City of Portland
Remote CDBG Priority Task Force

ZOOM MEETING INSTRUCTIONS:
The CDBG Priority Task Force will hold a remote meeting on Thursday, May 28, 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.

Please click the link below to join the webinar:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83201909212

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: +1 312 626 6799 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 6833

Or one¬tap for mobile: US: +13126266799,,940614580# or +19292056099,,940614580#

Webinar ID: 832 0190 9212

1. Introduction of meeting to Zoom attendees
2. Review and Accept Minutes of CDBG Priority Task Force meeting held on May 11, 2020.
    a. Minutes of the May 11, 2020 Meeting
3. Review Detailed work plan/Q&A regarding work plan with Staff
    a. Detailed Work Plan
4. Set-Asides/Maximum and Minimum Grant Amounts ACTION REQUIRED (See information provided in May 11 meeting packet)
    a. Discuss and take action on construction maximum and minimums
    b. Discuss and take action on up to 60% set aside for public infrastructure
    c. Discuss and take action on City allocation caps
5. Bonus Points and Penalty Points
    a. Discuss history and use of bonus points and penalty points
    b. Brainstorm potential changes
    c. Decide on additional information needed, if any
6. Next Meeting

a. June 8th 5:00-7:00, location to be determined

b. Take action on bonus points and penalty points

c. Discuss guiding principles:
   i) Guidance in application;
   ii) How they relate to scoring

Community Development Priority Setting Task Force

MEETING MINUTES

May 11th, 2020 5:00-7:00pm via Zoom

Task Force Attendees: Jim Hall, Mark Adelson, Grace Braley, Matt Dubel, Brad Hanscom, Ben Strick, Don Harding, Adam Cohen, Andrew Ouellette, Ashish Shrestha, Julia Sheridan, Lucas Blom, Sam Heck

City Staff: Mary Davis, Amanda Methot, Kelley Walsh

Introductions

Committee went through introductions for the meeting attendees

Minutes

Approved unanimously without comment

Set Aside/ Maximum/ Minimums

Co-Chair introduced the agenda item

Member mentioned the goal and purpose of the CDBG and how that needs to be in the forefront when this group makes a decision

Member mentioned the flow of the work plan, top down vs. down up.

Member asked for staff clarification on what our tools are to make changes and where is the most change going to happen in the work plan

Member mentioned making an agency cap rather than a program cap

- Staff provided guidance that the task force has the power to do this

Member gave an example of Preble Street as an agency that puts in multiple applications each year with the total being larger than the maximum

Member asked the group why we should continue to support set asides generally

Members discussed programs that are great and long standing that may be worth taking out of the competitive process

Member said they would be hesitant to remove community policing from set asides

Member discussed the competitive nature of the allocation process and that community policing gets to be an outlier to that process. In addition, maximums are a good way to get more projects funded by reducing it, or change the scoring to give additional points that are below the average ask. Lastly, putting more weight on the per unit cost ration may be a way to reward people for low unit cost.

Member stated they are against formal set asides as of now

Member supports community policing continuing to have a set aside

Member discussed their role in the social service landscape in Portland and how Community Policing involves social service providers. Member said they would support Community Policing becoming part of the City budget if possible, but if it cannot be than the set aside should stay. Member also stated that the maximum and minimums could diminish the power of the program the agency is trying to build.

Member asked for clarification on the roles of the task force versus the allocation committee, the City funding caps, and the City's budgeting of Community Policing.

- Staff explained that the task force makes large systematic changes to the process while the allocation committee reviews and scores who receives funding year to year, based on the process the task force has created.
- Staff explained that the City funding caps are in place to ensure that CDBG funding goes to organizations and projects outside of the City
- Staff explained that

Member said they were in favor of set-asides and that community policing is valuable, but it is an ongoing City budgeting issue.

Member asked for clarification on the community policing budget

- Staff stated that community policing became a priority and in order the ensure that funding would be available a set aside was created

Member thinks the homeless service set aside is interesting but would like to hear more discussion

Member asked about using CDBG funds for the City budget

- Staff explained that CDBG cannot be used to supplant local funds for the general conduct of government, but it can be used to create new City programs.

