through scoring. Director Levine responded that it is unclear at this time. Councilor Donoghue followed up asking if this will be focused on the presented block groups. Ms. Davis noted that Bayside will be the first focus area.

Councilor Mavodones asked how the areas are defined. Director Levine noted that staff is still defining the neighborhood to some degree but a census tract is a good start but we could draw an area that needs support.

Councilor Donoghue stated that if we don't define the boundary now there could be mission creep in the future that gets away from the intent of today's policy. Director Levine clarified that it is not intended for every dollar to go into this area.

Councilor Brenerman asked for clarification on whether defining East Bayside includes portions of Bayside too? Councilor Mavodones noted that they could draw the boundaries as desired. Director Levine reminded the Committee that the Planning Department is working with a brown field planning grant at the moment which may offer a good boundary for this but further analysis is needed.

Councilor Donoghue mentioned that when looking at maps it would be helpful to have additional data within the map to outline other information like population, income levels, etc. In order to help make sure funds are allocated where they are most warranted it would be helpful to understand each area better.

Councilor Brenerman asked for clarification stating that the funding is only about \$2.5 million dollars, correct? Ms. Davis confirmed that he was correct. Councilor Brenerman noted that it is a relatively modest figure and could potentially be spent all on a single street.

Councilor Donoghue said the Committee could benefit from having a better sense of where geographically we need to focus. Ms. Davis said that the process offers two subjects for priority and high priority. Within the scoring system high priority uses receive 11 pts and priority would receive 7 pts. This is based on staff evaluation of the application. This would be CDBG specific.

Councilor Donoghue asked how community policing falls within this system as most of the priority items listed are physical capital improvements. Ms. Davis explained that the need is described as neighborhood investment with a goal of creating strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods.

Councilor Donoghue asked about how the priority status relates to the “retention” of housing. Ms. Davis noted that this could be added. Councilor Donoghue said that the City is spending money to create and rehab housing and we should be able to keep that housing.

Councilor Donoghue asked about child care which could allow people to work and noted that its fall under the high priority category of economic opportunity. How would that prioritization take place? Ms. Davis explained that the determination of an activity has high priority or priority would be done under a staff review. Councilor Donoghue followed up saying he would like to see child care specifically identified so that it isn’t lost amongst other needs. Councilor Donoghue asked how you would go about making child care a top priority in this format if the Committee wanted to support that. Ms. Davis explained that could be accomplished with a set aside Councilor Donoghue asked if there could be bonus points for child

care. Director Levine noted that staff is not a fan of bonus points. Councilor Donoghue countered that set asides are essentially a limitless bonus point. Councilor Donoghue continued that it has been a priority of this committee for child care and it seems like the allocation of points to high priority and priority projects will mean every activity will get bonus points.

Councilor Donoghue asked for clarification on how to establish a set aside. Ms. Davis explained that a set-aside could be designated for a specific type of activity but not a specific organization. You would then review all applications for that activity separately. Councilor Brenerman mentioned that he believed last year \$50,000 was allocated to child care out of \$90k requested. Councilor Donoghue suggested the Committee propose a higher amount. He stated that the council were adverse to bonus points for child care but may be more open to a set aside. Councilor Donoghue asked how the HCDC might best make additional policy recommendations. Ms. Davis said that staff is asking for recommendations on four items: high priority + priority; four city goals; neighborhood investment strategy; and imbedding 60% of funding be used for public infrastructure and the Committee could make additional recommendations.

Councilor Donoghue asked where is community policing memorialized. Ms. Davis responded that item was already approved in the spring by the Council. It is in the social service funding category with a set aside of \$150,000.

Councilor Mavodones asked if there was a reason not to do a set aside. Ms. Davis noted there is not as long as it is not given to a particular organization. Councilor Mavodones acknowledged that it can be a challenge for the Council to give direction up front when there are so many good projects to fund. It could be a life of its own but identifying priorities would be helpful.

Councilor Donoghue said that he would like to see a \$100,000 set aside for child care.

