



**CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
CDBG PRIORITY TASK FORCE**

DATE: Thursday September 3rd, 2020
TIME: 5:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Remote Meeting via Zoom

ZOOM MEETING INSTRUCTIONS:

The CDBG Priority Task Force will hold a remote meeting on Thursday, September 3rd, 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. §403A, that authorizes cities and towns to conduct meetings online.

Allow your computer to install the free Zoom app to get the best meeting experience.

Link to join Webinar

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81655485766>

iPhone one-tap :

US: +16465588656,,83419359532# or +13017158592,83419359532#

Telephone: Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

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

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81655485766>

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.

Webinar ID: 816 5548 5766

AGENDA

- 1) Introduction of meeting to Zoom attendees – Amanda Presenting
- 2) Review and accept Minutes of CDBG Task Force from the August 27th, 2020 meeting.
- 3) Review detailed work plan/ Q&A regarding work plan with staff - Amanda Presenting
- 4) Score Card Presentation and revisions, ACTION NEEDED

- a) Discussion regarding remaining point distribution
 - i) Collaboration
 - b) Vote on final point distributions
- 5) Council Report
- a) Initial thoughts and edits to report sections
 - b) Focus on additional considerations for Council



CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE

August 27, 2020 CBDG Priority Task Force Meeting Minutes:

TIME: 5:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Remote Meeting via Zoom

In attendance: Jim, Don, Adam, Mark, Chase, Andrew, Brad, Julia, Grace, Matt, Ben,
Absent: Lucas, Sam, Ashish
Staff: Mary Davis, HCD Division Director, Kelley Walsh HCD Program Manager,
Amanda Methot, HCD Compliance Officer

Review and accept Minutes of CDBG Task Force from the August 10th, 2020 meeting.

Motion to pass 8.10 minutes: Motion passed unanimously

Staff reviewed the work plan for this meeting, noting that the task force is already a meeting behind. The action that is required to take place in this meeting is allocating a set number of points for each scoring category.

Score Card Presentation and revisions and discussion:

Staff discussed the score card memo and the focus on the large scoring categories. The Task Force and the Council make the decisions regarding the point allocation of the larger categories. The Allocation Committee historically has control over changing point allocations in the subcategories.

Member stated that more scoring categories end up neutralizing the scoring and complicates things.

Group discussed the pros and cons of having subcategories to provide guidance to the Allocation Committee.

Large Scoring Categories

The group discussed the data and average points that task force members allotted to each category.

Members suggested to round the average scores to multiples of 5 in each of the large categories.

Member asked about the quorum to ensure that there was one to take a vote, staff clarified that 11 of the 14 members were present.

Motion to allocate category points in both Social services and Development as follows:

30 points - Goal, Priority Impact Level & Community Need

30 points - Guiding principles

25 points - Capacity to deliver

15 points - Collaboration

Motion passed unanimously

Sub-categories

Member asked about how the goal and priority are separated out. Staff clarified that the priority impact speaks directly to the activity the applicant is carrying out, while goal speaks to how they will carry out the activity and what the activity will achieve over the year.

The group discussed making each sub-category a multiple of 5

Discussion around the sub category multiplier for sections that have more than 5 points. Staff explained how they would set up score cards and additions they would make to the application and orientation documents for applicants and allocation committee members.

Member stated that when scoring, scorers may need more leeway than 1-5 and would like the group to consider allowing half and quarter points.

Motion to allocate Goal, Priority Impact Level, & Community Need sub-categories points, in both Social Services and Development Activities, as follows:

15 points - Goal

10 points - Community need

5 points - Priority

Motion passed 9-2

Member made a suggestion of allocating 5 points to each category under guiding principles.

Member suggested combining “consistent with City goals, plans, and initiatives” and “goal”. The explanation under goal in the application will encompass the consistent with city goals portion of the applications.

Motion to remove Guiding principles sub-category consistency with city goals, plans, and initiative (4 points) and include this subcategory with the Goal, Priority Impact

Level and Community Need, Goal Subcategory

Motion passed unanimously

Member suggested making the point allocation in social services for guiding principles as 10 across the board

Member stated that measurable community impact should be slightly higher than the other categories and suggested 12 points for that category

Members discussed sticking with multiples of 5 for scoring

Members discussed that given the climate in the world today there should be a focus on diversity and inclusiveness

Motion for to allocate measurable community impact, diversity and inclusiveness, Priority to lower income as follows in social service

Measurable Community Impact 10

Diversity and Inclusiveness 10

Priority to Lower Incomes 10

Motion passed 7-3

Member stated that location should be removed, members discussed.