Member discussed the history of the minimums and that Council often does not make changes to the Allocation Committee recommendations. Therefore, this process is where we can "steer the balloon". In regards to Community Policing, we cannot guarantee that the City will have the funds for Community Policing and this is a way to ensure that neighborhoods still get this service.

Member gave example of Preble Street and how they put in multiple applications each year and continue to get funded even though they are not a set aside

Member discussed that innovation is a goal of the program and wanted to know if the group had the ability and be interested in doing a set-aside for new applicants, give them an advantage and foster innovation rather than penalize long standing successful programs

- Staff provided clarification that the group can create a new program set aside.

Member strongly supports a new program set aside, in addition they gave insight about homeless programs having difficulty getting sustainable funding as easily as other social services that are able to tap insurance (MaineCare)

Member asked about the amount of time goes in to writing an application

- Staff let group know that it is a 6 week turnaround
- Member that was also an applicant estimated that it takes about 40 hours over that 6 weeks

- Another member that has been an applicant discussed the difficulty of certain parts of the application when the organization does not have a sophisticated development staff
- Another member that has been applicant stated that the application is clear and easy compared to other proposals, in addition, the process is easy and the ability to communicate with staff is a nice process.

Member suggested making the minimum an amount that would be equal to the amount of time that a staffer puts in to the writing the grant

- Members that are applicants stated that $10,000 is a reasonable minimum, but would not go below that
- Staff gave insight about the reporting requirements of subrecipients and grants under $10,000 are not proportionate to the amount of paper work that needs to be done

Member agreed that giving new comers an advantage rather than giving essential services a disadvantage is the right way to go about these changes. Member also talked about a program that scored very low this past application season and how they are very important to the community, and managing new applicants like them against long standing more established programs.

Chair gave a recap of the current discussion

- Agency vs program limit
- Community Policing set aside
- Minimum and the reasoning behind that figure
- New program set aside
- Homeless Services set aside
- Lowering the maximum

Member stated they were in favor of a minimum of $10,000 as well as a new program set aside the coincides with a high priority of an emerging trend. Member also cautioned about complicating the program more than it already is through scoring. Still unsure about the agency limit vs the program limit.

Member suggested taking a straw poll on Agency maximum vs. program maximum 6 in favor, 7 against

There was confusion on how the straw poll question was posed and a suggestion that we vote on the maximums and the vote separately about the agency vs program maximum.

Member made a motion to change the maximum $250,000 in construction and $150,000 in social service per applicant, 2nd

- Member asked for clarification on the construction maximum, and how to define agency since DPW is a multi-project applicant
- Member made a motion to bifurcate the motion to only consider social service maximum, 2nd
    - Discussion
    - Member is not in favor of agency max because there aren't that many programs doing this type of work
    - Member disagreed and thinks we should open it up to more applicants
    - Member would like to amend the motion to be agency and or partnership
    - Member asked for clarification on a project that went over the maximum in construction

        - Staff stated that two projects were funded and reprioritized what needed to be done and transferred money from one project to another, the original allocations did not surpass the maximums
    - Member stated that lowering the maximums will allow for more applications to get funded or establishing a new program set aside
    - Member stated that the groups seems to be trying to prevent agencies from getting too much so others get nothing, we want the system to be as open and available as possible.
    - Member stated that we don't want to stop strong efficient programs

Motion was repeated, $150,000 maximum per agency in social services

- 6 in favor, 7 against

Member suggested continuing to focus on social services

Motion was made to maintain $150,000 maximum, motion failed

Member discussed wanting to lower the maximum to allow for more programs to get funded.

Motion made to lower the maximum to $100,000 for social services, motion failed

Member suggested making a set aside for new programs

Member asked what a 20% set aside would look like in dollar amount

- Staff calculated it would have been $128,000 for this year

Member stated they do not like the cap because someone programs that are new and score well would be overlooked

Members discussed that new programs are not necessarily discouraged from applying, but are at a disadvantage due to lack of experience.