Councilor Mavodones said that he would be happy to go above \$50,000 but not as high as \$100,000. Councilor Donoghue mentioned that there appeared to be consensus on establishing a set aside. Councilor Mavodones suggested \$90,000. Councilor Brenerman supported the \$90,000 figure. Councilor Donoghue also agreed to the \$90,000 figure.

Ms. Davis reminded the Committee that the only other item left to discuss is the allocation restrictions. In years past there were limits on minimum and maximum request amounts and maximum percentage of funds for city requests. Staff is not recommending changing that. Staff is asking that the public infrastructure max cumulative amount should be 60% of the existing percentage allowed for city requests in the Development Activity funding category. Councilor Donoghue noted that the City created the CEI workforce development category. Does that still exist? Ms. Davis responded that staff feels that this need is still identified in the needs and goals but there is no funding set aside. Councilor Donoghue stated that he was concerned that we may incentivize funding for job creation for low paying jobs. Ms. Davis said that it could be designed for a higher priority for better paying jobs.

Councilor Brenerman asked if there was an analysis of how well the job programs work. Ms. Davis confirmed that this analysis exists and noted that the information was provided in the spring to the Council which included a report on how many jobs, what types of jobs, etc. Councilor Brenerman noted that he would hate to continue this effort if it doesn't provide real results. Ms. Davis noted that one of the activities funded was the Portland Food Co-Op which created 12 new jobs. Councilor Brenerman asked if there was job training money available. Ms. Davis confirmed that would qualify.

ETHAN K. STRIMLING (MAYOR)
BELINDA S. RAY (1)
SPENCER THIBODEAU (2)
EDWARD J. SUSLOVIC (3)
JUSTIN COSTA (4)

DAVID BRENERMAN (5)
JON HINCK (A/L)
JILL C. DUSON, (A/L)
NICHOLAS M. MAVODONES, JR. (A/L)

AGENDA
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 28, 2016

The Portland City Council will hold a Special City Council Meeting at 5:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall. The Honorable Ethan K. Strimling, Mayor, will preside.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

ROLL CALL:

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Community Development Block Grant Annual Allocation Committee
Presentation; and City Manager Presentation

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

**Order 197-15.16
(Tab 1)**

**Order Approving Revisions to the Community Development Block
Grant (CDBG) Allocation Process Re: Elimination of the Child Care
Voucher Set-Aside – Sponsored by Jon P. Jennings, City Manager.**

At the October 19, 2015 City Council Meeting, the City Council approved a \$90,000 childcare set-aside in the CDBG allocation process. When the Allocation Committee scored all of the applications, however, the Milestone Homeless Outreach and Mobile Engagement (HOME) team and the Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter (both of which were not funded by the Committee) scored higher than the Catherine Morrill Day Nursery Childcare Voucher Program, which received the \$90,000 childcare set-aside. The City Manager's CBDG funding recommendations, however, partially fund the Home team and the Teen Shelter, as well as provide sufficient funding to Catherine Morrill. As a result, the City Manager is requesting that the City Council eliminate the child care set-aside in order to allow for all applicants to compete on an equal playing field now and in the future.

Five affirmative votes are required for passage after public comment.

MEMORANDUM
City Council Agenda Item

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Planning and Urban Development Department

DATE: March 22, 2016

DISTRIBUTION: City Manager, Mayor, Anita LaChance, Sonia Bean, Danielle West-Chuhta, Nancy English, Julie Sullivan

SUBJECT: Order Approving Revisions to the CDBG Allocation Process

SPONSOR: Jon P. Jennings, City Manager

I. SUMMARY OF ISSUE

At the October 19, 2015 City Council Meeting, the City Council approved a \$90,000 childcare set-aside in the CDBG allocation process. In the Allocation Committee's scores, the Milestone HOME team as well as the Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter both scored higher than the Catherine Morrill Day Nursery Childcare Voucher Program which received the childcare set-aside. There was not enough funding available, however, for the Milestone HOME team and Teen Shelter requests. As a result, the City Manager is hereby requesting that the City Council eliminate the childcare set-aside in order to allow for all applicants to compete for funding on an equal playing field.