Motion for to allocate measurable community impact, diversity and inclusiveness, Priority to lower income as follows in Development

Measurable Community Impact 10

Diversity and Inclusiveness 5

Priority to Lower Incomes 5

Location 5

Sustainability 5

Motion passed 9-1

Staff gave an overview of the importance of the capacity to deliver when it comes to accounting and reporting expectations of subrecipients.

Motion to allocate Capacity to deliver subcategory point distribution as follows:

5- Financial need

5- Leveraged funding

5- Experience Providing Service

5- Readiness to Proceed

5- Financial Stability

Motion passed 9 approve

Meeting adjourned: 7:07pm

Next meeting Thursday, September 3 -Council Report, unfinished business

MEMORANDUM

To: 2020 CDBG Priority Setting Task Force

From: Amanda Methot, HCD Compliance Officer

Date: July 23, 2020

Re: Scoring

History and Background, Current 5 Year Plan

The score card has remained the same throughout the 5 year plan. The major categories include Goal/Priority Impact/Community Need, Guiding Principles, Capacity to Deliver, and Partnership/Collaboration/Outreach. The point allocation for the major categories are as follows; Goal/Priority Impact/Community Need **33**, Guiding Principles **30**, Capacity to Deliver **25**, and Partnership/Collaboration/Outreach **max of 12**. The scoring matrix can be found at the end of this memo

The total points for each category have remained unchanged, this change can only occur with council approval. The Allocation Committee has historically talked about making changes to the major scoring categories, but did not create a proposal to bring to council. The Allocation committee does have the authority to move points within the sub categories of each larger scoring category. In years 2016-2019 the committee did not make any changes. In 2019-2020 the Committee chose to overhaul the point allocations in the sub categories. Changes were made at the December 12, 2018 meeting, below is an excerpt from the meeting minutes:

Scoring Matrix: Discussions and Changes

The Committee reviewed the current scoring matrix and asked staff about the changes they can make on a committee level. The Committee discussed the categories of partnerships, capacity to deliver, priority impacts, and guiding principles. Changes in point allocations are detailed below:

<i>Capacity to deliver (25 points),</i>	<i><u>Past Years</u></i>	<i><u>Development</u></i>	<i><u>Social Service</u></i>
• <i>Financial need:</i>	<i>5/5</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>6</i>
• <i>Leveraged funding:</i>	<i>5/5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>8</i>
• <i>Experience:</i>	<i>4/5</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>
• <i>Readiness to proceed:</i>	<i>7/5</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>4</i>
• <i>Financial stability:</i>	<i>4/5</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Priority Impacts (33 points)</i>	<i><u>Past Years</u></i>	<i><u>Development</u></i>	<i><u>Social Service</u></i>
• <i>Goal:</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>12</i>
• <i>Priority impact :</i>	<i>Set 7 or 11</i>	<i>Set 7 or 11</i>	<i>Set 7 or 11</i>
• <i>Community need:</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>

<i>Guiding Principles (30 points)</i>	<i><u>Past Years</u></i>	<i><u>Development</u></i>	<i><u>Social Service</u></i>
• <i>Measurable community impact:</i>	<i>10/15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11</i>
• <i>Diversity:</i>	<i>4/5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>9</i>
• <i>Priority to lower incomes:</i>	<i>4/5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>9</i>
• <i>Consistency with City goals:</i>	<i>4/5</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
• <i>Location:</i>	<i>4/X</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>X</i>
• <i>Sustainability:</i>	<i>4/X</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>X</i>

The Allocation committee felt that many of the categories were repetitive such as goal and consistency with City goals, hence they reduced the point allocation in the latter. In addition, the Committee felt that CDBG funds should truly be used for gap funding and chose to increase the financial need and leveraged funding point allocations. Lastly, balancing experienced organizations and new innovated programs has historically been a challenge. In an effort to create a more level playing field the committee reduced the experience and readiness to proceed point allocations.