Staff clarified that new applicants that score well will still get funded even if there is a new program set aside; there are typically only 1-2 new applicants per year. It is unlikely that there will be an overwhelming number of new programs that this set aside will go towards

Members discussed having a percentage of the allocation for new programs and whatever is not used can go back in to the general pool of funds for social service

Member stated that there needs to be some criteria for new programs so the set aside money is not going towards programs that are not "good" programs

Member mentioned addressing the criteria at the scoring portion of the work plan

Motion to establish a 20% set aside with a yet to be determined floor, and any new applicant that is not funded would go back in, 2nd

- Discussion
- Member asked staff about how often do new applicants get funded with the current process
    - Staff provided feedback that the majority of first time applicants do not get funded on the first try, but they do come back the following year.
- Member asked about how new applicants can be forgiven for missteps in the application
- Member stated that this could be done with the point floor for new applicants

- Member discussed that there is some complexity around creating to point floor for new applicants. It would be creating another thing to assess. They do like the idea though
- Member suggested lowering the percentage and taking away the point floor
- Member suggested making a decision on creating the new program set aside and work out the details later
- Member wanted make a clarification of new applicants vs applicants that have not been funded.
    - Member stated new program should be used over new applicant
- Member asked how this action item relates to the report
    - Staff clarified that the action items are creating the outline for the report
- Vote
    - Passed unanimously

Motion made to keep the social service maximum at $150,000, 2nd

- Discussion
- Member stated that the averages are not near the maximum, and most programs are not funded at that maximum
- Member agreed that the maximum seems high, but that allows an agency to fund 2 programs
- Vote
    - 12 in favor, 1 against

Next Meeting

Staff explained that Construction will still need to be discussed

Member made a motion to keep construction the same, motion failed

Meeting adjourned at 7:04

STRUCTURAL CHANGES (4/30 & 5/11 MEETINGS)

The structural changes that are being decided on apply to all applicants regardless of what need category or activity they fall in to, therefore an analysis of the community needs is not a factor.

Maximums/Minimums

Maximums and minimums are applied based on the pot of money you are applying for and do not change based on the applicants specific program.

- $10,000 minimum across the board
- $250,000 maximum for construction projects regardless of what need category they fit in to
- $150,000 maximum for social service projects regardless of what need category they fit in to

ACTION: The group can adjust these up or down, and should not take specific applicants or programs in to consideration. In addition, the group can choose to apply the maximum and minimums to the program or the organization applying.

Set-Asides

Set- Asides have mostly been used to keep Community Policing funded and allow for 60% of the construction funding to go towards public infrastructure

- $150,000 for community policing
- Up to a 60% set aside for public infrastructure

ACTION: The group can choose to:

- Keep these as is
- Remove all set-asides
- Create new set-asides based on broad categories, NOT specific programs or activities
- Or a combination of any of those options.
- Examples
    - Setting aside a percentage of the allocation for new programs that score above 85.
    - Set aside a certain percentage for homeless service programs.

Additional Caps on Funding

The City is limited to 45% of the total funding in social services and 85% in development activities. The 60% cap for public infrastructure is part of the 85% cap in development; this essentially overrides the $250,000 maximum for public infrastructure projects. Lastly, the maximum for development activities is 30% of the pervious year's allocation amount or $250,000 whichever is LARGER. HCD staff does the calculation each year and the $250,000 maximum has historically been the greater of the two numbers.

ACTION: The group can choose to increase, decrease, or take no action on the City funding caps in both social service and development activities

ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (5/28 & 6/8 MEETINGS)

Bonus/Penalty Points

Bonus and penalty points are applied regardless of who the applicant is or what priority activity they are engaging in. Currently, bonus points are applied based on high priority and priority activities. The group will have the opportunity to change the activities in each category, but for now, they should determine the point difference for a high priority activity vs. a priority activity.

- High priority receives 11 points
- Priority receives 7 points

ACTION: The group can changes the point spread between the two categories

Penalty points are applied to all applications regardless of need category and activity.