II. REASON FOR SUBMISSION

The HUD regulations require that two public hearings be held on the CDBG allocations, and that local rules be adopted for the allocation process. However, HUD does not dictate the content of the local rules. The City Council has adopted specific local rules, and thus any revision to the rules requires Council review and approval.

III. INTENDED RESULT

The CDBG allocation rules would be revised and the Child Care Voucher set aside would be eliminated.

IV. FINANCIAL IMPACT

The elimination of the child care voucher set aside will allow for partial funding to be provided to the HOME team and the Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter. In addition the one application eligible for the set aside, Catherine Morrill, will still receive funding. In fact, Catherine Morrill will receive slightly more CDBG funding than they received last year.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Council approval of the removal of the child care voucher set-aside from the CDBG Allocation Process rules.

*Order 197-15/16
Tab 1 3-28-16*

ETHAN K. STRIMLING (MAYOR)
BELINDA S. RAY (1)
SPENCER R. THIBODEAU (2)
EDWARD J. SUSLOVIC (3)
JUSTIN COSTA (4)

**CITY OF PORTLAND
IN THE CITY COUNCIL**

DAVID H. BRENERMAN (5)
JILL C. DUSON (A/L)
JON HINCK (A/L)
NICHOLAS M. MAVODONES, JR (A/L)

**ORDER APPROVING REVISIONS TO THE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ALLOCATION PROCESS
RE: ELIMINATION OF THE CHILD CARE VOUCHER SET-ASIDE**

ORDERED, that the Community Development Block Grant allocation process shall be revised
to eliminate the child care voucher set-aside of \$90,000.

City of Portland Division of Housing & Neighborhood Services
Community Development Block Grant
Community Policing Coordinators

Phone: 874-8731 Fax : 874-8949

FY 2016/2017



Prepared By: **Lisa Perrotta** Email Address: _____

Please Submit To: kms@portlandmaine.gov by October 10, January 10, April 10 and July 10

2016/2017	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	Total	Goals	% of Goal
Portland Low/Mod Residents (count each person once)	524	597	707	492	436	430	418	497	666	515	610	605	6497	5000	129.9%
Total Persons Served	582	663	799	579	536	531	473	541	698	569	666	646	7283	5000	145.7%
% of Low/Mod Portland Residents	90%	90%	88%	85%	81%	81%	88%	92%	95%	91%	92%	94%	89%	66%	
Hours	788	863	825	825	825	825	825	750	863	750	863	825	9825	9825	100.0%
Health, Safety, Education Presentations	4	10	12	14	21	14	22	13	18	22	27	20	197	200	98.5%
Community Meetings	18	28	38	36	33	31	32	26	40	30	28	27	367	200	183.5%
Youth Programs	37	30	34	27	23	26	24	19	23	14	17	20	294	200	147.0%

	Hispanic or Latino		Non Hispanic or Non Latino		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
American Indian or Alaskan Native			3	4	12
Asian			66	86	358
Black or African American	7	9	576	682	2357
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander					0
White	179	120	635	760	3285
Am.Indian or Alaskan Native and White			1	4	10
Asian and White			11	63	267
Black or African American and White			210	155	809
Am.Indian or AK Native & Black /African-American			1		7
Other Individuals reporting > 1 one race			105	13	178
Totals	186	129	1608	1767	7283

TOTAL NUMBER OF PERSONS ON ALL CHARTS NEEDS TO MATCH!

Census Tracts

Census Tract 1	646	Census Tract 11	116	Census Tract 19	196	Census Tract 23	
Census Tract 2	532	Census Tract 12	145	Census Tract 20.01		Census Tract 24	
Census Tract 3		Census Tract 13	270	Census Tract 20.02	172	Public Housing	1873
Census Tract 5	786	Census Tract 15		Census Tract 21.01		Presumed Benefit	35
Census Tract 6	1005	Census Tract 17		Census Tract 21.02		Non-Portland	12
Census Tract 10	1495	Census Tract 18		Census Tract 22		Total	7283

Please separate out the count for Males/Females (YTD) for reporting purposes. The total Males + the total Females (YTD) needs to match the total persons YTD, in the shaded box.