A full breakdown of the internal scoring guide summary can be found at the end of the memo

2020-2021 Scoring Analysis

The Allocation Committee was blessed to have a member this past year that works in analytics and took an interest in the scoring data over the past 2 years. The member analyzed the data and produced a small report for the Committee. The full report can be found at the end of the memo

Report Findings

In the large scoring categories the percentage of maximum points were given out as follows

- Development
 - Goals/Priority/Community Need, 89%
 - Guiding Principles, 81%
 - Capacity to Deliver, 81%
 - Partnership/Collaboration/ Outreach, 86%
- Social Service
 - Goals/Priority/Community Need, 93%
 - Guiding Principles, 89%
 - Capacity to Deliver, 82%
 - Partnership/Collaboration/ Outreach, 88%

This data shows that the largest range in point allocations fall in the capacity to deliver section on both development and social service. It does not come as a surprise that Goals/Priority/Community Need and Partnership/Collaboration/ Outreach have a larger percentage of maximum points since both categories have point allocations attached to activities as well as MOU's and Letters of Support.

Sub-categories with largest and smallest percentage of points allocated are as follows;

Development	Social Service
-------------	----------------

HIGH (90-100%) • Priority Impact Level • Consistent with City Goals	HIGH (90-100%) • Goal • Priority Impact Level • Community Need • Priority to Lower Incomes • Consistent with City Goals • Readiness to Proceed • Financial Stability
LOW (65-75%) • Leveraged Funding • Financial Need	LOW (70-80%) • Financial Need • Leveraged Funding

Action Item

The Task Force can choose to change the point allocation within the large categories as well as the sub-categories. The total point allocation will stay at 100. The Task Force has made the decision to change the priority impact level to 5 points for a high priority activity and 0 for a priority activity, this change must be reflected in the final score card. The Task Force has also focused in on the collaboration portion of the application and increased the number of pages for MOU's and Letters of support from 2 to 5. This change should be taken in to consideration when finalizing the score card.

SCORING CATEGORIES AND POINT DISTRIBUTION

SCORING CATEGORIES AND POINT DISTRIBUTION

SCORING CATEGORY, SEE I.B FOR MORE INFORMATION	POSSIBLE POINTS
Guiding Principles: measurable community impact, diversity and inclusiveness, priority to lower incomes, consistent with city goals, plans, or initiatives	30 points
Capacity to deliver, including financial need, leveraged funding, experience providing service, readiness to proceed, and financial stability	25 points
Goal, Priority Impact Level & Community Need	33 points
Partnership/Collaboration, points distributed based on highest submitted documentation (MOA, LOS or Outreach) • Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) • Letter of Support (LOS) • Demonstrated Outreach	MOA maximum of 12 points LOS maximum of 9 points Outreach maximum of 6 points

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

Internal Scoring Guide Summary 2019-2020

[illegible]

Variance of Scoring by Category

Notes

- Two categories that always score
- Finance categories more variable
- Development specific categories more variable
- Goal categories less variable
- Partner category...complicated

(Symbols)
Score Category

Variance Coefficient
of Scores (all)
Scores (development)
Scores (soc services)
Score Values

Goals

VarCo:
17%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Priority Impact Lvl

VarCo:
1%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Community Need

VarCo:
17%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Measure Comm Imp

VarCo:
21%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Diverse & Inclusive

VarCo:
19%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Priority to Lower Inc

VarCo:
16%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Consistent w City Goals

VarCo:
0%

1

Location

VarCo:
28%

1 2 3 4

Sustainability

VarCo:
32%

1 2 3 4 5

Financial Need

VarCo:
32%

1 2 3 4 5 6

Leveraged Funds

VarCo:
31%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Exp Prov Services

VarCo:
23%

1 2 3 4 5

Readiness to Proc

VarCo:
16%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Financial Stability

VarCo:
19%

1 2 3

Partner/Collab/Out

VarCo:
24%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Maximum Score Possible