- Missing sections = 1 point
- Failing to follow submission guidelines = .25 point for each instance
- Errors in budget calculations = .25 points for each instance

ACTION: The group can choose the remove penalty points or change their values up or down.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND PRIORTIES (6/25, 7/13, & 7/30 MEETINGS)

Guiding Principles

Guiding principles are found in the narrative of the application. They also make up the categories on the scorecard. The taskforce will focus on reviewing the application language describing each guiding principle. The guiding principle categories will not be changed. These guiding principles are applied to all applications regardless of organization or activity.

ACTION: The group can make edits to the language to make it clearer; the group should use feedback from the allocation committee as well as staff in regards to issues on collecting the right information in each of these sections.

Priority Activities

In each of the four need categories there are priority activities assigned to the need. Within the priority activities, they are labeled as high priority and priority. As discussed earlier, high priority activities receive more points than priority activities. The group will used the data collected from the Consolidated Plan survey to re-arrange the activities within each of the four needs group. The taskforce should use the survey data to inform their decision.

ACTION: The group can make changes to how activities are labeled therefore giving certain activities a point advantage over others. The changes need to be in line with the survey data as part of the citizen participation requirement.

Score Card

The scorecard has four large point categories will smaller sub categories within them. The taskforce can move point allotments in the large categories as well as the small categories. The large category allotments will be decided first with subcategory distribution coming second. These changes should be informed by the Allocation Committee recommendations as well as the point analysis that was conducted this year by an Allocation Committee member.

ACTION:

- Change point allotment in the 4 major scoring categories (Goal/priority impact/community need, Guiding Principles, Capacity to Deliver, and Partnership/Collaboration)
- Distribute points in each major category to the subcategories

WRITE REPORT (8/10 & 8/27 MEETINGS)

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS

1. Updated set-aside, minimum/maximum memo
2. History of child care voucher set aside
    a. HCDC Committee Minutes recommending the set aside
    b. City Council meeting and City Manager Memo removing the set aside
3. Community Policing Performance Reports
    a. Yearly performance report 2016-2019
    b. Current program year report through quarter 3

Please review and be prepared to discuss the enclosed materials at the May 11th meeting.

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 maxiumum/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 disproportionally 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.

Prepared by: Mary Davis, HCD Division Director Date: March 22, 2016

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

Phone: 874-8731   *Fax : 874-8949*

Community Development Block Grant

Community Policing Coordinators

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		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Total
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.

Community Policing-Lisa Perrotta 874-8515

City of Portland Division of Housing & Neighborhood Services *Phone: 874-8731* *Fax : 874-8949*
Community Development Block Grant
Community Policing Coordinators

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		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Total
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.

Community Policing-Lisa Perrotta 874-8515

PERFORMANCE REPORT

City of Portland Division of Housing & Community Development *Phone: 874-8731* *Fax : 874-8949*

Community Development Block Grant ***FY2018/2019*** ***CD1912 IDIS***

City of Portland, Police Department

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 *Phone: 874-8731* *Fax : 874-8949*

Community Development Block Grant ***FY2019/2020*** ***CD1912***

City of Portland, Police Department ***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.

MEMORANDUM

TO: CDBG Priority Setting Task Force

FROM: Amanda Methot, HCD Compliance Officer

DATE: May 26, 2020

RE: Bonus points and penalty points

HISTORY OF BONUS POINTS AND PENALTY POINTS

2011: Council Adds Bonus Points

In 2011, the City Council reviewed the CDBG allocation program and implementation, through that review 3 bonus points were added to social service applications that met the work and shop priority category *(see below)*, for development activities, priority points were given to projects located in Libbytown. These changes were made based off Staff, Allocation Committee, and Subrecipient feedback.

2011: CDBG Update from HCD Staff

HCD Staff gave an update to Council prior to the 2011-2012 application release. The 2010-2011 application cycle was the first year penalty points were applied. Based on feedback from applicants, the 2011-2012 application specified what would result in point deductions, including, but not limited to: errors, missing documents, and incomplete sections. Point deductions will be administered by staff prior to distributing the applications to the CDBG Allocation Committee.