Presumed Benefit clientele are presumed to be low income clients, defined by HUD as: elderly persons, persons with disabilities, persons with AIDS, migrant farm workers, abused children, battered spouses and illiterate persons.

City of Portland Division of Housing & Neighborhood Services
Community Development Block Grant
Community Policing Coordinators

Phone: 874-8731 Fax : 874-8949

FY 2017/2018



Prepared By: **Lisa Perrotta** Email Address: _____

Please Submit To: kms@portlandmaine.gov by October 10, January 10, April 10 and July 10

2017/2018	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	Total	Goals	% of Goal
Portland Low/Mod Residents (count each person once)	750	839	692	725	687	553	617	682	624	695	712	772	8348	3300	253.0%
Total Persons Served	844	942	743	791	737	612	667	728	668	759	773	848	9112	5000	182.2%
% of Low/Mod Portland Residents	89%	89%	93%	92%	93%	90%	90%	90%	91%	92%	92%	91%	92%	66%	
Hours				825	825	788	863	750	825	788	863	788	7313	9750	100.0%
Health, Safety, Education Presentations	13	16	13	21	16	15	21	19	24	19	17	22	216	200	108.0%
Community Meetings	20	23	17	32	29	22	23	31	27	29	22	30	305	200	152.5%
Youth Programs	41	33	20	15	13	16	23	19	21	22	23	24	270	200	135.0%

	Hispanic or Latino		Non Hispanic or Non Latino		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
American Indian or Alaskan Native			2	4	6
Asian			119	141	260
Black or African American	153	121	1470	1478	3222
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander					0
White	415	353	1741	1456	3965
Am.Indian or Alaskan Native and White			6	5	11
Asian and White	2		150	233	385
Black or African American and White	81	32	498	443	1054
Am.Indian or AK Native & Black /African-American			1	1	2
Other Individuals reporting > 1 one race	31	20	151	5	207
Totals					9112

TOTAL NUMBER OF PERSONS ON ALL CHARTS NEEDS TO MATCH!

Census Tracts

Census Tract 1	573	Census Tract 11	154	Census Tract 19	502	Census Tract 23	
Census Tract 2	541	Census Tract 12	146	Census Tract 20.01		Census Tract 24	
Census Tract 3	8	Census Tract 13	226	Census Tract 20.02	174	Public Housing	1866
Census Tract 5	714	Census Tract 15		Census Tract 21.01		Presumed Benefit	60
Census Tract 6	2550	Census Tract 17		Census Tract 21.02		Non-Portland	47
Census Tract 10	1551	Census Tract 18		Census Tract 22		Total	9112

Please separate out the count for Males/Females (YTD) for reporting purposes. The total Males + the total Females (YTD) needs to match the total persons YTD, in the shaded box.

Presumed Benefit clientele are presumed to be low income clients, defined by HUD as: elderly persons, persons with disabilities, persons with AIDS, migrant farm workers, abused children, battered spouses and illiterate persons.

PERFORMANCE REPORT

City of Portland Division of Housing & Community Development
Community Development Block Grant
City of Portland, Police Department

Phone: 874-8731 Fax : 874-8949

FY2018/2019

CD1912
IDIS



Prepared By: LisaPerrotta Email Address: lcp@portlandmaine.gov

Please Submit To: amethot@portlandmaine.gov by October 10, January 10, April 10 and July 10

FY2018/2019	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	Total	Goals	% of Goal
New Extremely Low Income Clients	246	235	210	219	172	226	263	202	220	260	256	325	2,834		#DIV/0!
New Low Income Clients	515	595	646	347	318	329	284	265	328	304	265	336	4,532		#DIV/0!
Moderate Income Clients	70	68	69	147	179	120	120	127	95	105	184	157	1,441		#DIV/0!
All new low/mod Clients	831	898	925	713	669	675	667	594	643	669	705	818	8,807	3,300	266.9%
All new clients	831	898	925	737	726	700	754	648	663	669	705	818	9,074	5,000	181.5%
Unit of Service: One Service Hour	788	863	750	863	825	788	863	750	787	825	863	788	9,750	9,825	99.2%