	Development			Social Services		
	2017/18	2019	+/-	2017/18	2019	+/-
Goal	7	12	+5	7	12	+5
Priority Impact Level	11	11	0	11	11	0
Community Need	15	10	-5	15	10	-5
Goal/Priority/ Comm Need	33	33		33	33	
Measurable Comm Impact	10	10	0	15	11	-4
Diversity & Inclusiveness	4	6	+2	5	9	+4
Priority to lower incomes	4	4	0	5	9	+4
Consistent w City Goals	4	1	-3	5	1	-4
Location	4	4	0	0	0	0
Sustainability	4	5	+1	0	0	0
Guiding Principles	30	30		30	30	
Financial Need	5	3	-2	5	6	+1
Leveraged Funds	5	6	+1	5	8	+3
Exp. Providing Service	4	5	+1	5	4	-1
Readiness to Proceed	7	8	+1	5	4	-1
Financial Stability	4	3	-1	5	3	-2
Capacity to Deliver	25	25		25	25	
PCO	12	12	0	12	12	0
Partner/Collab/Outreach	12	12	0	12	12	0
Total	100	100		100	100	

% Points Given Out of Maximum

	Development			Social Services		
	2017/18	2019	+/-	2017/18	2019	+/-
Goal	85%	85%	0%	87%	91%	4%
Priority Impact Level	99%	100%	0%	100%	97%	-3%
Community Need	83%	83%	0%	84%	92%	8%
Goal/Priority/ Comm Need	89%	89%		90%	93%	
Measurable Comm Impact	78%	79%	1%	82%	83%	1%
Diversity & Inclusiveness	88%	87%	-1%	85%	88%	3%
Priority to lower incomes	87%	85%	-2%	89%	95%	6%
Consistent w City Goals	89%	99%	9%	87%	99%	12%
Location	83%	80%	-3%			0%
Sustainability	81%	75%	-6%			0%
Guiding Principles	83%	81%		85%	89%	
Financial Need	78%	75%	-3%	79%	71%	-8%
Leveraged Funds	62%	68%	6%	76%	79%	3%
Exp. Providing Service	91%	88%	-3%	86%	89%	3%
Readiness to Proceed	87%	88%	0%	88%	94%	6%
Financial Stability	88%	81%	-6%	85%	90%	4%
Capacity to Deliver	81%	81%		83%	82%	
PCO	86%	86%	-1%	88%	88%	0%
Partner/Collab/Outreach	86%	86%	-1%	88%	88%	0%
Total	85%	84%		86%	88%	

MEMORANDUM

To: CDBG Priority Setting Taskforce

From: Amanda Methot, HCD Compliance Officer

Date: August 17, 2020

Re: Taskforce Score Card Analysis

COMMENTS REGARDING SCORING

Scoring Generally

Make the scoring consistent with a max of 5 in each category so AC can score with 1 being poor and 5 being excellent.

Combining Scoring Sub Categories

- Measurable community impact should be absorbed under priority impact
- Capacity to deliver should not have any sub categories
- Combine goal, priority and city goal into a single category
- Combine community need and community impact
- Combine leveraged funding, experience, and stability into a catch-all category labeled readiness to deliver

Removal of Sub Categories

- Remove priority impact (redundant with category)
- Remove **diversity** and **priority to lower incomes** and **location**, if they don't meet these they shouldn't qualify
- Remove **financial need** and **leveraged financing**

TASKFORCE SCORING ANALYSIS

Development

Scorer #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		AVERAGE
Goal, Priority Impact Initiative, Community Need	30	34	33	35	35	33	20	25	40	33		31.8
Guiding Principles	25	31	30	30	20	30	60	30	20	30		30.6
Capacity to Deliver	35	25	25	20	30	25	10	30	40	25		26.5
Collaboration	10	10	12	15	15	12	10	0	0	12		9.6

Social Services

Scorer #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		AVERAGE
Goal, Priority Impact Initiative, Community Need	30	34	33	35	35	33	20	30	40	33		32.3
Guiding Principles	25	31	30	30	20	30	60	25	20	30		30.1
Capacity to Deliver	35	25	25	20	30	25	25	30	40	25		28
Collaboration	10	10	12	15	15	12	10	0	0	12		9.6

Overview of Completed Score Cards

The table below shows the raw data of taskforce members that assigned point values to the entire score card. The priority impact category was adjusted on all cards to reflect the point value the taskforce has already voted on, 5 for high priority, 2 for priority, and 0 for eligible activities.