2014-2015 Changes to Bonus Points

In 2014-2015 bonus points included basic need *(see below)* and childcare activities, job creation was removed.

- Priority Categories
  Work and Shop Priority. Create or support places for people to work and shop within their neighborhoods as well as the means to gain and maintain employment. *Including but not limited to: creating a community and economic development plan; creating jobs; attracting/ retaining businesses, retail and service jobs; creating or supporting business incubators; small business start up loans; education; job training; child care.*

  Basic Needs Priority *Programs that respond to an acute need where no other options exist and such a response is temporary in nature.* Examples include but are not limited to: *short term shelter; emergency food services; emergency heat assistance; other emergency services.*

Removal of Bonus Points

The Allocation Committee writes a letter to the City Manager each year outlining their recommendations based on scoring. In addition, the Committee will often provide insight in to what made the process difficult from year to year. The 2014-2015 Allocation Committee recommended that bonus points be removed from Social Service applications and that location determine bonus points for development activities. Excerpts from the letter are highlighted below.

- **Allocation Committee Letter**

BONUS POINTS
Social Services
The Committee discussed the bonus points that were awarded this year to both Childcare and Basic Needs. According to the application Basic Needs is defined as "programs that respond to an acute need where no other options exist and such a response is temporary in nature." The Committee feels that this definition is so broad that it removes the Committee's discretion to effectively score applications. Nine (9) of the fourteen (14) social service applications qualified to receive an additional three (3) bonus points (8 for basic needs and 1 for childcare). Three bonus points makes a significant impact on the resulting scores when the difference between receiving funding and not receiving funding falls to a tenth or one-hundredth of a point. If Basic Needs, or any Priority Impact Area, receives three (3) additional bonus points it effectively ensures that those applications have a high likelihood of being funded, while other highly needed applications are at a significant disadvantage. Seven (7) of the eight (8) applications being recommended for funding by the committee (based on score) received Basic Needs or Childcare bonus points. Only one applicant who received the bonus points did not receive a recommendation for funding.
The Committee recommends that there be NO bonus points for social service applications for next year.
Development Activities
This is the first year that Development Activity applications received the same bonus points as Social Service applicants, for Basic Needs and Childcare. Five applicants received additional bonus points. The Committee feels strongly that these types of bonus points should not apply to Development Activity applications.
The Committee recommends limiting bonus points to location only for Development Activity applications, where the location compliments a larger City initiative.

The City Manager responded to the Allocation Committee and ultimately left the bonus points in place.

The issue of bonus points were raised again to the City Council in October of 2015, prior to the release of the 2015-2016 application. The Housing Committee recommended to the council remove bonus points due to the issues raised by the Allocation Committee in their 2014 letter to the City Manager. The Council approved the removal of bonus points.

Current use of Points

Currently, the application states activities that are priority and high priority under each City goal. If an application is performing a high priority activity they will receive 11 points in the priority impact category on the scorecard, priority activities will receive 7 points in the priority impact category on the scorecard. *(Sample scorecards are on the next page)*

SAMPLE SCORE CARDS

SOCIAL SERVICE SAMPLE	**Organization Name**			**Program Name**	**Funding Request**
Category	***Suggested Distribution***		***Score***	***Scorer Comments***	
Goal/ Priority Impact/ Community Need (total = 33 possible points)	*Goal*	*12*			
	Priority Impact Level (11 or 7)	*Set at 11 or 7*	11		
	Community Need	*10*			
		Subtotal	11		
Guiding Principles (total = 30 points)	*Measurable Comm Impact*	*11*			
	Diversity & Inclusiveness	*9*			
	Priority to lower incomes	*9*			
	Consistent w City Goals	*1*			
		Subtotal	0		
Capacity to Deliver (total = 25 points)	*Financial Need*	*6*			
	Leveraged Funds	*8*			
	Exp. Providing Service	*4*			
	Readiness to Proceed	*4*			
	Financial Stability	*3*			
		Subtotal	0		
Partnership/ Collaboration/ Outreach					
	No letter of support of MOU	***max 0***	**0**		
		Subtotal	0		
		TOTAL	**11**		