TOTAL PERSONS COUNTED ON BOTH CHARTS NEED TO MATCH!									
	Hispanic or Latino			Non Hispanic or Latino			TOTALS: Male, Female, All		
	Male	Female	Sub Total	Male	Female	Sub Total	Male Total	Female Total	All Total
White	78	79	157	334	326	660	412	405	817
Black or African American	48	23	71	323	348	671	371	371	742
Asian			0	51	54	105	51	54	105
Am.Indian or Alaskan Native			0	1	1	2	1	1	2
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander			0	1		1	1	0	1
Am.Indian or Alaskan Native and White			0	3		3	3	0	3
Asian and White	4	6	10	67	58	125	71	64	135
Black or African American and White	38	42	80	114	135	249	152	177	329
Am.Indian or AK Native & Black /African-American			0		1	1	0	1	1
Other Individuals reporting > 1 one race			0	23	34	57	23	34	57
Totals	168	150	318	917	957	1874	1085	1107	2192

Please separate out the count for Males/Females (YTD) for reporting purposes. The total Males + the total Females (YTD) needs to match the total persons YTD, in the

Group Presumed Income Level
Abused children: Extremely low income
Battered spouses: Low income
Severely disabled: Adults Low income
Homeless persons: Extremely low income
Illiterate adults: Low income
Persons with AIDS: Low income
Migrant farm workers: Low income
Elderly: If assistance is to acquire, construct, convert, and/or rehabilitate a senior center or to pay for providing center-based senior services, report the beneficiaries as moderate income. If assistance is for other services (not center-based), report the elderly beneficiaries as low income.

PERFORMANCE REPORT

City of Portland Division of Housing & Community Development
Community Development Block Grant
City of Portland, Police Department

Phone: 874-8731 Fax : 874-8949

FY2019/2020

CD1912
IDIS



Prepared By: _____ Email Address: _____

Please Submit To: kwalsh@portlandmaine.gov by October 10, January 10, April 10 and July 10

FY2019/2020	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	Total	Goals	% of Goal
New Extremely Low Income Clients	320	303	280	293	237	220	213	194	123				530		#DIV/0!
New Low Income Clients	409	344	343	319	285	249	183	162	96				441		#DIV/0!
Moderate Income Clients	157	152	164	163	73	112	114	109	60				283		#DIV/0!
All new low/mod Clients	886	799	787	775	595	581	510	465	279				5,677	3,300	172.0%
All new clients	925	819	823	834	633	603	525	480	303				5,945	5,000	118.9%
Unit of Service: One Service Hour	788	863	750	825	825	825	863	750	788				7,275	9,825	74.0%

TOTAL PERSONS COUNTED ON BOTH CHARTS NEED TO MATCH!									
	Hispanic or Latino			Non Hispanic or Latino			TOTALS: Male, Female, All		
	Male	Female	Sub Total	Male	Female	Sub Total	Male Total	Female Total	All Total
White	36	32	68	207	190	407	243	222	465
Black or African American	18	17	35	188	172	363	206	189	395
Asian				19	20	39	19	20	39
Am.Indian or Alaskan Native				1	1	2	1	1	2
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander				1		1	1		1
Am.Indian or Alaskan Native and White									
Asian and White	7	10	17	47	41	88	54	51	105
Black or African American and White	24	23	47	85	91	176	109	114	223
Am.Indian or AK Native & Black /African-American	1		1				1		1
Other Individuals reporting > 1 one race				8	15	23	8	15	23
Totals	86	82	168	556	530	1099	642	612	1254

Please separate out the count for Males/Females (YTD) for reporting purposes. The total Males + the total Females (YTD) needs to match the total persons YTD, in the

Group **Presumed Income Level**
Abused children: Extremely low income
Battered spouses: Low income
Severely disabled: Adults Low income
Homeless persons: Extremely low income
Illiterate adults: Low income
Persons with AIDS: Low income
Migrant farm workers: Low income
Elderly: If assistance is to acquire, construct, convert, and/or rehabilitate a senior center or to pay for providing center-based senior services, report the beneficiaries as moderate income. If assistance is for other services (not center-based), report the elderly beneficiaries as low income.