DEVELOPMENT						
Scorer #	1	2	3	4	5	6
Goal, Priority Impact Initiative, Community Need						
Goal		12	11	10		7
Priority Impact (5 High Priority, 2 Priority, 0 Eligible)		5,2, or 0	5,2, or 0	5,2,or 0	5,2,or 0	5,2, or 0
Community Need		10	12	13	15	10
Total Goal, Priority, Need	25	30	23	33	30	33
Guiding Principles						
Measurable Community Impact	5	10	12	10		8
Diversity and Inclusiveness	10	4	4	4	10	6
Priority to Lower Incomes	5	4	6	4		6
Const w City Goals, Plans or Initiatives	0	4	1	4		1
Location	5	4	4	4		4
Sustainability	5	4	4	4	10	5
Total Guiding Principles	30	30	31	30	20	30
Capacity to Deliver						
Financial Need	5	3	2	4	15	3
Leveraged Funding*	10	6	7	5		6
Experience Providing Service	5	4	4	5		5
Readiness to Proceed	10	7	8	7	15	8
Financial Stability		5	4	4		3
Total for Capacity to Deliver	30	25	25	25	30	25
<i>*Last year Leveraged funds were in Guiding Principles</i>						
Partnership with MOA	12 max	12 max	10	12 max	10	12

Collaboration w Support Letter	6 max	6 max	7	9 max	5	9
Outreach to the community	6 max	6 max	5	6 max	5	6
			10		15	

SOCIAL SERVICE						
Scorer #	1	2	3	4	5	6
Goal, Priority Impact Initiative, Community Need						
Goal		12	11	10		7
Priority Impact (5 high priority, 2 priority, 0 eligible	5,2,or 0	5,2, or 0	5,2,or 0	5,2, or 0	5,2,or 0	5,2, or 0
Community Need		10	12	13	15	15
Total Goal, Priority, Need	30	33	34	33	30	33
Guiding Principles						
Measurable Community Impact	10	5	12	11		7
Diversity and Inclusiveness	10	5	6	9	10	11
Priority to Lower Incomes	5	5	12	9		11
Const w City Goals, Plans or Initiatives	0	5	1	1		1
					10	
Total Guiding Principles	25	30	31	30	20	30
Capacity to Deliver						
Financial Need	10	5	8	5	15	5
Leveraged Funding*	5	5	6	5		5
Experience Providing Service	5	5	6	5		5
Readiness to Proceed	5	5	3	5	15	5
Financial Stability	5	5	2	5		5
Total for Capacity to Deliver	30	25	25	25	30	25
<i>*Last year Leveraged funds were in Guiding Principles</i>						
Partnership with MOA	12 max	12 max	10	12 max	10	12
Collaboration w Support Letter	6 max	6 max	7	9 max	5	9
Outreach to the community	6 max	6 max	5	6 max	5	6
			10		15	12

2020 CDBG PRIORTIY TASK FORCE REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Faced with a growing demand for resources and a dwindling stream of funding, the City of Portland must redefine how federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) dollars are allocated to emphasize, to the greatest extent possible, successful and measurable outcomes.

With this in mind, the members of the 2020 CDBG Priorities Task Force agreed that CDBG funding should be focused on: Community Policing, Public Infrastructure in targeted neighborhoods, Accessibility/ADA Compliance, Alternative modes of transportation, Parks and recreation facilities, Construction of new housing (HOME funds only), Adaptive reuse for housing, rehabilitation of existing housing, housing retention, housing start up assistance, career advancement services, job retention support services, behavioral health services, Shelter services, Housing and Housing Services for long term stayers, and emergency services to prevent homelessness. Toward that end, the 2020 Priorities Task Force makes the following set of recommendations with respect to how CDBG funds should be allocated and spent in the coming years. To maximize impact, the Task Force is also recommending increased communication with other funding sources within the City government and outside in the community to focus on similar outcomes and achievements.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

COMPLETE LAST

PARTICIPANTS

Jim Hall – Chair
Mark Adelson – Chair
Adam Cohen
Andrew Ouellette
Ashish Shrestha
Ben Strick
Brad Hanscom
Chase Hewitt
Don Harden
Grace Braley
Julia Sheridan
Lucas Blom
Matt Dubel
Sam Heck

PREAMBLE

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) is a federal program that distributes funding based on allocations from Congress to its entitlement communities, comprising over 1,200 cities and counties throughout the country. For the past ten years this funding has decreased. The goal of the CDBG Priority Task Force of 2008 was to focus CDBG resources in a complementary way to create a comprehensive community impact and make a visible difference in the eligible neighborhoods.