CONSTRUCTION SAMPLE	**Organization Name**			**Project Name**	**Funding Request**
Category	***Suggested Distribution***			***Scorer Comments***	
Goal/ Priority Impact/ Community Need (total = 33 possible points)	*Goal*	*12*			
	Priority Impact Level (11 or 7)	*Set at 11*	11		
	Community Need	*10*			
		Subtotal	11		
Guiding Principles (total = 30 points)	*Measurable Comm Impact*	*10*			
	Diversity & Inclusiveness	*6*			
	Priority to lower incomes	*4*			
	Consistent w City Goals	*1*			
	Location	*4*			
	Sustainability	*5*			
		Subtotal	0		
Capacity to Deliver (total = 25 points)	*Financial Need*	*3*			
	Leveraged Funds	*6*			
	Exp. Providing Service	*5*			
	Readiness to Proceed	*8*			
	Financial Stability	*3*			
		Subtotal			
Partnership/ Collaboration/ Outreach					
	Letter of Support	***max 9***			
		Subtotal	0		
		TOTAL	**11**		

APPLICATION SECTIONS

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

All applications must follow the formatting described below or be subject to penalty points:

a. Separate applications for each program requesting funds shall be submitted;

b. Applications must be typewritten;

c. White 8 ½ x 11” paper; with 1” margins;

d. Text must be Times New Roman 12pt for the narrative, single spaced with double spacing between paragraph, the Summary and Worksheet may use Times New Roman 11 pt;

e. All sections and narrative questions must be labeled, page numbering is encouraged;

f. Maps and larger sections must be shrunk to fit onto an 8 ½ x 11” paper;

g. The check list provided must be completed and submitted with the application;

h. Page limits listed on the check list must be followed, additional pages may not be forwarded to the Committee for review;

i. Required and supporting documents shall be labeled and placed in an appendix. Extraneous information will not be considered;

j. Required documents must be attached:

   Non-profit applications: verification of 501(c)3 status; agency organizational chart; most recent agency operating budget; most recent audit or <u>if not available</u> the most recent 990 financial statement.

k. Supporting Documents (subject to scoring)

   i. Memorandum of Agreement: describes the relationship between partner entities for this application, including specific details concerning the allocation of funds, shared goals, objectives, space, employees, and other resources. If awarded funds, the MOA will be attached to your contract.

      a. Memorandum of Agreement: describes the relationship between partner entities for this application, including specific details concerning the allocation of funds, shared goals, objectives, space, employees, and other resources. If awarded funds, the MOA will be attached to your contract.

      b. Letter of Support: describes relationship between applicant and the entity writing the letter and the reason for support, including impacts the applicant has on the community, strength and benefits of partnerships established with other organizations, etc.

      c. These documents should be specific about how the organizations service is enhanced through the collaboration. In addition, the document should describe where the service and collaborator fits on the “continuum of care”.

   ii. Letter of Support: describes relationship between applicant and the entity writing the letter and the reason for support, including impacts the applicant has on the community, strength and benefits of partnerships established with other organizations, etc.

   iii. Project Timeline: describes when the program will occur with specific dates and times

l. One (1) original printed version of the application with original signatures <u>**plus**</u> one (1) <u>full</u> electronic version, submitted via email, USB drive, or CD;

m. All applications shall be complete, approved, and signed by the owner, the Board of Directors, or the Executive Director authorized by the Board.

PENALTY	**POINTS DEDUCTED**
Missing section/s	1 point deducted per item
Failing to follow Submission Guidelines, section I.C.3 (including but not limited to: application not typed, page limits, max/min request amounts, etc)	0.25 point deducted per instance
Errors (e.g. in budget calculation)	0.25 points deducted per instance

TASK FORCE ACTION

The Task Force can choose to change the point difference between priority and high priority activities, the activities that go into these categories will be decided on next month after the survey closes. In addition, the task force can choose to decrease, increase, or remove penalty points.