Over the past few years there has been increased scrutiny of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the CDBG program nationally. Congress has delivered a 25% cut in the last two years which has significantly impacted the CDBG Program and the funding recipients. With further depleting

resources and the heightened need to justify the allocation of funds to the CDBG program nationally, the need for focus, impact and accountability is greater than ever before.

INTRODUCTION

The City of Portland receives approximately \$2 million in CDBG funds annually of federal funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in CDBG. Resetting priorities for the CDBG Program was identified as a priority by the Portland City Council for 2020

Taskforce vacancies were advertised on the City website as a newsflash as well as on the Council and Committees Vacancy page. The advertisement included a description of the taskforce as well as the roles and duties of the members. Lastly, the application was available online with contact information attached if a paper copy was needed. In addition, to the advertising on the website HCD staff sent the advertisement and application to individuals that had expressed interest during the City's District Meetings, and past CDBG applicants. In total, the ad and application went out to 380 individuals.

Sixteen individuals submitted an application by the June 24th deadline, and after staff review the 16 applicants represented all of the demographics listed in the taskforce guidelines.

At the February 19th, 2020 Council Meeting, the City Council approved an order to reinstate the task force and approve the 16 applicants as members.

The City's establishment of the CDBG Priority Task Force of 2020 stemmed from the City's commitment to re-evaluate the priorities to the CDBG Program identified by the CDBG Priority Task Force of 2008 and 2012 every three to five years. This continues a process which began with the Housing and Community Development (HCD) Ten Point Plan, approved by the City on October 1, 2007. The HCD Ten Point Plan, a product of the HCD Task Force, required the creation of the CDBG Priority Task Force, followed by the Annual Allocation Committee.

GOAL OF THE 2020 PRIORITY TASK FORCE

The 2020 CDBG Priorities Task Force was asked to re-evaluate the current CDBG priorities. Their goal is to focus the funds, target desired outcomes, and continue to support a process that is both objective and transparent in an environment of diminishing funding. In addition, the Task Force was asked to review the administrative and structural procedure of the allocation process. The goal was to evaluate and make changes that would create fairness and efficiency.

PROCESS

The 2020 CDBG Priority Setting Task Force was reinstated by the City Council at the February 9, 2020 meeting. In addition, the new task force members were approved at the February 9, 2020 meeting. Prior to reinstating the task force HCD Staff advertised the opportunity to participate in the Community Development Priority Setting Task Force 2020 to all past committee members including the City Manager's Policy Advisory Committee, Housing and Community Development (HCD) Task Force, CDBG Priority Task Force, CDBG Annual Allocation/ Scoring Committee, past awardees of CDBG and HOME funds, interested parties from the 2019 District Meetings, and interested parties. Invitations were sent via email to over 300 individuals and organizations. HCD Staff received 18 applications, members were diverse in their skill sets and represented every neighborhood in Portland. Due to unforeseen circumstances caused by COVID-19, 4 members of the task force could no longer serve.

The Task Force had a strict work plan that covered priorities, structural changes, and administrative changes to the CDBG Allocation process. The Task Force met 12 times between March and September,

twice a month for two hours. The majority of these meetings had to take place over zoom due to COVID-19.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND RATIONALE

The taskforce focused their analysis and review of the CDBG priorities and process in three distinct parts; structural, administrative, and guiding principles/priorities. Structural changes encompass the application guidelines and distribution of set asides and allowable grant requests. Administrative changes deal with bonus points, penalty points, and the appeals process. Lastly, the guiding principles and priorities speak directly to the types of activities the money should be funneled into.

Structural Changes

- Maximum and minimum grant requests

The Task Force made changes to the maximum requests in the Construction and Development category. The change came after reviewing the average grant request over the last 5 years. It was clear that the maximums were too high considering the average was \$127,000 for construction and development and \$63,000 for social services. In addition, it was rare that an applicant would request the full maximum in any given year. The Task Force chose to reduce the maximum in hope that more applications will receive funding.

Changes are outlined below:

- o Minimum grant request for both funding categories will remain at \$10,000
- o Social Services
 - Keep the maximum at \$150,000 per program
- o Construction/ Development
 - Reduce the maximum to \$200,000 per program
- Set-Asides

The Task Force first discussed creating a set aside for new programs. Creating a balance between new programs/ applicants and veteran programs that provide essential services has been a consistent discussion between staff and the yearly allocation committee. After thorough discussion and analyzing the average allocations and requests from year to year the Task Force chose to create a 20% set-aside for new programs. In addition, if there are not enough new programs to make up 20% then the remaining percentage will be allocated to veteran applicants. Lastly, the Task Force understands the importance of scoring applications and did not want to grant funds to a program simply because it was new, therefore the new program will also need to obtain a score of _____ or higher in order to access the set aside.

The Task Force made a slight reduction in the City funding caps. The goal for the reduction is to free up more funding for non-city programming with the hopes of granting funds to a larger number of applicants.

Changes are outlined below:

- o Create a 20% set aside for new programs that meet a certain score (TBD at a later date)
- o Reduce the City funding cap in Social Services from 45% to 40%

- o Eliminate the 60% public infrastructure cap and reduce the maximum City funding cap in Construction and Development from 85% to 80%

Administrative Changes

The majority of the Task Force focus in the section centered around the point allocations for high priority and priority activities. The task force is recommending 5 points for high priority activity, 2 points for priority activity, and 0 points for an eligible activity that is not labeled as priority or high priority.

- Bonus Points & Penalty Points
 - o Change the high priority activity point value to 5 from 11
 - o Change the priority activity point value to 2 from 7
 - o Add in a section regarding eligible activities that are not priority activities, these activities will be allowed to apply, but will not receive any bonus points
 - o Penalty points are to remain the same

Guiding Principles and Priorities

The Task Force chose to make one minor change to the collaboration portion of the application. Collaboration includes letters of support and Memorandum's of Understanding. The Task Force increased the page allotment for collaboration from 2 pages to 5 pages. The decision was based on Allocation Committee member comments regarding the lack of quality of letters of support and MOUs. In addition, Task Force Members that have been past applicants stated the page limits provide a challenge to creating a robust MOU.

Changes outlined below

- Application sections
 - o Changed the page limit for supporting documents for MOU and LOS from 2 to 5 pages

The Task Force made significant changes to the scoring structure as well as the sub categories. The goals of the changes are to streamline the scoring, make it more predictable for applicants and the allocation committee, and decrease arbitrary point value assignments to the subcategories. The Task Force made the decision to have each category be a multiple of 5 with a score of a 1 being poor and 5 being excellent. The Task Force did express concern that the Allocation Committee may feel the need to use half and quarter points, for example, an applicant may not deserve a perfect 5 but a scorer may feel they are above a 4 and award a 4.5. The Task Force feels the scoring structure should allow for this flexibility. In addition to simplifying the scoring structure the Task Force recommends the removal of the sub category for "consistent with city goals, plans, or initiatives". The group feels that the subcategory is redundant and can be absorbed by "goals".

Changes outlined below

- Scoring
 - o Scoring will be based on a scale of 1 through 5
 - o Scoring in each category are in multiples of 5
 - o Removed the category for consistent with city goals, plans, or initiatives

The largest part of the Task Force work focused around the City's "Needs-Goals-Priorities" table, with a specific focus on high priority and priority activities. This work was also the focus of the large community outreach effort taken by the HCD office. Unfortunately, COVID-19 caused the HCD staff to

revise their outreach plan and take it entirely online. HCD staff created a targeted website to provide residents, business owners, and service providers with information regarding the consolidated planning process as well as multiple platforms to provide feedback. The website contained targeted surveys for the general public, business owners, social service providers, and past applicants and subrecipients of CDBG funding. The City highlighted the website multiple times throughout the spring and summer on their website and social media platforms. In addition, HCD staff partnered with Portland Downtown, the Chamber of Commerce, and Social Service provider networks to spread the word and encourage participation. At the time of survey close there were 477 responses. The Task Force took this data to inform their decisions on rearranging high priority and priority activities. The final rankings are below.

[INSERT NEW NEEDS GOALS PRIORITY TABLE]

COUNCIL CONSIDERATIONS THROUGHOUT THE 5 YEAR PLAN

- Community policing should be absorbed into the budget
- Black Lives Matter Movement
- Health Crisis Response
- New Homeless Service Center